

**From:** [Scott Seidman](#)  
**To:** [LandmarksCommission](#)  
**Subject:** Comments regarding Landmark Commission DRH21-0006  
**Date:** Saturday, September 4, 2021 12:26:57 PM

---

## EXTERNAL

September 4, 2021

RE: DRH21-0006

Dear Landmarks Commission members:

It is illogical to consider approval of the appearance of proposed new development before the actual development project has been analyzed.

Before any consideration of the appearance of a new development or approval by the Landmarks Commission, proposed new development should first be evaluated for consistency under the General Plan. Specifically:

- Is this proposed new use and development compliant with Policy LU-12e: "... apply the "Limited Commercial" designation only to existing uses and limit their expansion"?

Before approval by the Landmarks Commission, establishment of baseline conditions, identification of potential environmental impacts under CEQA, and evaluation of mitigations should occur. These considerations would include water, transportation, noise and others. Specifically, before considering approval of a new development's appearance:

- Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering the local groundwater table level?
- Would the production rate of preexisting wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?
- Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?
- Would the project have sufficient water supplies to serve the project and reasonably foreseeably future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
- Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, including but not limited to General Plan or a zoning ordinance adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an

environmental effect?

- Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (baseline)?
- Would the project create traffic impacts that would require mitigation?
- Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?
- Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- Would the project comply with Federal , State, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?
- Would the project substantially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, if located in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity zones?
- Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Until these and other considerations regarding a proposed new development are fully evaluated and analyzed, the Landmarks Commission should suspend any consideration regarding the appearance of a new project, lest the Commission give the public the impression it is approving this project absent these considerations. Further, all decisions for any project should reflect a consistent application of the guidelines for the Historic District.

Sincerely,

Scott Seidman

Freestone, CA

cc: Derek Michaelson, project manager, PRMD

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.