



## City of Sonoma Planning Commission **AGENDA**

*Special Meeting of September 26, 2013 -- 6:30 PM*  
*Community Meeting Room, 177 First Street West*  
*Sonoma, CA 95476*

Meeting Length: No new items will be heard by the Planning Commission after 10:30 PM, unless the Commission, by majority vote, specifically decides to continue reviewing items. If an item is not heard due to the length of the meeting, the Commission will attempt to schedule a special meeting for the following week. If a special meeting is necessary, potential dates will be established at the close of this meeting, and a date set as soon as possible thereafter.

---

**CALL TO ORDER** – Chair, Chip Roberson

Commissioners: Gary Edwards  
Robert Felder  
Mark Heneveld  
Matt Howarth  
Mathew Tippell  
Bill Willers  
James Cribb (Alternate)

*Be Courteous - **TURN OFF** your cell phones and pagers while the meeting is in session.*

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** Presentations by audience members on items not appearing on the agenda.

### CORRESPONDENCE

---

#### ITEM #1 – PUBLIC HEARING

**REQUEST:**

Review of Nicora Place, an 18-unit planned development, including consideration of environmental review, a Planned Development Permit, Tentative Map, and Use Permit.

**Applicant/Property Owner:**

Ledson & Ledson Development/  
Steve Ledson

**Staff:** Rob Gjestland, Senior Planner

**Project Location:**

821-845 West Spain Street

**General Plan Designation:**

Medium Density Residential (MR)

**Zoning:**

**Planning Area:** Northwest Area

**Base:**

Medium Density Residential (R-M)

**Overlay:** None

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

- 1) Adopt Negative Declaration.
- 2) Commission discretion with respect to planning permit approvals.

---

### ISSUES UPDATE

**COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION**

**COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

### ADJOURNMENT

I do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing agenda was posted on the City Hall bulletin board on September 20, 2013.

JUDY MORGAN, ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK

Rights of Appeal: Any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council. Appeals must be filed with the City Clerk within fifteen (15) calendar days following the Planning Commission's decision, unless the fifteenth day falls on a weekend or a holiday, in which case the appeal period ends at the close of the next working day at City Hall. Appeals must be made in writing and must clearly state the reason for the appeal. Appeals will be set for hearing before the City Council on the earliest available agenda. A fee is charged for appeals.

*Copies of all staff reports and documents subject to disclosure that relate to any item of business referred to on the agenda are available for public inspection the Monday before each regularly scheduled meeting at City Hall, located at No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA, (707) 938-3681. Any documents subject to disclosure that are provided to all, or a majority of all, of the members of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda after the agenda has been distributed will be made available for inspection at the Administrative Assistant office, No. 1 The Plaza, Sonoma CA during regular business hours.*

*If you challenge the action of the Planning Commission in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described on the agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Administrative Assistant, at or prior to the public hearing.*

*In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk (707) 933-2216. Notification 48-hours before the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*

**Agenda Item Title:** Review of Nicora Place, an 18-unit planned development, including consideration of environmental review, a Planned Development Permit, a Tentative Map, and a Use Permit.

**Applicant/Owner:** Ledson & Ledson Development/Steve Ledson

**Site Address/Location:** 821-845 West Spain Street (APN 127-211-021 and 127-211-022)

**Staff Contact:** Rob Gjestland, Senior Planner  
Staff Report Prepared: 9/23/13

---

### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

---

**Description:** Application of Steve Ledson for a Planned Development Permit, Tentative Map, and Use Permit to construct an 18-unit planned development at 821-845 West Spain Street.

**General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential

**Zoning:** **Base:** Medium Density Residential (R-M) **Overlay:** None

**Site Characteristics:** The project site is comprised of two adjoining parcels located on the south side of West Spain Street, opposite its intersection with Juniper Serra Drive. The parcels are relatively flat and form a square area of approximately 2 acres. Existing development on the site consists of eight residential/accessory buildings with associated paved drive/parking areas that occupy the west and south sides of the project site. Most of the existing structures were constructed between 1946 and 1964 and contain a total of ten housing units. The remainder of the site is undeveloped with grasses and some grapevines. In addition, numerous trees are located on the site. The frontage is improved with curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

**Surrounding Land Use/Zoning:**

**North:** Two small apartment complexes and an 8-unit condominium development (across West Spain Street)/Medium Density Residential

**South:** Two-story apartment building as well as common pool area and paved parking associated with Sonoma Park Condominiums/Medium Density Residential

**East:** Driveway and several single-story units within Sonoma Park Condominiums/Medium Density Residential

**West:** Sonoma Gardens, a 12-unit condominium complex that includes one and two-story building elements plus a common pool area/Medium Density Residential

**Environmental Review:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved/Certified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration	<input type="checkbox"/> No Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

**Staff Recommendation:**

1. Environmental Review: Adopt Negative Declaration.
2. Project Review: Commission discretion.

---

## **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

---

### **BACKGROUND**

On July 12, 2012, the Planning Commission held a study session on a previous iteration of the project that proposed 19 detached units in a similar layout (minutes from this Planning Commission meeting are included with the project narrative). Following this review, the applicant/project architect met with concerned neighbors on three occasions. In response to issues identified through this process, the applicant made several modifications to the project and resubmitted a revised proposal in March 2013. In terms of improvements, the most significant changes include:

- The density/number of residences has been reduced from 19 to 18 units.
- Increased building setbacks have been provided from the perimeter of the project site. Most notably, a minimum 20-foot setback has been provided on the west and south sides of the project where the site adjoins other condominiums, apartments, and common pool areas. In addition, the front yard setback for the units facing West Spain Street has been increased to 23 feet.
- A new partial two-story unit type (E1) has been introduced that does not have a second floor element over the garage. This E1 plan is proposed for three lots, including Lots 2 and 4 on the west side of the project and Lot 1 on the east side of the project.
- A second floor, west-facing deck has been removed from the unit on Lot 1.

The two areas that have worsened under the revised proposal are the amount of guest parking and size of the park. The amount of dedicated guest parking has been reduced from six spaces to four and the size of the park has been reduced by approximately 1,000 square feet.

### **DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project involves developing the 2-acre site with a residential Planned Development consisting of 18 detached single-family homes on individual lots. All of the homes are proposed as two-story units with 3 bedrooms and 2 or 2½ baths (building heights range from ±24 to ±30 feet measured to the roof peak). Five basic unit types are proposed that would be further differentiated by 12 different architectural treatments drawing from Farmhouse, Craftsman, Victorian, and French styles. For purposes of economy all of the proposed units except for the E1 plan are identical to those approved for the applicant's planned development on West MacArthur Street. Four contract affordable units would be provided consistent with the City's inclusionary affordable housing requirements, identified by the project architect as the units on lots 3, 11, 15, and 16.

Living areas for the units range from 1,247 to 1,472 square feet, and each home would have a one or two-car attached garage. Lot sizes range between 2,555 and 6,713 square feet with an average size of 3,717 square feet. The homes are arranged along a U-shaped, 20-foot wide private street, Nicora Way, that would access the development from two driveways off West Spain Street. The private street is proposed for two-way travel and would provide all interior circulation for the site including emergency vehicle access (the private road would function as a fire lane with parking prohibited on both sides). Each unit would have a private rear yard and a small park is proposed toward the center of the site for residents, which would also function as a bioretention area to treat and allow for the infiltration of stormwater runoff. In addition to garage and apron parking, four guest parking spaces are proposed flanking the park.

In terms of setbacks, the four units facing West Spain Street would have a uniform front yard setback of 23 feet to the building wall and 18 feet to the front porch/balcony. Rear yard setbacks along the perimeter of the project site (on the south, east and west) would range from ±16.5 to ±30 feet, with a minimum 20-foot setback provided on the west and south sides. For the most part, internal side yard setbacks for the units are five or six feet, resulting in a 10 to 12-foot separation between buildings. The eight residential/accessory structures currently on the property, which contain ten housing units, would be demolished to accommodate the development. The project narrative states that the project is aimed at providing “market-rate affordable” housing for medium-sized families.

**GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY** ( **Not Applicable to this Project**)

The project site is designated Medium Density Residential by the General Plan. This designation is intended to provide opportunities for multi-family housing and related public improvements, especially in transition areas between higher density and single-family development. The designation allows a density of 7 to 11 residential units per acre. It is worth pointing out that the Housing Element of the General Plan identifies the property as a Housing Opportunity site that is a suitable candidate for redevelopment. In addition, the Community Development Element (CDE) of the General Plan recognizes that citizen approval of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in 2000 reflects a commitment to focus growth within city limits in order to prevent urban sprawl into agriculturally and environmentally sensitive areas surrounding the city. The CDE notes that the UGB is also intended to concentrate future residential, commercial, and industrial growth in areas already served by urban services.

General Plan goals and policies that apply to the project are evaluated in the table below.

<b>Review of General Plan Consistency</b>	
<b>General Plan Policy</b>	<b>Project Response</b>
<b>Community Development Element</b>	
<i>Goal CD-4: Encourage quality, variety, and innovation in new development.</i>	
Encourage a variety of unit types in residential projects (CDE 4.2).	All of the homes are proposed as two-story, detached 3-bedroom, 2-bathroom units. However, five basic unit types are proposed, that would be further differentiated by 12 different architectural treatments.
Coordinate development on small contiguous lots to the extent possible (CDE-4.3).	The project combines two adjoining parcels, including a smaller landlocked property that would otherwise be difficult to develop effectively.
Require pedestrian and bicycle access and amenities in all development (CDE-4.4).	The project features internal sidewalks along the both sides of the private drive and sidewalks along the West Spain St. frontage are already in place. Because the project calls for detached units with garages, shared/common bicycle parking is not necessary.
<i>Goal CDE-5: Reinforce the historic, small-town characteristics that give Sonoma its unique sense of place.</i>	
Protect important scenic vistas and natural resources, and incorporate significant views and natural features into project designs (CDE-5.3).	The project would not significantly impact public views scenic vistas. Although a number of trees would be removed to accommodate the project, 48 replacement trees are identified on the site plan which would include 60” box size trees on the west and south edges of the project site for screening and 24” box size street trees per the Tree Committee’s recommendation.

Promote higher density, infill development, while ensuring that building mass, scale, and form are compatible with neighborhood and town character (CDE-5.5).	The project density is proposed at the middle range allowed for in the Medium Density Residential designation and setbacks, building orientation/types have been improved for better compatibility with adjacent apartment and condominium complexes.
<b>Environmental Resources Element</b>	
<i>Goal ER-1: Acquire and protect important open space in and around Sonoma.</i>	
Require new development to provide adequate private and, where appropriate, public open space (ERE-1.4).	The project design provides private yards for each home plus a small private park as an amenity for residents.
<i>Goal ER-2: Identify, preserve, and enhance important habitat areas and significant environmental resources.</i>	
Protect Sonoma Valley watershed resources, including surface and groundwater supplies and quality (ERE 2.4).	The park proposed near the center of the site would also function as a bioretention area to treat and allow for the infiltration of stormwater runoff.
Preserve existing trees and plant trees (ERE 2.6)	A significant number of trees would be removed to accommodate the project. However, 48 replacement trees are identified on the site plan which would include 60” box size trees on the west and south edges of the project site for screening and 24” box size street trees per the Tree Committee’s recommendation.
<i>Goal ER-3: Conserve natural resources to ensure their long-term sustainability.</i>	
Encourage construction, building maintenance, landscaping, and transportation practices that promote energy and water conservation and reduce GHG emissions (ERE 3.2)	The proposed development is an infill project near public transportation and commercial services to reduce vehicle trips. In addition, the project would be subject to the CA Green Building Code and the City’s WELO ordinance, which requires low-water use landscaping and irrigation systems.
<b>Circulation Element</b>	
<i>Goal CE-3: Minimize vehicle trips while ensuring safe and convenient access to activity centers and maintaining Sonoma’s small-town character.</i>	
Encourage a mixture of uses and higher densities where appropriate to improve the viability of transit and pedestrian and bicycle travel (CE-3.2).	The proposed development is an infill project with a density at the middle range allowed for in the Medium Density Residential designation. In addition, the project site is located along a collector street near commercial services, jobs, and public transportation.
Ensure that new development mitigates its traffic impacts (CE 3.7).	A traffic impact study was prepared for the project that identified mitigation measures to ensure appropriate sight lines at the project driveways, contribute to improvement of the intersection of Fifth Street West/West Spain Street, and prohibit parking on the private road consistent with emergency vehicle access requirements of the SVFRA.
<b>Public Safety Element</b>	
<i>Goal PS.1: Minimize risks to life and property associated with seismic and other geologic hazards, fire, hazardous materials, and flooding.</i>	
Ensure that all development projects provide adequate fire protection (PSE-1.3).	The 20-foot wide private drive has been designed as a fire lane in conformance with SVFRA access standards. In addition, fire sprinklers would be required in all units.
<b>Housing Element</b>	
<i>Goal HE-1: To provide a mix of housing types affordable to all income levels, allowing those who work in Sonoma to also live in the community.</i>	
Encourage diversity in the type, size, price and tenure of residential development in Sonoma, while maintaining quality of life (HE-1.1).	In general, the project would contribute to the diversity of the City’s housing stock by providing modest-sized, detached single-family homes on small lots in the Medium Density Residential land use designation. In addition, per the City’s inclusionary requirements, four of the units would be contract affordable.

Encourage the sustainable use of land and promote affordability by encouraging development at the higher end of the density range within the Medium Density, High Density, Housing Opportunity, and Mixed Use land use designations (HE-1.4).	The Medium Density Residential land use designation of the site allows for residential densities of up to 11 units per acre. The proposed project has a density of 9 units per acre.
Utilize inclusionary zoning as a tool to integrate affordable units within market rate developments and increase the availability of affordable housing throughout the community (HE-1.6).	As required under section 19.44.020 of the Development Code, 4 of the 18 homes would be required to be inclusionary affordable units subject to long-term affordability covenants.
<i>Goal HE-3: Maintain and enhance the existing housing stock and ensure that new residential development is consistent with Sonoma's town character and neighborhood quality.</i>	
Maintain sustainable neighborhoods with quality housing, infrastructure and open space that fosters neighborhood character and the health of residents (HE-3.1).	The project intends to provide quality family housing and includes a small private park as an amenity for residents.
<i>Goal HE-6: Promote environmental sustainability through support of existing and new development which minimizes reliance on natural resources.</i>	
Preserve open space, watersheds, environmental habitats and agricultural lands, while accommodating new growth in compact forms in a manner that de-emphasizes the automobile (HE-6.1).	The proposed development is a compact, infill project on an identified housing opportunity site near commercial services, jobs, and public transportation.
Promote the use of sustainable construction techniques and environmentally sensitive design for all housing, to include best practices in water conservation, low-impact drainage, and greenhouse gas reduction (HE-6.3).	The proposed development is an infill project near public transportation and commercial services to reduce vehicle trips. In addition, the project would be subject to the CA Green Building Code and the City's WELO ordinance, which requires low-water use landscaping and irrigation systems. The park would also function as a bioretention area to treat and allow for the infiltration of stormwater runoff.

In general, the proposal is consistent with General Plan policies and goals that promote infill development and housing opportunities. That being said, the project must be evaluated carefully in terms the Planned Development Permit findings, unit variety, compatibility with adjoining development, and guest parking adequacy.

**DEVELOPMENT CODE CONSISTENCY ( Not Applicable to this Project)**

*Use:* The project site is zoned Medium Density Residential (R-M). The R-M zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for medium density, multi-family residential development including apartments, condominiums, and planned developments. Planned Developments are allowed in residential zoning districts subject to review and approval of a Planned Development Permit by the Planning Commission.

*Density:* The R-M zone allows a density of 7 to 11 residential units per acre. The project proposes 18 units on the 2-acre site, resulting in a density of 9 units per acre.

*Lot Size:* Within the Northwest Planning Area, the minimum lot size for the R-M zone is 5,000 square feet. Most of the lots do not meet this requirement in that they range between 2,555 and 6,713 square feet with an average size of 3,717 square feet (only Lots 5 and 8 exceed the minimum lot size). However, a Planned Development Permit is being requested for the project to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Lot Width & Depth:* The minimum lot width in the R-M zone is 55 feet (70 feet for corner lots) and the minimum lot depth is 90 feet. None of the lots meet the combined dimensional requirements. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Front & Streetside Yard Setbacks:* The minimum front/streetside yard setback for two-story structures in the R-M is 20 feet and front porches may extend up to 10 feet into the front setback. The four units facing West Spain Street (Lots 1, 12, 13, and 18) meet this requirement with a front yard setback of 23 feet to the building wall and 18 feet to the front porch/balcony. However, the front yard setback is not met for interior units along Nicora Way, except for the units on Lots 5 and 8. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Side Yard Setbacks:* In the Northwest Planning Area the minimum side yard setback in the R-M zone is five to seven feet depending on the building wall height (combined side yards must also total a minimum of 15 feet). While some of the units comply with the independent setback requirement, most do not meet the combined 15-foot requirement. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Rear Yard Setbacks:* The minimum rear yard setback for two-story buildings within the R-M zone is 20 feet. This requirement is met for seven units along the south and west sides of the project site (Lots 2-8). However, none of the other units comply with this standard, having rear yard setbacks of 14 to 18 feet in general. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Garage Setback:* Within the R-M zone, garages must be setback 20 feet from the front of the primary structure. This requirement is not met in that most garages are setback roughly 10 to 11 feet from the face of the residence (three of the units have a four-foot garage setback). As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Floor Area Ratio (FAR):* For the Northwest Planning Area the maximum FAR in the R-M zone is 0.50. Two-thirds of the lots do not comply with this standard, and the average FAR for lots within the development is 0.55. However, based on the total area of the site, the project as a whole would have an FAR of 0.39. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from this and other development standards.

*Coverage:* For the Northwest Planning Area the maximum coverage in the R-M zone is 60% of the total lot area. This standard is met as lots within the development would result in coverage between 15% and 34%, with an average lot coverage of 28%.

*Building Height:* The maximum building height for the R-M zone is 30 feet. The proposed unit types would range from  $\pm 24$  to  $\pm 30$  feet in height.

*Common Open Space:* Within the R-M zone, 300 square feet of usable common open space is required per unit, which equals 5,400 square feet for the proposed 18-unit development. A small private park is proposed toward the center of the site as an amenity for residents, however this feature falls short of requirement with an area of  $\pm 3,700$  square feet. As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from the development standards. In addition, each unit is provided with private yard areas as noted below.

*Private Open Space:* Within the R-M zone, 75 to 225 square feet of private open space is required per unit. All of the units are provided with private yard areas of 700 square feet or greater.

*Inclusionary Units:* Under Section 19.44.020.B of the Development Code, projects containing five or more residential parcels or units shall provide that at least 20% of the total number of parcels or units are affordable to households in the low and moderate-income categories. Accordingly, a minimum of four units within the development must be affordable. The project architect has indicated that the units on lots 3, 11, 15, and 16 would be the designated affordable properties/units that would be sold or rented at the moderate income level. Draft condition of approval No. 21 implements this requirement, including the standard provision that the designated units remain affordable for a minimum period of 45 years under contract with the City.

*On-Site Parking:* Multi-family development, including Planned Developments, must provide 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit (one of which must be covered) plus guest parking at the rate of 25% of the total required parking. Under this standard, a total of 34 on-site parking spaces are required for the project, including 18 covered spaces and 7 guest spaces. Thirty-two (32) covered parking spaces are provided as 14 units have two-car garages and four units have one-car garages. An equivalent number of driveway apron spaces (32) are also provided for the units in tandem with the garage spaces. However, only four dedicated guest parking spaces are proposed versus the normal requirement of seven spaces. As part of the Planned Development Permit, flexibility is being requested from the guest parking standard (refer to “Discussion of Project Issues” below).

*Site Design & Architectural Review:* Pursuant to the Development Code, the Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing and acting upon the project site plan, building massing and elevation concepts to the extent it deems necessary. Subsequent review by the Design Review Commission is also required for Planned Unit Developments, encompassing elevation details, colors and materials, landscaping (including fences and walls), lighting, site details, and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission (§19.54.080E). This requirement has been included in the draft conditions of approval.

*Demolition Permit:* The eight residential/accessory buildings currently located on the site (most constructed between 1946 and 1964) would be demolished to accommodate the project. Evaluations of these buildings concluded that they are not historically significant, and on May 21, 2013, the Design Review Commission approved demolition of the structures.

*Planned Development Permit:* A Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow variation from the following development standards that apply to development in the R-M zone: lot size and dimension, setbacks (front/streetside, side, rear, and garage), Floor Area Ratio (FAR), common open space, and parking requirements (number of dedicated guest spaces). A Planned Development Permit is intended to address development under specified circumstances, such as on sites that are physically constrained, developments that provide additional affordable housing, or projects that require variations from the normal development standards to achieve a higher level of design quality than would otherwise be possible. A Planned Development Permit is not intended for the purpose of maximizing development potential or maximizing unit sizes. The Planning Commission may approve a Planned Development Permit application provided that the following findings can be made:

1. *That the PDP is consistent with the General Plan and the intent and objectives of Section 19.54.070 of the Development Code;*

As set forth in the preceding discussion of General Plan consistency, the project is substantially consistent with applicable General Plan policies that promote infill development and housing opportunities. As previously noted, the project departs from several Development Code standards,

which is allowable through the PD process, as long as the Planning Commission is able to find that the overall qualities of the project justify such departures. The project's conformance with the intent and objectives of a Planned Development Permit are examined in detail within the analysis of the following findings.

2. *That the design of the development is consistent with the intent of applicable regulations and design guidelines of the Development Code;*

In general, the project design, including the U-shaped private street, represents an efficient use of the property for detached homes on small lots. As a whole, the project falls well below the maximum allowance for floor area ratio and site coverage, while providing high quality housing at the middle of the density range allowed for the R-M zone. The area of common open space falls short of the normal standard but this deficiency is more than offset by the amount of private open space provided for each unit. Increased setbacks have been provided on the south and west sides of the project to improve compatibility with neighboring residential development, and greater setbacks have also been provided from West MacArthur Street.

Desired future conditions and the design guidelines for residential structures in the Northwest Planning Area encourage new multi-family development along West Spain Street that emulates good examples in the area by providing generous street-side setbacks, maintaining low building profiles, and locating interior parking within the interior or back of lot (Chapter 19.24 of the Development Code). Under the revised proposal, units along the West Spain Street frontage, while two-story, exceed the minimum 20-foot setback standard and staff appreciates the orientation of the units to the street with garages tucked behind, along with the provision of porches, and varying architectural styles and detailing.

Accordingly, many objectives of the Development Code for providing medium-density residential housing consistent with neighboring development are met. However, the shortfall in the amount of guest parking, and the lack of unit variety must also be considered. In addition, Planning Commission must determine if the project modifications respond adequately to the compatibility and other concerns identified through the review process.

3. *The various use and development elements of the Planned Development relate to one another in such a way as to justify exceptions to the normal zoning standards of the Development Code;*

The applicant is pursuing a Planned Development Permit in order to implement the development concept of detached homes on small lots. This concept provides some contrast with neighboring attached residential developments, but the revisions made to the project following the initial Planning Commission study session have improved its fit with its surroundings. Notwithstanding the detached unit design, the project features a common open space area that is well-situated to improve the sense of openness within the development, while also providing benefits with respect to stormwater retention and protecting water quality. Although internal building setbacks are reduced, setbacks that meet or exceed the normal standard are provided on the north, south and west in order to improve compatibility. (On the east, the driveway serving the adjoining residential development provides significant separation.) That said, while there are five different unit types, including a partial two-story building plan, all of the units have two-story elements and all of them are configured with three bedrooms and two bathrooms. While the project complies with minimum inclusionary affordable requirement, it does not provide anything extra in this regard.

4. *The design flexibility allowed by the PDP has been used to creatively address identified physical and environmental constraints; and*

The size and depth of the project site, in conjunction with public street frontage on only one side, makes it somewhat difficult to provide compliant emergency vehicles access in an efficient manner for multi-family development. The proposed U-shaped drive meets the required EVA standard while maximizing egress and ingress options, as opposed to concentrating these movements at a single point of entry.

5. *The proposed development will be well-integrated into its setting, will relate appropriately to adjacent uses, and will retain desirable natural features of the site and the surrounding area.*

Because the proposal is an infill project it must be evaluated carefully in terms of how it relates to existing development on adjoining properties, especially considering that two-story homes are proposed. The table below compares the proposed setbacks to adjoining development:

Site Boundary	Adjoining Development			Nicora Place PD (Proposed)	
	Complex Name	Improvement Type	(E) Setback	(P) Setback	Improvement Type (P)
East Edge	Sonoma Park Condominiums	1-story condos	37'	16.5' to 30.5'	2-story home
South Edge	Sonoma Park Condominiums	community pool	25'	20' to 22'	2-story home
	De Smet Apartments	2-story apartments	10'	20'	2-story home
West Edge	Sonoma Gardens Condominiums	1 & 2-story buildings	15.5'	20' to 33'	2-story home
		community pool	28'	20'	2-story home

The project’s relationship to the condominiums to the east does not raise any significant concern because the intervening driveway contributes to a substantial separation between existing and proposed development. In response to conditions on the south and west sides of the site where adjoining improvements are closer, the setbacks have been increased to a minimum of 20 feet (compliant with zoning), and two E1 units with partial second-stories have been sited on the west edge where condominiums in the Sonoma Gardens complex are in proximity. In addition, elimination of a unit has allowed for the site layout to be loosened up to some degree. The Planning Commission must determine if these modifications respond adequately to the compatibility concerns that have been raised through the review process.

In terms of retaining natural features, tree preservation is focused on perimeter trees, although a few interior trees would be preserved as well. While several larger trees would be removed as a result of the project, a minimum of 48 replacement trees would be required per the Tree Committee’s recommendation, including 60” box size trees on the west and south edges of the project site for screening and 24” box size street trees (see ”Tree Ordinance” section below)

In summary, it is staff’s view that the revised project is much improved and on the threshold with respect to the findings necessary to approve a Planned Development Permit. The Planning Commission

could determine that the revised project meets the PD findings or it could decide that additional modifications should be required in order to justify approval of the PD permit. See the additional analysis under “Discussion of Project Issues” regarding the Planned Development Permit Findings.

**CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER**

**CITY ORDINANCES/POLICIES** ( **Not Applicable to this Project**)

*Growth Management Ordinance:* Under the Growth Management Ordinance (GMO), the project is considered a “Large Project” which is subject to pre-application requirements for establishing a place in the processing queue to receive unit allocations. As required by the GMO, the site accumulated the necessary unit allocations prior to submittal of the formal development application.

*Tree Ordinance:* As required by the City’s Tree Ordinance, an arborist report was prepared evaluating trees on and adjacent to the project site. The Tree Protection Plan (TPP) prepared by Sherby Sanborn Consulting Arborist identified 93 trees on the project site (plus numerous privets), of which 36 would be retained and protected with development of the project. The Tree Committee (TC) reviewed the TPP on May 23, 2013. Several neighbors attended the meeting expressing concerns about the project and proposed tree removal. Neighbors identified several trees of particular value to them that would be removed, including a silk tree prominently located along the project frontage, the Italian cypress trees toward the northwest corner of the site, and several large interior trees (a cluster of three redwoods, an Arizona cypress, and a deodor cedar). In review of the TPP, peer review arborist James MacNair noted the difficulty in preserving existing trees in medium-density projects. Accordingly, the Tree Committee’s efforts focused on preserving trees along the perimeter of the site and appropriate replanting requirements. Ultimately, the Tree Committee made the following recommendations to the Planning Commission, which have been included in the draft conditions of approval:

1. Adhere to the recommendations and tree protection measures set forth in the Tree Protection Plan prepared by Sherby Sanborn (dated April 15, 2013).
2. Conduct tree removal activities outside of the nesting season.
3. Shift the storm drain and residence on Lot 9, as well as small portion of storm drain on Lots 8 & 10 two feet to the west to further minimize potential impacts on trees #70-77 along the east project boundary.
4. For the replanting program require a minimum of 48 replacement trees as illustrated on the Preliminary Site Plan prepared Civil Design Consultants Inc. Plant 60” box size trees on the west and south edges of the project site for screening and 24” box size street trees.
5. During demolition activities pay special attention to the mulberrys on the south side of the project site (trees #6-11), as some root pruning and watering may be necessary.

*Review by Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission (SVCAC):* The SVCAC considered the project at a public hearing held on August 28, 2013. Nine members of the public addressed the commission, expressing concerns about density, inadequate parking, traffic impacts, tree removal, construction impacts, issues of affordability, loss private views and neighborhood open space, relocation of existing residents, and variation from normal zoning standards as a Planned Development. While some of these issues were discussed by individual commissioners, the SVCAC ultimately voted to forward the public comments to the Planning Commission for consideration and requested that the Planning Commission look at stormwater and traffic/traffic safety concerns (the draft minutes from the SVCAC meeting are attached).

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW** ( **Not Applicable to this Project**)

An Initial Study was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate potential environmental impacts that could result from the project. Potentially significant impacts were identified in the following areas: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities/Service Systems. However, all potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through incorporation of mitigation measures, which have been included in the draft conditions of approval and mitigation monitoring program. The Environmental Review Committee (ERC) reviewed the Initial Study on September 4, 2013. On a vote of 4-0, the ERC recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. In light of water supply constraints, one ERC member raised the possibility of prohibiting turf within the project, a suggestion that the Planning Commission may wish to consider in review of the project.

*Traffic:* As discussed in the Transportation/Traffic section of the Initial Study (beginning on page 34), a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared by W-Trans to analyze the potential traffic and circulation impacts associated with the proposed development, including cumulative impacts. Taking into account the 10 existing housing units on the site the *net* increase in traffic associated with the project is expected to average 76 trips per day, with 6 of these during the morning peak hour and 8 during the evening peak hour. A capacity analysis and discussion of access and circulation are included in the TIS:

- *Capacity Analysis:* The TIS concludes that the study intersections and roadways are projected to operate acceptably with the project, except for the intersection of West Spain Street/Fifth Street West, which currently operates at an unacceptable level of service during the p.m. peak hour. Because the project would have an incremental contribution to delay at this intersection, the TIS recommends that the applicant pay a proportional share of the cost of signaling the intersection (a planned future improvement), or alternatively cover the cost of installing red curbing on the north side of West Spain Street on the westbound approach to the intersection (this has been included as a mitigation measure). Either of these improvements would result in acceptable operating conditions at the intersection.
- *Access and Circulation:* The TIS evaluates site access, including sight distance and the easterly driveway's offset alignment with Junipero Serra Drive. The TIS concludes that limited vehicle conflicts are expected to result from the project and that the access points, including the offset intersection with Junipero Serra Drive, are expected to operate within acceptable safety parameters given the low turning movement volumes that would be generated at the site's driveways. However, in order to maintain adequate sight lines for vehicles leaving the site, the TIS recommends red-curbings adjacent to both driveways, appropriate location of signs/monuments along the project frontage, and appropriate landscape plantings and maintenance along the project frontage (this has been included as a mitigation measure).

*Stormwater Management:* As discussed in the Hydrology/Water Quality section of the Initial Study (beginning on page 21), the project is subject to the Storm Water and Standard Urban Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, which call for the implementation of post-construction measures to treat and prevent increases in storm water runoff. Consistent with the SUSMP requirements, a Preliminary Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SMP) has been developed by the applicant's engineer to demonstrate compliance with these standards. As illustrated by the SMP and Tentative Map, stormwater treatment, retention and infiltration would be accomplished by conveying the majority of surface runoff from the site to two depressed bioretention beds located in the park. In addition, each lot would have small yard areas with landscaping where the filtration of stormwater would also be expected to occur. Excess flows

would enter an underground storm drain system that would ultimately connect to an existing 7' x 4' concrete box storm drain under West Spain Street.

### **DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ISSUES**

*Parking:* As noted above, the amount of dedicated guest parking has been reduced in the revised proposal, with four spaces proposed versus the normal requirement of seven spaces. While the City's parking standards are otherwise met and the total number of spaces as a whole (garage, apron, plus guest) exceeds the minimum requirement, staff feels that further discussion of the amount of dedicated guest spaces is warranted considering:

- Parking on the private street (Nicora Way) would be prohibited as a fire lane.
- All of the homes are proposed as 3-bedroom, 2-bath units aimed toward families.
- Garages are proposed at the minimum dimension and storage needs could reduce the number of cars parked in garages.

To address general concerns about parking, the applicant has proposed that the CC&R's for the development would require that garages be used exclusively for vehicle parking (this has been included in draft condition of approval No. 22). Staff would note that CC&R's are private restrictions subject to enforcement by the owner/HOA and not the City. Ultimately, flexibility from the guest parking requirement is an issue that the Planning Commission must consider as part of the Planned Development Permit.

*Planned Development Permit Findings:* As previously noted, a Planned Development Permit is being requested to allow flexibility from a number of development standards in order to accommodate the proposed design concept (detached 3-bedroom, 2-bath homes on small, independent lots). In the study session review of July 2012, staff emphasized that, as a Planned Development, a higher level of quality, design, site amenities and/or project benefits is expected to justify variations from the normal standards, and that the project must relate appropriately to adjacent uses. At the study session, neighbors expressed concerns about compatibility in terms of the two-story design, proposed setbacks, privacy impacts, density, traffic, tree removal, construction impacts, loss private views and light, and variation from normal zoning standards as a Planned Development. The commission seemed supportive of the concept of detached homes for the Planned Development but echoed some of the neighbor concerns.

A number of modifications have been made to the project in response to these comments including a reduction in density to loosen up the layout, increased building setbacks at the perimeter of the site (notably on the south and west sides as well as from West Spain Street), and the introduction of a new partial two-story unit plan. Despite these changes, many neighbors still have some of the same concerns. Elements of the project that support a Planned Development Permit include the common park amenity, modest unit sizes, the use of high quality exterior materials and detailing, a reasonable FAR overall (0.39 vs. 0.50 allowed in the R-M zone) and, to some degree, the division of the mass of the project into smaller individual structures, rather than concentrated within fewer but larger buildings.

That said, when scrutinizing the proposal closely, staff does have concerns about the amount of guest parking, the lack of unit variety in that all homes are detached, two-story, 3-bedroom/2-bath homes, many with a vertical nature featuring 9-foot ceiling heights and high roof peaks/pitches in certain cases. Further, it is not entirely clear to staff whether the changes that have been made to project following the initial Planning Commission study session fully address the issues expressed by Commissioners at that time, including the key concern of compatibility with adjacent development.

In light of concerns about the PD findings, staff had suggested that the applicant consider designating the inclusionary units affordable at the low income level and employing a smaller, single-story design for them, possibly as attached duplexes. In addition to providing a greater level of affordability, the variety of unit designs would be improved and, depending on the design and placement of the modified units, it might be possible to provide two additional guest parking spaces and further improve compatibility with adjoining development. In considering this proposal, it was the applicant's view that a duplex design would not be consistent with the overall project concept and that further project modifications would be counterproductive to providing market-rate, housing opportunities for families at a reasonable price, as the greater subsidy required for the low income units would be reflected in the cost of the market-rate units.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

As noted above questions remain related to the PD findings, unit variety, guest parking, and whether the revised proposal adequately responds to compatibility concerns and other commissioner direction from the study session review. Accordingly, staff recommends commission discretion, with respect to the requested planning permits.

To approve the project, the Planning Commission must take the following actions:

1. *Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, based on the attached findings.* Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take this action.
2. *Approve the Tentative Map, Use Permit, and Planned Development Permit based on the attached findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval.* Staff recommends Commission discretion. In this regard, it is staff's view that the key issue is the findings for approval of the Planned Development Permit. The Planning Commission may determine that the findings may be made for the project as submitted, or the Commission may find that additional changes are necessary to achieve compliance with the findings.

### **Attachments:**

1. *Resolution Adopting Findings of Negative Declaration*
2. *Draft Findings of Project Approval*
3. *Draft Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Monitoring Program, including PRMD Sanitation Conditions*
4. *Draft Minutes of the SVCAC meeting of August 28, 2013*

### **Enclosures:**

1. *Project Information/Application Submittal*
2. *Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study with Attachments*

**All documents and studies associated with the project, including the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study with attachments can be downloaded from the City's website at <http://www.sonomacity.org/default.aspx?PageId=455> (under "Current Reports").**

cc: Steve Ledson  
P.O. Box 915  
Sonoma, CA 95476

Axia Architects  
Attn. Doug Hilberman  
250 D Street, Suite 210  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Civil Design Consultants, Inc.  
Attn: Andy Bordessa  
2200 Range Avenue, Suite 204  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Interested Neighbor List (via email)

**CITY OF SONOMA**

**RESOLUTION**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SONOMA  
ADOPTING FINDINGS OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO THE  
PROPOSED NICORA PLACE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AT 821-845 WEST SPAIN STREET**

WHEREAS, an application has been made for a Planned Development Permit, Use Permit, and Tentative Map to subdivide and construct an 18-unit Planned Development on a 2-acre site at 821 and 845 West Spain Street; and,

WHEREAS, because this proposal qualifies as a “project,” as defined in the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study was prepared; and,

WHEREAS, the Initial Study identified several areas where the project is anticipated to have an adverse impact on the environment, unless appropriate mitigation measures are taken; and,

WHEREAS, for each area where a significant impact was identified, the Initial Study also identified mitigation measures capable of reducing the impact to a less-than-significant level; and,

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study have been agreed to by the project sponsor and incorporated into the conditions of project approval and mitigation monitoring program; and,

WHEREAS, the Initial Study was reviewed by the Planning Commission in a duly noticed public hearing held on September 26, 2013.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Sonoma hereby finds and declares as follows:

- a. That the Mitigated Negative Declaration, along with all comments received during the public review period, was considered and acted upon prior to any action or recommendation regarding the project.
- b. That, based on the Initial Study and taking into account the comments received during the public review period, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- c. That there is no reasonable likelihood that the project will result in any of the impacts specified under the mandatory findings of significance, as defined in the Initial Study.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission  
**FINDINGS OF PROJECT APPROVAL**  
Nicora Place Planned Development  
821-845 West Spain Street

September 26, 2013

Based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the initial study and staff report, and upon consideration of all testimony received in the course of the public review, including the public review, the City of Sonoma Planning Commission finds and declares as follows:

**Tentative Map Findings**

1. That the proposed subdivision, together with the provisions for its design and improvement, is consistent with the 2020 General Plan land use designation requirements and the applicable provisions of the Development Code (including exceptions specifically authorized through the Planned Development Permit).
2. That the tentative map complies with the requirements of the Article VI (Subdivisions) of the Development Code.
3. That the site is physically suited to the type and density of the proposed development, regulated by the conditions of project approval.

**Planned Development Permit Findings**

1. The PUD is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable Specific Plan, and the intent and objectives of Section 19.54.070 of the Development Code;
2. The design of the development is consistent with the intent of applicable regulations and design guidelines of the Development Code;
3. The various use and development elements of the Planned Development relate to one another in such a way as to justify exceptions to the normal zoning standards of the Development Code;
4. The design flexibility allowed by the Planned Development Permit has been used to creatively address identified physical and environmental constraints; and
5. The proposed development will be well-integrated into its setting, will relate appropriately to adjacent uses, and will retain desirable natural features of the site and the surrounding area.

**Use Permit Findings**

1. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan;
2. The proposed use is allowed with a conditional Use Permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable standards and regulations of this Development Code;
3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity; and
4. The proposed use will not impair the architectural integrity and character of the zoning district in which it is to be located.

City of Sonoma Planning Commission  
**CONDITIONS OF PROJECT APPROVAL AND  
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**  
Nicora Place Planned Development  
821-845 West Spain Street

September 26, 2013

1. The planned development shall be constructed in conformance with the approved tentative map, site plan, floor plans and building elevations, except as modified by these conditions and the following:
  - a. The storm drain and residence on Lot 9, as well as small portion of SD on Lots 8 & 10 shall be shifted two feet to the west to further minimize potential impacts on trees along the east project boundary.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department; Building Division; Public Works Division, City Engineer  
*Timing:* Ongoing

2. The following are required by the City and other affected agencies prior to the approval of the Final Map.
  - a. A Final Map shall be prepared and submitted to the City Engineer and Planning Director for approval along with the following supporting data: recent (within the most recent three months) preliminary title report, closure calculations and copies of records used to prepare survey (such as deeds and easements, filed maps, etc.). Upon approval and acceptance by the City, the map will be released to the Applicant's title company for filing at the office of the Sonoma County Recorder. The Applicant shall provide the number and types of copies to the City as directed by the City Engineer.
  - b. All required sidewalk, street, storm drainage, water, sewer, access and public utility easements shall be dedicated to the City of Sonoma or to other affected agencies of jurisdiction, as required and shown on the Final Map.
  - c. Three-quarter inch iron pipe monuments shall be set at all tract corners and at all lot corners, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer. Street centerline monuments shall be set as directed by the City Engineer. All monuments must be approved by the City Engineer.
  - d. The applicant shall show proof of payment of all outstanding engineering plan check fees within thirty (30) days of notice for payment and prior to Final Map recordation, whichever occurs first.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Director; City Engineer  
*Timing:* Prior to acceptance of the Final Map

3. A grading and drainage plan and an erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and submitted to the City Engineer and the Sonoma County Water Agency for review and approval. The required plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of a grading permit and commencement of grading/construction activities. The erosion control measures specified in the approved plan shall be implemented during construction prior to the first rains or October 1<sup>st</sup>. Grade differences between lots will not be permitted unless separated by properly designed concrete or masonry retaining walls. This requirement may be modified or waived at the discretion of the City Engineer. An NPDES permit shall be required and the plans shall conform to the 2005 SUSMP Guidelines and the City of Sonoma Grading Ordinance (Chapter 14.20 of the Municipal Code). Applicable erosion control measures shall be identified on the erosion control plan and shall be implemented throughout the construction phase of the project: soil stabilization techniques such as hydroseeding and short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets or wattles, silt fences and/or some kind of inlet protection at downstream storm drain inlets, post-construction inspection of all facilities for accumulated sediment, and post-construction clearing of all drainage structures of debris and sediment. Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SMP) in accordance with the 2005 SUSMP Guidelines with the grading plans. The improvement plans (see Condition #4 below) will not be accepted by the City Engineer for review without first reviewing and approving the SMP.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; SCWA; Public Works Department  
*Timing:* Prior to issuance of the grading permit

4. The following improvements shall be required and shown on the improvement plans and are subject to the review of the City Engineer, Planning Administrator and Fire Chief. Public improvements shall meet City standards. The improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and approved by the City Engineer prior to recording of the Final Map. All drainage improvements shall be designed in accordance with the Sonoma County Water Agency "Flood Control Design Criteria." Plans and engineering calculations for drainage improvements, and plans for sanitary sewer facilities, shall be submitted to the Sonoma County Water Agency (and a copy of submittal packet to the City Engineer) for review and approval.
  - a. The property frontage on East Spain Street shall be improved with curb, gutter, and sidewalk as required by the City Engineer. Existing curb and gutter along the East Spain Street frontage that are damaged or deemed by the City Engineer to be in disrepair shall be replaced to City standards. In addition, paving upgrades to centerline of the East Spain Street in front of the property may be required. The existing residential driveway serving the site shall be eliminated. The two new project driveways shall be constructed in conformance with the City's standard specifications and meet ADA requirements.
  - b. Storm drains and related facilities, including off-site storm drain facilities as necessary to connect to existing storm drain facilities and on-site drainage systems.
  - c. Stormwater BMPs as approved in the Applicant's preliminary and final Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SMP) shall be shown on the drainage and improvement plans.
  - d. Grading plans shall be included in the improvement plans and are subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer, Planning Administrator and the Building Official.
  - e. Sewer mains, laterals and appurtenances, including off-site sewer mains and facilities as required by the Sonoma County Water Agency; water conservation measures installed and/or applicable mitigation fees paid as determined by the Sonoma County Water Agency.
  - f. Water mains and appurtenances in all streets within the subdivision including service laterals and water meters to all lots.
  - g. Fire hydrants in the number and at the locations specified by the Fire Chief. Fire hydrants shall be operational prior to beginning combustible construction.
  - h. The private street structural section shall be designed to City standards and in accordance with the recommendations in the Soils Report. In addition, the private road shall be designed to support a 40,000 lb. load for emergency vehicle access. Documentation demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be required
  - i. Private underground utility services, including gas, electricity, cable TV and telephone, to all residential lots/units in the subdivision. Any overhead utilities along the property frontage shall be undergrounded in accordance with Section 19.62.100 of the Municipal Code.
  - j. Signing and striping plans shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. Said plans shall include "No Parking" signs/markings along the private street, traffic control signs, and pavement markings as required by the City Engineer and SVFRA/Fire Chief.
  - k. Street trees as required by the Planning Administrator and the Public Works Director. All street trees shall be planted concurrently with completion of street construction and shall be consistent with the City's Tree Planting Program, including the District Tree List. The developer shall provide for irrigation of the trees until occupancy of houses on a lot-by-lot basis within the project.
  - l. Parking and drives shall be surfaced with an all-weather surface material as approved by the Building Department.

- m. The address numbers shall be posted at the public street and on the individual structures in a manner visible from the public/private street. Type and location of posting are subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer, Fire Chief and Planning Administrator.
- n. All public sidewalk, street, storm drainage, water, sewer, access and public utility easements shall be dedicated to the City of Sonoma or to other affected agencies of jurisdiction, as required
- o. The applicant shall show proof of payment of all outstanding engineering plan check fees within thirty (30) days of notice for payment and prior to the approval of the improvement plans, whichever occurs first.
- p. All grading, including all swales, etc., shall be performed between April 1<sup>st</sup> and October 15<sup>th</sup> of any year, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department; Building Department; Planning Department; Fire Department; SCWA

*Timing:* Prior to the approval of the Final Map and issuance of the grading and encroachment permits

- 5. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the City of Sonoma for all work within the West Spain Street right-of-way.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department; Building Department

*Timing:* Prior to City approval of public improvement plans

- 6. The applicant shall be required to pay for all inspections prior to the acceptance of public improvements, or within 30 days of receipt of invoice; all plan checking fees at the time of the plan checks; and any other fees charged by the City of Sonoma, the Sonoma County Water Agency or other affected agencies with reviewing authority over this project, except those fees from which any designated affordable units are specifically exempted.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Public Works Department; Building Department; City Engineer; Affected agency

*Timing:* Prior to the acceptance of public improvements, or plan check, or within 30 days of receipt of invoice, as specified above

- 7. No structures of any kind shall be constructed within the public easements dedicated for public use, except for structures for which the easements are intended.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department; Planning Department

*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any grading/building permit; Ongoing

- 8. The project shall comply with the standards set forth in the 2005 SUSMP Guidelines (i.e., the City-adopted document entitled "Guidelines for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan" for the Santa Rosa Area and Unincorporated Areas around Petaluma and Sonoma, dated June 3, 2005) herein referred to as SUSMP guidelines. Applicant shall submit a final Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SWP) in accordance with the SUSMP guidelines to the City's Stormwater Coordinator and City Engineer for review and approval. Said SMP shall identify specific BMPs and include the BMPs in the project drainage and improvement plans.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department

*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any grading/building permit

- 9. The project applicant/developer shall comply with all Phase II NPDES requirements. A Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and submitted to the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) Division of Water Quality.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* SWRCB; City Engineer; Public Works Department; Stormwater Coordinator

*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any grading/building permit; Ongoing through construction

10. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a water demand analysis shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and submitted by the applicant and shall be subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer. Said analysis shall be in compliance with the City's current policy on water demand and capacity analysis as outlined in Resolution 46-2010. Building permits for the project shall only be issued if the City Engineer finds, based on the water demand analysis in relation to the available water supply, that sufficient capacity is available to serve the proposed development, which finding shall be documented in the form of a will-serve letter, prepared by the City Engineer. Any will-serve letter shall remain valid only so long as the use permit for the project remains valid.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department  
*Timing:* Prior to issuance of any building permit

11. A soils and geotechnical investigation and report, prepared by a licensed civil engineer, shall be required for the development prior to the issuance of a grading permit and/or approval of the improvement plans, as determined by the City Engineer. Recommendations identified in the geotechnical investigation and report shall be incorporated into the construction plans for the project and into the building permits.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Building Department  
*Timing:* Prior to issuance of a grading/building permit or recording of the Final Map

12. Provisions shall be made to provide for temporary parking of construction related vehicles and equipment on or adjacent to the project site, and not in the adjacent neighborhoods, to be approved by the City of Sonoma Building, Planning, and Public Works Department. The contractors shall be required to maintain traffic flow on all affected roadways adjacent to the project site during non-working hours, and to minimize traffic restrictions during construction. The contractors shall notify all appropriate City of Sonoma and Sonoma County emergency service providers of planned construction schedules and roadways affected by construction in writing at least 48 hours in advance of any construction activity that could involve road closure or any significant constraint to emergency vehicle movement through the project area or the adjacent neighborhoods.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building, Planning & Public Works Departments; Police & Fire Departments  
*Timing:* Ongoing during construction

13. Any septic systems on the site shall be removed or closed in place, consistent with the permit requirements of the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health. Said septic system(s) shall be shown on the grading plans with details for removal.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health; City Engineer  
*Timing:* Prior to issuance of the Grading and Improvement Plans

14. Any wells on the site shall be abandoned in accordance with permit requirements of the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health; or equipped with a back-flow prevention device as approved by the City Engineer. Wells that will remain shall be plumbed to irrigation system only and not for domestic use.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer; Public Works Department  
*Timing:* Prior to approval of the Grading Plans and Improvement Plans

15. The following agencies must be contacted by the applicant to determine permit or other regulatory requirements of the agency prior to issuance of a building permit, including the payment of applicable fees:
- a. Sonoma County Water Agency. [For sewer connections and modifications and interceptor requirements, and for grading, drainage, and erosion control plans]
  - b. Sonoma County Department of Public Health [For closure and removal of septic tanks]
  - c. Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health [For abandonment of wells]
  - d. Sonoma Valley Unified School District [For school impact fees]

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Department; Public Works Department  
*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any grading/building permit

16. A sewer clearance shall be provided to the City of Sonoma Building Division verifying that all applicable sewer fees have been paid prior to the issuance of any building permit. **Note: Substantial fees may apply for new sewer connections and/or the use of additional ESDs from an existing sewer connection. The applicant is encouraged to check with the Sonoma County Water Agency immediately to determine whether such fees apply.**

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Department  
*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any building permit

17. The applicant/developer shall comply with all public sanitary sewer and water service requirements of the County of Sonoma Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) as outlined in their letter dated June 1, 2012 (attached).

*Enforcement Responsibility:* PRMD; City Engineer; Public Works Department; Planning Department  
*Timing:* As set forth in the letter dated 6/1/2012; Prior to final occupancy

18. All Building Department requirements shall be met, including Building Code requirements related to compliance with CALGreen standards. Building permits shall be required.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Department  
*Timing:* Prior to construction

19. All Fire Department requirements shall be met, including turn radius requirements for emergency vehicle access and any code modifications effective prior to the date of issuance of any building permit. Automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be provided in all buildings. "No Parking Fire Lane" signs, red-curbings or other markings/measures as prescribed by the SVFRA shall be provided along both sides of private street. An approved all-weather emergency vehicle access road to within 150 feet of all portions of all structures shall be provided prior to beginning combustible construction.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Fire Department; Building Department  
*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any building permit

20. The following dust control measures shall be implemented as necessary during the construction phase of the project: 1) all exposed soil areas (i.e. building sites, unpaved access roads, parking or staging areas) shall be watered at least twice daily or as required by the City's construction inspector; 2) exposed soil stockpiles shall be enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily; and 3) the portion of West Spain Street providing construction vehicle access to the project site shall be swept daily, if visible soil material is deposited onto the road.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Building Inspector; Public Works Inspector  
*Timing:* Ongoing during construction

21. Four (4) units within the development (the units located on Lots 3, 11, 15, and 16) shall be designated as affordable units for households in the low or moderate income categories. The affordable units shall be recorded against the deeds of the lots on which they lie at the County Recorder's Office, with a standard City Affordability Agreement subject to review and approval by the Planning Administrator. The developer shall enter into a contract with the City assuring the continued affordability of the designated units for a minimum period of 45 years and establishing maximum rents, maximum sale prices, and resale restrictions. The affordable units shall be constructed in conjunction with construction of the market rate units.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department, Building Department  
*Timing:* Prior to occupancy of any unit.

22. The applicant shall submit a Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions document for review and approval by the City Attorney and City Engineer in conjunction with the establishment of a homeowner's association for the subdivision. At a minimum, the CC&R's shall provide for maintenance and specify standards to be used to maintain the private

street, private street furniture/light standards, private street signs, red-curbings and other pavement markings/stripping, private drainage facilities, private park, private curb, gutter, sidewalk, the driveways and common landscape areas/features (including private street trees) and shall be recorded with the County of Sonoma. The CC&R's shall also include a requirement mandating that garages be maintained for vehicle parking. This project shall be developed as a common interest subdivision.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* City Engineer, City Attorney  
*Timing:* Prior the recordation of the Final Map

23. The project shall be constructed in accordance with the following requirements related to tree preservation, mitigation and replacement:
- a. Adhere to the recommendations and tree protection measures set forth in the Tree Protection Plan prepared by Sherby Sanborn Consulting Arborist (dated April 15, 2013).
  - b. Conduct tree removal activities outside of the nesting season (February 15 and August 15).
  - c. Shift the storm drain and residence on Lot 9, as well as small portion of SD on Lots 8 & 10 two feet to the west to further minimize potential impacts on trees #70-77 along the east project boundary.
  - d. For the replanting program require a minimum of 48 replacement trees as illustrated on the Preliminary Site Plan prepared Civil Design Consultants Inc. Plant 60" box size trees on the west and south edges of the project site for screening and 24" box size street trees.
  - e. During demolition activities pay special attention to the Mulberrys on the south side of the project site (trees #6-11) as some root pruning and watering may be necessary.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department, Design Review Commission  
*Timing:* Throughout demolition/construction; Prior to the issuance of any occupancy permit

24. The project shall be subject to architectural review by the Design Review Commission (DRC), encompassing elevation details, exterior colors and materials, site details, and any other issues specifically referred to the DRC by the Planning Commission.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department; DRC  
*Timing:* Prior to the issuance of any building permit

25. Solid wood fencing with a minimum height of 6 feet shall be installed along the east, west, and southern boundaries of the development in compliance with Development Code §19.40.100 (Screening and Buffering) and §19.46 (Fences, Hedges, and Walls). The fencing shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC) as part of the landscape plan.

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department; DRC  
*Timing:* Prior to any occupancy permit

26. A landscape plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. The plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC). The plan shall address site landscaping, the private park, fencing/walls, hardscape improvements, and required tree plantings. Street trees along the West Spain Street frontage and along the private street shall be consistent with the City's Tree Planting Program, including the District Tree List. The landscape plan shall comply with City of Sonoma's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code §14.32) and Development Code Sections 19.40.100 (Screening and Buffering), 19.46 (Fences, Hedges, and Walls), 19.40.070 (Open Space for Multi-Family Residential Projects), and 19.40.060 (Landscape Standards).

*Enforcement Responsibility:* Planning Department; DRC  
*Timing:* Prior to any occupancy permit

27. Onsite lighting shall be addressed through a lighting plan, subject to the review and approval of the Design Review Commission (DRC). All proposed exterior lighting for the buildings and/or site shall be indicated on the lighting plan and specifications for light fixtures shall be included. The lighting shall conform to the standards and guidelines contained under Section 19.40.030 of the Development Code (Exterior Lighting). No light or glare shall be directed toward, or allowed to spill onto any offsite areas. All exterior light fixtures shall be shielded to avoid glare onto neighboring properties, and shall be the minimum necessary for site safety and security.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Division; DRC*  
*Timing: Prior to issuance of occupancy permit*

28. The following measures shall be implemented as necessary during the construction phase of the project for the protection of nesting birds.
- a. Grading or removal of nesting trees and habitat should be conducted outside the nesting season, which occurs between approximately February 15 and August 15.
  - b. If grading between August 15 and February 15 is infeasible and groundbreaking must occur within the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey of the grassland and trees shall be performed by a qualified biologist within 7 days of ground breaking. If no nesting birds are observed no further action is required and grading shall occur within one week of the survey to prevent “take” of individual birds that could begin nesting after the survey.
  - c. If active bird nests (either passerine and/or raptor) are observed during the pre-construction survey, a disturbance-free buffer zone shall be established around the nest tree(s) until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.
  - d. The radius of the required buffer zone can vary depending on the species, (i.e., 75-100 feet for passerines and 200-300 feet for raptors), with the dimensions of any required buffer zones to be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFG.
  - e. To delineate the buffer zone around a nesting tree, orange construction fencing shall be placed at the specified radius from the base of the tree within which no machinery or workers shall intrude.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Public Works Department*  
*Timing: Throughout project construction*

29. If historic or prehistoric artifacts or sites are observed during future grading or underground excavation, all work in the vicinity of the find shall stop until the discovery area can be evaluated by an archaeologist. Depending on the extent and cultural composition of the discovered materials, data recovery may be necessary and it may be advisable to have subsequent excavation monitored by an archaeologist who should be ready to record, recover, and/or protect significant cultural materials from further damage. Artifacts that are typically found associated with prehistoric sites include humanly modified stone, shell, bone or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary features are represented by human skeletal remains. Historic resources potentially include all by-products of human land use greater than 50 years of age, including alignments of stone, foundation elements from previous structures, minor earthworks, and surface scatters and subsurface deposits of domestic type debris.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; Public Works Department*  
*Timing: Throughout project construction*

30. A Tribal Treatment Plan shall be developed in consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) and entered into by the FIGR, the City of Sonoma, the Project Applicant, and the Contractor prior to construction. The plan shall address monitoring of excavation and other earth-moving activities and shall formalize protocol and procedures for the protection and treatment of Native American cultural resources in the event that any are discovered in conjunction with the project’s development.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department*  
*Timing: Prior to issuance of any grading/building permit*

31. If paleontological resources are identified during construction activities, all work in the immediate area will cease until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated the finds in accordance with the standard guidelines established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. If the paleontological resources are considered to be significant, a data recovery program will be implemented in accordance with the guidelines established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; Public Works Department*  
*Timing: Throughout project construction*

32. If human remains are encountered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist shall be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated and further recommendations regarding treatment of the remains is provided.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; County Coroner*  
*Timing: Throughout project construction*

33. Depending on which intersection improvement the City decides to implement, the project applicant shall either 1) pay a proportionate share of 1% of the cost of signalizing the intersection of West Spain Street/Fifth Street West; or 2) submit funds to cover the cost of installing red curb on the north side of West Spain Street for a distance of 125 feet east of Fifth Street West.

*Enforcement Responsibility: City Engineer; Planning Department; Traffic Safety Committee; City Council*  
*Timing: Prior to acceptance of the Final Map*

34. Landscaping shall be maintained such that foliage stays above seven feet and below three feet from the ground. Signs or monuments to be installed along the project frontage shall be placed so that sight distance is not obstructed at the project driveways. Red curbing shall be installed for a distance of ten feet on either side of both project driveways.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; DRC; Public Works Department*  
*Timing: Prior to final occupancy; Ongoing*

35. To ensure adequate emergency vehicle access, parking shall be prohibited along both sides of Nicora Way through the installation of "No Parking Fire Lane" signs or other markings/measures as prescribed by the SVFRA.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Fire Department/SVFRA; Public Works Department; Planning Department*  
*Timing: Prior to final occupancy; Ongoing*

36. The project applicant shall be required to prepare and implement a recycling plan for both the deconstruction of existing structures and new construction detailed in the project description. The recycling plan shall address the major materials generated through deconstruction of existing structures and construction of new buildings, and shall identify the means to divert these materials away from landfill disposal. Typical materials included in such a plan are soil, brush and other vegetative growth, sheetrock, dimensional lumber, metal scraps, cardboard packaging, and plastic wrap.

*Enforcement Responsibility: Planning Department; Building Department; Public Works Department*  
*Timing: Prior to demolition and/or construction; Ongoing through construction*



# COUNTY OF SONOMA

## PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403-2829  
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

---

### RECOMMENDED SANITATION CONDITIONS

Date: June 1, 2012

Planner: Rob Gjestland, City of Sonoma  
From: Charlie Ozanich, PRMD

File Number: "Nicora Place"  
Applicant: Axia Architects  
Owner: Steve Ledson  
Site Address: 845 W. Spain Street, Sonoma, CA  
A.P.N. 127-211-021, -022

**Project description:** Request for a planned development of 18 single family dwellings.

1. Prior to approval and signing of the sewer improvement plans for this project by the Sonoma County Water Agency (Water Agency), the Developer shall provide the Engineering Division of the Permit and Resource Management Department (P.R.M.D.) with a statement from the Water Agency, operator of the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District (District), addressing the current and future levels of collection and treatment capacity within the District. If it is determined by the Water Agency that a "Sewer Capacity Study" is warranted and required for the proposed project, the Developer shall have this study prepared and submitted to P.R.M.D. prior to approval and signing of the improvement plans.
2. The Developer shall obtain Sewer Disconnect permits from the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. to disconnect the existing structures on the project site from the public sewer system. Disconnection of the existing structures from the sewer system shall be inspected by the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. to ensure that disconnection is conducted in compliance with Water Agency Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities, and to preserve any sewer connection credits that may currently be assessed to the property.
3. NOTE ON MAP: "A separate Sewer Connection permit for each lot in this subdivision shall be obtained prior to occupancy of any building constructed on the lot. All fees shall be paid to, and all sewer construction shall be inspected and accepted by the Engineering Division of the Permit and Resource Management Department prior to occupancy of the building."
4. The Developer shall submit improvement plans to the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. for review and approval of the public sewer design. Improvement plans shall be blue line or black line drawings on standard bond paper, 24 inch by 36 inch in size, and prepared by a licensed civil engineer registered in the State of California. Sanitary sewer facilities shall be designed and improvement plans prepared in accordance with Water Agency Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities. The Developer shall pay Plan Checking fees to the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. prior to review of the sewer improvement plans.

Condition No. 4, continued:

**Please note that review of the sanitary sewer design is a separate review from that of the buildings, drainage and frontage improvements, and shall be performed by the Engineering Division of the Permit and Resource Management Department under a separate permit.**

The public sewer improvement plans shall be signed by the Water Agency's Chief Engineer prior to issuance of any permits to construct the public sewer facilities for the proposed subdivision. The design engineer shall submit improvement plans to the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. on 24 inch by 36 inch mylar or vellum originals for signature by the Water Agency. All sanitary sewer inspection permits shall be obtained from the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. prior to the start of construction.

5. Easements necessary for installation of public sewer facilities for the proposed subdivision shall be granted to the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District by separate document, and shall be shown on the subdivision map *and* the sewer improvement plans prior to signing of the improvement plans by the Water Agency. A copy of each easement for sewer construction shall be submitted with the improvement plans for review of the sewer design.
6. The Developer shall construct public sewer mains and appurtenances or post securities to ensure that public sewer facilities are constructed in accordance with Water Agency Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities, as shown on approved improvement plans.
7. The Developer shall construct water mains and appurtenances or post securities to ensure that water supply facilities are installed in accordance with City of Sonoma Water System Standards as shown on approved improvement plans.
8. Prior to the start of sewer construction within a City of Sonoma street right-of-way, the Developer's contractor shall obtain a City of Sonoma Encroachment Permit. A copy of the City Encroachment Permit must be submitted to the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. when obtaining a permit to construct the public sewer facilities for the proposed subdivision.
9. Prior to the start of sewer construction, the Developer shall obtain a permit to construct public sewer facilities for the proposed subdivision. All sewer construction work shall be inspected by the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D., and a Sewer Completion Notice shall be issued by the Inspector before final approved and acceptance of the sewer work by the Water Agency.

No building in the subdivision shall be connected to the newly constructed mainline sewer until the mainline sewer has been inspected by the Engineering Division of PRMD, accepted for maintenance by the Water Agency, and a Sewer Connection Permit has been issued by P.R.M.D. for the building. A Sewer Completion Notice is required prior to occupancy of any building connected to the new sewer main.

10. The Developer shall be responsible for the restoration of existing conditions including, but not limited to surfacing, landscaping, utilities and other public improvements that have been disturbed due to the construction of sanitary sewer facilities. Restoration of existing conditions must be completed prior to the issuance of a Completion Notice, unless otherwise specifically approved in advance by the City of Sonoma.

11. The Developer shall have “record drawings” prepared by the project engineer, in accordance with Section 6-5, of the Sonoma County Water Agency Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities. The record drawings shall be submitted to the Engineering Division of P.R.M.D. for review and approval prior to acceptance of the public sewer facilities.

**SONOMA VALLEY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING AUGUST 28, 2013  
SONOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY ROOM  
175 FIRST STREET WEST, SONOMA  
6:30 p.m.**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Cynthia Wood, Ditty Vella, Ken Brown, Pat Pulvirenti, Sean Bellach, Greg Carr, Tom Martin, Mark Bramfitt

**EXCUSED:** Bruce Green, Kirsten Lindquist, Rochelle Campana, Jack Ding, Richard Caselli, Dick Fogg

**ABSENT:** Clarence Jenkins, Angela White

**Call To Order: 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Minutes Approval Deferred to Next Meeting**

**2. Public Comment:** None

**3. Project Name: Nicora Place Resolution**  
**Applicant Name: AXIA Architects**  
**Owner Name: Ledson & Ledson Development /Steve Ledson**  
**Site Address: 281 and 845 West Spain Street, Sonoma**

**Consider proposal to construct a 19-unit Planned Development on a 2-acre site at 821-845 West Spain Street.**

Chair Bramfitt explained that this project is an application from the City which is rarely heard by the SVCAC. The SVCAC will offer advice to the City of Sonoma for issues with Valley-wide implications such as traffic on major roads and water/sewer concerns. The project will move through the Design Review process and the Planning Commission therefore, the public will have further opportunities for input.

**Applicant presentation:**

Rob Gjestland from Sonoma Planning Council, stated that this is a medium density residential development; the lot is an infill site which is presently 50% vacant and 50% low profile residential structures. The project was originally a 19-unit plan with a similar layout to the present plan but due to many neighbor concerns, 1 unit has been eliminated to loosen density. Proposal has been revised to 18 lots with 2-story homes on each lot and a single story garage, setbacks on the west and south sides have been increased to 20 ft, and setbacks on West Spain have been increased as well.

Doug Hilberman, AXIA Architects, added that owner Steve Ledson wanted to provide workforce housing with access to resources in the City of Sonoma. The property will have small lots with 3 bedroom/2 bath homes that would be affordable for young families while maintaining high quality and historical character. On the east, west and south sides of the property are condos and apartments and to the north are single family residences. Due to neighborhood feedback, there will be full 20 ft setbacks along property lines, a 16 ft setback on the east side, and the project has been scaled down to 18 units. Most of the trees around the perimeter of the property will be saved and supplemented with others for full visibility screening. Neighbors' requests and desires have been met halfway but they feel that the property is appropriate as an infill project and to target young families.

**Commissioner questions:**

Ms. Vella: What is the price point for workforce housing? Will there be a homeowners' association or will homeowners be responsible for their own landscaping?

Doug Hilberman: It has not yet been finalized but maybe 500-600 thousand depending on fluctuation of construction materials and labor. Yes, there will be a homeowners' association but I will defer to Mr. Ledson for more details.

Mr. Martin: What about privacy issues – 2-story structures will be looking down on other properties.

Doug Hilberman: 1) There will be a 20 ft setback on the west side where the issue is greatest; 2) corner houses will be built on a diagonal to other properties, and 3) landscaping and buildings will not look onto pool.

Mr. Martin: What is affordable housing, according to standards and goals?

Doug Hilberman: California has a specific model. There is a big gap between subsidized affordable housing and market rate affordable housing. Ours is an in-between price; it is market rate and not subsidized but at a lower price point, possibly for 1 strong professional income or 2 disposable incomes.

Rob Gjestland: The City has an inclusionary affordable housing requirement - that is 20% of total units. 4 of the 18 will be affordable to moderate or low income category.

Ms Wood: How large are the trees?

Doug Hilberman: Mr. Ledson will address that.

Mr. Bellach: What is market rate affordable housing?

Doug Hilberman: 500-600 thousand. It is at the initial stage, cursory at this point.

Mr. Bellach: It could go up or down...what is the percentage? What are the differences in planned development for setbacks and lot sizes?

Doug Hilberman: This is a medium density application. If we stayed within the zoning requirements, we would be looking at condos. This is an urban infill of single family homes with side yard and front yard setbacks for residences. We are asking for PD leniency and different standards due to a different model project. The perimeter of the lot and the west and south sides with proximity to neighbors will maintain the usual standards.

Rob Gjestland: PD request for flexibility to normal standards. Because of smaller size of lots, exception is asked for setback variation, floor area ratio variation, lot size/lot dimension variation.

Ms. Vella: What about roadsides?

Rob Gjestland: Based on Fire Department standards, 20 ft wide and 2 way travel, sufficient for ladder truck.

Mr. Carr: This Commission sees County projects, and doesn't see many planned development. There should be flexibility to allow for affordability/lower income levels.

Rob Gjestland: Sonoma Commons is PD, behind General's Daughter is RM/PD zone area.

Mr. Carr: The traffic study – offset connection to Junipero Serra not a problem.

Doug Hilberman: There are no issues with Junipero Serra, according to findings of study.

Mr. Carr: There are 5 or 6 mentals currently in the units; how will relocation affect the existing tenants on the lot?

Doug Hilberman: Mr. Ledson will have some time to address that issue.

Chair Bramfitt: We are looking for County-wide impact so please keep it in mind as you make comments.

**Public questions and comments:**

Deborah Nitasaka, on behalf of Sonoma County Housing Advisory, asks how many affordable units, and what price points since no info is available. How will tenants in the 11 currently occupied units be relocated? She states there is insufficient data on the project plan right now.

Laurie Burns, West Spain, is appreciative of the changes made and 20 ft now versus 8 ft before. She asserts they are still large buildings in the proposal and that there is a profit margin and not Habitat for Humanity. The parking in the development behind General's Daughter looks great but lots of juggling, air pollution, and dangerous for kids. The traffic study looks at 1 block on West Spain, it should look at all developments.

Laurie Winter, Junipero Serra, comments that setbacks are vastly improved and the vision of single family homes is nice but crowded in 2 acre space. Her concerns: the U shaped lane is a fire lane and no parking; 2 way traffic coming out of U – would 1 way in and out be possible; driveways are single car wide but there are 2 breadwinners per household; nice attention to the inside park but neighborhood curb appeal will be lost. The mimosa tree crowns the whole street, and natural beauty of the neighborhood is falling away to construction.

Judy Potter, West Spain, appreciates the single story garages but must all houses be 2 stories and geared to young families. What about retirees and single families – wouldn't they want single stories?

Georgette Darcy, West Spain, claims she is not an obstructionist but is facing development on both sides. West Spain is a peaceful street, another gateway to Sonoma. She is concerned with density of the project and obliteration of views to the west; Sonoma Commons does not fit in with neighborhood, no breathing space and beautiful mature trees and majestic oaks and cypresses will be gone. School and work traffic on 5<sup>th</sup> Street West during rush hour is congested.

Cynthia De Forge, mentions there are 4 driveways and all housing multiple units. Instead of 1 car, it's 48 or 36.

Mark Winter asks if the standards for the 4 affordable housing units are in place and will firemen, teachers, nurses, construction workers get priority. He is concerned about who's coming in, and traffic with other projects in development.

Nick Dolata, Palou St, is concerned about traffic and affordability. He has 2 homes considered affordable housing that had to be taken off the market due to restrictions. What are the requirements to allow for affordable and non-affordable so that homes do not sit vacant.

Karen Buscher, Palou St, is also concerned about traffic and all the development in the neighborhood. Also there are no crosswalks and too much close housing in small spaces.

Chair Bramfitt: There were many comments on affordability. Please speak to the requirements.

**Response by applicant:**

Rob Gjestland: There is a 20% inclusionary requirement; 40 years under contract available to households that meet income criteria/moderate or low income categories. There is no priority consideration for who's able to apply since it is private and not government housing. The City will screen applicants to meet income criteria.

Laurie Winter: Is it true with all projects?

Rob Gjestland: Yes, for any with 5 or more residential units.

Steve Ledson, owner and applicant of project: I have 150 employees and only 10 own their own homes. My challenge was to build reasonable homes in Sonoma for my employees and will not be bank-financed but by my family so that people can get loans. Units will be rented or leased to own – if rented, it will be through the affordable rental program. 11 units are already there, only adding 7. As for price, comparable to Macarthur Place at 500 thousand but construction prices keep creeping up. This is not a huge money-making project but to build the best house for the best dollar; the profit will be off the land which I own. The decision to cut down trees will be based on the report by the arborists and the mimosa tree is in the middle of the street and messy. Relocation assistance for the existing units may be at Macarthur Place or other rentals – no one will be displaced. Parking in the development will be in the garages, no materials are to be stored so no parking on the street. As to safety and no crosswalks on Spain, traffic study made different recommendations that address issues.

Ms. Vella: What about landscaping – will there be a homeowners' association?

Steve Ledson: There's a set of CC&R, 1 company will maintain a consistent look for all front yards; back yards will have small patios and keep a quaint look.

Ms. Vella: What about water recharge and retention?

Steve Ledson: There is a high ground water table and retention pond which holds water then releases it. As to contamination, more research needs to be done before I can answer.

**Commissioner comments:**

Chair Bramfitt: This is a joint powers authority between the City and County. We don't often hear City projects. Our charter is usually projects that have Valley-wide impact. There is a meeting in September for this project so you can work through the City process.

Ms. Pulvirenti: I am concerned with the lack of parking, guest parking, and traffic. There is an apartment project the next block over – we need to look at the cumulative effect, not the individual project.

Mr. Bellach: Traffic is a huge concern, sometimes backed up to 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Many people can't afford to live here and I appreciate the developer's mission but there is no control over reality – I am pulled between affordable housing and what the market is and traffic.

Ms. Wood: Looking at the broad perspective as a community, I applaud Mr. Ledson. The project is not stacked housing and fits into the community. The only issue is parking and how to ameliorate it.

Ms. Vella: Considering the economics, this is not workforce housing. The U shape – 1 way in and 1 way out is a good idea and safe for kids. I am concerned about runoff from Nathanson Creek and swamping in winter time which will impact surrounding properties.

Mr. Martin: 20 ft and 1 garage seems crowded. Fire/ambulance emergency vehicle will fit if no parking on the street. The guest parking recommendation by the City is 7 parking spaces but only 4 are allowed. On Junipero Serra, sign is needed to identify caution to offset left turn into each of the properties.

Mr. Carr: To provide perspective, cumulative picture is looked at, not at every project. 14-22 units, traffic, quality of life looked at, density range is what City feels is appropriate cumulative picture.

Mr. Brown: I will contact the traffic safety committee since there is no crosswalk on West 5<sup>th</sup> St to Highway 12. Also the status of Mr. Conforti's project vs Mr. Ledson's. We need to understand what could go there; Planned Development means less units. And property rights, if the project doesn't go, what is Mr. Ledson's right to build there?

Chair Bramfitt: We need to go over Valley-wide concerns. The County should look at the runoff and potential mitigations, the City and traffic safety commission. The affordability factor, workforce housing at ½ million and 4 units; they're really market price units; there is a need for single family homes with more members.

**Motion: Chair Bramfitt. Recommends that SVCAC send recommendation to the City passing along all comments from the public and asking the City to pay attention to runoff and stormwater management issues not addressed in application and take interest in traffic safety improvements on West Spain due to cumulative impact. Ms. Wood seconded. Motion passed: All in favor, none opposed.**

5. **Other Business:** Mr. Bramfitt read the report on Thornsberry Rd visit.

6. **Frequently Asked Questions:** Commissioners will edit and turn in to Mr. Bramfitt.

7. **Items for Future Agenda:** Commission must meet next month to discuss SVCAC Boundary; redo JPA in December; also possible future City projects: Conforti, project behind Pub at Plaza, Mission Square.

Mr. Brown also discussed time limits for speakers. City Council meetings allow 3 minutes per person and 10 minutes for 1 person from applying party. He also asked how many absences are allowed.

Ms. Wood responded that 3 unexcused and endless excused absences are allowed.

Mr. Bramfitt offered that perhaps that may be a discussion for the JPA.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:45 p.m.