



Sonoma County Planning Commission Draft Minutes

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

July 1, 2021
Meeting No.: 21-05

Roll Call

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

Staff Members

Brian Oh, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Scott Hunsperger, 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: None

Commissioner Announcements

Public Comments on matters not on the Agenda: None

Items scheduled on the agenda

Planning Commission Regular Calendar

Item No.: 1
Time: 1:10 PM
File: CMO20-0003
Applicant: Mark English
Owner: Brian Gearing
Cont. from: Non-applicable
Staff: Scott Hunsperger
Env. Doc: Exempt from CEQA (Section 15305, minor alteration in land use).

Proposal: Request for a Certificate of Modification to expand the alternate building envelope on Lot 7 of "Tract 926 Fountain Grove Meadows - Phase 1" recorded in Book 498, Pages 31-36 in

Sonoma County Records, on a 6.97 acre parcel. The proposed building envelope expansion extends west.

Location: 148 Meadowcroft Way, Santa Rosa
APN: 029-070-037
District: First
Zoning: RR (Rural Residential) and B7 (Frozen Lot Size).

Commissioner Disclosures: 0h06m

Commissioner Carr drove by site but it was hard to see from a distance. I also spoke with staff about the project.

Scott Hunsperger summarized the staff report, which is incorporated herein by reference. 0h08m

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Carr asked about Building envelope brings ADU closer to PG&E lines. Was PG&E consulted about the proposal? **Staff Hunsperger** responded. 0h13m

Commissioner Carr Finding number one eludes to modification need to be approved. Could you elaborate? discussed. **Staff Hunsperger** responded. 0h15m

Commissioner Carr ADU could be built in alternative on the East side?
Staff Hunsperger responded 0h19

Commissioner Tamura asked to make four findings but the first finding was not very clear in staff report. 0h19
Staff Hunsperger responded 0h21m

County Counsel Jennifer Klein highlighted findings and new Geologic information presented. 0h21m

Commissioner Carr Summarized Counsels input 0h22m

County Counsel Klein confirmed summary is correct 0h23

Commissioner Koenigshofer Was the original approval looked at to determine what the policy was for the Note on the Map? Does the subsequent change of visual guidelines by the Board..... When this item went to PRAC to consider what Standards did PRAC use to determine recommend approval? 0h23m
Staff Hunsperger responded 0h24m

Commissioner Koenigshofer asked again for PRAC's determination for approval?
Staff Hunsperger responded 0h27m

Staff County Counsel Klein responded 0h29m

Commissioner Tamura what is the criteria for approval for PRAC? Was the assesement made based on the four findings? 0h30 m

Staff Oh responded 0h31m

Commissioner Koenigshofer Map related to the whole of the Subdivision. When an Action is taken to an individual parcel can other owners request the same for other parcel in the Subdivision. 0h33m

Staff County Counsel, Klein responded 0h34m

Commissioner Koenigshofer So if the if the file indicates that there were two reasons underlying to building envelopes one geotechnical and the other visual. visual is more subjective, perhaps, than geotechnical.

Doing know that there are changed circumstances regarding the visual interest that was being protected by the building envelope that that have changed and or that brand considered, specifically the visual part. 0h35m

County Counsel Klein responded I would defer that question to the applicant. 0h35m

Commissioner Tamura: I guess do we even need to make that finding it doesn't say that all circumstances need to change it says there are changes in circumstances which make any and all of the conditions such map no longer appropriate or necessary. So in my mind if we said that Okay, the geo tech alone as a circumstance that makes certain conditions, no longer appropriate necessary we don't also have to make the finding on visual. 0h36m

County Counsel Klein responded: I think it's important to look at both. 0h36m

Commissioner Koenigshofer: Yeah because if you look at only the geotechnical and act in a way that the technical appears to be overriding the visual. I would say that something I mean not necessarily in this because nobody's raised an issue here, but in terms of how these things are treated, that would be the caution, I would be concerned with that we not negate one condition, because they were changed circumstances in another without intentionally considering the visual part of it. 0h36m

Commissioner Tamura: So you still have that open question to Scott right. 0h37m

Staff Hunsperger responded 0h37m

Commissioner Koenigshofer: Well, I don't know that that's been touched on, yet in the presentation, so if there's an answer to that sure let's be good to know. 0h37m

Commissioner Carr: If I could job as putting my attempt to answer hand as opposed to my question at oftentimes what happens with these subdivision maps is they're they're done at a level of detail that's much less thorough with respect to each property when the subdivision map is reviewed and ultimately approve, so you have situations where a subdivision been approved with building envelopes based upon the information that was available to the to the people board supervisors or Commission at the time but later on, there are circumstances that come to the attention of the staff through an application or some other means that may change that information that was available, and I think the so The simple answer here is it's critically important that we find changes in both the visual and geotechnical information available at this time that probably wasn't available in night in the 90s and use that as the basis to make that finding if we can't do that, then I don't see how we make the point. 0h 37m

Staff Hunsperger responded 0h39m

County Counsel Klein responded through the Chair that when the applicant has an opportunity to speak, they could speak to sort of the lay of the land out there i'm looking at the aerial picture that was provided in the packet on page 14 i'm not sure which picture for one slide, that is, but these parcels have been developed and vegetation and you know plantings have grown up since the map was approved, so there may be you know factors that the applicant could provide that would give you evidence to be able to make findings related to the aspect of in addition to technical that's provided by the study, so I think I just need you need to hear from the applicant.0h39m

Public Hearing Opened: 1:41 PM

Mark English, Applicant, gave an overview of the project. 0h41m

Commissioner Carr inquired about screening for pool from driveway. 0h46m

Mark English, Applicant responded 0h47m

Commissioner Carr How tall is the vegetation in SW corner? 0h48m

Brian Gearinger, Applicant Owner presented project and current project site uses and landscape. 0h49m

Commissioner Carr proposed envelope would be visible from sites that were burned in 2017 fire. 1h1m

Brian Gearinger, Owner responded 1h2m

Commissioner Carr issue is visual from public roads could you move the ADU to NE or NW corner or trees? 1h4m

Brian Gearinger, Owner responded 1h4m

Commissioner Koenigshofer to staff to you have a topographic map? What is the view line? Is it upslope? 1h6m

Commissioner Carr responded, it is downslope. 1h8m

Commissioner Carr is it possible to plant for visual mitigation? 1h11m

Brian Gearinger, responded 1h12m

Mark English, Applicant responded to planting south of ADU have 16 feet and we can add more planting in the PG&E Easement as well. 1h13m

Public Hearing Closed, and Commission discussion Opened: 2:14 PM

Commissioner Carr commented feeling pretty good about the project with mitigation of visual impact and discussion on Finding number one. 1h15m

Commissioner Ocana I agree with Commissioner Carr have vegetation to be planted discussed. 1h16m

Commissioner Deas trees will help and the other lots will be rebuilt at some point. 1h17m

County Counsel, Jennifer Klein responded no nexus to require landscaping as a Condition. But **applicant** did volunteer to do so. 1h17m

Commissioner Tamura still stuck on Finding number 1, What are the changes in existing circumstance that make the Findings? Current Note 1h20m

County Counsel clarified. 1h21m

Commissioner Carr update geologic information update is the changed circumstance to parcel. Visual respect need for plantings comes from Fir Ridge Road because of the Fires. In a sense the Fires have changed the circumstance. 1h23m

Commissioner Tamura visual restrictions no longer necessary how? 1h25m

Commissioner Koenigshofer the new geotechnic report is enough to drive the finding primary reason to allow change is due to technical information. 1h27m

County Counsel, Jennifer Klein presented revised language in Resolution 1h27m

Commission Carr recommend approving the amended Resolution, Commission Koenigshofer seconded.

Action: **Commissioner Carr** motioned to approve the project as recommended with an amended Resolution. Seconded by **Commissioner Koenigshofer** and approved with a 5-0-0 vote. 1h42m

Appeal Deadline: 10 days

Resolution No.: 20-003

Sonoma County Planning Commission Draft Minutes

July 1, 2021

Page 5

Vote:

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

Ayes: 5

Noes: 0

Absent: 0

Abstain: 0

Hearing Closed: 2:42 PM