

SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION
Notice of Meeting and Agenda
October 26, 2016
Sonoma Police Department, Community Room
177 First Street West, Sonoma
6:30 p.m.

Contact: Pat Gilardi, District Director to Supervisor Gorin at pat.gilardi@sonoma-county.org

1. Call to Order, Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes of the meeting of September 28, 2016 Resolution
3. Public Comment Receive
(Limited to items not appearing on the agenda)
4. Presentation – City of Sonoma County General Plan Receive
5. Applicant Name: Kenwood Investments, LLC Resolution
APNs: 018-251-017, 018-251-052, 018-251-051, 018-251-055

Review of a 62-room hotel, 80-seat restaurant, and spa, along with 115 on-site parking spaces, located on West Napa Street in Sonoma, California, on a 54,000-square-foot lot (1.24 acres). At build-out, the Project would include a total hotel building area of 67,478 square feet, a 37,655-square-foot basement parking garage, and 26,962 square feet of exterior courtyards, surface parking areas, and patio areas. Link to documents:
<http://www.sonomacity.org/Government/Resources/Reports.aspx>
6. Consideration of items for future agenda Receive
7. Adjourn Resolution

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Board of Supervisors' Office located at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100-AI, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours.

- Note: Consideration of proposed development projects will proceed as follows:

 1. Presentation by project applicant
 2. Questions by Commissioners
 3. Questions and comments from the public
 4. Response by applicant, if required
 5. Comments by Commissioners
 6. Resoluiton, if indicated

Web Links:

County of Sonoma: www.sonoma-county.org select Boards and Commissions
City of Sonoma: City of Sonoma: <http://www.sonomacity.org/Agenda-Minutes/Sonoma-Valley-Citizens-Advisory-Commission.aspx>

**SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 28, 2016
SONOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY ROOM
175 FIRST STREET WEST, SONOMA
6:30 pm**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Gini Dunlap, Ryan Lely, Pat Pulvirenti, Margaret Spaulding, Angela White, Greg Carr, Pat Stevens, Jack Ding

EXCUSED: Sean Bellach, Cynthia Wood, Ditty Vella

ABSENT: Tom Martin

1. **Call to Order:** 6:30 pm

2. **Minutes of August 24, 2016 Meeting:** Approved

3. **Public Comment (Limited to items not appearing on the agenda):**

Lnda Hale, Glen Ellen: If land zoned public facility as is Sonoma Developmental Center, and uses are proposed, does zoning get changed?

Mr. Carr: Depends on who is proposing and what's being proposed. If County is taking it over to turn into a medical facility, then public zoning probably remains because it's County sponsored use. If State sells to affordable housing company, that would require a change which goes before the County.

4. **File Number: DRH16-0006 Resolution**
Applicant Name: Flora Li, Tohigh Investments
Owner Name: Same
Site Address: 900, 1200, 1202, and 1204 Campagna Lane
APN: 051-260-014

Request for Design Review with Courtesy Public Noticing for previously approved Inn, Spa and Restaurant in a new 23,961 square foot building on a 51.9 acre parcel as a Condition of Approval of PLP01-0006 (AKA Sonoma Country Inn). The project is exempt from CEQA because an Environmental Impact Report was prepared and certified in 2004.

Chair White: This hearing is on design aspect of project. Use permit and EIR already issued in 2004 and not subject to this hearing.

Ms. Dunlap: I'm disclosing that I attended a meeting between Tohigh Investments and Valley of the Moon Alliance and I'm on the VOTMA board.

Applicant Presentation:

Tom Spoja, project manager and architect: Summary of existing site approvals in 2004 as part of EIR: central structure or main house is 23,000 sq ft. To east and west are 19 cottages with 50 rooms and number of pools and spa. We're staying within existing proposed site plan as outlined in use permit. New proposal still has 50 rooms in 19 cottages, main house structure has hotel administration, retail shop, reception, 2 meeting rooms, restaurant with 50 inside seats, 75 outdoor seats, 24 seat lounge. 6,235 sq ft spa structure is in similar location as original approved plan, treatment cottages, retail space, gym, small pools and hot tubs as part of spa program. Locations are determined by conditions of approval. Changes between 2 sites are primarily driven by emergency access and setback requirements of original EIR. 3 units in heavily wooded area with difficult fire access moved to flatter, less wooded area; pool shifted uphill further away from Hwy 12 and more screened by existing vegetation in area; spa also shifted to north to take advantage of existing meadow and open space. Outside: original design was stucco, tile roofs, shingles; now local stone walls, stained board on board, vertical surfaces, painted corrugated metal and slate tile roofs for reflectivity and to blend into existing tree canopy, rooftop and terrace edge planting for visual screening. Hotel set against hillside. Spa: slate tile, stained wood

walls, wood over stone, occasional stone walls, covered walkways, roofs pick up colors from rock outcropping in back. Property visible from certain locations along Hwy 12 and Adobe Rd.

Mr. Stevens: Those profiles looking south?

Tom Spoja: Looks south towards Hwy 12.

Mr. Stevens: But profiles themselves looking west?

Tom Spoja: Correct. So site section profiles are from location on Hwy 12 where property visible on original EIR. Distances are from 3400 to 3700 ft. Tree canopies in front of and behind structures screen below and behind so structures not exposed to sky or set out against ridgelines. From location along Adobe Rd, from 2400 to 2800 ft, tree canopy downslope provides screening and behind blends in.

Mr. Carr: Design undergoing preliminary review with PRMD staff? Received any feedback from staff on design?

Tom Spoja: Submitted to County and PRMD as part of DRC upcoming meeting – have had documents since beginning of July. No feedback yet.

Justin Winters, landscape architect: Trees on site most recognizable feature of project. Since original approved EIR, our arborist James McNair, updated tree survey and catalogued 2,774 trees with identification, measurements, species, and health so more complete picture of tree population on site. Most prominent species are Douglas fir, valley oak, and madrone. Comprehensive analysis prepared as to health of each tree, and identified as many as possible to retain and protect as well as those at present going in either direction to bring to good health. Outside tree expert, Dr. David Wood, UC Berkeley, consulted to keep existing population in good health and on site. Site is not all forest canopy. Biggest concentration is to north and along western promontory is conifer forest. Healthiest trees on perimeter, density not so concentrated. Trees to be used for screening from Hwy 12 and Sonoma Valley are in great health. 743 trees to be removed 12 years ago for construction purposes – new plan reduces number to 620. Characteristic of site is topography so very little grading, work with existing grade, nothing done to Broadiaea preserve. Existing asphalt paving on entryway, entry court is aggregate paving, cars to be valet parked at lot on east side, cluster of units on west side. Pedestrian paths on elevated boardwalks requiring no grading to retain tree roots. 2 predominant ecologies: conifer forest on west, grassland meadow on east. Vegetation design taken from existing plant ecologies to retain character of site. Feedback was received from VOTMA and Open Space Commission re: some elements on site: parking pulled back to minimize disturbance; water conservation – in compliance with plantings and irrigation.

Commissioner questions:

Ms. Dunlap: Photo of pool and main building facing mountains, changes in roof material – terraced roof? This building most visible from various locations and with hours of operation, what about light escaping?

Tom Spoja: Number of steps – each step has trellis area over open spaces, and steps back 15-18 ft at each level up the hillside, screening of light – long overhangs, trellises block escaping light, each terrace has planted edge vs open guard rail. We've covered conditions of approval: dark sky requirements, covered elements and downward lighting.

Ms. Dunlap: Originally 2 pools, evaporation and energy efficiency with infinity pool?

Tom Spoja: 15% larger, within compliance.

Ms. Spaulding: Differences between original use application and current - pool different but not mentioned when you were describing differences. Is scale of occupancy higher accommodating more people and traffic? What are changes and impacts?

Tom Spoja: No creeping of usage. As per conditions of approval: 50 rooms, # seats, # treatment rooms in spa, 300 points of compliance - staying within previously approved usage points.

Ms. Spaulding: Some issues have changed: water, traffic. Please address ways in which current conditions impact, and how to accommodate changes since 10 years ago.

Tom Spoja: Traffic mitigation measures on Highway 12 completed with CalTrans so no changes with components in EIR. Due to changes in water code and fixtures around units, water usage decreased. Also due to landscape plant selection, irrigation techniques– remain within previously approved EIR.

Ms. Spaulding: CalTrans approval based on traffic 10 years ago.

Tom Spoja: Yes, closed out due to completion of work on Hwy 12.

Mr. Lely: Statute of limitations once EIR issued?

Mr. Carr: No specific statute, only if changes in project trigger another EIR. Challenge for applicant after so much time to stay within impacts identified. A lot of time has passed – interesting to see how issue plays out through hearing process.

Mr. Lely: Pavers on motor courts being replaced by gravel, decomposed granite?

Justin Winters: Access to house will be porous, stone pavers.

Mr. Lely: Unit type B – walled in gardens – what plantings?

Justin Winters: Respective of ecologies on site, native to site and Sonoma County providing multi sensory experience, aromatic quality, soft to touch and feel.

Mr. Lely: Villas – vines up deck supports?

Justin Winters: Screen vertical spaces with vines and plants with height.

Mr. Lely: Wedding field – a lawn out there? Sculpture garden in middle of forest or lawn/plantings around them?

Justin Winters: Elements not compliant with original approved use, now omitted, not part of program on site.

Mr. Ding: Project approved 12 years ago, according to Greg Carr, no statute of limitations as long as keep within original. If big impacts on environment or safety issues, still entitled to go back to the village.

Mr. Carr: If changes and environmental impact are significant, and not identified, then case for another environmental review. More substantive question is if this application is compliant with original approval. Measure level of impact from those changes.

Mr. Ding: You have private water system from groundwater. How many wells? How deep?

David Brown, Adobe Associates: 2 existing wells on property serving water system which is in place and fully functional. Don't recall depth - one is 700-800 ft.

Mr. Ding: Water issue, especially groundwater is more serious, now not mandatory to measure. Consider groundwater management in long term.

Mr. Stevens: Valet parking facing north south? Concern is reflective sun, setting sun not a problem. Rising sun screened?

Tom Spoja: Yes.

Ms. Pulvirenti: Not mandatory that 2 wells be measured – did you measure those wells to see what’s happened over the years?

David Brown: Extensive studies on existing wells. Due to non-use right now so no monitoring, but condition of approval and requirement of state permit to be issued.

Mr. Carr: Photo simulations of new design before and after on highway. Is new design more or less visible from Hwy 12 and Adobe?

Tom Spoja: We have current photographs from highway and Adobe Rd.

Mr. Carr: Since project was approved, County adopted Mayacamas guidelines. This project in that area, does project meet substantial screening requirements?

Tom Spoja: Haven’t addressed that concern.

Mr. Carr: Since project approved in general plan specific lighting requirements: downward casting and screening lights....Hope changes in project not increasing visibility. Standards or requirements placed on events?

Tom Spoja: Not certain.

Mr. Carr: Hours for wineries 8:30-9:30. Addressed in use permit?

Tom Spoja: Yes, addressed in use permit – hours for restaurant till midnight, not function.

Mr. Carr: On site plan – lawns?

Justin Winters: No lawn on property.

Chair White: Photo at night? Any idea?

Tom Spoja: Not at this time.

Chair White: Based on design, how many people?

Tom Spoja: 50 keys/rooms with 2 person occupancy so 100 people. Full restaurant with people not staying in rooms, another 100, so 200 outlined in conditions of approval.

Chair White: Based on design, how much water will be utilized daily, monthly, or annually?

Tom Spoja: Annual usage number in conditions of approval.

Chair White: More on energy sufficiency: solar power, recycled water use, water reclamation?

Tom Spoja: California building code/Cal Green requirements, energy efficient windows, insulation values, mechanical systems, water usage. No solar due to location on hillside and reflective nature of panels and visibility into Valley. Cannot address hotel operation.

Ms. Dunlap: No mention of tennis court, lighting on court? Parking – sun direction - facing into forest?

Justin Winters: Tennis court no longer in program. Parking – studied multitude of configurations – valet only to reduce vehicular traffic, guests not pulling to and from units, other side has parking very close to units. Evening activity as part

of restaurant, guests pulling up. Layout of parking – single terminus lot – drive in, drive out to reduce amount of paving required. Access through center strip reduces asphalt thus saving more trees.

Mr. Lely: Sound – many units have rear exterior elevations, windows/glass walls open all the way? Main house too? Sound mitigation - opening into Valley and echoing? Control sounds of main house but can't control guests.

Tom Spoja: Correct. Distance from site allows acoustic energy to dissipate, foliage/tree canopy below property breaks down sound energy coming from units, planted edges at units and restaurant scatter directed sound energy.

Ms. Spaulding: Quite a bit of staff – how/where access property, in/out, parking?

Tom Spoja: Conditions of approval govern arrival/departure, number of staff at spa and hotel. Spa staff limited to 26, hotel operator will have to comply with EIR.

Ms. Spaulding: But no parking for staff. Light mitigated by trellises which are open – how prevent light from escaping?

Tom Spoja: No parking, part of EIR. Trellises block light upward into atmosphere and coming from below, shades terrace surfaces from sun.

Mr. Stevens: Housing for staff?

Tom Spoja: No housing for staff.

Public Comments:

(Note: In advance of tonight's meeting, SVCAC received copy of letter to PRMD by Kathy Pons, VOTMA, and email from Skye Davis, Kenwood resident, regarding tonight's project.)

Kathy Pons, VOTMA: VOTMA formed over this project, then known as Sonoma Country Inn, which came to light in 2002. Not only has 50 room Inn, 19 cottages, restaurant, spa, but also 11 spec homes, and purchase of adjacent properties to allow 5 more so total of 16 homes on property. 10,000 case winery, store, 30 events, all on Valley floor. Because of its size, full EIR was done. Approved in 2004, we filed a CEQA lawsuit against EIR which delayed development until 2008. Then came economic downturn, and land and use permit sold a couple times till 2015 when Tohigh purchased it. Although approved, not built yet so additional impacts not felt yet of traffic, water usage and noise levels. Design review requested to change original requirements. How might requested changes affect project's visibility, noise levels and night sky? Some concerns are making sure there are trees to shade and screen buildings from the highway, the infinity pool with the noise, main house with no roof and noise escaping, and lighting. We need to look more at those things or they need to share studies already done. ***(Note: See letter for more and complete details of concerns raised.)***

Randi Blythe, Hoff Rd: Can we take a look at the designs?

Iris Lombard, BHS: Have hotel operators considered impact of animals going through property? There'll be deer, rabbits, foxes, coyotes – what will that do to disturb experience of hotel guests and what will be response? Plants from Sonoma County with varied ecosystems - Kenwood pretty dry. Big concern is traffic – no parking for staff, bus them in? 12-14 yr old CalTrans study not adequate because traffic has changed so much. So many more events on Saturdays and Sundays in Valley – impacts and paying for them will eventually fall on County taxpayers. Traffic's already bad enough in that area. Concerned about events they'll be having and 10,000 case winery will generate even more traffic – trucks in and out and noise. How are hotel guests and people in Valley going to be sheltered from that noise?

Chair White: As far as additional phases – how will concerns be addressed? Right now just talking about layout and visuals. What happens with stage 2, the winery, stage 3....How does that affect the use permit and the EIR?

Mr. Carr: Assuming that all these future stages were included in cumulative impact analysis in EIR, as long as project stays within portions originally decided and no major changes to environmental impact, will go forward.

Chair White: Please speak to parking for staff and what it will look like.

Tom Spoja: Don't have info at hand, but part of report and will be considered with County. Have seen that portion of that condition but can't cite off hand.

Chair White: Mr. Carr, County will want to know where staff is going.

Mr. Carr: Surprised present company doesn't know. Maybe they are bussing folks in to reduce overall impact on site. When you formulate a recommendation, identify your concerns to County.

Chair White: Also, if the applicant can speak to the animals, what that will look like.

Justin Winters: The ecology and biological conditions, concerns about vegetation – clear in conditions of uses, light handed approach, will utilize what's appropriate to site, keep most of forest canopy intact. Intent not to evict wildlife, find balance.

Kathy Miller, Moon Mountain: Use of dark sky lighting standard?

Roger Peters, Hoff Rd: Lot of information being developed for submission to Design Review or recently developed and not reflective of what's going out to public, including most significantly tree survey. This project dormant for 10 years, and on July 1st there's a filing to rush and get Design Review done. Some responses to questions asked that 'we haven't tracked this or that' should result in asking for more information. Applicant here is a multinational company with deep pockets and can certainly do all studies necessary. Tree survey, reference to feedback from Open Space Commission to change some areas eliminating tennis court, wedding meadow, sculpture garden, etc. and comments should reflect what revised project looks like. Must be hard for you to make recommendation on Design Review since it's a new machine, it's in process, if it took 10 years to get moving, it should take more than a month to get the Design Review to completion. What is water usage, what is well situation and why not monitoring of the wells, status of trees and how to maintain health of trees – that hasn't been done. Does tree survey say what trees will look like in 5 years? In terms of visualization, how many there now are going to be cut down because of distress? What will that do to visualization? Roof at entrance taken off and what's there is a lounge, a bar, and lighting. How is that consistent with 1 of 2 critical issues that the Board of Supervisors found: adverse impacts that could not be mitigated adequately? But because project was otherwise useful, it was overwritten. You can't play with lighting, if you take off the roof, a trellis doesn't seem to work.. There are a lot of questions: noise, valet parking generated for restaurant, infinity pool not conservation efficient..... Earthquake in 2014 - look at seismic impacts, grading, new and endangered species in that area. Ask questions rather than take action tonight.

Tom Spoja: Seismic issues – have new updated geotechnical review of property. All structures will meet seismic recommendations. Infinity pool – can put cover. Concerns about evaporation and overall water usage - doing studies to comply with requirements. Roof on main house facing downvalley - original design was single pitched roof connecting all structures. Concerns that much roof would be visible so went with green roof on top, planting at edge, and terracing backwards so impact would be mitigated.

Justin Winters: Addressing tree population, arborist has surveyed every single tree – dead, sick, will be removed, striving to maintain healthy trees, working with Prof Emeritus Woods to develop vegetation management plan.

Roger Peters: Removing dead trees now?

Justin Winters: Identified.

Bob Coughenour, Fry Rd: This is the biggest development between San Francisco and Portland. Kathy mentioned 16 more homes, 10,000 case winery, 30 events, a store. Who's going to run the hotel? You're just building hotel, is there hotel manager, how employees get in, animals: among deer, foxes, also lots of skunks.

Chair White: Who's running hotel, do you know?

Tom Spoja: Not at this time.

EJ McVey, Fry Rd: Have not heard how traffic on Hwy 12 will get into and out of your project. Any coordination with CalTrans about left turn lane, since we are definitely affected on Fry Rd. It's hard for us to make left turn into Fry Rd. How are they going to make left turn into this project?

David Brown: There is a left turn lane on Hwy 12, also left turn lane in downtown Kenwood as part of mitigation for this project. Mitigations completed with CalTrans some time ago.

Mary Ellen King, Oakmont: To this committee, do not recommend this project at this time. Too many questions, too many aspects not properly addressed. There's a bigger consideration, this project along with others in this County, are killing the goose that laid the golden egg. Too many projects affecting this County and this is just one of them. Put this into a larger context with the number of events going on, impact on traffic, impact on congestion, noise, lifestyle, housing and availability, impact on environment and wildlife displaced.

Chair White: To clarify, this is a Design Review, not use permit.

Don Taylor, Lawndale Rd: Traffic – CalTrans has done all the modifications they're going to do on this project. How current is data used and is it still relevant today? With number of wineries going in and number of events, traffic is increasing, left turn lane is inadequate as it is now – how is it going to support the additional traffic?

David Brown: As part of EIR, traffic studies done. Mitigations required met with conditions of approval – left turn constructed, left turn pocket in downtown Kenwood constructed. When project has been approved, there are no additional mitigations down the road because things have changed. This project is fully vested.

Chris Koch, Kenwood: Traffic mitigations done based on traffic conditions decade ago. So it's relevant today to see if further mitigation is necessary. I urge the Commission to ask questions. Although tonight's meeting is about the design of this project, people in this County don't want it to become Napa. Process today where everything is looked at in discrete little pieces is leading to result nobody wants. You have winery coming in, events, outdoor music, all these things are dealt with piece by piece and County has no good way to deal with cumulative impact. Please look at and urge the County to look at all of these things with a critical eye because this rolling, rolling problem will only get worse.

Mr. Carr: For traffic, EIR has to look at cumulative impact into future. With any project, they use the current traffic counts to set the baseline. When you project out the use along with other general plan uses, foreseeable uses, you are looking at future traffic generation. In that look is substantive question, Is EIR adequate?

Dolores Solomon, El Verano: 10 yr old use permit needs to be looked at again – even in 5 years, many changes and tremendous growth.

Paulina Coughenour, Fry Rd: We live right across street from project. All neighbors, about 20 houses, we're all on wells and very concerned about the water usage. With the drought and all the construction coming into the Valley: new building, houses, wineries, Committee needs to focus on water, monitor it and see if it's adequate. Many houses, buildings being added weren't on original plan. Many of us have very short wells, are we to pay price for wells going dry, any mitigation from big projects to help small homeowners if wells go dry.

Chair White: Very good point. If project impacts homeowners with shallow wells, is there plan in place?

David Brown: Full geologic report prepared as part of EIR process, outlined in water usage report.

Jerry Bagger, Buckeye: 10-12 years ago, at one of these meetings, estimate of 1300 additional cars a day on Hwy 12. Is there current estimate, any plan to mitigate traffic, shuttling and offsite parking for staff?

Chair White: Any answers to those questions?

Tom Spoja: No (muffled due to speaking from seats).

Iris Lombard, BHS: 2004 EIR and water inadequate given drought that no one was anticipating. That portion at least inadequate.

Barbara Slatkin, Kenwood: Here since 1989 – less people. Don't think anyone could have predicted what's happened in last 14 years. Real traffic now, needs to be looked at again.

Commissioner discussions:

Ms. Dunlap: Great concerns re: missing elements that have been unanswered. Concerned about sound and light with main building. Although not hearing that tonight, questions about operations that will relate to design, such as employee parking, operating hours of restaurant to back up sound issue that doesn't seem to be in keeping with high end property. Don't have enough information to approve.

Ms. Spaulding: Design Review does include issues of scale, big concerns about scale of this project. Accumulated impacts: traffic, water use, years of drought, habitat destruction, wildlife corridor – stuff we know now that we didn't 10 years ago. The noise, the housing issue – conditions have changed.

Mr. Lely: Share concerns with audience and Commission, also agree with issue of scale. So many points not being addressed, so many outliers, not knowing what was originally proposed and how that's changing. Times and our environment, popularity of Sonoma Valley and number of people coming here have changed tremendously.

Mr. Ding: Tonight's meeting, we just look to identify potential issue, water usage great concern, you should consider water recharge system. Two years ago, Governor Brown passed Sustainable Groundwater Management Act for local governments to take care of groundwater, not mandatory now but sooner or later.

Ms. Pulvirenti: Agree with audience and Commissioners, lot of changes through the years. Use permit approved and in compliance. Whoever is responsible for EIR review, identify big changes: water, traffic, cumulative effect and see what needs to be mitigated now.

Mr. Carr: Is Design Review application in substantial compliance with old permit? Applicant views changes as minor and Commissioners concerned with changed conditions. Communicate to County if project in compliance with old permit. Don't think project needs Mayacamas guidelines for visibility. General plan and Mayacamas require buildings to be substantially screened from Hwy 12. There is screening although difficult to tell from drawings but these buildings are quite visible from Hwy 12 and Adobe. They want the views – part of attraction of site for views. That gets to the lighting, indirect way to look at noise issue as well. Needs clarification on events, restaurant and the hours - answers not clear.

Chair White: Clear lot of issues and concerns around this project. Applicant has done all they had to do but changes from 12 years ago, long time: drought, traffic crazy, scale of project overwhelming for Kenwood – sweet, quaint little town already being inundated with traffic and tourism. This will change the Valley, turning point for Valley if project like this comes to fruition. We're conveying everything that's been said: Mayacamas guidelines if in compliance with older permit. Still have much to talk about: events, restaurant, hours, open till midnight in that area is unbelievable. Look at EIR – County needs to take into consideration, we all have to use some common sense and care about Valley and look at people who live and call Kenwood home. We don't have to approve this design as presented – not good fit for area.

Ms. Spaulding: We recommend that this project not move forward at this time for several reasons: not clear this current design proposal complies with Mayacamas and approved EIR. Many questions about proposed operation of facility: hours, staffing, staff parking, big concerns about traffic impacts, CalTrans study 10 years ago not adequate for today, and water. Wells on property not used for 10 years, and once they start drawing doesn't mean there's adequate water from those wells.

Mr. Lely: Motion would be to not move project forward at this point due to questions of compliance with current use permit and may not comply with Mayacamas guidelines, and further questions re: EIR and changed conditions over past 12 years, as well as unanswered questions on operations that may affect design of project and water.

Mr. Ding: I suggest another resolution. Leave it here, keep it open and we're waiting for more information. Another example from before is Sonoma Raceway.

Chair White: It's important to seize the moment, to harness and really stress what's been said to County. Leaving it open feels unfinished. We need to make our points loud and clear, strong and concise tonight. We may not get another opportunity – no guarantee that this will come back before us.

Mr. Carr: That's also consistent with your charge. In spite of the Sears Point action, you get these at the referral stage, oftentimes information is not complete. By taking action tonight, your input goes into the finalization record and it does go to public hearing at Design Review Committee, and encourage anyone interested to follow process. That decision is appealable up the ladder.

Ms. Dunlap: Design Review schedule coming up in 3 weeks. As it proceeds, is it up to applicant – what are options?

Mr. Carr: Up to staff. If they get substantive comments more information needed or should be developed, probably would delay that. Not sure of time constraints, how many approval process there are, limitations on how long before hearing on project or if it applies to design. This came in July, staff would have option to delay it. Same things you're asking, the DRC will also ask. One member of DRC from Kenwood.....don't think it's mandated that it has to be approved.

Chair White: I urge the public and anyone who feels invested in this to not stop here – this is one part of process. Let your voices be heard, stay with it.

Motion: Mr. Lely. Not to move forward with the Design Review at this point based on questions of compliance with current use permit, compliance with Mayacamas design guidelines, questions of water usage on 12 year old EIR, and operational issues concerning employees, parking, and large scope of project. Ms. Spaulding seconded. Motion passed. All in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Stevens: Are we recommending this project not be approved because it already has been.

Chair White: It's not about the use permit, it's the design portion because of the concerns and unanswered questions.

5. Consideration of items for future agenda

Mr. Stevens: *(Note: too much background noise and speech unclear; could not make out exact statement)* Handle on Mayacamas portion of hillside ordinance?

Ms. Spaulding: It would be interesting for us to look at design guidelines for Mayacamas, lower end of Sonoma Mountain falls in our jurisdiction, review Sonoma Mountain Preservation adopted by PRMD.

Mr. Stevens: *(Note: again unintelligible).....*guidelines?

Mr. Carr: In zoning code

6. Adjourned: 9:00 pm