
Public Comment – 8100 Valentine Avenue Development

From Laryn Hargrove [REDACTED]

Date Sun 9/20/2026 4:02 PM

To Planning <planning@cityofsebastopol.gov>

9/20/2026

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing as a nearby resident regarding the proposed development at 8100 Valentine Avenue. I understand the need for additional housing in Sebastopol and recognize that California law has significantly changed what cities are required to allow. My concern is not simply that this project is dense. It is whether the combination of the subdivision, density bonus, ADUs, requested waivers, and possible future sale of those ADUs is being evaluated as the complete project and under the correct provisions of state law.

First, I would like the City to explain the legal basis for the density calculation. What is the site's allowable base density, what specifically qualifies this project for a density bonus, and how are the 19 ADUs treated in that calculation? If the ADUs are excluded from the density calculation under state law, please identify the provision allowing that and explain how it applies to this particular subdivision.

I am particularly concerned about the apparent possibility that the 19 ADUs may ultimately be sold separately from the 20 primary homes. If that is the applicant's intention, I would like the City to explain how 20 approved lots could ultimately result in as many as 39 separately owned properties, what legal mechanism would permit that, and whether that eventual configuration has been considered in approving the subdivision and calculating its density. If separate sale is not part of the proposal, I would appreciate the City stating that clearly.

The notice also says the developer is seeking waivers and/or concessions under Government Code Section 65915 for increased lot coverage, reduced setbacks, and increased building heights. I would like the City to identify which concessions and waivers are being requested, what affordable housing or other commitments qualify the project for them, and what findings the City is relying on in granting them.

Taken together, these issues raise a broader concern for me: whether state laws intended to encourage ADUs and affordable housing are being combined in a way that allows a substantially denser, predominantly market-rate development than would otherwise be permitted. I am not assuming that this is unlawful, but I do believe the City should explicitly address whether the proposed use of these statutes is authorized when the project is considered as a whole, rather than considering the initial subdivision and later ADUs separately.

I also have concerns about the determination that the project is exempt from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. I would like to understand which prior environmental

review the City is relying upon and whether that analysis adequately contemplated development of this site at the full potential buildout of 39 dwelling units.

In particular, I ask that the City consider whether the full project presents project-specific or cumulative impacts involving traffic and circulation, parking, emergency access, water and wastewater capacity, stormwater drainage, neighborhood infrastructure, and removal of up to seven protected native trees. The environmental analysis should reflect the actual reasonably foreseeable development of the property, including all proposed ADUs, rather than only the initial 20 homes if the additional 19 units are already contemplated as part of this project.

Finally, I ask the City to clarify whether the 83 proposed parking spaces and the project's infrastructure, access, and utility analyses were based on 20 residences or the potential full buildout of 39 residences.

I am not opposed to housing development simply because it increases density. I am asking the City to make sure that a project of this scale is being evaluated transparently as a whole and that the density bonus, ADU provisions, subdivision structure, requested waivers, and CEQA determination are all legally applicable to what is actually proposed and reasonably anticipated for this property.

Please include these comments in the administrative record for this project and address these issues as part of the Planning Commission's consideration of the application.

Thank you for considering the concerns of nearby residents.

Sincerely,

Laryn Hargrove

