

SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION
Minutes of the Virtual Meeting
December 22, 2021

1. Call to Order 6:30pm

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Freeman

Roll Call: Secretary Spaulding

Present: Dickey, Pulvirenti, Kokkonen, Brown, Curley

County Alternate: Mullen

County Ex Officio: Carr

City of Sonoma: Barnett

Excused: Kiser, Vella, Truesdale, Cornwall

Absent: Felder, Bramfitt

Present: First District Director for Supervisor Gorin, Arielle Kubu-Jones

Chair Freeman: Chat and Q&A turned off to avoid violation of Brown Act & any Public Comments made outside of Public Comment time.

2. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of October 27 and November 17, 2021

Commissioner Pulvirenti moved to approve Minutes of October 27 and November 17, 2021. Commissioner Brown seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment limited to 2 minutes (Items not on agenda)

None. Public Comment closed.

4. [File Number: PLP19-0048](#)

Applicant Name: Stephen Pasquan Owner Name: Same

Site Address: 654 Walnut Ave., Sonoma APN: 052-413-015

Zoning: R1 B6 5 DU, X

Project Description: Request for Use permit and Design Review with Hearing for five 2-bedroom cottage housing units, ranging from 895 square feet to 900 square feet, with 108 square feet of private outdoor space, served by public water and sewer, located on a .32-acre parcel.

Michael Pasquan & Irvin Klein, presenters

Irvin Klein, synopsis: parcel is slightly larger than those nearby- a double lot; an opportunity to work w/ new Sonoma County housing Policy. Two bdrm. units most desirable; 800-900 sq. ft. optimum size. Project will vary – single & two story. Outdoor space belongs to apartments in front, plus additional communal outdoor space. Goal to provide opportunity for varied uses, e.g. families w/ children; secure environment provided for all. Important for owners to have well landscaped, lush, green areas. This project putting in more plants at beginning, to create a mature look. Located close to Arnold Dr., close to public transport. Quiet neighborhoods, mix of

single family plus apartments. Working residents can commute, good connections. Referred commissioners to submitted Plans for further info.

Michael Pasquan, added that all parking has been designed to be on site/within property lines, including guest & handicapped. No on-street parking needed to satisfy requirements.

Chair Freeman called for Commissioners' Questions.

Commissioner Pulvirenti, drove through property/neighborhood; encouraged by plans for multiple units, not bigger mansions. Will one unit be identified as affordable, or all market rate rent? Michael, no affordable unit. Due to being under 10 unit limit, all will be market rate. Family oriented, double income, reasonable rate for neighborhood. Current Sonoma building climate very expensive. Commissioner Pulvirenti, has the applicant reached out to neighbors? Michael, yes. Met w/ several neighbors; hesitant to have 5 more units. Established neighbors; would rather see one McMansion w/ one car, than multitude of families. New project in center of block, 6/7 houses nearby all single family. Twelve units & apartment complex also nearby. Would like to build many more such projects, depending on neighborhoods' acceptance.

Secretary Spaulding, is applicant considering solar, w/ couple south facing roofs? Michael, yes, in process where possible to provide for common area lighting, security. Each unit separately metered. Not feasible for individual units. Irvin Klein, Design Review process requires a completed design; better to have an evolution. As project/design continues, could change roof angles for more solar potential. Long ways to go to permit process completion. Welcome comments.

Ex Officio Carr, inquired how many units possible if not going through Use Permit process? Are 3 allowed? Michael, identified under Sonoma General Plan rezoned as R2, could be high as six. With existing zoning it's one plus AU, Additional Unit.

Commissioner Mullen, doesn't CA mandate all new buildings have solar? How is applicant not providing for each unit? Irvin, yes, new houses required for solar but only 8 panels required; not necessary they be on each building. Might be exemptions for Cottage Houses. Could be one array rather than individual roofs. Still researching/consulting. Commissioner Mullen, Cottages aren't single dwellings, even if sold as such? Irvin, not sold individually. Michael, this is not a condo development; applicant is building & keeping, then rented as cottages.

Commissioner Brown, inquired re anticipated range of rental costs? Was this calculated? Michael, don't know. Market changes on daily basis. Recession anticipated; market for rentals may be lower; at an all-time high now. Another year to completion, market may be lower. Family owns several hundred rentals. Purpose not to load up w/ debt & maximize market. In business for sixty years. Pay for construction projects w/ cash, lease to good families who stay long term. Successful MO so far.

Vice Chair Dickey, is the parking covered? Irvin, ADA parking will be covered; pergola over

entrance will extend to cover. Vice Chair Dickey, full garages or car ports? Irvin, full garages. Vice Chair Dickey, plus storage? Irvin, longer than regular garage, space in back for tall storage. Vice Chair Dickey, is parking hardscape? Irvin, will be permeable, gravel. Vice Chair Dickey, how will garages & roofs drain water? Irvin, eventually into creek; majority contained in a retention pond being developed by Civil Engineer, can also soak into ground. Vice Chair Dickey, site has space for parking, ingress/egress, plus pond? Irvin, yes. Vice Chair Dickey, Zoned X, which means cannot be vacation rentals. Is that correct? Irvin, absolutely. Michael, family never does VRs. Vice Chair Dickey, on site laundry facilities? Irvin, stacked laundry in each apartment, utility room. Vice Chair Dickey, fencing? Irvin, site fenced all around outside, probably metal, allows for growing landscaping in. Units fenced separately from parking area, gated. Vice Chair Dickey, natural gas for heating, cooking? Electric? Michael, under current gas emissions CA standards require more electric, plus car charging. Opted to use mini split systems, inverter type 33 Systems. Hot water-tankless, drier-gas, kitchen-electric. Vice Chair Dickey, water recycling/gray water? Michael, engineer proposed retention pond for site groundwater, plus separate holding tank for gutter water to repurpose/water plants. Vice Chair Dickey, no gray water? Michael, correct, no internal/gray water, only roof water.

Secretary Spaulding, re landscaping, can applicant consider including more native plants? Description as “lush” not appropriate for area; suggested inclusion of more drought tolerant/natives. Irvin, thank you, will select drought tolerant. Meant more *abundant* than *lush*.

Commissioner Curley, asked for clarification on site plan re roof for ADA parking. Irvin, potential for adjustment, extension, pergola over the main gate. Have menu of components to satisfy requirements. Commissioner Curley, re solar, 4 garage roofs good potential, but would trees at back lot block/shade? Irvin, one large tree removed; trees going to be new, no roof shading. Commissioner Curley, commented use of 2.5 baths is nice but unusual. Irvin, it’s a design Michael likes.

Commissioner Mullen, has applicant built other similar sites in Sonoma? Michael, no, first here & first foray into Cottages; in business of San Francisco apartment buildings.

Chair Freeman, agreed w/ recommendation for more native plants to be included. Involved w/ another project, meadow in 8 acres, committed to native landscaping.

Chair Freeman called for Public Comment
None. Public Comment closed.

Chair Freeman called for Commissioners’ Comments

Secretary Spaulding, appreciated appealing presentation. Encouraged use of more energy efficiency; improve/upgrade landscaping w/ natives. Visited neighborhood, somewhat dense; but terrific concept, supports proposal.

Commissioner Mullen, also favorable to concept; similar to Spain St. i.e. small houses on small

parcel. Re electricity, vast majority of electricity in CA comes from natural gas. Already have brown outs; concerned about going totally electric w/ push for electric cars.

Commissioner Brown, a tidy project. Applicants gave clear/candid, thorough answers; not in Sonoma - are in SF, Kentfield, Marin County. Appreciates parking planned for on-site rather than on-street & still allow for open space on lot. Will be a welcome addition to community when complete.

Chair Freeman, just showed his client a newly remodeled 728 sq. ft. home in Springs - small spaces can be efficient; community wants this option. A few issues to tighten up but supportive of this approach; provides level of housing that is lacking. Good there is an ADA unit.

Chair Freeman called for a Motion.

Secretary Spaulding made a Motion to recommend approval w/ two concerns: energy consumption & landscaping. Commissioner Brown Seconded w/ request for more specific language re native/drought tolerant plants. Secretary Spaulding, the landscape consultant will be familiar w/ area & should have satisfactory experience. Motion confirmed.

Chair Freeman called for raised hand Vote.

Aye, All

Nay, None

Unanimous approval.

Chair Freeman thanked applicants.

5. Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Ad Hoc formation

Consider appointing Ad Hoc to focus on the SDC Specific Plan, as presented at Nov 17th Special meeting.

Chair Freeman invited Vice Chair Dickey to lead discussion.

Vice Chair Dickey, requested new Ad Hoc due to size & unpredictable aspects of SDC project. Opportunity to collect info, collate, public forum for /discussion & questions. Sonoma City Council waiting for North Sonoma Valley MAC to create & deliver letter to Supervisor Gorin. She requested letter that describes community's vision. City Council wants to support letter when complete. Perhaps SVCAC could express support or not. Important project, need all options available to respond in organized manner. Current focus on collection & dissemination of information.

Chair Freeman, problem in terms of timing of letter to Supervisor Gorin - SVCAC won't be meeting prior, but the longer term perspective - expect project will be brought back to SVCAC when EIR is done. Question if it will be modified prior. Good reason to have the Ad Hoc in place so as to be prepared.

Commissioner Kokkonen, appreciates idea for Ad Hoc. Re goals - would this be opportunity for community input for 4th option? If so, would Ad Hoc be able to deliver on expectations? What

is output and effect?

Vice Chair Dickey, the SVCAC is a public forum for public comment. So Ad Hoc would collect info, provide to SVCAC. If there is a community letter of support, SVCAC would have info for informed discussion of possibilities.

County Ex-Officio Carr, Ad Hoc a good idea; key point is to do detailed/in depth research, similar to Winery Event Guidelines process. Due to Brown Act, Ad Hoc not represent itself as Commission, unless Commission takes a position. Ad Hoc returns w/ report, asks SVCAC to carry from there. Would be worthwhile to set Ad Hoc in place throughout entire process, ongoing. Will be a benefit as long as committee members are clear they are not wearing SVCAC hat.

City of Sonoma Ex-Officio Barnett, agreed w/ Carr's points, Ad Hoc remain in place throughout process. Re letter of support to Sup Gorin - BoS making decision on preferred Alternative at Jan 25th meeting; next meeting of SVCAC Jan 26th. Unless there is a special meeting, or give Ad Hoc power to join letter, unclear if timing can work.

Arielle Kubu-Jones, the City Council & MAC have different positions from SVCAC since SVCAC will have an Action item & vote in official county process. Re: signing on to the letter - will check w/ County Counsel. Supervisor Gorin can ask for feedback, but need to be careful since SVCAC has recommendation powers in cycle. Could call a Special Meeting.

Commissioner Pulvirenti, at Nov 17th Special meeting of three Commissions/Councils - SVCAC gave feedback then that all 3 Alternatives were rebuffed. That info should have been given to BoS.

Chair Freeman, likes idea of long-term Ad Hoc. Unfortunate letter is happening now, would be unable to comment. But November 17th Meeting w/ 150 constituents expressed concerns. Supportive of creating Ad Hoc, but timing of letter is problematic.

Ex-Officio Carr, clarified that Jan 25th meeting of BoS will not be choosing a preferred Alternative - going to select project used in project description section of EIR. Expects County Counsel will be there, advising to not vote in a way that would be construed as approval. BoS not committing to any Alternative till after EIR. If they did, things would end up in court. Important for SVCAC & MACs to weigh in ongoing - January decision not ultimate. Urging Supervisor not to indicate any Alternative - not a new one, not one more in line w/ community, nor one favoring State. Legal process requires EIR first. May be an opportunity for SVCAC to comment along w/ Councils, or hold special meeting, but more important to comment individually, be well prepared at workshops, after draft EIR is released. SVCAC will have bigger meeting for actual vote on alternatives, before hearing process at Planning Commission & BoS. A long way to go. Newspapers, public testimony have been misled about the approaching Jan 25th decision. Meeting will be very revealing of Staff position. Continue to be engaged, go ahead w/ Ad Hoc to research.

Chair Freeman, emphasized importance of commenting as private citizens, as well as creating an ongoing Ad Hoc.

Commissioner Pulvirenti, after the EIR is released, when does it go back to Sacramento? Ex-Officio Carr, estimated that since county is obligated to continue to respond to State's request for economic feasibility, etc. that the ongoing decision-making process will reveal options. Believes County will want & try to balance economic feasibility & community's demands. If Specific Plan is given to State & they don't like it, results are unknown. State has to make their money from surplus property; that outcome is also unpredictable.

Secretary Spaulding, requested clarification on timeframes for an Ad Hoc. Ex-Officio Carr, there are parameters. Can propose a return in 6 months for reauthorization; or could be for one year. Secretary Spaulding, wants this Ad Hoc to continue as long as needed, unsure of time constraints.

Arielle, generally Ad Hoc is one year, can be extended. If it goes on too long becomes a Standing Committee, which must be publicly noted, hold meetings, have public input.

Commissioner Brown, it's a Brown Act issue. Agreed w/ Arielle one year is cut off point, but can be reauthorized.

Chair Freeman called for a Resolution.

Commissioner Brown made a Motion to create an Ad Hoc Committee for SDC project effective today, expiring in one year. [12/22/2021-2022] Vice Chair Dickey Seconded.

Vote. All in favor. Unanimous.

Chair Freeman called for Ad Hoc members. Vice Chair Dickey volunteered. Secretary Spaulding recommended 3-4 more; will be need for research & meetings. Chair Freeman volunteered.

Vice Chair Dickey to serve as Chair.

Arielle, noted Commission's light attendance tonight. Made note to set Item for next agenda. Secretary Spaulding will volunteer if needed.

6. Reports from MAC Liaisons

North Valley MAC, Vice Chair Dickey, met last week. Report from Gary H of Permit Sonoma re Vacation Rentals. Also, review of long Minutes & discussion re SDC from Nov 17th. Special meeting scheduled for Jan 5th w/ only topic - letter generated by SDC Ah Hoc for MAC.

Commissioner Brown, no liaison for Springs MAC. Suggested take volunteers & rotate?

Important to have Springs MAC liaison. She could do every other or every 3rd month.

Vice Chair Dickey, yes, very important. Can do it later in the year.

Arielle, Springs MAC/SVCAC liaison is in By Laws as being a ceded voting member, would need to amend By Laws to allow for rotation.

Vice Chair Dickey, can it be done informally?

Arielle, will bring up to Karina & Chair of Springs MAC. Recommended liaison be someone from Springs. Four Springs/El Verano residents on SVCAC

Secretary Spaulding suggested a Springs MAC member visit w/ report to SVCAC.

Arielle, will bring ideas forward. Also, Springs MAC moved their meeting date to first

Wednesdays to improve availability.

7. Consideration of Future Agenda Items

Chair Freeman:

- a cultivation site on Lovell Valley Rd - not ready yet.
- Springs Specific Plan EIR - not scheduled yet, no certain timeline.
- SDC - summer 2022.

Vice Chair Dickey, inquired how to approach Permit Sonoma w/ a subject of concern discussed at recent MAC meeting. Hannah Boys Center proposing site redevelopment. Combination of SDC, Hannah, hotel, affordable housing at Hwy 12/El Verano, senior citizens affordable housing project - now generating a lot of development activity. Worthwhile to have a report on sum total/cumulative nature/scale of this web of relationships.

Secretary Spaulding, agreed.

Chair Freeman, agreed, who to approach? Supervisor Gorin? But Re Hannah, their Board has been in discussion on senior housing idea for at least 5 years.

Commissioner Pulvirenti, assumes that Permit Sonoma would have a list of all current projects in all phases? Another project is Hwy 12 at Siesta Way senior housing. Also, request by Golf Course to double their membership which will impact that Arnold Dr. area/traffic.

Ex-Officio Carr, identified Permit Sonoma as the agency to contact. Brian Oh/Planning Division, or Dept. Director, or Tennis. Concerned that their reply will be that they would like to know too. General Plan Update been put on hold due to lack of staff, other priorities. Housing Element which is driving developments like tonight's presentation, plus SDC, Springs Plan. The other projects Commissioners' just listed pale in comparison to SDC & Springs Plan potential impacts. Even Brian would not have all data necessary re traffic, visuals, noise, other community impacts. He recommends patience. As a resident he understands concerns – wait how long? Issue comes up in Winery Ordinance debate, other various projects, re e.g. Vehicle Miles Travelled, procedures/protocols not being implemented by County. Finds this very frustrating. Important processes needed but not in place. Ok to ask Permit Sonoma – important questions. Chair Freeman, yes, but still need to move in that direction.

Ex-Officio Carr, agreed, recommended contacting Supervisor Gorin/staff, Tennis Wicks, express concern about cumulative impacts of individual projects in Valley.

Vice Chair Dickey, concerned about impacts of sum total of many projects but also concerned about what is happening as public confidence in bodies such as SVCAC is being slowly eroded. The Public Forum provides opportunities for questions to be asked, answers need to be provided. The Public can weigh into the Commission to inform & be sure any/all projects are noticed, e.g. the Lighthouse Church project off El Verano Ave. bordering City of Sonoma. Report would be like *a State of Sonoma Valley Development Report*.

Chair Freeman, will confer w/ Arielle re contacting/inviting speakers.

Chair Freeman, as 2021 comes to a close, expressed appreciation for Commission Members' work & support. Acknowledged strong collaboration of Secretary Spaulding & Vice Chair Dickey.

Election to be held first meeting in January.

8. Adjournment 7:54

SVCAC Dec 22, 2021 meeting you tube

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89gdwpcfZMIM>

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Board of Supervisors' Office located at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-A1, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours.

A **Receive** item indicates that the item is informational and the Commission will take no action.

A **Resolution** item indicates that the Commission will vote on a recommendation to the decision making body (e.g. Sonoma County Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Adjustments, City of Sonoma Planning Commission).

Consideration of proposed development projects will proceed as follows:

1. Presentation by project applicant
 2. Questions by Commissioners
 3. Questions and comments from the public
-

County: www.sonoma-county.org select Boards and Commissions | **City:** www.sonomacity.org select Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission