



County of Sonoma  
Permit & Resource Management Department

## **Sonoma County Planning Commission Draft Minutes**

Permit Sonoma  
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

January 13, 2022  
Meeting No.: 22-01

### **Roll Call**

Commissioner District 1	Cornwall
Commissioner District 3	Ocana
Commissioner District 4	Deas
Commissioner District 5	Koenigshofer
Commissioner District 2	Chair Reed

### **Staff Members**

Scott Orr, Deputy Director  
Gary Helfrich, Staff  
Chelsea Holup, Secretary  
Verne Ball, Deputy County Counsel IV

**1:00 PM** Call to order, Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance.

**Approval of Minutes** November 10, 2021 and December 9, 2021

**Correspondence**

**Board of Zoning Adjustments/Board of Supervisors Actions**

**Commissioner Announcements**

**Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda:** None

**Items scheduled on the agenda**

## **Planning Commission Regular Calendar**

Item No.:	1
Time:	1:05 PM
File:	Sonoma County Local Coastal Plan Update (PLP13-0014)
Applicant:	County of Sonoma
Owner:	Not Applicable
Cont. from:	July 26, 2021
Staff:	Gary Helfrich
Env. Doc:	The project is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as per Section 15265, Adoption of Coastal Plans and Programs. CEQA does not apply to

activities and approvals pursuant to the California Coastal Act by any local government, necessary for the preparation and adoption of a local coastal program.

**Proposal:** The State requires Sonoma County to develop and maintain a Local Coastal Program to regulate land use and protect coastal resources in compliance with the Coastal Act. The Revised Public Review Draft - June 2021 of the Local Coastal Plan Update was developed in response to public and agency comments on the Public Review Draft - 2019 and in response to changed conditions along the Sonoma County Coast since the certification of the 2001 Local Coastal Plan.

Sonoma County Planning Commission will resume the virtual public hearing opened on July 26 2021 to receive public comment and consider recommendations on the Public Review Draft of the Local Coastal Plan to the Board of Supervisors in which all interested persons are invited to attend and provide comments. The Planning Commission will review the Local Coastal Plan on an element by element basis and anticipates considering the **Cultural Resources and Land Use Elements** in this meeting. The Commission may also review revised sea level rise maps based on a 7-foot and 10-foot forecasts as directed by the Commission.

The Planning Commission will review and recommend elements of the Local Coastal Plan at subsequent meeting of this continued hearing on a monthly basis. As of the date of this agenda, future meetings are anticipated for February 3, 2022, March 3, 2022, and April 7, 2022. At the conclusion of each meeting, the Planning Commission will announce elements to be considered at the next scheduled meeting.

**APN:** Various within the Fifth District.  
**District:** All Item of County Wide Importance.  
**Zoning:** All Parcels within the Sonoma County Coastal Zone, CC (Coastal Combining District).

**Commissioner Disclosures:** None

**Gary Helfrich** summarized the staff report, which is incorporated herein by reference. **0h12m**

**Commissioner Questions:**

**Commissioner Deas** asked about compromise on sea level rise asked about a sliding scale for residential structures verses public facilities. **Staff Gary Helfrich** responded. **0h22m**

**Commissioner Cornwall** stated she agreed with Commissioner Deas approach. Discussed the idea of how long a structure lasts verses what it is built to last. Asked about the cleanup if a structure fails. **Staff Helfrich** responded. **0h24m**

**Commissioner Ocana** asked who is responsible for the environmental cleanup of a building fails? Staff Gary current owner always bears responsibility for clean up on property. **0h25m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** expected life of various structure and the life expectancy are we looking at just a specific structure on a specific site? Are we considering access to the site as well? What is the practical implication after we adopt the plan? What if it does not work in 20 years? **0h26m**

**Staff Gary** responded. We need to pick a number now in order for future development and for the Policies. Require preemptive flood. **0h28m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** how do we correlate the number we pick with the roads leading to the sites?

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded. Very different impacts from the seven-foot verses the ten-foot. Whatever sea level rise number we pick for infrastructure protection and we'll have to make a decision, if we identify roads that have no prospects for managed retreat and are not going to be usable for access. But to get there, we need to know which number we're working with to map and identify those areas because it'll there's very different impacts. The seven-foot rise doesn't really affect that many residential properties, the ten-foot rise effects, quite a few I mean is a dramatic increase in how many roads and access points we're going to lose at 10 feet based on a certain sea level rise that may be a reason to restrict future development in certain areas. **0h30m**

**Commissioner Koengishofer** asked the achievement of the seven-foot total or the ten-foot total is projected to be what date? **0h30m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded the Coastal Commission did not want a date chosen. Based on a 100-year projection. We know it will rise we don't how much it will rise. **0h33m**

**Commissioner Cornwall** stated it's useful one of the major uncertainties is the speed at which humanity as a whole, reduces emissions, so, in some ways, choosing one of these numbers is in some ways affected by our sense of optimism or pessimism about you know, will the emissions trajectory really change or will it probably just keep going up. **0h32m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked about the model of the difference between the two sea level rise predictions in the next 20 years? **Staff Gary Helfrich** responded very little will change in the next 5 or 10 years. We do have the models and could get that information from NOAA (National Weather Service). **0h32m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked how does the question of which of these two models seven or 10 or 20 year estimate how does it translate into regulatory basically law and restrictions? How do we deal with that, how do we deal with something that's in the immediate horizon, what are we going to tell them? **0h34m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** part of that is a policy decision for this commission to make. The Zoning Code could take a more nuanced approach. But we need a starting point to develop future policies. **0h34m**

**Commissioner Reed** asked is there any reason we could not pick both? **0h36m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded technically no. Staff can prepare both but it will be a lot of work. **0h36m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated it will be the driving force for implementing the Zoning Code. I agree with Reed we should be informed by both options. **0h37m**

**Commissioner Cornwall** stated we should be conservative with infrastructure and should use the higher levels. Residential houses stand for much longer than what they are built to stand. I would rather go with the higher number. I don't think were precluding any existing structures. **0h39m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated looking at map of 10-foot projection as a practical matter for State Park asked about future access by road? **0h43m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** by adopting this map that also allows us to create policy that would identify this road alignments being critical for coastal access getting it in the plan and therefore not having to basically, fight ourselves on our policy for protection of Russia River is that we make the findings that public access to this area overrides the small impact to coastal resources and we build into the plan, the alternative road alignment so when the time comes to build the road that's in there as its own policy and the road can just be built. That's the whole point of going through this is to identify those needs, and the opportunities and make the findings now for the necessity of building that road. **0h44m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked if we adopt the 10 foot then it would fold in other sites along the coast?

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded yes it would allow us to work with the Coastal Commission on other sites but still need to weigh in the public access. We would identify a policy that would allow an exception to build a road along that line. **0h46m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked about other sites on coasts and facilities. Should we plan the retreat now?  
0h47m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded yes that is the point of what we are asking now. 0h47m

**Commissioner Eric Koenigshofer** asked where does it show up we adopt a map, I want to know what language comes back and says Doran park is going to be abandoned Spud Point is going to be underwater the sewage treatment plant is no longer reliably operational and what are the options does that show up in the LCP somewhere or do we just wait for that to appear somewhere else it's not really pertinent stuff? 0h47m

**Counsel Verne Ball** stated, I can suggest that you're talking about two different maps, with seven and ten foot. And it may be beneficial to come back with an index of the policies that are implicated by the different maps and or options to use one or both in order to better understand the textual implications. In addition, that there's a huge amount of uncertainty and some of this, I mean if you were you were talking about scenarios that are likely, in which you know entire cities on this planet are going underwater so we're dealing with sort of concrete issues here but, the future may involve legal changes that we can anticipate right now and crises that we were foreseeing but and need to plan for, but what I'm hearing from the Commission might benefit from a kind of a legalistic index of here is everything where this is discussed, and this is what these triggers mean, because i'm hearing that you would like potentially to have information about both of these you know maps to be in seven and ten that's it on their own they're just informational and a disclosure matter, but the legal triggers are independent of the maps themselves. 0h49m

**Commissioner Ocana** I think it is best to error on side of caution and use the more conservative map. I am in favor of the 10-foot map. Can we take a straw vote? 0h50m

**Staff Gary Helfrich responded** staff is asking for direction from the Commission. It would be beneficial for staff if we could bring back policy recommendations based on the sea level rise chosen. 0h52m

**Commissioner Ocana** stated a 10-foot is my preference. 0h53m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** I do not have a preference. 0h54 m

**Commissioner Deas** stated agrees with the 10-foot map but still leery of lumping all structures and public facilities together. 0h57m

**Commissioner Reed** 10-foot is more conservative I agree with that proposal. 0h57m

**Staff Gary** responded thank you. 0h58m

#### **Cultural and Historic Resources Element**

**Staff Gary Helfrich gave update and overview** 1h0m

**Commissioner Ocana** disclosure I had a conversation about the cultural and resources element with Alegria de La Cruz who's the director of our new Sonoma County Office of Equity. To briefly describe what the Local Coastal Plan was and where we're moving towards incorporation with the Tribes and emphasizing the importance of sovereignty and inclusion in development going forward. I had a couple of questions related to the plan, but the first item that I wanted to kind of bring to Mr Balls' attention and see if perhaps he could assist me with is my understanding is that in order for the Office of Equity to really participate in a plan with the planning Commission that they need to be requested or asked, and so what I would like to do is request that the Office have a chance or be directed to review the section of cultural and historic resources and perhaps provide some input before the Local Coastal Plan has been finalized, and I hope that i'm saying that appropriately. 1h19m

**County Counsel Verne Ball** responded that's more of an administrative question than a legal question I would direct Brian Oh to respond to that it is the only issue there is that they would be subject to the same confidentiality restrictions as the rest of the of the county and that would be part of it.

**Staff Brian Oh** responded anything that we can do to ensure a robust presentation of the final draft within our county confines absolutely will look into that and see how we can make that happen. **1h04m**

**Commissioner Ocana** stated that the Coastal Commission made a reference to Sonoma State North West Informational Center questioning if they have the knowledge or ability to contribute to the Draft? Is there a direct pathway for them to work with county? **1h3m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded and explained NW Information Center's role in research and land development. They are informational research facility. Staff recommends putting in the description so it is clear who they are. **1h4m**

**Commissioner Ocana** asked how is staff going to elaborate on the Tribal input based on the Coastal Commission comments? **1h6m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded we have not received any comments from the Tribes on the recent LCP Draft. **1h6m**

**County Counsel Verne Ball** stated it is confidential. It is an ongoing discussion we can't reveal the communication between Tribes and the County. We can generalize outcomes. The outcome has not been reached yet. **1h09m**

**Commissioner Ocana** asked can we site this to the Coastal Commission? And if I could just comment on that I guess where I was going with that comment is more, how are we going, how can we satisfy the Coastal Commission's thoughts about elaborating on the Tribal input, can we put a line in there that says they are deeply involved or there is a lot of communication going on, I don't think we need to reference that it's confidential just that that we are in constant communication with them. **1h8m**

**County Counsel Verne Ball** responded I didn't see anything in their request in the record that required us to reveal confidential information, and we would, if it did, we would have to say no, but going to your comment, yes, I think we can include I mean they wanted some information on the background of the different Tribes and in the information of a general nature, about the relationship between the County Government and the Tribal Governments would not be inappropriate to include. **1h8m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** we all expressed interest and desire for the Tribes to be involved we just want to ensure this has been done and we are not making a decision without their input. Can we be assured outreach was done and received? If there were areas of issue could we at least be told of that aspect? We want to make sure the Tribe has been consulted. **1h11m**

**Commissioner Ocana** could we ask the office of equity to meet with the Tribes as a third party? **1h11m**

**Commissioner Ocana** I wonder if that wouldn't be the perfect opportunity to bring in the Office of Equity, because they are a third party, even though they are part of some county government, but they would be a third group that could be party to perhaps the confidentiality of those communications and then be able to somewhat report back to the Commission, just to let us know that they've been satisfied? **1h11m**

**Verne Ball** in general terms process cannot conclude until the process with the Tribe concludes. The outcome would be conveyed to the Commission we cannot move forward without it. **1h14m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked if any Tribes in Marin County have been consulted? **1h15m**

**County Counsel Verne Ball** stated we can't reveal any individual consultation information. Gary Helfrich did provide us with a list of the Tribes that was consulted. **1h15m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded we use the list from the NAHC (Native American Heritage Commission) **1h17m**

**Commissioner Cornwall** stated my conclusion is that they don't feel like we are a group that they need to talk

with that's their prerogative. 1h15m

**Commissioner Questions:**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** can we split the discussion into Cultural and Historic? 1h16m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded we could. 1h16m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated we have Historic Districts, we have all kinds of specific references to historic features that are distinct and not conjoined with cultural resources, so I don't really know where the difficulty is and distinguishing between the two. Gave example of Valley Ford structures historical but not cultural. 1h17m

**Commissioner Ocana** So that's my understanding is that's a very different terminology that they're not indigenous structures and they're not cultural structures, because culturally, yes, they have enormous significance to the people that came out here when they created those kind of homesteads, and so I agree that perhaps there could be a separation, but I think we have to be cautious about saying If you want to separate indigenous from other historical things and that's one thing, but I don't think that we could use the word cultural does that really encompasses all different cultures from all different time periods. 1h18m

**Commission Reed** stated there is a historic inventory of structures. 1h19m

**Commissioner Reed** I'd like to note that included in Appendix J is the historic resources inventory, which seemed to catalog all the historic structures which seems to coincide with the historic resources versus cultural, so I don't know if that's enough separation that there's a clear distinction, I wonder how up to date, this list is, and if it gets updated and certainly is your policy suggestions, just so it could be some sea level rise issues with a lot of these historic structures. 1h19m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** there is an array of historic interest sites that don't call for consultation with Tribes. 1h20m

**Commissioner Ocana** I think that's a very interesting point and I if we were to perhaps make a subsection that would be historical resources that do require consultation with Tribes with the overall, general cultural and within the overall, general cultural and historic resources and perhaps staff could provide some understanding to us, of whether or not, that would be feasible or if it would be better to have two separate elements. 1h20m

**Staff Gary** responded what is the advantage to having the separation? The purpose of document is to carry out the provisions of the Coastal Act. 1h23m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** Cultural and Historical Resources I was expected to read two different sections. Suggested a Non-Tribal section like historic preservation, expanded tools. I would like to see more treatment for that. 1h25m

**Staff Gary Helfrich:** The county historic resources policy applies everywhere it doesn't apply just inland so those structures are protected, regardless of whether or not there is something, both in the General Plan and in Coastal Plan regardless whether it's duplicated into documents that still exists, and the comment, I just wanted to make is we have a lot of elements that have the connective phrase at the top and when we get to Open Space and Resource Conservation it's going to be pretty tough to separate those two from each other. 1h26m

**Commissioner Reed** I'm hearing Commissioner Koenigshofer concern, and I agree that you know the appendix is the only thing that we have that refers to the historic resources inventory but if you go through that it's very detailed and it does include barn structures and things that are on private and public property, but what's not clear in the Policy is how you know, maybe some overview of those resources and how the county thinks about them and what the responsibility is for the county versus what you know homeowners have in terms of managing those things might be just a nice overview, I think we could include it in the same policy. 1h26m

**Commissioner Ocana** add a section for cultural resources that are not Tribal resources. I agree, I think, an additional objective right under one point to highlight all of the historical and cultural resources that are not native I could really add more depth to the to the element, and I think that might cover what Commissioner Koenigshofer is getting at which I agree there is an enormous amount of cultural resources that are not necessarily highlighted. **1h27m**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** so bifurcating objective 1.2 and then elaborating on the Historic resources and specifying giving some background and specifying the attachment would satisfy this, or is there more that needs to be done? **1h30m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** responded this would satisfy my request. **1h31m**

**Gary** responded we could have a program to consider new areas for consideration of historic designation. It would need to go to the Landmarks Commission. **1h32m**

**Commissioner Cornwall** stated concerned about time need to leave by 4:00 pm **1h33m**

**Public Hearing Opened: 2:33 PM**

**Kimberly Burr**  
**Beth Bruzzone**  
**Eric Fraser**  
**Carol Sklenicka**  
**Laura Morgan**  
**Lisa Dundee**

**Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: 2:47 PM**

**County Counsel Verne Ball** NW Information Center does have some reports that they do not disclose. No land owner is precluded from doing their own research. Could contact NW Information Center and or hire an Archeologist or work with Tribes. Some cultural resources are not archeological in nature. **1h46m**

**Break 2:47 pm**

**Land Use Element:**

**Gary Helfrich** summarized the staff report, which is incorporated herein by reference. **1h55m**

**Gary Helfrich** requested input for the new general provision section that was provided in the Memo. Also the inline edits from the CC to include. **2h01m**

**Gary Helfrich:** We also establish specific requirements for coastal development permit to make it clear that every activity. That is not on the excluded activities that sounds kind of funny, but there is an attachment to the land use element that is the exclusion orders that the county has received from the coastal Commission over the years, this is not new we're not adding anything to it, these have always been excluded activities but make it clear that everything else does require a coastal development permit. One recommendation from the Commission is to that we don't have this right now allow an exclusion in very limited circumstances from acquiring coastal permit for small scale activities that can be found with certainty, not to have an adverse impact on resources. Because right now quite literally we've had coastal permits for somebody swapping out their propane tank because it met the definition of development, however it's important to note that even when we issue a waiver that waiver has to go to the coastal Commission and be reviewed so everything is reviewed, but all our actions are reviewed by the coastal Commission, but it does give us a way to help the property owner under streamline routine maintenance activities around their property. So, before I go to the next one, I just like to get the commission's input on the new general provisions section it's the entire text is outlined in in the staff memo. **2h2m**

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked about legal non-conforming uses? **2h1m**

**Gary Helfrich** standard is one year without use whereas the Coastal Commission allows four years. 2h2m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** seems unlikely we can make it through the entire Land Use Element today. I would like to split it up. 2h4m

**Commission Ocana** can we divide the Land Use Element into two? 2h4m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** suggested reviewing general provisions and then housing policies and then return for the other policies? Finish up with this new section and then go onto two topics that has a lot of public interest. 2h6m

**Commissioner Ocana** agreed. 2h4m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** stated vacation rentals go over policy but no new restrictions are being presented. Clarification on vacation Rentals because they're essentially isn't really any restrictions being proposed of vacation Rentals, but I wanted to go over the policies that are being proposed and allow the folks who want to comment about vacation Rentals give them an opportunity to comment on that and we've also, I think, have a good solution to the comments we've received on offshore wind support facilities as it impacts commercial fishing and Richard Charter actually has a very good policy recommendation that both the Coastal Commission staff and Permit Sonoma staff would like to recommend. 2h5m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated new development policy change of use. Primary use and change of use are major concerns of mine. We will need a lot of clarity so we have a good definition. Issue Waiver for small scale Agriculture needs to be quantified and qualified. 2h10m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded generally the Coastal Commission wants it defined major versus minor. Staff will do that. 2h12m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer:** Day time noise is listed as 7am to 10 pm. I don't think many people think 10pm as daytime and I'm wondering why that is so late, is that the state's commission's definition of what daytime is? 2h11m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded that is based on what the Commission requested. It is the same standard for the inland noise. We could change this time frame. 2h12m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** inquired about meeting individually with staff to discuss. I have 6-8 notes on every page I would like to go over this with staff before the public meeting. 2h12m

**Commissioner Ocana** I have spoken with Gary Helfrich on several occasions and he has been helpful. 2h13m

**Gary Helfrich** responded we can discuss off line as soon as this meeting is over. 2h14m

#### **Offshore Wind Support Facilities:**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** gave presentation 2h14m

**Commissioner Cornwall** asked the folks who suggested this policy are they supportive of restricting them or prohibition to just the commercial fishing area? 2h18m

**Gary Helfrich** responded the letter is in the packet you received. This is based on his recommendation. 2h18m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** asked what other kinds of facilities would be allowed? Support facilities versus transmission facilities. 2h19m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** On of the same line of what Commissioner Cornwall is asking, what kind of facilities, other than work facilities, would be allowed if at all, and if so, in what land use category? 2h20m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** we allow substations in the PF zone. We don't have any PF near the waterways.



Well, certainly, you know inverter facility is from his physical appearance would look to a lay person to be a substation so the we allow substations in the PF zone and public facilities zone. That would be kind of unusual for us to allow one type of PG&E facility and not allow a different type of facility that's essentially doing the same thing, which is processing electrical energy. 2h21m

**Commission Cornwall** inclined to support this policy. Would not close the door to onshore facilities everywhere but should be tightly regulated. 2h21m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** stated there has been incredibly strong support for protecting our commercial fishing industry and that's one of the big reasons why staff is recommending this. 2h24m

**Commissioner Ocana** asked if the other Commissioners have thought on Amendment on a County Vote? What is the ability to change this plan if circumstances do change? If we prohibit it now will it be forever prohibited? 2h26m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** the LCP be can be amended in the future. There would be more steps with adding the amendment process. 2h27m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** I prefer we include them. Listed impacts visual, fishery, shipping and onshore impacts for moving the energy. We should prevent potential onshore development in the coastal zone. 2h29m

**Gary Helfrich include in 1 A?** 2h31m

**Commissioner Reed** good discussion inclined to agree with the commissioners. I would like to hear from the public. 2h33m

**Public Comment opened 3:34 pm**

**Richard Harter**  
**Laura Morgan**  
**Cea Higgins**  
**Beth Bruzzone**

**Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: 3:40 pm**

**Commissioner Ocana** can we get a vote from the commission to include in 1A and 1B? 2h40m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** agreed for now it seems fine. 2h40m

**Vacation Rentals:**

**Staff Gary Helfrich** gave presentation 2h40m

**Commissioner Cornwall** Coastal Act came before the explosion of Vacation Rentals. What can we do to protect the coast from the impacts of vacation Rentals and their impacts to roads and safety? 2h43m

**Staff Gary** responded lodging is seen as an integral part of coastal access and certainly is when you remember that the coast is available to all people, not just people who live in coastal areas and low cost lodging is actually extremely important. The situation in Sonoma county is most lodging in the coast is provided and has been historically provided by Vacation Rentals we really don't have a lot of what I would call traditional lodging facilities, we don't have a lot of beds available. Vacation rentals is the main way visitors can stay. Provides equitable access. Ability to restrict is based on the impact to coastal resources. 2h46m

**Commissioner Ocana** So if I could add I think this would be a great opportunity to elaborate on the cultural and historical resources, because there is something to be said about an excess of vacation Rentals in small communities that are made up of residents that live there, so, for example Duncan's Mills  
A couple other ones are escaping me, but those are very clear examples, and so I know Commissioner Koenigshofer had talked about elaborating on those kind of historical neighborhoods I think it would be

important to make sure that's very clear that an excess of a vacation Rentals would impact those communities, they would cease to become communities. 2h47m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** stated I have a huge problem with not engaging this question in the coastal zone at all. Resource protection only. We should look at workforce housing. I would like to see us press the analysis and questions to the Coastal Commission. Workforce housing is very inadequate in the coastal zone, as is affordability at all, and you know when I give this by extension the more conversion of the existing housing stock within the coastal zone that turns to vacation Rentals, the greater the possibility that you're eventually going to trigger response of having to build new housing to accommodate people that can't live and work in the in the coastal zone. Would like some way to address vacation rentals in the Coast. 2h50m

**Commissioner Ocana open to the public for comments: 2h53m**

**Public Comments 3:54 pm**

**Charles  
Laura Morgan  
Erin Casey  
Eric Fraser  
Cea Higgins  
Chris Stoessel**

**Public comment closed 4:04 pm**

**Gary Helfrich** responded HCD established income requirements. Policy has been reviewed from other jurisdictions. We have a competitive vacation rental industry on our coast lack of regular lodging makes it hard. We will review and discussion with the Coastal Commission and come back to you. 3h06m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** thanked staff for looking into this request. Camp grounds most affordable. A lot of places on coast that vacation rentals use that are not affordable in terms of workforce housing. We should explore more. Might help us decide how we would like to promote affordable housing. 3h08m

**Commissioner Reed** I think, in the spirit of moving this forward and getting a little bit more information, I like Gary's response and willingness to explore a little bit more, I did like I think it was Erin Casey's comments regarding performance standards and some look at what those might be particularly around concentration and things like that, just to begin to get my head around some of the broader issues around vacation Rentals. 3h09m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** business licensing and other revenue generating tools that might be applied. I would like us, while you're looking at the question of the coastal zone as well, whether or not any of those kinds of tools might apply and then whether or not the revenue from those the possible revenue from anything like that could be used to enhance affordability in some pockets of the coast for workforce. 3h10m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded When we're charging a fee what we spend that money on we can use for different purposes, but that license fee and that permit fee really have to go to the cost of administering those programs. Otherwise it's considered a tax, and it would have to go to a vote. 3h11m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** suggested an enhanced TOT in the Coastal Zone so the funds could be used. 3h11m

**Gary Helfrich** will look closer at Mendocino, Humboldt and San Luis Obispo. 3h12m

**Commissioner Ocana** inquired if we could you come back to the PC after doing review on the Vacation Rental Ordinance? 3h16m

**Staff Gary Helfrich** responded we can report back but would be hard to use in the Coastal Zone. The licensing program should help resolve the behavior based in neighborhoods. 3h16m

**Gary Helfrich** asked about the topic of housing and public access for next meeting? 3h16m

**Commissioner Ocana** can ask if housing is the last section in the Land use? 3h16m

**Commissioner Koenigshofer** I would prefer we pick up the Land Use Element at the next meeting it may take the entire meeting. 3h17m

**Commissioner Deas** agreed. 3h17m

**Hearing Closed: 4:20 pm**

**Minutes Approved: November 10, 2021 and December 9, 2021**

**Commissioner X** discussed. **Staff X** responded. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. **Staff X** responded. 0h0m

**Public Hearing Opened: PM**

**Ms. Y, Applicant**, gave an overview of the project. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** inquired about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** inquired about. 0h0m

**Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: PM**

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**County Counsel** clarified. 0h0m

**Action:** **Commissioner XXX** motioned to (**example:** approve the project as recommended with modified conditions). Seconded by **Commissioner XXX** and (approved) with a X-X-X vote.  
0h0m

Appeal Deadline: N/A  
Resolution No.: N/A

**Vote:**

Commissioner District 1  
Commissioner District 3  
Commissioner District 4  
Commissioner District 5  
Commissioner District 2, Chair

Ayes:  
Noes:  
Absent:

Abstain:

**Public Hearing Opened: PM**

**Ms. Y, Applicant,** gave an overview of the project. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** inquired about. 0h0m

**Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: PM**

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**County Counsel** clarified. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**County Counsel** clarified. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** commented about. 0h0m

**Commissioner X** discussed. 0h0m

**County Counsel** clarified. 0h0m

**Public Comments continued for items not on the Agenda: 0h0m**  
(List names here)

**Public commenters that want to receive future hearing notices regarding a project or topic:**  
No requests received at hearing.

**Hearing Closed: X:XX PM**

**Minutes Approved: Month Day, 2022**