

John Jay

From: Paul Fritz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 11:32 AM
To: Kari Svanstrom; John Jay
Subject: RE: tonight's Planning Commission meeting - cancellation

Hi Kari and John,

I'm sending my questions/comments about the Canopy draft EIR. A lot of these are just clarifications. The numbers are the page numbers of the pdf document.

- 10 – I'm not understanding the FAR calculation. Note 1 says the FAR is calculated by dividing the allowed lot coverage by the total ground floor area. This is not the way FAR is typically calculated.
- 12 – contaminated soil is to be buried with 6" of new soil. On page 160 the 6" is also mentioned, but on page 174 it says contaminated soil will be buried with 6' of new soil.
- 13 – due alternatives 2 and 3 assume minimum and maximum allowed density? Just wondering how these unit numbers were arrived at.
- 24 – HYD-1 – it says impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, but no mitigation measures are proposed.
- 27 – TRA-1 states the proposed path is at the center of the site, but the plan and other parts of the document note the path connection to 116 is at the south end of the site as the O'Reilly owner did not want to grant the easement through the center of the property. This is also mentioned on page 265.
- 40 – Many of the site descriptions mention Hwy 116 as being north of the property. This is one example. This one also states the West County Trail is to the east, but really it is north, as is the Charter School, which is not often mentioned as an adjacent use.
- 61 – In the third paragraph of the discussion of climate and topography, I'm wondering if the second sentence is describing the summer conditions rather than winter. The third sentence also mentions winter months.
- 223 – Policy N-1.13 – Error! Reference source not found. This should be fixed or removed.
- 229 – Table 4.10-6 has a Construction Activity Phase of 'Architectural Coating'. I'm not familiar with this construction phase. What is this supposed to be?
- 532 – existing site conditions mentions a sports facility to the north. I think this is probably the Charter School.
- 624 – residential density is noted as 15.7 du/ac. Table ES-1 on page 10 states the density as 13.1 du/ac. If the 13.1 du/ac is correct, does this impact the VMT reduction calculation?
- 636 – The sight distance at the Mill Station Rd entrance is noted as being inadequate. Is mitigation not required as this is an existing condition?

Thanks!

Paul



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

John Jay

From: Kari Svanstrom
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 4:28 PM
To: John Jay
Subject: FW: tonight's Planning Commission meeting - cancellation

From: Seth Hanley [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2024 1:08 PM
To: Kari Svanstrom <ksvanstrom@cityofsebastopol.gov>; Nzuzi Mahungu <nmahungu@cityofsebastopol.gov>
Subject: Re: tonight's Planning Commission meeting - cancellation

Hi Kari, Nzuzi.

I appreciate the hard work that went into preparing this comprehensive report, my thanks to the Planning Dept. I will be present on Jan. 23rd.

Admittedly, I haven't reviewed every page in detail, and I'm also playing catch up since I wasn't party to any earlier applications or discussions. Hence, some of these questions, comments, observations may be redundant, but will facilitate my own learning here with respect to the project and the process.

1. I don't see a recommendation (neg dec, or mit neg dec, etc.). Does this only come after public comments on the draft report?
2. I'm curious as to why the development doesn't connect to Hurlbut Ave. It seems like an easy connection to make, and would facilitate funnelling traffic from the Canopy site to two intersections along Grav N. with existing stop lights (rather than adding the new driveway from the existing O'Reilly parking lot).
3. Has the FD weighed-in on access and driveway design as part of the EIR? I see the engineer has, but unclear on the FD (just curious).

Some other thoughts (and to be clear - I'm not sure if this in our remit as commissioners or not, so feel free to tell me these are out of our scope):

- Page ES-4: It is noted that 4 alternatives were studied, but only 3 are noted (is this a typo or is one missing?).
- Page ES-4: Alternative 2 is noted as 'environmentally superior', but it seems like it's worth noting that the developer is able to build what they're proposing (and could in fact build more - per Alt. 3 if I'm reading this correctly).
- Page 19-3: Under BIO-1, should the heading include wording "has the potential to impact", or, "if identified on site"? The current heading reads like there's a significant problem, and the body text suggests that a problem is not anticipated (just for clarity).
- Page 6.3: In Alt 2, it's not clear to me how the reduced number of 73 residential units was arrived at (based on what methodology/calc?). Can you clarify, if only for my own insight (my apologies if this is described elsewhere and I'm missing it).
- Page 6-10: In Alt 3, it's not clear to me how the increased number of 103 residential units was arrived at (based on what methodology/calc?). Can you clarify, if only for my own insight (my apologies if this is described elsewhere and I'm missing it).
- Page 6-2 (Integral Report): Page ES-3 of the EIR notes that 22 trees need to be removed to accommodate the new project, whereas the Integral report notes 41. Has the project been modified since the Integral report to reduce the number of removed trees (maybe it relates to tree radius)?

Best,
Seth.