



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

June 3, 2021
Meeting No.: 21-03

Roll Call

Commissioner District 1 Carr
Commissioner District 3 Ocana
Commissioner District 4 Deas
Commissioner District 5 Davis
Commissioner District 2, Chair Tamura

Staff Members

Scott Orr, Deputy Director
Katrina Braehmer, Planner
Georgia McDaniel, Planner
Chelsea Holup, Secretary
Jennifer Klein, Chief Deputy County Counsel

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

Correspondence

Board of Zoning Adjustments/Board of Supervisors Actions

Commissioner Announcements

Commissioner Davis resigning as of today. Expressed appreciation to staff and public.
0h06m

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: ORD21-0002
Applicant: County of Sonoma
Owner: Non-applicable

Cont. from: Non-applicable
Staff: Katrina Braehmer
Env. Doc: Exempt from CEQA (Section 21080.17 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15282(h) of the CEQA Guidelines)

Proposal: Consideration of amendments to Sonoma County Code Chapter 26 (Zoning Code) to update the County's Accessory Dwelling Unit and Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinances in compliance with state law. These amendments would apply to unincorporated areas countywide, excluding the Coastal Zone which is subject to Chapter 26C (Coastal Zoning Code).

Location: Various
APN: Various
District: All
Zoning: Various

Commissioner Disclosures: Commissioner Davis live in an area where there is a Z overlay and have had conversations regarding this. **0h7m**

Katrina Braehmer summarized the staff report, which is incorporated herein by reference. **0h8m**

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Carr asked about number of ADU/JDU'S approved to date and where in the County?
Staff Bellucci responded. **0h19m**

Commissioner Carr does the septic system have to be upgraded with a proposed ADU?
Staff Braehmer responded. **21h0m**

Commissioner Carr ground water class 3 and 4 areas?
Staff Braehmer responded. **0h22m**

Commissioner Carr conversion can we impose a maximum size since the State did not? Ag land restrict under Williams Act? **Staff Braehmer.** **0h24m**

County Counsel Shaw responded **0h024m**

County Counsel Klein responded **0h26m**

Staff Orr responded **0h27m**

Commissioner Davis asked about garage conversions some areas require covered parking. Z overlay recent removal and requesting staff look at what remains and consider removal. **0h28m**

Staff Braehmer responded. **0h29m**

Staff Bellucci responded. **0h31m**

Commissioner Carr LAFCO sewer extension allowed outside of urban boundaries not an easy issue to deal with. **0h33m**

Public Hearing Opened: 1:34 PM

Charles Lachman

Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: 1:36 PM

Staff responded to public comment 0h37m

Action: **Commissioner Davis** motioned to approve the project as recommended with proposed changes. Seconded by **Commissioner Deas** and approved with a 5-0-0 vote. **0h 40m**
Appeal Deadline: Non-applicable
Resolution No.: 20-002

Vote:

Commissioner District 1 Carr
Commissioner District 3 Ocana
Commissioner District 4 Deas
Commissioner District 5 Davis
Commissioner District 2, Chair Tamura

Ayes: 5
Noes: 0
Absent: 0
Abstain: 0

Item No.: 2
Time: 1:50 PM
File: ORD16-0001
Applicant: County of Sonoma
Owner: Non-applicable
Cont. from: Non-applicable
Staff: Georgia McDaniel
Env. Doc: Exempt from CEQA (Section 15308 and 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines)

Proposal: Consideration of amendments to the County Code, Chapter 26, adding standards for new winery visitor serving uses on lands zoned Land Intensive Agriculture, Land Extensive Agriculture, and Diverse Agriculture, outside of the coastal zone.

Location: Various
APN: Various
District: All
Zoning: Various

Commissioner Disclosures: Commissioner Ocana Commissioner Deas Commissioner Carr Commissioner Davis Commissioner Tamura **0h50**

Georgia McDaniel summarized the staff report, which is incorporated herein by reference. **0h51m**

Hannah Spencer summarized overview of Winery Events Ordinance **0h59m**

Georgia McDaniel summarized General Plan and Zoning, Environmental Determination, Citizens Advisory Groups and approved guidelines, permitting process overview. **1h5m**

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Carr asked about permitting process confusion for SVCAC recommendation should go before staff report. Is there a proposed change? **Staff Orr** responded. 1h11m

Commissioner Carr will the recommend guidelines from SVCAC come to the PC or go straight to the Board of Supervisors? **Staff Oh** responded. 1h17m

Commissioner Carr Are the same definitions used across the board for all Advisory Committees? **Staff Spencer** responded. 1h18m

Commissioner Carr discussed stand alone tasting room still subject to winery standards?. **Staff Spencer** responded. 1h20m

Commissioner Carr asked about a vineyard next to a winery how would they hold events? **Staff Orr** responded. 1h21m

Staff McDaniel also responded 1h22m

Commissioner Ocana discussed will this set a precedence for other Ag Events such as Cannabis? **Staff Orr** responded. 1h23m

Commissioner Carr allow for Ag Events but do not allow any other Events. What is the intention? No longer any weddings or commercial events? Except by Zoning Permits?

Staff Spencer responded 1h25m

Commissioner Ocana: Flowchart appears every single event would go to BZA for approval? Or can staff waive that process and allow events to go forward? 1h28m

Staff Spencer respond 1h28m

Commissioner Davis clarify part of winery use permit allows them to hold events. 1h30m

Commissioner Ocana Grandfather wineries? 1h31

Staff Orr responded 1h31pm

Commissioner Tamura current Ordinance would not apply to already approved Use Permits? 1h33m

Staff Orr responded 1h33m

Commissioner Deas enforcement what are the options? Locally sourced food? 1h36m

Staff Spencer responded Enforcement is complaint-based Code Enforcement receives complaint and will work with Winery and Owner to ensure Conditions of Approval are met. Can be brought back to BZA for consideration of revoking the Use Permit. 1h38m

Staff McDaniel responded 1h39m

Public Hearing Opened: 2:40 PM

Bruce Riezenman
Jim CAO of Trinity Winery
Wendy Krupnick

Padi Selwyn
Tom Conlon
Kathy Pons
Nick Frey
Marc Bommersbach
David at Zo Wines
Erica Stancliff
Kim Wallace
Mike Martini
Vicky Farrow
Michael Haney
Roger Peters
Deb Preston
Rickey Standcliff

Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: 3:20 PM

Commissioner Carr commented about the CEQA new definitions would it open up to increased uses on previously approved Use Permits? **2h20m**

County Counsel Klein responded **2h21m**

Staff Orr responded **2h22m**

Staff Oh responded **2h24m**

Commissioner Carr commented on confusion approved Use Permit. Winery owners may feel like they have a grandfather rights. Some may and some may not. Staff will work with owners to discuss what grandfather rights they may have. **2h26m**

Commissioner Tamura confirmed. **2h28m**

County Counsel Klein clarified. **2h28m**

Commissioner Carr the Board may formalize the process. **2h29m**

Commissioner Tamura seeking clarification of what the Board directed. **2h30m**

Staff Oh responded **2h30m**

Commissioner Davis How many new winery applications have we processed in the last 10 years or last few years? **2h33m**

Staff Spencer responded **2h35pm**

Staff Orr responded **2h42m**

Commissioner Carr So no one with a current Use Permit will get an automatic change. **2h44min**

Commissioner Davis Event spaces in Ag land should apply for K Zoning. I don't support having events on Ag land. Increase in tourism effects our infrastructure which the community subsidizes. Tasting rooms appropriate, but industry wide events and parties should not be entitled. Environmental review concerned about reviews. Parcels should be able to support processing abilities.
2h44m

Commissioner Carr standards proposed are pretty consistent. The Events have always been the issue. Workshop scale of the event is the issue. Definitions lack this. Sonoma Valley had a good approach over 30 people it is defined as an event. Would like more defining of what can be done. Best practices sheet Industry came up with a few years back would like to see that adopted in this Ordinance. Wine Trade meetings should be stopped at 5pm. We should consider no permanent structures for events. I do not agree with out door amplification. Minimum parcel size I disagree with county wide. Will lobby for 20 acre minimum in Sonoma Valley. 18 foot road width should be a fire standard already. Propose fire safety red flag warning should close all events. 2h51m

Commissioner Deas Biggest concern function is for clarity but listening to public and Commission it does not seem clear enough. Protect small producers minimum parcel size should be handled at the Use Permit level. Ok for Pick up parties, dinner parties. We need to strike balance but the Ordinance does not achieve clarity. 3h0m

Commissioner Tamura I agree clarity is not in the Ordinance. I wouldn't recommend approval of this. But not sure how to avoid staff gong back to the beginning. 3h02m

Commissioner Carr offering some highlights for staff. Or take straw votes. Would like a party to be defined or define an event. Event is at a scheduled time and place. 3h05m

Staff Orr responded 3h08m

County Counsel Klein asked for business hours verses after hours?

Commissioner Carr objected to wine trade meetings after 5 pm. 3h11 m

Staff Orr asked for clarification on intent and direction. 3h12m

Commissioner Davis Winery Events and Parties as the same thing? 3h14m

Commissioner Carr responded 35 or more is an Event. 3h14m

Commissioner Ocana work off total capacity per each winery instead of group size. We should have a broader definition of what a party is. 3h14m

Commissioner Ocana concerned about picking a number. 3h18m

Commissioner Tamura did we get direction from the Board of Supervisor for clear county wide definitions? What did the Board say? 3h20m

Staff Oh responded 3h20m

County Counsel Klein responded 3h22m

Commissioner Carr Definitions should be for the entire county but Standards could be different depending on the area. 3h24m

Commissioner Tamura Focus just on definitions. 3h26m

Commissioner Carr recommend Staff go review Sonoma Valley CAC definitions and come back with revised definitions and standards. 3h27m

Staff Orr seeking clarification for staff direction. 3h28

Commissioner Carr: One step at a time do definitions first. The Board did require definitions be the same for each area. **3h30m**

Commissioner Carr recommend to bring back the item with definitions with a Time Certain **Commissioner Deas** Seconded.

Staff Orr would want additional notice for this project. Confident we could bring back sooner if it was limited to definitions. Table for Sonoma Valley and Dry Creek and Staff approach to harmonize on one page. **3h32m**

Action: **Commissioner Carr** motioned for Staff to return with updated definitions at a Time Certain. Seconded by **Commissioner Dias** and approved with 5-0-0 vote. **3h35m**

Appeal Deadline: Non- Applicable

Resolution No.: Non- Applicable

Vote:

Commissioner District 1 Carr	Aye
Commissioner District 3 Ocana	Aye
Commissioner District 4 Deas	Aye
Commissioner District 5 Davis	Aye
Commissioner District 2, Chair Tamura	Aye

Ayes: 5

Noes: 0

Absent: 0

Abstain: 0

Hearing Closed: 4:35 PM