



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: kvanstrom@cityofsebastopol.org

PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF: June 09, 2020

APPROVED MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF June 09, 2020

PLANNING COMMISSION:

The notice of the meeting was posted on June 04, 2020.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Fernandez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and read an opening statement.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Kelley, Oetinger, Douch, Lindenbusch and Haug
Absent: Commissioner Wilson (excused)
Staff: Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Alan Montes, Associate Planner

Chair Fernandez commented that items 7A and 8A on the agenda will be switched.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 26, 2020

Commissioner Lindenbusch amended the minutes.

Commissioner Oetinger made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Commissioner Douch seconded the motion.

The Commission voted on the motion as follows:

AYES: Chair Fernandez, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Oetinger, Douch, Kelley, Lindenbusch, and Haug

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: There were no members of the public in attendance who wished to speak. In addition, Associate Planner Montes and Director Svanstrom responded that no written comment had been received.

5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Chair Fernandez will recuse himself from Item 7A due to a proximity conflict.

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT (Update on Future Agendas, Action of Other Boards and City Council)

Director Svanstrom updated the Commission on the following:

- Provided updates related to COVID-19.
- Recent and upcoming Council actions.

Chair Fernandez asked for questions of Director Svanstrom from the Commission.

Commissioner Haug commented:

- Thanked Director Svanstrom for the report.
- After a prior Planning Commission discussion on parks, the Commission had requested a potential agenda item to include a walking tour of Ives Park as well as a tour of the Joe Rodota Trail connectors that are in Sebastopol.
 - With restrictions related to COVID-19 being relaxed, she asked if it would be possible to schedule these items for a future Commission agenda.
- Parks are essential in providing people with much needed outdoor space, as is being highlighted by the pandemic, and it would be good to work towards improving the outdoor spaces we have.

Director Svanstrom commented:

- Those are flagged internally as items that need to be placed on an upcoming Planning Commission agenda.
- In addition, the consultant that is working on the pathway redesign for Ives Park will be bringing the schematic design to the Commission for their review before proceeding with construction drawings or redesign.
- The health order does not yet allow for group gatherings.
- Those items will be scheduled when the health order allows it and when the logistics of doing so can be worked out.
- Anticipates that the next couple of Planning Commission meetings to be virtual.
- The current health order limits group gatherings to no more than 10 people.

Commissioner Lindenbusch commented:

- Asked a clarifying question about the proposed gas station at Hwy 12 and Llano Road.
- This is the first Planning Commission meeting since the Governor's eviction moratorium which expired on May 31, 2020 as well as being formally in a recession.
- Asked if staff or the City Council have addressed the wellbeing of our community at risk of eviction or foreclosure.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- The City has not addressed that directly.
- The County Board of Supervisors also has a moratorium on evictions which covers the whole county.
- Believes the County's eviction moratorium expiration date goes beyond what the Governor's was.

Commissioner Lindenbusch commented:

- The expiration dates may have been extended and reiterated his interest in knowing what the City may be doing about that.
- Referred to the June 2, 2020 Weed Abatement Ordinance and asked if there were broad plans to provide information to the community about it.

Director Svanstrom commented:

- The City sends out two different types of newsletters.
- Additional information on fire season preparedness is included.
- The City's Fire Chief has been doing site visits and working with property owners on getting in compliance with the Weed Abatement Ordinance.
- A lot of the owners of the properties on the list of needing weed abatement are not local.

Commissioner Lindenbusch commented:

- At the last meeting, Commission Haug asked if the Commission was going to meet with the City's new Economic Vitality consultant.
 - Echoed support for agendizing a meeting between the Commission and CoMission.
 - Will be looking at CoMission's presentation to the City Council next Tuesday as well.
- Interested in hearing what is on the horizon for the Commission for the next couple months.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- Future forecasts are usually shared with the Chair of the Commission so agenda management can be coordinated.
- Forecasts can change, particularly with applications, which is why staff does not share specifics until legal notices have gone out and agendas are set.
 - Doing so in advance of that could cause confusion.
 - For items such as presentations, advance notice is usually provided.

Commissioner Lindenbusch commented:

- Understands, especially in terms of permit timelines which can be subject to a variety of factors.
- On other items, he requested that the Commission and staff work as collaboratively as possible to figure out what is on the horizon, especially with the pandemic and recession, it is important for everyone to be on the same page.

Director Svanstrom responded in the affirmative and commented:

- The Commission will be having a study session on development impact fees.
- The City has a consultant working on the required updates for that.
- This will be a bigger, comprehensive discussion as the update is not limited to one type of fee.
- This study session is anticipated to occur at one of the two Commission meetings in July.

Chair Fernandez confirmed that Commissioner Lindenbusch would be attending the next Council meeting as he is listed as the Commission's liaison and commented that Commissioner Lindenbusch could provide an update to the Commission at their next meeting.

Commissioner Lindenbusch responded in the affirmative.

Chair Fernandez commented that Commissioner Lindenbusch could email any topics he would like to be agendaized to him so they could be considered for a future agenda.

There were no further questions of Director Svanstrom.

8. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. RECEIPT OF ANNUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE REPORT

Director Svanstrom provided an overview of the Annual Level of Service Report.

Vice Chair Fritz asked if staff had any updates on the proposed project by City Ventures at the north end of town.

Director Svanstrom responded that she has had conversations with them and that they are doing their due diligence (soils report, etc.) right now and believes they are planning on moving forward with the project.

Vice Chair Fritz asked how ADUs are counted towards the RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation).

Director Svanstrom responded:

- ADUs are counted and, for income level, are categorized based on rent surveys that have occurred in surrounding areas.
- While Sebastopol has not yet conducted a rent survey, she would like to.

Commissioner Haug referred to a prior agenda item which involved a request for a whole house to be used as a vacation rental and asked if the City's moratorium is still in effect.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- COVID-19 has brought a lot of restrictions to vacation rentals.
 - As of now, short-term rentals cannot be rented for tourism.
 - They can only be rented for people who are trying to quarantine from the rest of their family and cannot do it otherwise, for health care workers, or for homeless people who need to quarantine.
- The City's moratorium is still in place.
- The consultant that the City was hoping to work with on this has not been available to meet and work with the Commission.
- The moratorium may need to be extended until that work can occur.
- A Use Permit, reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, is required for short-term rental of an ADU.
- Both the Use Permit and moratorium apply to ADUs currently.
- A property owner can live in an ADU and rent out their main home as that would be considered a hosted rental which is not restricted.

- The City has seen a lot more applications for vacation rentals since beginning its work with Host Compliance, which is a monitoring service, although the pandemic has changed that.

Commissioner Haug commented:

- With the housing shortage, it seems odd to offer up vacation rentals which do not do anything to address our goals of providing more long-term housing.
- Suggesting incentivizing a developer to build a multi-unit property by allowing them to use it for vacation rentals for a period before converting it to long-term housing.
- Tourist dollars do not equate to a community benefit when it comes to our housing stock.

Director Svanstrom commented:

- Appreciates the sentiment.
- Knows of others that feel that way.
- Those comments are best saved for discussions specific to that matter.

Commissioner Douch expressed having no comments or questions.

Commissioner Kelley asked about our sewer and water capacity in terms of future development.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- Spoke on limitations while noting that the city does have sewer and water capacity to accommodate future development.

Commissioner Lindenbusch asked if staff had a sense of the numbers in terms of ADUs and how many were attached versus detached.

Associate Planner Montes stated that that information is being tracked but was not readily available and offered to send it out to Commissioner Lindenbusch and any others who may be interested at a later date.

Commissioner Haug referred to the fire department's concern about recruiting volunteers and asked if outreach has been done to young people who might not be able to find jobs now that we're entering into a recession and could use the experience for community and resume building that could lead towards a career down the road.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- The hiring age has been reduced from 21 to 18.
- Volunteer fire fighters are paid a stipend.
- Volunteer fire fighters would need to live within a certain radius to ensure a timely response.
- The City is in the process of hiring its first paid fire fighter, other than the Fire Chief.
- Not sure what the Fire Chief does in terms of recruitment.
- The fact that Sebastopol still has an all-volunteer fire force is pretty amazing.
- Our fire fighters have good equipment and training available to them.
- Community outreach is also a part of it.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- Knows it is a regional problem, more than a personnel problem having recently attended SRJC's EMT Program.

- There is great outreach to get placement in volunteer fire departments, et cetera.
- It is more about the number of interested and qualified people in the vicinity of the fire department that is doing the recruitment.

Commissioner Oetinger expressed appreciation for receiving the Level of Service report every year as she finds the snapshot it provides to be very helpful.

Commissioner Douch commented in past years we have had a pretty good spreadsheet that shows information on level of service with respect to traffic in the downtown which he did not see this time.

Director Svanstrom responded that that was not included but could be requested next time.

Associate Planner Montes concurred and commented that that information was not received this year.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- It is an interesting piece of information because we hear a lot of concern around traffic and it is often very unscientific.
- It is interesting to see the trends and how slowly the trends have changed.
- Generally speaking, there has been a decrease in level of service over the last number of years and it hasn't been as dramatic as you might expect on the one hand.
- On the other hand, it is at least quantified and gives a good snapshot which is helpful when looking at applications when they come through and on how traffic may or may not be impacted.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- Regionally the SCTA (Sonoma County Transportation Authority) has commissioned a county-wide traffic modeling.
- The City asked for information on how many passthrough trips we have as a gateway to the coast for many in the area.
- That data showed a significant number of passthrough trips.
- Looking at ways to divert traffic away from the heart of our community for passthrough trips.
- Can check on the status of that and send a link out once it has been finalized.

Commissioner Douch responded that that sounds excellent.

Chair Fernandez asked if the Railroad Forest project is the type of project that would be listed in the Level of Service report.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- Normally a project like that would be included in our Capital Improvement Program document.
- The City does not currently have a long-range parks and recreation master plan.
- Railroad Forest is a pretty new open space acquisition for the City, and it needs a lot of work in terms of vegetation management and removal of invasive species.
- That work would generally be identified in a longer-range master plan.
- Does not believe the City has ever had a parks and recreation master plan other than something site specific.
- The Railroad Forest is mentioned in the Laguna Master Plan, but that was prepared before the City acquired it.

- We will have to see where things are with the City budget over the next couple years due to COVID-19.
- The General Plan had identified a Parks and Recreation Master Plan as something we should be doing.

Chair Fernandez commented:

- Railroad Forest could also fall under the title of environmental issues which is why he asked if inclusion of it would be appropriate.

Commissioner Lindenbusch asked if WSCUHSD (West Sonoma County Union High School District) has communicated their intent for the Laguna High School property if they are to close the school.

Director Svanstrom responded that WSCUHSD has not been in communication with the City on that.

Chair Fernandez asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Suzanne Houston, a resident of Sebastopol, commented:

- Thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak.
- Comments are not specifically on this agenda item.
- Unsure if this is the appropriate forum for her remarks.
- Works at O'Reilly Media.
- Approached Barney Aldridge of The Barlow about the possibility of working with the City on indefinitely closing McKinley Street (through The Barlow channel) to avail that space to restaurants, tasting rooms, and breweries that are there to create a pedestrian byway.
- Does not see the need for car traffic along that thoroughfare at all given the parking that surrounds the area.
- Closing McKinley Street would provide for more social distancing and opportunities for those businesses to expand their seating capacity.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Chair Fernandez suggested that Ms. Houston attend the next City Council meeting as they will be receiving a report on community vitality and her suggestion would seem to fit in with that.

Director Svanstrom commented:

- Provide an update on recent Council action to allow businesses to use parking spaces and sidewalks, with an expedited review process, to be able to create parklets.
- An article on this action was in today's Sonoma West.
- Most of McKinley Street (from Taylor Lane down to Morris Street) is owned by The Barlow.
- On a temporary basis, closing that section of McKinley Street for the reason described, is something that the City would be willing to look at.
- Some businesses at The Barlow have already contacted the City about expanding their outdoor seating areas.

Ms. Houston responded:

- The Barlow has done a beautiful job.
- The number of parking spaces on McKinley Street is 29 by her count and it seems like the offset of removing them would be worth considering.

- Did not realize that that section of McKinley Street was owned by The Barlow.
- Thanked staff for the information.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fernandez closed public comment.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Chair Fernandez closed this item and departed the meeting.

7. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. USE PERMIT: Shahrokh Moaveni (742 South Main Street) – Project #2020-030

This is an application, submitted by Shahrokh Moaveni, requesting approval to allow a fitness facility and personal storage use to co-locate and occupy the northmost suite in an existing building at 742 South Main Street (formerly occupied by a mattress store). The fitness center is proposed to be open 24/7 and will occupy 2,052 sq. ft. within the existing building. In addition, 1,172 sq. ft. will be for a personal storage use within the existing building. This property is in the General Commercial Zoning District.

Vice Chair Fritz introduced this item and asked to hear from Associate Planner Montes.

Associate Planner Montes presented the staff report.

Commissioner Douch asked for the current situation with the potential tenant (Sues Circuit) and asked if the use type would be identical to a fitness facility like Coaches Corner.

Associate Planner Montes concurred on the use type being the same and commented:

- Condition of Approval #4 in the staff report reads that the personal storage use shall not exceed approximately 3,200 sq. ft. however, it was supposed to read 1,172 sq. ft. unless the Commission found the increase appropriate.

Commissioner Douch reiterated his question about the status of the potential tenant and commented that he could hold his question until the Commission has an opportunity to ask questions of the applicant. He further asked, if approval of this as a gym use would stand for future gyms which could include formula businesses such as 24 Hour Fitness.

Associate Planner Montes concurred in that is how the conditions are written and noted the opportunity for additional conditions that could be more specific in terms the type of use if that is the desire of the Commission.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- Sues Circuit is a very specific kind of use that may be more compatible as a 24-hour business than a 24 Hour Fitness type of facility.

Commissioner Haug asked if the applicant is someone who has a master lease on the space and is trying to sublease the space, or if they own the property and are trying to obtain people to lease the space.

Associate Planner Montes responded that the applicant is the property owner and noted that they have been in preliminary discussions with Sues Circuit and that the personal storage portion was being added to accommodate that use.

Commissioner Haug asked if the applicant would be operating the personal self storage facility themselves.

Associate Planner Montes responded in the affirmative as that was his understanding from the applicant.

Commissioner Haug asked what hours of operation Sues Circuit has in their current location.

Associate Planner Montes responded that he understood that their clients have 24-hour access to their facility as has been approved. He noted that he did not believe that they have specific classes scheduled at this time.

Commissioner Kelley asked for the boundary of the Downtown Core for purposes of the Formula Business Ordinance.

Associate Planner Montes commented that this property is outside of the boundary for the Downtown Core.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that the Downtown Core goes to Willow Street (near the Post Office).

Director Svanstrom commented:

- This site is outside the Downtown Core.
- As Commissioner Douch commented, while Sues Circuit may be a potential tenant, any Use Permit approved, unless specifically conditioned otherwise would allow for any type or brand of fitness center.

Commissioner Kelley recalled that Sues Circuit was at one time a franchise business.

Commissioner Oetinger recalled that Sues Circuit was once a Curves for Women which is a national brand until Sue broke off from that organization.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Uncomfortable reviewing and deciding on this application without knowing who the tenant will be.
- A lot of the proposed improvements have not been presented to the Commission, probably because this is preliminary.
- This is an unusual type of application for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Lindenbusch asked staff how the parking surplus, if this were to become a 100% storage facility, would match up with the broader goals of the southern gateway district in the General Plan.

Associate Planner Montes responded that he did not have specific thoughts on that.

Commissioner Oetinger referred to a comment letter that was sent to staff from a woman named Lynda Kanzler who resides in Sebastopol and asked if staff knew where she lives.

Associate Planner Montes responded that Ms. Kanzler did not provide her address.

Commissioner Oetinger confirmed that Ms. Kanzler's main concern was with the fitness use being 24-hours.

Associate Planner Montes responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Oetinger asked if staff had any updates on the storage facility that was proposed at the south end of town near Sequoia Burger.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- The Council submitted a letter of concern for a preliminary design review application for that use.
- Believes the applicant is planning on moving forward with the application in some form although she was not sure of the current status of it.

Commissioner Oetinger commented that that would put three storage unit facilities at the south end of town, especially if the whole building (for this application) were to become a storage facility which could be a concern.

Director Svanstrom commented:

- The City revised its Formula Business Ordinance to now require a Conditional Use Permit for a formula business anywhere in town, not just in our Downtown Core.
- A specific condition can be added to this approval to indicate that this is not to allow a formula business.
- Suggested that a specific condition be added to clarify that point for the applicant and any future business.

Associate Planner Montes referred to Condition of Approval #9 which states that a Conditional Use Permit shall be required for any formula business, not otherwise prohibited, unless in conformance with the Formula Business section.

Director Svanstrom thanked Associate Planner for including that in the Conditions of Approval for this application.

Vice Chair Fritz commented:

- Found it a little unusual that an exercise facility would need a Use Permit in a General Commercial district.
- Realizes that that is not something that should be discussed during their review of this application.
- Expressed confusion over the various definitions of storage which he would like to see clarified in the future.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- Has worked for other communities that require a Use Permit for this type of use.
- There are a few issues that can and do come up with fitness facilities.
- One has to do with class scheduling and possible overlapping which can lead to issues around parking.
- Completed a Planning Director level review of a yoga studio and one of the concerns was ensuring appropriate conditions for impacts to neighboring uses if it was to be bikram (hot) yoga.
- There could be similar issues with loud noise including music.
- The requirement for a Use Permit is more about making sure that the specific operating conditions are appropriate to the location.
- The conversation around different types of storage uses and their definitions was confusing and should be clarified in the future.
 - He noted that there were conflicting uses under the same definition.

Director Svanstrom concurred with Vice Chair Fritz on the need for clarification.

Associate Planner Montes commented:

- Exercise facilities are listed in three different places in our Zoning Ordinance.
 - This can be confusion as well, and for that reason it has also been added as a future ZO cleanup item.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that there is a reference to complying with the City of Larkspur's Municipal Code on page 4 from the Building Department.

Associate Planner Montes thanked Vice Chair Fritz for pointing that out.

Vice Chair Fritz referred to Findings of Approval #3 and commented that it refers to an office use which is not mentioned anywhere else in the staff report.

Associate Planner Montes thanked Vice Chair Fritz for catching that as well and commented:

- That reference was a leftover from when he first drafted the Findings of Approval as the initial intent was for the applicant to be looking for an office or retail use while potentially doing the gym and/or personal storage facility.
- Office uses are allowed in the district without the need for a Use Permit.
- That reference should be stricken if the Commission decides to act on this.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- The Commission had not talked about the compatibility of this use with the neighborhood (residential, automotive repair, tire shop, et cetera).
- The automotive repair and tire shop that are next door have a higher risk of toxic chemicals being released
- Suggested that some kind of mitigation be included to ensure that air doesn't get drawn into the ventilation system or if in fact, increased filtration is necessary.

Director Svanstrom responded that the applicant may be able to address those concerns.

Hearing nothing further, Vice Chair Fritz asked if the applicant wished to make a presentation.

The applicant, Mr. Moaveni, gave a brief presentation and was available for questions.

The Commission asked questions of Mr. Moaveni.

Vice Chair Fritz opened the public hearing.

Robert Jacob commented that he was present to observe the process and had no comment on this item.

A woman named Anita commented that she was present to observe the process and had no comment on this item.

Hearing nothing further, Vice Chair Fritz closed public comment and asked for Commission deliberation.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- Considering the application generally, based on what he has heard, the storage use, whether occupying part of all the facility, sounds like an appropriate use which he did not have any concerns over.
- Sues Circuit itself sounds like an okay use.
- Expressed being supportive of allowing Sues Circuit to operate either 24-hours or extended hours so they can serve their clientele.
- Expressed having a slight issue with granting a Use Permit for a 24-hour gym in this location from a cart blanch point of view.
- While Sues Circuit may be an appropriate use for the neighborhood, a 24 Hour Fitness or gym like it may generate more noise and more traffic and would be less easy to regulate.
- While he understands that a Conditional Use Permit would be needed for a formula business, he expressed being reluctant to approve a fitness facility here that can be open for 24-hours per day.
- Could be comfortable with granting approval if they could condition the use to Sues Circuit as the specific tenant, if possible.
- Otherwise he would be willing to grant specific hours of operation to accommodate Sues Circuit clientele.
- Generally, in favor of both uses.
- 24-hours per day hours of operation for a more conventional gym is a concern to him.

Commissioner Haug commented:

- Both uses sound like they fit the zoning.
- Interested in limiting the hours while still providing some flexibility given the demographic of their clientele.
- Echoed Commission Douch's comments on not wanting to grant a Use Permit for a 24-hour gym cart blanch which could allow another type of gym facility that may overwhelm the space.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Agreed with fellow Commissioners.
- Her preference would be to see retail in his location.
- The fact that it is located next to an automotive repair facility makes it less appealing for retail.
- In terms of hours, likes requiring some sort of break rather than allowing it to be open 24-hours.
- In general, agrees with limiting the hours of operation for the fitness use.
- Expressed concerns about opening up the fitness use to a larger formula business like 24 Hour Fitness.

Commissioner Lindenbusch commented:

- Agreed with the concern about having a 100% storage facility resulting in a bit of a dead space on the corridor of the southern gateway that has been identified in the General Plan as an area of economic vitality.
- Inclined to support approval of the long-term storage facility that sticks with the original allocation of 1,172 sq. ft.
- Primary concern with the recommended conditions of approval is Condition of Approval #3 as 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. seems a little bit like arbitrary numbers given the noise limits that are stipulated.
- It would make sense to limit this use to daytime hours.
- Supports the addition of a 24-hour gym in Sebastopol.

- The current location of Sues Circuit is directly across the street from where the applicant is asking for it to be moved.
- A gym facility with longer hours would be appropriate, provided that security would be sufficient for the space.
- Cannot necessarily assume that this application will indefinitely be for Sues Circuit as the applicant noted, or even that it will be for a primarily senior clientele moving forward.
- This town has a fair share of super commuters, people who commute very far distances, and people who work out before 6 a.m. and after 10 p.m.
- A 24-hour business model might be able to allow for greater competition in terms of finding a tenant for the space thus allowing lower membership rates just because the business model would allow for that which is an important consideration.
- As it stands, most of the fitness facilities in Sebastopol to date are geared to a more senior clientele.
- Even if we are not going to go for 24-hours, extending a little beyond 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. would be appropriate especially in that it would be able to compete a bit more with some of the 24-hour facilities we see in Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park because that is where a lot of our population is going to work out at this point.
- Would support extending morning operating hours to as early as 4 a.m. for counter commuters, if the Commission is not in support of a 24-hour model.

Commissioner Oetinger commented:

- It is difficult to evaluate this application based on a lack of information in terms of what type of storage facility or gym is planned.
- It would be a shame for the whole facility to be turned into storage because doing so would mean that we would lose that retail potential with the big storefront windows.
- Perhaps another smaller use, other than a gym, could fit in there to offer some opportunity for retail.
- If the application is for all storage, she could probably live with it since it's specialized air-conditioned storage.
- Regarding the fitness use and the residences behind, there is only one building that is very close to where the gym is.
- As it was pointed out, the building is concrete block and there are no windows on the back or so, except for one door to the storage unit on the side.
- Doubts that any noise from this use would be louder than the noise that comes from being near the highway.
- Open to changing the hours of operation.
- Without knowing who the fitness tenant will be, it seems appropriate to limit the opening hours to 5:00 or 6:00 a.m. and leaving the closing hour at 10:00 p.m.
- If Sues Circuit is the tenant and they decided that they would like their opening hours to begin at 4:00 a.m. to accommodate their clientele that can be looked at.

Vice Chair Fritz commented:

- Does not support this being a 100% storage facility as it would be dead space as pointed out in the staff report.
- Would like to see a more active use in the facility.
- Does not support the possible future conversion to 100% storage.
- Does not have a concern about 24-hour operating hours for the fitness use.
- A 24-hour fitness facility is something that is lacking in town.

- The Commission reviewed a proposal for an Anytime Fitness and during that time he had a lot of people come up to him and tell him that they were looking forward to having a 24-hour gym in town.
- People are going to Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park for 24-hour gyms.
- In addition to commuters, there are people that work different shifts that may get off work at 11 p.m. or midnight and want to go work out before returning home but they can't do that here.
- There is a need for a 24-hour fitness facility in town.
- Is not opposed to this being a 24-hour facility.
- Cannot imagine a large number of people working out here at late night or early morning hours.
- Does not see this use as something that would generate any more noise than what can be heard off the highway nearby during late night or early morning hours.
- If not a gym, there should be some other use rather than this becoming a 100% storage facility.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- It is great to hear everybody's thoughts.
- The utility and need for a 24-hour fitness facility does exist.
- Given that a formula business would have to come back to the Commission for a Use Permit, there is an opportunity to attach particular conditions at that time to ensure it wouldn't become a nuisance.
- His concern about allowing this fitness facility to operate 24-hours might be misjudged.
- Agrees with Vice Chair Fritz on the need to accommodate a use that would be more than just 100% storage.
- Granting a 24-hour fitness facility a Use Permit seems like an appropriate compromise.
- Almost every nearby residence is setback from this facility.
- There is a vacant property adjacent to this to the south.
- This is a commercial corridor.
- On balance, he would be inclined to approve the application as submitted for the dual use.
- Would want to reference and reinforce that Condition #9 is very important.

Associate Planner Montes commented:

- Because the Commission seems to be somewhat favorable to the 24-hour use, he suggested adding a Condition that would limit classes to daytime hours.

Vice Chair Fritz responded that he would be okay with limiting the classes to 5:00 a.m. or 6:00 a.m. to 10 p.m. or something along those lines.

Commissioner Douch commented that he would be in support of that as well.

Director Svanstrom noted the requirement for a good neighbor policy so that if there are concerns related to noise (car doors slamming, etc.) the City would be able to work with the applicant on addressing that with their customers.

Commissioner Oetinger noted the need to clarify Condition #8 if the Commission is considering extending the hours for the fitness use to 24 hours.

Vice Chair Fritz concurred.

Chair Douch made a motion to approve the application with the fitness facility and 1,172 sq. ft. storage facility as submitted with the following:

- The 24-hour gym use should limit the classes between the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Oetinger seconded the motion.

Director Svanstrom asked if Commissioner Douch's motion was to include the modification about no afterhours access to the storage area being allowed to Condition #8.

Commissioner Douch responded in the affirmative and commented that the storage use would have the hours as outlined in the application of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Oetinger clarified that the correct figure would be shown for Condition #4.

Director Svanstrom responded in the affirmative and noted that the square footage would be shown as 1,172 sq. ft.

Commissioner Kelley asked about the possibility of having it turn into 100% storage.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that there is a specific Condition which states that the storage facility shall not exceed 1,172 sq. ft.

Commissioner Kelley thanked Vice Chair Fritz for that clarification.

Vice Chair Fritz referred to Conditions of Approval #17, 18 and 20 and noted redundancies between them.

Director Svanstrom responded:

- These Conditions of Approval are meant to be advisory while letting them know our regulations.
- Referred to Condition of Approval #18 and commented that a licensed architect is required because it is for a commercial building.
- Condition of Approval #20 is outlining those requirements because a lot of applicant's do not necessarily know that.

Hearing nothing further, the Commission voted on the motion as follows:

AYES: Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Oetinger,
Douch, Kelley, Lindenbusch, and Haug

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Chair Fernandez

ABSENT: Commissioner Wilson

Director Svanstrom commented that she expected to know when the next Planning Commission meeting would be held (either June 23rd or July 14th) within the next day or two.

Commissioner Kelley asked if the virtual meeting format was expected to continue.

Director Svanstrom responded that the virtual format is expected to continue for the next few meetings, at least, due to technical issues such as separation for the Commission, staff, and members of the public.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Vice Chair Fritz adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on Tuesday, June 23, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kari Svanstrom
Planning Director