



TO: Planning Department, City Hall,
7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA 95472
T 707-823-6167 / www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

September 16, 2020

RE: Huntley Square, 7950 Bodega Avenue
Application Number: 2020-005

RESPONSE TO INCOMPLETENESS REVIEW COMMENTS DATED 6/11/20

General Items

1. Carports. The plans do not show the proposed 1598 sq. ft. of carports. Staff has concerns that the carports would not be consistent with the accessory structure requirements listed in the Overall Site Development Standards.

- a. Please include the carport in the submittal drawings.

Carport plan is updated on Sheets A1.0 and A1.1. Carport plan with notes and dimensions is added to floor plan sheet A2.0. New sheet A3.4 carport elevations and section added to architectural drawing set. Carport area is re-calculated to 1805 sq. ft., as indicated in revised proposed lot coverage standards.

- i. Additionally, please note that SMC 17.110.010(B)(2) states that the location of parking spaces shall conform to the setback requirements for accessory structures.

Proposed setback requirements for accessory structure in Planned Community zoning table is revised to allow 1-foot minimum setback for parking in rear of parcel.

2. Driveway. 1) Indicate the number of parking spaces accessed from the driveway (both properties);

All existing parking spaces on both properties are shown and identified on site plan, Sheet A1.0 Vicinity Map.

and 2) show the driveway access on the plans.

Driveway access is graphically enhanced with shading and additional notes on site plan, Sheet A1.0 Vicinity Map.

3. Easements. Architectural plans shall identify all easements (existing and proposed).

All easements shown on civil drawings are now delineated and labeled on architectural site plan sheets A1.0 and A1.1.

4. Geotechnical/Soils Report. Please provide a copy of the Geotechnical or Soils Report that is in accordance with SMC 16.40.200.

- a. <https://sebastopol.municipal.codes/SMC/16.40.200>

A “Soils Report Update” dated August 19, 2020 has been provided by Reese & Associates Consulting Geotechnical Engineers and is included with this resubmittal.

5. Lot Coverage (Advisory). As written in the proposed standards would not allow any additional lot coverage.

The proposed standards are written to allow only the proposed lot coverage and no additions in the future.

6. Architectural Plans, Setbacks. The architectural plans label the 8’ rear setback as a side yard setback. Please relabel to be consistent with the proposed development standards.

8-foot setback is relabeled to conform with proposed development standards.

7. Inconsistent Plans. The Architectural plans and Civil plans have several inconsistencies please coordinate the two plans.

- a. E.g.:
- i. The Architectural plans (Sheet A1.2) identifies different lot sizes than the civil plans.

Lot sizes in Lot & Unit Area table on sheet A1.0 are revised to conform with sizes indicated on civil plans, sheet 1 of 5. The inconsistencies on the civil sheets have been resolved and the civil plans have been changed per the planner’s comments.

- ii. The Green waste bin area is only shown on sheet A1.1

Correct green waste bin area is added to sheets A1.0, A1.2 and A2.0.

8. Justification for Rezoning. Please fill out the Justification form on Page 3 of the Rezoning or Zoning text Amendment Form, attached.

We have provided answers for the four questions on the Justification for Rezoning form. We are also submitting the other documents requested on the Zoning Text Amendment checklist, i.e. Location Map at 8.5”x11” (Sheet LM) and Area Development Map (Sheet A1.4, 15 copies), along with copies of documents previously submitted.

9. Protective Covenants. The application references CC&Rs please provide a copy, if applicable.

CC&R’s are not available at this stage of the process. There is substantial time and research yet needed on the part of our attorney to produce a working copy. If these are a requirement for approval, we request that they be handled as a condition of approval, or a deferred submittal prior to the first public hearing, in order to allow other parts of the entitlement process to proceed.

10. Trees. There appears to be several significant trees on adjacent properties/property lines that were not included in the plans (the bottom right and left center). Please include all significant trees on neighboring properties on the plans.

(response on next page)

Please find attached the Arborist Report provided by John Meserve of Horticultural Associates dated August 6, 2020, which identifies all of the significant trees on the property and on neighboring properties. All of the numbered trees have been added to the architectural site plan, coordinated with the arborist's numbering, as shown on sheets AI.0 and AI.1.

11. Tree Protection Plans. Provide tree protection plan(s) prepared by a registered arborist. The requirements for a Tree Protection Plan have been provided as an attachment.

A tree protection plan, attached, is part of the "Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report" prepared by John Meserve, Certified Arborist, referenced in Item 10 above.

Planned Community – Table of Allowed and Proposed Zoning Standards

12. Private Open Space. The private open space requirement for individual lots is identified as being 150 sq. ft. minimum, whereas several of the lots are identified as have ~130 sq. ft. of private open space.

- a. Please either revise the proposed standard, modify the plans to comply, or further elaborate on how each lot complies with the private open space requirement.

We have revised the proposed standards to allow a 140 SF minimum private open space.

13. Lot Coverage. Please provide lot coverage calculations for each proposed lot.

Lot coverage calculations have been added to the Lot & Unit Table on Sheet AI.0.

14. Street Side Yard Setback. The two units on the south end of the property (#9 & 10) have a partial 0' street side yard setback along a portion of the building, whereas the proposed requirement is 4'. As proposed, they are inconsistent with the proposed development standard.

We have revised the proposed standards to allow 0' side yard setbacks for individual small lots.

15. Accessory Structure Setbacks. Please include accessory structure setbacks in the requirement for individual lots.

- a. General note (not completeness), staff does have some concern with allowing for accessory structures on the individuals lots, given the size of the yards and the sewer easements.

We have revised the proposed standards to allow surface parking within one foot of one side property line and clarified the overhanging encroachment of the carport roof.

16. Accessory Structure Height (Advisory). Staff would encourage including an accessory structure height limit in the Overall Site Development Standards.

Accessory structure height limit of 15 feet is added to proposed overall site development standards

Tentative Map

17. The preliminary grading and topography plans are required to show the contours for a minimum of 100' beyond the project boundary.

- a. The plans currently vary from ~20' to ~90'.

The grading and topography plans, sheets 2 & 5, have been resized to 20 scale and show the contours to 100' beyond the property lines.

Public Works – Completeness Items

Please note that drainage DI callouts and flow indications, as well as other utilities notations, have been removed from the Tentative Map sheet 1 of 5 and now appear primarily on the Utility Plan, sheet 4.

18. The sewer main to the rear of the property should be a 6" main and based on the distance, a manhole should be installed not a cleanout.

The sewer has been revised to 6" and a manhole has been added on the civil drawings (sheets 1 & 4).

19. The main should be labeled and documented on the plans as "Private Sewer Main".

The sewer line is called out as "proposed private 6" SS main". See sheet 4, Utility Plan

Engineering Department – Completeness Items

20. Reduce topo to real world elevations (using an assumed elevation when there are developed parcels on 3 sides is not acceptable).

The topo elevations have been revised to match the benchmark on the Bodega Flats Improvement Plans.

21. The legal description submitted with the title report does not match anything on the tentative map or the AP Map. Submit a correct title report and legal description.

The boundary shown on the tentative map is based upon the Final Map of Bodega Flats. The title report and property legal description are current and correct as submitted. The boundary will be resolved when the final map is prepared. A new title report and legal description are not required at this time.

22. Provide preliminary curb grades on the grading plan. There is 5 1/2 ft of difference between Lot 2 and the existing driveway to the east.

Additional curb grades have been added to the grading plan, civil sheet 5.

23. Show the location of the trash enclosure on the tentative map.

The trash enclosure has been added.

24. Supply arborist review of proposed work within dripline of 20" redwood tree.

Please find Arborist Report attached, as referenced in Responses 10 and 11 above. Redwood tree, previously labeled as 20", has been called out as tree #773 with a DBH of 32". Mitigation of construction impacts on tree #773 is discussed on page 2 of 2 in arborist's cover letter at the front of his Report. General tree protection measures applicable to work within the dripline are discussed in the "Tree Preservation Guidelines" section of the Report.

25. Consider relocating the central north/south storm drain outside of the walk area. Currently, the DI grates are right in the center of the walk, creating ADA issues.

The storm drain and inlet grates have been relocated outside of the walk area (see Sheets 1 and 4).

26. The "thumb" to the west is shown as "Common Area," but there is no access to it. What is the disposition of the area outside the LID basin?

Access has been provided to the area northerly of the LID basin. The area outside the basin is to be landscaped.

27. Coordinate the civil plans with the architect's site plan on Sheet A1-1.

The civil plans have been coordinated with the architect's plans.

28. Show the adjacent structures on Sheet 2 of 5.

The existing structures have been added to sheet 2.

END OF COMMENTS

Justification for Rezoning

Prepared by: Healthy Buildings Design Group
Property Address: 7950 Bodega Avenue
Assessor's Parcel Number: 004-350-024-000

Please give your written response for each of the questions listed below. Use added pages if necessary.

1. Why do you want the Zoning changed?

Developer Huntley Square, LLC is proposing a 10-unit small-lot subdivision comprised exclusively of studios (ranging from 512 to 599 sf) organized around a central pedestrian walkway and greenspace. While much of the proposal conforms with the standards and context of the existing zoning district, there are key elements essential to the configuration of our proposed community that fall outside the parameters of the current zoning for either R7 Multifamily Residential or for Small Lot Subdivision standards. Specific changes that will enable development of this small home community include subdividing with reduced minimum lot size, reduced setbacks and reduced minimum yards, including zero lot line construction, and reduced minimum usable private outdoor space requirements.

To enable the construction of this innovative and much needed housing option, we are applying for designation of this development as a Planned Community District. The current underlying zoning of the properties along the north side of Bodega Avenue is R7 Multifamily Residential, and within that district are several planned community developments. The adjacent parcel on the east side at 120-132 Golden Ridge Avenue is a planned community of six two-story townhome condominiums on small zero lot line lots with a common area. The adjacent parcel on the north side (156-168 Golden Ridge Ave.) is also a planned community of seven one and two-story condominium residences. The adjacent parcel on the west side is also occupied by several multiple family residences. There is another planned community of residential apartments at the north end of the block at 220 Golden Ridge Ave.

2. What changes or events have occurred or what new evidence has arisen since the Zoning was adopted which now warrant a change?

While the property at 7950 Bodega avenue remains undeveloped, the landscape around it has changed significantly since its original zoning. Most importantly, this property was part of a much larger parcel with the sections to the east and west both originally combining with 7950 Bodega to form a plot 3X the size. The larger footprint of the original parcel made orientations and setbacks similar to what is outlined in the zoning standard for R7 easier to accommodate. Moreover, with the planned community to the east completed in 1993, the only access to our parcel is through an easement on the north end of the property. The design and location of that easement require all vehicular access to our property follow the same route and design of that community, and, given that that community does not comply with R7 standards, it makes it impossible for our development to implement and follow those standards retroactively. Finally, it is worth noting that while we are requesting a technical rezone, we are doing so in service of the intent of the original zoning: to provide high-density residential housing.

The cost of available housing in Sebastopol has become increasingly expensive, while the availability of affordable options has not kept up with the need or demand. The project will be targeted for first time homeowners and buyers who otherwise want to downsize. It will be a much-needed entry level housing solution for the City of Sebastopol.

3. Describe the effect the proposed change will have on the surrounding uses.

The proposed changes should generally have a positive effect on the surrounding uses, as they are consistent with the configuration of the surrounding developments. Approval of the zoning changes will allow the completion of a quiet residential community that is both innovative and unassuming, offering new housing options, and at the same time becoming an integral part of the larger community. It will complete the residential fabric of the neighborhood. There is no reason to expect a negative effect on the surrounding uses. All of the adjacent uses are multi-family residential in clusters of small low-rise buildings accommodating one, two or three dwelling units per structure. Two existing planned community developments are abutting on the eastern and northern property lines of our proposed planned community, with the rear walls of their residences oriented toward our site. Our design utilizes similar small-scale low-rise one and two-story buildings placed with similar setbacks from the outer property lines of the site. Privacy is maintained with the orientation of the fronts of the residences toward the center of the site. On-site surface parking for residents is located at the rear of the site adjacent to the existing surface parking of the neighboring planned community to the east. Setbacks for the carport structure will conform with current zoning on the north and west sides. In order to provide 10 parking spaces on site for the ten residences, a reduction in one side setback is required. This occurs only where there is existing surface parking on the adjacent parcel. The overall lot coverage of the site conforms with current R-7 standards. However, zoning changes are required to allow the attached residences on very small lots with zero-lot line clearance. The result will be the compact building footprint that leaves an aggregate common area of landscaped open space that is consistent with the landscaped nature of the neighborhood. These zoning changes support the ability to provide housing for ten small households, while locating the buildings on the site to have minimal visual impact on the primary street frontage facing Bodega Avenue.

4. Describe how the proposed change will be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and policies for this location and the surrounding area.

The proposed changes are consistent with multiple General Plan land use goals and policies.

- In keeping with Goal LU 6, to promote a range of housing options to provide affordability for families, seniors, and low-income households, the proposed change allows the development of a housing community of very small houses, which expands the variety of lower cost residential products available to the population of the City.
- Consistent with Housing Goals A-1/Action A-3 and C 2/Policy C-4 this is a project utilizing an infill site with ready access to existing infrastructure for sewer, water, power, and transit of all types including public transportation, bicycles, pedestrian walks and existing roadways.
- Being located on an existing primary circulation route, the project supports Goal CIR 2 by enhancing the utilization and efficiency of the existing pedestrian walks, bicycle lanes and public transit routes, thus maintaining and expanding the non-automobile transportation network.
- Consistent with resource conservation Goal COS 9 and Housing Goal F, this is a sustainable building project that will be designed to exceed state energy standards as a true Zero Net Energy project. From foundation to finish, every aspect of the buildings will be chosen for its contribution to conserving energy and providing a healthy and sustainable environment. Some of the project's features are a highly insulated, tightly sealed building envelope, heat recovery fresh air ventilation, high quality windows, Solar PV system for each residence, LED lighting throughout, energy efficient appliances and low flow water fixtures, durable and low maintenance exterior materials, and recycled or recyclable content throughout. There will be no natural gas installed at the site, which coupled with the solar array will push the project to true Zero Net Energy homes that produce as much energy as they consume. The structures will be framed with light gauge steel framing and finished with non-toxic materials.

POLICY STATEMENT – *PROJECT DESCRIPTION*
RE: Huntley Square, 7950 Bodega Avenue
rev. 9-10-20

1. Description of existing property and surrounding area.

The property is the last vacant parcel in an established residential neighborhood fronting on the north side of Bodega Avenue about a mile west of downtown Sebastopol. The tract on south side of Bodega Avenue is the permanent open space of Sebastopol Memorial Lawn. The **0.39 acre** site is presently notable for its elevation above the street level and the prominent embankment that interrupts the pedestrian sidewalk and supports a thick a cluster of mature oak trees. The neighborhood is notable for its quiet residential environment amid a consistent canopy of mature trees. The surrounding properties are all residential in character occupied by one and two-story structures. The current underlying zoning of the properties along the north side of Bodega Avenue is R7 Multifamily Residential, and within that district are several planned community developments. The adjacent parcel on the east side at 120-132 Golden Ridge Avenue is a planned community of six two-story townhome condominiums on small zero lot line lots with a common area. The adjacent parcel on the north side at is also a planned community of seven one and two-story condominium residences. The adjacent parcel on the west side is also occupied by several multiple family residences. There is another planned community of residential apartments on the north side of the block at 220 Golden Ridge Ave.

2. Table of allowed and proposed zoning standards – *see attached*

3. Developer is proposing a 10-unit small-lot subdivision comprised exclusively of studios (ranging from 512 to 599 sf) organized around a central pedestrian walkway and greenspace. To enable the construction of this innovative and much needed housing option, we are applying for designation of our development as a Planned Community District. While much of our proposal conforms with the standards and context of the existing zoning district, there are key elements essential to the configuration of our proposed community that fall outside the parameters of the current zoning for either R7 Multifamily Residential or for Small Lot Subdivision standards. Specific changes that will enable development of this small home community include subdividing with reduced minimum lot size, reduced setbacks and reduced minimum yards, including zero lot line construction, and reduced minimum usable private outdoor space requirements. The proposed planned community development will generally have a positive effect on the surrounding uses, as they are consistent with the configuration of the surrounding developments. Approval of the planned community zoning will allow the completion of a quiet residential community that is both innovative and unassuming, offering new housing options, and at the same time becoming an integral part of the larger community. It will complete the residential fabric of the neighborhood.

4. Common open space, common building space and common driveways or other circulation features will be permanently preserved and maintained. Methods of providing for the maintenance of common areas and the financing provisions of the same are currently in the process of being drafted and verified in relation to legal requirements.

TABLE OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED ZONING STANDARDS

<i>OVERALL SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</i>		
Regulatory element	Current Zoning Standard	Proposed Standard
Allowable uses	R-7 Multifamily Residential (MFR), high density Single family attached Dwelling groups Accessory structures	<i>Planned Community (PC) zoning Single family attached dwelling groups Accessory structures in common area only</i>
Minimum lot size	8000 sq. ft. MFR	Overall lot size: 16,972 sq. ft. (0.39 acre) Common area of 9535 sq. ft.
Density of development	1 DU/3600 SF min. = 12.1 DU/acre min. 1 DU/1743 SF max. = 25 DU/acre max. Studio = .5 DU x 2 studios = 1 DU 24 studios/ac min., 50 studios/ac max.	Conforms with equivalent ratio of 27 studios/acre
Density calculation factors	12.1 DU/ac x 0.39 acre = 4.7 DU min. 25 DU/ac x 0.39 acre = 9.75 DU max. x 2 studios/1 DU = 9 studio min., 19 studio max.	Proposed to build: 10 studio units on 0.39 acre
Lot coverage:	40% in R7 standards	Same for whole site: - Residential buildings: 4680 SF - Carport: 1805 SF (19'x95') Lot coverage: 6485/16972 = 38.2% whole site
Parking onsite	1 space/studio DU Parking space dimensions: 10'x20' in carport or garage	1 space/studio DU <i>Parking space dimensions conform with SMC Table 17.110-1. Off-Street Parking Chart, with no additional requirement for carport</i>
Circulation requirement	SMC Ch. 17.110 off-street parking standards. Accessible path of travel	Conform with current standards
Landscaping and Stormwater management	Required per SMC 16.40.070	Low water use landscaping. Stormwater treatment in onsite bioretention .
Design	Design Review Guidelines SMC 16.40 Subdivision Design & Improvement Standards	Conform with current design guidelines.

INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - PROPOSED		
Regulatory element	Current Zoning Standard	Proposed Standard
Maximum building heights		
Main building	30 ft. and 2 stories	30 ft. and 2 stories
Accessory building	17 ft. and 1 story	Not permitted
Accessory Dwelling Unit	17 ft.	Not permitted
Maximum lot coverage	65%, SMC 17.230.060 Small Lot Subdivision	75%
Minimum yards/setbacks		
Front yard	15 ft., SMC 17.230.030 Small Lot Subdiv.	0 ft.
Rear yard	10 ft.	8 ft.
Street side yard	15 ft.	0 ft.
Interior side yard	4 ft.	0 ft.
Private open space requirement	150 sq. ft. min.	140 sq. ft. min., including covered rear patio
Minimum residential density	1 DU per lot	1 studio = 0.50 DU per lot
Maximum residential density	1 DU per lot	1 studio = 0.50 DU per lot
Parking requirement	1 space/studio unit (as req'd by SMC17.110)	1 space/studio unit

COMMON AREA DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - PROPOSED		
Regulatory element	Current Zoning Standard	Proposed Standard
Non-residential accessory building <i>minimum</i> setbacks	Front yard: 10 ft. Side yard non-residential accessory: 3 ft. Rear yard non-residential accessory: 3 ft.	- Front setback: 24 ft. from nearest lot line to outermost edge of carport roof - East side yard: 1 ft. - West side yard: 5 ft. - Rear yard: 3 ft. - No additional overhang encroachment allowed into minimum yards.
Non-residential accessory building height	17 ft.	15 ft.
Parking onsite	1 space/studio DU Parking space dimensions: 10'x20' in carport or garage Location of parking spaces shall conform to setback requirements for accessory structures	- 1 space/studio DU - Parking space dimensions conform with SMC Table 17.110-1. Off-Street Parking Chart, with no additional requirement for carport: Standard 90° = 9'x19' in carport Compact = 8'x16' in carport - Location of parking spaces shall conform to setback requirements for accessory structures
Bicycle parking requirement	0.5 spaces per dwelling unit	0.5 spaces per dwelling unit (5 bicycle spaces min.)