



City of Sebastopol
Incorporated 1902
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF December 14, 2021

PLANNING COMMISSION:

The notice of the meeting was posted on December 9, 2021.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Fritz called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. and read a procedural statement.
2. **ROLL CALL:**
 - Present:** Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Oetinger, and Commissioners Burnes, Fernandez, and Kelley
 - Absent:** Commissioner Douch (excused)
 - Staff:** Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
John Jay, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 12, 2021

Vice Chair Oetinger moved to approve the minutes as presented.

Commissioner Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Oetinger, and Commissioners Burnes and Kelley
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioner Fernandez
ABSENT: Commissioner Douch

4. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** None.

5. **STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** None.

6. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- A. **Calder Creek Naturalization Project** – The Consultant/Fellow, WRI, will present design options for discussion and input.

Director Svanstrom presented the staff report.

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation, presented and was available for questions.

Chair Fritz asked for Commission questions.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

Is there any possibility or design that makes sense that would save all the trees, or is that not attainable in trying to set up a sustainable creek?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

I think the Updated Charrette is the most certain in terms of being able to preserve the most trees. I think that it does actually preserve all of the trees in concept right now. There are issues because the grading will impact the roots and because by moving the channel out of its current alignment, the way you deal with the void the old channel leaves that, could impact the roots as well; that's a consideration with all of them. I think that Stable Planform 1 has a fighting chance of being able to preserve the redwood trees similarly. As we go through here, on the Constrained Creek one the first batch of redwoods can be preserved, the second batch I think get too impacted by the floodplain of the channel and the grading.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

On the Stable Planform you mentioned the events area that could be graded. Would it have extra runoff water or absorb some of that? What effects do you think that would have downstream, or what does that create?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

I don't really think of it as creating more runoff per se. In this scenario the lawn will run off some water, but you have this vegetated buffer that is being created by the restoration and that's going to mitigate a lot of any impact from that, and the lawn itself is permeable. In your typical lowest flow storm or smaller storm event it's going to still absorb water. In a higher storm it might be more likely to run off. You're going to get more sheet flow off of it, but that would be true of any kind of landscape area in a really severe storm event.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

Maybe runoff wasn't the proper term. Is it going to absorb generally more water and keep maybe farther downstream from flooding? Does it create help with all of that? I'm just looking to see what the effect of that is.

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

Superficially speaking, I don't know that it creates more or less benefit, because you're not increasing paving and you're not necessarily decreasing paving. In all these scenarios the amount of paving is about the same. The ball field itself is a permeable surface, so removing the ball field doesn't necessarily reduce runoff.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

With drought conditions we have been under and the potential for more drought to come, with some of the fields that you have, and the rose gardens, and some of the planting, is it possible to have an element to this where there could be some rainwater capture to use for irrigation to maintain some of this beautiful landscaping that is there?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

That is a definite option. If you could work with some of the existing topography and existing paved areas to do some storm water capture that would definitely be something you could do. Also, I think it's really important to have a landscape that is low water using.

If you're taking on any of these scenarios there's a certain amount of re-landscaping that would be inherent to the work and that could really focus on the water-using plants outside of the riparian zone.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I was looking at the larger lawns that obviously take a lot of water to maintain, so would that be out of your scope, looking at rainwater capture for this?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

I could certainly recommend some areas for capture. I'm probably not going to be designing at this level. The roofs around the pool building and where there are roofs, just being able to have rainwater capture systems in place around that would be examples of things I could identify.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Just because we have a master plan for the park that shows the Willow Street and Jewell Avenue end of the creek capped, did you give that any thought or consideration, and in particular if you did or if it were capped, is it possible then to change some of the grade issues that require the modulation of the creek as it winds its way downhill?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

Our involvement in this really came from the desire of folks to think about restoring and protecting the stream, and capping it would be working in a different direction from that, so that was never a consideration for what we were doing. Basically, if it were capped the amount of stream that would be left open, we would be applying similar kinds of processes to it, so it would still need to have a ratio of 1.3 for stream length. It would just be a shorter overall length that we would be doing that within. There would still be a lot of the same issues; it would just be those issues for a smaller segment of the park.

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

One of the issues capping would create is permit issues. I have about 25 years into the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the regional boards don't want to write permits for capping creeks at this time in our history; they want to see restoration projects. The other barrier to capping is trying to attract grant funds. We have a number of state grant programs that we typically use for these kinds of projects, but the guidelines written into these state programs are for restoration of the natural resources, public access, interpretive signage, that kind of thing. We wanted to not create institutional and funding barriers.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

I mainly wanted to bring this up because it was in the master plan, and now we have it on the record that you have answered that question and the considerations that are in place.

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

The other thing that struck me in terms of the difference between these plans and the master plan is the master plan seems to take out all the redwoods and this plan goes over backwards to try to save redwoods, and what we were hearing from a number of community members is that redwoods were very important to them, so that is another part of this story.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Was analysis done of the amount of shading that will be lost with any of these plans?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

We haven't done a shade analysis. I would say that there is possibly going to be a temporary impact with grading, and I think some of the effort to preserve the redwoods shows that there are ways to work around the existing trees and that's something that we would definitely endeavor to do, but once you have the riparian corridor in place you're going to have more shade, because those trees that are supported by the stream and that are important for the stream's health will be increasing the amount of shade you have.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

I don't know a lot about redwoods and how much water they actually use. Are they deep rooted? I know that I have planted them on my property up in Mendocino County trying to create a little circular area for shade, and I'm surprised that after irrigating them for ten years that they're thriving in a very hot area off of Cobolo Road, so I don't know why they're doing so well. I know some people consider them trash trees because they're very difficult in a built-up environment with respect to how far from buildings and how big they get, that kind of thing. Just for my information, I know we want to save trees, but also what's an issue with the redwoods?

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

I think you might be a little worried about would this design sustain a water-loving tree like redwoods. The redwoods are maybe not typically native to Sebastopol; however, they do inherently occupy the floodplains and the tops of terraces of streams; that's where they like to live. What we're trying to do is, if possible, create some floodplain area for them, which are where you would find them in a state park up near Mendocino or Humboldt Counties, or even up in our local redwood park. We're going to see if we can create that sort of floodplain and terrace environment where redwoods can thrive, but the fact that they're located near a creek means they probably have a pretty good water supply, so I'm not too worried about their sustainability.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Any of these options are so inspiring to imagine what could happen to Ives Park, so it's super exciting. I'm so happy we have this opportunity with you guys, because any of these would be so much better than what is there. Jessica, you did talk a little bit about the void in the oak with the old channels. How are some ways that you deal with that? Do you have to take out all the concrete and fill it in? How exactly does that all work? What is that process?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

That's something we need to explore more in depth. There might be some partial fill, but the roots are currently established where they are. They get oxygen through the relationship they have to the soil and how permeable that soil is, and so when you cover those roots it's like you're starting the roots out and so they will die and then you lose that root and we all know that that has impacts. There's a certain amount of impact that the tree can handle, and part of what we have to evaluate is how much of that system is being impacted by everything that's happening with the restoration design. The City works with an arborist, Becky Duckles, and she's wonderful and has been very helpful and informative with giving us some baseline information about the redwoods there that relates to this. We think that moving forward there will probably need to be some more careful study to really drill into it—not the tree, but the issue.

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

Your question may be broader than that. What happens to that whole channel in any of these designs is after we've got a completely designed project and it's permitted and you're

going into construction, crews come in and demolish the concrete and they carry it away, and then you have excavators re-grade the channel to the right dimensions and the length, so the old environment just gets removed, including the fencing, and a new creek gets graded. The regulatory agencies require a cofferdam where the creek has to be put in a pipe during construction so you don't mess up the water quality, and so you basically take away what you see there now and you replace it with a very different cross section and natural environment.

Paul Fritz, Chair

In your Updated Charrette option you say the stream length is on target for stability. Does that mean that you think you can reach the appropriate 1.3 ratio with that scheme?

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

Yes.

Paul Fritz, Chair

This is a general question going back to Kathy's question about the master plan. When we met with you earlier you talked about grant money available to do this restoration work. If you go to something like the Stable Planform option, which is a completely different park, how does the grant money work in terms of this is grant money for the creek restoration, but obviously there are a whole bunch of other aspects of the park that it hits upon? How is that grant defined and how do we get other grants to supplement that to be able to do the rest of the work? Obviously, if you do something as extreme as the stable plan form you want to be able to do the rest of it too. We can't just do the stable plan form and leave the rest of it in a who knows what state at that point, so could you talk a little bit about that process?

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

I've raised funding for a lot of these projects. Typically you combine several state agency grant programs; they're very user-friendly. A program like the California Natural Resources Agency's River Parkways program is very open-ended about what they fund. They fund creek restoration, flood plain restoration, bridges, paths and trails, and interpretive aspects. Over in the city of San Pablo they helped fund a complete redevelopment of a baseball field area. Some local governments do look at redevelopment monies, although that's been less available in recent years. The Coastal Conservancy will fund a very broad range of features that are contained here. My guess is if I was giving you an assignment to do fundraising for this I would call in the Coastal Conservancy and the California Natural Resources Agency as two good partners to try to make something like this happen, thinking of the whole park, not just pieces of it.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Then, Kari, obviously any of these schemes completely transform the master plan, so what is the process for dealing with that? If we say we want to go ahead with stable plan form, how do we then revisit the master plan and make that adjustment so they conform to each other?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

The current Ives Park master plan, I know it's about eight years old, was adopted by Council, so any changes to it would need to be approved by Council. The process I would recommend, because any of these, even the Constrained Creek, because it doesn't cap the creek, whatever the Planning Commission is recommending, and if there's a first, second, third choice, that might also be helpful, bring that to the City Council for a check-in; if we can do it in January that would be great. I'll work with Jessica and Riley to get that

scheduled and make sure that Council is accepting about whatever direction the Planning Commission is interested in recommending and pursuing. Then we do know that there will be other details that need to be fleshed out in terms of any other adjustments to the master plan, and Council is aware of that. I did discuss that this creek design and naturalization project would likely result in some changes and updates to the master plan, and to me it made sense since you can't just put the creek anywhere, as Jessica explained. There are certain aspects it wants to be, and obviously the pool is already built, but looking at the creek would help inform the changes to the master plan, so let's work on this project first. I think with this meeting, and then going to Council with whatever the Planning Commission recommends pursuing, and certainly Jessica has done a good job of trying to make sure some of those other elements are in here, but if there needs to be a little bit more of any update to the master plan after that we can work on that as staff and the Commission.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I appreciate, Jessica, you incorporating all of the elements that were in the master plan. I think you've done a good job of capturing all the various pieces in each of these schemes, so we can at least know we have the same program that we're working with if we decide to move forward on one of these and know that we can get all those pieces in; that's good to know.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

To tag on what you had said, Chair Fritz, I was wondering about the financial implications for the different scenarios as well. I appreciate that the grants are available and it's something we can do, but with these presentations do we have any type of financial differentiation, like what the Constrained Creek versus the Stable Planform would be, or is that something that comes later on down the road?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

That would typically come later. I will say you have some infrastructure around the ball fields that would have to be worked around in either scenario and you want to be careful of. I'm not sure how much that would impact that cost estimates in the different scenarios. I mentioned the sewer line crossing the creek, but there are some sewer cleanouts for a lateral, and we don't have information about where that lateral connects to the main. All of that would impact the design as well as costs, depending on how you address that.

Chair Fritz opened public comment.

Lynn Deedler, a member of the public

I have lots of comments and lots of thoughts about each of these plans, but also I feel a bit overwhelmed. This is an awful lot of information to absorb and to really think out and put all the pieces together. Are there going to be public workshops coming up where we can look at a big drawing up on a board and talk and work on one plan at a time and look at the details of that? The other thing is will there be large copies of each one of these plans that are made available to us to look at, think about, and mark up? There's the triangular island at the corner of Jewell Avenue and Willow Street. It halfway looks like they're incorporated into each of these plans, but I can't tell for sure. Are they or are they not? Runoff is calculated in a city that's highly developed with lots of road surface and rooftops, and that drains a lot more water than natural ground. How is the calculation made from the many different surfaces? Do we really need barbeques? Santa Rosa is putting in new parks with lots of benches and picnic areas at Howarth Park and they don't have barbeques. People come with preheated food or propane barbeques that seem to work fine. I look at those barbeques in Ives Park that we have and they're hardly ever used and they create a cleanup problem and an obstacle problem. For the space that they take up I always question why we

have them in these days. One thing I wanted to point out is back by the Fire Department corner where it goes onto Jewell there's a big grove of redwood trees, and that seems like something that's totally overlooked in every plan I've seen, including our current master plan. That seems like an opportunity to save just a few pine trees and make a nice, solid backdrop to a very private, interesting nook, but right now all those trees have crowded and grown together so tightly that all the lower branches don't have much leaves and you look at the Fire Department parking lot where you could be looking at a beautiful background of redwoods, and these are left out of many plans.

Josho Somine, a member of the public

My name is Josho Somine. I'm trained as a landscape architect and I'm also on the City Climate Action Committee. I appreciate all the work and research that's gone into this and all the considerations. I feel like I'm playing catch up on this whole process to a certain extent, so I'm going to raise a few issues and forgive me if they've already been addressed in your previous discussions. I'm really sympathetic to naturalization and the aspirations and ethics involved in that, but this is a pretty urban park and as such it's main user groups, aside from the summer events that bring a lot of people but happen for a pretty short time, are young children and homeless people, frankly. These populations have really different needs, obviously, but issues that come up with respect to that are safety and visibility. A naturalized stream channel tends to be noteworthy for its density and shrubbery, and if we're really talking about having these little pockets tucked in all the way along there where it's hard to see through, how those pockets might get used is not programmable for the City and in some ways goes against the concerns of safety and visibility that are inherent in this kind of urban situation. That's just one consideration. Secondly, upstream of the park a little bit west of Jewell Avenue is a longstanding hobby farm that is packed with all kinds of different livestock and with no riparian buffers. In any rain event a certain amount of manure is washing directly into the creek—this is about a block away from the park—so we really can't assume that the water quality in the creek is that good overall. I wonder if there's any consideration to something along the lines of constructed wetlands or those more intensive rainstorm water details? Finally, there's a really long stretch of the creek in what you're calling the Railroad Forest on the other side of Petaluma Road where the creek is already exposed and there's a lot more space there. In terms of flood mitigation, habitat creation, and just channel manipulation I would suggest that there's more potential over there for an ecological impact than actually in the middle of this park, however sweet the aesthetics of it could be within the park setting itself.

Joan, a member of the public

Thanks for the presentation. It's really informative and inspiring to see these possibilities. If we went with the more constrained approach and the stream length, as you're characterizing it, is less stable, what would that mean? I'm guessing that means it would need some rock or some other way of stabilizing, but I'm curious to hear from your perspectives what that would require if we did go with that more constrained approach. Then on the fully stable plan form, which personally I would love to see, I guess it's really more of a topic for the whole Planning Commission, but I wonder about the feasibility of eliminating the ball field. I'm sure that's been raised, but I'm curious to hear folks talk about that, if you think that there's any possibility of allowing the creek that extra room by eliminating the ball field that is very heavily used and dearly beloved by a portion of the population. I just want to thank you and look forward to seeing the progress.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We did have one question in the chat asking where the first bridge was on one of the scenarios. I don't know if Jessica can maybe address that when we go through the questions.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Thanks for bringing that up, Kari. Yes, let's go back to the questions, starting with Lynn's question about future opportunities for public comment or being able to get copies of the proposed plans. I know at tonight's meeting we're going to be making a recommendation to the City Council, so obviously it's going to the City Council after this, but will there be any other public comment opportunities?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes, Chair Fritz. We will be bringing the Planning Commission's recommendations and these three schemes to the City Council, but certainly I can work with Jessica to put these up on the City's website so they're available for people to download and study them more thoroughly. It will be at least month before it goes to the City Council, so there should be plenty of time to do that, and so that will be another public comment opportunity. Then of course Jessica and Riley are going to be working to further develop whichever scheme is recommended, and that will come back to the Planning Commission with additional public comment, and I think for that one we should make sure we schedule it so that we can get the drawings published ahead of time so they're in the packet and people can study them before the meeting as well. This is kind of an interactive workshop and work with the Ives Park Master Plan Subcommittee, so these are works in progress, and then of course the final design would go to City Council for approval as well, so we've got a few public meetings coming up.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Then the question about do these three plans incorporate the kind of street like how Willow Street curves around into Jewell Avenue, are these kind of the current configuration of the park?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

That's a great question and feel a little bit busted because I didn't mention that. I did make an assumption based on some of the alternatives that the City had sought input on previously. I'm not sure I'm saying this right, but Kari provided me with some potential ways of dealing with that intersection and I did bump out the park a little bit and take advantage of one of those concepts. In the beginning of the presentation I mentioned we have these zones where we're looking at the creek, and one of those zones is in that intersection, depending on different approaches to how you deal with the traffic flow there, and so we will be playing around with that a little bit more and present Kari with some ideas for that intersection that are more about the creek in relationship to that traffic flow.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

And just to clarify a little bit further, the incorporation of that bit of roadway and median is in that expert master plan. I believe it was after the master plan, but a couple of years ago at least, that W-Trans, the City's traffic consultants, did some engineering to bring some options to Council. I don't recall exactly which was recommended by Council, but all of them were viable, and so I sent that to Jessica and feel that further discussion on that intersection is valid as part of this project.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Then, Jessica, can you talk a little bit about how your water hydrology calculations take into account the non-permeable surfaces throughout town?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

The initial restoration planning that we're doing is using regional references for sizing the channel itself and thinking about things like the stream length. What does need to happen that's a little bit outside of our scope is we're going to do some preliminary hydrology, and Riley can speak to that more clearly than I can. What's really pending is a hydraulics and hydrology study, and GHD is working with the City on exactly that kind of thing, so what we're hoping is that if one of these scenarios or some version that comes out of this is seen as worth pursuing that that could be integrated into the work that GHD is doing with the flood modeling.

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

We can't do the design without hydrology, so there's kind of a chicken and egg thing here. We have gone to the Sonoma County Water Agency Flood Management Design Manual and they recommend using a multiple regression analysis that the U.S. Geological Survey has formulated, and so we're following the Sonoma County Water Agency recommendations for how to calculate the hydrology. We're also using the hydrology that was calculated by the consulting firm report for the park from a few years ago and which nicely overlaps with the U.S. Geological Survey multiple regression analysis, so we're using standard engineering practice in terms of coming up with our own hydrology estimates. We're looking forward to having those fine-tuned or confirmed by the engineering firm.

Paul Fritz, Chair

The question about the barbecues and the redwood grove, that's something I think the Commission needs to think about as we talk about the future of the park and any revisions to the master plan, so I don't think we need to discuss that right now. Then, Josho's questions about safety and security, and how brushy and how many hiding places this kind of will have, and how do you prevent that from happening? Do you have any thoughts about that?

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

Something that came up in two of our earlier presentations, and Riley has spoken to this point before as well, is you can select species in your landscape plan that provide visual access into recessed areas, so if that were to go forward definitely part of what we would be doing is thinking about the creek corridor from a surveillance standpoint, maintaining that line of sight throughout, and that would important to do. I think we all live and deal with some of these issues in urban areas and are familiar with those needs for physical security.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Any thoughts about the question regarding the little upstream farm area and issues on water quality or how to deal with that?

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

Yes. Jessica and I have met with five property owners immediately upstream and we provided them with verbal reports on what they could do to enhance our stream corridor, stop excessive erosion and deposition, which we did see upstream, and also create riparian buffer zones along the creek where people could plant dogwood willows or other riparian species that could uptake nutrients on the corridor. There's a real water treatment function of streamside trees that has been quantified, and so we're encouraging that kind of plant growth along the stream corridor. I hope to work with Lynn Deedler and/or others to set up a workshop situation where those property owners can, under our supervision, collect some plant material and actually plant it along their stream corridor; I would like to do that sometime in January.

Paul Fritz, Chair

That's exciting. We heard the comment about the Railroad Forest and that's something we talked a little bit about; it's a little bit outside the scope of what you're looking at right now. Then Joan's question about the impact of the Constrained Creek option and how can we deal with the less stability of that option?

Ann Riley, Executive Director of Waterways Restoration Institute

If we can stream the channel and the floodplain we're going to have deeper flows and higher shear stresses and there are several ways to deal with them. There are very dense plantings on the channel bank in some situations, like in the downstream portions where the channel is overly shortened because it's going into that High Street culvert, and we would want pretty dense plantings near the channel, use some rocks as ripple zones, or even small step pool configurations if we've got like a 2% or 3% slope in one area because we can't flatten it enough. We are not going to have a design that contains riprap in it, meaning rocking the sides of the channels. I was going to emphasize the use of soil bio-engineering, which is in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Natural Resources Conservation Service engineering manuals for how you bundle plants to handle certain shear stresses, and I think in our basis of design report we will be estimating those shear stresses in pounds per square foot so that we have a quantitative view of what that's going to look like.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Regarding the feasibility of eliminating the ball field, I don't know if any of us have an answer to that at this point, Joan, but that's certainly something that both the Planning Commission and the City Council, probably more the City Council, will be taking into consideration. I'm sure that will be somewhat controversial; there are people that love the ball field, but that's probably an ongoing part of this conversation. Then, Jessica, if you could talk about the question about the first bridge location. I think it was the sketch you had shown about where the sewer crossing is and adding a bridge there.

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

If you know where the sewer line is in the park presently, that's where we would be thinking about a bridge potentially.

Chair Fritz asked for Commission deliberation.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

I live up Jewell and a lot of people walk down Jewell and enter the park, and right now we walk along the stream all the way to High Street when we go into town. In the third option, which was the Stable Planform design, the stream is moved farther away from that central, main corridor. I suppose it's a bit of an alternate walk. I think right now one of the pleasant things is that when you walk through the park you walk along the water, and the first two options have that feature. It seems like if we have barbeques they should be gas barbeques, but again, since most people walk through the park along the existing trail it seems weird that you'd have your barbeques and picnic areas right along the main thoroughfare; they are currently tucked away in areas that are more private and I think that's a good idea. I don't think a rose garden is necessary; it was something that was established because people wanted one and there was a committee that worked on it, and we don't have that right now. Knowing that there is a place where someday there could be a rose garden might work, but I don't think it's an essential feature for the park. I was also concerned about water quality in the park if people are walking through it, but it occurred to me that one of the educational programs could be something where the schools routinely test the water and then learn their computer skills by posting information about the water quality, which people could see by putting their phones up to a QR code and it would give them an updated rating of the water as a way that we could all know that the water was

safe to walk through. Those were my main first takes on looking at the plan. I know that the ball field is really important to a lot of people and I'm not prepared right now to try to eliminate it. I don't know how other people on the Commission feel, but for all the reasons I've mentioned I'm leaning toward the middle plan, the Updated Charrette, because of the way it uses space in the park. In particular I like that the children's playground, again, is right along the main walkway but is protected a bit by the pool building, which means it won't be as windy there. I agree that the redwoods over the firehouse are kind of a wasted spot and right I can't see that these plans find use there, because I know it's an entrance to the park too, but maybe eventually something else could come of that, or at least the trees could be thinned somewhat.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

There's a lot to be said as far as different options and opinions as far as the ball field. We have an opportunity to create something very special that we have not had an opportunity to do before, and we have a master plan that was developed without this very critical information that we have now, and it was developed with "what if" scenarios not really knowing if we had the funding or the abilities to do it, and then it sat on the shelf. We should take this very valuable information that we have, the flow of the streams, the engineering studies, etcetera, and create a master plan around that. I feel that our current master plan is not relevant to today's information that we have, it's 8-9 years old, and to try to fit in this type of thing, whatever the opinions are, would be a mistake. There's a lot to it that we can talk about, but I think it's a great idea to have some public input and scenarios, but again, based on our starting point with the streams and what needs to be done for their health, and move forward with that. I like the Stable Planform scenario, but again, there's a lot to be considered with the ballpark, because taking that space as open space for events frees up the rest of the park, but that's getting into details. So, that's my opinion and I'm really excited about the possibilities.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

I very much agree with Commissioner Fernandez about us moving forward with this momentum. The political fight that would happen around the ball field is going to be pretty insurmountable, even though I love the openness of that particular plan. I was wondering if we could create a plan that would give us the opportunities that the Stable Planform gives us if the ballpark had to remain for another ten years or so, but then if it is relocated at some point we've already designated that area in this plan?

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I think the Commissioners did a really great job in summing up the presentation. I remember at a few meetings past we did talk about the ballpark issue, and I can't remember who brought it up, but I didn't realize how many ballparks there are in Sebastopol, and they were saying that this ballpark is already underutilized, so I'm wondering, whoever said that, if we can get an idea of what the usage is and where the pushback would be, because perhaps we can regroup and re-channel some of the usage of the baseball field to one of the other fields. I think the openness and the freedom of the creek in the Stable Planform option is a better usage of the land.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Commissioner Burnes, I believe that was a member of the public. I haven't vetted that as staff. I know some of those fields aren't necessarily public, but in terms of the usage I would think it is something that if the Commission likes the Stable Planform option we would want to outreach to the Little League folks to understand their usage of it.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I think the momentum to get into a political battle over a ball field is not worth it, so that's a realistic consideration.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

That ball field has lights that work at night until 10:00 o'clock, and I'm not sure which of the other fields could accommodate those lights, because this ball field is particularly situated that the lights don't affect very many people except if you're up on Calder; sometimes you see the lights through the trees up there and you hear the noises, which are usually joyful sounds.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I agree with a lot of what's been said. I think that the Stable Planform design is great; it really feels like a city park for everyone. It celebrates the creek, but it accommodates a lot of different functions that are in the park now, but some of the functions that are in the park now don't work really well because they were just shoehorned in over time and not really thought about holistically. I love the approach of thinking about the design of Ives Park from a holistic standpoint; it's almost like a blank slate. If we were starting from scratch, what would we do with it? I'm personally excited about the Stable Planform option. I also think that's going to be a big political battle, so Plan B for me would be the Updated Charrette option, because the goal should be to have the creek as stable as possible. I'm concerned about doing this whole exercise and ending up with a potentially not ideal creek length, and that's the whole point of this, so I'm not in favor of the Constrained Creek option. If we're going to all this effort, let's do the best we can. If we can't get as far as the Stable Planform option, then I would go with the Updated Charrette option. I would like to push this to the Council saying we should look at this Stable Planform option and open dialogue with the Little League people, which I'm sure they're not going to like, but the City Council is the entity to make that decision and they're looking at what's best for the whole community and hopefully not one group over another. Again, that's a much bigger conversation, but I personally think there's a lot to like about the Stable Planform option in so many ways. If we were making recommendations to the Council tonight I would recommend that they seriously consider this Stable Planform option with the understanding that obviously something has to be worked out with the Little League, but that ball field takes up so much room in the park for such a small number of people in our community that are able to use it. I see that this park could be such a great celebration of Sebastopol if we went with the more intense rethinking of it. We could create a place where people wanted to be, because people go to Ives Park, but they go there because it's the park that is by their house, but is it really a great, exciting, thriving place? In many ways, I would say no. We do have events there like Peacetown that draw lots of people to the park, but just think of Peacetown on that green event space, and the Stable Planform scheme would provide that much better place for that kind of event to happen. I agree with what other Commissioners have said about reaching for the highest option. At least at this point, that would be my suggestion, and if we have to dial it back because we just can't make headway about the ball field, then we know where to dial.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I'm on the exact page as you, but one of the issues we've had in Sebastopol is we've become a really aging community and it's very hard to attract young families here for financial reasons of housing. While this correction is not serving a large part of our community now, do we want to take young children into consideration with respect to how important the baseball field is? However, as I'm saying this I feel like this park would attract all these young families if we went for the Stable Planform option, because it's so much friendlier. A lot of families don't bring their children to Ives Park right now because it feels a

little uninviting. So, just a consideration of trying to attract young families into the community, while pricing of course is a whole other issue.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I appreciate that, and I can hear where you're coming from, but to use that field you have to be in Little League. Even when the charter school was downtown and they would go to the park for recess they were not allowed on the Little League field. I think I'd have a slightly different attitude towards the Little League field if other people in the community were allowed to use it.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I didn't realize that. Thank you.

Paul Fritz, Chair

If that could be a part of this conversation, if the Little League made some compromises and said when we're to using it other people could use the field, that could be a nice outcome, because right now it's very exclusive.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

I agree with that concept that if you're not using facilities you should be able to rent them to other people but still be able to maintain them through the rents to help with that process. I would love to go to the ballpark too. I think it's a real issue, but that money helps with the maintenance in our small town. Right now there's a huge part of our park that the City doesn't need to maintain, and those are things we need to look at in a practical way. But yes, I would love to have the Stable Planform. I think it is beautiful. Not being able to walk along the water on the way through town, you can always take the other path that would allow you to walk along the water. I just hate to ask our Council to jump through all those hurdles and to deal with that; I feel like public money might go another way. It seems hard to tear apart a ball field that we already have. I would rather take out some of those in the Laguna and restore those areas before I took this one out. But yes, in a dream world I'd go with the Stable Planform as well; I just don't live there right now.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

I fully agree with the comments Chair Fritz made; very well put together. If there's a way to share the ball field, that would be my thinking. The problem is they keep it in such pristine condition that any kind of events in there would tear it up; you'd have to do something like AstroTurf or something like that, which is not very Sebastopolian. But it really would open up the rest of the park, because we're trying to fit in a space for events in between trees and put stages in places that aren't really made for that and it takes away from the rest of the park. I totally support Little League and I'm not saying let's do the Stable Planform option; I think it's just something that we need to talk about. There are quite a few other options. I believe it was Lynn Deedler who did a report on all the different types of parks that we have; there are quite a few per capita. We have more than I think any other city in the County, and so again, we just want to open up conversation about that. I also agree with Chair Fritz that if we're going to do it, let's do it right, let's not constrain ourselves. The creek is really what we should be planning around, not the other way around.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I feel like this is a once in a lifetime opportunity and we're at the point where we should at least have the conversation about the ball field. Ultimately, what to do with it is going to be a City Council decision, but it sounds like the consensus of the Commissioners is that we all really like the Stable Planform option and I think we should recommend that Council take a serious look at that with the understanding that the ballpark is obviously a big issue that

we'll have to deal with, but again, we might as well start high. It's easier to start high and dial back than to start low and push it up another notch.

Evert Fernandez, Commissioner

You're right, and one other thing that's very important is we need to tie in a way for maintenance to be able to keep up this park. We are all in favor of opening space, but then we just move along without anything there to maintain it and we just expect that the same crews maintain it and somehow they're going to be taken care of, so part of this deal and structure has to be to come up with funding or a plan to be able to maintain this park, to have someone on staff that understands that part of it who could be part of the Park Commission, but that's a crucial part and should be included in our recommendation.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I know we've talked previously about the idea of having some kind of Friends of Ives Park or some kind of organization like that. If we were able to actually pull this off and do that Stable Planform and make this a really fantastic downtown urban park, we'd probably get a lot more members of the community interested in being a Friend of Ives Park, because Ives Park would be the kind of place that you'd want to be its friend. It's kind of hard to love Ives Park right now, so it may be easier to do some fundraising for ongoing maintenance and taking care of Ives Park if we could really pull something like that off.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Once the deliberations are done it may be appropriate to make a motion for a recommendation. The discussion I'm hearing tonight is if this was a blank slate and nothing was there the Stable Planform is the preferred option, with the Updated Charrette as a secondary recommendation Plan B. I can work with Jessica. We'll write the staff report and want a Planning Commission liaison or two at the City Council meeting when this goes to them to discuss taking a serious look at the Stable Planform option; it sounds like that's where the recommendation is going. I will definitely want to reach out to Little League in terms of the options and make sure they're aware of this project. They may see creek naturalization and not realize what that all entails in terms of revisions to the master plan. I also want to thank Evert for his comments on the maintenance, because I'm seeing some of this new tonight as well, so a work in progress. With respect to the Stable Planform, the one comment I would have is most of you know that I'm an avid dog person, but I would probably not want a dog park. I think it's a little small, but we also have the amazing dog park at Ragle Park just up the road, and the County maintains one. It would a huge maintenance issue that would probably be best left at the regional park that's literally across the street from City boundaries, but I would be interested to hear what Commissioners think about that. Probably when I visited Ives Park the most was when I was training my dog and getting him used to little kids and people.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I appreciate that, Kari. I kind of like the idea of having a dog park in Ives Park because it's the densest part of Sebastopol; there are a lot of people that live around there and I certainly see a lot of people walking their dogs in my neighborhood. It would be nice to have a dog park you could walk to. People in my neighborhood that do take their dogs to Ragle Park tend to drive there, so I like it for that option. I do appreciate the increased maintenance issues around having a dog park, but I'm happy to hear any other comments.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Since you're talking about that area of the park, there is an entrance to the park in that back corner as well, and if there were no ballpark there something more could be made of

that entrance coming into the park. I would certainly add that to the plan as something that should be looked at a little bit more closely eventually if there's no ballpark.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Yes, it's a little hidden. It sort of comes between the fire station and the Ceres Project building. Is that the one you're talking about, Kathy?

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Yes. I think in some plan it was intended to have wheelchair access or something, or maybe I'm confused, but some of it is a ramp and some of it is stairs. But I think more could be made of it, even now, because people don't even know it's there.

Paul Fritz, Chair

One other thing I want to throw out there is the thing I really liked in the Constrained Creek option was when you talked about downstream and cross the bridge you had the terraces down to a little beach-like area. I had a really great vision of that and I missed it in the other schemes, so I just want to throw that out that I really like that idea, having almost a little amphitheater kind of thing stepping down to the creek; I think it would be a nice feature.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Chair Fritz, one other thing regarding recommending one option and then a secondary option, I just got a note from the project manager from GHD, who is joining us on this meeting, that the scope we have with them is to assess two alternatives in terms of their hydrology, so they could look at all of those in terms of the pros and cons before we go to Council. It seems pretty clear the Constrained Creek option isn't preferred.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

The point you brought up about the exclusivity of the ball field being Little League, it seems like a couple questions need to go forward in terms of legal counsel. Do you know how long the lease is, or is it just forever? Also, what if someone did bring a lawsuit, like an ADA lawsuit or an environmental lawsuit, in terms of us not using public monies for a park property that we can't all enjoy? I think there is really something to that question that you brought forward, Chair Fritz.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I can respond to that, Chair Fritz. The lease terms are pretty flexible. It's not a forever lease; it could be terminated. Obviously, there's some good will in the fact that the Little League has invested in the field in terms of the lights, the maintenance, the fencing, etcetera, but there is a tension in the fact that others are not able to use it. I think that's all something we can phrase for the Council to consider.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Yes, and my understanding is that the Little League does all the maintenance, so we're not using City funding to maintain something that's just for the Little League, but I think that is why they exclude everyone else. As Evert mentioned, they keep it in pretty good condition and if they did allow anyone to use it and tear it up, then they have more maintenance to do. But again, that's a bigger question for the City Council to think of in terms of the highest and best use for the full community and is having a ball field there in everyone's best interest?

Chair Fritz asked the Commission for a motion.

Commissioner Fernandez made a motion to recommend to City Council Option 3, Stable Planform, as the preferred option, with a secondary choice of Option 2, Updated Charrette, and further recommend that the City Council consider revisions to the master plan in accordance with the option as it moves forward, and also consider maintenance requirements of the schemes.

Chair Fritz seconded the motion.

Chair Fritz asked for further Commission discussion. Hearing none, he called the question.

The Commission voted as follows:

AYES: Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Oetinger, and Commissioners Burnes, Fernandez, and Kelley.

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Douch.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We normally have a Planning Commission liaison for items based on the schedule. I don't know if there are any particular people who would like to join as a second, or recommending Ives Park Subcommittee as the representative. We can also talk about this later on the agenda if we need to.

Paul Fritz, Chair

That's a good idea. I think maybe, Kari, we need to know when it's going to be scheduled. If you can let us know, and then we can figure out who is available. I think having a Committee member would be a good idea, and then whatever the other liaison; I think two people is good to have there. Thank you so much, Riley and Jessica. I never thought that we would be able to do something like this, so it's very exciting. Thanks for being here.

Jessica Hall, Fellow of Switzer Foundation

Thank you for having us.

Commissioner Fernandez announced that he would be leaving meeting.

- B. Housing Element Update** – The City's Consultant, 4LEAF, will present an update on the Housing Element, including initial survey results and next steps.

Director Svanstrom presented the staff report.

Elliott Pickett, Associate Planner, and Jackie Criger, Assistant Planner, of 4LEAF, Inc., presented and were available for questions.

Chair Fritz asked for Commission questions.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

How do we know that ADUs or JADUs are affordable and what categories they would fit into? Do we have information on that? Does staff have any record? I could imagine a small ADU going for quite a lot in this town and not qualifying anyone. AB-1397 was saying that non-vacant sites may not be used again in 2023, so if we designated an already built site for housing and it didn't get used the last time, are they saying we can no longer consider that because nobody picked that site?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

First, if 4LEAF can answer regarding the safe harbor and the assumptions, I can follow up with some Sebastopol-specific information.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

There are a couple of different ways that you can assess the affordability of ADUs and JADUs and have them used in your Housing Element. One is to actually survey your residents and see what they're going for, and that in fact is what ABAG did for the Bay Area. They surveyed a large number of units throughout the Bay Area and they came up with the fact that a whole lot of units are rented for zero, because they're rented for family members, and so that takes care of the extremely low-income part of it, and the rest of them are distributed along the income. Again, this is an aggregate for the entire Bay Area and we have sent that into HCD who has tentatively said that they will accept that as a safe harbor, because that's been found by a survey for the entire Bay Area. So, we can either use that survey for a safe harbor, or you can do your own survey of rental prices for ADUs.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

When I saw the presentation from ABAG at one of my regional planning director meetings they did actually single out Napa, Sonoma, and Marin as the North Bay counties separate from other parts of the Bay Area as they were doing it, and the data definitely made sense from what I hear about some people as they're creating the units. There's certainly a portion that does intend to rent them to family members: a kid who can't afford to buy a place in town, or a grandparent, or an aging parent on limited income. I've been here through three cycles and it will be four this coming year. In addition to the salary survey, we track the types of units we're creating. Is it a 400 square foot attached garage that's being converted, or is a brand new detached 1,000 square foot ADU? And we actually have a lot of 250-350 square foot JADUs or attached ADUs that people are creating, and what they're able to rent that for if they're renting it on the open market effects what they're likely to get for rents, and it does fall in line with the percentages of what we're seeing in terms of the creation of those units. There are a few high-end units where it's clearly a detached brand new construction that's going to be an above market rate rent, and the smaller studio units at the lower end of the rent.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

So we're following along with the safe harbor concept?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes, we're following the safe harbor, and that's what I'm seeing just from reality on the ground.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

As to the other question about AB-1397 and the inability to reuse non-vacant sites that were in the last Housing Element, yes, that's what the law says. They consider those sites to be stale. If a developer didn't come after them in the last eight years, then they feel it's unlikely that they're going to in the next eight years. They technically consider a non-vacant site that was in the last Housing Element to be constrained; housing development is constrained on that site by the existing use. You can still use those sites, but you have to go through some pretty big exercises in order to prove that you have developer interest in those sites: the lease for the existing use is about ready to expire, the building is old and falling down, something like that. Even something as small as a parking lot renders a site non-vacant and you have to go through this process, so we don't want to assume right off

the top that we are going to be able to use the non-vacant sites unless we actually can demonstrate developer interest in those sites.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

But they still then are there, available for people to buy and develop even though we can't use them as our numbers?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Absolutely.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, that's the concept of putting poor people into richer neighborhoods because they do better and consciously doing that, is that what that is?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

In its very simplest terms, yes, it's about creating equal opportunities, but as far as the housing sites go, that's exactly right. They want to ensure that we're not locating all of our high-density affordable housing sites in the same area of town and in poorer areas. This is not so applicable in Sebastopol, because all of Sebastopol is a high resources expensive area.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

That's where I was going with that.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

But they do want them to be dispersed in town in all the different residential areas.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Which means most of our sites are along the highways, because that's where transportation is.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes, very common.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Does that count?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Absolutely.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

Because they're still kind of aware of those neighborhoods. That's works. Good. That's reassuring, although I can understand the other concept of building within the neighborhood rather than along the edge of it. You mentioned SB-9 and SB-10, and I'm not familiar with what those are. That was also on page four.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

The governor recently signed SB-9 and SB-10. SB-9 is a required program. SB-10 only happens if the jurisdiction adopts an ordinance allowing it to happen, so from now on SB-10 would allow up to ten units on a single-family property and you would opt in to that program. SB-9 is the urban lot splits bill. If the conditions are right and the house is located in just the right place, and its walls are in the right place, it would allow a single-family lot to be split into two and each of those parcels could have a primary unit and an accessory

dwelling unit of not more than 800 square feet, so it really allows four in existing neighborhoods.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I believe SB-10 is specific to places that have higher quality transit than the City of Sebastopol has, so I don't think we could actually opt into that; it's not applicable to us.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes, you don't have the bus headways right now to do it.

Paul Fritz, Chair

You talked about the workforce housing overlay program and commercial or light industrial. Are those the only places we're talking about doing that, or would there be other zones that that could be applicable to?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

You could do it any way you want. The beauty of this program is that it gives the City Council the ability to determine exactly what parcels are going to be appropriate for this use, so the Council would set some criteria; usually it's distance to transit or jobs and zoning district. But you don't have to do it that way; you could do it another way. It also has the benefit of a developer being able to come in, and if a site is available that isn't currently zoned for residential, they could request that the overlay be placed on the site and they could then develop it.

Paul Fritz, Chair

My other question goes back to the survey and public input. Jackie had mentioned how you guys were really happy with the survey results. It didn't seem like that many people to me, so I just wanted to know if that really is a good number for the size of Sebastopol or should we try to do something else to reach out to more people, because the number of survey respondents seems kind of paltry in my opinion; I was hoping we'd have more.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Let me give you an example. We've recently completed a housing element for a large jurisdiction in Los Angeles County, population of 220,000. Sebastopol got a better survey response. I'm not joking. And we had that survey advertised on all the buses and everything. Sebastopol's residents are very, very activated on this topic.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Good to know. My follow up would be are you going to be doing any further public outreach? What does that look like as this goes forward?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

We are. We'll be doing public outreach every step of the way; we have a whole plan for outreach. We could probably share that with the Commission if what we're planning on doing interests everyone.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I'm curious what happens. Obviously there are these public hearings, but a lot of people don't attend public hearings, so trying to reach out to where people are. We don't have to go over it right now, but I'm wondering for my own personal information.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

If you have any ideas, we'd like to hear them too.

Chair Fritz asked for additional Commission questions. Not hearing any, he opened public comment.

Kyle, a member of the public

I see in the presentation that the ADU average was based on the last three years of ADU permits. Has this group looked more historically to see if we might have actually reached our upper limit of properties feasible for ADUs at this point? To address Vice Chair Oetinger's question about cost, from my research I don't believe that a livable ADU could be built for anything less than \$200,000 to \$300,000. This back of the napkin calculation does not consider the drastic increase in across the board permitting costs that our City Council recently approved. Likely, a rezoning will be necessary. It would be my hope that this group recognizes the responsibility to make appropriate adjustments to relevant aspects of the General Plan, such as considerations of increased traffic; reducing allowable parking; a need for public transportation; concrete requirements for capital improvements, such as sidewalks, pedestrian-centric infrastructure like protected bike lanes, and pedestrian traffic signals. I can't emphasize this enough. This is not just about rezoning and calling it a day. Without clearly enforceable policies within our General Plan the ramifications of rezoning the higher densities results in a handout to outside developers to build high-density, automobile-centric housing that does not meet the needs and the expectations of our community. With the state recently removing the amount of subjective requirements that can be enforced by local jurisdictions, we will need to take many our expectations, such as those seen in our design review, and make them enforceable requirements to development by making these language changes in our General Plan, and there is no better time for this to be done than during our Housing Element update.

Chair Fritz asked for additional public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and asked for Commission deliberation.

Paul Fritz, Chair

We'll start with the issues. The first one is Issue #1: Zone or Not Rezone. I think the no rezoning sounds like it's easier to do, so that does seem preferable and obviously makes sense as we get more through the inventory analysis that determines if we have enough inventory or not. If we don't have enough inventory, then obviously we need to rezone. I have a question about the rezoning and how this would fit in. When we did our last zoning code update, we have a zoning designation of general commercial. Most of the Highway 116 corridor through town that is commercial, but it does allow residential as part of a mixed-use project, and one of my issues is that I would like to see residential allowed as 100% residential by-right and not with a use permit, so is that considered a rezoning or is that already zoned that way and we just need to change the zoning code to allow 100% residential? How does that fit into this conversation?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Good question. As long as you didn't have to rezone those sites in order to make your inventory numbers, that would be Option B, which is a rezone after inventory. That's a program to change the zoning code or to make it allowed with an overlay zone or whatever you guys want to do. That would be Option B and that is one of the things that we're recommending.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Does anyone else have any thoughts about how to move this forward? Do you generally agree with the recommendation for Option A and Option B?

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I definitely agree with Option A, No Rezone, and trying to eliminate any additional penalties. My concern is that since we know if we have a parcel and it doesn't get developed in an eight-year period it becomes non-negotiable to use again, we really want to be very careful about also rezoning and overstepping and looking forward, not having that be out of our inventory potential.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

With our current Housing Element I believe we have 120 units required and something like 220 units worth of sites on it. We didn't used to have the inability to reuse sites that didn't get developed in the past. It doesn't reward communities for having plenty of sites like we did, other than like you're scrambling to find a site that you might need to rezone. Jane, I don't know if you want to talk about the strategy or if you just want me to outline it in terms of how we're thinking about doing it, which is we have 213 units at the various incomes, and so you're right, we don't want to put any more on the official inventory that we submit to HCD than we have to, because we know that Sebastopol sites take time to develop. Small, fairly local developers develop most of our sites, and they struggle sometimes with the logistics and cost, and so it can take time. It doesn't mean they're not viable sites. Huntley Square is one in particular that a small, local developer is doing. They started in 2017 and they're going to Council in January, so it just takes time. Then the suggestion is to make sure we have enough sites that have a secondary list that we can add to that inventory as we need to. If we were doing the current Housing Element under the current regulations we'd have the 120 units on the housing inventory and we'd have that other list of sites, that other 100 units worth, on a secondary list that staff could, without having to go through Planning Commission and City Council to rezone or something, administratively add in to the inventory. Jane, does that have a secondary list?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

That's exactly right, and we'll talk about that a little bit with the No Net Loss issue discussion, and that is a program that we came up with in Southern California. We took it to HCD and said will you accept this and they said heck, yeah, we don't want to see your housing elements more than we have to, and now they're telling other jurisdictions to do it, so we think that program will work, but we didn't get there yet.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Then it will also be helpful, like in our current Housing Element we have a site where the Barlow Townhomes, used to be called Davis Townhomes, are being developed at the end of Morris Street, south of Highway 12. I believe in our Housing Element that was something around 30 units. Well, that property is in the flood plain, and I know in preliminary discussions the Commission asked about garden apartments and things like that. It ended up being 18 units. They looked at potential garden units, but you can't have that in a flood plain, you can't have lower, basement, below the flood plain units, and so it has certain site constraints that limited that. In that case we had excess sites to account for the 12 or 15 units that were in the inventory that didn't get developed, but in this case we have a secondary list where if we need more units we could find sites to put them into the housing inventory. But that's an excellent point, Commissioner Burnes; we don't want to overdo things.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Option A is my preference, but if your adequate inventory revealed that it was not adequate we'd have to go to the next step anyhow it sounds like, so I can go along with the consultant's recommendations, except I'm not saying Option B is fine with me if Option A is really meaningless from what's happening here. I think it's an okay step if we're very

careful with it. My sense is our community's wishes is they would really like a disruption as much as possible and find the right site or do it with the ADU program.

Paul Fritz, Chair

A recommendation for Option A, followed by Option B, seems to be the general consensus of the group so far, so let's go on to Issue #2, ADUs. Are there any thoughts about how to deal with accessory dwelling units?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

A quick refresher on this one. Right now the safe harbor that HCD uses is the average of the units that you produced in 2018-2020. We see here you went 10, 8, 12, so you might be working on an upswing. I don't know what your 2021 numbers look like, but if after the new changes to law your community started building significantly more ADUs then we would try to argue that you're going to be building more ADUs. Likewise, if you decide you're going to have a program to incentivize and help fund people building JADUs, because that is the least expensive way to get more units in town, then we would up that number in your inventory because you're doing more to incentivize them than you have done in the years past. It really is do we want to stick with that safe harbor or do we want to adopt some other programs? And you're not making up your mind right now, you're just telling us whether or not we should explore these things further. Do you want to just stick with the safe harbor, because we know HCD will go ahead and bless that, or do we want to adopt some programs that promote ADUs since that's what the community wants and it meets so many of the community needs, and try to claim more accessory dwelling units than HCD safe harbor?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Before the Commission deliberates on the naval reference a member of the public asked a question about do we have capacity for additional ADUs in town, and yes, we absolutely do. We had the number of the single-family homes combined with properties that we have. We've had significant interest of people developing ADUs pretty constantly in the last few years. We've had new construction where they want to do an ADU, so it's two units to begin with on some of the vacant lots. We have one in design review right now going to the Design Review Board for discussion, and we have some others. People are thinking of that from the outside, and we also have a lot of conversions of garages and things like that, so we do have a pretty constant flow in terms of the safe harbor assessment, and we do certainly have the capacity in our town for that. Jane, I don't know if you want to go a little bit into what those programs might be to entice. Some of those could be offering deed restrictions for restricted income to help assist people with that. We do have a pretty straightforward program in terms of ADUs not requiring design review, except for really specific circumstances, to expedite that process.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes, there are a large number of things that many different jurisdictions are looking at or have adopted to promote accessory dwelling units. We work with the Napa/Sonoma Accessory Dwelling Units Group who have produced a website that you can put the size and your situation into and what affordability level you want to rent at, and it will give you a tentative construction cost and your return on investment and so on. There are also jurisdictions that put their money towards hiring a developer or contractor to go out to peoples' homes and assess their ability to build a JADU, for example, because many people don't know how to get started on those. The most important thing is to make financing available, and Calhfa has just come out with a new program that will make financing available to qualified households and lower-income households that own their homes. They'll make that available at \$25,000, which is just the start-up costs to get all your plans

drawn and all your permits in place, and they bridge that gap until they get the construction loan, so lots of new stuff out there.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Thanks for the background, Jane and Kari. That's helpful, and I think it's great. I'm certainly supportive of the City doing what it can to encourage more ADUs, and I know there has been more interest and the City has some programs in place that they have been encouraging. I know professionally I'm working on several ADUs right now. I'm getting more calls on ADUs, so there does seem to be a little bit of momentum building. We're not deciding those programs right now, but I think encouraging the City to develop more programs would be super helpful. I just learned about that Calhfa funding program, so however we can help disseminate that to the community, getting that \$25,000 grant could be really helpful for a lot of people to feel that they can actually do this. And it's a grant, not a loan. They just give you \$25,000 up front to start your ADU design process.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

You're right, Chair Fritz, the issue is do we really want to explore as a community Option A?

Paul Fritz, Chair

I'm personally for Option A. I think it would be great to do what we can to push more ADUs, because I do think they fit with Sebastopol's vibe. I think a lot of people are interested in doing them and there is always a lot of pushback against big housing projects, so I'm in favor of Option A.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

I would agree with that too. I think that's the way to go.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I agree.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Linda, do you have any opposing thoughts to Option A for this issue?

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

I think it's ultimately what's going to happen anyhow. With SB-9, I know there are going to be challenges to it, either a ballot measure or whatever. I don't know where it is on that, but that means that someone could buy an empty lot, I imagine it's instituted already, and then split it and put four units on it right now, isn't that correct?

Paul Fritz, Chair

It will be as of January 1st.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

As of January 1st you could purchase a lot, do an urban lot split as long as certain criteria are met, and then put a single-family plus accessory dwelling unit of up to 800 square feet on each of the resulting two lots.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Would Option A take care of that kind of an adjustment then? We're making an assumption. It could increase the ADU numbers, right?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

It could increase the ADU numbers and it could increase just the general housing numbers, and HCD is currently coming up with their own safe assumptions for us to use for SB-9 if it survives the legal challenges.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Years ago when I was on the Council, the way neighbors communicated with each other was very simple. If there was an issue with somebody building an extension onto their house, just a bedroom and a bathroom, all that needed to happen was the window got raised so that it wasn't looking right into the neighbor's house, and it's so hard for neighbors to have those discussions anymore. It was different planners and different Building Department officials. We all want that to happen, but how do we as a city help? One of the main issues that neighbors have is privacy.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I can answer regarding the ADUs. In 2019 the state adopted new regulations saying that ADUs could be four feet from a side or rear property line as long as it's a one-story ADU. What we did to address that was you can have that, however, we adopted a regulation that if you choose to put an ADU within what would normally be the setback for the main home, which is usually about 15-25 feet for a rear yard and 5-15 feet for the side yards, depending on your lot size and your zoning, if you're within that area the windows facing the property lines need to be clerestory. The bottom of the window needs to be at 5.5 feet at a minimum, so you can still have windows and get light in and open an operable window, but it's not a privacy issue then, or if you have something that's lower than that, it needs to be permanently obscured, like a frosted window. If you want to have clear windows in places facing a garage or the neighbor doesn't care, you can do that, but you have to go through the design review process where the Planning Department notifies the adjoining neighbors and they can comment on it. That's how we've handled that for ADUs, Linda. The City does not have that for a single-family home, although single-family homes usually have greater setbacks in the zoning. I have worked in communities where additions to single-family homes have design review. I don't think Sebastopol has the appetite or desire to go there, but that's how we've dealt with the smaller setbacks that are allowed by state for the ADU.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Yes, I know it's a delicate issue, and the state just decided we'll help you not have everyone whine, we'll just make the rules, and so like I said, we'll see if SB-9 survives or not. I'm fine with the recommendation of Option A.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Issue #3, No Net Loss.

Elliott Pickett, Associate Planner, 4LEAF, Inc.

We already started talking about this with the rezoning, so you can just continue your conversation about the B list where you were.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

We actually recommend that we're both conservative with our development capacity assumptions, and that addresses such things as the project in the flood zone that Kari talked about a little bit ago and how it was an inventory for 30 units and it ended developing at 18 units because the site was physically constrained. You can't put livable area below the base flood elevation; it's just the law. A more conservative development capacity assumption would consider that as well as the need for parking onsite and all those other kinds of things. We would suggest you both use conservative development assumptions and that you do this administrative B list of sites. This addresses most of the

things that we talked about a little bit ago. If the City has it's A list of sites and these are the ones that they need to meet their inventory and that they put in the inventory, we don't want to add more sites to that inventory unless we have to, because if we add more sites and then we can't use them, we want to save something for the next time, so we have a back pocket B list of sites that are already zoned for housing; this doesn't work if you have to rezone. You would have a back pocket B list of sites that are already zoned for housing that you can administratively take out and add to inventory, because that inventory is a demonstration to the state that you have adequate sites with appropriate zoning to meet your RHNA and to meet that RHNA throughout the Housing Element period, so it's become a dynamic inventory and we're suggesting that you treat it that way.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Any thoughts from the Commission on these recommendations for Options B and C?

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I feel like we covered both of these.

Paul Fritz, Chair

It sounds like Options B and C are good to go. Issue #4, Non-Unit Housing Objectives.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

We're required to list the quantified objectives, which are the amount of homes that the City expects to construct, rehabilitate, and keep from converting to market rate within the next eight years, so that's something that we will be doing and it needs to be at the RHNA or above. You can say you want to do more; there's no penalty. The only reporting requirement on those regular quantified objectives is in the next Housing Element where you have to go back and assess how well you did in reaching them. What this policy option asks is in addition to the quantified objectives for units that are statutorily required, does the City also want to set these objectives for themselves to do so many beds of homeless housing, or so many safe parking pads, or so many things that HCD and the census don't count as actual units but that fulfill some of your very real housing needs? A little more responsibility in reporting on it once a year, and the same thing with the next Housing Element, but I think it best reflects what Sebastopol is about.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

If you don't do some of those objectives, are you then not in compliance with your Housing Element?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

No, there's no obligation. It's simply stating an objective. You do have to assess how you're doing with your RHNA, so this assessment only comes up during your annual report and then when you do the next Housing Element.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

For those of you who have been through a General Plan process, it would be similar to setting goals where you want to consider adopting certain policies or doing certain things. We've been very proactive as a city in terms of limiting non-hosted vacation rentals, because it's not consistent with our Housing Element's goal of preserving existing housing stock for permanent residents. That's the type of policy that I'm assuming you're talking about in this section, Jane.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

As staff, I don't think we have an issue with the additional reporting. We are doing that right now on all of these various policies with their status reporting to the state every year anyway.

Paul Fritz, Chair

At what point do we decide on what these non-unit housing objectives are? Do you bring them back to the Planning Commission at some point and say these are the non-housing objectives we think you should consider, and then we say yes, we want to do this one and this one, or we don't want to do this one? Is that how that's going to work?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes, exactly. You would tell us to explore it.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

And if you have input on those as a Commission you can give that to staff either individually and we'll get to the Housing Element through John and the 4LEAF team, or in an open, public meeting like this as well.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Any issues with this recommendation to go with Option B, Include Non-Unit Housing Objectives?

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

No.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I suspect that our Council, which recently approved a RV safe parking site for short term would want to include these types of things in what we're telling the state and doing as a community.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Issue #5, Consideration of Potential New Programs.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

This isn't really an issue, we're just being wide open here and saying there are all kinds of programs that you could adopt that would help you have adequate sites without going through a rezoning process. You could do a zoning code amendment that says you can have attached residential units on church sites. You could do a density bonus program that says once you meet the state density bonus program, if you also do things like 100% permeable pavement we'll give you another two units, or whatever it is to incentivize the things that you actually want to see. Probably the most out of the box thing here is the density unit equivalence to incentivize units that are affordable by design. That has been adopted by at least one other Sonoma County jurisdiction, but it hasn't been effective because the impact fees were not changed to also be like the three for one kind of thing. But this is a program that you could use to allow tiny homes that meet the requirements, if there's a big push for tiny homes out there, and you could also do micro-units in there. The census data showed us there is some need in Sebastopol for housing for smaller households, so it's something you could consider. You could consider limiting the area where it's at. All we're asking for you to do is tell us if there's any of this stuff that's just a non-starter, you don't even want to talk about it, you don't want us to spend any time on it.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Jane, just so you and some of the other Commissioners who aren't intimately familiar with all the small details of our zoning ordinance know, we already allow studio units, and I forget the size, smaller than a certain size; they count as .5 of a unit.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Beautiful, you're already doing it.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We already do that incentivizing; that's the Huntley Square project actually where it's ten units. They would be allowed seven, but with the small units they're able to do a couple of extra units. The cottage development is something when you look at the co-housing programs and things like that that the Commission had the lecture series on at the start of this year, some of those things. If there is a way to encourage the more grass root housing, some of those end up being like a real co-housing where it's a family around a big farmhouse and then you have really small units without kitchens. That type of thing is potentially compatible with the ethos of Sebastopol.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Do any Commissioners have anything on this list that is a non-starter for anybody?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Or other ideas that you'd like to see us explore.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I'm happy to throw out some other ideas too, but I want to start with your question of any non-starters. For me, I don't see any non-starters here, but I'm wondering if other Commissioners see anything that they don't like.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I don't see any non-starters.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I know we do this a little bit, but I like the example you give for the density unit equivalence; I think that's a really interesting concept and something that could be useful, but I see how the impact fees would have to be tailored to match that, and we have revised our impact fees structure a bit already based more on a square footage basis, so we do have some alignment there.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes, we already give a discount for small units. I will note one thing on the density bonus program, because we do have one project that is potentially going to use density bonus, not for the number of units but for some of the other concessions. It's a really difficult program to understand for neighbors of the project and maybe some folks in the community. You buy a house or condo and you have an assumption of what's going to go on next door, and then all of a sudden the number of units is double what you think it is going to be; it can be a little bit shocking for people. I will say that Sebastopol already has a pretty high base density for multiple-family zones at 29 units per acre. For instance, the Woodmark project on Bodega, the 84 units, that is 28 units per acre, and we have heard a lot about they're basically taking out every tree on the site and how do they work with the site at that density? So, there are some downsides to that to be aware of in terms of what people's expectations are when they looked at the zoning ordinance, which is a density bonus that is a whole bunch of extra stuff that they weren't expecting necessarily.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

And the state program itself is very complex, so adding a City program on top of it could be more confusing. On the other hand, this is a good way for the City to require the things that they want out of a program that you no longer have discretionary review authority over, so incentivize the things that you want by telling them they'll get a density bonus. You don't have to add more concessions. It's crazy how many concessions they already have to have.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

The state has already doubled that.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I think it could be a useful program, like you said, Jane, to get something we want out of it. We talk a lot about universal design, affordability, and accessibility and things like that, and I think those are all really good examples of we get something. Yes, we get more units, which is not a bad thing, but we also get something else out of it. I like the workforce housing overlay; I guess it's sort of related. A workforce housing or affordable housing overlay that allows just affordable housing by right in certain zoning districts is something worth looking at. I know there are a lot of ways the state is making it easier to do affordable housing by right anyway with things like SB-35 and other state regulations, but I think looking at an affordable housing overlay zone would help affordable housing developers. I've worked on plenty of affordable housing projects where it's a five-year entitlement process and those are draining and expensive. It's hard to build affordable housing anyway, and then going through five years of entitlements just adds more to the cost, so anything we can do to streamline that kind of thing I would be in favor of. I'm also a big fan of *Missing Middle Housing*; I've got the book sitting right here on my desk and they have a lot of great ideas. I know it would be very controversial in a lot of ways, but what they talk about in *Missing Middle Housing* is specifying the form that you want, how big of a structure you want, and not focusing so much on the density, because density can be very misleading. We all get very caught up in a density number because we're afraid high numbers mean more units, but you can have a well-designed, small scale, multi-family building that has a lot of units in it that if you knew what the density was, you'd be outraged. I'm going to throw out a quick personal example. I've been trying to get my own little two-unit development in town that would essentially be a house and an ADU, one on top of the other, they're both about 600 square feet. It's on a very tiny little lot. If I'm successful in doing this, and I know the City doesn't count designation differently for smaller units, but if you look at two units on a 1,400 square foot lot the density is about 62 units an acre, so that would just blow anyone's mind in Sebastopol if I told them I was doing 62 units an acre, but I'm only doing two units on a little lot. I think there are ways to talk about some of these things, and I know our zoning code is based on density, but I personally am interested in looking at other ways of regulating some of this stuff that doesn't get us so caught up in this density number, because I think just because of this density number we take a lot of development opportunity away from sites that could be developed very contextually and very nicely. That's something I'd like to throw out there for consideration.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Cottage housing development encouraging those, I heard you say a little form based. Give them the cubic size that they can do and let them worry about how many units are in there, whatever the average single-family home is in the neighborhood to get that much?

Paul Fritz, Chair

Yes, and again, *Missing Middle Housing* talks about you give a maximum building width and depth; that's what we're really concerned about. We don't want these giant apartment complexes in a single-family neighborhood. I've pointed out these examples before, but there's a building at the corner of Vine and Calder Avenues that looks like a single-family house and there are four units in there, and it's in a single-family residential zone. Building it today would never be allowed, but it's there and it's fine.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Get me the address, because ABAG is hiring a photographer to go out and take pictures of *Missing Middle Housing* that actually exists.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I can give you the address, Jane, so you can take a look at it. And again, that has maybe an 18-inch setback from the back of the sidewalk. It has no setback, it's four units, it's so many things that are not allowed with this, but it fits in the neighborhood and it's fine; it's an old house, it's been there forever. I just want to look at things like that. I would also be happy to have a duplex on any single-family's lot in Sebastopol. I don't see any reason why any single property in Sebastopol couldn't have a duplex on it, and I'm not talking about a house and an ADU, I'm talking about two 1,200 square foot, three-bedroom, side-by-side, upstairs/downstairs. It's a very traditional housing type you see in a lot of very old, traditional neighborhoods, but we don't do that here. I was actually looking at our zoning code, and Sebastopol doesn't have any like poor neighborhoods, there's no like ghetto in Sebastopol, but if you look at our zoning map all of our multi-family housing is in, again, I wouldn't say the poor neighborhoods, but I will they're the poorer neighborhoods. We don't see any multi-family housing in Swain Woods or off of Valentine Avenue or Covert Lane, those areas that are newer and nicer. We put all the multi-family housing in closer-in neighborhoods and I think we need to spread this out a little bit. It's an equity issue. It's common knowledge at this point that single-family housing came out of trying to keep minorities out of neighborhoods, so I think we need to get beyond that history, especially in Sebastopol. I think it's something that fits with who we are, and if you look around Sebastopol, we're also a very white community. That's not a surprise that we are that way, because 80% of our residential land is zoned for single-families only, and that's the most expensive housing there is and a lot of minorities can't afford that type of housing, and I think we need to change that.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

I agree we need to change it, but with all due respect to that concept, the City has been trying to do that since I've been around. Down at the end of Valley View Court, when the first homes came in they put in some apartment units at the bottom. Meadowlark Drive, we got a couple units in there. Right where you come off of the end of Jewell Avenue there's a couple of houses that we got in there, but it's really hard. We've been working on trying to get developments to have inclusionary housing within their neighborhoods. It's usually at the end of the property or the last houses they build after selling all the others, but we're working on it. We just need to do more of it.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I know it's very hard to do those buildings, and even if we were to allow this by some miracle and say you can do a duplex on any lot in Sebastopol, I doubt we would get very many. I don't think it's going to be someone is going rush out to do that. I will tell you from my own experience of trying to do this little, tiny two-unit building, the margins are very tight, and it's very hard to do. Construction is very expensive right now and it's hard to make little projects pencil out, so I really have no concern that we will all of a sudden be overrun with duplexes in Sebastopol. I think if we get ten, we would be lucky. But the more

we can do to give people a variety of options the better, so any of these new programs I'm all in favor of, because we just need to throw things out there and something will fit for somebody somewhere. We definitely just need more housing.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Would you want to look at a program where we allow interior conversions of existing units for up to three units?

Paul Fritz, Chair

Personally, yes, I would. That house that has four units in it was probably a single-family house at one time and it was carved up into four units, and it looks like a single-family house. I think that's what people are concerned about, changing their neighborhoods. There's a large house on the corner of Wilton Avenue and North High Street behind Rite Aid, it looks like an old farmhouse, and it has three units in it. Any interior conversion, if you can carve it up in a way that makes sense, I'd certainly be in favor of that.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

The only thing we'd have to look at with that would be parking. Right behind Rite Aid there's also that home for seniors that's cut up into several units, but parking is an issue. As long as parking isn't an issue, I think it's a great idea.

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Great. This is really helpful.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

We have spent some time on ADU type uses. Was it after 2016 that you couldn't use your ADU as a vacation rental? The front house could be rented out; you could live in the back. I don't remember quite the rules, but I am concerned that our rules are tight around that issue. If I'm correct, we're still working on that, Kari?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

That is correct. The current regulations are that if you construct an ADU after 2017 the development impact fees are greatly reduced, and pretty much eliminated at this point, to encourage housing, and the setbacks were changed and those types of things. If you created an ADU after 2017 you would need a use permit to rent the ADU for short-term rental. John and I are constantly telling people you're not going to get a use permit approved by the Planning Commission to use your ADU as a short-term rental unless there's a special circumstance like there is a permanent resident there and you're using this while they're gone for the summer on sabbatical or whatever, something like that. You can live in the ADU and rent the main house, but that's one of the policies that we'll be bringing back to you hopefully in early 2022 to look at potentially how we look at those. We're looking at some people can afford to live in Sebastopol if they build or convert an ADU and live there while they rent the main house until they have a growing family and move in to the main house.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

Does that apply also to the JADUs?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

That does apply to a JADU. You cannot rent that short-term. Additionally, a JADU does require owner occupancy in one of the units, and an ADU and single-family home you can rent both of the units long-term.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

If we're looking at a workforce housing overlay I want to make sure that anything that we're increasing allowances, maybe not workforce as much as the incentivizing smaller units by design, especially if it's going to be you can have three units, that those rules and those policies that we've done for ADUs apply to those other small units that we create, because we cannot lose one more family housing. My good friend is being evicted. She lives just north of the City and she's being evicted, and no special accommodations were made and it's awful. The woman is going by the rules of how to evict her, but I don't believe her. Just like what happened in San Francisco when you could kick someone out because a family member was moving in there, and how many of those were false? So, even monitoring of that is asking for the moon, but that's the only way we'd know sometimes.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I want to jump back to this duplex issue. I'm looking at our zoning code. We did the zoning code update, we made this new R-5 zoning district that would allow duplexes, but there's only like nine lots in town that have it and six of them already have a duplex. The minimum lot size is 4,000 square feet, but the maximum designation is one unit per 3,630 square feet, so you would need like an over 7,000 square foot lot to actually be able to build a duplex in that zone. That just needs to be matched up. If we're going to allow duplexes, we need to make sure the density allows you to actually build a duplex on a more typical lot size. I'd say there are plenty of lots in town that are less than 7,000 square feet and they should be allowed to have a duplex on them without having to meet this kind of minimum density requirement again, so it goes back to that density issue of is that the right way to really look at this?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

So, maximum form rather than density?

Paul Fritz, Chair

That's what I'm interested in. All right, does that give you what you're looking for from us this evening?

Jane Riley, Director of Housing Policy, 4LEAF, Inc.

Yes, this is fantastic; it's been really helpful. Really appreciate the input.

Chair Fritz asked Commissioners for any final thoughts. Seeing none, he thanked the 4LEAF team and moved to the next item.

C. Planning Commission Training Discussion - (No written report). Potential training: <https://courses.planetizen.com/planning-commissioner-training>

Chair Fritz introduced the item and asked for Commission comments.

Deborah Burnes, Commissioner

I think it's a great idea, and I think it's a great idea to do it on a public forum, not only because it makes it easier for us, but also because I believe if you're going to do it, let's utilize this for not just us.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I think it could be interesting for some community members, maybe not a lot. We would have to pay by the number of Commissioners taking the class, but if we do it in a public forum then we can at least have a conversation about it afterwards and probably bring up some issues and questions. I don't think it's specific to California planning, it's a national

program, but Kari could probably help respond to California-specific issues if things might be a little different in California so we could have a dialogue amongst ourselves and have a better understanding of how some of these things apply to California. Like our General Plan, most of the country calls them a Comprehensive Plan, and probably in this course I'm assuming they call it a Comprehensive Plan, so there might be little things like that. Maybe there are also more significant issues with planning law that are different in California, but it would at least be a good place to start the conversation and learn a little bit more about what it is that we're doing here.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

How much is it to attend?

Paul Fritz, Chair

I want to say \$300-and-something per person, and if you have a group like us, you get a 10% discount. I know that there were no applicants for the last application period and that application period has been extended. I don't know if you've gotten any applications yet, Kari, for new Commissioners.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Not that I know of. Usually the City Clerk sends me an application if she receives one.

Paul Fritz, Chair

When Zach Douch leaves we'll be down to five if we get no new applicants, so we could have between five and seven of us that the City would be paying for.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

It would be between \$1,500 for five Commissioners and \$2,200 for seven Commissioners. We do have budget amendment requests due later this week, so getting input from the Commission tonight is very timely in terms of if this were to start sometime in the new year.

Paul Fritz, Chair

If there's no opposition, then will let Council Member Gurney know.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

It just depends on when it is. I'm already giving up activities that I'd like to do on Tuesdays, so if you're adding more meeting times or other evenings it might be hard for me to attend.

Paul Fritz, Chair

I would think it's going to be no additional time outside of regular second and fourth Tuesdays. It would just be in a regular meeting, and if we have a really full agenda then it may get pushed off. I can work with Kari on scheduling it. I don't know what the full length of it is. I know there are ten courses. I think some of them may be 30 minutes. I didn't look at the details to how long each one was, but yes, I think we should gear towards whatever else is going on.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Paul, when I looked at it, they range from about 45 minutes to 60 minutes per session.

Paul Fritz, Chair

My intention would not be to increase our regularly scheduled meetings or increase an unreasonable amount of time in a meeting. I may take us six months to get through all of them, but I do think it would be nice for future Commissioners to have to take it over a

period of time, say, in the first year, and give a time frame that as people are added to the Commission that they would be required to take it as well.

Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair

As long as it seems useful and pertinent to the things that we do. The issue of it not being in California law is a little bit of an issue, but if it were just the general process, I could see it being useful.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

If it's going to be during Planning Commission time already and it's going to be on YouTube so then we would have it for future use, maybe future Planning Commissioners would be required to watch the YouTube videos if there isn't a copyright issue or whatever. And it was \$300 or so for the whole course for each Planning Commissioner, or per Commissioner?

Paul Fritz, Chair

For the whole thing.

Linda Kelley, Commissioner

And I think instead of making a recommendation that we should do this, we could pilot it and see how it worked out and if we thought the information was presented in a way that was applicable to us.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Yes, that's a good idea. The courses are: Introduction to Planning, Planning Official Ethics, What is a Comprehensive Plan?, An Overview of the Planning Process, Working with the Public, Basis Legal Framework for Planning Officials, Constitutional Limits on Planning and Zoning, How Does Zoning Work?, A Site Plan, and An Overview of the Zoning Process. It looks like they are about 38 minutes to 67 minutes.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

If we move forward with this, I like Linda's idea of piloting it. There are other programs out there, as you know. In the past I think you had done Planning Commission Academy. It's been more like the SB-35 or the fire recovery, planning for fire hazards and things like that. I do not know if they'll be doing it this coming year. It doesn't preclude us from doing that as well, but that's either a Friday or Saturday.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Usually Saturday morning.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

But that doesn't necessarily preclude us doing that if that happens again. The League of California Cities also does have a Planning Commission Academy, which has a lot of the same courses, which is another alternative. Again, piloting this, I support the education and the components of it. I have not looked at the course to know the content, but the curriculum seems appropriate.

Paul Fritz, Chair

If you have other suggestions, Kari, of other maybe California-specific courses, I'm certainly open to that too. I just came across this one and thought it was a good idea, so I'm happy to take a look at some other ideas if they make sense.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I've attended League of California Cities before. It's an actual two or three day conference though, and so that's very difficult, and then they have a number of different topics, just a conference format. So, that's an option; it's a little bit more expensive than something like this and it's usually not something all the Commissioners end up being able to do time wise.

Paul Fritz, Chair

That's what I thought. Even that Sonoma State program I've gone to in the past, it's not a requirement and it doesn't always work for everybody. But I figured this is something we could bring to us and schedule the courses as it works with our schedule rather than going to a conference or having to require people to go out someplace to attend something like that. But if you do come across any other online things that could work, I'd be happy to take a look at those too. It sounds like there's a general okay if we can fit this in, and I'll work with Council Member Gurney on taking this to the Council for the budget adjustment.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Actually, because I have a budget amendment due, I will just put it in the Planning Department budget as a request when I submit that later this week, and then I'll let you know if I need you speak to that at Council when they hear the amendments.

Paul Fritz, Chair

Sounds good.

Chair Fritz closed the item and moved on to the next item.

7. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Ives Park Subcommittee, Vice Chair Oetinger

The stage in Ives Park has been repaired thanks in part to funds from the Rotary Club. A ramp with a handrail, stairs, and a skirt along the front has been added. Lampposts, benches, and fencing may have to be moved if the creek restoration occurs.

Commissioner Fernandez and I are concerned about recycling, because there is a three-can system now for waste, recycling, and compost, but when the City picks it up it all goes into one can. All the low-hanging fruit projects have been completed, so perhaps the Committee might want to evolve into something else in the future, which could become the starting point for Friends of Ives Park.

Design Guidelines Subcommittee, Chair Fritz

We have had a couple meetings so far working on objective design standards.

8. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Svanstrom provided updates.

The Commission asked questions of Director Svanstrom.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Fritz adjourned the meeting at 9:56 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on Wednesday, January 11, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.