

City of Sebastopol City Council Regular Meeting  
- Minutes of  
Meeting of May 1, 2018

The public is advised that pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.5 all writings submitted to the City Council are public records and will be made available for review.

Please note that minutes are not verbatim minutes and are meant to be the City's record of a summary of actions that took place at the meeting.

Notice: All resolutions and ordinances introduced and/or adopted under this agenda are waived of all reading of entire resolution(s) and ordinance(s).

The Sebastopol City Council welcomes you to its meetings that are generally scheduled for the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of every month. Your interest and participation are encouraged and appreciated.

SIMULTANEOUS MEETING COMPENSATION DISCLOSURE (Government Code § 54952.3): Members of the City Council receive no additional compensation as a result of convening a joint meeting of the City Council and Successor Agency to the Former Community Development Agency

SB 751 Legislative bodies of local agencies must publicly report: (1) any action taken and (2) the vote or abstention on each action taken by each member present for the action at a meeting.

A notice of the meeting was posted by the City Clerk on April 24, 2018.

4:00 pm – 6:00 pm      CONVENE CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION  
                                 Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Slayter called the meeting to order at 4:06 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present:            Mayor Slayter  
                         Vice Mayor Hinton  
                         Councilmember Carnacchi  
                         Councilmember Glass (arrived at 4:11 pm)  
                         Councilmember Gurney

Absent:            None

Staff:              City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
                         Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley  
                         Planning Director Kenyon Webster

STUDY SESSION

1. To conduct a Study Session on the Comprehensive Update to the City's Zoning Ordinance to make a variety of amendments. The Planning Commission has been working on the revisions at a series of public meetings since fall 2017 and has transmitted its recommendations to the City Council. The amendments include changes related to definitions, use allowances, lot sizes and setbacks, general development standards, zoning districts, and additional revisions aimed at facilitating needed housing pursuant to policies of the General Plan. Specific revisions include but are not limited to consolidation of several similar zoning districts, renaming of a number of zoning

districts, creation of standards for mobile food trucks, commercial outdoor barbeques and downtown noise standards, updating of formula business provisions, and organizational changes, as well as other changes. The intent of the revisions is to achieve consistency with the City's new General Plan, address selected policy issues, streamline provisions, provide standards for several uses not currently addressed, and address internal consistency issues. *A public hearing on this item will be conducted at or after 6:00 pm.* (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council conduct the study session on the zoning ordinance amendments.

Beth Thompson and Elise Carroll, De Novo Planning Group, conducted the study session on the zoning ordinance amendments and discussed housing related issues first and presented slides to the City Council with the following highlights:

High Density Housing in Non-Residential Districts  
SMC 17.25.030.C

Small Lot Subdivisions  
Draft SMC 17.230; Existing SMC 17.245

Very Small Homes

Councilmember Gurney questioned the correlation of the smallest home on the smallest lot (how small does this get).

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- No correlation between lot size and size of home allowed on the lot
- Size of very small home based on building code requirements

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Planning Commission talked of tiny homes
- Conclusion is that they are allowed
- Can be developed in a number of different ways
- Gives people flexibility to have small houses on a range of lots

Beth Thompson discussed that the changes are intended to provide for smaller lots.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed small lot subdivisions
- Discussed removal of standard of a variety of lot sizes

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Determined that it would encourage small lot subdivisions if that standard was removed
- Developer could propose a variety of housing standards
- Not tying it to the lot size

Parking Requirements

Draft SMC 17.110; Existing SMC 17.220

Councilmember Gurney questioned if this counts the street parking as parking or counting the front yard as parking.

Beth Thompson commented that the public parking on the street would count as parking for the project.

Temporary Care Units: Draft SMC 17.225

Inclusionary Housing

Draft SMC 17.250

Existing SMC 17.240

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- 20% reduction of inclusionary requirement
- For most needy of people, we are doing much less
- Tiering it down by income
- Developer in town, project in town – is land trust in town or Sonoma County wide

Beth Thompson commented it is very expensive to provide affordable housing for very low-income group and stated the land trust is for units within the City.

Mayor Slayter commented costs to developer is roughly the same whichever of three choices selected.

Councilmember Glass questions how inclusionary and land trust mechanism would work.

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Very specific requirements for inclusionary units that do not jive with what land trust would require to be done
- Discussed land trusts
- Providing units and affordable flexibility in terms of resale
- Requirements (deed restrictions) tailored for land trust

Design Review

SMC 17.450

Accessory Dwelling Units

Draft SMC 17.220

Existing SMC 17.110.030

Junior Accessory Dwelling Units

SMC 17.220.303

Councilmember Glass questioned if there is a maximum size of junior ADU.

Beth Thompson stated no and State Law is very specific and indicates a bedroom.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Junior ADU is one bedroom in home
- Build second unit and then build ADU separate
- Smallest size lot and largest size allowable – considering parking and cars- how do all those foot prints fit together on a piece of property
- Look like first two blocks of Calder or Fellers Lane or Swain Woods
- How do all these pieces fit onto the land with all these cars

Mayor Slayter stated it is very difficult to picture and each site is different.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Junior ADU created by State of California
- Restrictive Standards
- Can do Junior ADU under current law
- Commission felt no need to create whole category
- Advocates discussed financing purposes – legally recognized accessory unit has value
- Nature similar to what people already do – rent out room in house

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Requirement is that the unit be located within the existing walls of the structure
- Does not limit to one bedroom

Councilmember Glass questioned if someone had wing of house with couple of bedrooms and bathroom, could this be turned into an ADU or J ADU

Beth Thompson stated it could be a J ADU or could be ADU (if under ADU standards).

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Residential in Industrial/Commercial District – where is this permitted/ where is this not permitted
- If in these areas, it is right that permitted over 5 units does not require design review

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Under five units does not need design review
- Page 52/53 explains what is permitted

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Adjacent on street parking
- Once Bodega Avenue corridor is rezoned to high density residential; buy property; and tear down property and rebuild, is the on street parking that is directly in front of building considered parking

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Frontage of parcel would count towards parking
- Parking count would be deducted from parking requirements for development
- Parking not assigned to development but available parking to tenants

Councilmember Gurney questioned how that works if the public street parking is a red zone.

Beth Thompson commented that it would not count towards the parking.

Zoning Districts  
SMC 17.10-17.48

Councilmember Carnacchi stated the table is confusing and stated it would helpful to put in designation.

Beth Thompson commented they could add a column to table that corresponds to General Plan designation.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Mobile home parks are conditionally allowed in mobile home park district
- Trying to understand that

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- All mobile home parks have to go through conditional use permit
- Could make it not need conditional approval
- Only place is Fircrest and Park Village
- Not an overlay, but separate district
- Would make sense to make it permitted

Residential Standards Table 17.20-2

The consultant provided a presentation on the following:

Introduction and Definitions  
SMC 17.04 and 17.08

Zoning Districts  
SMC 17.10-18.48

Commercial, Office and Industrial Districts  
SMC 17.25.030

Uses in Commercial, Office and Industrial Districts  
Table 17.25-1

Open Space District SMC 17.32

Wetlands District  
SMC 17.44

Environmental Open Space and Combining District  
Chapter 17.46

Councilmember Gurney discussed the hearing process that was changed and requested clarification.

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Resource analysis does not have a separate review process
- Would be reviewed in conjunction with the project

Councilmember Gurney questioned if this means that the City does not review an EIR separate from a project.

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- EIR has a 45-day review period
- EIR reviewed in conjunction with project
- Can be done at same meeting

Councilmember Gurney questioned if it has to be done at the same meeting,

Beth Thompson commented that it is not a requirement that it has to be held separately.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed the Northeast area specific plan
- Review of EIR and project review was combined
- Compounds difficulty in project if find problem with EIR
- EIR review could change project

Mayor Slayter asked if this requirement just relates to this district.

Beth Thompson stated that is correct in ESOS district.

Director Webster provided an example as follows:

- Solar energy/parking lot project at old cement plant
- Under this code Commission would receive ESOS study and project hearing combined in one hearing
- Would not proceed if issue with an inadequate study
- Streamline and consolidate
- Up to Commission to determine if study is adequate

Councilmember Gurney questioned if the ESOS would be combined in one meeting at the City Council level.

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- If project requires Council approval yes
- If not require Council approval then no

Councilmember Gurney questioned if something like a hotel project in middle of town could be separate EIR and not part of the ESOS process.

Beth Thompson stated that is correct.

Recovery Combining District  
SMC 17.48

Community Gardens SMC 17.100

Parking SMC 17.110

Councilmember Carnacchi questioned the reduced parking.

Beth Thompson

- 1 space per 300 feet for commercial - previously
- 1 space per 500 feet for industrial uses

Councilmember Carnacchi discussed the residential use and questioned which applies.

Beth Thompson commented that it is any permitted nonresidential use.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Discussed existing parking for downtown
- Normal residential parking requirement applies but is 20% less than otherwise applicable standard
- Reduction for downtown residential

Beth Thompson stated the intent was not to have residential in this calculation.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Discussed parking
- Discussed chart – page 32
- Discussed chart – says single family dwelling
- In every R – is it two cars per dwelling

Beth Thomson stated no, that it is based on the type of development or proposed use.

Councilmember Gurney commented that this relates to zoning but they are not coupled directly.

Vacation Rentals SMC 17.260.060

Park and Recreation Land/Fees  
SMC 17.280

Rental Housing Price Gouging Prohibition SMC 17.290

Councilmember Glass questioned if the disaster would be local of regional.

Beth Thompson stated it would be as declared by City Council.

Councilmember Gurney stated it would relate to local disaster.

Disaster Recovery Housing SMC 17.295

Standards for Specific Uses  
SMC 17.300

Downtown Outdoor Noise and Music  
SMC 17.330

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned if this was new or changed.

Beth Thompson stated it is new.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Concern with the limitations of twice a month
- Discussed weekly events

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Could consider that a community event or requires a temporary use permit
- Discussed private events
- Discussed per permit requestor

Vice Mayor Hinton commented that Mr. Music would be considered a community event.

Councilmember Gurney questioned if this addresses noise complaints from downtown businesses.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Multiple categories for these events
- Social events
- Community market events
- Temporary use permits for some events - Not subject to this
- City events – different category - Not relating to this
- Restaurant that wants to have event that may exceed noise may apply
- Generated from General Plan policy on this topic
- Parameters are strict

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Normal restaurant noise venues are not considered events
- Covered by existing noise ordinance

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Reason why this is downtown specific and not for whole community
- Such as neighborhood parties that are recurring events

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Conflicting information with regard to downtown

- Page 11 map
- Definitions include Barlow
- Page 32
- Zoning District
- CD is Central Core
- CD is Downtown Core on Map

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Need to revise zoning map to be consistent with terminology on page 32
- Downtown is reference without district after it refers to larger district that include Barlow

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Discussed the chart on page 51
- Lists permitted and conditionally permitted uses
- CM for Barlow
- Retail sales – shows P/C with hyper 3
- Cannot find definition for 3
- What means

Beth Thompson commented as follows:

- Bottom portion of table explains P/C
- Page 54 also explains hyper 3

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Concern
- Permitting retail up to 1500 SF that makes the property value of the Barlow skyrocketing which in turn can drive up prices
- Possibility of Barlow echoing small Montgomery Village with high end boutique shops
- Expressed that at the Planning Commission
- Should not be permitted
- Should be a conditional use permit

Formula Business SMC 17.340.040.A

Service Station and Car Wash Standards  
SMC 17.345

Mobile Food Trucks SMC 17.355

Permits and Approvals  
SMC 17.400-17.470

City Council Action: Continued this item to the Public Hearing Portion of the Meeting of May 1, 2018.  
Minute Order Number: 2018-092

ADJOURN TO REGULAR MEETING: Mayor Slayter adjourned the study session at 5:50 pm to the regular meeting.

6:00 pm CONVENE CITY COUNCIL MEETING, Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Slayter called the meeting to order at 6:29 pm.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mayor Slayter  
Vice Mayor Hinton  
Councilmember Carnacchi  
Councilmember Glass  
Councilmember Gurney

Absent: None

Staff: City Manager/City Attorney Larry McLaughlin  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk Mary Gourley  
Fire Chief Bill Braga  
Planning Director Kenyon Webster  
Police Lieutenant Greg DeVore  
Assistant Public Works Superintendent Nate Sutton

SALUTE TO THE FLAG: Mayor Slayter led the salute to the flag.

PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS:

The following were presented:

- Proclamation - May 6-12, 2018 - Municipal Clerk's Week
- Proclamation - May 21-27, 2018 - Public Works Week

PUBLIC COMMENT

- o Speakers are allowed to speak for a maximum of three minutes so that all speakers have an opportunity to address the City Council. Power point or visual presentations for public comment shall not be permitted unless approved by the Agenda Review Committee two weeks prior to the requested meeting date.
- o Yielding Time: Speakers may not "yield" a portion of their allotted time to others.
- o The Mayor has the authority to limit or extend the time allowed for speakers dependent on the number of speakers in attendance.
- o The Mayor can poll the members of the public for an indication of the number of people wishing to speak, then call on individuals to speak.
- o It is the goal of the Council to conclude the public comments portion of the agenda within 20 minutes. If the public comment period exceeds twenty minutes, the presiding officer, typically the Mayor, reserves the right to reduce the time per speaker or carry over public comments to after all business items are completed.
- o The City Clerk will monitor the time for public comments and inform the speakers when the time limitation has been reached.
- o The Mayor could survey the members of the public, as appropriate, to move agenda items up or back to address the members of the public items of concern.
- o Public participation is encouraged on all public agenda items.
- o Council and staff will treat participants and each other with courtesy. Derogatory or sarcastic comments are inappropriate.
- o The public will likewise be encouraged by the Mayor to maintain meeting decorum.
- o In Council meetings when citizens are agitated, the Mayor may call a short recess to calm the situation.
- o If a member of the public is unable to attend the Council meeting, written communications may be sent to the City Clerk by e-mail or by regular mail. Communications received after distribution of the agenda packet will be made available to the Council at the meeting.

Mayor Slayter opened for public comment.

Linda Berg commented as follows:

- Staff members are outstanding
- Discussed signage for ticks in Laguna
- Living in man-made microwave oven

- Reduce exposure
- Matter of life and death
- Newer cell phones are more dangerous
- Discussed article in Nation magazine – how big wireless duped the world
- In process of getting meters to measure waves
- In unhealthy environment right now
- Put phones in air plane mode
- Displayed sign for Verizon protest
- Financial fraud

ila Benavidez-Heaster commented as follows:

- Discussed concern of what has been happening lately
- Discussed Kenyon Webster being maligned
- Those speakers should learn to manage their anger
- Some anger turned into being bullies
- Not okay
- Brown Act is important
- Make it a better act
- Rare gift to be with Kenyon Webster
- Emotional intelligence
- Intellectual intelligence
- Social intelligence
- Goes way off the chat
- Collegial
- Well versed
- Nothing that is not asked of him that he does not know
- Knows material
- Respected
- Work needs to be commended
- People need to look at their own behavior
- This should not be personal
- People treating him personally
- Done an outstanding job for all of us
- This man has saved the day
- Brings the group through
- Amazing
- Someone who does not polarize the group
- Does not enflame

STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST BY MAYOR/CITY COUNCILMEMBERS FOR ITEMS ON THE AGENDA  
(This is the time for the Mayor or City Councilmembers to indicate any statements of conflicts of interests for any item listed on this agenda) *There were none.*

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

- The consent agenda consists of items that are routine in nature and do not require additional discussion by the City Council or have been reviewed by the City Council previously. These items may be approved by one motion without discussion unless a member of the City Council requests that the item be taken off the consent calendar.

- o The Mayor will read the consent calendar items; ask if a Councilmember wishes to remove one or more items from the consent calendar; and then open public comment to the members of the public in attendance. At this time, a member of the public may speak for up to three minutes on the entire consent calendar and request at that time that an agenda item or items be removed for discussion.
- o If an item or items are removed from the consent calendar, the item shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem.
- o Council Members may comment on Consent Calendar items or ask for minor clarifications without the need for pulling the item for separate consideration. Items requiring deliberation should be pulled for separate consideration and shall be placed at the end of the regular agenda items unless otherwise determined by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem.

Councilmember Gurney moved and Councilmember Glass the motion to approve the Consent Calendar Item(s) number(s) 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**VOTE:**

Ayes: Councilmembers Carnacchi, Glass, Gurney, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter  
Noes: None  
Absent: None  
Abstain: None

2. Approval of Minutes of April 17, 2018 City Council Meeting Minutes (City Administration)

**City Council Action: Approved the Minutes of the April 17, 2018 City Council Meeting Minutes**

**Minute Order Number: 2018-093**

3. Approval of Resolution Declaring Weeds on Private Property a Public Nuisance and Setting the Public Hearing Date/Time (Fire Chief)

**City Council Action: Approved Resolution Declaring Weeds on Private Property a Public Nuisance and Setting the Public Hearing Date/Time**

**Minute Order Number: 2018-094**

**Resolution Number: 6185**

4. Approval of Temporary Use Permits, Fire Works Stands (Fire Chief)

**City Council Action: Approved Temporary Use Permits, Fire Works Stands**

**Minute Order Number: 2018-095**

5. Approval of Design for New Restroom at Burbank Experiment Farm (Planning Director)

**City Council Action: Approved Design for New Restroom at Burbank Experiment Farm**

**Minute Order Number: 2018-096**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS/PRESENTATION:**

6. Informational Presentation - Annual Report from Outreach Community Coordinator Holly Hansen (Holly Hansen/City Administration)

Holly Hansen, Outreach Community Coordinator, provided an informational presentation to the City Council.

Vice Mayor Hinton expressed appreciation to our outreach community coordinator.

Mayor Slayter expressed appreciation as well.

Councilmember Gurney thanked Holly for her quick response.

Councilmember Carnacchi asked if the City could use the outreach coordinator for retail and business locations and bringing retailer and businesses to town.

Councilmember Gurney discussed the Sound Like a Fit brochure.

Councilmember Glass thanked Holly for the work and being embedded in community and understanding it.

City Council Action: None required. Reference only.

Reference Order Number: 2018-097

**PUBLIC HEARING(s):**

7. Public Hearing - Waiving of Further Reading and Introduction of Ordinance to consider a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Ordinance to make a variety of amendments. The Planning Commission has been working on the revisions at a series of public meetings since fall 2017 and has transmitted its recommendations to the City Council. The amendments include changes related to definitions, use allowances, lot sizes and setbacks, general development standards, zoning districts, and additional revisions aimed at facilitating needed housing pursuant to policies of the General Plan. Specific revisions include but are not limited to consolidation of several similar zoning districts, renaming of a number of zoning districts, creation of standards for mobile food trucks, commercial outdoor barbeques and downtown noise standards, updating of formula business provisions, and organizational changes, as well as other changes. The intent of the revisions is to achieve consistency with the City's new General Plan, address selected policy issues, streamline provisions, provide standards for several uses not currently addressed, and address internal consistency issues. (Planning Director)

Planning Director Webster presented the staff report recommending the City Council Waive Further Reading and Introduction of Ordinance to consider a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Ordinance to make a variety of amendments.

Beth Thompson and Elise Carroll, De Novo Planning Group, were in attendance and provided a presentation to the City Council.

Mayor Slayter opened the public hearing.

Dev Executive Director of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, commented as follows:

- Thanked the hard work of the Planning Commission
- Outstanding staff
- Voice support for changes and comments on inclusionary units
- Use of Housing Land Trust model as an option to create home ownership opportunities
- Recruit and retain work force
- Creating housing in perpetuity
- Obligation for developers is 20% - breakdown of that
- Different AMIs
- Done a great job
- Complete logical
- Reflects the needs

Sunny Galbraith commented as follows:

- Support affordable housing in town
- Discussed being a teacher

- Discussed teachers not being able to afford housing
- Discussed commute times for workers
- Discussed Paul Fritz's memo
- Raising SF limit for accessory dwelling units – be a 1000 SF for family size
- Allow family to live in town
- Say yes in my backyard
- Welcome more families

Paul Fritz, resident, and member of the Planning Commission, commented as follows:

- Increase in size for accessory dwelling units
- Difficult for families to live in a 840 SF unit
- Encourage a larger ADU in town
- Support inclusionary housing ordinance
- Way current inclusionary housing ordinance is - is not effective
- Disincentive to developers
- Housing impact fee assessed to all building permits and using that money for an affordable housing fund
- Consider multi-family in commercial district and by right in certain locations

Kate Thompson commented as follow:

- Extended gratitude to Planning Commission and Council
- Voice support for more aggressive and faceted approach to problem in town
- Voice concern of vacation rentals
- Ratio in our area
- Having new accessory dwelling units
- Pay attention for rentals available for people to live
- Fine with high density housing and more cars
- Welcome more families and more opportunities to live here

Nancy Janeck commented as follows:

- Not hear anything not liked
- Concern for infrastructure
- Live on Florence Avenue
- Sewage spill under house
- Caused by City
- Took on 500 gallons
- Still have sewage under house
- Happened day after Christmas
- Infrastructure that is old
- Cannot talk to anyone in Sebastopol
- Insurance company made her the contractor
- Received bill from insurance company
- Is for affordable housing
- Next door 3 ½ years ago sewage came through bathtub
- Not one-time incident
- Look at infrastructure first

ila Benavidez-Heaster commented as follows

- Reinforce what Nancy just said
- Got to take care of the infrastructure
- Sewer, Transportation everything

Rick Rossette commented as follows:

- Discussed business in house
- Look at encouraging people to run low impact business in residential areas
- Self employed
- Creative people
- Encourage that
- Encouraging people to rent
- Elder people who have large houses and have space to rent
- Encourage people to rent or share their housing
- Great opportunity for students and those who need low income housing

Mayor Slayter requested a memo from City staff to the Council regarding the Florence Avenue incident.

City Manager McLaughlin commented as follows:

- Being handled by REMIF
- Can summarize sequence of events
- Not being handled by the City

Councilmember Glass discussed the Share Sebastopol program.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Slayter closed the public hearing.

Mayor Slayter discussed procedures for tonight's item. The Council was in consensus to address housing first and then move onto the other items in the ordinance and other items would be continued to a potential special meeting.

#### Housing Topics:

Accessory Dwelling Units

Inclusionary Housing

Very Small Houses Definitions

#### Accessory Dwelling Units:

SMC 17.220

Mayor Slayter asked for information that shows the number of residential lots by size.

- 15000 or greater = 323 residential lots (includes mobile home park sand multi-family units) – up to 1000 SF granny unit
- 2000 lots in City of Sebastopol that are residential
- If say 10,000 SF or greater, more than doubles – 371 and 323 – number of lots that would allow a larger accessory dwelling unit

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Size of ADU as it relates to the size of the lot
- No idea of how large a 15000 SF lot is

Mayor Slayter commented that two lots on Murphy would be around 14000 SF.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Like idea of allowing slightly larger ADUs
- Discussed footprint
- If two story it is a 500 SF footprint
- Allow larger ADUs if footprint is smaller
- Lot coverage ratio

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Look at footprint that parking creates
- Discussed parking standards
- Discussed more cars
- Affect parking
- Hard to know what to do with all the cars that could come

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Larger lots can support larger dwellings is logical
- 1000 SF is permissible on lots of 10000 SF or more
- Compromise what majority of Planning Commission felt and also from members of the public and housing advocates

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Discussed ADUs
- Discussed infill requirements
- Discussed fire issues
- Discussed shaded fuel break around City of Sebastopol
- Discussed requirement for sprinklers
- Discussed one-hour fire wall
- Concur with concerns of parking

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- From design perspective – understand lot split and putting a second home onto it
- 1000 SF is a large home
- Significant building not an accessory
- Lot split clearly designed for access
- Can put on property wherever it fits
- Not necessarily need parking
- Different world when put houses in back yard with no driveways

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed lot frontage that is short but deep lot

- Can fit four cars in front of her house because the lot is long
- Parking issue is different
- Depending on ratio of depth versus length

Mayor Slayter stated he is not sure how that can be addressed in the zoning ordinance.

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned if everything can be two story in this ordinance.

Mayor Slayter stated it can be one or two story. He stated a 10000 SF lot contains a good-sized home and setback requirements would lead discussion of how big an ADU can be and also may be able to provide parking on site.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented she would support 10000 SF for up to a 1000 SF accessory unit.

Councilmember Gurney commented it can be concluded that it is a case by case situation.

Councilmember Glass commented that she would support Mayor's proposal but wanted to bring up the point of what we are doing here which is to fairly, rapidly, and easily create a policy that allows for increased investment in housing. She stated it needs to be focused on mid-range housing. She discussed the ABAG report which Sebastopol exceeded low and very low affordable housing requirement from ABAG. She stated we have quite a bit of low and very low-income housing which is why we have an average lower income than other cities but we are lacking that middle range (\$80-\$120 median). She discussed the housing bond on the upcoming election. She stated the policies we set should be within that framework.

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Go slower
- Can we survive this kind of population growth
- Not support change to 10000 SF
- Need to consider questions
- Discussed June 23, 2015 national geographic magazine
- How will population growth affect solitude and cleanliness of inland parks and coast
- Discussed traffic
- Go at slower pace
- Discussed impacts on natural resources
- Discussed impacts on infrastructure

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed census numbers
- Population stable over last couple of decades
- Appreciate global view
- Have to be relevant to our own community

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Flat population for a while
- Big picture is grim but Sebastopol has been flat
- Housing targets that are part of Plan Bay Area

- Discussed Plan Bay Area
- Discussed how to make units targeted at demographic that we need

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Concern
  - Genuinely looking to build housing that is reasonably sized for that missing middle group of people
  - Good purposes for that (age in their home)
  - Worried of people who will use this as opportunity to make more money
  - Market allows that
  - Becoming more desirable place to live
  - Sebastopol listed in Forbes magazine
  - Building housing and not protect it
  - Parallel need to develop the job market
  - Need affordable jobs that allow people to be here and afford housing we are making affordable by design
  - Almost bedroom community as it is
  - Issues are related
  - Need to take some initiative in looking for those employment opportunities
  - Discussed economic vitality position
  - Look at how do we support our own people (teachers, nurses, police, fire, etc.) and provide opportunities for other people to be here
  - How do we measure what is affordable
  - Cannot live here because the jobs are not here
- ❖ 10,000 SF or greater to allow up to 1000 SF accessory unit
  - ❖ Others up to 840 SF accessory unit

The Council conducted a straw vote as follows:

Support: Councilmembers Glass, Gurney, Vice Mayor Hinton and Mayor Slayter

Not Support: Councilmember Carnacchi

Mayor Slayter discussed verbiage for entrances, waste line diameter but no requirement for refrigeration.

The consultant stated this is copied out of State law.

Mayor Slayter questioned if we could require refrigeration.

The consultant stated no.

Inclusionary Housing:

Chapter 17.250

The consultant addressed housing needs between now and 2040.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Percentages as stated are pretty viable numbers
- Discussed the housing land trust

- Requested a brief description of a housing land trust

The consultant described a housing land trust (permanent source of affordable housing) – land trust will own the real estate.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Sebastopol built out
- Not understand significance of land trust for a few units

The consultant stated it would be a very small name roof unit that would be parcel dove retime.

Councilmember Gurney stated the off site would be a mitigation bank.

The consultant stated you could look at it that way.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Proposal for affordable by design condo project
- Of those units two of them were to be in mid-range affordable
- Could housing trust own land under condo unit

Director Webster commented not necessarily condo units but could be attached townhome but would be on its own parcel.

Dev Goetschius, Executive Director, Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, commented as follows:

- Partner with cities except Sebastopol and Windsor
- Expensive for work force
- No money involved
- Inclusionary housing not effective way to use land trust
- Steward partnership and get people in here
- Is in perpetuity
- If zero lot line can be any kind of product
- Trust would own land
- Put house on it that would be affordable
- Monitoring and report back to City
- Make easier for developer to get it down
- Discussed condos in construction
- No dirt underneath
- Have 99-year restriction- land trust has first option

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Want to understand how the fee system is going to work
- If satisfying requirement by paying a few how can those fees be enough aggregate in some way to be meaningful to help a family

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- In lieu fees never fix the problem
- Kick the can down the road

- Not facilitate in lieu fees

Councilmember Gurney questioned what is motivating builders to build when they can pay their way out of it.

Vice Mayor Hinton stated this is easier for builder who wants to build in our City based on the new inclusionary fees. She stated that this brings in the work force housing.

Councilmember Gurney questioned who will build 3-5 units and on what property as we have so few of those.

Director Webster commented as follows:

- Discussed 961 Gravenstein Highway South project has inclusionary units
- Discussed Litchfield and Habitat for Humanity projects
- Discussed the current inclusionary ordinance – Planning Commission thought the fee was too high and discussed alternatives
- Whole process to create
- Ordinance not change today's existing impact fee
- Allows full satisfaction of the inclusionary requirement through the in-lieu fee under proposed ordinance – existing fee is a high fee

Mayor Slayter this does not remove the requirement to build inclusionary housing.

Director Webster stated the proposal in 17.250.110 – allows payment of in lieu fee to satisfy requirement.

The consultant discussed State law and discussed the intent of the fee.

Councilmember Carnacchi questioned what is the AMI and how would that work for a 10 unit project.

The consultant stated for ½ unit or provide one full unit and pay portion of fee and stated the AMI is \$83,900 for household of four.

Councilmember Gurney commented that sounds good in theory but not sure it would work in real life.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Discussed inclusionary
- Discussed investment from a housing trust with money coming from housing bond
- Leveraging money from State of California
- All components have to fit together

Vice Mayor Hinton questioned work force housing numbers. The consultant stated median income for two-person household would be \$67,100.

Mayor Slayter stated the pay to play may not be way to go.

Vice Mayor Hinton stated she would prefer to have a building and not paying the fee.

Strike 17.250.110

The consultant stated under State law the City would need to pay for rental housing. She discussed State Law for rental housing.

The Council was in consensus that in lieu fees are fine for this requirement for rental projects. Mayor Slayter discussed percentages for inclusionary requirements. He stated he is comfortable with this change and basing it on historical precedence. He stated this is also targeting the low middle which has been identified as the City's target. Mayor Slayter discussed affordable by design rather than affordable by legislation. Section 7 should be expanded to read developments consisting of 1000SF.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Stated that sounds good in theory
- Concern of building weekend homes

Mayor Slayter questioned if this could be based on AMI.

Vice Mayor Hinton stated she does not like the pay to play and does not like this allowance. She stated she likes to strike 7 out (1000 SF).

Councilmember Gurney clarified that Vice Mayor Hinton is stating that this requirement applies to all projects regardless of size of units.

The consultant stated if a sales price is attached to it - it is an inclusionary unit and meets the requirement. She also discussed deed restriction of primary residence only.

Councilmember Gurney stated this would be a restricted rental or sale to primary residence only on deed.

The Executive Director of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, commented as follows:

- Can deed restrict inclusionary unit
- Can do nothing about the rest
- Is a free market

The Council discussed the size of inclusionary units.

Mayor Slayter opened public comment.

Colin Doyle commented as follows:

- Planning Commission looked at inclusionary housing programs in different cities
- Inclusionary fee best way to go
- Discussed County program
- Discussed City's fees versus County fees
- Encourage Council if stay with on site and in lieu fee for remainder to look at reducing in lieu fee

The Executive Director of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, commented as follows:

- Discussed partnership with schools

- World that the land trust plays in
- Stated mixed income neighborhood is way to go
- Want inclusion
- Place and zip code matter
- Mixed income is way to go
- If smaller product makes more affordable for developer to do inclusionary
- Charge whatever market will bear
- Cannot product will make a difference
- About the lack of inventory

Mayor Slayter called for a break at 8:57 pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Councilmember Glass commented as follows:

- Leaning towards 1000 SF exemption
- Standard condo
- Undercutting doing inclusionary period
- If detached a different matter
- Kills the whole inclusionary

Councilmember Carnacchi suggested leaving it as rental housing development.

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Get inclusionary housing in every development
- Concern of City fees
- Should have conversation of in lieu fees

The consultant stated they could make recommendations for the Council to consider.

Vice Mayor Hinton stated she would like to see what other cities are doing as well.

Mayor Slayter suggested a fee study to review all fees.

The Council discussed inclusionary requirements.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Suggested 600 SF
- Less attractive than get away county place
- May not want it to be that small
- 500-600 SF are livable units

Vice Mayor Hinton requested that the City require inclusionary housing and strike section 7.

Mayor Slayter commented this may be putting the burden on the backs of other moderate-income people.

Vice Mayor Hinton stated it may or may not.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Statistics would say they are not being built
- Not put on backs of middle income people
- Gap becomes greater – those other units go to higher economic group
- Agree we would like mixed community – different lot sizes, styles, income

The Council discussed section 7.

Councilmember Glass discussed the exemption for 650 SF or less for anything including multi-unit developments (attached) and 1000 SF exemption for single family detached if all units were under 1000 SF.

Straw Vote:

Support: Councilmember Glass, Gurney and Mayor Slayter

Non-Support: Vice Mayor Hinton and Councilmember Carnacchi

Councilmember Carnacchi commented as follows:

- Discussed Huntley Square
- Little units
- 10 units
- None affordable
- Affordable by design
- \$400,000 for unit of 500 SF
- Not affordable
- Needs to have one unit affordable in it
- If 650 SF still under

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed construction costs
- \$350-400 a square foot
- Cannot ask a developer to build something and then lose money on it
- Not a recipe for success

Vice Mayor Hinton commented as follows:

- Huntley Square is around \$450,000
- Taking down percentage requirements in same ordinance
- Hoping to stimulate building

The consultant commented as follows:

- In agreement with ordinance
- Leave out exemption
- Revisit it at end or when project comes forward and make great case to put exemption back in
- Making significant roads by providing tiered requirement
- Huge step forward
- Can adopt this tonight and leave out the exemption in this ordinance

Mayor Slayter stated the Planning Commission going forward needs to know the right project to make the ask. He stated he is reluctant to remove the exemption.

The Council discussed the following:

- Strike Number 7
- Adopt percentage changes
- Alternative for rentals (in lieu fee or off-site requirement)

The Mayor called for a straw poll. There were five thumbs up.

Small Lot Sub-Division Requirements:

Mayor Slayter discussed the R districts and parcel sizes and minimum lot sizes.

Councilmember Gurney quested how this incentives that kind of development.

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Allowing smaller lot sizes
- smaller house development
- Less expensive to build and more affordable

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Build smaller homes
- Design will make it more affordable
- Apply to bigger lots

Mayor Slayter commented stated that access requirements will still be in place or zoning district.

Councilmember Gurney commented as follows:

- Compare this to PC zone
- More potential creativity in use of land
- More open space potentially
- Seems PC zoning would be preferable

Mayor Slayter commented as follows:

- Discussed PC
- Generally those zoning districts occur by request
- Cannot necessarily pre-zone

Mayor Slayter stated he was in favor of the changes.

Straw Poll in Favor of Changes: Five thumbs

The council discussed whether or not to approve for introduction and first reading changes as discussed tonight.

The Council was in support to approve the following changes and return the zoning ordinance in it's entirety for adoption at a later meeting.

Sections 17.220; 250; 230  
New Proposed Chapters  
Inclusionary  
Chapter 17 240  
Renumber as appropriate

**City Council Action:**

**Minute Order Number:** 2018-098

8. Public Hearing: Public hearing to consider a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Map. The primary objective of the Map update is to achieve consistency with the recently-adopted 2016 General Plan, which specifically identified changes to the Land Use Map, which are required to be reflected on the Zoning Map. In addition, under proposed Zoning Ordinance changes, to simplify allowances, several similar zoning districts will be consolidated, and this is reflected on the draft Zoning Map. Changes to the Map are also the result of a land use consistency analysis which compared existing land use to zoning; several changes to the Map are intended to better align land use and zoning. In addition, consistent with the proposed Zoning Ordinance changes, a number of zoning districts, particularly residential districts, will be renamed to have a more logical naming protocol to ease understanding of regulations. (Planning Director)

**Item Continued to Future Meeting.**

**City Council Action:** None Taken. Continued Item.

**Minute Order Number:** 2018-099

**REGULAR CALENDAR AGENDA ITEMS (DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION):** None

**CITY COUNCIL REPORTS:**

9. City Manager-Attorney/City Clerk Reports: There were none.
10. City Council Reports/Committee/Sub-Committee Meeting Reports: (Reports by Mayor/City Councilmembers Regarding Various Agency Meetings/Committee Meetings/Sub-Committee Meeting /Conferences Attended and Possible Direction to its Representatives (If Needed) on Pending issues before such Boards):

Councilmember Gurney reported as follows:

- Community Outreach Meeting
- Joint Application with County
- June 6<sup>th</sup>
- 5:30 pm
- Parkside School

Vice Mayor Hinton reported as follows:

- Budget subcommittee meeting
- Budget on agenda for the next meeting
- Attended League of CA Cities Meeting
- A lot of bills proposed for fire related items
- Hosted the Sebastopol Walks – Housing Walk – 8 locations

Councilmember Carnacchi displayed a Make Sebastopol Great Again hat.

Mayor Slayter discussed Rebuilding Together Day.

11. Council Communications Received: None
12. Future City Meeting Dates/Events (Informational Only): (See Agenda and City Web site for Up to Date Meeting Dates/Times)

CLOSED SESSION: None

**ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING:** Mayor Slayter adjourned the regular City Council meeting of May 1, 2018 at 10:00 p.m. The meeting will be adjourned to the next Regular City Council Meeting which will be held on Tuesday, May 15, 2018 at 6:00 pm, at the Sebastopol Youth Annex/Teen Center, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Gourley  
Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC