

4.0 CONSISTENCY WITH PUBLIC PLANS AND ZONING

4.0 CONSISTENCY WITH PUBLIC PLANS AND ZONING

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require EIRs to "... discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans".¹ This chapter presents an analysis of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* project's consistency with adopted public plans and zoning in order to determine the extent to which the project would be consistent or would conflict with policies and zoning. One objective of this analysis is to provide information to find ways to modify the project to reduce any identified inconsistencies with relevant plans and policies. The project is examined in relation to policies and provisions of the following documents:

- *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan*
- *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*
- *Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines*
- *Sonoma County Zoning Code*

General Plans articulate long-term goals and policies for economic growth, proposed use of land, development of infrastructure, conservation of resources, preservation of open space, and related issues (see Government Code sections 63300 and 65302). A project does not need to be consistent with every policy of a general plan; rather, it must be "generally consistent" and "in harmony".

State law does not impose a requirement that a project completely satisfy every policy stated in a general plan. The goals, objectives, and policies in a general plan set the stage for later decision-making. As noted in the recent case of *Sierra Club v. County of Napa*,² "A project is consistent with a county's general plan if... "considering all its aspects; it will further the objectives and policies of the general plan and not obstruct their attainment. A given project need not be in perfect conformity with every general plan policy. To be consistent, a project must be compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the general plan" (internal citations omitted).

A general plan "must try to accommodate a wide range of competing interests... and to present a clear and comprehensive set of principles to guide development decisions. Once a general plan is in place, it is the province of elected officials to examine the specifics of a proposed project to determine if it would be "in harmony" with the policies stated in the plan."³ Recognizing the plan provisions would ordinarily provide policy guidance on a range of issues, rather than mandatory, objective regulatory standards, the courts have recognized that the decision-maker must weigh plan policies when applying them, and that the law does not require every policy be completely satisfied.⁴ However, in some instances general plans contain fundamental, mandatory, and objective standards that do not allow any

¹ *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15125(d).

² *Sierra Club v. County of Napa et al.* (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490.

³ *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal. App. 4th 704,791, summarizing from *Greenbaum v. City of Los Angeles*, 153 Cal. App. 3d 391.

⁴ *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal. App. 4th 704,791, summarizing from *Greenbaum v. City of Los Angeles*, 153 Cal. App. 3d 391.

discretion in interpretation and application. A project will be found inconsistent with such a standard if it is clearly incompatible.⁵

Consistency Determination

The discussions provided below represent the EIR authors' best judgment of the policies examined. **Sonoma County ultimately must determine the project's consistency with County policies before taking action to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the pending application.** (Other responsible agencies similarly must determine the project's consistency with their relevant policies when reviewing and commenting on or taking action on the project.) The discussion in this EIR is intended to aid in these decisions.

While CEQA requires a discussion of consistency with public plans, inconsistency does not necessarily lead to a significant impact. Inconsistencies with public plans create significant impacts under CEQA only when an *adverse physical effect* would result from the inconsistency. All adverse physical effects resulting from any inconsistency are discussed in the appropriate environmental analysis in the EIR (in **Chapter 5.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**). The location of these environmental analyses is referenced in each policy discussion, as appropriate.

4.1 SONOMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan*⁶ is the County's guide for all development in the unincorporated areas of Sonoma County. The *1989 General Plan* identifies goals, objectives and policies in ten areas:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Open Space
- Agricultural Resources
- Resource Conservation
- Public Safety
- Circulation and Transit
- Air Transportation
- Public Services
- Noise

The *1989 General Plan* establishes nine planning areas in the county in order to define further specific area and parcel policies. The *Wolf House Inn* project site is in the Sonoma Valley Planning Area.

⁵ *Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado Co. v. El Dorado County*, 62 Cal.App.4th 1332 (1998).

⁶ *Sonoma County General Plan*, adopted by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1989, as amended through March 1, 1994.

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The *1989 General Plan* designates the project site Limited Commercial (LC).

The *1989 General Plan* includes three commercial land use categories. General Commercial permits all types of commercial use and is applied only to lands within urban service areas. Limited Commercial allows a smaller range of commercial uses and may be applied to areas either outside or inside urban service areas. The Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial use category allows for visitor serving uses such as restaurants, lodging, developed campgrounds, resorts, marinas, golf courses, and similar types of uses.

The *1989 General Plan* Open Space Element discusses important scenic resources and includes three open space categories: community separators, scenic landscape units, and scenic highway corridors. The project site lies adjacent to but outside of the County designated Glen Ellen – Agua Caliente Community Separator.

The *1989 General Plan* acknowledges that many residents value the variety and beauty of the county's many landscapes as viewed from rural roads. Motorists can travel from urban centers into orchard and forest covered hills, rolling dairy lands, and scenic valley planted in vineyards. According to the *1989 General Plan*, preserving these landscapes is important to the character of the county. Arnold Drive adjacent to the *Wolf House Inn* project site is designated a Scenic Corridor.

The *1989 General Plan* Open Space Element includes a discussion of open space for outdoor recreation, including parks, equestrian and hiking trails, and bicycle routes. Figure OS-4a is the County's designated plan for trails. The figure designates the Valley of the Moon Trail near the project site. The proposed trail would traverse the Valley of the Moon between Jack London State Park and the Sonoma / Napa county line and would link Sonoma Valley Regional Park to the Glen Ellen community.

In addition, Figure OS-4b shows a Class II bikeway on Arnold Drive along the project site frontage.⁷ A Class I Bikeway is shown to link Arnold Drive to Highway 12 through the Sonoma County Regional Park near the project site.

Figure OS-3 shows designated natural resources protection areas. Sonoma Creek is designated as a riparian corridor. The portion of Sonoma Creek adjacent to the project site is subject to a 50-foot riparian corridor setback.⁸

Figure OS-5i is the Open Space Plan Map for the Sonoma Valley Planning Area. Figure OS-5i designates Arnold Drive as a Scenic Corridor and Sonoma Creek as a Riparian Corridor. No critical biotic area is designated on the project site.

The *1989 General Plan* Resource Conservation Element provides for the conservation of natural resources including water, forests, soils, rivers, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, and other natural

⁷ There are three types of bikeways, Class I, II, and III. A Class II Bikeway is a bike lane on a right-of-way for the primary use of bicycles. Through travel by autos or pedestrians is not allowed, although vehicle parking is permissible.

⁸ The setback corridor is measured from the top of the higher bank as determined by the Sonoma County Water Agency.

resources. Figure RC-2i designates the *Wolf House Inn* project site as a part of an area with marginal groundwater availability.

The 1989 *General Plan* Public Safety Element is intended to protect the community from unreasonable risks from such conditions as geologic hazards, flood hazards, and wildland fire hazards. Figure PS-1i designates the project site as having high or moderate potential for liquefaction. No other hazards are designated on the project site.

The 1989 *General Plan* Circulation and Transit Element addresses existing and planned transportation routes and facilities in Sonoma County. Figure CT-6i designates Arnold Drive along the project site frontage as a Secondary Arterial.

Sonoma County General Plan Amendment

As discussed in *Chapter 3.0 Description of the Proposed Project*, it is proposed to revise the land use designation of the 1989 *General Plan* for the project site from LC (Limited Commercial) to GC (General Commercial). No other General Plan amendments are proposed.

GENERAL PLAN POLICY ANALYSIS

Below is an assessment of the consistency of the *Wolf House Inn* project with the relevant policies of the 1989 *General Plan*.

Land Use Element

Policy LU-1a – This policy states in part that the following plans shall be repealed, but development guidelines contained therein shall be reviewed and updated and considered for adoption as “local area development guidelines,” provided that they are consistent with the general plan. Until such a time as these guidelines are adopted, any policies contained in these plans shall continue to apply provided they are consistent with the general plan.

Included in the list of plans cited in this policy is the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*.

Analysis – The proposed project’s consistency with the relevant portions of the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan* is provided in *Section 4.2 North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*.

Goal LU-4.1 – Maintain adequate public services in both rural and urban service areas to accommodate projected growth. Authorize additional development only when it is clear that a funding plan or mechanism is in place to provide needed services in a timely manner.

Analysis – The project is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area. The project would be required to connect to existing public services including water supply (Valley of the Moon Water District) and wastewater treatment (Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District) which have existing capacity / ability to serve the project. In the future, both of these providers may lack capacity to serve the proposed project or have difficulty in expanding their systems.⁹ Long-term planning for the provision of adequate public services is addressed through the General Plan update process (currently

⁹ *Water and Sewer Capacities: Final Report*, memo to the Community Advisory Committee (General Plan 2020 Update) from Sonoma County PRMD, October 16, 2003.

underway in Sonoma County) and Master Facilities Plans or similar documents by public service providers.

Objective LU-4.1 – Assure that development occurs only where physical public services and infrastructure, including school and park facilities, public safety, access and response times, water and wastewater management systems, drainage, and roads, are planned to be available in time to serve the protected development.

Analysis – Development of the *Wolf House Inn* would result in project specific impacts associated with *fireflow* water supply (i.e., water for fire suppression) and solid waste disposal services. As described in **Section 5.10 Public Services**, the existing water main has inadequate pressure to provide sufficient fireflow to the project. In addition, the project would be served by a landfill with inadequate capacity. **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation** describes the need for shoulder-widening on Arnold Drive to address safety concerns associated with vehicle and pedestrian / bicycle traffic. As discussed in **Section 7.2 Cumulative Impacts**, the project could also result in cumulative impacts to water supply and wastewater treatment service providers.

Policy LU-4b – Use the levels of service shown on Figures CT-2c and Ct-2d on pages 289-291 of the Circulation and Transit Element to determine whether or not congestion is exceeding the desired level of service on the county highway system. Use area and / or project traffic analyses to determine whether intersection impacts or other localized congestion may also affect these desired levels of service.

Analysis – As described in **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**, data from the most recent traffic model (designed for the *Sonoma County General Plan 2020*) indicated that project traffic would not cause an intersection currently operating at an acceptable level of service to operate below County standards. In addition, for intersection(s) currently operating at a less than acceptable level of service, project traffic would not cause an increase in the delay that would exceed County standards.

Policy LU-4f – Assure that new development contributes its fair share toward provision of the public services and infrastructure needed for projected growth.

Analysis – The project applicant would be required to make improvements to a segment of Arnold Drive (from the project site to Hill Road, approximately 0.2 mile. In addition, the applicant may need to work with Valley of the Moon Water District to replace a section of six-inch water main in Glen Ellen that constrains fireflow water pressure at hydrants serving the project site.

Permitted Uses General Commercial Areas – All commercial uses except regional shopping centers are allowed. Primary uses range from department stores and specialty shops to space extensive business such as paint, tire, carpet, lumber, home materials and feed stores. Wholesale and heavy commercial uses and services are also included. Professional, administrative, financial, medical and general business offices that have more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area require this category. Residential and general commercial uses may be combined in a single development where the residential use is clearly compatible with and secondary to the commercial use. This category also provides for consideration of a single-family residence in place of commercial uses allowed by zoning. The zoning ordinance may further define the uses which are permitted within this category and the bulk, height, coverage and other standards for such development.

Analysis – As described previously, the current land use designation (i.e., LC [Limited Commercial]) of the project site does not permit hotels. The project proposes to amend the land use designation of

the 1989 General Plan for the project site to GC (General Commercial), which permits all commercial uses.

Designation Criteria – General Commercial Areas – Amendments to add this designation must meet all of the following:

1. Lands shall be located within an urban service area.
2. Adequate public services shall be available or shall be planned to be available.
3. Lands shall be located on or have convenient access to arterial or collector highways.
4. Lands shall be near other commercial uses, but shall not occur in strips along highways.
5. Lands shall not be located in environmentally sensitive or hazardous areas such as floodways or fault zones.
6. Any applicable planning area policies.

Analysis – The project site is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area with adequate existing public services. The project site is located adjacent to Arnold Drive (designated by the County as a Secondary Arterial), which serves the western side of central and southern Sonoma Valley. The project site is part of the existing Jack London Village an existing commercial center in and near other commercial uses in downtown Glen Ellen. While the project would be located near environmentally-sensitive Sonoma Creek, it would be located outside of required riparian setbacks and above identified flood hazard zones. The project site is not subject to fault zones or associated hazards.

Policy LU-18h – Encourage and cooperate in the preparation of a community design plan for Glen Ellen. It is intended that the completed plan be submitted for review and action by the County.

Analysis – *Section 4.3 Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines* evaluates the project’s consistency with the community design plan for Glen Ellen.

Policy LU-18k – Encourage the development or redevelopment of existing commercial land use as a greater priority than designation of additional lands for new commercial uses. Approve new commercial designations only if they meet the following minimum criteria and where applicable comply with LU-18g and j:

1. The lands are in an urban service area or in Kenwood.
2. The existing supply of commercial land is insufficient to meet projected needs.
3. Service capacities, including water and sewer systems and roads, are adequate to accommodate the additional development.

Analysis – The project site is currently designated for commercial use and is part of an existing commercial center (i.e., Jack London Village) located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area with adequate existing public services, except as noted. Project development would not change the designation of land with an existing non-commercial use to one of a commercial use.

Open Space Element

Goal OS-5 – Provide protective measures for riparian corridors along selected streams that balance the need for agricultural production, urban development, timber and mining operations, and flood control with preservation of riparian values.

Analysis – Project implementation would result in a new commercial use adjacent to Sonoma Creek. Protective measures are discussed below.

Objective OS-5.1 – Classify important streams with native vegetation as “riparian corridors”. Develop guidelines to protect and manage these areas as valuable resources.

Analysis – The proposed project would be located outside of the 50-foot setback required of Urban Riparian Corridors (see Policy OS-5c below) from the top of bank of Sonoma Creek. **Section 5.6 Biological Resources** describes measures (primarily the use of native vegetation for landscaping in riparian areas) to protect Sonoma Creek consistent with 1989 *General Plan* policies and State and federal regulations. **Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality** describes additional measures necessary to reduce erosion and sedimentation.

Policy OS-5c – Establish streamside conservation areas, measured from the top of the higher bank as determined by the SCWA, for designated riparian corridors as follows:

1. Urban Riparian Corridors: 50 feet
2. Russian River Riparian Corridor: 200 feet
3. Flatland Riparian Corridors: 100 feet
4. Upland Riparian Corridors: 50 feet

Analysis – As the project site is within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area, the 50-foot setback of Urban Riparian Corridors would apply. **Exhibit 3.0-5** shows that proposed buildings would be located outside of the 50-foot setback from the top of bank of Sonoma Creek.

Policy OS-5e – Allow or consider allowing the following uses within any streamside conservation areas:

Numbers 1 through 8 omitted.

9. Creekside bikeways, trails and parks within urban riparian corridors.
10. Development authorized by waiver under OS-5f.

Analysis – The project proposes development of a “creek walk”, a pedestrian trail parallel to the channel of Sonoma Creek, within the streamside conservation area.

Policy OS-5f – Prohibit, except as allowed by OS-5e, structures, roads and utility lines and parking lots within any streamside conservation areas. Consider waiver of this prohibition if:

1. It makes a lot unbuildable and vegetation removal is minimized.
2. No significant disturbance of riparian habitat would occur, or

3. The use involves only the maintenance, restoration or minor expansion of an existing structure.

A biotic resource assessment may be required prior to issuance of a waiver.

Analysis – Proposed development would involve construction of new structures, landscaping, and parking improvements in locations generally occupied by existing parking and ruderal (i.e., weedy) grasslands. However, **Exhibit 3.0-5** shows that proposed parking for 18 vehicles would be located within the streamside conservation area. This parking lot already exists and project implementation would result in relatively minor improvements including landscaping. Mitigation measures presented in *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* would minimize the removal of existing vegetation and require the use of native species in landscaping improvements.

Policy OS-7d – The trails on Figure OS-4a on page 185 make up the County’s designated plan for trails. Trail locations are approximate and are described below. Roadways may be used where access cannot be obtained through private property.

Valley of the Moon Trail – The proposed trail traverses the Valley of the Moon between Jack London State Park and the Sonoma/Napa county line and links Sonoma Valley Regional Park to the Glen Ellen community.

Analysis – The proposed project does not propose any connection to the adjacent Sonoma Valley Regional Park that would cross Sonoma Creek. The nearest entrance to trails at Sonoma Valley Regional Park is located less-than one-half mile south of the project site on the east side of Arnold Drive. While the project proposes a “creek walk” along the banks of Sonoma Creek that would cross Asbury Creek into the Jack London Village, it is unknown if this improvement would or could ever be used as part of the proposed connection trail that would connect the community of Glen Ellen to area parks. Proposed mitigation to widen the shoulders of Arnold Drive (see *Impact 5.2-4 Insufficient Roadway Width Along Arnold Drive*) would improve bicycle and pedestrian travel between downtown Glen Ellen and the existing trailhead to Sonoma Valley Regional Park.

Policy OS-8o – Encourage the dedication of Class 1 bikeways as part of open space requirements for development, when a nexus can be established between the proposed development and the need for bikeways in the affected area.

Analysis – Figure OS-4b designates Arnold Drive in the vicinity of the project site a Class II Bikeway for planning purposes.

Policy OS-8q – Use the following criteria to determine consistency of public and private projects with this element:

- Development of lands traversed or adjoined by a designated Class I bikeway accommodates, and does not conflict, with development of the bikeway.
- Construction or widening of roads designated for Class II bikeways meets the criteria for Class II bikeways specified in the Bikeways Plan.
- Construction or widening of roads designated for Class III bikeways meets the criteria for Class III bikeways specified in the Bikeways Plan.

In the event that a project proposed without inclusion of a bikeway has a significant, overriding public benefit, or no funds are available for bikeway construction, the project may be found consistent with this Element and the Bikeways Plan if it does not preclude future construction of a bikeway and makes the best feasible provision for interim bicycle travel.

Analysis – Mitigation Measure 5.2-4(b) would require shoulder-widening between the project site’s frontage with Arnold Drive and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder-Widening Project at Hill Road. Shoulder widening would improve safety conditions and bring this portion of Arnold Drive into compliance with Class II Bikeway requirements. As described in **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**, based on a preliminary review of information at the Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works continuation of the shoulder widening to the project site appears feasible if funds are available for the project.

Resource Conservation Element

Policy RC-2e – Retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent economically feasible for any discretionary project improvements near waterways or in areas with a high risk of erosion as noted in the Soil Survey of Sonoma.

Analysis – The proposed project would not make substantial changes to the existing topography. Development of the *Wolf House Inn* would place a “creek walk”, swimming hole, and landscaping improvements within the streamside conservation area (i.e., within the 50-foot setback from Sonoma Creek) as well as improve the existing parking lot. The proposed *Preliminary Landscape Plan* (see **Exhibit 3.0-9**) would remove some existing vegetation and supplement with ornamental landscaping. **Sections 5.6 Biological Resources** and **5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality** evaluate related impacts and propose mitigation to retain existing vegetation, use plants native to the Glen Ellen area for project landscaping, and minimize erosion and sedimentation in Sonoma and Asbury Creeks.

Policy RC-2g – Continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code to reduce erosion and slope instability problems.

Analysis – *Impacts 5.5-1 Soil Erosion from Grading and Construction Activities, 5.5-3 Increased Surface Runoff, and 5.7-3 Landslides and Slope Instability* address slope instability and erosion. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Objective RC-3.1 – Preserve watersheds and groundwater recharge areas by avoiding the placement of potential pollution sources in areas with high percolation rates.

Analysis – The proposed project would not place potential pollution sources in areas of high percolation rates.

Objective RC-3.2 – Provide development standards in recharge areas to maintain groundwater supplies.

Analysis – The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to groundwater recharge. No additional development standards would be required.

Objective RC-3.3 – Preserve and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources

Analysis – The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to groundwater resources. *Impacts 5.5-1 Soil Erosion from Grading and Construction Activities, Impact 5.5-2 Nonpoint Source*

Pollution in Receiving Waters, and 5.5-3 Increased Surface Runoff, discuss impacts to water quality from project-related pollutants, primarily sediment from increased erosion and nonpoint source pollutants (e.g., motor oil, pesticides, and fertilizer). Recommended mitigation measures including the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Policy RC-3a – Grading, filling and construction should not substantially reduce or divert any stream flow that would affect groundwater recharge.

Analysis – The project proposes no alterations to channels of Sonoma Creek, Asbury Creek or the unnamed drainage that borders the project site’s northern boundary. Placement of structures within the streamside conservation areas would not substantially reduce or divert any stream flow that would affect groundwater discharge.

Goal RC-5 – Promote and maintain the County’s diverse plant and animal communities and protect biotic resources from development activities.

Analysis – *Section 5.6 Biological Resources* fully evaluates the presence of special-status species and sensitive natural communities present at the project site. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than significant level.

Objective RC-5.1 – Identify and encourage protection of areas with important wildlife habitats and woodland resources.

Analysis – *Impacts 5.6-1 Special-Status Species, 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities, and 5.6-3 Wetlands and Drainages* identify impacts to existing riparian vegetation and native plants as well as indirect impacts to important wildlife habitat for California red legged frog, salmonids, and raptors.

Objective RC-5.2 – Encourage the use of native plants in landscaping to reduce the risk of introducing exotic plant species into wildlife areas.

Analysis – *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* evaluates the presence of non-native species at the project site as well as the potential of proposed landscaping to introduce such species. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Objective RC-5.4 – Identify important valley oak habitat areas and protect and enhance valley oaks and valley oak woodlands in these areas.

Analysis – *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* addresses the presence of oak trees at the project site and recommends revisions to the *Preliminary Landscape Plan* (see **Exhibit 3.0-9**) to minimize or avoid their removal.

Objective RC-5b – On discretionary projects, use native or compatible non-native species to the extent possible for landscaping. Discourage use of exotics, such as pampas grass and scotch broom.

Analysis – *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* evaluates the presence of non-native species at the project site as well as the potential of proposed landscaping to introduce such species. The EIR includes specific mitigation to prevent the use of non-native species in project landscaping, control existing invasive species, and retain existing vegetation (e.g., oak trees).

Policy RC-5c – Make the preservation of significant native oaks and other native trees a primary consideration in the review of development projects.

Analysis – While a detailed Tree Report was not prepared for the project, the *Preliminary Landscape Plan* indicates some oak trees would be removed with project development. Mitigation Measure 5.6-2 would call for the retention all native trees with trunk diameters greater than four inches and revisions to the landscape plan by a qualified landscape architect or restoration ecologist who specializes in native habitat restoration.

Goal RC-6 – Identify and protect rare and endangered species and their environment.

Analysis – *Impacts 5.6-1 Special-Status Species* and *5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* address the presence of rare or endangered plant and animal species. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Objective RC-6.1 – Identify the locations of rare and endangered plants and animals.

Analysis – *Section 5.6 Biological Resources* discusses detailed biological surveys of the project site conducted as part of this environmental review.

Objective RC-6.2 – Require that any development on lands containing rare and endangered species be done in a manner that protects the resource or mitigates adverse impacts.

Analysis – Project development could adversely affect raptors (if present) as well as California red legged frog (if present) along the upper bank of creeks / drainages at the project site. In addition, pollutants (e.g., sediment, motor oil, and pesticides) from construction or operation of the proposed project could indirectly affect rare or endangered species in Sonoma Creek and receiving waters. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Policy RC-6b – Protection for rare and endangered species, wetlands, and other biotic resources not indicated on Figure OS-3 on page 183 shall be accomplished through compliance with applicable State and federal law.

Analysis – In the vicinity of the project site, Figure OS-3 only indicates the presence of the Sonoma Creek riparian corridor. *Section 5.6 Biological Resources* discusses the regulatory framework of local, State, and federal agencies with respect to special-status species, sensitive natural communities, and wetlands / waterways at or near the project site.

Policy RC-8c – Design public and private projects to minimize damage to the stream environment and to maintain instream flows.

Analysis – While the project does not propose direct modifications to the aquatic habitat of the creeks / drainages that border the site, project implementation would increase peak flows in Sonoma Creek (see *Impact 5.5-4 Increased Surface Runoff*), increase erosion, and impair water quality. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Public Safety Element

Goal PS-1 – Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to risks of damage or injury from earthquakes, landslides and other geologic hazards.

Analysis – Section 5.7 Geology and Soils summarizes the previously prepared geotechnical study and site reconnaissance by the EIR geologist to identify geological hazards present at the project site.

Objective PS-1.2 – Regulate new development to reduce the risks of damage and injury from known geologic hazards to acceptable levels.

Analysis – Mitigation measures presented in **Section 5.7 Geology and Soils** would reduce identified impacts including strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, slope instability, and unstable or expansive soils to less-than-significant levels.

Policy PS-1f – Require review of geologic reports prior to decisions on any project which would subject property or persons to significant risks from the geologic hazards shown on Figures PS-1a through PS-1i and related file maps and source documents. Geologic reports shall describe the hazards and include mitigation measures to reduce risks to acceptable levels. Where appropriate, require an engineer's or geologist's certification that risks have been mitigated to an acceptable level and, if indicated, obtain indemnification or insurance from the engineer, geologist, or developer to minimize County exposure to liability.

Analysis – The EIR geologist conducted a peer review of a previously prepared geotechnical investigation report as described in **Section 5.7 Geology and Soils**. Mitigation Measures 5.7-1 through 5.7-5 would reduce or avoid impacts of identified geological hazards (either existing or those created by project development) to a less-than-significant level.

Goal PS-3.1 – Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to risks of damage or injury from wildland and structural fires.

Analysis – Section 5.10 Public Services discusses impacts associated with fire hazards. There is insufficient fireflow (i.e., water available for fire suppression) serving the project site. Fireflow is constrained by transition of an eight-inch water main from the Glen Ellen Storage Tank to a six-inch line in downtown Glen Ellen. The Glen Ellen Fire Protection District does not anticipate any problems serving the proposed project.

Policy PS-3b – Consider the severity of natural fire hazards, potential damage from wildland and structural fires, adequacy of fire protection and mitigation measures consistent with this element in the review of projects.

Analysis – Mitigation Measure 5.10-2 would require the project applicant to increase fireflow at the site to meet State Codes and National Fire Protection Association guidelines. This may require the construction of on-site water storage, replacement of the six-inch water main (see above) constraining flow, and the use of fire resistant construction materials.

Goal PS-4 – Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to risks of damage or injury from hazardous materials.

Analysis – Section 5.11 Hazardous Materials summarizes soil testing of fill previously placed at the project site for hazardous materials. In addition, the section analyzes the use of hazardous chemicals for building and pool maintenance, landscaping, and other activities related to operation of the *Wolf House Inn*. Recommended mitigation measures, including Best Management Practices and preparation of a long-term Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Policy PS-4a – While maintaining the autonomy granted to it pursuant to State zoning laws, implement State and County requirements for the storage, transport, disposal and use of hazardous materials, including requirements for management plans, security precautions, and contingency plans.

Analysis – See analysis for Goal PS-4 above.

Circulation and Transit Element

Objective CT-1.3 – Require that circulation and transit system improvements be done in a manner which, to the extent practical, minimizes disturbance of the natural environment and reduces air and noise pollution.

Analysis – *Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation* describes improvements (e.g., shoulder-widening) required by the proposed project. The use of Best Management Practices and other mitigation would minimize disturbance of the natural environment and would not result in significant air or noise impacts.

Policy CT-1k – Where practical, locate and design improvements and new circulation and transit facilities to minimize disruption of neighborhoods and communities, disturbance of biotic resource areas, destruction of trees, and noise impacts.

Analysis – Recommended mitigation would minimize the disruption of project related traffic at the North Driveway and Arnold Drive intersection through the provision of a left turn lane for southbound vehicles (see Mitigation Measure 5.2-7). Recommended improvements would not result in noise impacts or substantial disturbance of biological resources.

Objective CT-2.1 – Reduce congestion on the countywide highway system by maintaining a "C" level of service or better on designated arterial and collector roadways unless a lower level of service is shown on Figures CT-2c and CT-2d on pages 289 - 291, a lower level of service is determined to be acceptable due to environmental or community values existing in some portions of the County, or the project(s) which would cause the lower level of service has an overriding public benefit which outweighs the increased congestion that would result.

Analysis – *Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation* (see **Exhibit 5.2-8**) shows that all analyzed intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service (i.e., C or better) during the weekday AM and PM peak traffic hours. Project-related traffic would not result in significant impacts at any intersection in the near-term (i.e., through 2010). Although buildout of the proposed General Plan 2020 Update would result in an unacceptable level of service at the Arnold Drive London Ranch Road intersection, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact.

Objective CT-2.2 – Correlate new development with roadway improvements necessary to maintain the countywide levels of service set forth in Objective CT-2.1 or better on arterial and collector roadways as is more fully explained in policy CT-2b.

Analysis – The project could be required to pay a fair share contribution for shoulder widening along Arnold Drive as well as provide a left turn lane to improve safety conditions and traffic circulation. See analysis under Objective CT-2.1 above for a description of impacts to level of service standards on County roadways.

Policy CT-2a – Use the levels of service shown on Figures CT-2c and CT-2d on pages 289 -291 to determine whether or not congestion is exceeding the desired level of service on the countywide

highway system. Use area and / or project traffic analyses to determine whether intersection impacts or other localized congestion may also affect these desired levels of service.

Analysis – See analysis under Objective CT-2.1 above for a description of impacts to level of service standards on County roadways.

Policy CT-2b – Assure that new development occurs only when a funding mechanism is available for improvements needed to achieve these levels of service specified in CT-2a above. If the Board determines that a project will provide significant overriding public benefit, the project may be exempt from this requirement.

Analysis – The project would have a standard condition requiring a fair share contribution for construction of improvements triggered by traffic generated by this project, if any.

Policy CT-2e – Primary responsibility for funding intersection, right-of-way, and other needed localized improvements not identified as part of the countywide highway system belongs to individual projects.

Analysis – The applicant would be required to provide a left turn lane for south bound traffic at the project access driveway.

Policy CT-2k – The County may require correction of potential safety deficiencies (inadequate road width, lack of traffic control devices, intersection alignment) prior to, or as part of, project approval.

Analysis – *Impact 5.2-4 Insufficient Roadway Width Along Arnold Drive and 5.2-7 Provision of Safe Roadways – Driveways and Driveway Sight Lines* identifies deficiencies in existing conditions such as sightlines from site access driveways and insufficient shoulder width. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Policy CT-2y – Secondary arterials are highways that carry lower traffic volumes than primary arterials or cover shorter distances. Within urban areas, these highways may connect large-scale traffic generators and carry more local traffic. The following design standards and those included in Table CT-3 apply to secondary arterials.

1. the needed number of travel lanes is indicated on Figures CT-6a through 6i;
2. Allow access from abutting parcels if it does not interfere with the traffic function of the highway. Encourage consolidation of driveways;
3. Provide continuous left turn lanes in urban areas. Where practical, provide turning lanes at intersections with other arterial and collector highways. Signals shall favor the arterial; and
4. Within urban service areas, consider requiring urban improvement standards.

Analysis

1. Arnold Drive would remain a two lane secondary arterial according to the *1989 General Plan*.
2. The project driveway onto Arnold Drive is an existing drive and improvements are planned which should reduce its impact on traffic flow on Arnold Drive.

3. A continuous left turn lane would not be required. Even though the site is within an Urban Service Area it is not a truly urbanized area. A left turn pocket would be required for south bound traffic entering the project site.
4. Although the project site is within an Urban Service Area the *1989 General Plan* does not indicate that Arnold Drive needs major work to function at its current level. Improving Arnold Drive in this area to urban standards would have a negative impact on the rural character of the area.

Policy CT-13f – Require developers of proposed projects to install or finance a portion of the costs of off-site improvements needed to accommodate project generated traffic and maintain acceptable levels of service on area roadways.

Analysis – The applicant could be required to improve Arnold Drive between the project site and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder Widening Project at Hill Road as well as for the cost of providing a left turn lane for south bound traffic at the project access driveway.

Noise Element

Objective NE-1.3 – Protect the present noise environment and prevent intrusion of new noise sources that would substantially alter the noise environment.

Analysis – *Section 5.3 Noise* describes the existing acoustic environment and evaluates both the impact of existing noise sources (i.e., primarily vehicles on Arnold Drive) to the proposed project as well as noise impacts resulting from project implementation (i.e., noise from construction and future operation of the *Wolf House Inn*).

Objective NE-1.4 – Mitigate noise from recreational and tourist serving uses.

Analysis – *Section 5.3 Noise* identifies noise impacts as well as required mitigation as described below in the analysis of Policy NE-1c.

Policy NE-1c – Control non-transportation related noise from new projects. The total noise level resulting from new sources and ambient noise shall not exceed the standards in Table NE-2 as measured at the exterior property line of any affected residential land uses. (Note: certain exceptions are listed in this policy).

Analysis – As described in *Section 5.3 Noise*, noise generated by *Wolf House Inn* rooftop equipment as well as guests and residents using the proposed swimming holes would result in an adverse impact to an existing residence immediately north of the project site. Mitigation Measures 5.3-2(a) and 5.3-2(b) would call for appropriate measures (e.g., the installation of a sound wall) to reduce these impacts. In addition, *Impact 5.3-4 Construction Noise and Vibration* describes construction noise impacts and includes appropriate measures to reduce construction noise impacts.

Policy NE-1m – Consider requiring the monitoring of noise levels for discretionary projects to determine if noise levels are in compliance with required standards. The cost of monitoring shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

Analysis – *Section 5.3 Noise* presents noise analyses prepared as part of this EIR that evaluate noise impacts including construction noise and land use compatibility issues.

4.2 NORTH SONOMA VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

The project site is located within the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan* area. The *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan (Specific Plan)* ¹⁰ was adopted in 1981. ¹¹ The *Specific Plan* describes both the natural and the cultural characteristics of the study area, as they existed at the time the plan was prepared. The *Specific Plan* establishes goals and policies, a land use plan, and an open space plan for the study area based on the conditions, issues, and values of the community as they existed at the time of preparation. ¹²

The *1989 General Plan* includes Policy LU-1a which states that certain “plans” shall be repealed, but development guidelines contained in the plans shall be reviewed and updated and considered for adoption as “local area development guidelines”, provided that they are consistent with the *General Plan*. The policy goes on to state that until such a time that these guidelines are adopted, any policies contained in these plans shall continue to apply provided they are consistent with the *General Plan*. Included in the list of plans to be repealed is the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*. To date, the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan* has not been repealed and “local area development guidelines” have not been adopted. The following information from the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan* is consistent with the *General Plan*.

The project site is within the unincorporated community of Glen Ellen and the *Specific Plan* land use designation for the *Wolf House Inn* site is “Unincorporated Community”. ¹³ This land use designation includes small central business districts and related industrial, recreational, and residential land uses. ¹⁴

Goal A of the *Specific Plan* is to “provide for the safe and efficient travel of citizens and movement of goods without disturbing the quality of the area”.

Policy 1 of this goal states that “peak hour traffic should not exceed “D” service level on Highway 12 or Arnold Drive, and “C” service level on other roadways.

Goal D of the *Specific Plan* is to “maintain or enhance existing views from Highway 12, other roads, residences and work places”.

Goal E of the *Specific Plan* is to “preserve and enhance existing scenic and historic resources while acknowledging their regional and national importance”.

¹⁰ *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*, adopted by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors on January 5, 1981.

¹¹ The *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan* has not been updated since adoption of the *1989 Sonoma County General Plan*.

¹² The Board of Supervisors appointed a Citizen’s Advisory Committee in April 1980 to provide a formal mechanism for citizen involvement in the preparation of the *Specific Plan*. The Committee held six public meetings between April and September 1980. *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*, page 2-3.

¹³ The *Specific Plan*’s land use map designations have not been updated since adoption of the *1989 General Plan*.

¹⁴ *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*, page 6-8.

Policy 2 of this goal states “limit moderate sized tourist facilities (50-100 guests) to sites in existing communities served by roads with adequate capacity”.

Policy 3 of this goal states “prohibit large new tourist facilities or events, and theme facilities unrelated to valley resources”.

Goal I of the *Specific Plan* is to “develop a hiking trails network between the public lands in the valley.

Map 7-1¹⁵ is a conceptual schematic diagram to reflect the basic concept of a hiking trail network included in Goal I. Arnold Drive adjacent to the *Wolf House Inn* project is designated as a “master planned bike corridor”.

The *Specific Plan*’s Open Space Plan designates portions of the project site as; major riparian corridor, 100-year flood area, and high archaeological sensitivity area.

Specific Plan Analysis

Below is an assessment of the conformance of the *Wolf House Inn* project with the *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*.

The proposed project does not appear to conflict with Goal A and Policy 1. Project implementation would not cause any studied intersections to operate at an unacceptable level of service in the near-term (i.e., through 2010). In addition, while buildout of the proposed General Plan 2020 Update would result in an unacceptable level of service at the Arnold Drive / London Ranch Road intersection, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact. Required mitigation would improve safety conditions associated with site access and vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle travel on Arnold Drive.

The proposed project appears to conflict with Goal D as its scale and proximity to Arnold Drive would result in a significant visual impact at one of the two viewpoints studied in **Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality**. Recommended mitigation would require additional vegetative screening along the project’s frontage with Arnold Drive.

While the proposed project would result in a visual impact as described above, it does not appear to conflict with Goal E to preserve historic resources. The project would not alter or degrade existing historic buildings in Jack London Village. As discussed in **Section 3.2 Proposed Project**, two objectives of the project would be to (1) enhance the character of Glen Ellen and provide unique visitor accommodations near the town center; and (2) design a project that respects the historically significant buildings in the adjacent village complex as well as the historic buildings of Glen Ellen.

The project does not appear to conflict with Policy 2 of Goal E as the project would be located in an existing commercial center within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area and served by roads with adequate capacity. While the term “large” is subjective, the project does not appear to conflict with Policy 3 of Goal E as it would be related to valley resources; specifically a connection to the existing commercial uses at Jack London Village and the intent to provide a “wine country experience”.

¹⁵ *North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan*, page 7-5.

The proposed project does not appear to conflict with Goal I. While the project site is limited in its ability to provide trail connections between public lands, recommended mitigation would widen the shoulders of Arnold Drive along its frontage with the project and improve safety for bicycles and pedestrians traveling from downtown Glen Ellen to the trailhead at Sonoma Valley Regional Park, less than one-half mile south of the project site.

4.3 GLEN ELLEN DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

The *Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines)* were adopted in 1990.¹⁶ The *Design Guidelines* establish Subareas I and II. The *Wolf House Inn* project site is within Subarea I. Within Subarea I applications for exterior building permit, discretionary permits, and projects subject to administrative design review are subject to the *Design Guidelines*.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following general goals and objectives are intended to guide design and development in the Glen Ellen area.

- A. MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE GLEN ELLEN'S UNIQUE AND SMALL TOWN CHARACTER.
 - A.1. Ensure that the size, scale, and intensity of all developments are consistent and compatible with the character of Glen Ellen.
 - A.2. Require that the capacities of public services are adequate to accommodate proposed land uses and to maintain an acceptable level of service.
 - A.3. Ensure that the design and siting of structures are compatible with the scenic qualities, planned infrastructure improvements, and the local development guidelines of Glen Ellen.
 - A.4. Preserve and enhance the distinct character of the north entrance area and the north residential neighborhood.
 - A.5. Maintain the various architectural styles and the mix of commercial and residential uses characteristic of the town center.
 - A.6. Retain the single-family residential character of the south residential neighborhood.
 - A.7. Retain the picturesque quality of the south entrance area characterized by the old truss bridge and rural grasslands.

Analysis – Section 5.1 Land Use evaluates the projects overall compatibility with existing land uses near the project site as well as Glen Ellen's rural character. Site development would result in less-than significant impacts to rural character, although short-term noise impacts would occur during project construction. **Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality** evaluates the project's compatibility with

¹⁶ *Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines*, adopted by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, November 14, 1990.

existing visual character (i.e., size, scale, intensity, and architectural elements) of the area as well as impacts to identified scenic resources. The project appears to conflict with goals to preserve scenic qualities, as site development would result in significant visual impacts associated with views from Arnold Drive and the addition of new sources of glare and nighttime lighting. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project does not appear to conflict with policies designed to preserve the north and south entrance areas and the north and south residential neighborhoods. The project site is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area in which public services (e.g., wastewater and water supply) are available.

B. PROVIDE SAFE AND FUNCTIONAL CIRCULATION FOR PEDESTRIANS, BICYCLISTS AND VEHICLES.

B.1. Minimize pedestrian-vehicular-bicycle conflicts and hazards in the design of new or upgraded developments and improvements.

B.2. Integrate pedestrian and bicycle pathways in the design of vehicular circulation systems.

B.3. Provide means to service commercial uses without disrupting circulation.

B.4. Ensure safe and convenient pedestrian, vehicular, and bicycling access to neighboring recreational areas.

Analysis – The project appears to conflict with polices to minimize pedestrian-vehicular-bicycle conflicts. *Impact 5.2-4 Insufficient Roadway Width along Arnold Drive* (see **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**) identifies deficiencies on Arnold Drive between the project site and central Glen Ellen. A gap with insufficient roadway width to accommodate safely bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles would occur between the project site and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder Widening Project at Hill Road, a distance of approximately 0.2 mile. Mitigation Measure 5.2-4(a) would require shoulder widening along the project frontage. Mitigation Measure 5.2-4(b) would require the applicant to improve Arnold Drive between the project site and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder-Widening Project.

C. MANAGE, PRESERVE AND ENHANCE GLEN ELLEN'S NATURAL QUALITIES AND RESOURCES

C.1. Protect and enhance creeks and riparian corridors.

C.2. Minimize disturbance of slopes and avoid practices that contribute to erosion.

D. MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE GLEN ELLEN'S PRESENT IMAGE AND AESTHETIC CHARACTER.

Analysis – *Sections 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality* and *5.6 Biological Resources* address impacts to creeks and riparian corridors from erosion and other aspects of project implementation. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce all identified impacts to creeks and riparian corridors to a less-than-significant level.

D.1. Preserve and enhance significant views and vistas.

- D.2. Continue to use established patterns of physical development such as lot widths, setbacks, massing, relationship to the street, auxiliary structures, semi-private spaces, entrances and approaches etc.
- D.3. Site and mass buildings in a manner that acknowledges and accentuates Glen Ellen's topographical features.
- D.4. Use forms and materials which are harmonious with the natural environment.
- D.5. Provide a subtle, understated visual sense of arrival to the town and the town center.
- D.6. Preserve and enhance important historic places structures and artifacts.

Analysis – As described above, *Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality* evaluates the project's compatibility with existing visual character (i.e., size, scale, intensity, and architectural elements) of the area as well as impacts to identified scenic resources. The project appears to conflict with goals to preserve scenic qualities, as site development would result in significant visual impacts associated with views from Arnold Drive and the addition of new sources of glare and nighttime lighting. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project does not appear to conflict with policies to preserve historical resources present in Jack London Village. *Section 4.4 Zoning* describes consistency with "established patterns of physical development".

TOWN DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

A. LAND USE

Policies listed in this section are intended to maintain and enhance Glen Ellen's small town character. These policies address land use throughout the town of Glen Ellen, and within the five distinct areas described in Section II: Areas of Glen Ellen.

POLICIES ON LAND USE

1. Land use for the Glen Ellen area, including residential densities, should correspond with the General Plan Land Use Element for Sonoma Valley.
2. Use the General Plan particularly the Open Space and Resource Conservation Elements to guide development along scenic and riparian corridors and other designated open space areas.
3. Maintain the designated community separators between Northeast Santa Rosa and Kenwood and Glen Ellen and Agua Caliente / Boyes Hot Springs.
4. Maintain the existing sewer district boundary except where sewer service is required to correct a documented health hazard in an area adjacent to the district's sphere of influence boundary or as otherwise provided by the General Plan Public Safety Element.
5. The "Limited Commercial" land use designation is intended to accommodate retail sales and services for the daily self sufficiency of local communities. Ensure that the intensity of limited commercial development is compatible with the character of the area.

6. Continue to allow integration of residential and commercial uses along Arnold Drive consistent with the policies of the General Plan. Proposals for mixed developments should consider residential use as secondary and allowed only in conjunction with and compatible with the commercial use.
7. Encourage commercial uses and activities in the town center at street level along Arnold Drive except where in conflict with public open spaces or where development would occur within a floodplain.
8. All development shall be subject to a traffic mitigation fee to finance roadway facilities and improvements in accordance with the General Plan.
9. All development within the 100-year floodplain should conform to applicable policies of the General Plan.

Analysis – The project would require a general plan amendment to revise the land use designation of the project site from Limited Commercial to General Commercial as well as include a definition of *condominium hotel* as a permitted use. The project does not appear to conflict with established community separators nor require an extension of the existing Urban Service Boundary. The project site is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area. The project would be subject to a traffic mitigation fee to finance roadway facilities and improvements in accordance with the General Plan. The project would locate the *Wolf House Inn* structure outside of the 100-Year Flood Hazard Area, although the proposed “creek walk” and other elements of the project would be located within this area. Recommended mitigation measures in **Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality** would reduce identified impacts to a less-than significant level.

B. CIRCULATION

Access to Glen Ellen is along State Highway 12 and Arnold Drive from the north and along Arnold Drive from the south. Jack London State Park and the Glen Ellen Winery are located to the west of the town; the Sonoma Developmental Center is located to the south. Arnold Drive provides the primary access to these properties.

Given its location relative to these facilities and development activity in the area, Glen Ellen has experienced increased traffic congestion, traffic safety problems, and insufficient parking. Solutions to these problems are crucial to ensure that the quality of life in the community is enhanced and not threatened. The policies and guidelines established herein are based on the following:

Scenic Value/ Sense of Entry:

Entry into Glen Ellen is usually from Highway 12, a State Scenic Highway and a designated Scenic Corridor in the General Plan. Arrival into town should continue to reflect the natural setting characteristic of the Sonoma Valley. Understated gateways are desirable to maintain the inconspicuous nature of the community.

Need for Bike Lanes:

Glen Ellen has become popular for bicycling among both tourists and local residents. A primary goal of the local guidelines is to provide convenient access through town while minimizing vehicular-bicycle conflicts. Development of bike lanes in accordance with Figure OS-4b and policies

established by the General Plan is of high priority (refer to Goal OS-8, Objective OS-8.1 and policies OS-8a through i).

Pedestrian Activity:

Glen Ellen's small town way of life encourages pedestrian activity. Due to the proximity of residences to other uses and services, safe pedestrian movement is vital to the town. A primary goal of the local guidelines is to provide for safe pedestrian movement.

POLICIES ON CIRCULATION

1. Minimize on-street parking through project design and circulation improvements.
2. Coordinate with the Department of Public Works to stripe or place crosswalks at key intersections to ensure safe pedestrian movement where necessary.
3. Locate bicycle and pedestrian paths to connect residential commercial and recreational areas in a safe and efficient manner.

Analysis – As previously described, the project appears to conflict with policies to minimize pedestrian-vehicular-bicycle conflicts. *Impact 5.2-4 Insufficient Roadway Width Along Arnold Drive* (see **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**) identifies deficiencies on Arnold Drive between the project site and central Glen Ellen. In addition, existing on-street parking at Jack London Village represents an existing safety hazard. Project development would reduce the number of on-street parking spaces and improve safety along the Jack London Village frontage with Arnold Drive. The project includes mitigation measures to provide shoulder improvements from the project north to the terminus of the County's shoulder widening project (0.2 of a mile). With implementation of recommended mitigation measures the project will not conflict with these policies.

C. OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS

Glen Ellen's character can be attributed largely to the town's natural setting along Sonoma Creek and its tributaries, the eastern slopes of Sonoma Mountains, and the adjacent hillsides. Living in close proximity to this natural environment contributes significantly to the quality of life for residents of Glen Ellen. The following policies seek to enhance and preserve Glen Ellen's natural environment and to provide access to it.

POLICIES ON OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL SYSTEMS

1. Consider providing areas for passive and active recreation in commercial developments.
2. Encourage informal opportunities for recreation throughout the Glen Ellen area.
3. Provide pedestrian and bicycle access to neighboring regional and State parks where feasible.
4. On discretionary projects, encourage access to open spaces and natural areas such as riparian corridors where practical.
5. Retain existing riparian vegetation along stream and creek corridors in accordance with the General Plan Open Space Element.

6. On discretionary projects, use native or compatible non-native plant species to the extent possible for landscaping.
7. Minimize the disturbance of hillsides by regrading.
8. Encourage public open space areas in the design of projects in or near the town center.

Analysis – The project does not appear to conflict with identified policies to preserve open space and natural systems. The proposed “creek walk” would create an opportunity for informal gathering of visitors to Jack London Village along Sonoma Creek. Although the project would not provide access to recreational areas, established access to Sonoma Valley Regional Park lies just south of Jack London Village and visitors / residents would have ample opportunity for recreation. Recommended mitigation measures in **Section 5.6 Biological Resources** would retain existing riparian vegetation and require the use of native vegetation in project landscaping.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

The following design guidelines strive to maintain and enhance Glen Ellen's small town way of life, rural character and scenic charm. They encourage the use of forms and materials that are human in scale and allow expression of Glen Ellen's sense of community.

Boundaries and Entrances

(Items 1,3, and 8 omitted)

2. At commercial frontages, concrete pads at entries should be used to accommodate pedestrian use. Widths should be sufficient to allow for entry and safe passage. Widths should be compatible with roof overhangs, porticos, and awnings to provide pleasant spaces for informal gathering and socializing.
4. New fences, walls, and gates made of indigenous materials such as wood and stone are recommended. Plant materials should take the place of fences where possible.
5. Neighborly gathering should be encouraged by creating semi-private spaces such as porches, patios and gardens near the street.
6. Entrances, driveways and property lines should not detract from the visual character of the open, natural landscape of the south residential and south entrance areas.
7. Fencing should be permitted along private lot lines on Arnold Drive. Chain link fencing should be discouraged; ornamental fencing is preferred.

Analysis – The project’s proposed entry would provide safe access and passage to / from the *Wolf House Inn*. The project would employ extensive vegetation to screen the *Wolf House Inn* from view along Arnold Drive.

Public Amenities

1. Benches should be provided in areas where socializing and informal gathering are encouraged, including the transit stop at Arnold Drive and Carquinez Avenue, the London Lodge Restaurant

& Bar, Shone's Country Store, public open space areas, and along Sonoma Creek. Standard wood benches are preferred; ornamental benches should be discouraged.

2. Trash receptacles should be conveniently located in areas where public sitting and socializing are common. Receptacles should be simple and similar in design; wood materials are preferred.

Analysis – It is unknown whether the project would include benches or trash receptacles along the proposed "creek walk".

Walkways

1. Concrete paving should be encouraged along commercial building frontages in the town center.
2. Specialty paving such as cobblestone, brick and wood should be encouraged at public and private spaces to introduce variety. Paving should not be stylish, but should resemble existing character and form.
3. Ramps along pedestrian paths are preferred over steps in areas of steep gradient change.
4. Pedestrian walkways having slopes less than eight percent are recommended.

Analysis – The project proposes the construction of a "creek walk" along its frontage with Sonoma Creek. The path would be relatively flat. The path would mostly serve residents and guests of the *Wolf House Inn* and Jack London Village.

Bollards

1. Bollards should be installed where hazards exist with vehicular-pedestrian circulation.
2. Bollards should resemble the existing 3' wood hitch post in the town center.
3. Ornamental bollards should be discouraged.

Analysis – The project does not propose the use of bollards. Recommended mitigation measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety on Arnold Drive do not propose the use of bollards.

Setbacks and Building Placement

1. Views of ridgetops, natural systems, and grasslands should be preserved as parcels are developed.
2. Setbacks should be maintained in accordance with current zoning and the General Plan Open Space Element in order to preserve views of distant ridgelines and to protect riparian corridors. Variances from required setbacks should be avoided.
3. Most commercial development in the town center along Arnold Drive lies close to the road. This pattern encourages pedestrian and community activity along the street, contributes to Glen Ellen's village atmosphere, and creates a distinctive environment announcing the town center. New commercial development in this area should maintain this setback adjacent to Arnold Drive where possible and not conflict with circulation patterns.
4. Hilltop and ridgeline siting of homes and structures shall conform to applicable requirements set forth in the General Plan Open Space Element.

Analysis – The project’s height and proximity to Arnold Drive would obscure existing views of Sonoma Creek and the Mayacamas from Arnold Drive as discussed in *Impact 5.8-2 View from Northbound Arnold Drive at Jack London Village*. Consistency with setbacks required by the Zoning Code is discussed below in **Section 4.4 Zoning**. Recommended mitigation measures (e.g., the provision of a left turn lane and realignment of proposed driveways) in **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation** would reduce the project’s impact to circulation on Arnold Drive to a less-than-significant level. The project site is not located on a ridgeline or hilltop.

Elevations

1. The mass of new structures should be softened by landscaping or lessened by small-scale elements such as windows panels, entrances, and other detail features to avoid monotony in design.
2. Features such as garage doors and windowless facade should be minimized along Arnold Drive. The visual impact of garages may be reduced by orientation away from the street or by screening with native vegetation.
3. Breaks in street frontage provide opportunities for visual connections with Glen Ellen's natural surroundings and maintain the traditional rhythm of development. This separation between buildings should be incorporated into new development.
4. The height of new structures in the town center should not exceed two stories above street level.
5. New structures visible from Arnold Drive in the north and south entrance areas should not exceed two stories in height. Excavation and use of dormers may be appropriate to create additional living space.

Analysis – Exhibit 3.0-8 illustrates proposed elevations of the project. As shown, the project would be fronted by landscaping and does not propose either garage doors or windowless facades. Although the proposed building would be three stories in height, one floor would be below the existing grade and the proposed building height would meet County-zoning requirements. However, the project’s height and proximity to Arnold Drive would obscure existing views of Sonoma Creek and the Mayacamas from Arnold Drive as discussed in *Impact 5.8-2 View from Northbound Arnold Drive at Jack London Village*.

Building Materials and Construction

1. Simple hip and gable roofs predominate in the area and should be encouraged for new structures. Flat roofs should be strongly discouraged.
2. The exterior color of buildings should generally resemble the existing natural environment in hue and value.
3. Indigenous materials such as wood and stone should be used for exterior finishes. Stucco and structural brick found in the town center are also recommended. Other materials such as aluminum siding and brick veneers should not be recommended.
4. Window and door frames should be at least 1" wide and of a traditional scale. Narrow, silver aluminum frames should be discouraged.

5. Evidence of the craftsmanship which contributes to Glen Ellen's historic, intimate, and cared for character should be encouraged.
6. Contemporary art and sculpture, particularly by Glen Ellen residents, should be incorporated with new development to enhance the town's unique character.

(Items 7 and 8 omitted)

Analysis – Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality explains the proposed modern styling of the *Wolf House Inn* building would borrow architectural elements from the existing buildings at Jack London Village using wood, stone, concrete, and glass. Proposed colors would resemble the natural environment and the proposed roof would not be flat. The building's orientation and horizontal roofline would be a visual continuation of, and consistent with that of the existing Jack London Village. The project does not propose to include contemporary art or sculpture.

Parking / Circulation

1. Parking for commercial areas should have minimal frontage on Arnold Drive and should be located behind buildings whenever possible.
2. Development should provide on-site parking according to existing County standards. Any waiver from these requirements should be only for demonstrated public benefit.
3. Service parking areas should be avoided at building fronts wherever possible, and should not interrupt vehicular or pedestrian traffic.
4. Servicing should be accommodated at the rear of commercial and retail buildings. Where rear service entries are not provided, parking areas should be designated for service use during a specified time.
5. Continuous pedestrian paths should be provided on both sides of Arnold Drive from the fire station south through the town center to the extent possible.
6. Pedestrian / bicycle access should be established between the town center and Sonoma Valley Regional Park, to the extent practical.

Analysis – Impacts 5.2-5 Parking Safety on Arnold Drive, 5.2-6 Consistency with County Standards for Parking Lot Dimensions, 5.2-9 Parking Supply and 5.2-10 Event Parking Supply address the adequacy of parking supply at the project site. Recommend mitigation would reduce the current amount of parking on Arnold Drive and redesign parking lot and loading dock dimensions consistent with County requirements. Recommended mitigation would also require the applicant to complete shoulder-widening of Arnold Drive to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Landscaping

1. New landscaping along Arnold Drive should be compatible with the existing vegetation in the various areas of Glen Ellen.
2. Tree planting should be encouraged on private residential lots. Formal street tree planting along public rights of way should be discouraged. Large native canopy trees should be encouraged,

providing overhang onto public rights of way. Where public spaces / private open spaces exist, informal tree planting should be encouraged.

3. Where unpleasant views of private lots are present or where uses are incompatible, buffer planting using informal massing of native trees and shrubs should be encouraged.
4. Where development occurs close to the roadside, adequate screening using native plant massing similar to the existing landscaping should be provided.
5. Existing healthy plant material, including trees, should be preserved to the extent possible where on-street parking occurs.

Analysis – *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* evaluates the *Preliminary Landscape Plan* (see **Exhibit 3.0-9**) submitted by the project applicant. Recommended mitigation would require the use of native plants in project landscaping and the retention of existing native vegetation. In addition, *Impact 5.8-2 View from Northbound Arnold Drive at Jack London Village* determined the project would have a significant visual impact due to the projects proximity to Arnold Drive. Mitigation Measure 5.8-2 would call for the use of additional native plants and trees in project landscaping to screen the project from view on Arnold Drive.

Lighting

1. Pedestrian lighting should not be placed in regular patterns. Lighting for pedestrian paths should be incorporated into building facades where possible.
2. Lighting for walks and parking areas should be small in scale and used to illuminate signs, displays and pedestrian paths. High intensity lighting in parking lots and along roadsides should be discouraged.
3. Historical or ornamental lighting should be encouraged.

Analysis – *Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality* addresses nighttime lighting. As the project applicant did not submit a detailed Lighting Plan, thorough evaluation of the proposed outdoor lighting cannot be completed at this time. The intended extent of lighting for the *Wolf House Inn* would be low-level ground and path lighting.¹⁷ The project would introduce additional sources of both daytime glare and nighttime lighting that could result in light trespass that would adversely affect nearby residences, vehicles traveling along Arnold Drive and biological resources of Sonoma Creek. Recommended mitigation would reduce identified impacts to a less-than-significant level.

4.4 ZONING

The *Wolf House Inn* project site contains four zoning districts – Planned Community (PC), Scenic Resources (SR), Secondary Floodplain (F2), and Biotic Resources (BR). The SR zone covers 30 percent of the project site depth from Arnold Drive, the F2 zone covers that portion of the project site that is within the 100-year flood hazard zone and the BR zone extends 50 feet from the top of the bank of Sonoma Creek.

¹⁷ Nichols • Berman communication with John Pflueger, *Wolf House Inn* Architect and Project Applicant, August 2007.

CONFORMANCE WITH SONOMA COUNTY ZONING

Below is a discussion of those aspects of the *Wolf House Inn* with possible conflicts with the *Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance*.

ARTICLE 26 – PC – PLANNED COMMUNITY DISTRICT

Sec. 26-26-060. Residential density, building intensity and development criteria.

The use of land and structures within this district is subject to this article, the applicable regulations of this chapter, and the provisions of any district which is combined herewith. Policies and criteria of the general plan and any applicable specific or area plan or local area development guidelines shall supersede the standards herein.

- (a) Omitted (Residential Density Requirement)
- (b) Building Intensity. The maximum building intensity of the use of a site for lands in commercial land use categories shall be determined by multiplying the maximum building height limit and the maximum lot coverage. The specified height or lot coverage limits may be modified if a use permit is first secured and if the maximum building intensity is not exceeded.
- (c) Maximum Building Height.
 - (1) Thirty-five feet (35') subject to Section 26-26-060(b);
- (d) Minimum Lot Size. Six thousand (6,000) square feet or as indicated on the approved precise development plan.
- (e) Maximum Lot Coverage.
 - (1) Percentage. Thirty-five percent (35%) or as indicated on the approved precise development plan; provided, however, that for a mixed commercial and residential development, pursuant to Section 26-26-040(e), the maximum lot coverage shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) subject to subsection (b) of this section. Lot coverage limitation may be waived by the planning director for swimming pools. (Ord. No. 3932.)
 - (2) Building Mass. Whereas this section permits, in effect, single-family dwellings with no side yards between, there shall be no more than six (6) dwelling units nor a length of more than one hundred fifty feet (150'), whichever is less, in any contiguous group or in any one building, unless specifically approved otherwise by the Sonoma County Planning Commission.
- (f) Yard Requirements. The following shall apply except that if the subject property adjoins land which is zoned AR or is designated as agricultural land, the use is subject to the requirements of Section 26-88-040(g).
 - (1) Front Yard Required. Twenty feet (20') or as shown on the approved precise development plan, provided that no garage opening may be located closer than twenty feet (20') from any road, right-of-way or common driveway. A variation in setbacks shall be encouraged.

- (2) Side or Rear Yards Required. As required by Article 20 or as indicated on the approved precise development plan, provided that at least ten feet (10') must be maintained between all detached buildings.
- (3) Special Yards Required for Dwelling Groups. According to the provisions of Section 26-24-030(i).

(g) Parking Requirements.

- (1) Residential. Garage space or parking space.
 - (i) Not less than (1) covered off-street parking space per dwelling unit. The requirements for covered parking may be waived for single-family dwellings if the lot on which the dwelling is to be placed is of such size, shape or location that the areas devoted to automobile parking will be visually screened from adjacent lots and from the common roadway(s) serving the property, provided that site plan approval in accordance with Article 82 is first secured.
 - (ii) Multifamily Dwellings and Dwelling Groups. One (1) uncovered guest parking space per dwelling unit.
- (2) Any other use shall provide parking in accordance with the standards in Article 86. (Ord. No. 4973 § 7(f), 1996; Ord. No. 4839 § 1(E), 1994; Ord. No. 4643, 1993.)

Analysis – Maximum lot coverage for the 2.5-acre (approximately 108,900 square feet) project site for a commercial project would be 38,115 square feet. At a maximum building height of 35 feet the maximum building intensity would be 1,334,025 cubic feet (38,115 square feet times 35 feet). The building intensity of the proposed structure is 549,150 cubic feet (15,690 square foot footprint times 35 feet) which would be less than the maximum. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with the building intensity for the PC zoning district.

Adequacy of proposed parking facilities is addressed in *Impacts 5.2-9 Parking Supply* and *5.2-10 Event Parking Supply*. Identified impacts related to inadequate parking supply would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

ARTICLE 58 – F2 – FLOODPLAIN COMBINING DISTRICT

Section 26-58-005 Purpose

The purpose of the F2 district is to provide for the protection from hazards and damage that may result from floodwaters.

Section 26-58-010 Location and Boundaries

The F2 district applies to properties that lie within the 100-year flood hazard area as shown on the most recent FEMA maps and accompanying report.

Section 26-58-020 Uses within Floodplain and 26-58-030 Development Standards

All uses allowed within the base district with which this district is combined shall be permitted subject to the provisions of Section 26-58-030. Section 26-58-030 provides that in combining the F2 district

with one or more other zoning district, new residential, commercial, and industrial structures will be permitted, if designed, constructed and utilized so that appreciable damage will not occur from the selected flood and provided that such structures comply with the flood protection regulations established in Chapter 7B (Flood Damage Prevention) of the Sonoma County Code.

Analysis – The 100-year flood plain of Sonoma Creek is estimated at elevations ranging between 206 and 210 along the eastern boundary of the project site. According to the *Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan* (see **Exhibit 3.0-11**) provided by the applicant, the ground level of the proposed inn would be placed at 215 feet above sea level. The proposed ground floor elevation of the inn and the setbacks to the creek satisfy the requirements of the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Chapter 7B) of the Sonoma County Code. Construction of the “creek walk” would likely require land clearing and grading directly adjacent to and / or within the 100-year Flood Hazard Area. Recommended mitigation would reduce associated impacts to a less-than-significant level.

ARTICLE 64 – SR – SCENIC RESOURCES COMBINING DISTRICT

Section 26-42-005 Purpose

The purpose of the SR Combining District is to preserve the visual character and scenic resources of lands in the county and to implement the provisions of Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the *1989 General Plan* Open Space Element.

Section 26-64-010 Development Criteria

Maximum building heights, minimum lot areas and lot widths, yard requirements and maximum percentages of lot coverage shall comply with the requirements for the districts with which the SR regulations are combined unless otherwise provided for in the zoning code.

Analysis – Development criteria for the project site zoning designation are discussed above in the Article 26 – PC – Planned Community District section. The SR zoning overlay would not apply additional criteria.

Section 26-64-030 Scenic Corridors

The following provisions shall apply to properties along scenic corridors illustrated on Figures OS-5a through OS-5i, inclusive, of the *1989 General Plan* Open Space Element unless otherwise provided herein:

All structures located within scenic corridors established outside of the urban service area boundaries shown on Figures LU-5a through LU-5i, inclusive, of the *1989 General Plan* Land Use Element, shall be subject to the setbacks of thirty percent (30%) of the depth of the lot to a maximum of two hundred feet (200') from the centerline of the road. Development within the setback shall be prohibited with the following exceptions, where such uses are allowed by the base district with which this district is combined:

New barns and similar agricultural support structures which are added to existing farm complexes provided that such structures proposed within a state scenic highway or where local design review exists by community choice in an adopted specific or area plan are subject to design review;

New barns and similar agricultural support structures which do not require a use permit in this chapter; provided, however, that such structures proposed within a State Scenic Highway or where local design review exists by community choice in an adopted specific or area plan are subject to design review;

Maintenance, restoration, reconstruction or minor expansion of existing structures;

Certain telecommunication facilities as provided in Section 26-64-040;

Other new structures provided they are subject to design review and

They are associated with existing structures,
There is no other reasonable location for the structure,
The location within the setback is necessary for the use, or
Existing vegetation and topography screen the use;
Compliance with the setback would render the parcel unbuildable; and
Satellite dishes that are not visible from the roadway.

Where the Scenic Corridor setback provided for in Section 26-64-030(a), conflicts with the Scenic Corridor Setback along Highway 12 established by Ordinance 1810, the latter shall apply.

(Additional provisions not relative to the project site are omitted.)

Analysis – The project site is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area. Accordingly, the project would be exempt from the required setback of 30 percent of the depth of the lot to a maximum of two hundred feet (200') from the centerline of the road. The project would be subject to design review by the County and the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Committee. **Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality** notes that the project's scale and proximity to Arnold Drive would result in a significant visual impact from one of the study viewpoints. Recommended mitigation (i.e., additional vegetative screening would reduce identified impacts to a less-than significant level. **Section 4.3 Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines** evaluates consistency with adopted design guidelines for the Community of Glen Ellen.

Section 26-64-050 Design Review Approval

All plans for land divisions or development projects shall be reviewed and approved, conditional approved, or denied by the Planning Director on the basis of compliance with the provisions of this article. Where a use permit is required and following design review approval, development plans shall be reviewed and acted upon by the Board of Zoning Adjustments / Planning Commission. Where a local citizen's committee has been recognized by the Board of Supervisors, development plans shall be submitted to such committee for review and advisory recommendation prior to action by the Planning Director.

Analysis – The Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Committee reviewed the project application in July 2004. The proposed project would be subject to design review by the Sonoma County Design Review Committee prior to project approval.

ARTICLE 66 – BR – BIOTIC RESOURCE COMBINING DISTRICT

Section 26-66-005 Purpose

The purpose of the BR district is to protect resource communities including critical habitat areas and riparian corridors for their habitat and environmental value and to implement the provisions of Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the *1989 General Plan Open Space Element*.

Section 26-64-010 Development Criteria

Maximum building heights, minimum lot areas and lot widths, yard requirements and maximum percentages of lot coverage shall comply with the requirements for the districts with which the BR regulations are combined unless otherwise provided for in the zoning code.

Analysis – Development criteria for the project site zoning designation are discussed above in the Article 26 – PC – Planned Community District section. The BR zoning overlay would not apply additional criteria except as described below.

Section 26-66-030 Riparian Corridors

The following provisions shall apply to properties within the BR district that are designated as riparian corridors on Figures OS-5a through OS-5i, inclusive, of the *1989 General Plan Open Space Element*. These provisions are intended to be protective measures along selected streams that balance the need for agricultural production, urban development, timber and mining operations, and flood control, with preservation of riparian values.

Definitions. Riparian corridors designated in the *1989 General Plan* are defined as follows for purposes of this chapter:

- (1) “Flatland riparian corridors” include the corridors adjacent to any streams which flow through predominantly flat or very gently sloping land, generally with alluvial soil. This classification excludes areas covered by (2) and (4).
- (2) “Russian River Riparian Corridor” includes the corridor adjacent to any part of the Russian River which is neither located within the above urban riparian corridor nor within the jurisdiction of a city.
- (3) “Upland riparian corridors” include the corridors adjacent to streams not included in categories (1), (2), and (4).
- (4) “Urban riparian corridors” include those portions of designated corridors within urban residential, commercial, industrial or public / quasi-public land use categories.
 - (a) The BR district shall be applied to streamside conservation areas along designated riparian corridors. The outermost boundaries of streamside conservation areas within the BR zoning district as indicated on the zoning maps should be considered approximate in order to allow for parcel specific determinations of the appropriate classification of a riparian corridor as a flatland or upland corridor based upon more detailed analysis of the parcel topography, and for the purpose of this section, shall be measured from the top of the higher bank as determined by the Sonoma County Water Agency, for designated riparian corridors as follows:

- (1) Urban riparian corridors, fifty feet (50');

- (2) Russian River Riparian Corridor, two hundred feet (200');
 - (3) Flatland riparian corridor, one hundred feet (100');
 - (4) Upland riparian corridor, fifty feet (50').
- (b) Except as allowed by subsection (c) of this section, structures, roads, utility lines, parking lots, planting of lawns, grading, fill or excavation shall be prohibited within any streamside conservation area. This prohibition may be waived if:
- (1) It makes a lot unbuildable and vegetation removal is minimized;
 - (2) No significant disturbance of riparian habitat would occur; or
 - (3) The use involves only the maintenance, restoration or minor expansion of an existing structure.

The planning director may require a biotic resource assessment prior to waiver of this prohibition so that any potentially significant adverse effects on riparian habitat can be avoided or mitigated.

- (c) The following uses where allowed by the base district with which this district is combined shall be considered within any streamside conservation area. Such uses are also subject to the requirements of the base district:
- (1) Timber operations conducted in accordance with an approved timber harvest plan;
 - (2) Streamside maintenance carried out by or under the authorization of responsible flood control agencies or pursuant to a permit issued by said responsible agencies;
 - (3) Road crossings and street crossings, utility line crossings;
 - (4) Mining operations conducted in accordance with the county surface mining and reclamation ordinance;
 - (5) Permitted summer dams;
 - (6) Grazing and similar agricultural production activities not involving structures or cultivation, except as defined by subsection (7) below;
 - (7) Agricultural Cultivation.
 - (i) Located no closer than one hundred feet (100') from the top of the bank in the Russian River riparian corridor,
 - (ii) Located no closer than fifty feet (50') from the top of the bank in flatland riparian corridors,
 - (iii) Located no closer than twenty-five feet (25') from the top of the bank in upland riparian corridors,
 - (iv) The setbacks of subsections (c)(7)(i) through (iv) of this section may be reduced through the use permit process or through a plan approved by the planning director provided the

owner includes appropriate mitigations for potential erosion, bank stabilization and biotic impacts;

- (8) Selective vegetation removal as part of an integrated pest management program administered by the agricultural commissioner;
- (9) Creekside bikeways, trails and parks within urban riparian corridors;
- (10) Development authorized by waiver under subsection (b) of this section. (Ordinance. No. 4643, 1993)

Analysis – As the project site is within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area, the 50-foot setback of Urban Riparian Corridors would apply. **Exhibit 3.0-5** shows that proposed buildings would be located outside of the 50-foot setback from the top of bank of Sonoma Creek. **Section 5.6 Biological Resources** describes measures (primarily the use of native vegetation for landscaping in riparian areas) to protect Sonoma Creek consistent with *1989 General Plan* policies and State and federal regulations. **Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality** describes additional measures necessary to reduce erosion and sedimentation.

Proposed development would involve construction of new structures, landscaping, and parking improvements in locations generally occupied by existing parking and ruderal (i.e., weedy) grasslands. However, **Exhibit 3.0-5** shows that proposed parking for 18 vehicles would be located within the streamside conservation area. This parking lot already exists and project implementation would result in relatively minor improvements including landscaping. Mitigation measures presented in *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities* would minimize the removal of existing vegetation and require the use of native species in landscaping improvements / restoration. The project proposes development of a “creek walk”, a pedestrian trail parallel to the channel of Sonoma Creek, within the streamside conservation area as permitted under Urban Riparian Corridors, Subsection C, Number 8.