

WOOD, HAT & SILVER, LLC

557 THIRD STREET EAST, SONOMA, CALIFORNIA 95476

JOSEPH M. AARON
PRESIDENT

RECEIVED

APR - 9 2018

CITY OF SONOMA

PHONE: 707-939-1234
FAX: 415-329-1788
JOE@WOODHATSILVER.COM

April 9, 2017 at 1 PM.

Cathy Capriola, City Manager
City of Sonoma
1 The Plaza
Sonoma, CA 95476
ccapriola@sonomacity.org
jwalter@walterpistole.com

Dear Cathy,

Today, the City Council will meet at 3:30 to discuss privately the potential for litigation over the three lots in Schocken Hill. I'm sharing ahead of this meeting concerns I have that I had hoped to meet with Mayor Agrimonti on, but we've been limited to a short phone call. I will be sharing these concerns tonight publicly.

Regretfully I have been both a plaintiff and a defendant in civil litigation many times over my career. I assure you, it will suck the life out of your staff, out of our town and out of you. There will be no winners. The wounds will not heal in a few months.

My special little town is caught in the middle of a fight between two rich white guys, Bill and Art.

This is a story about how the world of litigation works. This is what the attorneys for Mr. Jasper will lay out to a jury.

Bill sold Art his home. They were friends until they weren't. Both are honorable men.

During the litigation, Art will affirm he walked the site many times, met with the architect and landscape architect and all of his requests were incorporated.

Art will confirm he approved the home design, and the landscaping design to hide the garage from his view, which was his biggest concern.

Art will admit he had fully negotiated what he wanted, accepted the terms offered to him and then wrote a letter of support to the City.

Art will admit he backed out of his negotiated deal.

Art will confirm he has publicly stated he doesn't care about 227 & 228.

Art only cares about 149, which is behind home.

Art will confirm he appealed all three to improve his chances of stopping the one home next to him.

Art will agree he appealed the Planning Commission's ruling to force the city to fight his legal battle at no cost to him.

Art will admit he knew the three lots were there when he bought his home from Bill.

Art is an honorable man. He will tell the truth. Furthermore, he has no financial incentive to lie.

James Cribb, an honorable man, the then Chair of the Planning Commission will be deposed. He will confirm:

The Planning Commission studied this application for close to two years. All public comments were considered and all necessary studies were completed.

The Planning Commission approved the project 3:1. A fifth Commissioner stated he would have voted to approve had he been able to attend. He had been injured at work and could not attend.

Mr. Crib will confirm, Jim Bohar was the lone no vote.

Now here comes our City Council, and the challenges it faces demonstrating it provided a fair and impartial tribunal.

Council Woman Hundley when deposed will admit she stated publically she did not want people who had taken a public position against a project before the Planning Commission to be appointed to the Planning Commission. Rachel appointed Jim Bohar to the Planning Commission. Mr. Bohar had publically opposed projects that were before the Planning Commission. This opposition included speaking as a member of the public against Mr. Jasper's project.

Mr. Bohar, when deposed, will admit he publically opposed multiple projects before being chosen by Hundley. Mr. Bohar will testify Hundley subsequently appointed him to the Planning Commission in direct conflict of her public statements.

Mr. Bohar's vote against Mr. Jasper's project will not be considered credible by a jury.

Now comes Council Woman Amy Harrington who will be deposed.

Amy will be asked if she wrote a memo to David Goodison in early 2017, questioning the legitimacy of the applications for the three lots on Schocken Hill.

Amy will be asked if she shared that memo with Sheila O'Neil or Karin Skooglund, the two leaders of Protect Sonoma.

Amy will be asked if she provided Bill Jasper with her memo. Why not? Could she have?

Amy will be asked if she shared that memo with Protect Sonoma.

Amy will be asked if she met with other real estate professionals to find ways to kill the projects, before they were voted on by the Planning Commission.

Amy will be asked if she shared those conversations with Protect Sonoma.

Amy will be asked if she shared Mr. Goodison's response to her memo with Protect Sonoma.

Amy will answer yes because she is an honorable woman.

Amy will be asked if she shared any of these ex-parte communications with Bill Jasper or the other members of the City Council. Why not? Could she?

Amy will answer no because she is an honorable woman.

Amy appointed Kelso Barnett to the Planning Commission.

Kelso, when deposed, will be asked if he formed www.StopFSE.com. (Stop First Street East)

Kelso will be asked if FSE was a project currently before the Planning Commission when he was appointed.

Kelso will be asked if he was an original founder of Protect Sonoma. He will say yes.

Kelso will be asked to admit Amy had publically stated she did not want people who had taken a public position against a project before the Planning Commission to be on the Planning Commission.

Kelso will be asked if he stated on his Planning Commission application he was no longer supporting Protect Sonoma. He will say yes.

Bill's attorney will show Kelso documents subpoenaed from Facebook. These documents will show posts days ago, on Sonoma Hillside Homes' Facebook page under the Alias: Agoston Haraszthy & Protect Sonoma.

Kelso will then be asked if he has ever used the alias, Agoston Haraszthy.

Kelso will be asked if he made post on Sonoma Hillside Homes' Facebook page as Protect Sonoma.

Kelso will answer truthfully because he is an honorable man.

The Facebook documents subpoenaed will confirm he told the truth, that he is Agoston Haraszthy and he is Protect Sonoma.

Kelso will be asked if he had met with Amy shortly after the City announced it would have a closed door meeting to discuss pending litigation on April 5th. Kelso will answer he does not recall.

Kelso will be asked if he met with Amy in 2017 to discuss issues related to the firing of Ron Wellander.

Kelso will answer he does not recall. He will be shown time stamped pictures by Bill's attorney.

We do not know what Kelso will say then.

Kelso's involvement in Protect Sonoma and with Harrington creates the appearance that she is indeed a de facto member and supporter. The optics for the City would not be favorable. Harrington's undisclosed ex-parte

communications, and her personal attack of Mr. Jasper over the property ownership, will further add to the taint of any City Council vote in which she is involved.

Larry Barnett will be deposed by the City and Bill's attorneys.

They City's attorneys will defend the City Council's upholding of the appeal. Part of their claim will be Larry Barnett and crew's letter constitutes legislative history. Larry will confirm it. He is an honorable man.

Bill's attorney will ask for any evidence in the record to support his letter.

Larry will be unable to produce any evidence.

Larry Barnett will be asked if he has ever made false and misleading statements to try to stop a development he was against.

Larry will say he does not recall.

Larry will be shown multiple public videos of gross misstatements during his many development oppositional speeches and asked how they support his answer.

We do not know what Mr. Barnett will say then.

Back to the rich guys.

Bill was President of Dolby Laboratories from 1983 until 2009. While President, the company went public, raising \$495 million in a 2005 IPO. Some of that IPO went to Bill. The man can afford to litigate. He will no longer accept the City Council upholding the appeal or sending it back for further review.

Art is the clear winner here. Art doesn't have to spend a penny. Art has cleverly saddle the City with his problem and the incumbent financial obligations. Art engaged Protect Sonoma to provide the political ground game. Art will claim he was a victim of an overzealous planning commission. Art looks like an abused genius.

With all the parties being deposed, Bill will easily spend a million. That is slightly more than his gift to the Sonoma Valley Hospital. (I know because I was on the fund raising committee) A million dollars will not impact his lifestyle. Bill is mad.

The City will spend between \$250,000 and \$500,000 preparing for a trial. I note the City Budget allocates \$408,432 for legal services. I can only assume, very little of that allocation was set aside for Schocken Hill litigation.

If my understanding is correct, if the City loses this case, the City will be forced to pay Mr. Jasper's legal fees as well.

Art litigation is funded by the City. It will not impact his financial situation either.

I implore you not to let a fight between two rich guys drain our coffers.

Do not let it be your legacy that you overrode your own Planning Commission to satisfy some NIMBYs.

As Members of the City Council and as our Mayor you represent all the voters. Not just those of us who voted for you. And yes, I voted for each and every one of you.

As an important aside to the other Members of the City Council, Mrs. Harrington recently pulled papers to run for the office of County Assessor. These papers were surreptitiously pulled using her previous married name, Amy Sandoval. Amy was thinking about her political ambitions. That would leave you to deal with Bill Jasper's lawsuit and the fallout from it.

This is a business decision, not a political decision. I suggest Madame Mayor that you address the public at 6 PM tonight and tell them this. After a vigorous discussion all five members of the Council have agreed the City's financial interest must take president over the alternative.

Let Art fund his own civil suit.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'J' followed by 'M. Aaron' and a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joseph M. Aaron

Rebekah Barr

From: I support this project as approved by the previous Planning Commission.
<friendsofbilljasper@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 9:57 AM
To: City Council; Planning
Subject: Support Bill Jasper's New Homes

Council Member,

After several years of working collaboratively with the Planning Commission, City Staff, and neighbors, Bill Jasper has received approval for a thoughtful plan to build three new homes in Sonoma. The homes comply with the Hillside Guidelines by protecting the view from the valley, are appropriate in scale, and mitigate environmental impacts while adding new housing. I urge you to confirm the findings of the Planning Commission and deny the appeal.

I support this project as approved by the previous Planning Commission.

mikecoleman371@gmail.com

Email address mikecoleman371@gmail.com

Name I support this project as approved by the previous Planning Commission.

Additional Comment

I hope the City Council will not be the Lap Dogs for the so called Watch Dogs of Sonoma Valley. The Merchants of Smear on this matter have raised a lot of false information and have done nothing but create a campaign of smoke and mirrors to distract from the reality that this project, based on its merits, has passed the gauntlet of checks and balances through our City Staff and previous Planning Commissioners. I feel the attacks on Bill Jasper are vindictive and seem to have a direct connection with Bill's connection to developers the Watch Dogs don't agree with. When i look up the North side of our Valley and see countless Hillside homes that made no effort to hide their footprint on their surrounding environment, then witness the Witch hunt on Bill Jasper's approved property, it saddens me what a double standard can look like when misguided activist create an unfair campaign against a man who has demonstrated Patience and Civility in this unfair climate of Attack Dogs!

I hope you can weigh all the evidence and decide this issue based on the Merits and Rights rather than falling for a Smear campaign!

Thank You, Mike Coleman

I hope the City Council will not be the Lap Dogs for the so called Watch Dogs of Sonoma Valley. The Merchants of Smear on this matter have raised a lot of false information and have done nothing but create a campaign of smoke and mirrors to distract from the reality that this project, based on its merits, has passed the gauntlet of checks and balances through our City Staff and previous Planning Commissioners. I feel the attacks on Bill Jasper are vindictive and seem to have a direct connection with Bill's connection to developers the Watch Dogs don't agree with. When i look up the North side of our Valley and see countless Hillside homes that made no effort to hide their footprint on their surrounding environment, then witness the Witch hunt on Bill Jasper's approved property, it saddens me what a double standard can look like when misguided activist create an unfair campaign against a man who has demonstrated Patience and Civility in this unfair climate of Attack Dogs!

I hope you can weigh all the evidence and decide this issue based on the Merits and Rights rather than falling for a Smear campaign!

Thank You, Mike Coleman

Send personalized emails with [Mail Merge](#) for Gmail.

This email was sent via the [Google Forms Add-on](#).

Rebekah Barr

From: David Goodison
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 1:06 PM
To: Rebekah Barr
Subject: FW: City Council Appeal Brazil and Fourth Street Single-family Residential Projects – 149 Fourth Street East, 227 Brazil Street, and 228 Brazil Street

From: "jmpatri@aol.com" <jmpatri@aol.com>
Date: Monday, April 9, 2018 at 12:52 PM
To: Madolyn Agrimonti <madolyn.agrimonti@sonomacity.org>, "amyharringtonlaw@gmail.com" <amyharringtonlaw@gmail.com>, David Cook <david.cook@sonomacity.org>, Gary Edwards <gary.edwards@sonomacity.org>, Rachel Hundley <rachel.hundley@sonomacity.org>, David Goodison <davidg@sonomacity.org>, "cathy.capriola@sonomacity.org" <cathy.capriola@sonomacity.org>
Subject: City Council Appeal Brazil and Fourth Street Single-family Residential Projects – 149 Fourth Street East, 227 Brazil Street, and 228 Brazil Street

TO: Mayor Agrimonti and City Councilmembers

FROM: Johanna M. Patri, AICP

DATE: April 9, 2018

RE: Brazil and Fourth Street Single-family Residential Projects – 149 Fourth Street East, 227 Brazil Street, and 228 Brazil Street

1. Lot 228 Brazil Street (often referred to as the “water tank lot”) Easement

My question regarding this “water tank lot” is: What happened to the Permanent Water Facilities Easement on Lot 228 Brazil Street?

On January 22, 1968, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 6 (1968) intending to vacate a street right-of-way (Huichica Street and a Portion of Fourth Street East) to an adjacent private property owner, but reserved to the City (Grantor) a permanent easement to maintain and operate the water well and water tank existing on the Grantee property on the date of the deed, for the Municipal Water System, including the right to deepen and enlarge the well, and the right to construct, maintain, operate, replace, remove, renew and enlarge lines of pipe and other convenient structures, equipment, and fixtures for the pumping and transportation of water from the said well and tank site to the Municipal Water System, including access to the same.

A Lot Line Adjustment was granted by the City and recorded in February 2017. Was the water facilities easement amended at this time?

However, upon my inquiring, David Goodison, Planning Director, with verification from the applicant's engineer, informed me that there are no recorded easements on Title against the property. **So, what happened to the Permanent Water Facilities Easement on Lot 228 Brazil Street?**

This Permanent Water Facilities Easement should be part of the project plans, clearly designated on all relevant project plans for public review and verification as it is for the health and safety of the community and cannot be built on or obstructed.

2. Appeal

The Appellants request that your Council uphold and grant the appeals on the approval of the three Brazil and Fourth Street single family residential projects - 149 Fourth Street East, 227 Brazil Street, and 228 Brazil Street - as proposed, including the Mitigated Negative Declarations and Use Permits, on the bases that these projects separately and in total are inconsistent with key and applicable regulations, guidelines, and objectives of the Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050. In addition, the Appellants request that you allow without prejudice – without loss or waiver of rights, privileges, or entitlements – the applicants to submit revised applications and plans for review and analysis by City staff and the Planning Commission that comply with all provisions of the Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050 and subject to direction and criteria from the Council.

3. Housing Accountability Act

The Housing Accountability Act (HAA) has been brought into question and legal counsel varies on its interpretation, applicability, and effect regarding the proposed project. However, four factors as they relate to the HAA are acutely clear: (1) neither the City nor the appellants are suggesting that the three single-family residential proposals, on three legal lots of record, be developed at a lower density; (2) the standards and guidelines apply to all uses and structures within the hillside area and hillside zoning district and new development shall be subject to a conditional Use Permit in compliance with Sonoma Municipal Code Section 19.54.040; (3) the three single family residential projects as proposed do not comply with applicable provisions of the Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050; and (4) there exists feasible and easily attainable methods to: (a) mitigate the intensity of development for compliance with the Hillside Ordinance regulations (size of development, size of lot pads, site coverage, excessive grading, excessive tree removal, visibility of development, etc.) so that the three single family residential projects comply with the applicable provisions and objectives of the Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050; and (b) mitigate the environmental and safety impacts (loss of habitat value, natural topographic features and terrain impacts drainage impacts, etc.) to provide health and safety public benefits.

4. Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050 Findings.

- a. The Hillside Zoning District is the only residential zone in Sonoma that requires a Use Permit for development of a single-family residence, illustrating the purpose, objectives, and significance of establishing “regulations and guidelines to preserve and protect views to and from the hillside areas within the city, to preserve significant topographical features and habitats, and to maintain the identity, character, and environmental quality of the city”. (Section 19.40.050 A Purpose)
- b. “The standards and guidelines contained in this section apply to all uses and structures within areas that and to all development within the Hillside zoning district.” (Section 19.40.050 B.1.)
- c. New development within a hillside area shall be subject to the approval of a conditional Use Permit in compliance with Sonoma Municipal Code Section 19.54.040 (Section 19.54.040 B.3.)
- d. Grading shall be designed to conserve natural topographic features and appearance by minimizing the amount of cut and fill. Projects shall be evaluated for preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by maintaining the natural topography to the greatest extent possible. (Section 19.40.050 D.2. and E.1.)
- e. The design guidelines and objectives (purpose) (see Section 19.40.050 A Purpose) should be implemented whenever applicable. (Section 19.40.050 E.) The Hillside Residential Zone is the only

residential zone in Sonoma that requires a "use permit" for a single-family home, illustrating the importance of **careful adherence to the regulations and guidelines. Substantial reasons must be given and findings must be made to deviate from the regulations and guidelines.**

- f. The project should be designed to fit the terrain rather than altering the terrain to fit the project, thereby minimizing cut and fill. (Section 19.40.050 E 1.)
- g. **Lot Pad Grading should be limited to the boundaries of the structure's foundation, vehicle parking space and a yard area shown on approved grading plans. Pads should not exceed 5,000 square feet in total area.** The intent of the 5,000 square foot pad limitation was defined by the five original City Council members who authored this code as total pad size per parcel in order to limit intensity of development, grading, and tree removal on the hillside while maintain a property owner's right to build. (Section 19.40.050 E 2.)
- h. Development must adhere to all design and location of structures relating to form, mass, and profile to blend with the natural terrain and preserve the character and profile of the natural slopes. (Section 19.40.050 E 5.)
- i. The projects must utilize clustered sites and buildings on gently sloping terrain to reduce grading and protect views (Section 19.40.050 E. Evaluation of Applications)

5. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- a. **Cumulative Impacts and Fair Argument:** The proposed single family residential projects should be reviewed under the provisions of CEQA as one project because of their common and cumulative impact characteristics. In addition, as proposed, the projects are subject to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The way a project is defined directly affects how the proposed action is analyzed for environmental compliance with CEQA, particularly in relation to such issues as primary and secondary environmental effects. In accordance with CEQA Section 15064 (f) (1), given the amount of grading, tree removal and testimony of neighboring property owners and appellants' engineers, there is substantial evidence in the record and a fair argument that the three project may have a significant effect on the environment. Substantial evidence means enough relevant information and reasonable inferences that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions may be reached (CEQA Section 15384 (a)).
- b. **Piecemealing and Whole of the Action:** It is clear that these three projects are connected and together constitute the "whole of the action" and therefore, should be reviewed and analyzed in total. Under State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15378), "project" means the "whole of the action", which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. This definition provides for the maximum protection of the environment. Under the provisions of CEQA, if the Lead Agency needs to grant more than one approval for a project, the CEQA document must include all those components. "Piecemealing", rather than evaluating the whole of the project in one environmental document, is explicitly forbidden by CEQA.
 - All parcels are contiguous and share common property lines;
 - All parcels are under common ownership;
 - All parcels and projects have one common access; and
 - Construction activities associated with the three proposed projects have common activities and/or infrastructure, including, but not necessarily limited to grading, excavation, trenching for installation of required improvements (e.g., utilities, driveway, and drainage features), preparation of building pads, construction of the residential buildings, and infrastructure.

- a **c. Additional Environmental Review for a Revised Project:** Any revised project will require preparation of a new Initial Study (for one project). Any revised project will result in its own outcome

and extent of environmental review requirements by: (1) reducing the intensity of the project for compliance with the Hillside Ordinance regulations including, but not necessarily limited to, size of development, size of lot pads, site coverage, grading and cut and fill, tree removal, and visibility of development by lowering and clustering the residential developments, so that the three single family residential developments comply with all applicable provisions and objectives of the Sonoma Municipal Code Hillside Ordinance Section 19.40.050; and (2) mitigating the environmental and safety impacts (minimizing tree removal and increasing habitat value, conserving natural topographic features and terrain, and minimizing drainage impacts to provide public health and safety public benefits.

Rebekah Barr

From: David Eichar <eichar@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 6:05 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Appeal of hillside residential develop on Shocken Hill
Attachments: Attached Message

Mayor, Council Members;

I have read through the latest staff report and comments available on the city's web site.

The aggregate interpretation of the Development Code is not “novel” as I have previously cited other cities/counties in California which interpret the limit on” pad size in total” to be an aggregate. Ryan Patterson’s letter states that the “lot pad grading guideline is not an 'Objective Standard' under the HAA” because it is a guideline, not a standard. What Mr. Patterson fails to mention here is that the wording of the HAA which includes “standards and criteria”. The Development Code guidelines are definitely “criteria”. Note that not only do all 3 projects exceed the maximum lot pad size, 149 Fourth Street East also exceeds the site coverage limit; which is a standard, not a guideline. See Development Code section 19.18.020 Project planning and design, paragraph A. Site Planning Standards, table 3.3.

There was one comment that landscape area should not be included in the calculation of pad size because it provides a fire break. Landscape areas on a slope can also work as a fire break. You don’t need a flat piece of land for a fire break. Look at all of the vineyards on the slopes that acted as a firebreak during the October fires.

There was another comment about how the water in a pool water could be used to fight a fire. This is true, but we have many more years of drought than fires. Pools use a lot water, not only to fill, but to top off due to evaporation. Other communities include pools in calculation of pad size. To exclude pools would be an exception.

Some statements made by Clare Walton are inaccurate. For example, "Included within the 5,000 square foot limit would be all firetruck turnarounds and clearances. Included within the 5,000 square foot limit would be all terraces and walkways necessary to make the sloping sites accessible for users." Firetruck turnarounds and driveways are not included in the pad size calculations. See attached e-mail from David Goodison. It appears from Mr. Goodison's e-mail that walkways are also not part of the pad size calculations.

Of the hillside projects approved since 2003, three were replacements/expansions. 175 4th Street East did not go in front of the Planning Commission, but did go in front of the Design Review Commission. According to 19.40.050 Hillside development, paragraph 3, "New development within a hillside area shall be subject to the approval of a conditional use permit." Replacing a building is considered new development. Therefore; the project at 174 4th Street East should have gone before the Planning Commission.

The 175 4th Street East Design Review Commission staff report says lot coverage is 3.4%, which is the building coverage, not site coverage. Site coverage includes drives or uncovered parking. Two Design Review Commissioners expressed concern about the square foot size of the residence, but the square foot size of buildings is outside of the purview of the Design Review Commission.

In all five of these projects, there was no mention of pad size in staff reports or minutes. “Pads should not exceed 5,000 square feet in total area” is a guideline. Development Code section 19.01.060 Guidelines:

“The decision-making authority shall consider applicable guidelines in its review of applications for discretionary planning and subdivision permit approvals. The failure of a proposed project to comply with applicable guidelines may be used by the decision-making authority as a basis for denial. To approve a project that fails to comply with applicable guidelines, the decision-making authority must find that substantial reasons exist that justify the noncompliance.”

The decision making body, the Planning Commission, did not make the finding that substantial reasons exist that justify the noncompliance. Therefore; the hillside projects done since 2003 were all illegally done. Past failures of the Planning Department to point out that these completed hillside project were inconsistent with the Development Code cannot be used as an excuse to allow new projects to be inconsistent with the Development Code.

Regards,
David Eichar

Rebekah Barr

From: David Goodison <davidg@sonomacity.org>
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 1:35 PM
To: David Eichar
Subject: Re: Appeal - Residents on Shocken Hill

Hi--In my reading, I saw no reference to the lot pad guideline in any of those staff reports.

The DRHPC staff report must be making reference to building coverage, not site coverage, which includes paving.

For Lots 227 and 228 I counted the paved areas closest to the two residences (to a depth of 20 feet) as parking and therefore included in the pad area. These seemed like the two areas where parking would most likely occur. The fire truck turnaround was not included in the pad area calculation. I considered it to be part of the drive, especially as parking is not supposed to happen within it.

On 4/6/18, 1:27 PM, "David Eichar" <eichar@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

David,
First, correct me if I am wrong, but it appears that pad grading size was never mentioned in the staff reports or minutes of either the Planning Commission or Design Review Commission meetings.

Why the difference in lot coverage for 175 4th St E? The Design Review Commission staff report says lot coverage is 3.4%, while the staff report for the City Council meeting this Monday says lot coverage is 19.7%.

Is grading for fire truck turnaround included in the pad size or excluded because it is part of the driveway?

Thanks,
Dave

On 4/6/2018 11:24 AM, David Goodison wrote:

> Hi--By coincidence, we previously had a request for that information so those materials are posted to the website here:

>
> <https://www.sonomacity.org/documents/previous-hillside-project-reviews-and-minutes/>

>
>
>
>
> On 4/6/18, 11:10 AM, "David Eichar" <eichar@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

>
> David,
> I assume you have and reviewed copies of the staff reports and meeting minutes for those project that went before the PC. Can I get a copy?
> If you don't have it electronically, I will stop by to pick them up.

>
> Thanks,
> Dave

>
> On 4/6/2018 10:51 AM, David Goodison wrote:
> > Hi--I may or may not have those number by Monday, but I would say that it is unlikely.
> >
> > In the current staff report and the staff report for the March 1st meeting, I try to make it very clear that the Hillside regulations apply not only to properties having the hillside residential zoning designation, but also to properties having certain slope conditions.
> >
> > A key issue is the application of the hillside regulations/ guidelines and the guidelines apply equally whether or not the property has a hillside zoning, all applicable projects are included in the tables. However the tables clearly show the zoning of each site.
> >
> > David
> >
> > On 4/6/18, 10:46 AM, "David Eichar" <eichar@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> >
> > David,
> > I wasn't sure that including the ungraded areas under decks, etc.
> > received a majority of support by the city council, but you may have
> > been keeping better track than me. I suggest having the numbers ready
> > with ungraded areas are excluded. I would also like to see those numbers.
> >
> > You may also be asked whether the Planning Commission knew about any
> > grading and/or lot coverage requirements being exceeded for the hillside
> > projects since 2003, and the PC's basis for approving such.
> >
> > One point for clarification please, for those hillside projects approved
> > since 2003, it looks like only 2 were in the hillside zone. Is this
> > correct? If so, then calling the others "hillside projects" without
> > specifically stating they are not in the hillside zone, implies that
> > they are within the hillside zone.
> >
> > Dave
> >
> >
> >
> > On 4/6/2018 8:27 AM, David Goodison wrote:
> > > Hi--Ungraded areas under decks are included, per the Council's direction. Of the hillside projects since 2003, the only one that did not go to the PC was 175 Fourth Street East.
> > >
> > > David
> > >
> > > On 4/5/18, 6:09 PM, "David Eichar" <eichar@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > David,
> > > Does the Aggregate Pad Area Calculation included in the staff report
> > > include only graded areas or is ungraded areas under decks included?
> > > For the Projects Approved Since 2003, which ones went before the
> > > Planning Commission for approval?
> > >
> > > Thanks in advance,
> > > Dave

Rebekah Barr

From: Marguerite Julia Regan <friendsofbilljasper@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2018 3:05 PM
To: City Council; Planning
Subject: Support Bill Jasper's New Homes

Council Member,

After several years of working collaboratively with the Planning Commission, City Staff, and neighbors, Bill Jasper has received approval for a thoughtful plan to build three new homes in Sonoma. The homes comply with the Hillside Guidelines by protecting the view from the valley, are appropriate in scale, and mitigate environmental impacts while adding new housing. I urge you to confirm the findings of the Planning Commission and deny the appeal.

Marguerite Julia Regan

mjuliaregan@gmail.com

Email address mjuliaregan@gmail.com

Name Marguerite Julia Regan

Additional Comment

From what came thru on the U Tube video, I wouldn't support the design of the houses being considered as, in my opinion they are too modern in design & take away from Sonoma's history & certainly don't pay homage to it.I believe that any structure that is built in an area of significant history should arch back to that time period so therefore be in a older style such as a large farmhouse that can still be grand ,in it's own way.I absolutely, hate the buildings that have been approved in the last 10 yrs or so ...you are taking the beauty & charm out of the town instead of honoring it.

From what came thru on the U Tube video, I wouldn't support the design of the houses being considered as, in my opinion they are too modern in design & take away from Sonoma's history & certainly don't pay homage to it.I believe that any structure that is built in an area of significant history should arch back to that time period so therefore be in a older style such as a large farmhouse that can still be grand ,in it's own way.I absolutely, hate the buildings that have been approved in the last 10 yrs or so ...you are taking the beauty & charm out of the town instead of honoring it.

Pull email addresses from Gmail with [Address Extractor for Gmail](#).

This email was sent via the [Google Forms Add-on](#).