



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: October 13, 2020

UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF October 13, 2020

PLANNING COMMISSION:

The notice of the meeting was posted on October 08, 2020.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Fernandez called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: None

Staff: Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director
Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

Chair Fernandez read an opening statement.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of: September 22, 2020

Members of the Commission discussed the new format for minutes and made several amendments to the draft minutes of September 22, 2020.

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

Vice Chair Fritz seconded the motion.

VOTE:

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

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: None.

5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. CONDITIONAL 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. This item was continued from the Planning Commission meeting on September 22, 2020.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Introduced this item.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Gave a brief presentation and introduced Contract Planner, Dave Hogan.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Clarified that he intends to reopen the public hearing as new information has been presented.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We did close the public hearing at the last Commission meeting; however, it is the Commission's right to reopen for additional public comment which would happen after the staff report and any additional applicant presentation.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

Presented the staff report.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant from Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., and Steve Weinberger, traffic consultant from W-Trans, gave presentations.

Paul Fritz, Vice Chair

My first question is the plan that showed the proposed sound wall curving along the edge of the exit drive, what is the height of that wall.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

The minimum height would be 10'.

Paul Fritz, Vice Chair

You mentioned that the decibel level was going to be at 60 or below 60 decibels. Where is that measured? Was that measured at the second-floor window location level?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, exactly. It was measured at the equivalent height of the second-floor window.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

I have a couple questions. One, is for the noise consultant. It looks like most of the noise, and when I walked by the carwash in Santa Rosa on Mendocino Avenue, it seemed that most of the noise came out of the front where the vehicles exit the carwash. Is that correct? That is also when I looked at the different graphing that also seemed to correspond. Is that correct?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, that is correct.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

It seemed to me when I was in person, that there was less noise to the entrance of the carwash. Is that correct?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, that would also be correct. Our measurements in the past have determined there is usually about a three dBA difference between the exit and the entrance of the carwash.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

I am wondering if the car wash were moved a little bit away from the property line would decrease the noise to the people in the Ford building.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Depending on how far you increase the distance, it could have a measurable effect. It seems there is only so much space for it to be moved. I am not sure of the other ramifications of relocating the carwash, but most of the mitigation would need to be provided by a sound wall, as opposed to just relocating the structure.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

I'm not familiar with the in's and outs of designing a carwash, it just seems like, if you could face it in a direction where there's no residences or potential residents, you would mitigate the impact of the noise on the overall community. For such a large lot, it seems like there might be some different options in terms of placement, since the owner of this lot also owns the adjacent two lots, and it is quite a bit of space.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, I can confirm that there may potentially be some ways to relocate the building there with decreased noise, but it would not have the most substantial effect overall, given the general size of the site in general.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

Thank you. And then my next question is for the traffic consultant. You are estimating that the carwash will generate 16 new trips per hour. Do you know what existing trips come in and out of the other services are, or is this 16 trips total for tire, lube, and carwash?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

We were estimating traffic just for the carwash, as if that would be the only new generator on site, and we did not have counts available for the other uses. Based on those rates for that size of a carwash, considering some of the traffic comes from the existing stream of traffic on Sebastopol Avenue, it is actually during the peak hour 32 additional trips, which is 16 in and 16 out during that peak hour.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

It is 32 total in and out plus the other customers that might be using the tire services and the lube services?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

Right, that is independent of the other uses. But as you know, from that facility, there are some times where people will go to the lube at the same time. I know that Benedetti's provides a service where you can bring your tires in to be rotated and they will take your car over to the lube and vice versa. I do not know if that is going to happen with carwash facility, we did not assume any commingling of trips. We assumed as if it were the only thing on the site. With uses like this, you will get some combining of trips, people may go get a carwash and get a lube at the same time. In terms of trying to find out the worst-case number of trips added to the site, we just assumed it was an independent carwash facility adding trips to that driveway.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

Do you think it would be fair to assume that it there may be four additional per hour bringing the total up to 20 cars entering over the course of an hour?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

The estimate is an average peak hour, and we had daily trips as well. 300 additional trips were estimated on a daily basis, that is 150 in 150 out, during the peak hour. It was 32 trips, 16 in 16 out additional was what the rate show for that size of facility.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

If it is 32 trips per hour, that is a car entering or exiting about every two minutes just for the carwash?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

That is right. If I can add on to that. Another thing to consider is, we estimated about a third of those trips are going to be using that rear entrance at Barnes and Abbott. The number you just related is assuming all the carwash traffic comes in and out of that driveway on Sebastopol Avenue, we are estimating that is not going to be the case. It is about a third would be using the Abbott and Barnes rear exit. So maybe on the order rather than a car every two minutes, it could be a car every three minutes.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

Okay. Theoretically, because the Barnes Avenue one and the front of Benedetti's both are outputs on to Sebastopol Avenue, they will theoretically have the most traffic coming from that access points.

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

Yes.

Linda Kelley, Planning Commissioner

Let me start with the traffic consultant. There were several of us who were concerned about turning left onto Barnes from Sebastopol Avenue because there is not a dedicated turn lane there. I know when I am going to work around 2:30 in the afternoon to Santa Rosa, there is sometimes a double slowing of the traffic to allow someone to turn left. I am wondering if you have suggestions, maybe asking Caltrans to double double yellow that area to maybe prohibit or queue people away from turning left. I know the traffic study did not really reveal that since you were looking at intersections. Can you have some comments on that?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

I think so. You are talking about left turns on to Barnes not left turns into the project driveway, correct?

Linda Kelley, Planning Commissioner

Correct, onto Barnes from Highway 12.

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

I will just preface it by saying that the center to a left turn lane still exists. To turn left into the project, you are making that left from the center turn lane, which then ends right after that, and then just to the west, is the Barnes intersection. You are correct in saying that a person can now make a legal left from that through lane into Barnes, there is nothing prohibiting that. I do not see this as necessarily related to this project. I understand that movement does cause some delay in getting traffic up to the Petaluma intersection. I kind of see it as a movement that happens more during off peak hours because it can be quite difficult to somebody on your tail to make that left during a peak hour. But if the City chooses to work with Caltrans, I really think that Caltrans would shy away from doing a double double line because the width of the street is so narrow there, so you would have to put in other measures such as raised markers on the existing double yellow to discourage and prevent people from turning left there. That could be something for us to pass on to Public Works to discuss with Caltrans.

Linda Kelley, Planning Commissioner

My other concern was turning north, or right, out of Abbott on to Petaluma, people have a difficult time getting across to either the turn left lane to go west, or trying to turn onto Burnett which is the street before it. Will that cause any more problems? I know people will not actually turn right because they are trying to find a hole in the flow, but I am just concerned that it is going to even slow traffic a little bit more.

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

We did evaluate the intersection of Abbott and Petaluma in terms of level of delay with the additional, and again, a small amount of traffic with the additional returning vehicles, that intersection does meet City Standards as I said, with a Level of Service B for that right turn which is well within the General Plan standards, and the change is less than a second or a second and a half increase in delay for that right turn, but still well with standards at a Level of Service B. Just anecdotally, where I live in Sebastopol west of Main Street, I have made that move many times, and for this study I checked it out. Because most of the traffic that turns right from Abbott, a lot of a good portion of it wants to get in the left lane to turn left onto Burnett and then south and left on South Main Street, you tend to wait for a bigger gap in traffic since you have two lanes approaching you it is easier just to

turn right and continue straight, like say towards Whole Foods than it is to turn left on Burnett, you do have to wait a little bit longer. But again, everything is within City Standards. I do not see it as a critical movement, it just requires a little bit more patience to wait for that. There are gaps in traffic there. There are heavy volumes on Petaluma as we know, but Abbott is situated south of that queue that forms up at the signal and there are gaps that come along to allow that right turn with about 300 feet before you have to turn left on Burnett. I think that is a nice feature for the rear access to the project to take advantage of because frankly in terms of the level of delay in accessing the site you will have an easier time leaving via Abbott and making a left on Burnett then you would waiting for a gap to turn left directly onto Sebastopol Avenue, which is why I thought that was a nice feature of the project to open up that were access.

Linda Kelley, Planning Commissioner

My last question to you is, I had brought up the idea to discourage folks as they're exiting the project and now if their intention is to turn left on to Sebastopol Avenue from Barnes where there is a no left turn indication there, but if coming out of the project there was also a sign on the project's property, indicating that there'll be no left turn ahead, or something like that, just so folks don't find themselves all the way up to Sebastopol Avenue before realizing they are not to turn left there.

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

I think it is an interesting and difficult mitigation to provide a no left turn, Barnes is appropriate for no left turn because that center turn lane is now gone. The nice thing about the center turn lane and making a left turn is you can use that for a refuge to make your left as a two stage movement, turn left into the center turn lane and then merge to the right, you don't have that at Barnes, which is why when that project was developed, it was developed as a right turn only. The thing about applying no left turns at this driveway is you have a good half dozen or more other driveways on this section of Sebastopol Avenue and they should all be treated similarly. So, if you are going to prohibit left turns, you should do it at all these driveways, not just one. Again, going back to the rear access to Abbott and Barnes, that is an outlet that local users of the site will use knowing how difficult it is to make a left during peak hours. Especially with the carwash, users will see this access towards the Feed Store and will make the connection that that is an easier way to leave the site rather than making that left onto Sebastopol Avenue. During off peak hours, it is easier. As a user of many businesses on this corridor, planning your exit based on the time of day seems to work for that. But again, I think the carwash being located close to that new exit will give people a cue that that is the best and easiest way out. Those are my thoughts.

Zac Douch, Commissioner

I have a question for the sound consultant. I think you said that the noise at the upper floor exterior of the neighboring building, with the addition of the 10' curved wall would be around 60 dBA. Is that correct?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

That is correct.

Zac Douch, Commissioner

The analysis or staff report talked about typical construction and what you might see, in terms of reduction from the exterior of the building to the interior of the building. With windows closed, that was around 25 dBA and with the windows open for ventilation around 15. So that would yield an interior noise level of around 35 to 45 depending on if

the windows are open or closed. Can you give us a sense of how that compares to an indoor office environment typically? Frankly, I read these numbers and have tried to have an understanding of what 70 dBA is because that was relevant to the exit of the carwash, and went to another carwash to see what that was like, but it's hard to gauge what 35 or 45 dBA is to the layperson. Can you tell us a little more about what the experience of those levels will be?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, sure. I'll state off beforehand that the CALGreen code limits the interior noise level in non-residential structures to 50 dBA Leq during hours of operation so this project would not result in an exceedance of that even with the windows open for partial ventilation. 35 to 45 is usually the maximum allowable interior noise level for residential structures. Typically, as another reference for just general conversation between two people is generally around the 60 dBA level. Having noise levels around 35 to 45 would be substantially below your typical level of speech and would not result in any interferences in conversation.

Zac Douch, Commissioner

Thank you. I do not have any questions regarding traffic so thank you very much.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I have several questions about noise and traffic, I will start with noise. Originally, we had a wall along the edge of the property at 6', and now we have a new 10' wall that extends 50', I understand. How is that while reducing the numbers that we have, and there are some numbers that we do not have. So in terms of the numbers that we have, originally with the silencer at the exit, at 10' from the exit we had 77 dBA with a silencer, now, I'm guessing that the 10' is within that sound wall. So that is not really an important message for us now, because the sound wall is keeping the neighbors and the nearby residents outside of that 10' area. But regarding that, with a sound wall, if you are standing at the exit, doesn't it make standing at the exit louder?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

There will be some reflections provided by the wall that would make the area immediately adjacent to the exit louder, but not at any adjacent receptors or structures.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

The sound emanating is going to reflect or deflect off that wall. But sound goes up and out in all directions and it goes around corners. When that sound is deflected or reflected, I am not sure what that is, is that louder as it is going out? Like straight up, for instance.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

You could have some focusing provided by the curved wall. The way it is currently designed and the presented figure, and from the results of the modeling that we ran, it would not result in any noise increases in the vicinity. But generally, yes, reflections can potentially result in increased noise levels in select locations.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Since the sound wall is 10' from the entrance, I sort of have to ignore that number in terms of how that affects the neighbors. But with a silencer, it is 63 dBA at 50'. How do you think at 50' the sound would be affected let's say 50' to the east on the other on the adjacent property to the east at 50' , what do you think the sound would be because of the wall?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

With the wall implemented it would be much lower than that. The 77 at 10' and 63 at 50' numbers refer to the specific manufacturer's noise levels after the installation of the silencer. So that would be without any obstruction whatsoever. I do not have a particular receptor set in the model, but it would be reduced substantially below 63 dBA. It would not exceed 60 at the adjacent property

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Not exceed, so it would be less than 60. But you cannot tell me what it might be?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

I can say that I did also test at the southern facade of the Ford building and noise levels would reach about 58 dBA with introduction of the noise wall.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Okay south of the Ford building, and that is immediately south of the building in the open area? Because I was concerned that the sound would come up and bounce off the corrugated siding and come down. You think that would be 58?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, the results of our model would indicate that having a wall of sufficient height would reduce the possibility that noise levels from the carwash would exceed any standards of the Ford building property.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

And I am looking at table two, which compares what comparable sound is to 60, which is a little bit over 58. And that is the sound of heavy traffic at 300', which is about where that site is, except that it is quieted a bit by the Ford building, it is very quiet back there. It is going to be a little bit louder in the traffic.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Generally, it could be a little bit louder. A guideline, in general, is the lowest increase in noise that one can usually notice, just with their ears alone is a three dBA increase. We find that with the introduction of the wall it would be a slightly noticeable increase in noise overall.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

In your opinion, if people were behind the Ford building at the makerspace, holding a meeting or talking to someone, I was there recently listening to two people talk in very common normal voices, and the traffic was not a concern at all. Do you feel like they could continue to have that quiet person to person conversation with 58?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, I believe it would be appropriate. Yes, I think we typically manage to do that while walking along busy roads or even smaller roads in general, where the noise level even exceeds that.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

At the second story office building, let us assume that the window is open, and you are saying it would be less than 60?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Correct.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

60 is a little less than what my chart says normal speech is at 3'. So, people inside that building would still be able to sit across the table from each other and hear each other. It still seems like it's very close to the fact that with the window open, they'd be hearing traffic at 300', which I guess is fairly quiet, just trying to make sure that the numbers we had before are the same here.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

The old study said that without the new wall the number was 46 at the Sebastopol Inn during the peak hour of use and the Sebastopol Inn is 480 feet away. 46 is somewhere between a large theater conference room and a dishwasher in the next room. Do you think it would be even less than that now with the wall at 480' away?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, I think after introduction of the suggested wall, it would be slightly less. If I could attest to the noise levels, potentially at the interior of the second floor office of the Ford building, even with the window partially open for ventilation, you'd have about a 15 dBA decrease in noise level, which would bring it down to a maximum of about 45 dBA interior, which would be very easy to maintain a conversation above.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

45 is somewhere between a large conference room and a dishwasher in the next room?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I am trying to make the numbers mean something to me and to other people. With the office closed, is that the 45 that you were saying?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

The 45 was about having the window partially open. It would be another 10 dBA below that with standard commercial construction for a building like this. We brought it down to 35 dBA.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Which is only a little bit less.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

It is approximately twice as quiet to be perceived.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

As noises go around, over the top of the wall, they go around corners, you can hear them, they drop off fairly significantly as they go. I am thinking of the sound going over the wall to the makerspace, which is my big concern. It goes around the 90-degree corners, does it wrap around? I think it does.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, you are right there, there will be some diffraction around the wall. But the vast, vast majority of the sound would be reflected away from the Ford building.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

It would be probably less than heavy traffic at 300' at that point.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, my modeling results show that it would not be significantly above the existing ambient noise levels.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

You believe that two people talking could hear each other speak without conflict with the noise?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

I do, yes.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

If there were a housing structure built across the wall and the windows went up even higher than the second floor, what if they went up to a third floor and they were residences, so people open them? We do not know where those windows are, they might be right at the makerspace. If they were at the second or third floor, could we assume that they were the same as at the second store window of the Ford building, would it be similar, or because it's directly above, would it be greater?

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Usually, in situations like that the noise level would increase slightly with elevation up to a certain point. But with introduction of the wall, because the wall would be shielding so much of the direct sound from the carwash, even at elevated floors, I wouldn't imagine there would be significant noise that would result in any exceedances for interior noise levels that would exceed any building code standards.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Thank you. I believe you have answered all my questions or noise.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

Well, my questions are not related to the two experts that are here, I want to ask staff about the variance findings and the draft resolution.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

You can ask now, I think it may give information, we will get to public comment, if you would like.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

I am looking at the draft resolution that you have prepared for the Planning Commission on page 4 under variance. I am looking at the 8th whereas, the zoning code required exceptional or extraordinary circumstances to approve of this. So I'm looking at what the proposed findings are on that and there's a sentence there at the end of that 8th whereas on page 4, it says the site is an infill development project within an automotive uses, which should read use, and the use itself, a carwash, is compatible with other uses on the site. Then this is the part I am confused about, it goes on to say the use is not compatible with other mixed uses, such as office and residential uses. What does that mean? There are office uses nearby and in fact, this proposal includes an office. If the carwash is not compatible with other mixed uses nearby, when zoning for uses nearby is mixed use, how does that make any sense? How does that support the variance?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

The variance is for a floor area variance and the variance is basically for not covering the entire site. In this case, to meet the minimum FAR 1, you would have to either have 50% of the new parcel, covered with structure at two stories, or the entire site would need to be covered at a one story level. The dynamics of a carwash with the required circulation and the queuing that our code requires for that make this difficult. They do have an office on the second floor for the car wash. That structure is designed with insulated concrete blocks so that it protects adjacent uses and uses that side, but to have it within that same envelope would be difficult with other uses. So it's not necessarily about adjacent sites so much as it is the particular site itself and the ability to do an FAR of 1 on that particular site, given the constraints of the use, and also the dynamics of how it's connected to the automotive uses.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

The situation is that the variance is for floor area ratio, and floor area ratio in the context of the downtown is really looking at future systematic redevelopment in parts of the downtown where you are going to be looking at three story buildings with a combination of commercial and office and residential, to put that type of standard on to an auto service center creates a hardship that you weren't really going to see in other locations in the community. As Director Svanstrom pointed out, to meet the floor area ratio for this new lot, you'd have to have a building covering the entire lot, one story, you're not going to be able to do that with an auto service center in a suburban community like this. You could probably get away with it in downtown San Francisco where your property values are higher, but it is just not going to support it here. So, the principle of the variance is you have a situation not created by the property owner, that creates a hardship by the strict interpretation of a code requirement. I think that is the key and I do see the typo so we can fix that. Does that address your concern?

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

Not really, no. I do not understand the sentence. I understand why they want to put a carwash there, but are you saying that a residential use or an office use could not be put on that site as an alternative?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

No, we are saying, given the proposed use for the site, building it out with a carwash and other components to get to the FAR of 1 does not make sense. Our variance requirements, or additional requirements do allow the exceptional circumstances or conditions related to the use, not just the land and the building or the site characteristics. Specific requirements of the use to be considered whether those strict conditions of the zoning ordinance should apply when reviewing a variance. In this case, we're saying the automotive uses that are there, and the proposed automotive use of a carwash is allowed in our in the downtown commercial zone with the use permit, it's not necessarily compatible with doing a full buildout with FAR 1 on that site. The other thing that staff looked at as well was in a lot of ways other than the subdivision of the site is if this wasn't being subdivided, it would not need to meet the FAR requirement of 1 because it would be an intensification of an existing site. The FAR 1 is only required when you have a vacant lot or a complete redevelopment of the site. It is not required when you are just intensifying the uses of an existing site.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

The next sentence is incomplete. It says the location of the site is and then nothing after that. Is that a typo? Or am I missing something?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

The sentence is clearly missing something. I would declare that a typo and the Commission's approval just strike it because that was in the previous resolution as well. I think we can delete that fragment of a sentence.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

I have a question about Table 17.25-1 on page 17-39. As I read that, this talks about various uses that may be permitted or may not be permitted in commercial and industrial zones. This is Table 17.25-1 of the zoning code. There are three automotive related uses described on the Table, automotive gas and fueling, which does not apply here. The next one is automotive repair and service, and the third one is automotive sales, service, and repair. Of the two that might be applicable, Benedetti does not sell gas and they do not sell vehicles. When I looked at that, I thought that the automotive repair and service category fit Benedetti, unfortunately, that is not a permitted use in the CD zone. It looks like staff has instead applied a different category, automotive sales, service, and repair which is conditionally permitted but there are no sales to occur here. If you use that one, you are basically ignoring the prior category in that Table. Could you explain that please?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Sure, if you look at the definitions in our code for automotive sales service and repair, it specifically says, automotive sales, repair and service uses including the following uses, and similar uses as may be determined by the Planning Commission, includes auto sales, rental service, auto rentals, auto service stations, auto repair garages, auto or truck washes, tire sales and services, and fast service oil change. In our code, automotive washes are specifically listed underneath automotive sales servicing repair. The classification of it is plain language of the code in my mind, that does not require that there be automotive sales.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

Are not you then reading of the code the prior category of automotive repair and service since by your interpretation, you are assuming all of that in the next category and they're completely different. I mean, automotive repair and service is not allowed in the CD zone, but it is permitted in the M zone. Automotive sales, service and repair is conditionally permitted in the CD zone and not allowed in the M zone. You are ignoring the automotive repair and service category in selecting the sales category. I had assumed the sales category was more akin to the Volvo dealership on Corby or something and you want to sell cars, and cities like to have car dealers because of sales tax, and people who sell cars, they like to service them, and they like to be able to wash the cars. That's how I interpret that one, because if you don't interpret it that way, you are basically reading the prior section out of the code, automotive repair and service, which is not permitted in the CD zone.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

I think this is an interpretation because this says it is up to the Planning Commission to determine if this is a like use. As we were reviewing this, one thing we saw is that the automotive service and repair section that you are referring to is not in the code definitions anymore. I do not know why that was, but it is something that we will need to correct. What that necessarily included, versus the automotive sales, service, and repair, it does not say that it needs to include all the following or any specific of the following. Obviously, the fuel station is an easy one to discount and I agree with you there. So, this is sales, repair, and service uses including the following uses and similar uses that may be determined by the Commission. The site currently already has two or three of those uses

on the site. They are asking to add a third. It is the Commission's pleasure as stated in that definition to determine whether this is a similar and compatible use.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

Well, I do not think every term in the zoning code has to be in the definition section. Just because automotive repair and service is not defined in the definition section, I do not think means that it is a typo or something. I also think your interpretation does not give any credence to that category. You are just basically saying it is a typo, but it's not. The uses are allowed depending on which one you pick in the M zone or not, or in the CD zone or not. I just think that by your interpretation, you are also saying the automotive repair and service section immediately above should be cut out of the code, because that is what you are doing. I do not know that that's the Commission's role. I think the Council could fix this in a rezoning. I think this should have been handled as a rezoning, then we would not be worried about the variance findings, which I find somewhat difficult to make.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

I have a couple questions. Will the sound wall that is going to be 10' be subject to design review to determine how it looks, obstruction, how it fits in, et cetera?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

Yes, the actual design of the wall in terms of the materials, and its relationship to the landscaping and other things that may go into it will be going to the Design Review Board.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Is that wall set up to deflect sound? Does it have any kind of absorbing properties of sound?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

At this point, I don't think they've actually designed the wall, I think the primary purpose is to deflect the sound from the adjacent property to keep the noise generated by the carwash on the site consistent with the City's noise requirements.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Would there be a way to have some material that would absorb sound rather than just deflect it?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

I am sure there is. The architect, or somebody from the applicant team may be in a better position to answer that.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We did have a preliminary meeting with the applicant to discuss the change of curving that wall instead, and what we discussed was it would likely be set back about 4' or so from the curb so that you're not hitting the wall as you're making the turn. That provides an opportunity for planting some vegetation in front of it. I know plants are not necessarily as acoustically absorbing as people sometimes think they are. They did talk about that as well as potentially planting the wall with some vines and things like that. I do know the construction itself would most likely be a block construction. That was what the noise consultants requires in terms of it being at least a certain density or solidness of material to be effective for the other side of that as well.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes, our modeling assumed that it would just be a solid wall without any additional absorption added, that would be a possibility. There are walls that one could build that would have that function. For the purposes of our analysis, we did not assume that would be implemented.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

I went to the carwash on Mendocino that was given as an example. It was kind of difficult to determine the sound because they had a fan there, like a blower for marketing and advertising. Plus, there are a lot of cars going by. Do you know if that facility has the type of silencer that you described? Could you also explain how the silencer that will be incorporated into the carwash works?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

The blowers that are located upstairs, there's inlet baffles for sound reduction, and then there's mufflers put in the outbound, the discharge sides of the blower. There's sound suppression both on the inlet and the outlet side of the blowers. As well as having the producers upstairs like no carwash around really has that. The one on Mendocino does have the blowers upstairs, what we call producers, and it is retrofitted with exhaust mufflers, if you will.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Okay, thank you. Then Director Svanstrom I have a question on Condition number 78, which is on page 14. 78 A says the car wash and vacuum show operate only between the hours of 7am and 7pm. There is no designation of days there. 7am seems early. I am wondering if there is additional information that needs to be added to that and to the applicant, is the intent to have the carwash open at 7am?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Thank you, Chair Fernandez. I think that is a good question for the applicant to address in terms of hours of operation, particularly on weekends compared to weekdays. Depending on what they think their actual hours would be, the Commission could adjust that condition if they wanted to, based on discussions with the applicant, and taking into consideration public comment and Commission deliberation.

Mark Reece, Owner

Our intentions are 7am to 7pm. There is a high number of people that really like to get their cars washed before they either head into work or sometimes early on a weekend morning just to get their chores out of the way. Our preference to be able to operate under those hours and that is what we would ask for.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Okay, just wanted to clarify that. A question for the traffic consultant. We're talking about 16 trips for the carwash, does that take into account customers that already are there at the tire shop or oil change and now they're going over to the carwash, or is that considered to be just new customers that are coming in off the street to go into the carwash?

Steve Weinberger, Traffic Consultant

We took a worst-case estimate of trips and essentially viewed the site as a blank site with a carwash going in. We had the rates tell us, given that size a carwash, how much traffic is going to come to and from the carwash. Given the other uses, we know that there will be some commingling of trip purposes. People go for a lube and a carwash, things like

that reduce the number of new trips coming on the site. But for worst case, we assume this was an isolated site and that all the trips coming were what a carwash would generate. So that 16 in, 16 out, for a total of 32 trips during the peak hour, were estimated to be generated by the carwash, that's what we evaluated the intersection level of service with at that volume. But, as you pointed out, there will be some commingling of trips, which will bring down that number. Our report looked at sort of worst-case conditions if that makes sense.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Regarding the City's noise ordinance, where on weekends, it is eight o'clock, is that for noise level? I know that certain workers, construction and so forth cannot be started till that time. How does this integrate with that noise ordinance?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We do have a noise ordinance. The noise level standard for the commercial zone, daytime hours is 55 dBA. Daytime hours are 8am to 10pm on weekdays, 9am to 10pm on Saturdays, and 9am to 7pm on Sundays. This particular use would not be exempt. We do exempt some certain construction noises and things like that, that are temporary in nature, not a permanent use. This particular use would be subject to those.

The 8am start time where they have the lower threshold, Monday through Friday, and then 9am on Saturdays and Sundays, the evening hours are past when they are proposing to operate so that is not an issue. I do want to note that we did an Administrative Use Permit back in 2013 to deal with some noise complaints we had from Robin Robbie's. One of the conditions we had for them was a 7am start time on weekdays in the summer months, and 8am in winter months. The start time on Sundays was 8:30am. I do not know if that was related to different noise ordinance hours. We have not updated our noise ordinance since 2013, when that was done. But they were restricted to different hours on Sundays, which is a consistent with the daytime hours.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

So, Condition 78 A is contrary to the noise ordinance?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes, we should change that to an 8am start time, the evening hours will not be a problem.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

8am on Mondays through Fridays, and then 9am on Saturdays and Sundays. If they could get the noise on the site down to the 45 dBA adjusted for ambient noise, which is whatever the ambient noise is plus five decibels, then those earlier morning hours wouldn't be as much of an issue. But that is an excellent point, Chair Fernandez.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

That is something that if it were not the case, because the Council could consider making an exception for that, I assume?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

That would be a noise variance and I am not sure that that would be supportable.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Got it. Condition 78 A would need to be changed on that.

Luke Lindenbusch, Commissioner

Most of my questions have been answered. I do have some questions about water recycling and water runoff because that was indicated as a priority when this came up in 2017. If a member of the applicant team could just go through what the 80% water recycling is going to look like, are there any other mitigation techniques that will be in place, particularly to prevent any runoff from getting into the Laguna?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

We use a company's reclaimed system which is built in Austria and is world renowned. It has been proven worthy of continuing the installing of that model. It is at or above the 80% recapture rate. Tunnel Vision also takes a secondary look at how to recycle water. We identify it as recapturing water before it is recycled. There are tiered elements in the water process where there's rinse water which doesn't have soap suspended in it that we can use at a different part of the wash, it gives us the ability to even increase our percentage of, if you will, reclaim. The blower system is more of a squeegee rather than just a surface blower, it can squeegee the vehicle which in turn retains the water in the bay. It is a great system and we have proven over time that it is very, very successful.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Commissioner Lindenbusch, is one of your questions about how stormwater would be treated or just about the recycled water?

Luke Lindenbusch, Commissioner

I am interested in stormwater as well. I looked at the site, and it seemed that the drainage on both the Ford building site and the Benedetti site drains straight to the Laguna so that is definitely an issue of concern for me.

James Jensen, Civil Engineer

For stormwater, every new land development project that hits particular very low thresholds of new impervious or style of development are required to comply with low impact development standards. I believe Sebastopol adopted the Santa Rosa manual like most of the rest of Sonoma County north of Cotati. When we get into the stage of applying for a building permit, we will prepare what is called a storm water low impact development submittal, SWLIDS is the acronym for it. It will identify impervious areas and where those impervious areas will drain to bioretention. Looking at the site plan at the end of the packet, the shaded areas are landscape opportunities, and we will basically divide the property into maybe four different drainage areas. They will go into bioretention. Bioretention constitutes a slightly depressed area, there will probably be curb cuts in the face of curb to allow water to sheet flow into the bioretention areas. From there, it will go through a medium of amended soils, those amended soils are planted with various landscapes that can tolerate the wet feet. What happens is the media strips constituents from the stormwater and then the plant life over time processes those constituents into carbon and then it just renews every year, the process just keeps going. On this site, I can't recall if we have subsurface storm drain already on site, I believe we do. In that particular case, we would install perforated pipes at an elevated level in those bioretention facilities so that once a storage volume, a retention volume below that perforated pipe, once that's full, then that satisfies what we call hydro modification. Any excess water will still get treated through that amended soil material and then it will enter the storm drain system.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I have a question on the carwash itself, and then also some about traffic. When I went to visit the car wash on Mendocino Avenue, I was standing on the property to the north, and

the attendant was very nice. There were no cars there because evacuations were going on. The attendant turned the carwash on for me so I could hear it and watch it. While I was standing on the property to the north, just over the fence, but pretty perpendicular to the opening, I noticed that when the soap started coming down, and the bubbles were floating around, there actually was a vapor coming out from the doorway, toward the east in that location. I am not concerned about the vapor being toxic. I am concerned about what I have heard about it being soapy and greasy and being a nuisance on neighboring properties. Since the neighboring property, the makerspace unit or perhaps another housing facility, I think the vapor could be a nuisance. My question to you is, how far from the doorway is the soap dispenser? Is that a foot inside the doorway, do you imagine? I guess I am talking to Mr. Blair.

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

Which end of the building were you standing at?

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I was at the entrance and I was at the north side of the entrance, perpendicular to it.

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

You referred to bubbles. Those are foamers rather than spray nozzles and so bubbles are generated with the little fans up in the apparatus. It is not pressurized chemistry so there is no vapor. We try to apply all our chemistry without high pressure air driven. The bubbles are a good example of not atomizing the chemistry.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I understand what you are saying. However, I did see vapor coming out the building. But my question is, how far from the actual physical entrance of the building is the mechanism that drops the bubbles onto the car?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

On that specific wash it's about 1' - 1 1/2' inside. That is giving you bubbles, yes.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Is there any way that the entrance could be closer, more into the building? Because I would think that since I was seeing it come out of the building, and I did see it, you should go look at it sometime. There is something coming out and that concerns me. I am wondering whether this site could be designed in such a way that there was a covering on that location at the entrance, or that the soap was dispensed further inside from the exit. Are either of those solutions that might prevent me from seeing that coming out of the building.

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

There would be considerably less with a car in the bay. The equipment layout can be moved, there is no real standard, mind you this was a repurposed building, it used to be a hamburger stand, built in 1966. It came with a lot of challenges. One of the challenges we specifically had to address was the length of the building. The proposed building that we have here in Sebastopol is longer, so it gives you more ability to be a little more flexible in the location of your equipment.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

The attendant said that the building had been added to. But what you are telling me now is that the building that you are proposing for the Benedetti site is actually longer than

this building. Is it possible then that the facility could either have a roof or that the soap dispenser could be located, say 2 1/2' - 3' inside the doorway?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

If it were deemed that that would be a condition of approval, then yes, we would move it in the distance that the Commission might suggest.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I think if you went and watched what I watched on a non-windy day, then you could imagine that on a windy day, that vapor or aerosolized whatever it is, and I don't think it's toxic, I just think it could be a nuisance and that's my concern that if there's more development, or even for the makerspace people, that they could experience the soapy greasy material on their on their projects.

Mark Reece, Owner

One of the things that Mr. Blair said, which will be different on our particular building, is that building there was a repurposed building, our building is going to be designed and develop exactly for the carwash equipment. I was there, I did not see any vapor on the day that I was there, but it was very busy, cars were going in all the time. Our building will be designed to a point where we should not have any of those issues coming out of either end of the building as far as that's concerned, because that building will be designed for that equipment.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I hope that that is the case and that we don't see any of that vapor coming out, I did see it, so that is a concern. My next question is, at the Wash Barn there was water outside at the entrance on the ground before cars went in. I asked the attendant why the water was there, and he said that at that site, you have a prewash, where apparently an attendant takes a garden hose with a pressurized nozzle and washes the car off. Is that something that you would have at this carwash?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

It is in the plan to have a high-pressure gun at the entrance.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Do we know what kind of noise that high pressure makes against a car?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

It is considered in the sound study that has been provided.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I am guessing that there is what I'll call an automated teller for the carwash. Is that located in the area as you enter the carwash, it looks like there is a little island there that may be covered?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

Yes.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

That is where that equipment is. Does that have a speaker attached to it? Does it talk to the customers?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

That one does not, no.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

All the information is on a screen?

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

There is no communication on those pay points.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I am looking at the schematic. I am not sure exactly where 50' would be and I cannot see where this sound wall ends exactly, because it looks like it goes along the property line. I just do not know how far it is. I guess that is not really an important issue to me at the present time. Since we no longer have the wall on the east side of the property that was originally a sound wall, is there some sort of a privacy wall? My concern is that if there were a development on the other side of the wall, I don't think they'd want to be looking due west at the southwest edge and see cars turning that corner and going into the carwash on a regular basis. Will there be some sort of a privacy fence along the east wall now that there is no longer a sound wall. I know that's sort of design review, but I am thinking about an adjacent use in the downtown core.

Ed Blair, Tunnel Vision

Tunnel Vision knows of no such plans at this point.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I have questions about traffic. Condition 78 B is still confusing to me because it seems like vehicles accessing the carwash facility shall not make a left turn onto Sebastopol Avenue to turn left on Barnes. It means that if they are already at the tire shop, they shall not exit to the highway as a left turn and then turn left onto Barnes. I am wondering how often that would even happen? Who would do that? I feel like what we are trying to say is that we do not want excessive left hand turns on the highway. Wouldn't it be better to be proactive and suggest that Condition 78 B say that all verbal, written or digital instructions shall direct customers to enter and exit the carwash via Abbott and Petaluma Avenues, because that would at least be proactive, in that, if you're going on the website it will show you how to get in and out, and if someone's asking you, you'll tell them to please come from the other direction. Not that people will do what we asked them, but it seems like it is accomplishing more than just saying do not turn left on the highway, which we know they're going to do that anyway.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

In thinking about that condition that you proposed, Commissioner Oetinger, what if I am getting my car washed and then going to Santa Rosa? If I am required to go out of Abbott or out the Barnes entry that would be adding to the congestion of that intersection. I do not think we want that.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I am confused on what you were saying. What would create more traffic?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Were you proposing that all exits from the carwash be via the Barnes Avenue exit?

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

If we were trying to prevent traffic, making turns onto Sebastopol Avenue, it seems to me we would be wanting people then to use Abbot and Petaluma to avoid the congestion we have in that short distance on Bodega Avenue. By suggesting that all spoken and written communications direct people to use that exit would encourage more people to use that exit right from the start when they go online to see how to get there. Otherwise, I don't think it's even a useful thing at all because we're directing people not to do something that really very few people would actually do in my opinion, but you know, it's not a big deal.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

That might be my over sensitivity to this condition and not wanting people to be taking turns there. Perhaps Mr. Hogan can think about this during public comment, or as we move forward. Mr. Reece could have that be part of a good neighbor policy, if people are going into town he can have them go out the south entry, however, I wouldn't want people going out that south way if they were only then going to have to make two more right turns to get to Santa Rosa versus just going to the current main Benedetti entrance on Sebastopol and taking a right going to Santa Rosa. I would not want to prohibit that.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Yes, it is just that one is in the flow on Sebastopol Avenue. Whereas the other one is a stop on Sebastopol Avenue. My other traffic comment was regarding Commissioner Kelley's suggestion that they put a sign stating no left turn onto Sebastopol Avenue at the exit. I volunteered at The Legacy in the Southpoint Shopping Center, and I know when that one came in, they put up a no left turn sign as you exit, and now with Starbucks, there is quite a bit of traffic there. It's don't think it is an official no left turn sign, but people don't respect it anyway, but it is nice that it is there because a lot of people do, and cars do stack up behind the people who are trying to turn left there. I am thinking that any sign that encourages people to not do what we do not want them to do could be helpful. This is in support of that of that sign, perhaps being required at the exit. So those are my comments and questions at this point.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fernandez opened the public hearing for members of the public to speak on this item.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Huck Hensley

I am sad because I really fear that the city's being bamboozled again, just like it was by CVS and it is fictional second story. I have listened to this entire evening and the last episode too. Spiritual teacher Byron Katie says, argue with reality and you will lose. I am the owner of the Ford building next door. I gave that building a deep green renovation five years ago, and I do not enjoy the conflict and contention of all this but locating this mechanical carwash on the property line creates a conflict with my tenants. Due to the intrusive noise, it is going to discourage downtown housing, on my property and elsewhere. It is a basic tenet of urban planning. Please do not look at conflicting uses next to each other. There is a real alternative to all this machinery, it is noiseless and almost waterless. A small crew rushes around and sprays the bottle and wipes down your car and they dry it. It takes five minutes, 10 minutes, maybe you'll still have the traffic impact, but you'd have no noise and actually watching these guys run around your car is kind of entertaining and would contribute to downtown. When I was renovating the Ford building, I relied on this report, a lot of you worked on it, it is the SDAT (Sustainable

Design Assessment Team) report. Lars Langberg, Cary Bush, Paul Fritz, Ted Luthin, and Sarah Gurney all worked on it. It is a product of thousands of hours of great intelligent input, along with eight top notch professionals from across the country. Read a quote from the SDAT report. This will take huge volumes of drinking water and power and sacrifice the downtown ambiance and add to traffic all to make material objects a little shinier. Please note, nobody has brought this up, car washes pay no sales tax which proves that this carwash will have a domino effect on downtown core properties. Any new noise generator can claim their noise will be drowned out by the carwash so who cares? And if you are approving car washes, let us have some more. This carwash is going to be there 20, 30, 40 years from now screeching away, ending the possibility of infill housing downtown for decades to come when you really need it. I'd say you have a choice between a carwash downtown or downtown housing, between congestion or a quieter, calmer, pedestrian friendly, livable downtown, between a downtown that serves cars or a downtown that serves people. No one really needs a carwash, but everybody needs housing. I hope you have the courage to envision Sebastopol as it ought to be and build that vision. Thank you. May wisdom guide you.

Annabelle

Hi everyone. My name is Annabel, I'm 18 years old and I really appreciate Mr. Hensley mentioning the vision of a future Sebastopol because I am going to be in this town for longer than most of you and would like to envision a Sebastopol that is just, and values the local ecology, and I am very concerned about this carwash because there was mention of bubbles of soap, and of lubricants, and all of these chemicals, and actually have we even studied these chemicals to know if they are toxic, or not? Most of these chemicals that will be used for the carwash have not had sufficient studies and data gathered to know how they will affect the local life, and groundwater. Even if 80% of the water is recycled and reused, that still leaves 20% that goes to groundwater pollution affecting our drinking water and goes into the Laguna which is a preservation. Also, these chemicals go into the toxic waste center eventually, but the toxic waste center is not designed to ever eliminate chemicals. These chemicals are going to be in our environment and bio accumulate in animals and the other life in our community. These are synthetic, manmade chemicals that we do not know a lot about. Carwashes also use an obscene amount of resources, 40 gallons, on average per car, California is in a drought, and we're in a climate crisis where we do not need a car wash that sucks up all of these resources. To put up a concrete wall to eliminate sound. Have we thought about how concrete is one of the major fossil fuels uses in terms of how we produce concrete? Not only that, but the whole carwash is also going to have to be paved, which prevents the soil from sequestering carbon. It is 2020, we are in a climate crisis and the City of Sebastopol passed a climate emergency resolution. I would like to remind the Commission that you have been appointed by this elected City Council that approved this climate emergency resolution. I think that it's time to think beyond regulations and fitting within the bureaucracy of how companies would like to profit and think, what good can we actually do and how we can actually envision a community that works for us all. Thank you. I would like more than three minutes, but all my time is up.

Martin Reed

All right, good evening, thank you for your time. I'm going on my fifth hour of listening to deliberation here and it feels, you know, look, there may be no standards or the standards may be well within for decibels or traffic, but the fact is, we're listening to a lot of consultants that are likely on the applicant's payroll and so you've got a question. When it comes to chemicals, I think Annabelle makes a good point. The fact is, you may say and you may vehemently nod your head no as she talks about toxic chemicals but DuPont lied about Teflon for 60 years and the fact is, the science just doesn't really agree with you.

You know, I have sat across from the Rotten Robbie carwash and it makes eating outside at D's Diner unpleasant. Every time the industrial fan turns on, it is disruptive. You cannot have a conversation. The same will be true for people at this building, including neighbors who come down for Chimera. One thing I wanted to bring up, I noticed on page 31 of the application, it says that exhibit 4 was written by Patrick Slayter. He was the architect of the project plans. I am very curious if this is the same Patrick Slayter who is the mayor of Sebastopol? If so, I would hope that that would have been mentioned risking impropriety if not, so that was concerning. I posted on Nextdoor about 4 hours ago that there's a proposed carwash down here that could significantly increase traffic and noise in this area next to the Joe Rodota trail, next to the Laguna habitat, at the busiest intersection in town, and more than 20 people agreed and said that they came out not in favor of this project. I will read just a couple of the names, Jane Eagle, Gil Cruz, Jocelyn Wilson, Alan Green Jr, Carrie Ann Tomlin, and Robin Morton. Sherry Kearney says, in my opinion, two car washes are quite enough in our small town. Sounds like a bad idea to me. It does not exactly add to the ambiance of downtown Sebastopol. Jessica Quigley said no, Richard Bland, Debbie Turner, Megan Burchfield, Linda Lynch, Paula Summer said with all the backup traffic on Highway 12, the size of Sebastopol, and the fact that we already have two car washes, I say why on earth would we need yet another carwash? First CVS in our quaint little town and now another carwash, crazy. And then three exclamation points. Penelope Butterfield, Brian Tuite, Lin Jo Kim says I will not make it to the 7pm meeting, but I am not in favor of the carwash. There's over 20 people saying no, the fact is, downtown Sebastopol is quaint and that's the reason we love it that's the reason we all live here, that's the reason we work here, the last thing we need is something that's going to make it noisier and that could possibly be throwing off vapors, and it's going to increase traffic. You know, we may say that, hey, we do not actually know, it is going to be insignificant. But the fact is, it will increase noise, and it will increase traffic, is that the direction we want to go? I hear from these consultants that it is going to be insignificant, and yet that is what every consultant says about every project, and I just do not buy it. Modifications are insufficient. This project is the wrong project in the wrong spot, and it presents real increases to noise and traffic in this community. Dozens of residents are opposing it, and it should be denied. Thanks for your consideration.

Jim Wheaton

Thank you. I am Jim Wheaton. I have sort of two hats on. I am a board member of the Chimera makerspace; we have been there for seven years. I am also a previous tenant in the upstairs office where Mr. Reed is now and worked in that office for two years above Benedetti, so I have a lot of experience about what it is like in that space. I will start off by saying I do appreciate the mitigation effects. I was not aware of the curved wall and the sound studies saying there will be less noise at the higher level. But I still do not think it is a great project in the long-term interest of Sebastopol. I know that decibel numbers are not indicative of how annoying a sound is. Think of a leaf blower versus something else. If every two minutes or so you have got a motor turning on all day long, or maybe not every two minutes all day long, but during peak times, I find that annoying. I got used to Benedetti's, I take my car there, and I appreciate their local business. I got used to little sounds and the makerspace makes noise and sometimes we are out there grinding, so there is a certain level of industrialness of this whole area that has to be considered as that is okay. But the Class A kind of office space upstairs I am sure will be impacted when you have that window open. I had to shut it several times when cars are idling, or other noises come by so it will have an impact on offices at that level. I know that for Chimera, since we do make noise, and we have people out there, and we are welding and grinding sometimes, we cannot complain too much. We picked a spot that was downtown that is kind of semi industrial. Having housing there, if it is possible, I am all in favor of the infill. I think this would negatively impact that possibility. My last point is, I know that we've

had Linda Collister, the Healdsburg EPA person down and we can't even run our hose legally on the backlot because there's a drain outside Chimera and you're not allowed to put anything down there so we had to come up with a plan about how to try to really protect the Laguna. I know there is a lot of water recycling, but I'm curious whether or not there's any direct drainage to the Laguna and if so, that's got to be looked at more carefully. Thank you very much.

Charles Dunley

Yes, I'm excited to be able to have one stop shopping, to be able to take my vehicle in, get my oil changed, get regular service done, and be able to have my car washed at the same time. It is convenient. It is not another trip out of my day, or more importantly, my day off that I have to deal with yet again, another vehicle issue. My big plus here is convenience. That is all I really have.

Leslie Richter

Hi, good evening. I would have to agree with Charlie Dunn Levy in the fact that having it all in one spot does make it extremely convenient. I live on Bodega Avenue, and I like to keep my trips in and out of Sebastopol down to a minimum, especially because I have little ones that are usually going everywhere with me when I leave the house. I am sure you can imagine that being able to not only have my oil change, my tires serviced, but being able to wash my car all at once would be more than convenient. Just to kind of step back for a moment, what the gentleman said about the noise and how it would be a concern and how it can impact housing. I mean, I know that when I've gone to Benedetti's before to get my oil change, I personally can definitely hear noise coming from welding and grinding at the other businesses in the areas so I don't know if a car wash is going to be louder than a grinder. I think that there are some very beneficial points to having one locally here in town. Thank you.

David Hadley

Well, hello. I would like to start by saying I am sitting here with my home air conditioner; it is 35 decibels. It is not very loud and not very annoying. 70 is not horrible. Things can be installed on the wall like split stone, which will keep it much quieter, like everything on every freeway in America. That will drop the noise level. Secondly, Mr. Hensley sounded like he was trying to be a little selfish there in speaking about his property, it sounds like he wants to sell to build housing. I understand that, I would do the same if I were him. To Annabelle, the average household, each person will use 100 gallons of water a day. I do not know how many houses they are planning on putting in there, but you know, with 100 people, that is 10,000 gallons a day blasting down into the sewage systems and not helping. We have all these things called bioswales, which is new construction, I deal with every day in my construction deal and this place will have bioswales, permeable concrete, things that go in through filters and natural processes of cleanliness, and put clean water back into the environment and back into the water table. I highly recommend, I mean, letting the water run out because that is how this stuff works. I have put in millions of millions of feet of bioswales. And that is what it is designed to do. It puts it back into the water table and back into the environment clean and clear. All those concerns seem a little silly to me. If you do not research it, you probably should not talk about it. But I could be wrong. Um, what else do I have? That is really it for me. I think it is a good thing, I built Benedetti tires whenever it came in and I have been there hundreds of times. One suggestion would be for the traffic people to put a keep clear sign at the Benedetti entrance so the people of Sebastopol will be thoughtful enough to maybe stop and let you in and out and it would really alleviate most of the traffic problems in that whole area. It has been bothering me for 30 plus years and I just do not understand why people will not stop and let you in and out. That is about all I have to say, thank you for listening.

Tania Chatila

Hi, my name is Tania Chatila and as a resident of this community I honestly find it a bit atrocious and completely out of character that the City of Sebastopol would even consider a project such as this one for what is really its downtown corridor. Many of the folks on this call have already called out a number of critical issues that should be taken into account when considering the feasibility and really the appropriateness of this proposed carwash, mainly noise, traffic and other environmental concerns as well. I think it is clearly apparent to everyone on this call and in this community that we are all drawn to Sebastopol because of its small-town feel, a town generally void of big box retailers and big city businesses. Truly, this community already has enough car washes and honestly, this project feels more like something our neighboring cities like Santa Rosa would consider. As someone who also works in this community right behind the proposed project site, I am also extremely concerned about the noise that is going to be associated with this project. I am a writer by trade, creative, who values a quiet peaceful space to work. The thought of a car wash and the humming of drying stations all day every day is really very concerning to me and I really question the impact a sound wall would actually have, not to mention that sound walls are generally an eyesore, and think about the trail that this project would border. Finally, I just have to end with really what is my biggest concern, which was brought up on this call tonight, the fact that one of the highest-ranking City officials is apparently an architect on this project. Is this true? I hope that this will be addressed tonight. If so, why was not this clearly stated before, if this is truly the case, it is very disappointing that this was not divulged sooner and represents a total lack of transparency here. As a former reporter for major Southern California newspapers, such as the Los Angeles Times, this honestly reeks of unethical conflicts of interest and really makes me question whether this project is being considered for the good of the community, or for the good of the interested parties. I also understand that these are very difficult economic times for everyone, every municipality, every business, but please, let us also consider the integrity of this community as a whole. Thank you for your time.

Russ Taylor

Russ Taylor, born in Sebastopol, raised in Sebastopol for pretty much 50 years of my life. I have seen the town go through many changes. This is not the town I grew up in. The things that are being addressed, the water and the potential of where that water is going into the Laguna, what about the consideration of everybody in their driveway, washing their car, all the soap, other chemicals, oils from the car running down into the gutter, into the storm drains, and then in the Laguna with no process, treatment, or anything? Here is an opportunity for people to avoid that, and maybe reduce that. Another note with the Ford building next door, that building was remodeled, and those offices were added after Benedetti tire was already there. They knew that there was noise currently there when they designed that and built it. The minor added noise of adding the car wash to the existing facility, people moving in there know what they are moving in next to. That does not make much sense to me because if they were concerned about it, then why build the offices there? Why would people move into them, if they can see there is a facility that makes noise next door? Like was mentioned earlier, the convenience of being able to get your car serviced, have it washed, have the oil changed, all in one spot, not leaving Sebastopol and going to another town, the option of, while you're waiting to get your oil changed or your car serviced, people have the ability to go across the street to The Barlow and utilize those businesses over there and keep them going in these times. I just see it as an opportunity for growth of what Sebastopol could use and just an all-around good idea, I think. I think everybody is taking the noise a little excessively, based on studies, and they are just assuming there is going to be noise. Everybody is getting a little up about that. The sound wall might be spending a whole bunch of money for no reason, why not wait and see what the sound is? Then if it is a little excessive, add the sound wall after

that. I hope everybody can see to not just take the extreme side of what might happen, but the other side of what the possibility might be. Thank you.

Nadine Sanders

Hello. My name is Nadine Sanders, and I am a tenant in the Ford building lot. I went and did my homework after the last meeting, I sat in on at the Wash Barn and I got to ask a lot of questions of the manager there. I don't know if this will be brought up if you approve it, or even if you don't approve it, one thing I haven't heard talked about is, I would imagine when we're living in drought ville, California and our water tables are going down, I think it would be very important for the people who are going to approve it or disapprove it to know exactly how many gallons are used per car that goes through. Knowing that if people like it and this car wash is successful, there will be more and more water used. I live in Belmont Terrace actually when I am not at my studio here in downtown Sebastopol. Our Belmont Terrace water entity makes us do all kinds of things to show that we are not wasting water. My biggest thing is, you really need to know the hard facts of water use and you really need to look at what kinds of things we want in our town, given the fact that we live in drought ville, California. One thing is, I washed my car once a year, until I got married, now my husband washes a little more. My car runs perfect by getting its oil changed and getting its tires rotated, I do not give a darn how my car looks. I am just giving that perspective. The question I think you really need to find out is how many gallons per car. Thank you for listening. Bye.

Lisa Newbold

I work in the Ford building and the company that I work for is a major tenant of that building so we have offices upstairs. We have offices downstairs that will be right next to the proceedings of the carwash. I am concerned about sound and traffic. What I'm concerned about is, somebody mentioned it earlier actually, the on and off and on and off as far as that being a distraction for people who are doing accounting and thinking work and people that are doing design work right up against that sound. I think that, Yes, we knew Benedetti was there when we moved in, but we didn't know there would be more sound in addition to that, and I do have a question for Steve Deines if he's available. I thought Mr. Deines said that his baseline numbers were done in June. That he took his baseline readings for the sound levels in June and I was not sure if I heard that right or not. If I did hear that right, I had a comment I wanted to make about that. I think that once the horse is out of the barn, it is out of the barn and it is just very hard. I looked at the diagrams, and I looked at a lot of the information and it's hard to see how big of an impact it'll be but it seems to me that there will be an impact on the offices that are next door to the carwash.

Joe Gurrola

Good evening. I am kind of outside walking around. It is a little dark. I have been listening for a while tonight. I do not live in Sebastopol, but I do come to Sebastopol quite frequently for work and personal reasons. That means I am impacted by Highway 12 and Main Street in and out. I heard a lot of things mentioned about the traffic tonight. But all the construction over the last decade, decade and a half and they did not make a bigger portion of that two lanes to begin with. I mean, that could have solved the traffic questions that we are talking about tonight. I do not think it is on Benedetti necessarily, to take on the entire traffic burden. To just comment on environmental projects, they do not always work out. There's a big one, we're all familiar with the Smart Train in Sonoma County, I'd say that was a step backwards, although it's progressive and a good idea and could have been a good thing in this county, I think it set us back and didn't do what it was set to accomplish, and has been nothing but a nuisance. What kind of noise was produced while all those Barlow buildings were being constructed? I think the construction

to build all those businesses over there that everybody's defending is substantially greater than carwash operating. To comment about the carwash over at Rotten Robbie's, I think Benedetti's operations with better quality materials, and a better handling of the water and disposal of all the ingredients is probably much safer for the environment. I think Benedetti's will service away from Rotten Robbie's. A couple of people mentioned the convenience of an all in one stop. I have a work service vehicle, and two personal vehicles I service with Benedetti. I know for myself; I would not have to go to another carwash. I don't do it in my own front yard, just because I think a gentleman a couple minutes ago mentioned, I don't want to be responsible for anything coming off my car that could go down the drains that the city could find something wrong with and then I'm accountable for something I don't know I'm doing wrong. I feel much safer just disposing all my oil and anything all in one. While people mentioned negative environmental impacts, I think the potential could have more positive environmental impacts with bringing people from doing it at their own homes to Benedetti and encouraging more people to not change their own oil because I don't know if every resident properly disposes of their oil, but we can trust that Benedetti does it properly, as they have some pretty big restrictions and could get fined pretty heavily for not complying. I just feel like they cannot really take on all the burdens for each and everything pointed their way. I have heard quite a few people comment and disregard on sound walls, and if you really do not know anything about sound walls, I do not know how you discredit them either. Thank you.

Carol

My name is Carol. I am a resident of Sebastopol. I have lived here for a long time, I moved here to raise my children here in this lovely town, which I absolutely adore. I believe that putting a carwash at Benedetti's is a good idea. As someone said earlier, it's a one stop shop, which would not only help our county and our city, but while we're waiting to go get our tires rotated, our oil changed and then go get our carwash, I think Mr. Taylor said it good when he said we could go walk over and support our local Barlow, we could go over and support our little town. I keep hearing we are such a little town, which is nice because we could walk to these little places and support Sebastopol while we are getting serviced at Benedetti's. I believe it was also Mr. Taylor that said something about us washing our vehicles in our driveways and not knowing what we're actually putting into our system which then goes into the Laguna and with the actual carwash, they will be recycling and doing everything that they need to do. I just think that it is a better, safer solution for those of us who live here in town. To be quite honest, I do not want to go out of our town and go give our revenue to another to another city. I definitely agree with Benedetti's.

Tony

Hi, Tony. Longtime listener, first time caller. Just want to put my two cents here. I do not live in Sebastopol; I do frequent Sebastopol for work and or personal reasons. Environmentally, I do feel that going with an up to date, more state of the art style carwash would benefit environmentally opposed to standard car washes or those quick throw up car washes that you see at gas stations where there's no there's no real reclaim or reuse of the water that goes through those. As for traffic, that has always been an issue for me. Any which way you cut it through Sebastopol during peak hours, you are going to hit traffic. Carwash or no carwash, you are going to hit traffic, especially right through downtown. That is an issue that has been a problem. As for noise, Sebastopol is a small town with a lot of different types of businesses. You are going to get noise, it is a small town, you have a lot of different types of businesses right next to each other. I do feel that having the one stop shop does make it a lot safer. All those types of oils and chemicals that are being disposed of, are being disposed of properly, reclaimed properly. Opposed to, like somebody else mentioned, having them washed away from your

driveway right into the drain. Losing oil and things like that. Benedetti is a staple in Sebastopol, it has been for a long time. I am not opposed to it. I do like to see local businesses as opposed to corporations like Rotten Robbie's or other corporations taking business away from local businesses. It does seem like a lot of bickering with the next-door neighbor, but I am sorry that you guys renovated and built offices next to an industrial type facility. That is just the choice that you made, whoever owns that building. Thanks for listening.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fernandez closed the public hearing and adjourned the meeting for a 10-minute break at 9:34pm.

Chair Fernandez reconvened the meeting and asked for additional questions.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I know that we can often talk about the conditions of approval, can we talk about the mitigation measures that are on page 5 or 10 of your document? I wanted to ask about NOI-1. Prior to issuing the building permit the applicant is supposed to prove that there will be noise levels no greater than 77 dBA at 10'. The existing documents are proving that, is that what we are saying?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

That would be the mitigation measures in the environmental document, in addition to the conditions of approval, it sets the standards by which the project will be built and operated. Did I understand your question?

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I just wanted to make sure that we are required to use those numbers. We cannot change, I mean it seems so odd that the science, the recording of the study that they did is exactly what our documents say, seem kind of strange. They are just trying to meet that standard. I guess I am suspicious, but I just wanted to know.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

The numbers in the mitigation measure refer directly to the noise levels produced by the system specified for the carwash after introduction of the silencer. Those levels are not calculated levels, those are levels that would be generated by the dryer based on the information provided by the manufacturer. The mitigation measure is intended to imply that the silencer be correctly installed to meet the noise levels suggested by the manufacturer documentation.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

So that first mitigation is because they have added the silencers. The second mitigation, we are talking about still a 6' barrier and I think we should change that to say a 10' barrier. I do not see any information saying what it will accomplish, or the minimum that we expect it to accomplish. I was wondering whether we could require that with the 10' barrier written into this mitigation measure that it is supposed to take us down to 60, less than 60 is what I was hearing. I just, can you do that, is that something that we would do?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

I think that is perfectly reasonable. The mitigation measure that we have here was the original one that went with the original study, and the project has evolved since then. Let me summarize, there is three different ways to mitigate an impact. One of them is to change the project, and that's what the applicant is proposing now, which is to change the

project to alter the wall that was originally proposed to address not only the ground floor use, but also the second floor use. Yes, as the Commission discusses I will make some adjustments to that mitigation measure and share that with the Commission should the Commission act to recommend approval tonight to the City Council.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

You feel comfortable using the new figure of 60 at that, so the wall would still be required at final inspection to accomplish the 60 DBI?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

What I suspect the city would do would be, prior to issuance of the building permit they would assess the noise with the actual design that is going in place.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Makes sense. I had concerns if we could add a Condition to 78 E to say that if any equipment changed or was remodeled or added to, that it would be required to meet the same sound standards as the approval or need to come back for a CUP (Conditional Use Permit). Is that something that we could add?

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

Yes, if the Commission so chooses to add a specific requirement they could. I would just suggest that we look carefully at the wording so we do not regulate ourselves into a corner that we cannot get out of.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

We would not want it to be noisier.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

That is correct.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

That is what we have experienced before - somebody modified something and then people get even more upset.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

The future project, if they change it, it would still have to comply with the standards in the initial study, or if it didn't, say they were proposing to make things worse, the City would be in a position to have them go through and reevaluate the noise impacts in this case, because I think that's what you're concerned with.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Yes, I am thinking of 10 years down the line.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

Yes. All future projects would have to comply with the standards in the initial study for the CUP. You are correct.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I was wondering whether there was any way we could get some sort of a guarantee DBI level reading for the makerspace as well? That would be the area to the south. I do not see that mentioned specifically. That is NOI-2 where they specifically mention south from the adjacent commercial building. I guess I am asking if the 60 dBA applies to that site.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

I know Mr. Deines is here and can give us all a well-informed answer. There are different measurements for sound, there is a spot measurement, and then there's various forms of average measurements over time.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

I would think that the spot measurement would be important for a neighbor living next door. So That's what I am asking for, not the averaged.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Our requirement is at the property line, and is measured at the property line, not interior to either of the properties. The way our noise ordinance works, if you do not have any noise exceeding the noise ordinance from ambient noise, then it is that set anywhere along the property line. In this case, the ambient noise allows them to do a higher level based on the ambient noise is already exceeding the noise level on the site. That allows for a five decibel, which is not a huge amount, over the ambient noise level.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes. Referring back to the noise survey that we did conduct, we found that the average hourly noise level during weekdays during the proposed hours of operation would be 57 dBA, so that would exceed the municipal code limit by 2 dBA which would bring up then the limit to 62 that the carwash would not be to exceed. On Saturdays we found the average hourly noise level during hours of operation was 56 dBA, hourly average noise level. That would correspond to a limit of 61 dBA on Saturdays. Referring back to the model of noise levels that we've determined with the introduction of the 10' curved wall at the southern facade of the Ford building, the highest expected hourly average noise level will be 58 dBA which is below both of the weekday and weekend limits.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Yes, and that is again an average over large trucks making noise and what is normally there on any day when the carwash is not moving.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

I can maybe specify that our analysis was a very conservative analysis, assuming that the car wash was going to be in continuous operation simultaneously with all the vacuum stations. It would really be truly representative of the absolute worst-case noise scenario with all operational sources of noise at the site occurring simultaneously.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

There were a couple questions that were brought up during public comment that we want to address.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

To the question about when the ambient noise readings were done, and this was actually an interesting thing because they were planning to do them I think the third or fourth week of March, the shelter in place order came, so that did not seem appropriate. We did have them wait until things started to open again. I believe it was June and Mr. Deines may be able to tell us the exact date of when those measurements were done.

Steve Deines, Noise Consultant

Yes. Our measurements began on June 4 and concluded on June 9.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

We figured that that was still probably conservative in that they were not back to full normal yet, but essential businesses were operating at that time. Some restaurants had started to open in town and things like that with outdoor dining but there still was not quite as much activity as there is today, so those readings are still a little bit conservative, potentially. We felt that it was appropriate enough to move forward with.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

There is also a question regarding the architect on this project. It is Patrick Slayter, it is on all the documents, he is on City Council. This will be going to City Council and we expect him to recuse himself from the discussion, so he will not have a say or a vote on this project. It is clearly stated on all the documents.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

As staff, I had noted that he was not going to be a presenter and his obviously not a presenter at this meeting. The Commission is advisory to the Council for this project.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

This situation is not unusual in small towns, where most of your elected officials are businesspeople, either that or they are retired. It is not unusual to have a member of the Commission or the Council who has business in the design and development fields to have projects coming before this body. As long as that person keeps themselves out of the process and does not confuse their private self and their public self, there really is no conflict. Mr. Slayter has not interjected himself into this process at all.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

I am not aware of that either.

Luke Lindenbusch, Commissioner

I just want to say for the record, with full understanding that Mayor Slayter would recuse himself. I think public concern might have related to the fact that Mayor Slayter did respond to some questioning in the first installment of our hearing. Just to state that for the record. I understand that he is fully within his right to be exercising his professional life as architect on this project and will be recusing himself, but just so that is stated.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Thank you for that. Hearing no further questions, he asked for Commission deliberation.

Paul Fritz, Vice Chair

I will just state what I stated at the last meeting. I did go to the Wash Barn on Mendocino and observed it, I thought it was fairly loud at the exit. I appreciate the revised sound wall design; I think that will help. I appreciate the sound study and the applicant's willingness to work with the redesign of the site to prevent sound from impacting the second-floor neighbors directly. Overall, as I said last time, our General Plan and our revision of the zoning code and as Mr. Hensley mentioned, the SDAT and things that we've been doing in this community have been really trying to change our downtown to become a more pedestrian friendly, mixed-use, vibrant place. I don't think expanding automotive users in our downtown core is appropriate, I think Commissioner Wilson brought up some interesting points that I also had pointed out in our first meeting about some strangeness in the table in the zoning code about automotive uses and what's allowed downtown and what's conditionally permitted. It is a conditional use permit; it is for us to determine if this is an appropriate use for that site. I do not think automotive use is appropriate in the downtown core with idling cars, it is just not appropriate, and I am not supportive of the

variance request. The floor air ratio was clearly put into the zoning code because we want to encourage more high intensity uses downtown, and this clearly is not a high intensity use downtown.

I am a little puzzled by the variance language. Again, as Commissioner Wilson pointed out earlier, I agree, I think it is worded very strangely. It is basically saying, well because the use is a carwash, clearly a carwash would not have a floor area ratio of 1 because it is only a carwash. I mean, in my mind that is not an excuse for not complying with the requirement, I think it is just the wrong use. I just do not understand that logic. I think that, clearly, we want more intensive use downtown, and this is not an intensive use. I am just not really in favor of the project and I guess I will just leave it there.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Director Svanstrom, just a clarification, since we are making a recommendation to Council, if our recommendation is to approve it, it continues to Council, and if our recommendation is to not approve it, it still continues to Council, is that correct?

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes. The way our code is written, and this was changed in 2018, says that if there is an entitlement that requires a higher bodies, all of the decisions related to that except for design review and tree removal, which are a separate process, are determined by that highest body so that would all be from the City Council.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Okay. Yes, I just want to clarify that.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Okay. Thank you. Because like I said, that is a change from when we did Hotel Sebastopol, where the Commission decided on certain items, and the Council decided on others. That is a change from 2018.

Kate Haug, Commissioner

I feel that the applicant has worked hard on the sound mitigation part of this. For me, I am more concerned about the variance and the zoning issues that have been brought up by Vice Chair Fritz and Commissioner Wilson. I am also concerned about traffic. This is obviously a proposal in the hopes of making money so that would require more trips to the carwash than less. If they're if they're projecting 16 new trips with the carwash, there will be some overlap with existing customers, but in my mind, you're going to have existing customers plus carwash customers so I would conservatively think that it would easily be 20-25 cars entering, which means you'd have 50 entrances and exits an hour potentially, which is one every minute or so. I also agree with the person who commented that it is not Benedetti's responsibility to solve the traffic issues in Sebastopol. That is obviously something that needs to be looked at and addressed as a community in a much more thoughtful long-term way. Adding a carwash will increase traffic in an area that already suffers from congestion and I am not sure how to solve the overall grid planning. My question to the traffic consultant was about timed lights, maybe there's a way we can look at timing lights throughout the downtown corridor to slow traffic to 20-25 miles an hour, but to keep it moving instead of stopping and starting, but that's not being addressed at this point. I think that they've done a good job in terms of trying to mitigate the sound, but if we are looking at increasing density in downtown Sebastopol, and we establish this business that increases traffic, how will that impact if we want to start doing more infill in downtown? I am just looking more long range on that. Thank you.

Linda Kelley, Planning Commissioner

Okay. Um, I agree wholeheartedly with Vice Chair Fritz, in his comments, I think it is going to discourage doing some needed housing, mixed-use, especially to the east and the south. I agree with the comments about the issues around the variance and definitions. I think the sound wall mitigation is a good start, but I am concerned about the sound to the south and south east of the carwash. I am especially still concerned about what is going to happen at Barnes. I just know that when I go to work, people want to be considered and let them turn left in front of them from traffic coming from the east. It slows up two lanes of traffic. I just think it is bad for our first responders and our times to be able to get through. I did not know that there was not any sales tax generated, so that's interesting. I am concerned about our water use in town, we're on our own wells and I know it's a high percentage of recycled, but there still will be some and I didn't hear the answer to how many gallons of water per wash. I do like the project though in terms of all the most modern types of equipment and being able to get it more and more green as we go along. I just think this is being proposed in the wrong place. Those are my comments.

Zac Douch, Commissioner

I listen carefully to the concerns and the additional information from the consultants has been very helpful. The questions have been addressed really well. I've appreciated the that that side of things, the sound mitigation I'm pretty happy with, the traffic mitigation or the traffic study, I agree, I think there is room for concern but I also think the addition of the Abbott exit and entrance offsets the concerns along Sebastopol Avenue, so I don't have any real concerns with traffic. I feel this is an appropriate use, we have an automotive use in this location, the very nature of that use means you're not going to get the floor area ratio, and to effectively deny this business owner the ability to maximize his business on his lot, I feel he has the right to this in the zoning and I think he's doing everything he can to be a good citizen here and to offer a good service. I feel it is appropriate. I recognize the concerns of Vice Chair Fritz and the work that the organization that he has worked with does and I understand the thrust of that, but it doesn't exclude this kind of use, it doesn't need to exclude this kind of use. This kind of use does need careful consideration and I think that is being given tonight. The zoning code question that Commissioner Wilson brought up is a good one. The written designation delineation between the two uses is poorly written. If my memory serves, it is really about where automotive sales can occur. Automotive service repair should be one line item and automotive sales should be another. I agree with the interpretation there. I also agree with variance based on what is there now. Unless the intent is to have Benedetti's close and to build apartments, or storefronts with housing behind, or something like that. It is unreasonable to expect an FAR of 1 on that site given the use that is there and the use that is allowed there. While I fully understand the argument that says well, it's in the code and therefore it has to be done, well, the whole point of a variance is for circumstances like this where it's extremely difficult or onerous, or even impossible to meet the FAR without wholesale change to the usage of the given piece of land. I am in support of recommending this go forward to the City Council where I'm sure it will be given the same level of scrutiny and they will have the benefit of our five hours or whatever it is of deliberation and consideration, I hope. The one item that I think needs addressing probably by the Council is the hours of operation. Again, 7am to 7pm in that location seems like a like a reasonable time for it to be open if it complies with the noise ordinance. If it does not, the hours would have to be reduced to meet that data and use level. I also like the idea of the adding Condition 78 E as suggested by Commission Oetinger being explicit that future equipment modifications and changes needing to meet the same standards. I would be in favor of striking 78 B because I frankly think it conflates two ideas, the left turn onto Sebastopol Avenue and the left turn into Barnes. I don't think they're related. As someone pointed out, the idea that that would be

happening seems remote. I think that condition should be struck. Those are my thoughts. Again, it has been very helpful to have Mr. Deines and Mr. Weinberger here as consultants, thank you for your input, and for helping us understand this project.

Luke Lindenbusch, Commissioner

As a lifelong Sebastopudlian, I think I understand tonight, as most of us probably here do understand, that Benedetti is an important business in our community and an important service to our residents. I think the consideration here is not whether this is a good proposal, but whether this proposal makes sense for this site and for our downtown. It was brought up that this would create a hardship in terms of the business that would be allowed here with the zoning variance, which I have the biggest problem with as well along with other commissioners. The zoning is there for a reason, we have an FAR of 1, which is pretty attainable for a downtown core and pretty low ultimately, and it's there because we don't want these types of projects in our downtown core to be proliferating in a way that denies us our ability to create the downtown that we've been working towards for a long time. That number was not just created out of nowhere, it was part of the General Plan and went through the Council and was subject to extensive community review. Our community wants a downtown that is livable and walkable and can support the kinds of residential developments that were brought up, not just for the site with the Ford building. I think when you look at downtown, this is sort of one of the last areas of relatively undeveloped land in our downtown that might actually be a vessel for us to be able to meet some of our housing needs, and really advance forward to some of the priorities that have been outlined time and time again, not just by the General Plan or zoning or any of the other proposals that have been brought up, but by the community at large. I do see a lot of work that has gone into this application and I think it is a strong application. It is difficult for me to be against it because it's in our downtown, because I think there has been a lot of attention paid to important issues of mitigation. There have also been others that I think leave some to be desired. In 2017 when this came before this Commission, the issue of water and runoff was addressed as a key priority, we went in a little bit of a different direction in our proceedings, with concern around noise, or sound and water vapor and other considerations that I think were addressed fairly well. That being said, I just don't think that there is enough detail in the proposal in terms of the impacts on the Laguna, we didn't hear anything from the applicant about what does this site look like if and when it floods again. This is in our flood zone and we have to be sensitive to that as well. I just think there are a lot of considerations that are stacked against this project and I generally probably would have been inclined to support it if it were in a different area or at a different highway corridor of our town. It's especially harder to not support this project because of the strength of the applicant, because of the strength of Benedetti, and the understanding that they would provide the due diligence that they would need to for this project to be a success. That being said, I just think that the cons really outweigh it, and we have to be thinking about the type of downtown that we want to be stewarding. I think that should be the number one consideration for the Council as well. Really looking at the long range for what this means for Sebastopol, not just for the next 10-20 years, but what it's going to look like for my children, my grandchildren, who I hope can also call Sebastopol and be a place that they can be proud of.

Kathy Oetinger, Commissioner

Yes. I was feeling very strongly that the proposal was so good and that it combined a lot of the same auto oriented uses and that this would be a good project for the site. There are so many benefits, but I'm still feeling very disappointed about the fact that I don't see any guarantees that the building is containing its uses within the building that we already know produced irritating sounds. I'm remembering when we approved a winery on

the north side of town, and they guaranteed that even the odor of the occasional truck full of grapes, fresh, picked, or spent after processing, that those odors wouldn't escape the building except when the truck was actually coming in and going out at a few points throughout the year when they're harvesting and I thought that's great, we can use science ingenuity to create a building that contains its untoward effects on the neighbors because we're a small town and we all live next to each other. I think our land is worth what land in San Francisco is worth, a lot more, maybe not in dollars, but in making the place where we want to live. I feel like if we were in San Francisco and they were building over this carwash that that car wash wouldn't emit noises or vapors or water of any sort, it would just happen and I think that we need to move in that direction. The other thing is, when I went to Santa Rosa to look at the carwash, and normally when I think of a carwash, I think of it being associated with a gas station along a highway strip. Again, this downtown urban carwash was next to a McDonald's drive thru and next to a Dutch Bros Coffee and some kind of funky buildings that have been there for years and are begging for renewal, and some apartment houses on the back that are totally undeveloped and are begging for some attention and renewal as well. I don't think that the area looked primed for that, because perhaps the carwash and the auto oriented uses right there, and I worry about the feeling that we're just throwing away this part of town, and we have such great hopes of what could be built here. That bothers me a lot. I feel like between that, and the fact that I actually thought there'd be taxes on a service, what was I thinking, so I'm concerned about the general blight in the area from this purpose. I feel like there are two properties adjacent to it, to the east and to the south, that could become substantially useful developments in the area, but I think the carwash will be detrimental to that investment unless it can be completely contained. I'm inclined to try to fix as much as we can of the language so when it goes to the Council, they can say what they think and move in a direction that might create a building that absolutely positively contains all the noises so that it isn't irritating, or it isn't detrimental to the neighbors. I do not see that it is doing that now. That is how I am feeling right now.

Patrick Wilson, Commissioner

I feel like the City Council has already given us guidance on this in its zoning code, and I've mentioned Table 17.25-1 and it has a category for automotive repair and service and that is not permitted in the downtown commercial zone. Under that analysis, Benedetti's would be a legal non-conforming use, perhaps not much different than the distillery at The Barlow. For some reason distilleries are not allowed in The Barlow anymore. When Spirit Works came back, that was a legal non-conforming use, and it was a permissible expansion. I think that this table represents a policy decision by the Council that automotive repair and services are not permitted in the CD zone. The automotive sales section is the one that staff has invoked without any analysis or discussion in the staff report, and so forth. I feel like a lot of the sentiments that people have raised are consistent with this conclusion that automotive repair and service is simply not appropriate under the zoning code in the CD zone. That is how I feel on that. A variance requires a high bar, it is an exceptional and extraordinary circumstance and I really have not seen the facts, I do not think the findings make me comfortable in supporting that. I agree with the comment that if this use was put in it would tend to undermine the ability of the City to implement the General Plan and the zoning for the CD zone to have mixed-use and residential and so forth. So that is how I feel.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

This is a difficult project because on the one hand, we have a local businessperson who is trying to expand his business, keep people from driving to Santa Rosa to get this car washed, making extra trips. I think they have done a really good job as far as at least attempting to answer the questions with traffic and several mitigation factors. This is

allowed in that zone; however, I feel similar as far as the variance, is there enough compelling argument there to go off and make those changes to the variance? If there wasn't a variance, and everything else was there, even though it may not be the appropriate place, I would say that it's zoned for it, it's how the General Plan is set up to put the business there, it makes sense how they would want to combine it. The variance is the one part that gives me a little concern because then we kind of lose our opportunity with other businesses coming in and wanting to do the same thing.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

I think it is worthy of Council consideration. There are a lot of factors in here for that. I support the project, but I am having difficulty with the variances and the changes that need to be made. Some of the points brought up as far as what we want in the downtown. I mean, Benedetti's is already there, but it is a difficult decision, because I have a lot of respect for the business owner and we are always talking about supporting local business. It is a difficult situation. Does anyone want to make a motion?

Commissioner Lindenbusch made a motion to recommend denial of this project to the City Council.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Do we have a second?

Vice Chair Fritz seconded the motion.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Just to be clear on this as a point of order if I may. This is obviously a motion to recommend denial to the City Council, and given that we don't have a resolution prepared for this, I would request that if this motion passes, this be continued so that staff can prepare a resolution and bring it to the Commission for review.

Chair Fernandez asked for further deliberation or discussion.

Paul Fritz, Vice Chair

Honestly, I concur. I think this is a hard decision. Again, I do not think it's the appropriate place for what we imagine for the future of our town, unfortunately.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

All right. Before we vote. I guess our comments are going to be forwarded to City Council. Because this has come up multiple times, the idea of turning, Sebastopol Avenue, and the double double line or double line, I would like to have that comment clearly expressed to Council as something that needs to be addressed. Because this is going to come up again, as somebody else mentioned, we can't single out one business or one driveway, that needs to be considered because it just really messes up traffic, people trying to turn left anywhere on there.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Yes, we will draft the resolution based on the Commission's deliberations this evening.

Evert Fernandez, Chair

Asked staff to do a roll call on the vote to recommend to the City Council that the project be denied based on the Commission's deliberations on the resolution which will be forthcoming.

VOTE:

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

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Okay. Our alternate will not vote since we do have a full Commission although she got to participate in deliberation. The motion passes 6-1.

Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director

Given that we would like to do a thorough job since this is a very complex project, and as you've seen with two full evenings of deliberations, we'd like to do a full explanation of that with the resolution. I would ask that the Commission continue this to the November 10th meeting so that we can draft that and bring that back, as our next meeting is very full, and we anticipate there might be a bit of discussion on the item when the resolution comes back to the Commission.

Dave Hogan, Contract Planner

I have been taking notes as the commissioners have spoken, and I will use those notes to provide the foundation for the findings that the Commission has made recommendations on.

7. DISCUSSION:

A. UPDATE ON BAY AREA REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)

Given the hour and the importance of the item, the Commission agreed to continue the next agenda item to the Planning Commission meeting on November 10th.

8. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Svanstrom updated the Commission on the following:

- LHMP (Local Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- Upcoming items for the Planning Commission
- Recent Council actions
- A project turnkey grant was approved for a project in Santa Rosa, there no updates on Sebastopol Inn at this time.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Fernandez adjourned the meeting at 10:34 p.m. The next specially scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on Tuesday, October 27, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. which will be immediately followed by the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kari Svanstrom
Planning Director