***City of Sebastopol***
*Incorporated 1902*
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472
707-823-6167
707-823-1135 (Fax)
www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us
Email: ksvanstrom@cityofsebastopol.org

PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF: September 22, 2020

APPROVED MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF September 22, 2020

**PLANNING COMMISSION:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on September 17, 2020.

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Fernandez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Present:** | Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Douch, Oetinger, Kelley, Lindenbusch and Haug |
| **Absent:** | Commissioner Wilson (excused) |
| **Staff:** | Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director |

Chair Fernandez read an opening statement.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of:** August 25, 2020 and September 08, 2020

Commissioner Oetinger made a motion to approve the minutes of August 25, 2020 as submitted.

Commissioner Kelley seconded the motion.

VOTE:
AYES: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Kelley, Oetinger, Haug, and Lindenbusch
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioner Douch
ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

Commissioner Douch made a motion to approve the minutes of September 08, 2020 as submitted.

Commissioner Oetinger seconded the motion.

VOTE:
AYES: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Douch, Haug, Oetinger, and Lindenbusch
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioner Kelley
ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

**4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:**

Director Svanstrom noted that staff has not received public comment for items not on the agenda to date.

While members of the public were in attendance, there was no public comment on items not on the agenda.

**5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:** There were none.

**6. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**A. TEMPORARY USE PERMIT AMENDMENT:** Headwest Market Place (The Barlow) – Project #2020-014 – The applicant has requested an amendment to increase the number of booths, extend the market to the end of 2021 and to modify the layout. The project was first acted on by the Commission at their meeting on August 25, 2020.

Chair Fernandez read a brief description of this request.

Vice Chair Fritz made a motion to approve this application as submitted.

Commissioner Douch seconded the motion.

VOTE:
AYES: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Douch, Kelley, Oetinger, Haug, and Lindenbusch
NOES: None
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. CONDITONAL USE PERMIT/TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP/VARIANCE –** Project #2019-027 – This is a public hearing for an application from Mark Reece, requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit, to operate an automated car wash at 6809 Sebastopol Avenue, a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide an existing 1.51 acre lot into three commercial parcels, and a Variance to allow a reduction in the minimum floor area ratio below the requirement of the municipal code, and a proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). The project includes the construction of an automated car wash with

upstairs office space and the installation of a driveway to Barnes Avenue. The existing tire shop and oil change operation will continue onsite and are not affected by this application. The Planning Commission is advisory on this application, and its recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for final action.

Chair Fernandez read a brief description of this request.

Director Svanstrom provided introductory remarks and introduced Dave Hogan from M-Group, the Contract Planner for this project.

Contract Planner, Dave Hogan from M-Group, presented the staff report.

The Commission asked questions of Mr. Hogan and Director Svanstrom.

Vice Chair Fritz - It was one of the conditions of approval has to do with the flood elevation condition 12 on page eight of the conditions.

Mr. Hogan - yes.

Vice Chair Fritz - So one part of that, and some came up that's in the condition or someplace in the report that discusses the fact that the grading plan shows the finished floor at 78. But the finished floor is required to be 80 feet. And maybe this is a question for the applicant, but I'm just wondering if that's going to be an issue for them to raise that finish floor, you know, two feet and still get the rest of the grading and everything and accessibility to work on the site. Is that something that you can answer? Should I hold that for the applicant?

Mr. Hogan - I think I would save that for the applicant.

Vice Chair Fritz - Okay.

Vice Chair Fritz - So in the initial study, this has to do with the noise section of the initial study. There was a figure given for distance from the source and one of the distances was like 50 feet. I'm just wondering how are those distances determined? Like what is there a standard for that? Why was it 50 feet and not 20 feet or 75 feet or what's the magic with the 50-foot distance for evaluating the noise impact?

Mr. Hogan – I am going to have to get back to you on that one.

Vice Chair Fritz - So it's um so on the staff reports page eight of the staff report so discusses 77 decibels at a distance of 10 feet, okay 63 decibels at a distance of 50 feet from the entrance and exit of the carwash. I'm just wondering where those numbers come from. Is that the general plan or what's where does that evaluate?

Mr. Hogan - That came from the noise technical study, that was based upon their analysis and of the projected noise from the silencing from the dryer silencing equipment. And based upon their technical recommendation, they felt that that would maintain the proper noise environment. That's a technical recommendation from the from Illingworth & Rodkin.

Vice Chair Fritz - Is someone from Illingworth & Rodkin available to answer questions, or is this just something for the applicant to respond to?

Mr. Hogan - Well, I do not have Illingworth and Rodkin online to join this conversation. Perhaps the applicant can give some you can share some insight on it.

Vice Chair Fritz - Okay.

Vice Chair Fritz - And then another initial study question on page 14 of initial study is a section on greenhouse gases. And I'm just wondering if because the nature of the carwash, you know, and there will be potentially queuing of cars and idling of cars while they're waiting to go through the carwash. Is that something that gets evaluated as part of the greenhouse gas emissions section of the initial study?

Mr. Hogan - Yes, there are Bay Area Air Quality Management District screening criteria, that for an effect for small projects, their presumption is that you're not going to get a significant impact. So the philosophy is rather than assessed for every single project, the screening criteria, this project comes out well below the threshold. And for that reason, it's considered to be not an issue.

Vice Chair Fritz – Okay, I'm sorry, now back to the conditions of approval, and you kind of brought this up condition 78, which has to do with a turning from Sebastopol Avenue onto Barnes. Yes. One, I think that condition is worded a little backwards. Because it says on seven. And this is on page, page 14 of the conditions. Yes, I have it in front of me. So it says vehicles leaving the site shall not make left turns from Sebastopol, I think it should be vehicles entering the site should not make left turns from Sebastopol Avenue onto Barnes Avenue. And then, kind of related to that. My question is, how is that going to be prevented? Is there going to be signage or a barrier? Or what's the applicant required to do to make sure that no one is turning left from Sebastopol Avenue because people do it now to get to CVS. So is there's going to be something that's required of the applicant so that that does not happen?

Director Svanstrom - And I can answer this one because I know it's come up before our engineering manager has worked with Caltrans to see if there's any way to get no left turn signage onto that road. However, the constraints of basically there's nowhere to put the sign is, unfortunately was the response from them. And, you know, the reality is when you got to the site other than a pavement marking and there really isn't a place to put a sign that wouldn't conflict with the sidewalks and things like that out there. We did put the condition on so that any you know, if people are giving directions to people on how to get to the carwash how to enter it, that type of thing that the intent is that the applicant provide directions that don't include the left turn from Sebastopol onto Barnes. So in some ways, it's a reminder that that's not a long term, because there's no way to easily sign it on the street.

Vice Chair Fritz - But people are allowed to make a left turn from Sebastopol into the current facility. Correct?

Director Svanstrom – Correct.

Vice Chair Fritz – that's all my questions for now. Thank you.

Commissioner Douch – no questions at this time.

Commissioner Oetinger – Yes, I'm going to have to read some notes about questions regarding what we were just talking about. Number 78. I'm still not clear whether you're talking about leaving from Benedetti tire and turning left onto the highway or whether

you're talking about leaving the carwash going right on to Barnes and then turning left onto the highway. Because both a person could leave by both means. And both of those left turns on to Sebastopol Avenue would be difficult and not warranted. So I think it's leaving, they should not attempt to turn left in any, any location onto the highway, that I think that language should be cleared up. If it is, in fact, leaving, I can see entering, they could want to turn left onto Barnes as well. So perhaps the messages not turning left into Barnes or left out of Barnes or left, I suppose left out of the tire place. But you know, I just think it needs to be cleaned up one way or the other because I was very confused by it too. And I could see it applying to both entrance and exit sites.

Mr. Hogan – I will make some adjustments and share that with the Commission before a motion is made.

Director Svanstrom - I believe currently if you're at the because we can't condition the oil change and the tire center you are allowed to make a left turn out of the main entry onto Sebastopol Avenue. It is difficult and a lot of people will go right and then around the block. You know, especially during certain time times of day. I know I've done that when it's more during the rush hour, but right now there is a left turn allowed out for the other uses.

Commissioner Oetinger - I can understand that. So basically, I think it would just be reading oddly. Perhaps just even restructuring the sentence diagram would make more sense.

Mr. Hogan – That may be a case where a picture's worth 1000 words, but I think I fixed the chaos of that.

Vice Chair Fritz - Can I just jump in? Because I believe and I could be wrong. Maybe Kari you know this, but I believe on Barnes there is a sign that says no left turn, or it says right turn only or something like that.

Director Svanstrom - I believe that is signed, yes.

Vice Chair Fritz - So yeah, I don't think you're allowed to do that. I think it is signed currently. Okay.

Commissioner Oetinger - My next question is they were talking about nearby residences, and I just felt to be accurate. I do believe there's a closer residence than the 700 feet and I think that that actually, this question regards, at one point in the documents, I saw 600 feet and another document I saw 700 feet, I just sought for clarity. I'm sorry, I can't tell you where that is right now. Because it's so hard to be on the computer and then my notes at the same time. But maybe that should just be looked at and cleaned up before the final presentation to the council.

Commissioner Oetinger - My other question is, I think that there's a legal residential unit at 130 Sebastopol Avenue at Burnett Street. That's the building that will go building up directly across from CVS. I don't think they have any outdoor spaces, but they certainly do have windows and doors that open onto a Juliet balcony of sorts. So I think for clarity that should be included in the list in the sound study, because it does affect them. And I think there's also another legal unit at 100 Brown Street, which I think is even closer I just you know, judging it was hard to tell. And I don't think they have any outdoor space either to, but they also have windows and doors and they're also on the second and third floors, these two facilities.

Mr.Hogan - I will look into that and verify or clarify that accordingly.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay, I'll check that I've asked those questions. I think the others, at this point are we discussing questions about all the materials or just generally things?

Chair Fernandez - I would say questions of staff or Mr. Hogan at this point.

Commissioner Oetinger – Okay, then that's it for staff.

Commissioner Lindenbusch - Thank you chair Fernandez. I have no questions for staff at this time.

Commissioner Haug - Thank you. I just I'm kind of looking at the site on Google Earth. Google Maps. And I'm wondering, I didn't see it, but I could have missed it. How slow do you have to slow down to make a right if you're heading east on Sebastopol Avenue to go in? To access the parking lot? the carwash?

Mr. Hogan - I would say you'd have to be going fairly slow to turn into the to the car to the Auto Center from Sebastopol Avenue.

Commissioner Haug - So, so if cars are access, but they'd also if they're accessing it, is there a chance that that would slow down traffic on the 12 because there's the stoplight is right there. So there. It's already metered going through that stoplight. So if you had someone that was slowing if he had several cars slowing down to make a right to go into the carwash, will that impact the speed of traffic on 12 because we already have substantial backup on highway 12.

Mr. Hogan – Potentially, yes, I suspect most people are going to approach it from Barnes Avenue.

Commissioner Haug - But they still have to slow down and that's even closer to the traffic light.

Mr. Hogan - Very likely. Yes, ma'am.

Commissioner Haug - It looks like I mean, to me it looks about between the traffic light and Barnes Avenue. Do you know how many feet that is?

Mr. Hogan - Not right off the top of my head, I could look.

Commissioner Haug - Because I was just wondering to me when I just eyeball it, which once again could just be an approximation. It looks at to me between like 12 and 14 cars. So if you theoretically had two or three cars slowing down to make the turn into the carwash it could impact the speed of traffic on the 12 causing further backup on Bodega Highway.

Mr. Hogan - I am going into Google Maps myself right now to measure. Okay, so we're looking at the distance from Petaluma Avenue to the driveway. Correct?

Commissioner Haug - Correct.

Mr. Hogan - Okay.  Measured distance to the carwash entrance is right from the intersection of Petaluma and Sebastopol, it's about 500 feet to the entrance to the to the to the to the existing Auto Center.

Commissioner Haug -  Okay.

Director Svanstrom - into Barnes Avenue is two barns that say I measured that in is about 220 feet, which is about a block, basically.

Commissioner Haug – Do you know how many car links that is?  How many car lengths is one block?

Director Svanstrom - It's about 20 to 25 feet for a car length or car length plus space? So it's eight to 10 cars, I would say before you get to Barnes Avenue.

Commissioner Haug - Okay.

Director Svanstrom - Your question about how slow people need to go to make the right turn into Benedetti Tire via the existing driveway is probably something the applicant can advise on as well, since it's obviously it's been existing and they've been open for some time.

Chair Fernandez – any other questions Commissioner Haug?

Commissioner Haug - No, that's my only concern is causing further backup on the 12 right there.

Chair Fernandez - Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Kelley - I have questions around, turning left onto Barnes going west on Sebastopol. I remember our building official said that when we brought up an idea of maybe I know Caltrans wasn't somehow they weren't clear that they were supposed to put in and no left there. So that was a whole other thing around CVS back in the day. However, he was mentioning our Building Official, that maybe we could just get double lines put in there double yellow. So that that does indicate that you're not supposed to turn left. Does anyone recall that?

Chair Fernandez - I do. Yeah.

Director Svanstrom -  I'm looking on Google Earth, it does look like across the intersection to Barnes there are double yellows there now. So they have striped that, and then coming north out of it, looking at the photos, there is a right only arrow as you're coming to that from Barnes up to Sebastopol Avenue.

Commissioner Kelley - I know I go to work in the evening to Santa Rosa, around three o'clock. And currently, when people are trying to turn left onto Barnes, going west on Sebastopol, not only will the person try and cross over, but then it holds up the traffic in both lanes going and coming in terms of going west and going east to let that car through. And it does totally back up. And my concerns always were for time to allow our fire and our police services to be able to get through there. I think it's going to slow down our response time. My second question is that I'm still not totally clear about how the traffic is supposed to enter the establishment. The last time we saw this, that you were going to turn on the barns going west, to get in and then come down to the entrance. But you

weren't going to go through the business itself. So now I'm confused. And so what's the preferred way to the traffic flow? Is it supposed to go into the actual business? Go past the other, the tire and the and the lube area? And then go to the back? It seems a little confusing to me. It forces folks to go to Barnes?

Commissioner Douch - I know this is questions of staff, but the traffic report, page 18 highlights the entrance and exits. And it points out that the entrance is either through the existing facility or through Abbott and Barnes if you're coming on Healdsburg Avenue or via Barnes Avenue. So I think that's the answer to the question is those are the entry points.

Mr. Hogan - Yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Kelley - You could also turn right on to Barnes without any problem, you're not slowing traffic up too much. So that we're not worried about. So then I'm going to switch over to the sound wall, the sound wall seems very short. Is there a reason why it doesn't go further north and also go all the way to the end of the south part of the carwash project.

Mr. Hogan – The noisiest part of the carwash operation is the drying function and the drying function is at the north end of the building as you come in the cars get washed and are then dried. The reason it's fairly short is that the sound doesn't really bend back around and go south again at that point. We're more concerned with the sound radiating up to the up to the north. And so the sound wall runs from the noise source which is the carwash building up to the corner of the of the building where the Chimera art facility is located. So the purpose of that is to keep the noise on the property and minimize the amount of noise that goes off site. That's the reason the wall is somewhat short. If the Commission has concerns and they feel that the wall should be longer or higher we can certainly leave that recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Kelley - And the building itself as acting as a sound wall on the east side as it is built to reduce sound too, I imagine.

Mr. Hogan – Yes.

Commissioner Kelley - Okay, is that blocks or how is that created?

Mr. Hogan - I suspect that's a question for the applicant in terms of the specific materials they're going to use. It's my impression it's block, but I think we should all get a more accurate answer from the applicant team.

Commissioner Kelley - We received a letter from a neighbor from the other carwash on Healdsburg complaining that, yes, they put the doors in at the end, but when it opens up, the sound still comes out. And so of course, I'm worried mostly to the north to the facility to the east of this project.

Mr. Hogan – Yes. You're getting into the realm of the design of the carwash drying equipment, and this may also be best posed to the applicant and his team. That's something that we've had a lot of discussion with about how to reduce the noise impacts from the dryer unit. And I think that's been a main item of discussion as this project went through. So I think they would do they would be best questioned on that.

Commissioner Kelley – Right, thank you.

Chair Fernandez - Most of my questions have been answered. I just want to make one question in a comment. So I believe that you can turn across a double yellow line. So you would have to add a double, double yellow line, essentially, to make it an illegal crossing. Isn't that correct?

Director Svanstrom - Yeah, I believe that's correct. Yeah. That's important, because that double double yellow is the same as a median barrier.

Chair Fernandez - Right. So was there any discussion or research on possibly being able to do that?

Director Svanstrom - I believe the engineering manager had looked at that, but I will certainly ask him again as he was to coordinate with Caltrans on a number of items.

Chair Fernandez - Thank you. And then the question, also regarding the left turn, going west on highway 12, would it have affected the traffic study? If that had been taken into consideration? In other words, that vehicles are allowed to turn left there. And if that was taken into consideration that some vehicles will be turned left? What effect you know, would that have had on the traffic study?

Mr. Hogan - The purpose of the study was to look at the traffic impacts of the three key intersections around the project site. I don't believe the focus of the study was to look at turning motions going left into the facility that you currently have now I don't believe the study was looking at that.

Chair Fernandez - Because that would certainly affect the point. The intersection number two, I think you had labeled it at Morris and 12. And that was the only one that changed.

Mr. Hogan - I'm not sure how realistic that change is because I don't I think the peak hour traffic going eastward. I think there is the model assume that okay, it starts at seven so you're getting carwash business at seven in the morning, when you've got commute traffic, heading over toward one on a Saturday, Santa Rosa and the 101. So as I look at it, that's the reason I thought there was a change of level of service at that intersection. But it's still complies with the city's standard, which is ultimately what we were assessing the project on.

Chair Fernandez - Okay, because I you know, I think it would affect I think that delay time there if there were vehicles stopping, waiting further to go by going east and then make that left turn. So I think that would certainly have an effect on the timing or how long would it take to get across that intersection.

Mr. Hogan – Very likely.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Fernandez asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

James Jensen, Civil Engineer for this project responded to a question that was asked about raising the facility to feet to an 80' elevation, I understand that this building is technically floodable and that it can be constructed at 78' with floodwaters entering and receding the structure which is actually preferable because by doing that we won't displace as much floodwater as we would by trying to raise everything two feet. So I understand that that is an option. I see the condition written the way it is, but I believe that the criteria for requiring the building to be elevated as it is written is in the event that

the building is not flood proof. All of the other questions that I have heard at this point are really geared towards Tunnel Vision, the constructor of the carwash. Happy to answer additional site plan related questions.

Chair Fernandez asked for questions of the applicant.

Commissioner Oetinger - Mr. Jensen Are you interested in asking answering questions about the vapors that escaped from the facility?

Mr. Jensen - So if that is a question related to the carwash, then that will be for Tunnel Vision. Oh, yeah, I think Tunnel Vision really has the lion's share of information for this meeting.

Commissioner Oetinger - They'll also discuss decibels with us correct and the sound studies, and water usage and that kind of thing.

Mr. Jensen - Yep.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay, thank you. Is there a representative from Tunnel Vision available?

Ed Blair from Tunnel Vision was present and available to answer questions.

Commissioner Oetinger - I have a concern about the water vapor because from past carwash experience, we've discovered that that water vapor also has soapy and greasy residues that land on property, buildings, windows, decks, lawn furniture, chairs, cars, etc. Especially when there's a breeze and so I'm wondering if there are any studies to determine what's actually in that water vapor?

Mr. Blair - No as for the water vapors are pretty much captured within the wash bay itself and there's no migrate particulates that would go out more specifically beyond the property boundaries.

Commissioner Oetinger - Are there studies that show that?

Mr. Blair - No, not that I'm aware of.

Commissioner Oetinger – I was wondering if it could be proved that there were vapors leaving if it would be possible to modify the building in such a way that it could stop those. It is just hard to imagine when the door opens that this aerosolized vapor isn't escaping.

Mr. Blair - I'm not aware of any studies that have focused in on this challenge.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay. If they were would the carwash owner normally be responsible for cleaning that material off of objects where that vapor has landed. I guess you can't answer that because you don't know that it exists. Right. Okay. Are you familiar with the equipment that has been installed? You've seen it in use at other sites.

Mr. Blair - I'm familiar with most sites in Sonoma County. Yes.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay. Normally when the dryer equipment is running, is the exit door closed or open?

Mr. Jensen - Yeah. There's no plan to have an exit door on this, the business plan, the profile of carwash that you're requesting is completely different than the design carwash that Mr. Reece is planning here.

Commissioner Oetinger – I'm not sure what you're saying exactly.

Mr. Blair - The carwash that you're referring to is a roll over automatic as you would have up at Rotten Robbie, which this site and this configuration carwash is completely different. It's not anywhere near the same equipment or configuration.

Commissioner Oetinger - So I still don't understand the answer to my question which is if the equipment is drying a car will the door always be closed?

Mr. Blair – No, there are no doors on the entrance or exit end of this carwash.

Commissioner Oetinger - Oh, because in the illustrations that we saw the building there were doors.

Mr. Blair - Well there are security doors at night.

Commissioner Oetinger - So these doors don't close while the facility is functioning?

Mr. Blair – The doors are open when the facility is open.

Commissioner Oetinger – You're saying there are no vapors escaping?

Mr. Blair – No.

Commissioner Oetinger - So that answers some questions I had. For the sound of the equipment itself we get a reading of 91 dBA less the 14 dBA from the silencer and we come up with 77 dBA at seven feet. Now where is the sound equipment when it's recording that 77 dBA, is it at the door?

Mr. Blair - I don't know where the sound study was taken from but normally it's about 10 feet from the exit door. The sound suppression portion of this proposed project is upstairs and not in the wash bay itself.

Commissioner Oetinger - Oh so the equipment is silenced but not the blasting of the air down below.

Mr. Blair - The equipment is silenced.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay, but the receiver you believe is 10 feet from the exit?

Mr. Blair – Yeah, we will pass those questions on to the sound study specialist as they know that criteria.

Commissioner Oetinger - Okay then if the sound specialist is available then I can ask those tonight.

Mr. Blair – I don't know if they are. In the south study they show that it is consistent with being within tolerances.

Commissioner Oetinger – I have questions about that too because, again, the next level is 50 feet away and there are people right over the fence adjacent to a two-story building, where the sound is going to be hitting that building, and we don't have any recording for what the sound will be there, it's important to note for me, my point of view is that at that location right over the six foot wall, they are protected from the sound of the traffic, so they're not really going to hear the traffic. So this is the sound that they will hear. And I feel like we're at a loss to know how that property is affected because we don't know the sound that they will be hearing right across the wall. And it sounds like you can't answer those questions and I am disappointed with that. Let me see if I have any questions about the facility.

Mr. Blair - I think is best answered by the sound study analysis people. They show in their diagrams that they are consistent with the requirements of sound augmentation. In other words, they were within the boundaries of tolerance.

Commissioner Oetinger - But since decibels are logarithmic, there's a big difference between one number and the next number. And so I get confused, because up above the equipment, you say, 10 feet from the equipment, we're assuming that's 10 feet from the door, it's 77 decibels. And with the silencer, and yet, what's normally acceptable in our plan is 70 decibels. But you're saying that with a sight, silence or the adjacent property is only experiencing 64 to 65 and so there's I'm getting confused. But I'm wondering if it's also just barely 10 feet away. I'm wondering why that number is so much lower.

Mr. Blair - Again, you'd have to talk to somebody that worked on the sound study analysis.

Mr. Hogan - Unfortunately, we did not arrange for Illingworth and Rodkin to be on our call tonight. So, if the Commission has questions regarding the technical nature of the analysis as it sounds like you do, then we'll have to wait. If the commission needs more information, we'll have to arrange for them to come in and explain the details of the noise study.

Commissioner Oetinger – thank you.

Chair Fernandez - You have any other questions Commissioner Oetinger?

Commissioner Oetinger - Yeah, I'm looking over my notes to see if I can find something?

Chair Fernandez - Yeah, just let me know.

Commissioner Oetinger - Thank you.

Chair Fernandez - Vice Chair Fritz do you have any questions?

Vice Chair Fritz - Yeah, I had a question about just again trying to understand this compared to, you said it's not like Rotten Robbie's, it's something different. Is it anything similar to the Splash Express carwash in Santa Rosa? I mean, that's one that I'm familiar with. Can you kind of compare it to that?

Mr. Blair - Yeah, Splash Express is different, they use equipment that they don't endorse. The difference between what we do and what is done there is that all the producers at Splash are nearly at car level in the wash bay. What we do is take all of our energy producers and put them upstairs which mitigates sound migrations.

Vice Chair Fritz – So, the equipment is upstairs and you're relying on the building to block the sound?

Mr. Blair - Actually, as proposed is better than that, it's the ICF concept, which is a foam block with nine inches of concrete cells, which helps mitigate vibration and sound, which is even more in effect than is CMU block walls. The difference is the CMU block walls are eight inches, we're 13 inches overall, two inches of Styrofoam on the outside with nine inches of concrete fill.

Vice Chair Fritz - And so again, with Splash Express, the equipment's upstairs, but obviously, the car washing is happening down at the ground level. There are no doors on that facility either. And I've been there and there's definitely water vapor escaping that facility.

Mr. Blair - Yeah. Water vapor, you're talking about, you know, clean water. You're talking about spot free rinse, which is designed not to spot cars, it's not resting and contaminating or coating things at the exit. So that concept is probably not a reality.

Vice Chair Fritz – Other questions are more detailed and acoustic related so it would have been nice to have somebody from Illingworth and Rodkin here to answer some of those more specific questions about the acoustic side. So I don't really have any more questions at the moment, thanks.

Chair Fernandez – Commissioner Douch do you have any questions?

Commissioner Douch – No, not at this time.

Chair Fernandez – Commissioner Oetinger do you have any questions?

Commissioner Oetinger – No.

Chair Fernandez – Commissioner Lindenbusch do you have any questions?

Commissioner Lindenbusch – no questions at this time, thank you.

Chair Fernandez - Commissioner Haug do you have any questions?

Commissioner Haug – I'm sure this was already covered but to reiterate, I know that Benedetti does a great business in their tire portion and also in their express lube portion, how many cars currently enter and exit the facility now?

Director Svanstrom asked Mr. Reece if he could provide that information?

Mr. Reece - Yeah, I just didn't know if anybody, any of my professionals, we're going to take over or not. Hi, everybody. So I would say that we probably average between both facilities, anywhere between 75 to 125 cars per day.

Commissioner Haug - Okay. And then I assume that you're going to dovetail in some of your existing customers through the carwash. I mean, to me from a business perspective, that would make sense. So I'm wondering what is the increased amount of cars that you think would be coming in and out of the facility due to the carwash because you're not offering gas? It's just a carwash? Correct?

Mr. Reece - That is correct. You know, it's hard to anticipate how much we'll get because what our anticipation is, we pretty much have pooled a lot of people in Sebastopol and as somebody born and raised here he has been looking for a good carwash for a long time, and so has everybody else so typically people leave town to get their car washed, so we're hoping to be able to draw from that, but our customers also, one of our highest requested amenities to add to our facility is, when are you going to be able to wash our car? And so we're hoping that we'll be able to grab a large percentage of our already clientele. To answer a question more specifically. It could be as many as 50 to 75 more cars per day to the carwash.

Commissioner Haug - Okay, so let's say that you, let's say 50% of your existing clientele use the carwash. Would that make it pencil for you? Or do you need to have a full 75 car per day increase for it to pencil?

Mr. Reece - It's difficult to give you that number right now because the since this started in 2017, the building costs have gone up exponentially. So it's really hard to say where the breakeven point is going to be at this point. So that's not a number that I can really give you.

Commissioner Haug - Okay, I'm just trying to get a sense of what your expectations are about the increased amount of cars going through the carwash, so you're kind of thinking if you're at let's say, on average 100 cars per day coming in and out that then it could go up to 175 cars per day.

Mr. Reece - The potential is there. Yes. Really what I would like is if I could get every car that came in here for service to get a carwash, that would be optimal.

Commissioner Haug - Okay, thank you.

Director Svanstrom - The traffic study is a little conservative on that. If you look at page 13 of the traffic study, not only does it assume that there's up to 400 trips, and that would be sort of a standalone, you know, freeway by the freeway, because I had carwash and it assumes that 100, a quarter of the carwash trips would be generated that are already being generated by the existing customers.

Commissioner Haug - Yeah. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Chair Fernandez – Commissioner Kelley do you have any further questions?

Commissioner Kelley - When you're going out Abbott, to turn north on to Petaluma, I mean, it's sort of crazy there now. And for people to be able to get over so they can take a left-hand turn the block before Sebastopol, it’s crazy now, and I am just not sure, I know it was studied as an intersection, however, it seems like it’s unacceptable to add that many more cars trying to get out of there. So I'm just going to put that in as an I don't know if there's a way to answer that? Do we have our traffic consultants here tonight?

Director Svanstrom – We do not.  And again, depending on the conditions, you know, if we’re not able to answer these questions, we can work to get them at the next meeting.

Commissioner Kelley - Okay, and then I know that the applicant was answering questions. Why is the sound wall short? Would it help the business to the east if the sound wall was longer going north?

Mr. Hogan – going north the sound wall would run into the existing building.

Commissioner Kelley – It's on the property line?

Mr. Hogan – I believe it is, yes.

Commissioner Kelley - Wow, that is closer than I thought. All right. So that answers that. I think that's my questions right now. Thank you.

Chair Fernandez expressed having no further questions at this time and asked staff a procedural question on public comment.

Director Svanstrom - We do have a number of folks from the public. I'm just going to go ahead. And if you want to call on people, I see one hand raised. If I see a visual and you're just raising your hand physically as well that works or through the chat window. If you don't have visuals and you want to you can send a chat to the host, Kari, and we will invite you to comment. We have a Nadine who has her hand raised so I'm going to go ahead and unmute her. The three minute time represents the amount of time you may spend commenting on this item.

Nadine Sanders commented:
Thank you for taking our comments tonight commissioners. I have a vested interest in this. I am right next door in the Ford building property. I'm a tenant here. And I am sitting right now about 40 feet from where this is going to be. I have one comment based on the good information I've heard tonight. I think it would be really excellent to find a carwash that is just like this. So that the sound and the vapor could really be studied because it sounds like none of us here are familiar with the kind of carwash that's being proposed. Number two, I'm very curious about the fact that a carwash essentially is a drive thru and there will be cars sitting there idling. And I have not lived in Sebastopol my whole life, just the last five years, but I do know that the city has been very specific about not allowing drive throughs. So that's just something I want to bring up from the public. If this carwash is allowed right here in the center of town, you may have people like CVS and other places who also then want to have a drive thru. So I'm concerned about the consistency of what the city has done with this in the past. And then thirdly, I haven't heard it brought up at all. And I think you might want to consider this fact, this area of town has really been changing. There used to be a Chevy dealership, this was the old Ford building. Across the street, there was apple warehouses, there was a train next door to Gravenstein station, and what it's been turning into is retail and offices, and I haven't heard this addressed at all, your vision for this town of Sebastopol, which I know you're trying to court a luxury hotel and there's more and more foot traffic because of the Barlow andn the restaurants. I don't see a carwash right in this area as consistent with all the retail and the offices. All my other concerns like sound and traffic you have addressed very well. But those are the three things I wanted to bring up. And I hope you will consider my comments. Thank you very much.

Ted Luthin commented:
Hello, thanks for letting me speak. I appreciate all the questions that have been asked. And a lot of a lot of my concerns I think have been answered today. But I think the biggest one, just like the previous speaker said, I think it would be very short sighted to

approve this without actually seeing one of these in action. The only one that I'm familiar with that looks just like this is the Splash Express carwash and a friend of mine had a car dealership right across the street that had to close because of the noise and because of the vapor that settled on all of his cars right across the street. And if you've ever been to that thing, it's a noisy beast outside of it. And I know that the designer said that they don't use that technology and they have sound deadening and all this sort of stuff. But I think I think it'd be very prudent to actually go to one of these facilities that is built just like this one, stand out in front of it and see what's coming out. What is the thing breathing? And what does it sound like? I also agree with the previous speaker, that you know, it seems a little strange that in the center of our downtown which is supposed to be pedestrian friendly, and prohibit drive thrus it seems a little strange that a drive thru carwash is being considered and that doesn't really seem compatible with the pedestrian friendly downtown. Thank you very much.

Martin Reed commented:
Thank you. Good evening, commissioners. My name is Martin Reed, and I'm CEO of a tech services company with offices on the adjacent parcel. So I'm actually sitting in my office right now about 25 feet from these proposed dryers of the carwash. So our second story office here has large windows that are overlooking the Benedetti property. And currently it can be a very noisy neighbor. So Mr. Hogan, I know that you were inside the building, and it's possible it was quiet at that time. But periodically, there is a loudspeaker that is used for communication on the property. There are cars or trucks that that are starting, turning off, honking. There's beeping from large trucks backing up. There are power tools that are used for oil and tire changes. So it can already be a very noisy facility. And I shudder to think what an additional, you know, 77 decibels, which is comparable to standing 50 feet from a freeway would do to this area, which is a really nice area. We have the Rodota Trail we have The Barlow, so we're very concerned about the noise. In addition, the traffic on Sebastopol Avenue can be very, very difficult at certain times of the day, particularly between Petaluma and Morris, and cars turning left into the facility, cars turning left out of the facility. I think we concluded that you know, there would be about eight to 10 car lengths between possibly the city's busiest intersection at highway 12 and Petaluma and Barnes where customers could you know be slowing down to a couple miles per hour in order to make that right turn. So I think the traffic on this road already can be very difficult. And I am afraid to think what would happen if you know we potentially double the amount of cars frequenting the Benedetti property. In addition to the noise and the traffic, this project will consume large amounts of water and power, and could possibly contribute to downtown flooding by adding thousands of square feet of impervious paving. As we know, this is right next to the Rodota Trail and the Laguna, part of what makes this town so special. Page 13, Table 8 fails to include our building in the noise monitoring survey. And I think as you've heard tonight, we are possibly the most likely to be affected by the significant increase in noise and all the cars idling all the emissions from that. You know, I think we're all here because we love the charm of Sebastopol. And I would urge the Commission to expand the ordinance against drive thru uses to include carwashes and to reject this project as it currently stands and to keep the charm in this downtown area. Thank you.

Director Svanstrom - I do not see any other hands raised. I see one potential other member of the public.  Asked Huck Hensley if he wished to make a comment.

Huck Hensley commented:
Yes, I'm sorry my video isn't working but I am the owner of the adjacent Ford building and I'm usually happy to hear about investment in new projects but this use just creates too many liabilities.  I think Mr. Reed was pretty eloquent in expressing the problems that

the tenants are going to face. I too like the direction that downtown Sebastopol has taken the past few years. The pedestrian wayfinding, the signage, the bike lanes, the narrowing of traffic lanes on the highway, all that makes for a more livable, inviting, quiet, and slower city. I think that's really widely appreciated and this use just flies in the face of all that hard work and progress. It will make a lot of noise, that is why there's a noise study. It will generate traffic. It kind of makes a mockery of the City's attempt to save water and the drought. And the City's wanted to encourage downtown infill housing and no one will build within earshot of a carwash. I would like to build some infill housing on the back of my property which is really pretty nice, it faces the Laguna, it's pretty quiet, and about 300 feet from the street. And now it would be just over the fence from the carwash. I asked a neighbor of mine who's just an ordinary guy, a common sense contractor, if it would be good or urban planning to look at a carwash downtown next to an office building and it took him about five seconds to say no, I don't think that's a good idea. The tenants and office workers aren't going to like that. That would be poor planning. The sound wall shows the noise projecting over the property line plainly exceeds that allowed by the City ordinance by about 15 decibels. It's black and white, just read it, don't look at the conclusions. And the traffic studies got to be rerun using the same customer count as the acoustic study. The number of customers varies between those two by a great deal, and varies again by tonight's estimate. That's about all I have at this point. Thank you.

Director Svanstrom - Thank you, Chair Fernandez. That looks like that's it for public comments tonight. I will note that I can't recall if Mr. Hogan said during his report that we did receive comments from some of the folks who spoke this evening and that are in your packet as well as number of other comments that have also been transmitted to the Commission both in the original staff report as well as uploaded online and forwarded on to the Commission this afternoon.

Chair Fernandez – Asked Director Svanstrom if she could comment on one of the questions regarding drive thrus and how the drive thru carwash differs from that?

Director Svanstrom - Sure I would be happy to. This issue did come up in the 2017 Preliminary Review that the Planning Commission had for this project. At that time, there was a brand-new General Plan that was adopted in 2016. I don't know if the Zoning Ordinance updates that were adopted in November of 2018 we're underway yet, but it was known that there was going to be a major Zoning Ordinance update to address the General Plan as well as some of the other issues. In that process, the Zoning Ordinance regulations defined car washes as a type of automotive use, not as a drive thru, similar to an oil change or getting your tires or any other type of automotive service, you physically can't do it without driving your car to and sometimes through the equipment that is doing that. And so that was defined differently than a drive thru. There was a moratorium on drive thrus prior to the Zoning Ordinance update, but the Zoning Ordinance that we have now was adopted in 2018 and continues to define drive thrus for other uses that aren't automotive like this, and does prohibit them in any district. And I think one of the things we are also looking at is, this is in some ways an infill to the property, which already has automotive uses on it. And then I think for the question about the car washes of the same model, I believe there are one or two that are local, because Mr. Blair suggested them to staff after the initial application.

Mr. Blair - Yes, I can, there are two now operating. The first which was used in the sound study is located at Coffey and Piner and operates 24/7 at a 76 gas station. The producers in this case are beside the building and the equipment room. There is another one at 1240 Mendocino Avenue, which is called Wash Barn and just opened at the beginning of the year. The equipment in this case is upstairs and is very different than the Splash

application. They had to do a sound study at the Wash Barn and prior to their opening they had to make sure that they were consistent with the sound mitigation requirements at the backside of the sidewalk which they were able to comply with.

Commissioner Oetinger - You said you had sound requirements at the back of the sidewalk?

Mr. Blair – Yeah, there's guidelines on sound studies for properties and so the back of sidewalk, which would be a condition here, which is I'm going to guess 150 feet away is I think 70 decibels and it depends on the city. And so we would be far less, far, far less as we're nearly that at the exit end of the wash bay. So there would be no exceeding the sound, the ambient sound, at the back of sidewalk at any property line.

Director Svanstrom – And perhaps I can clarify for the Commission what the City's regulations are, we do have a noise ordinance, it is relative to it. The requirement is to measure the noise at the property line wherever that property line is for the front property line. And obviously that's often the back of sidewalk is the property line. But in this case, we know that the more sensitive property line is the eastern property line and that does need to meet the noise ordinance as well.

Mr. Hogan – To add on to what Director Svanstrom said, that was one of the reasons that we requested the supplemental analysis looking at the placement of a sound wall, from the exit of the dryer unit up to the corner of the adjacent building, because that appeared to be the location where there was a potential for noise at the property line.

A representative of the applicant team - We agreed with that.

Chair Fernandez - Any other questions?

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fernandez brought this back to the Commission for questions, comments, suggestions, and direction from here.

Vice Chair Fritz – Happy to get started. First off, it seems like there is a lot of obviously questions around acoustics and I don't know how other Commissioners feel, but I feel like there are a lot of very technical questions that we can't seem to have answered without the acoustic consultants available. So I would suggest that before we make a decision, we at least do that. But I also have just started some general comments. Yeah, I do have some concerns about the fact that this is in our downtown core zoning district. We've been making efforts and I think some success in recent years over making downtown Sebastopol more people oriented, less car oriented, although I think we have a long way to go. But we're obviously taking steps. You know, The Barlow has been fairly successful, there's the bike lanes, and there's a lot of opportunity for potential infill development and getting more people, more businesses, and more residences downtown. And I don't think, personally, that setting a precedent for well, it's already an existing automotive use. It's downtown. We don't really like that, but we'll let them expand their existing automotive use downtown. I mean, there's other downtown businesses that are automotive oriented, that if we let this business expand the auto functions of their property, there's nothing to you know, we're sort of setting a precedent for all the others, there's the smog test place that's next to the Basso building. You know, if they want to put a carwash in or

Jiffy Lube or something like that, I mean, if we let this person do it, then we have to let that person do it. And there's the auto repair place south on Main Street by Hippizzazz and the taqueria. Same thing, if they want to redevelop that and add an additional automotive

use after we approve this project. It's sort of setting a precedent for continuing to do that. And I just feel that this isn't really the right use for this site. I do have a great deal of concern for the adjacent properties. I know Mr. Hensley has been thinking about doing residential at the back of his property, but if there's a carwash next to it, it will really discourage him from doing that. And I think we need more of that type of development downtown. We want more housing downtown. So I would hate for a carwash to go in and then Mr. Hensley say, well, I don't want to do this, it kind of devalues my property and my ability to develop. There's also an adjacent property to the rear to the south that's vacant that, you know, could also be an apartment or multifamily housing kind of property. But again, if there's a carwash next door, it really discourages that kind of development of that property. I'm really generally not in favor of allowing this used to go forward. I think the variance is problematic, I don't quite see why this property is unique from any other property that we would need to give them a variance on the floor area ratio. The idea of the floor area ratio when we went through the General Plan update was to make people do more mixed-use residential, commercial development downtown, that's what we wanted. A floor area ratio of .2 doesn't meet that. I'm not really in favor of the variance. I'm not really in favor of the use. Doesn't really understand how the six foot sound wall for that sort of distance does anything to benefit the second floor tenants next door. I can see how maybe the Chimera that's right behind the sound wall would benefit from the sound wall. But if you're on the second floor of that building, that sound was not preventing the sound from going up over the wall. So I do have concerns from that aspect as well. So I guess I'll leave my comments at there for now. Thank you.

Commissioner Douch - Yeah, sure, I'll jump in. I remember when this came to the Commission for an advisory hearing, and I remember that we discussed the noise at some length, we did compare it to some other car washes at the time. And you know, it is significantly less noisy than some of the ones we experienced like Rotten Robbie's. Be that as it may, at the time, I think the Commission's position was generally in favor of this location for this development. It came on the back of a number of applications, or at least explorations around gas stations, issues with the current carwash. Where these things could go generally. We were looking at the General Plan and we discussed how if you look at the main streets through Sebastopol, where could you put a facility for vehicles either gas station, etc. And the fact is, there are none that do not affect residences. Except not not only this one, but very few, including this site, which is currently an automotive use. And I while I'm appreciative of the sentiments of the concerns, I feel personally that this is an appropriate place for this use, based on what's there now and what available space we have for these kinds of uses. And I think additionally, for the need to serve our broad community in town, you know, when we talk about hotels or things that are going to generate pedestrian traffic and commerce we hear complaints of gentrification and not, you know, becoming Healdsburg, but when we talk about practical uses, the unique local businesses putting in a facility that clearly has some demand and there's been a lot of comments in favor. Then the Healdsburg, gentrification argument seems to evaporate. So I think it's important that we do cater to the needs of our community. And I think this does so, I think it relieves some of the issues with the current carwash at north end of town. And I am of course sensitive to the noise to the offices immediately adjacent. And I think that needs to be addressed. I think if you read the noise study fairly carefully, I think it has been addressed. I think they have used real data from real car washes. Not making things up, not trying to make it better than it is, I think it's an honest evaluation of the noise and 70 decibels for that rather small area. You know, that's a vacuum cleaner, or it's a loudish noise, but it is not a freeway. So I think we have to be careful to evaluate the impacts appropriately. And I think we have good materials to do that. There may be some nuanced questions about acoustics, how does it affect the upstairs offices may be a fair and important question. As to traffic, I feel the same applies. We are, as

we've heard from Mr. Reece, the potential impact on a really, with a really successful role in this business might be 70 additional trips, we're also adding a really good entry and exit to that site. So frankly, I appreciate the general concern, but we have a traffic study here that does point to limited impacts, the reason the numbers are different for the traffic study and the noise study has to do with the consultants trying to be conservative, trying to look at what the reality is based on maximum usage or, sensible approximation of maximum usage, I don't know exactly. But I think we have material that gives us a lot of good information and our concerns that are natural for us living here about Highway 12 and everything else, I appreciate them. And I think we live in a congested zone right there. But adding an entry to this site and an exit and better flow, I think ultimately is going to have minimal impact. As really the traffic study indicates, I think a really careful reading of those documents bears this out. That notwithstanding, I respect the considerations of additional questions, but I'm in favor of the variance and I'm in favor of the project and my position would be to recommend forward to the City Council.

Commissioner Oetinger - Yes, I think that this project could be a really good project. I like the traffic circulation with the exit on Barnes, I think it'll make it easier when I get my tires changed to walk home and to leave the facility instead of turning left onto the highway. So I think that is a good benefit. I think it's a benefit to have the car oriented uses together, I think it's a little bit of the philosophy of their closeness and the downtown core that they're centralized together. I think the business is well respected and the place is always clean and I appreciate that the applicant has been redoing the landscaping and that the vacant lot will be improved through the addition of the carwash. I like that you're using the recycled water. And I like that the building itself doesn't look like a typical carwash. But it looks like it fits in with other buildings. Although, at some point, we're going to get tired of looking at just that, we'll need a more eclectic look. But I think this is far better than your typical carwash. I'm okay with the floor area ratio, because, in fact, the stalls with the vacuums are part of the business, it's as if you just don't need to put walls over them. Unless, of course, you want to add some shade. And some solar panels, that might not be a bad idea. On the negative side, I feel like we've been through the carwash problem with neighbors in this town. And I really don't feel comfortable with the sound report that we've seen. I don't feel comfortable with the lack of information on the vapors which people have witnessed themselves when there are no doors, or no collection system for that. And I feel like this is a really good opportunity to take an existing idea and make it the kind of a carwash that you'd want in your downtown next door to other neighbors. And I think that that could happen. But there are things that would need to be done. One of them in particular is that we're going to need doors. The other one is that I don't think the sound wall that's only six feet high works. But since the building is an insulated concrete building, it could easily have t-structures where the wall itself is the building. The building could extend in both directions, appropriate number of feet away from the building and shield the neighbors at the same height as the building wall itself with even a covered roof over some parts of it that would help contain and reduce the noise so that nobody was concerned about it. I think that's the kind of a facility that would be appropriate in this location that took the neighbors, the vapors, and the noise under consideration without resorting to a six foot concrete wall. I think it could be done. I'm not an acoustical engineer, and I'm not an architect, but I would beg that if the applicant wants to proceed here with a recommendation to the Council, that they're willing to make adjustments to the buildings so that it really is an appropriate good neighbor, and that our town doesn't have to go through the years of pain and suffering we have had with other neighbors in this situation. I think it's really important that the property next door be suitable for housing and if that's going to happen, and if the neighborhood is going to be walkable and enjoyable we're going to have to start reducing some of the sounds of our businesses. And I think doing so would show good effort on the part of the applicant to

get something that the town can be proud of and not struggle with for years and years. I don't want to go specifically through the negative declaration, but I wouldn't recommend approving it without upfront changes to the building. And I say that because even if the sound is okay, and meets the standards of our law for an industrial area, it might not be the case for the existing neighbors next door who in the future might be housing, or right currently are now doing things outdoors, with their customers. So I think the negative declaration is not appropriate without looking at a different plan for solving the sound problem for those people. Either that or a real thorough study. My concern is that once the building is built, and you get the studies, the neighbors next door will still complain about that sound, and then they'll still complain about the vapors. And then you're looking at a retrofit situation on those doors. So I would like to see that happen up front, that we create something that really is appropriate for being in our downtown. As far as the traffic and the stalling, I think we're working at getting cleaner cars, my car wouldn't have exhaust if I were waiting in that line. And I think more and more we'll see cars that don't. So I think we can move toward the future with that. So I think I've given you some ideas where I would be happy to say yes, I'm all for it. But right now, I would have a no recommendation and I would have specific changes to the staff report in mitigating some issues in the EIR. I think that's it for now. Thank you.

Commissioner Lindenbusch - Thank you, Chair Fernandez. Before I start, I just want to thank Vice Chair Fritz and Commissioner Oetinger in particular for their comments. I tend to agree with a lot of them. Where I'm finding conflict with the benefit and detriment of this project, I think, sort of delineates between the benefits of regional planning and the detriments of downtown planning. From a regional planning perspective, this type of project could be in line with some climate goals of vehicle miles traveled (VMT): people have to drive less far to get the type of carwash experience they want. And that's been reflected in comments across the board. So I think that could be a potential benefit for our regional community. In terms of downtown planning, I don't think that this is a type of project that is consistent with the goals of what our city wants to establish. For our downtown core. I do hear the concerns about such a project like this in such an intensification like this, leading to a potential reduction in the suitability of neighboring sites for housing or commercial development. Moving forward, that is in line with the goals of the downtown, the General Plan, our Housing Element, everything to do with our downtown. So that's where I am conflicted a little bit on this project. I do think there are some unanswered questions in terms of the water vapor and the sound. Just because there aren't people who live nearby right now, it doesn't mean that the sites nearby are not going to have people living on them for the decades to come. And I didn't really see a lot in the staff report, in terms of any environmental impact on the Joe Rodota trail or any of the surrounding areas including the Laguna as this is an environmentally sensitive site even if it's not required to be considered under certain elements of CEQA I think the environmental elements are still something that are worth considering. So for those reasons, I'm sort of leaning toward no just because I think that we have a lot of unanswered questions from the Commission. And I just don't know if this is exactly the type of project that we need to be looking at for downtown Sebastopol. I do have respect for the applicant for bringing it forward and for doing a really good job of trying to meet some of the demands of our downtown and the expectations of our community in terms of what a project like this could look like. And I do also want to echo Commissioner Oetinger and others who have expressed the benefit of having this connection on Abbott. I think it would be really helpful in terms of traffic. So traffic isn't really a concern. It's just more of the general character of the downtown and opportunities moving forward.

Commissioner Haug - Thank you Chair Fernandez. I feel that my thoughts are very much in line with other comments from the Commission. I feel that that this would be a good

service for our community and for West County, there's clearly a need for it. I'm also looking forward and thinking about, you know, we do have an urgent need for infill housing in our downtown for environmental reasons and for viability reasons. I also am still concerned a bit about the traffic going in both the east and west directions on the 12. Just because there's a crosswalk as well, right where Barnes Avenue is. And so if you have a pedestrian crossing, and then someone turning into the carwash, you basically might not get any movement at all across Petaluma Avenue for an entire light cycle. And to me that area is already very congested. So I just have concerns about the combination of a right hand turn and the crosswalk, creating further congestion in that area. I appreciated what Commissioner Oetinger said about making the facility truly a good neighbor so it doesn't inhibit further office space or residential building. I think those are part of the priorities of the downtown. And yeah, so those are my concerns at this point.

Commissioner Kelley - I have to say I agree with everybody, these have been very thoughtful discussions. The issue around sound is a big one. I don't know if there's a way of even moving the building further to the west, like Commissioner Oetinger said, or giving it a little bit of a different orientation. I have concerns about traffic on Barnes and I am wondering if, this is just a suggestion, as you're coming out of the carwash at Barnes and Abbott, is there a way to put a sign on the applicant's property that says there's a no left turn further north on Barnes just to give them a heads up so that they already haven't gone in there, then they see the sign at the corner of Sebastopol and Barnes and then you're sort of stuck and you have to go right. So I think for folks to plan, to understand that that's not what you're supposed to do, that maybe there could be a little signage as you exit the property. I am very concerned about, if in fact the County does purchase the Sebastopol Inn, now we're going to have fulltime people living there rather than more of a transient hotel. And so I have a little concern around the sound going to the eastern part of that structure. We haven't really talked about it. So I'm going to have to agree that I don't believe this is the appropriate type of business for our downtown core, especially when it's so near an office building and the property's potential use for mixed-use development. That's it.

Chair Fernandez – Thank you Commissioner Kelley. Very well spoken and described comments from the Commission. Thank you for those descriptions. You know, I have some of the similar concerns as far as needing additional information. I would like to see if there's a way to make this work, if at all possible. You know, we talk about supporting our local business and Mr. Reece has had that business and has done a very good job as far as being a local patron and taking care of the needs of local customers. Also, not only trips would be saved, but also people washing cars at their home, which would waste a lot more water than that area. It is zoned for this, we just did the General Plan update. I do have a concern of putting that facility in, and then also eliminating the possibility of adding housing, I think that's something that we need to look at and address. You know, everybody talks about housing. And so maybe there's a way to make this work and get that around there. They're never going to eliminate 100% of the sound, it is downtown and there are going to be noises, that's part of the part of living in the downtown area. So it's just getting it to be reasonable. And I also have some questions with the negative declaration as well as there are some unanswered questions. So, you know, I'd like to get more information before my decision, but I don't know if the rest of the Commission would also like to do that as I heard a couple say they're looking at possibly voting to deny this, or if they would be open to hearing more information before making a final decision.

Commissioner Douch – In listening to the balance of comments, it feels to me that there are areas to hone in on, you know, specific elements that would be helpful to understand better or explore. I've made the sentiment clear that I am in favor of this, in principal. If

there is something we can do to either continue this meeting, to invite the sound engineer to join us, or other people that could help answer questions, I would be in favor of that. Wondered how other commissioners may feel about that. Maybe it's understanding what noise levels would be inside the office space adjacent, or if indeed the wall should be higher, or if a roof structure over the wall would make a significant difference. I think these are all great questions. But I do feel that this is a service that's needed. And of course it would be great to make it without eliminating the possibility of having housing adjacent. And, Commissioner Oetinger, I appreciate your comments in that regard. So my question to the Commission would be, is the right thing to continue this to ask for the sound engineer and possibly the traffic engineer to be present for some questions, try and answer some concerns to get to a point where we can make a make an informed decision.

Chair Fernandez thanked Commissioner Douch for his comments.

Vice Chair Fritz – I'll be open to hearing more. I think we definitely need more information on the acoustics and I'd be willing to go to these other facilities to see how they operate and see what the noise levels are. Would ask staff in terms of this kind of variance and precedent setting for other downtown automotive oriented sites that, if we grant all these different variances and use permits and such, and someone else comes forward and they say, well, look, you let Benedetti's do it, we want to do it too. Is this a precedent setting kind of issue or should I not be concerned about that?

Director Svanstrom - I don't think the Commission should be concerned about a precedent, there are a couple of things that are pretty particular to this site. One is, the minimum FAR requirement is only applicable to vacant sites or complete redevelopment of sites. For this particular project, if they weren't doing the subdivision, the minimum FAR would not be an issue. It would be simply considered infill or an intensification of an existing use, and it would not be subject to the minimum FAR. That's one of the unusual characteristics of this particular project. So I don't think that is something to be concerned about in terms of a precedent for other sites.

Vice Chair Fritz - But wouldn't that be a precedent so say, you know, the smog shop said we want to put in a Jiffy Lube on our property and we're going to do a lot split so we have the smog site and then a Jiffy Lube then say, oh look, we have a Jiffy Lube property and we don't have to meet the floor area ratio requirement because we just did a lot split. I think the whole thing is precedent setting in terms of a way to get around the floor area ratio requirement.

Director Svanstrom - Yeah, I think there are a lot of other examples. For instance, the smog shop probably doesn't have the minimum frontage requirement. There are a number of other characteristics. Plus there is a lot of what the very good discussion tonight is about, the appropriateness of this use for the site. I personally am comfortable that the Commission would not be setting a precedent. Each site is unique, and the layout of each site is unique in terms of the variance to the FAR.

Vice Chair Fritz - Well, I definitely think we need more information before we make a decision on this. Given a lot of the questions around the acoustics in particular, and possibly traffic issues that have come up, and without those consultants here to give us kind of more specific answers, I definitely don't think we should make a decision on this tonight, unless the applicant is in some hurry for us to do so.
Director Svanstrom - From a staff perspective, I apologize for not having those consultants as it's always hard to judge how detailed the conversation will get. But we can arrange to potentially have them at the next Planning Commission meeting where we

have some availability for that if the Commission wanted to continue to a date certain. Both the sound and traffic consultant are very local.

Chair Fernandez – Asked about the viability of any modifications to the current building plan, is that realistic, has that already been looked at, is there the possibility of any change to it?

Mr. Blair – Yes, actually, we have a project down in Berkeley where we have residents adjacent as would be the Ford building and the residents are anxious for the project to go forward. There was a little more modification to the exit end than is planned, that we can provide. What we don't want is to build this project and then have bad relationships with the neighbors. That's not what we're looking for. We don't want the complaints, we're very familiar with the challenges that Sebastopol has had. Has been directly and indirectly involved in it. Has gone to sites, has met the neighbors of those sites, and has been active trying to resolve these problems in Sebastopol. Tunnel Vision is also Bay Area Green, which started out as Sonoma Green. And so we're concerned about all of the things that the commissioners are concerned with. And we want to get this right on behalf of all of us. So yes, there's some I don't want to say minor, but there are some things that we can do to address the concerns, specifically to sound and I can't really speak on behalf of traffic.

Chair Fernandez – Okay. And I don't know if it's realistic to be able to present those? Or if the sound consultant would be here for the next meeting, or how that would be handled?

Director Svanstrom – Staff can contact the consultants about participating in either the next meeting or the meeting after that could work. Obviously, we will need to confirm their availability.

Chair Fernandez – Yeah, I'd like to see it coordinated with Tunnel Vision or whomever most appropriate, so they have time to come back and maybe make some suggestions as well.

Commissioner Oetinger – I support continuing as well. And I think it'd be nice to get that information on the sound and then to look at some of the conditions of approval that we would recommend to the City Council so that they actually have something that reflects some of the things that we think about, even though the final conclusion might be a recommendation to deny to the Council, it'd be nice of them to have some things that they might consider. Okay.

Director Svanstrom – Chair Fernandez, one of the things that might be helpful is to have the applicant address some of the questions or concerns about potentially modifying the location of the building or, as Commission Oetinger had suggested, the idea of having doors from the get go. I don't know if they're able to respond tonight, or if that's something they'll need to study. But I'm hearing questions from the Commission that would need to be looked at by the applicants.

Commissioner Oetinger - I just wanted to clarify, I did not suggest moving the building to another site, I just was suggesting extension of the east wall, north and south at the wall height versus building the retaining wall. That was my only suggestion about changes to the building and roof.

Patrick Slayter – Project Architect, if I could answer a question regarding the design of the building itself, what you see is something that is extremely preliminary. The Planning Commission is not design review, it's to give an idea of the massing of the building. And

regarding the sound study and the information, the application and the packet was put together in anticipation of the of the two independent studies being done, the traffic and the sound study, so anything that is reflected in the application packet that's supplied by the applicant is prior to any of the recommendations that subsequently were made by either the Planning staff or their consultants in the traffic and noise arenas. So, we're absolutely open to looking at the building and discussing new ways of addressing the sound. What we're looking at is just a circumstance of timing, and what's reflected at what point in history.

Director Svanstrom thanked Mr. Slayter for his comments.

Chair Fernandez asked if a motion to continue this was needed.

Director Svanstrom - Yes. And if you're able to continue it to a date certain, you can always do that. And if the consultants for some reason aren't available, then we can notify everybody and renotice it if needed. If we continue it to a date certain we won't need to renotice. Obviously, we've got a number of the neighbors here so they would know tonight when the next hearing would be.

Chair Fernandez – Would you suggest that it be continued to the next meeting or the meeting after?

Director Svanstrom – If it's just getting the consultants, I think the next meeting should work. That's three weeks away, given the extra weekends at the end of September. And so if they're available, they should have plenty of time to prepare for it.

Vice Chair Fritz made a motion to continue this application to the regular Planning Commission meeting on October 13, 2020 to allow the Commission to receive additional information from the consultants.

Commissioner Oetinger seconded the motion.

Chair Fernandez asked for discussion of the motion.

Vice Chair Fritz – If commissioners can make it to maybe one of these other sites to see a similar carwash that would be good.

Commissioner Haug – Yeah, I agree with Vice Chair Fritz. If we could get a list of potential sites to visit that would be very helpful prior to the October 13 meeting that way they can actually see the equipment and stand in front of it. I think that would be extremely helpful in our decision making.

Chair Fernandez - And it should also be noted, if it's exactly the same or if it's a little bit different because if we go there, and we see that it's maybe noisier that may not be a fair comparison.

Mr. Hogan – We can work with the Tunnel Vision people to get a list of other sites in the area and see how they're different. And then forward that on to the Commission so that if you do get a chance, you'll know the differences between the projects.

Chair Fernandez – Yep, good suggestion.

Chair Fernandez - Okay, we have motion and a second for continuance. Asked for a roll call.

The Commission voted on the motion as follows:

VOTE:
AYES: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Kelley, Oetinger, Haug, Douch, and Lindenbusch
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

Director Svanstrom - And so the motion passes, and the hearing will be continued to the October 13, 2020 meeting of the Planning Commission.

## 8. REGULAR AGENDA:

### A. IVES PARK WALKING TOUR

Chair Fernandez introduced the item.

Director Svanstrom provided a brief staff report.

Commissioner Haug - Thank you for supporting this idea and participating in kind of an unusual format. I tried to make the instructions as straightforward as possible. And so the idea is that we will individually walk the park and using the 2013 Master Plan as our guiding document. And I called out specific pages that I have found to be very useful. And, personally, I work best with paper documents so I just listed the pages that I thought might be helpful for those who also like paper documents. And then, as Director Svanstrom said, the second part of it is my own kind of thoughts and reflections just in terms of questions I'm asking myself as I'm looking at the Plan. One of my considerations is can we make small improvements to the park that will increase usability and heighten user experience, given the fact that our capacity to raise money through fundraising might take a while or might be limited due to the pandemic. Her final paragraph asks the commissioners to list five primary uses or needs of the park and how we could support them through Measure M improvements. I was thinking if we ourselves generate a list that, perhaps at some point if we have the capacity, could send out a community survey using our list as a beginning jumping off platform.

Chair Fernandez - Okay, good. Thank you for putting this together. Well done. Any questions at this point?

Hearing nothing further, the Commission concluded discussion of this item.

## 9. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Svanstrom provided the following updates:

- The City Council adopting the Tobacco Retail License Ordinance by approving the second reading at their last meeting.
- The City Council passed a microloan program for Sebastopol businesses as well as some changes to the Façade Improvement Program.

- Considering some public comment that was received, additional changes to the Façade Improvement Program, designed to make the program easier to access, will be considered.
- The first quarterly deadline for the Façade Improvement Program is October 20, 2020 and those applications will be reviewed at the first Design Review Board meeting in November.
- A group of staff and other people are going to be meeting tomorrow about furthering the idea of parklets on Main Street with Caltrans.
- A regional housing needs allocation process is underway. Discussed regional housing needs allocation and methodology.

Chair Fernandez - Who's handling the lead on the Façade Improvement Program?

Direction Svanstrom responded that Associate Planner, Alan Montes is the point person for the Façade Improvement Program as he is the staff liaison for the Design Review Board.

Chair Fernandez asked for questions of Director Svanstrom.

Commissioner Haug - I was reading through the City Council meeting and I believe they discussed impact fees at their last meeting.

Director Svanstrom - They did not, however, impact fees came up because they did review and hold a public hearing and adopt the User Fee Schedule. There are two different types of fees. One is a user fee, which is really the application fee for processing application, dog licenses, building permits, and all types of things. The other is a separate set of fees that is under the same contract. Development impact fees will be coming back to the Commission for review. And then the Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council.

Commissioner Haug - Okay, thank you for the clarification. That's helpful.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fernandez concluded this item.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Fernandez adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kari Svanstrom
Planning Director