

## ***4.1 LAND USE, POPULATION, AND HOUSING***

## 4.1 LAND USE, POPULATION, AND HOUSING

---

### ***Land Use, Population, and Housing – Environmental Setting***

This section describes the existing land use patterns in Sonoma County. The nine Planning Areas are described in terms of communities, land uses, and local issues. Land use issues that occur in more than one Planning Area are outlined, including: community change and resources conflicts; gentrification; urban / rural conflicts; development density; sustainability; and certificates of compliance. County, regional, State, and federal regulatory authority over land use is described.

#### ***EXISTING LAND USE***

Sonoma County has a diverse and unique physical setting, including mountain ridges, hills, and valleys, which are replete with forests, oak woodlands, stream corridors, and tidal and fresh water marshes. It borders on both the Pacific Ocean and the San Pablo Bay. A high density of Native Americans once thrived on abundant wildlife, anadromous fish, and acorns.<sup>1</sup> Beginning early in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the Spanish military, ranchers, and Franciscan missionaries arrived. Russians established agricultural colonies along the coast. Cattle grazing, the introduction of annual grasses and the reduction of large wildlife species irretrievably changed the landscape. Mexico ruled the land. In 1846, the Anglo-American immigrants who had been coming to California led the Bear Flag Revolt at Sonoma. The subsequent Gold Rush of 1849 initiated a major migration to California.

California gained statehood in 1851. Sonoma County's growth following that time was strongly tied to the Gold Rush impacts on San Francisco. Sonoma County supplied lumber, other building materials, and various food products to San Francisco, a short boat ride away. As this part of the economy grew, business services grew; the county's communities diversified along its farmers, lumbermen, and miners. Summer home communities developed along the Russian River as tourism began to play a role in the local economy. With the completion of the Golden Gate Bridge in 1937, Marin County and southern and central Sonoma County became the site for tract home subdivisions in the 1950s and 1960s.

The demand for subdividing rural land was also spurred by the growth to the north of San Francisco. Requirements were limited to surveying and filing parcel maps for four or fewer parcels, which were often split again into four. Road access and proof of water and on-site waste disposal capacity was required for five or more parcels, but the filing of serial parcel maps was a way around those requirements. By the mid-1960s, the county's cities became stressed by the post World War II growth. A proposed nuclear power plant on Bodega Head was defeated, while large portions of both the Marin and Sonoma coasts were preserved as parkland.

The County and its cities created new land use tools, including general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, and subdivision and building controls. The County's initial and subsequent general plans

---

<sup>1</sup> For further description of historical land use in Sonoma County, refer to *Sonoma County Land Use Audit – Draft Report*, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., prepared for Greenbelt Alliance and Sonoma County Farm Bureau, October 2003.

established a *city-centered* development pattern, in order to direct future growth to cities and to protect the surrounding agricultural and resource lands. The existing *General Plan* continued the policy of locating *Community Separators* that provide open space between cities. Since 1989, except for Cloverdale, all incorporated cities have established voter-approved urban growth boundaries. There are nine incorporated cities in Sonoma County; the Town of Windsor was the last city to incorporate in 1992.

The majority of the Sonoma County population lives in cities along US 101. Designated Community Separators provide separation between cities. Beyond the main corridor, the City of Sonoma is located on Highway 12 in the southeast and the City of Sebastopol is located west of the US 101 corridor on Highway 116. The county's 12 unincorporated communities are concentrated along these three main highway corridors, though the area beyond Sebastopol and the coastal communities also contain small, yet notable concentrations of unincorporated growth. The infrastructure systems that support and constrain continued growth and development in the county include not only highways and roads, but water and wastewater systems and flood control facilities.

Sonoma County's development pattern is typical for some of California's rural counties, with low density land uses in small towns and much land devoted to rural residential development in outlying areas. One study determined Sonoma County to be the highest ranked "small parcel" county in California, reflecting the past history of small parcel development throughout much of the county's natural, agricultural, and forest areas. This has created a land use pattern where much of the county land area experiences an interface between wildlands or agriculture and homes. Individual management of large rural lots and small farms and vineyards will shape the future functionality of wildlife habitat and vegetative and water systems.<sup>2</sup>

According to State Department of Conservation data, about 71,000 acres or seven percent of the county's 1,026,060 acres are developed at a density of at least 1.5 units per acre (termed *urbanized*).<sup>3</sup> The majority of this urbanized land, 45,000 acres, is within the spheres of influence of the nine cities.<sup>4</sup> While most of the urbanized area is residential, about five percent of the urbanized area is developed for industrial and commercial use. Roads, schools, and other infrastructure account for a significant proportion of the urban acreage.

Farmland (17 percent) and grazing land (41 percent) account for a total of 58 percent of the county's land area, with the other land and water areas comprising 35 percent of the county. This 35 percent includes lower-density (more than 1.5 acres per unit) rural residential development areas and timberlands.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Patterns of Settlement Density in Selected Counties, FRAP Analysis of 1990 Census Data*, California Department of Forestry, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> *Sonoma County 1998-2000 Land Use Conversion*, State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, data as of 2000.

<sup>4</sup> *Sonoma County Land Use Audi - Draft Report t*, prepared for Greenbelt Alliance and Sonoma County Farm Bureau, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., October 2003.

Within the entire county, including the cities, the uses of land are estimated as follows:

- Urbanized 7 percent
- Grazing land 41 percent
- Important Farmland 17 percent
- Timber / Other Lands 33 percent
- Water Bodies 2 percent.
- **Total 100 percent**<sup>5</sup>

Existing and projected 2020 population and housing growth with the *Draft GP 2020* are provided in *Chapter 3.0 Project Description*.

**LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATIONS**

**Exhibit 4.1-1** shows the acreage of the existing *General Plan* land use designations by Planning Area. For unincorporated Sonoma County, lands designated agriculture account for 34 percent or 329,562 acres. Lands designated for resources and rural development account for 51 percent, or 492,658 acres. Residential lands account for 81,895, or nine percent. Commercial and industrial lands individually account for less than one percent. Public lands are six percent, or 55,723 acres, while incorporated cities are 44,237 acres, or three percent of total county acres.

These land use plan designations form the foundation of the existing *General Plan* and are the primary tool utilized to implement the major goals of city and community centered growth and the protection of agriculture.

**Agricultural and Other Resource Land Uses**

The existing *General Plan* land use plan includes three agricultural land use categories: *Land Intensive Agriculture (LIA)*, *Land Extensive Agriculture (LEA)*, and *Diverse Agriculture (DA)*. Designation of parcels was based on multiple considerations, including the parcel size, lack of infrastructure, distance from public services, access, conflicts with resource conservation and production, and topographic and environmental features.

The existing *General Plan* land use plan also uses the *Resources and Rural Development (RRD)* designation to protect the county’s natural resource lands and allow only very low density residential development. Resources to be protected include commercial timber lands, lands within the Known Geothermal Resource Area (KGRA), lands identified in the County’s *Aggregate Resources Management Plan*, and natural resource lands including watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, and other biotic areas.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Sonoma County 1998-2000 Land Use Conversion*, State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, data as of 2000.

**Exhibit 4.1-1**  
**Acreege of Land Use Category Designation by Planning Areas**

Land Use	Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin	Cloverdale / N.E. County	Healdsburg & Environs	Russian River Area	Santa Rosa and Environs	Sebastopol & Environs	Rohnert Park – Cotati & Environs	Petaluma & Environs	Sonoma Valley	Total County
<i>Agricultural Land Uses</i>										
Diverse Agriculture	1,349 (0.5%)	932 (0.5%)	6,034 (6.2%)	5,648 (9.3%)	14,481 (15.0%)	16,184 (36.6%)	4,448 (26.8%)	11,181 (13.0%)	8,588 (9.5%)	68,845 (7.1%)
Land Extensive Agriculture	29,178 (10.5%)	40,113 (20.3%)	1,185 (1.2%)	709 (1.2%)	8,733 (9.0%)	14,570 (32.9%)	1,934 (11.7%)	63,995 (74.2%)	26,046 (28.8%)	186,462 (19.3%)
Land Intensive Agriculture	233 (0.1%)	24,476 (12.4%)	23,169 (23.6%)	3,481 (5.7%)	6,213 (6.4%)	448 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	246 (0.3%)	15,988 (17.7%)	74,255 (7.7%)
<i>Ag Totals</i>	<i>30,760 (11.1%)</i>	<i>65,521 (33.2%)</i>	<i>30,387 (31.0%)</i>	<i>9,838 (16.2%)</i>	<i>29,427 (30.5%)</i>	<i>31,202 (70.6%)</i>	<i>6,382 (38.5%)</i>	<i>75,423 (87.4%)</i>	<i>50,622 (56.1%)</i>	<i>329,562 (34.1%)</i>
<i>Resources &amp; Rural Development Land Use</i>										
RRD	222,752 (80.5%)	110,898 (56.2%)	63,313 (64.6%)	38,026 (62.6%)	31,510 (32.7%)	2,066 (4.7%)	3,624 (21.9%)	291 (0.3%)	20,179 (22.3%)	492,658 (51.0%)
<i>Residential Land Uses</i>										
Rural Residential	10,398 (3.8%)	2,081 (1.1%)	3,696 (3.8%)	6,077 (10.0%)	19,660 (20.4%)	10,295 (23.3%)	5,758 (34.8%)	7,465 (8.7%)	10,157 (11.2%)	75,588 (7.8%)
Urban Residential	130 (0.0%)	76 (0.0%)	48 (0.0%)	1,146 (1.9%)	2,362 (2.4%)	202 (0.5%)	315 (1.9%)	2 (0.0%)	2,028 (2.2%)	6,307 (0.7%)
<i>Residential Totals</i>	<i>10,528 (3.8%)</i>	<i>2,157 (1.1%)</i>	<i>3,744 (3.8%)</i>	<i>7,223 (11.9%)</i>	<i>22,021(22.8%)</i>	<i>10,497(23.7%)</i>	<i>6,073(36.7%)</i>	<i>7,467(8.7%)</i>	<i>12,185(13.5%)</i>	<i>81,895 (8.5%)</i>
<i>Commercial Land Uses</i>										
Recreation / Visitor- Serving Commercial	353 (0.1%)	268 (0.1%)	15 (0.0%)	339 (0.6%)	184 (0.2%)	23 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1,067 (1.2%)	281 (0.9%)	2,530 (0.3%)
General Commercial	8 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	134 (0.1%)	3 (0.0%)	11 (0.1%)	61 (0.1%)	20 (0.0%)	241 (0.0%)
Limited Commercial	184 (0.1%)	46 (0.0%)	15 (0.0%)	213 (0.4%)	148 (0.2%)	165 (0.4%)	45 (0.3%)	138 (0.2%)	214 (0.2%)	1,167 (0.1%)
Limited Commercial Traffic Sensitive	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (0.0%)	22 (0.0%)
<i>Commercial Totals</i>	<i>545 (0.2%)</i>	<i>317 (0.2%)</i>	<i>29 (0.0%)</i>	<i>553 (0.9%)</i>	<i>465 (0.5%)</i>	<i>191 (0.4%)</i>	<i>56 (0.3%)</i>	<i>1,266 (1.5%)</i>	<i>537 (0.6%)</i>	<i>3,960 (0.4%)</i>

4.1 LAND USE, POPULATION, AND HOUSING  
**Sonoma County GP 2020 Draft EIR**

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin</b>	<b>Cloverdale / N.E. County</b>	<b>Healdsburg &amp; Environs</b>	<b>Russian River Area</b>	<b>Santa Rosa and Environs</b>	<b>Sebastopol &amp; Environs</b>	<b>Rohnert Park – Cotati &amp; Environs</b>	<b>Petaluma &amp; Environs</b>	<b>Sonoma Valley</b>	<b>Total County</b>
<i>Industrial Land Uses</i>										
General Industrial	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	557 (0.6%)	23 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	83 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	663 (0.1%)
Limited Industrial	37 (0.0%)	604 (0.3%)	47 (0.0%)	32 (0.1%)	876 (0.9%)	20 (0.0%)	50 (0.3%)	24 (0.0%)	359 (0.4%)	2,049 (0.2%)
<i>Industrial Totals</i>	<i>37 (0.0%)</i>	<i>604 (0.3%)</i>	<i>48 (0.0%)</i>	<i>32 (0.1%)</i>	<i>1,433 (1.5%)</i>	<i>42 (0.1%)</i>	<i>50 (0.3%)</i>	<i>107 (0.1%)</i>	<i>359 (0.4%)</i>	<i>2,712 (0.3%)</i>
<i>Public / Quasi Public Land Use</i>										
Public / Quasi Public	12,193 (4.4%)	17,679 (9.0%)	453 (0.5%)	5,030 (8.3%)	11,640 (12.1%)	222 (0.5%)	382 (2.3%)	1,703 (2.0%)	6,420 (7.1%)	55,723 (5.8%)
<i>Planning Area Subtotal</i>	<i>276,815 (100%)</i>	<i>197,177 (100%)</i>	<i>97,974 (100%)</i>	<i>60,701 (100%)</i>	<i>96,496 (100%)</i>	<i>44,220 (100%)</i>	<i>16,558 (100%)</i>	<i>86,257 (100%)</i>	<i>90,302 (100%)</i>	<i>966,000 (100%)</i>
<i>City Acreage</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1,341</i>	<i>6,314</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22,384</i>	<i>1,015</i>	<i>4,303</i>	<i>7,404</i>	<i>1,476</i>	<i>44,237</i>
<i>County Total</i>	<i>276,815</i>	<i>198,517</i>	<i>104,288</i>	<i>60,701</i>	<i>118,880</i>	<i>45,235</i>	<i>20,871</i>	<i>93,662</i>	<i>91,778</i>	<i>1,010,747</i>

### **Residential Land Uses**

The existing *General Plan* Land Use Plan includes two residential land use categories: *Urban Residential* and *Rural Residential*. Maximum residential densities are shown on the Land Use Plan Map. The Urban Residential category is used only within urban service areas. Sonoma County has a past history of dispersed rural residential development that has resulted in scattered concentrations of smaller two- to ten-acre lots. These areas are typically designated Rural Residential.

Rural Residential designated areas provide for very low density residential development on lands that have few if any urban services, but have access to county maintained roads. Approximately eight percent of the total county acreage, or 75,588 acres are designated Rural Residential. Found throughout the county, Rural Residential areas are both in close proximity to urban areas and in isolated rural pockets. Countywide, of these Rural Residential lands, slightly more than half are zoned Agriculture and Residential (AR) while the remaining are zoned Rural Residential (RR). Rural Residential lands that are zoned AR are mostly located in the west and south county, including west of Petaluma, south and west of Sebastopol, Joy Road, Forestville, Penngrove, and east of Sonoma.

An increasing number of agricultural uses are being conducted on smaller parcels in the Rural Residential land use category, including those that are zoned AR and RR. These small farms are making an increasingly important contribution to agriculture, as well as helping to maintain the traditional rural character of the county. Many of these small farms are located in areas of good climate and soils, and have been used for agricultural purposes in the past. These smaller farms can contribute to the agricultural production value of the county, especially in certain niche markets. There is a land use issue regarding whether these small farm operations should be recognized as agriculture, and, if so, to what extent they should enjoy protections similar to those currently in effect on agricultural lands.<sup>6</sup>

### **Commercial and Industrial Land Uses**

The land use plan includes three categories of commercial uses.

- *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 is applied to areas either outside or inside urban service areas; and
- *Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial* allows for visitor serving uses including restaurants, lodging, campgrounds, resorts, marinas, and golf courses. Its purpose is to limit this type of development to appropriate sites.

The land use plan includes two industrial use categories, designating lands needed to provide jobs and services for county residents and businesses.

- *General Industrial* allows all industrial uses but only within urban service areas; and

---

<sup>6</sup> *Rural Residential Lands as Agriculture*, CAC memo, Greg Carr, Sonoma County PRMD, September 19, 2002.

- *Limited Industrial* allows a smaller range of uses and may also be applied outside urban service areas.

### **Public / Quasi Public Land Use**

This land use category recognizes sites that serve community or public need and are owned or operated by government agencies, non profit entities, or public utilities. Minor facilities are allowed in any land use category where they are compatible with the neighborhood character and preservation of natural and scenic resources. The *Public / Quasi Public* (P/QP) category is used for larger facilities, including parks, public schools, wastewater treatment facilities, institutional uses (Sonoma Development Center and Sonoma State University), and military facilities (Two Rock Coast Guard Station). These facilities can only receive a P/QP designation after acquisition has taken place. The existing *General Plan* pre-designates public uses such as schools, parks, wastewater management facilities or solid waste disposal facilities using a symbol in the general location where there is a need for certain facilities.<sup>7</sup>

### **COMMUNITY CHANGE AND RESOURCE CONFLICTS**

The beauty and variety of Sonoma County's natural environment has long attracted migration to the county. Beginning in the 1970s, significant changes have occurred in the use of natural and agricultural lands within the county. Continued population growth; an increase in viticulture, wineries, and tourism; and the development of larger homes and rural estates are predominant factors in recent land use changes.<sup>8</sup>

In general, California's agricultural lands have experienced the greatest proportional change until now, while future growth is expected to shift more towards rangelands and forests.<sup>9</sup> Sonoma County is following a similar trend, with development pressures encroaching further into remote areas. However, Sonoma County's restrictive rural land use policies have minimized this trend. In general, this type of development results in two primary environmental consequences: habitat loss and fragmentation, and the degradation of water resources and water quality.<sup>10</sup>

The overall success of the agricultural sector combined with Sonoma County's efforts to preserve it, has facilitated urban center growth. Such growth has contributed to the avoidance of sprawl and the reduction of growth pressure in the unincorporated area.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Public Facilities Designation and Development Process*, CAC memo, Richard Rogers, PRMD, July 17, 2003.

<sup>8</sup> *Sonoma County's Countryside: a destination for the wealthy*, Tom Chorneau and Matt Weiser, Press Democrat, May 6, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> *Development and Vegetation Trends*, Technical Working Paper, James G. Spero, Fire and Resources Assessment Program (FRAP), California Department of Forestry, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> *Our Built and Natural Environments – A Technical Review of the Interactions between Land Use, Transportation, and Environmental Quality*, U.S. EPA, January 2001.

### **Gentrification**

Existing land use designations and zoning curtail growth in rural areas and direct development toward cities. While building is allowed on existing parcels as small as one acre, the majority of rural home construction requires 20 to 600 acres per home. Parcels of 40 acres and larger that were once considered undesirable for development now are attractive locations for large homes and rural estates. These expensive homes are sometimes used as second homes, but not exclusively. Open space and agricultural lands have been protected to a degree by County land use policies, but these large rural parcels are becoming more expensive as land values have increased. The number of new rural homes built in the county with a construction cost of more than \$250,000 went from ten in 1996 to 43 in 2000. Also, the average size of new homes increased 32 percent during the last five years, from 2,493 square feet in 1996 to 3,290 square feet in January 2001.<sup>11</sup>

There is still some limited capacity for more population in the urbanized communities of the unincorporated county, including the communities of Forestville, Penngrove, and Boyes Hot Springs, depending on the continuing availability of sewer and water.

### **Urban / Rural Conflicts**

Rural lands are valued both for vineyards and as attractive home sites, indicating that agricultural and residential conflicts will increase.<sup>12</sup> Over the past decade, during the increase in premium grape vineyard development in the county, agricultural land with the ability to be converted into vineyards attained a similar value compared to land used for residential development. There is no guarantee, however, that high agricultural land values will continue to help hold the line against future residential development pressures.<sup>13</sup>

As people continue to move into rural areas, conflicts also arise in the county's dispersed rural residential areas where parcels range from two to ten acres. Many of these parcels, located within the Rural Residential land use category, are suitable for small scale agricultural uses. Some are zoned Agriculture and Residential, which generally allows unlimited animal and crop production. Others are zoned Rural Residential, which limits agricultural activities. With the growth of the organic produce industry, smaller parcels have become attractive for growing vegetables and other crops, as well as for marketing activities to directly reach the consumer. Conflicts arise when area residents not connected with agriculture are exposed to noise, odors, traffic and other activities associated with agriculture.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *Sonoma County's Countryside: a destination for the wealthy*, Tom Chorneau and Matt Weiser, The Press Democrat, May 6, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> *Modeling future development for Sonoma County, California: The Consequence of Agricultural Land Protection Policies for Habitat Conservation*, Adina Merenlender, Colin Brooks, David Shabazian, Shengy Gao, and Robert Johnston, U.C. Berkeley, Hopland Research and Extension Center, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and U.C. Davis, 2003.

<sup>13</sup> Nichols•Berman communication with Adina Merenlender, University of California Berkeley, April 2003.

<sup>14</sup> *Rural Residential Lands as Agriculture*, CAC memo, Greg Carr, Sonoma County PRMD, September 19, 2002.

### ***Density of Development***

Most counties surrounding the San Francisco Bay Area exemplify a different pattern of development than the more saturated metropolitan sprawl of Southern California. San Francisco is an anomaly among California counties, at 16,634 persons per square mile, the most densely populated county in the State. Orange County is the second, at 3,606 persons per square mile, with Los Angeles the third, at 2,344 persons per square mile. Bay Area counties range from Alameda County, the fourth densest in the State, with 1,957 persons per square mile, to Napa County at 165 persons per square mile. Sonoma County population density is the second lowest in the Bay Area, at 291 persons per square mile.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to impacts on natural resources and urban / rural land use impacts, a lack of concentrated development makes most people in the county dependent on automobiles for mobility and results in more acreage needed for roads, parking lots, etc. for housing, commercial and public services, and jobs. This dispersion results in an increase in the average amount of land consumed by each new dwelling unit.

### ***Certificates of Compliance***

Over the past decade, the resurrection of antiquated parcels through the Certificate of Compliance process has conflicted with the policies of the existing *General Plan*. The County has over 5,000 lots that result from early government land patents. These lots vary from 40 to 160 acres but are located in areas designated for densities of 160 to 320 acres. There are also close to 75,000 lots depicted in old subdivision maps recorded prior to modern State Subdivision Map Act laws, lots created without any regard to location, topography, access, their buildability, or provision of public services. Some of these parcels may be reconfigured through lot line adjustments.<sup>16</sup> The existing *General Plan* does not contain policies specific to antiquated parcels or certificates of compliance.<sup>17</sup> However, the County has attempted to respond to this concern by adopting several amendments to the County Code to provide more control over the development of antiquated parcels through lot line adjustments. Senate Bill 497, effective January 1, 2002, allows a jurisdiction to attach conditions of approval to lot line adjustments to assure compliance with building and zoning codes, as well as General Plans and Coastal Programs. Also, adjustments of five or more parcels now must be processed as a subdivision. The county prevailed in a 2003 court decision, County of Sonoma vs. Gardner, which confirmed the current practice of the County with regard to denying certificates of compliance based upon old subdivision maps.

## **THE DRAFT GP 2020 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS**

The *Draft GP 2020* continues the County's use of *Planning Areas* to delineate and plan for different regions of the county. **Exhibit 3.0-2** depicts the County's nine Planning Areas.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Population, Housing Units, Area, and Density*, U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 data.

<sup>16</sup> Nichols•Berman communication with Sue Gallagher, Sonoma County Counsel's Office, February 2003.

<sup>17</sup> *Certificates of Compliance*, CAC memo, Dave Schiltgen, Sonoma County PRMD, Dec. 19, 2002.

### **Land Use Map Amendments**

The *Draft GP 2020* proposes minimal changes to the land use map in the existing *General Plan*, based on the desire to maintain the County's long standing goals of city-centered growth and agricultural protection. Proposed *Draft GP 2020* land use amendments were considered if they advanced a broader public goal and were consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the final plan. These amendments included changes that involved the review of the following issues:

- Review of Urban Service Boundaries to reflect city Urban Growth Boundaries and General Plans, LAFCO decisions, and approval of new wastewater systems;
- Changes to reduce or avoid further traffic congestion;
- Re-use of public properties for private use, including Skaggs Island and the Sonoma Development Center;
- Designation of sites for agriculture-related commercial uses to address the issue of visitor serving and support uses on agricultural lands;
- Designation of some Rural Residential lands as Agriculture to support agricultural uses on smaller parcels;
- Better accommodation for public facilities, including churches and schools; and
- Additional Recreation and Visitor-Serving Commercial sites.

Other land use map amendment considerations involve technical correction, non-conforming uses, and other changes necessary to be consistent with concurrent policy changes.

The following specific screening criteria were used by PRMD staff and the Citizens Advisory Committee in 2003 to evaluate requests for land use map amendments:

- All land use map amendments that are considered should advance a broader public interest and be consistent with the framework of goals, objectives, and policies of the *GP 2020*.
- All land use map amendments shall fit under at least one of the following categories (i.e., criteria):
  1. Those amendments that are needed to address an issue that is included in the Final Work Plan for General Plan Update 2020;
  2. Those amendments that are needed to address technical corrections and non-conforming uses where such uses are consistent with surrounding uses and community character;
  3. Those amendments that are needed to be consistent with a concurrent policy change; or

4. Those amendments that are needed to address development or construction of a new or revised use involving a public facility of substantial public benefit or importance.<sup>18</sup>

**Exhibit 4.1-2** shows the proposed Land Use Amendments by Planning Area. This exhibit shows the request number, owner / applicant, Assessor's Parcel Number, size, location, land use map amendment request, existing land use designation and uses, existing zoning, which screening criteria the request meets, and the net change if the request is eventually approved and implemented.

Specific land use policies were developed for each Planning Area to implement broader County goals and objectives. Land use policies for each Planning Area are in the Land Use Element. Separate maps in the *Draft GP 2020* (see Figures LU 2a through LU 2i in the Land Use Element) show applicable land use categories and maximum permitted residential density for each parcel.

**Exhibit 4.1-3** shows the existing and proposed acreage for all of the land use designations.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Land Use Element- Requests for Land Use Map Amendments*, CAC memo, Lisa Posternak, Sonoma County PRMD, July 10, 2003.

**Exhibit 4.1-2  
 Draft GP 2020 Land Use Amendments**

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin Planning Area</b>							
1-1	PRMD (Gonnella)	074-300-017 (0.15) Occidental	Change Land Use Designation and Zoning to LC and LC HD SR.	RR 10 Occidental Hardware	RR 10 HD SR	Yes, Criterion 2 Non-conforming Use	None
1-2	PRMD (Gonnella)	074-300-009 (0.12) Occidental	Change Land Use Designation and Zoning to LC and LC HD SR.	RR 10 Westpole Bakery	RR 10 HD SR	Yes, Criterion 2 Non-conforming Use	None
1-3	PRMD (County of Sonoma)	074-300-015 (0.34) Occidental	Change Land Use Designation and Zoning to PQP and PF HD SR.	RR 10 Occidental Volunteer Fire Department Station	RR 10 HD SR	Yes, Criterion 2 Non-conforming Use	None
1-4	PRMD (County of Sonoma)	074-300-013 (0.57) 074-300-014 (0.55) Occidental	Change Land Use Designation and Zoning to PQP and PF HD SR.	RR 10 Occidental Community Center and Park	RR 10 HD SR	Yes, Criterion 2 Non-conforming Use	None
1-6	PRMD (Thomas)	074-300-034 (0.31) Occidental	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF HD SR.	RR 10 Occidental Post Office	RR 10 HD SR	Yes, Criterion 2 Non-conforming Use	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Cloverdale / NE County Planning Area</b>							
2-3	PRMD (Mittelstadt)	116-050-010 (12.22) Cloverdale	Change land use designation and zoning to LI and LI SR.	RR 20 Lumber yard	AR B8 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
2-4	PRMD (Holmes)	115-160-011 (1.27) Cloverdale	Change land use designation and zoning to UR 9 and R2 9 du/ac BR SR.	LC Residential	LC BR SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
2-10	Vanoni	140-100-029 (0.09) Geyserville	Change land use designation and zoning to LC.	UR 6 Pump and irrigation sales and repair	R2 6 du/ac	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use.	None
2-11	Geyserville Volunteer Fire Department (County of Sonoma)	140-100-071 (5.36) Geyserville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF.	RVSC Vacant	K	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Replace potential recreational and visitor-serving commercial use with 9,300 square feet of public use.
2-15	Sonoma County Transit Agency	140-100-012 (.07) Geyserville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF.	UR 6 Vacant	R2 6 du/ac	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	None - Visitor center has already been approved.
2-16	PRMD (Parde)	140-180-035 (5.11) Geyserville	Change land use map to show parcel as located within Geyserville Urban Service Area.	LC Vacant	LC SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	Increase in commercial use due to availability of sewer.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Healdsburg and Environs Planning Area</b>							
3-4	Redding (Musante)	120-120-006 (20.46) 120-140-063 (61.49) Calistoga	Change land use designation and zoning to LEA 60 and LEA 60 SR to allow for development of winery to serve Knights Valley vineyards.	RR 20 Residential, pasture, vacant	AR 20 SR	No	Agricultural processing facility (winery).
3-5	Sonoma County Agricultural Protection and Open Space District (SCAPOS D)	028-060-062 (78.78) 028-060-063 (21.62) 028-060-064 (37.00) 028-060-066 (213.26) 028-060-067 (25.20) 028-070-036 (206.34) Santa Rosa	Change land use designation and zoning of portions of parcels pursuant to LLA02-0029 (see below) which will result in placement of land under conservation easement with SCAPOS D.  to RRD 100: 028-060-062, 028-060-063, 028-060-064, 028-060-066, 028-060-067  to RRD 60 and RRDWA 60: 028-070-036	RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 100  Vacant	RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 60  RRD 60  RRDWA 100	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Russian River Planning Area</b>							
4-2	Caracappa (Zamlich)	072-100-059 (1.56) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to RVSC and K F1 F2 SR to increase potential for recreational and visitor-serving commercial development.	PQP Vacant	PF F1 F2 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	Replace potential park or other public use with 33,976 square feet of recreational and visitor-serving use (50% maximum lot coverage).
4-4	Sonoma County Regional Parks Department	082-210-012 (0.31) 082-210-037 (9.66) 082-220-033 (1.61) Forestville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF F1 SR, PF BR F1 SR, and PF BR F1 SD, respectively, to recognize expansion of Forestville river access and construction of new trail, site improvements, and parking facility.	RR 1.5 RRD 160 RRD 160 Vacant, recreation	RR 1.5 F1 SR RRD 160 BR F1 SR RRD 160 BR F1 SD	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Replace residential and recreational uses with park.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
4-5	Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) and Sonoma County Regional Parks Department  (Note: should be under Planning Area 3)	066-230-069 (3.20) 066-230-080 (19.83) 066-230-083 (177.80) 110-210-010 (55.72) 110-210-011 (47.04) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF BR F1 pursuant to SCWA purchase of Hanson Aggregates property, to be developed as public Riverfront Park.	LIA 60 Vacant	LIA 60 BR F1 MR Z  LIA 60 BR F1  LIA 60 BR F1  LIA 60 BR F1 F2 MR  LIA 60 F1 F2 MR	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Addition of park.
4-6	Leonberger and Mazingo	070-120-027 (0.14) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC F2 SR.	UR 1 Restaurant	R1 1du/ac F2 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	None
4-7	PRMD (Blumhoefer)	070-120-026 (0.03) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC F2 SR (see Request 4-6).	UR 1 Vacant	R1 1 du/ac F2 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	Replace potential residential use with commercial use.
4-8	PRMD (Troendly)	070-020-001 (0.45) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to RVSC and K F2.	UR 10 Zen Spa Resort	R2 10 du/ac F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use.	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
4-9	PRMD (Loundagin)	070-020-037 (0.78) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC F2.	UR 10 Noonan's Auto Garage	R2 10 du/ac F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use.	None
4-10	PRMD (U.S. Postal Service)	070-030-079 (0.94) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF SR F2.	RVSC Guerneville Post Office	K SR F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
4-11	PRMD (Wilson)	070-030-010 (0.51) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to RVSC and K F2.	UR 10 Russian River Resort	R2 10 du/ac F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use.	None
4-12	PRMD, (Roman Catholic Bishop of Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma, and Russian River Fire Protection District)	070-060-010 (0.31) 070-060-012 (0.26) 070-060-039 (0.21) 070-060-040 (0.48) 070-060-050 (0.36) Guerneville	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF SR or PF SR F2.	UR 4 St. Elizabeth's Church, County land, Guerneville Fire Protection District, and Guerneville Regional Library	R1 4 du/ac SR R1 4 du/ac SR R1 4 du/ac SR R1 4 du/ac SR F2 R1 4 du/ac SR F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
4-13	PRMD (Tabib)	094-127-003 (0.16) Monte Rio 094-127-004 (0.15) Monte Rio	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF SR F2.	UR 1 St. Andrews Episcopal Mission in the Redwoods	R1 1 du/ac SR F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
4-14	PRMD (Kokalis)	094-129-003 (0.36) Monte Rio	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC SR F2.	UR 1 Weekend Gardener Nursery	R1 1 du/ac SR F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
4-15	PRMD (Angel One Management)	070-380-008 (1.06) Forestville	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC SR F2.	RR 1.5 Russian River Pub	AR 1.5 SR F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
4-16	Fulkerson	070-390-001 (0.77) 070-390-018 (0.95) 070-390-031 (3.77) 070-390-032 (0.31) Forestville	Change land use designation and zoning to RVSC and K BR F1 F2 or K F2.	RR 1.5 Hilton Park Family Campground	AR 1.5 BR F1 F2 AR 1.5 BR F1 F2 AR 1.5 BR F1 F2 AR 1.5 F2	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Santa Rosa and Environs Planning Area</b>							
5-6	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (SCAPOS D)	051 010 054 (290.66) 051 010 036 (38.10) 030 110 013 (38.53) Hood Mountain Regional Park	Change land use designation and zoning on "Parcel B" (388.82 acres, portions of three parcels) to PQP and PF BR SD, PF BR SR, or PF SD in association with LLA02-0076 to expand Hood Mountain Regional Park.	RRD 100 RRD 100 RRD 100 Vacant	RRD 100 BR SD RRD 100 BR SR RRD 100 SD	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Expansion of park.
5-7	Symons	058-232-032 (0.63) 058-232-033 (0.91) Wikiup	Change zoning to RR B7.	UR 1 Residential, agriculture	R1 B7	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
5-8	Vieira	134-132-062 (4.41) Santa Rosa	Change land use designation and zoning to UR 10 and PC to comply with conditions of PLP00-0022 for residential subdivision and mixed use building of live/work units and retail.	GC Vacant	C2	Yes, Criterion 2: Technical Correction	None

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
<b>Sebastopol and Environs Planning Area</b>							
6-4	Dutton	063-040-013 (1.31) Sebastopol	Change land use designation and zoning to LC and LC SR.	RR 3 Coffee stand	RR3 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
<b>Rohnert Park – Cotati and Environs Planning Area (No Land Use Amendments)</b>							
<b>Petaluma and Environs Planning Area</b>							
8-2	Michaelson (Baxman)	113-173-047 (4.07)  113-173-058 (1.80) Petaluma	Change land use designation and zoning to DA 10, to recognize a historic, non-conforming livestock yard and allow for maintenance and repair of horse trailers.	RR 3 Livestock yard and residential	AR 3	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	Expansion to include maintenance and repair of horse trailers.
8-4	City of Petaluma (Martinelli)	017-170-002 (197.00)  068-010-026 (97.94) Petaluma	Change land use designation and zoning to PQP and PF to allow for development of Petaluma Water Recycling Project by City of Petaluma.	LEA 60 Agriculture  LEA 60	LEA 60  LEA 60	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Replace agricultural use with wastewater treatment facility.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>Applicant (Owner)</b>	<b>APN (Acres) Location</b>	<b>Land Use Map Amendment Request</b>	<b>Existing Land Use Designation and Use(s)</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Meets Screening Criteria?</b>	<b>Net Changes if Approved</b>
8-5	Weinstock	021-021-010 (0.37) Petaluma	Change land use designation and zoning to GC and C3.	RR 1.5 Dave's Auto Repair	AR 1.5 SR	Yes, Criterion 2: Non-conforming Use	None
<b>Sonoma Valley Planning Area</b>							
9-5	Curotto	128-322-013 (4.48) Sonoma	Change land use designation and zoning to LC to allow for solid waste and recycling collection facility.	RR 2.5 Residential, vacant	RR 2.5	Yes, Criterion 4: Public Facility	Replace potential residential use with commercial solid waste and recycling collection facility.
9-7	Weiss	056-051-017 (63.16) Agua Caliente	Change land use designation and zoning to RRD 100 and RRD 100 SR to comply with conditions of Lot Line Adjustment LLA 01-0081.	RRD 40 Vacant	RRD 40 SR	Yes, Criterion 3: Consistency with Concurrent Policy Change	N/A Addressed under separate application; approved under Resolution #02-1028.
9-8	Hill, Perry	Town of Glen Ellen	Incorporate specific new policies into Sonoma Valley Planning Area policies of Land Use Element.	N/A	N/A	Yes, Criterion 1: Agricultural Tourism	None

**Exhibit 4.1-3**  
**General Plan Land Use Designations, Existing and Proposed <sup>a</sup>**

<b>General Plan Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Existing General Plan <sup>b</sup> (acres)</b>	<b>Draft GP 2020 (acres)</b>	<b>Net Change (acres)</b>
<b>Agricultural Land Uses</b>			
<i>Diverse Agriculture</i>	68,845	68,809	-36
<i>Land Extensive Agriculture</i>	186,462	186,540	+78
<i>Land Intensive Agriculture</i>	74,255	73,957	-298
<b><i>Agricultural Total</i></b>	<b>329,562</b>	<b>329,306</b>	<b>-256</b>
<b>Resources and Rural Development Land Uses</b>			
<i>Resources &amp; Rural Development</i>	492,658	492,305	-353
<b><i>Resources &amp; Rural Development Total</i></b>	<b>492,658</b>	<b>492,305</b>	<b>-353</b>
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>			
<i>Rural Residential</i>	75,588	75,482	-106
<i>Urban Residential</i>	6,307	6,303	-4
<b><i>Residential Total</i></b>	<b>81,895</b>	<b>81,785</b>	<b>-110</b>
<b>Commercial Land Uses</b>			
<i>Recreation / Visitor - Serving Commercial</i>	2,530	2,532	+2
<i>General Commercial</i>	241	241	0
<i>Limited Commercial</i>	1,167	1,172	+5
<i>Limited Commercial Traffic Sensitive</i>	22	22	0
<b><i>Commercial Total</i></b>	<b>3,960</b>	<b>3,966</b>	<b>+6</b>
<b>Industrial Land Uses</b>			
<i>General Industrial</i>	663	663	0
<i>Limited Industrial</i>	2,049	2,063	+14
<b><i>Industrial Total</i></b>	<b>2,712</b>	<b>2,726</b>	<b>+14</b>
<b>Other Land Uses</b>			
<i>Public / Quasi-Public</i>	55,723	56,425	+702
<b><i>Public / Quasi-Public Total</i></b>	<b>55,723</b>	<b>56,425</b>	<b>+702</b>
<b><i>Unincorporated Area Subtotal</i></b>	<b>966,510</b>	<b>966,513<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>- - -</b>
<b><i>City Total</i></b>	<b>44,237</b>	<b>44,237</b>	<b>- - -</b>
<b><i>TOTAL COUNTY</i></b>	<b>1,010,747</b>	<b>1,010,750</b>	<b>- - -</b>

a These projections do not include acreages of roads within either the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County or its cities. Furthermore, parcels having split land use designations are accounted for by the total parcel size for each designation. For example, a 10 acre parcel that is designated 5 acres Rural Residential and 5 acres Diverse Agriculture would be represented as 10 acres Rural Residential and 10 acres of Diverse Agriculture. There are approximately 300 parcels that have such designation in the unincorporated portion of the county.

b Amended though September 22, 2004.

c Difference in total county acreage is due to rounding of figures.

Source: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, September, 2004.

### **Urban Service Boundaries**

The *Draft GP 2020* continues the County's commitment to concentrate future growth in cities and urban areas with community sewer and water systems. The key to implementing this strategy is the designation of urban service boundaries (USBs) on the land use plan maps and the establishment of policies regarding extension of public sewer and water service outside these designated areas. Revisions to the USBs are recommended to reflect changes in service availability and decisions made by voters, cities and other agencies regarding growth patterns in Sonoma County.

The proposed changes to each of the USBs would be as follows:

#### **Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin Planning Area**

*Bodega Bay USA* – No change to USB proposed.

*Sea Ranch USA* – No change to USB proposed.

*Occidental USA* – Expand the USB to match the sanitation district boundary, except limit the USB on the three larger parcels on the District perimeter to the portions of the parcels occupied by the uses served by the sewer system. This change would add 21 developed parcels to USA.

#### **Cloverdale / NE County Planning Area**

*City of Cloverdale USA* – No change to USB proposed.

*Geyserville USA* – Expand the USB to match the sanitation zone boundary. This change would add three developed parcels, one undeveloped parcel, and treatment plant to the USA.

#### **Healdsburg and Environs Planning Area**

*City of Healdsburg USA* – Revise the USB to match the City Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Sphere of Influence (SOI). This change would delete two parcels from USA.

*Town of Windsor USA* – Expand the USB to match the Town UGB. This change would add approximately 117 parcels in eight areas to USA.

#### **Russian River Planning Area**

*Forestville USA* – No change to USB proposed.

*Russian River USA* – Expand the USB to include all parcels in the sanitation district and AP 072-180-027. This change would add approximately 20 developed and approximately 13 undeveloped parcels to USA.

*Monte Rio USA* – No change to USB proposed.

#### **Santa Rosa and Environs Planning Area**

*City of Santa Rosa USA* – Change the USB to match the City UGB. This change would add approximately 40 developed and undeveloped parcels in the South Santa Rosa Area to the USA, but

would delete approximately 80 mostly-developed parcels west of South Wright Road and north of Rincon Valley.

*Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup USA* – Expand the USB to match the sanitation district boundary, except to exclude parcels in the designated Community Separator. This change would add Sonoma County Airport and 16 mostly-developed parcels to the USA and would delete one parcel in the Community Separator.

***Sebastopol and Environs Planning Area***

*City of Sebastopol USA* – Reduce the USB to match the City UGB and SOI. This change would delete approximately 270 mostly-developed parcels in seven areas from USA.

*Graton USA* – Expand the USB to include areas which are in the sanitation district in areas contiguous to the current USB. This change would add approximately 33 mostly-developed parcels in three areas.

***Rohnert Park – Cotati and Environs Planning Area***

*City of Rohnert Park USA* – Expand the USB to match the UGB, except to delete 170 acres removed from the SOI by LAFCO pursuant to lawsuit settlement and City request. This change would add 195 mostly undeveloped acres northwest of City, 80 undeveloped acres south of Canon Manor subdivision, and Sonoma State University to the USA.

*City of Cotati USA* – No change to USB proposed.

*Penngrove USA* – Change the USB to match the sanitation district boundary. This change would add four developed parcels to the USA and would delete two developed parcels.

***Petaluma and Environs Planning Area***

*City of Petaluma USA* – Expand the USB to match the UGB. This change would add two mostly-developed parcels to the USA and would delete three mostly-developed parcels.

***Sonoma Valley Planning Area***

*City of Sonoma / Sonoma Valley USA* – Reduce the USB for the City of Sonoma to match the City UGB, deleting approximately 100 mostly-developed parcels. This change would also expand the USB for the Sonoma Valley sanitation district to match the current district boundary, including the 8<sup>th</sup> Street East Assessment District, but exclude two mostly-undeveloped parcels near Glen Ellen, developed parcels with outside service agreements, and other developed parcels south of Sonoma which are not contiguous to the current USB. This change would add approximately 30 mostly-developed parcels to the USA.

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Objective **HE-3.2** of the Housing Element is to provide sites for an additional 500 housing units affordable to very low- or low-income households on parcels in Urban Service Areas designated on

the land use maps.<sup>19</sup> The selected sites would not be identified on the land use maps, but would be zoned with an affordable housing combining district that would allow either an affordable housing project or the uses allowed by the underlying district.

Policy **HE-30** of the Housing Element directs Sonoma County to develop an affordable housing combining district for application to parcels in unincorporated communities within Urban Service Areas.<sup>20</sup> The purposes of the district zone would be to allow built densities of 20 units or more per acre on urban sites zoned for commercial, industrial, or public uses. If insufficient sites exist in these zoning districts, sites in residential or other zoning districts may be designated. The policy includes criteria that are to be applied to affordable housing projects proposed within the district.

As a part of the actions necessary to implement the *GP 2020* it is proposed to amend the *Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance* to include an Affordable Housing (AH) Combining District. The purpose of the AH Combining District is to implement Policy **HE-30** of the Housing Element, by identifying under-utilized commercial, industrial, or residential lands, within the county's Urban Service Areas, which could be developed for housing affordable to Low and Very Low income households to increase the supply of affordable housing to County Residents.

The proposed sites are as follows:<sup>21</sup>

***Airport Business Park Area***

- Site A1 – 5100 Airport Boulevard 3.75 acres APN 0590230-051, current zoning R3-B6-155 dwelling units maximum.
- Site A2 – 380 Aviation Boulevard, 2.04 acres APN 0590350-016, current zoning MP 2 acre average.

***Forestville Urban Service Area***

- Site A4 – 6310 Forestville Street, 3.76 acres, APN 084-020-043, current zoning M1-SD.

***Geyserville Urban Service Area***

- Site A5 – 21225 Geyserville Avenue, 1.42 acres, APN 140-140-056, current zoning PC-HD-16 dwelling units / acre maximum.

---

<sup>19</sup> Very low-income households are households earning not more than 50 percent of the Sonoma County area median income. Low-income households are households earning between 51 and 80 percent of the Sonoma County are median income.

<sup>20</sup> As used in the *Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance* a combining district is a zoning designation which is superimposed over a base zoning district to modify the regulations in the base zoning district.

<sup>21</sup> PRMD staff prepared a list of potential sites for review by the CAC that would be appropriate for the AH Combining District. The list was prioritized into an “A” and “B” list. Memos to GP 2002 Citizen’s Advisory Committee from Denise Peter, Planner III regarding Affordable Housing Combining District, July 18, 2002, October 17, 2002, and December 4, 2003.

**Graton Urban Service Area**

- Site A6 – 2999 Bowen Avenue, 0.64 acre, APN 130-152-008, current zoning M1.

**Larkfield / Wikiup Urban Service Area**

- Site A7 – 175, 245 Airport Boulevard, 5.20 acres, APN 039-025-028, 026, 060, current zoning CO.

**Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area**

- Site A9 – 17302 Vailetti Drive, 5.02 acres, APN 056-201-091, current zoning R2-B6-8 dwelling units / acre-F2-BR.
- Site A10 – 18503 Highway 12, 1.04 acres, APN 056-511-046, current zoning LC-TS-SR-SD.

**Eighth Street East Sewer Assessment District Area**

- Site A11 – 21988 8<sup>th</sup> Street East, 2.00 acres of a 53 acre site, APN 128-381-037, current zoning MP.

**Penngrove Urban Service Area**

- Site B6 – 220 Hatchery Road, 5.0 acres, APN 047-153-004, current zoning RR-B6-2 dwelling units / acres.

The total acreage of the ten sites is 29.87 acres. At a density of 20 units per acre these 10 sites could produce 597 housing units.

---

**Land Use, Population, and Housing – Regulatory Setting**

**COUNTY AND REGIONAL**

**Sonoma County General Plan**

The existing *General Plan* establishes goals, objectives, and policies that guide and direct the location and extent of future land uses, population growth, and housing as well as the services and infrastructure required to accommodate them. The existing General Plan includes Land Use Maps for the nine Planning Areas depicting the location of various land uses and the future boundaries of sewer and water services. The existing General Plan includes a Housing Element, adopted by the County and certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development in 2002, that includes a wide range of housing policies and programs that will contribute to opportunities for all income levels and people with special needs

**Sonoma County Local Coastal Program**

The *Local Coastal Program* (LCP) for Sonoma County was adopted by the County in 1981. A revision to the LCP was certified by the California Coastal Commission in December, 2001; this

revision was limited to changes necessary to make the LCP consistent with the existing General Plan. In particular, the coastal zone now uses a modified version of the countywide zoning ordinance that provides additional protection to lands within the coastal zone. Land use designations and zoning categories are now similar to those used countywide. The LCP is currently being updated to include new background information as well as policies and implementation measures in coordination with the GP 2020 update.<sup>22</sup>

### **County Zoning Code**

The *Zoning Code* implements the policies of the General Plan; it is the primary land use tool used by the Project Review Division, Board of Zoning Adjustments, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors in reviewing and regulating new development. The code contains criteria for making findings of approval, allowing certain uses, and placing, locating, and controlling the form of new structures.<sup>23</sup>

### **County Redevelopment Agency**

Redevelopment agencies operate under the provisions of the State Community Redevelopment Law (CRL). The CRL allows a designated project area to receive focused public attention and financial investment to reverse deterioration trends, specifically through the allocation of the tax increment dollars in the project area. The public funds can be used to rehabilitate housing stock, revitalize business environments, and create jobs. The Roseland and Sonoma Valley project areas were designated in 1984. The Windsor project area, also established in 1984, was assumed by the Town of Windsor upon its incorporation. The Russian River Redevelopment Area was approved in 2000.<sup>24</sup> Each Redevelopment Area is subject to a Redevelopment Plan that relies upon the General Plan Land Use Map for future land use and development decisions.

### **Other County Plans and Programs**

Other entities in the county that exert influence over land use, either regulatory or non-regulatory, include the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, the Sonoma County Water Agency, the Sonoma County Waste Management Authority, and the Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission.

### **Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)**

LAFCo is an independent agency, established by State law and comprised of representatives of the county, cities, special districts, and the public. Each incorporated city and many other public agencies that provide sewage collection or supply water have a district boundary indicating the service area. LAFCo has responsibility for reviewing, approving, or disapproving changes in boundaries of all jurisdictions within county boundaries, including annexations, detachments, new formations, and

---

<sup>22</sup> Nichols • Berman communication with Kathy Jacobs, Sonoma County PRMD, March, 2003.

<sup>23</sup> *Taylor Mountain/Sonoma Mountain Development Guidelines and Proposed Sonoma Valley Mayacamas Mountains Guidelines*, CAC memo, Denise Peter, Sonoma County PRMD, August 15, 2002.

<sup>24</sup> *Redevelopment*, County of Sonoma Community Development Commission website, <http://www.sonoma-county.org/cdc/redevagency.htm>.

incorporations. New State legislation requires that LAFCoS perform Municipal Service Reviews as part of this process.

LAFCoS have intended to discourage urban sprawl, preserve open space and agricultural land, and provide government services efficiently. LAFCo must adopt for each local agency a *sphere of influence* that describes the area within which properties are eligible to annex to the city or district. The Sonoma County LAFCo has adopted policies that support urban growth boundaries and their coordination with spheres of influence; disapprove annexation within Community Separators; and discourage conversion of designated agricultural and open space land to urban uses.<sup>25</sup>

### **City General Plans**

Incorporated cities have a broad range of powers, responsibilities, and political independence. Within their limits, cities control development permits and utility services. The County relies on interagency communication, review procedures, voluntary coordination, and LAFCo actions to influence the future boundaries of cities.

Each city within the County has adopted a general plan that guides where development and services are planned. Most of these general plans have policies regarding future annexation, urban development, and extension of urban services in areas not within current city limits. In addition, voters in every city with the exception of Cloverdale have approved urban growth boundaries that cannot be changed without another vote by city residents. Each city has adopted a General Plan since 1992, or is in the process of doing so.

A major issue addressed by policies in both city and the county general plans is whether to allow extension of urban sewer and water services beyond city limits, district boundaries, sphere of influence, urban growth boundaries, and / or Urban Service Boundaries (USBs). The existing County *General Plan* policy allows extension outside of USBs only where necessary to resolve a public health hazard resulting from existing development.<sup>26</sup>

### **Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Smart Growth Strategy**

Five of the Bay Area's regional agencies, organized by ABAG, developed the *Smart Growth Strategy-Regional Livability Footprint Project*. The project aims to change the underlying fiscal and regulatory structure of current growth patterns to support more sustainable land use patterns. The future ideal vision developed by the project for Sonoma County featured a rail line extending along the currently unused Northwestern Pacific railroad right-of-way from Cloverdale south into Marin County. New stations in most cities and new mixed-use communities would be built. Densities in existing urban areas would be increased. A smart growth scenario was modeled to illustrate the potential positive effects of these land use policy changes.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *Urban Boundaries*, CAC memo, Robert Gaiser, Sonoma County PRMD, November 6, 2003.

<sup>26</sup> *Urban Boundaries*, CAC memo, Robert Gaiser, Sonoma County PRMD, November 6, 2003.

<sup>27</sup> *Regional Livability Footprint Project*, ABAG, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and Regional Water Quality Control Board, October, 2002.

## **STATE AND FEDERAL**

### **State Department of Parks and Recreation**

The State Department of Parks and Recreation owns and manages a number of parks, historic parks, reserves, and a recreation area within Sonoma County, totaling more than 17,000 acres. It has regulatory authority over these lands. They include Annadel State Park, Armstrong Redwoods State Reserve, Austin Creek State Recreation Area, Fort Ross State Historic Park, Jack London State Historic Park, Kruse Rhododendron State Reserve, Petaluma Adobe State Historic Park, Salt Point State Park, Sonoma State Historic Park, Sonoma Coast State Beach, and Sugarloaf Ridge State Park.<sup>28</sup>

### **State Department of Fish and Game**

The State Department of Fish and Game owns and manages several wildlife areas within Sonoma County. It has regulatory authority over these lands. These include 8,000 acres surrounding Lake Sonoma and the Warm Springs salmon and steelhead fish hatchery; the dam and reservoir are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Laguna Wildlife Area contains 539 acres of freshwater wetland. The Petaluma Marsh, located partially in Marin County, contains 3,748 acres of salt and brackish marshes. The Napa-Sonoma Marshes (also partially located in Solano County) are comprised of 11,892 acres of bay front wetlands.

---

## **Land Use, Population, and Housing – Significance Criteria**

The land use, population, and housing analysis use criteria from the *State CEQA Guidelines*. According to these criteria, the project would have a significant land use, population, or housing impact if it would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Introduce new land uses, or alter the intensity of existing land uses, which would be incompatible with the established land uses within Sonoma County's unincorporated area;
- Physically divide an established community. *No significant impact, see Appendix 7.4 Initial Study;*
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. *No significant impact, see Section 4.6 Biological Resources; or*
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or, displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. *No significant impact, see Appendix 7.4 Initial Study.*

---

<sup>28</sup> California State Parks website, <http://www.parks.ca.gov>.

---

## **Land Use, Population, and Housing – Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

### **SUMMARY OF LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT CONSISTENT WITH THE DRAFT GP 2020**

This EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of a wide range of land use activities and development that would occur through the implementation of the *Draft GP 2020*. The phrase *land uses and development consistent with the Draft GP 2020* is used throughout this EIR to describe both what may be considered traditional development (i.e., residential, commercial, and industrial development) as well as development related to other permitted land uses (e.g., agricultural cultivation, public services, public infrastructure projects, and resources extraction) that would occur. When appropriate, specific development projects, types of development, and / or land uses and activities that would result in adverse environmental impacts are discussed in greater detail in various sections of this EIR. The following provides a general summary of land uses and development that are projected to occur as a result of implementation of the *Draft GP 2020*.

#### **Residential, Agricultural, Commercial, and Industrial Development**

**Exhibit 4.1-4** describes the amount of projected residential, agricultural, and commercial and industrial development and is consistent with the data presented in Table LU-5 of the *Draft GP 2020*. However, **Exhibit 4.1-4** includes in its residential total, units within the unincorporated portions of the USAs of Sonoma County's nine cities. Inclusion of these units in **Exhibit 4.1-4** results in a higher total of existing residential units than does Table LU-5. Because all of these units are assumed to be annexed by the cities through 2020, **Exhibit 4.1-4** shows an overall decline in the number of residential units in the unincorporated area by 2020. It is important to note that data for both the number of existing residential units and projected increases to residential units in the unincorporated area outside of the USAs of the nine cities are consistent between Table LU-5 of the *Draft GP 2020* and **Exhibit 4.1-4**. It should also be noted that agricultural processing facilities, such as wineries, are included in the square footage of agricultural, commercial, and industrial development projected through 2020.

**Exhibit 4.1-4**  
**Summary of Development Consistent with the Draft GP 2020**

Planning Area	Residential (Units)			Agricultural / Commercial / Industrial (Square Feet)		
	2000 <sup>a</sup>	2020	Net Change	2000	2020	Net Change
Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin	6,131	7,508	+1,377	325,898	871,888	+545,990
Cloverdale / N.E. County	2,385	2,821	+436	1,575,407	7,676,097	+6,100,690
Healdsburg	3,017	3,041	+24	989,606	4,756,947	+3,767,341
Russian River	9,345	10,343	+998	826,809	1,958,819	+1,132,010
Santa Rosa	15,622	11,306	-4,316	5,504,607	10,098,554	+4,593,947
Sebastopol	8,594	8,278	-316	562,377	1,902,357	+1,339,980
Rohnert Park- Cotati	2,256	2,018	-238	240,293	772,201	+531,908
Petaluma	4,202	4,086	-116	85,119	876,346	+791,227
Sonoma Valley	12,849	14,388	+1,539	2,496,657	7,128,651	+4,631,994
<b>Total</b>	<b>64,401</b>	<b>63,789</b>	<b>-612</b>	<b>12,606,773</b>	<b>36,041,860</b>	<b>+23,435,087</b>

a Year 2000 data based upon Year 2000 City Limits

Sources: Nichols • Berman and PRMD – Final Development Data for Planning Areas by Traffic Assignment Zones.

**Development and Activities Related to Other Land Uses**

In addition to residential, commercial, and industrial development, the *Draft GP 2020* would permit development related to a wide range of land uses and activities in the unincorporated area. Such uses would primarily include public services and facilities, agricultural cultivation, and resource use and extraction. As previously noted, adverse environmental impacts that may result from development and operation of these activities are discussed, as appropriate throughout various sections of this EIR.

The development and operation of public services and facilities is primarily discussed in **Section 4.9 Public Services**. Examples of public use projects that could be developed consistent with the *Draft GP 2020* include parks, water supply and wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, wastewater irrigation, road and transit systems, and other infrastructure improvements. In general, these types of land uses could result in a number of adverse environmental impacts. For example, the use of parks could generate additional traffic and some possible land use conflicts in adjacent agricultural areas. Landfills could generate water quality, noise, traffic, and odor issues. Water supply and wastewater

treatment facilities could affect water quality, water availability, and biotic resources. Road and transit uses could affect water quality, noise, and air quality.

The development and operation of agricultural uses are primarily discussed in *Section 4.8 Agricultural and Timber Resources*. Examples of such land uses and development that could occur through implementation of the *Draft GP 2020* include vineyards, row crops, orchards, grazing and the raising of animals (e.g., dairies, livestock, and horses), processing (e.g., wineries), support (e.g. sales of farm supplies), and visitor-serving uses (e.g., tasting rooms and homestays). Potential adverse environmental impacts related to agricultural activities include: erosion, sedimentation and alteration of drainage patterns; water use; loss of biotic habitat; noise; hazardous materials use; disturbance of cultural resources; and circulation (e.g., generation of truck traffic).

The development and operation of resource use and extraction activities that would occur are primarily discussed in *Sections 4.7 Geology / Soils, 4.8 Agricultural and Timber Resources, and 4.12 Energy*. Examples of such land uses include timber and mining operations as well as energy producing activities such as steam generation. In general, these uses have impacts similar to agricultural uses.

**Impact 4.1-1 Growth and Concentration of Population**

*Implementation of the Draft GP 2020 would induce growth of population within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County by accommodating new housing and businesses and by providing services and infrastructure capacity. However, this would be a less-than-significant impact. (LTS)*

As of Census 2000 the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County, outside of the incorporated city USAs, had a population of 128,596.<sup>29</sup> The *Draft GP 2020* projects a population of 147,660 in the unincorporated area by 2020. This would be a 15 percent increase between 2000 and 2020 for a total of 19,064 additional residents.

Sonoma County (incorporated plus unincorporated areas) had a Census 2000 population of 458,614. The population within the unincorporated area, outside of the incorporated city USAs, therefore represents 28 percent of the total County population. Sonoma County estimates that in 2020 it would have a total population of 546,030, a 19 percent increase above the 2000 level.<sup>30</sup> The portion of the population residing within the unincorporated area in 2020 would be consistent with its 2000 level, representing 27 percent of the total population of Sonoma County.

The Census 2000 population for the nine Bay Area counties was 6,783,762. According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) *Projections 2002*, the Bay Area is expected to have a population of 8,014,000 in the year 2020, an 18 percent increase above its 2000 level.<sup>31</sup> In 2000 the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County represented approximately 1.9 percent of the Bay Area population. With implementation of the *Draft GP 2020*, population in the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County would represent 1.8 percent of the projected Bay Area population by 2020.

---

<sup>29</sup> Table LU-2, *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 28, 2004.

<sup>30</sup> Table LU-2, *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 28, 2004.

<sup>31</sup> *Projections 2002*, Association of Bay Area Governments, 2002.

Therefore, population growth within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County would be consistent with ABAG's regional projections.

ABAG's *Projections 2002* projects a 2020 population for the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County of 151,200. Thus, the ABAG projected population for the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County is 4,450 persons more than the population projections of the *Draft GP 2020*. However, as shown above, the *Draft GP 2020* population projections are otherwise consistent with ABAG's regional projections.<sup>32</sup>

Population growth consistent with that projected for the *Draft GP 2020* would result in secondary impacts related to public services and utilities. These impacts are described in **Section 4.9 Public Services** of this EIR.

The *Draft GP 2020* also proposes amendments to existing land use designations as described in the environmental setting section that were considered for approval by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Land Use Amendments recommended for approval by the CAC are included as a part of the *Draft GP 2020* summarized in **Exhibit 4.1-2**. Land Use Amendments that were recommended for denial are considered as part of **Chapter 5.0 Alternatives**.

The majority of the proposed amendments would be to achieve technical corrections, to recognize and correct an existing non-conforming land uses, to accommodate previously approved public facilities (e.g., a public park), or to achieve consistency with a General Plan policy change proposed by the *Draft GP 2020*. If adopted, none of the proposed amendments would change an existing land use designation that does not permit residential development to a designation that would allow residential development for any undeveloped parcels. Land Use Amendments 2-16 and 4-7 would allow the development of commercial uses on parcels of 5.11 and 0.3 acres in size, respectively. Land Use Amendment 3-4 would allow the development of a winery on approximately 87 acres of land designated Land Extensive Agriculture (LEA). Impacts to agricultural resources resulting from proposed Land Use Amendments are considered in **Section 4.8 Agricultural and Timber Resources**.

Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County as a result of proposed Land use Amendments contained in the *Draft GP 2020*.

As described in the environmental setting, the *Draft GP 2020* also continues the County's commitment to concentrate future growth in cities and urban service areas with community sewer and water systems through, among other means, the designation of urban service boundaries (USBs). Proposed changes to existing USBs could result in the development of residential and other uses if they allowed the extension of water or sanitation services to *undeveloped* parcels outside of current service districts. However, the majority of proposed changes to the unincorporated USBs contained in the *Draft GP 2020* would be to include *developed* parcels already within existing sanitation districts. Therefore, proposed changes to the USBs would not induce substantial growth due to the availability of sewer service.

Proposed changes to the USBs of Sonoma County's nine cities would mostly reflect boundaries that have already been adopted by LAFCo and the county's nine cities. As the *Draft GP 2020* assumes the

---

<sup>32</sup> *Draft GP 2020* uses *Projections 2002* as a starting point for population, housing and employment projections. However since the time *Draft GP 2020* was prepared, ABAG has published *Projections 2003* which estimates a lower population for the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County due to its use of a Smart Growth scenario for the region.

annexation of lands within the City UGB or SOI, such changes would not induce substantial growth of population within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County.

Within the Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin Planning Area, proposed expansion of the Occidental USB to match the sanitation district boundary would not result in substantial growth of population due to the availability of sewer service as the 21 parcels that would be included are already developed. Expansion of the USB would also avoid the inclusion of the undeveloped portions of three large parcels. No changes to the USBs of either the Bodega Bay or Sea Ranch USAs are proposed. Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area.

Within the Cloverdale / N.E. County Planning Area, the proposed expansion of the Geyserville USB to match the sanitation zone boundary would add one undeveloped parcel to the USA. Inclusion of this undeveloped parcel (approximately five acres in size) designated Limited Commercial would result in an increase in commercial use due to the availability of sewer service.<sup>33</sup> No changes are proposed to the Cloverdale USB. Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area.

Within the Healdsburg and Environs Planning Area there are no unincorporated USAs. Proposed revisions to the USBs to match either the City Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and / or the Sphere of Influence (SOI) for the City of Healdsburg and the Town of Windsor would not result in substantial growth of population within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County as the *Draft GP 2020* assumes the annexation of lands within the City UGB or SOI.

Within the Russian River Planning Area, the proposed expansion of the Russian River USB would add 13 undeveloped parcels to the USA. However, of these 13 undeveloped parcels, only five small parcels within and one small parcel adjacent to the sanitation district could be developed for residential use. No changes are proposed to the USBs of either the Forestville or Monte Rio USAs. Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area.

Within the Santa Rosa and Environs Planning Area, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area. The proposed expansion of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup USB to match the sanitation district boundary would not result in substantial development of residential or other uses due to the availability of sewer service as most of the 16 parcels that would be included are already developed.

In the Sebastopol and Environs Planning Area, proposed changes to the Graton USB would not result in substantial growth of population due to the availability of sewer service as most of the 33 parcels within the existing sanitation district that would be included are already developed. The proposed deletion of 270 parcels from the Sebastopol USB would not result in substantial growth of population within the unincorporated area subsequent to their deletion, as most of these parcels are already developed. Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area.

Within the Rohnert Park - Cotati and Environs Planning Area, proposed changes to the Penngrove USB would not result in substantial growth of population due to the availability of sewer service as the

---

<sup>33</sup> Inclusion of this undeveloped parcel is proposed as part of Land Use Amendment Request 2-16.

four parcels within the existing sanitation district that would be included are already developed. No changes to the USB are proposed within the Cotati USA. The proposed changes to the Rohnert Park USB to match the city's UGB would add 195 mostly undeveloped acres northwest of City, and 80 mostly undeveloped acres south of the Canon Manor subdivision, and Sonoma State University to the unincorporated area at the request of the City.

Within the Petaluma and Environs Planning Area, the *Draft GP 2020* would expand the Petaluma USB to match the UGB. As the three parcels that would be added to unincorporated area by deletion from the Petaluma USA are mostly developed, substantial growth of population would not occur within the Planning Area as a result of proposed changes to the USB.

Within the Sonoma Valley Planning Area, the *Draft GP 2020* proposes the expansion of the Sonoma Valley USB to match the sanitation district boundary, including the 8<sup>th</sup> Street East Assessment District. Substantial growth of population would not occur in this area as a result of the availability of sewer service as the approximately 30 parcels that would be added to the USA are already developed and also because two undeveloped parcels within the sanitation district near Glen Ellen would be excluded. The proposed reduction of the Sonoma USB to match the city UGB, would not result in substantial growth of population in the unincorporated area as the 100 parcels that would be added to the unincorporated area are mostly-developed. Therefore, substantial growth of population would not occur as a result of changes to USBs within the Planning Area.

In spite of the limited changes to the land use designations and urban service boundaries noted above, land use designations of the *Draft GP 2020* would accommodate the projected population growth described earlier in this section. In this sense, the *Draft GP 2020* is growth inducing. The *Draft GP 2020* also provides for the expansion of public services and infrastructure necessary to serve this projected growth. However, the *Draft GP 2020* includes goals, objectives, and policies that assure that the land use maps, public services, and infrastructure do not induce substantial additional growth beyond what is projected.

As shown in **Exhibit 4.1-3**, there would not be a substantial change in the land use plan between the existing *General Plan* and the *Draft GP 2020*. Furthermore, the goals and policies would direct future growth towards USAs with established growth boundaries to ensure that biotic, agricultural, open space and other resources are protected consistent with the ten goals of the *Draft GP 2020*. Therefore, implementation of the *Draft GP 2020* would reduce the potential for substantial growth of population within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County.

Specifically, Goals **LU-2** and **LU-3** of the Land Use Element would accommodate the major share of future growth in a compact manner within the nine existing cities and their expansion areas and within selected unincorporated communities which are planned to have adequate water and sewer capacities. These goals would be implemented by the following policies.

Policies **LU-2a** and **LU-2b** would ensure growth consistent with the *GP 2020* and balance residential holding capacity with projected growth and consider denial of land use amendments which add residential density in *rural areas* if the residential capacity exceeds projected growth. Policies **LU-3a**, **LU-3b**, **LU-3c** and **LU-3d** would ensure that growth would be contained within the unincorporated and incorporated USAs by: requiring consistency between *GP 2020* and amendments to LAFCo SOIs or USAs; by denying land use amendments that increased residential density beyond projected growth; by limiting, with exceptions, the extension of water or sewer services outside of designated USAs; and by maintaining low development densities outside of the USAs.

Policies **PF-1a**, **PF-1b**, **PF-1e**, and **PF-1f** would implement Goal **PF-1** of the Public Facilities Element to assure that water and wastewater services are available when necessary to serve planned growth and development without unduly promoting sprawl or unplanned growth. Specifically Policy **PF-1f** would, with certain exceptions, avoid the extension of public sewer services outside of either a LAFCo SOI or the USA.

Similarly, policies of Agricultural Resources Element would promote an urban centered development strategy, stabilize the urban fringe, and thereby limit the conversion of agricultural land outside the USAs to urban uses. Policy **AR-2a** would limit residential and commercial or industrial growth in agricultural areas by prohibiting the extension of necessary urban services into these areas. Additionally, Policies **AR-2b** and **AR-2d** would limit urban growth on these lands by requiring consistency between the *GP 2020* and proposed LAFCo changes to either a SOI or USA and through the use of purchase or transfer of development rights to prevent the intrusion of residential lands.

In conclusion, the *Draft GP 2020* projects future population growth and economic development as well as needed housing and jobs in accordance with compact urban boundaries, protection of agriculture, and the other major goals enumerated in the land use policy framework. The *Draft GP 2020* also provides for the expansion of public services and infrastructure needed to serve this growth. However, since the *Draft GP 2020* includes substantial limitations on the amount of rural growth that would be allowed as well as policies which minimize the extension of urban services into rural and agricultural areas, it would accommodate planned growth but would not induce substantial growth within the unincorporated beyond what is currently planned. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures 4.1-1** None required.

**Impact 4.1-2 Land Use Conflicts between Agricultural and Residential / Urban Uses**

*Implementation of the Draft GP 2020 would result in the intrusion of residential uses into agricultural areas thereby exposing residents to noise, odors, dust, and similar nuisances associated with agricultural operations. Such residential development may be incompatible with agricultural operations. Urban uses at the fringe of cities and the unincorporated communities may also encounter these agricultural operations. Both residential intrusion and urban uses at the fringe may result in land use conflicts and land use incompatibility. While the Draft GP 2020 and the Sonoma County Code contain policies and ordinances to reduce this impact, this would be a significant impact. (S)*

Land use conflicts between urban and agricultural uses result when residential and other uses become the primary use of lands adjacent to or surrounded by agricultural uses. Urban intrusion into agricultural lands could occur as a result of implementation of the *Draft GP 2020* Land Use Plan as well as from the proposed expansion of the unincorporated urban service areas. As discussed in *Impact 4.8-1 Conversion of Agricultural Lands to Non-Agricultural Uses*, proposed land use amendments contained in the *Draft GP 2020* would not convert agricultural land to residential uses in such areas.<sup>34</sup>

As discussed in the environmental setting, the increasing value of property in rural areas can result in land use conflicts in agricultural areas. Maintaining parcels in large minimum sizes no longer protects

---

<sup>34</sup> Land use amendment requests that proposed changing agricultural land use designations to residential ones were not recommended by the CAC as part of *Draft GP 2020*. Such requests are considered in *Chapter 5.0 Alternatives*.

agricultural resources as effectively as in the past as such parcels have become attractive places to live for an increasing number of people that can afford them. In addition, parcelization has occurred both on the urban fringe and in the midst of agricultural areas which has resulted in residential use being the primary use of the land.<sup>35</sup> In some areas, County zoning also permits small residential lots to be clustered together, surrounded by large agricultural areas. This type of development withdraws some land from production, exposes a large perimeter area to conflicts, and can threaten the interior areas.<sup>36</sup>

Competition also occurs between urban and agricultural uses along the boundaries of the USAs.<sup>37</sup> Rapid urban growth produces pressures on agricultural lands that tend to discourage new agricultural investment and uses, raises the price of land making purchase for farming unrealistic, and increases the likelihood of conversion to a non-agricultural use.<sup>38</sup> Conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses is further discussed in *Section 4.8 Agricultural and Timber Resources*.

Complaints from residents about noise, odors, flies, spraying, etc attendant to adjacent agricultural practices have discouraged and sometimes prevented farmers from managing their operations in an efficient and economic manner.<sup>39</sup> Not only do residents complain about aspects of farming operations, but residential areas often directly affect the operations. For example, residential sites can become a sanctuary for pests which could damage adjacent crops.<sup>40</sup>

Goal **LU-9** and its implementing policies provide for the protection of lands suitable for or currently in agricultural production as a guiding principle of the *Draft GP 2020*. Accordingly, the Land Use, Agricultural Resources, and Public Facilities and Services Elements establish policies that would limit land use conflicts between residential and agricultural uses by reducing the intrusion of residential uses into agricultural areas, stabilizing the urban fringe, and supporting the needs and practices of agriculture as the highest priority in areas designated for agricultural use. In addition, land use conflicts would be mitigated by the continued application of the Right to Farm Ordinance contained in the Sonoma County Code.

Right to Farm (RTF) ordinances are intended to reduce land use conflicts between agricultural and residential neighbors. Such ordinances are not regulatory mechanisms but rather informational tools whereby new residents, especially those from urban areas unfamiliar with rural living, are educated

---

<sup>35</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004.

<sup>36</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004.

<sup>37</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004.

<sup>38</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004.

<sup>39</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004

<sup>40</sup> *Agricultural Resources Element, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Hearing Draft*, Sonoma County PRMD, October 2004

about the realities of modern farming. A RTF ordinance reduces the opposition of urban neighbors to agricultural operations as a nuisance generator and in doing so, makes residents less inclined to complain or file lawsuits over common nuisances such as sprays, dusts, odors, and noise. As a result, the normal activities of farmers and ranchers are thereby protected.

The Sonoma County Right to Farm Ordinance, contained in the Sonoma County Code, would support the policies of the *Draft GP 2020* in reducing agricultural and residential land use conflicts. Since 1999, this ordinance requires the disclosure of potential nuisances from agricultural operations to affected parties in annual tax bills, at issuance of building permits, and at close of escrow for existing home sales. In addition, it requires the developer builder / purchaser sign and file the disclosure notice with the County Recorder's Office. Such a filing assures the disclosure is attached to the property deed and transmitted to future buyers during the title search process.

The ordinance provides that a legal and properly conducted agricultural operation will not be considered a nuisance under the Sonoma County Code. The ordinance further reduces the potential for land use conflicts through asserting (both to county government and its residents) the importance of preserving agriculture as a policy matter, by providing a factual basis from which county government can respond to complaints, and by providing a framework for discussion between farmers and residential neighbors. All of these effects would, in general, be expected to prevent minor complaints from becoming lawsuits and promote a more peaceful coexistence between agricultural and residential neighbors.

The Sonoma County RTF ordinance informs those directly affected and the community at large about the importance of maintaining a productive agricultural sector in the face of urban growth.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, it provides information about the consequences of residing near agricultural operations that generate noise, dust, odor, traffic and other negative effects. Buyers can then weigh these consequences against other factors such as the price of the home or the importance of rural aesthetics.

However, a RTF ordinance is a limited answer to the problem of conflict and incompatible land uses at the urban edge. It does not prevent lawsuits even if the practice in question is normally accepted. A comprehensive solution depends upon more active measures. These include the planning and design of urban development sensitive to agricultural operations as well as appropriate modifications in farm practices at the urban edge. The *Draft GP 2020* contains such measures implemented by the policies of the Agricultural Resources, Land Use, and Public Facilities and Services Elements

Goal **AR-4** of the Agricultural Resources Element would seek to allow farmers to manage their operations in an efficient economic manner through the implementation of policies designed to mitigate conflicts between agricultural and nonagricultural uses in designated agricultural production areas.

To implement Goal **AR-4**, Policies **AR-4a**, and **AR-4b** would continue to apply agricultural zoning districts to agricultural lands while formally recognizing that the primary use of any parcel within the three agricultural land use categories would be agricultural production and related processing, support services, and visitor serving uses. In addition, residential uses in these areas would recognize that the primary use of the land may create agricultural "nuisance" situations, such as flies, noise, odors, and spraying of chemicals. The continued implementation of Policy **AR-4d** would reduce the likelihood

---

<sup>41</sup> *County Right-to-Farm Ordinances in California: An Assessment of Impact and Effectiveness*, Matthew Wacker et al., University of California Agricultural Issues Center, May 2001.

of nuisance complaints through the application of the provisions of the Right to Farm Ordinance (see earlier discussion) to all lands designated within agricultural land use categories. Additionally, Policy **AR-4e** would continue to enforce provisions of existing state nuisance law (California Civil Code Section 3482.5).

Policy **AR-4c** would continue to reduce the land use conflicts and protect agricultural operations by establishing an agricultural setback that would maintain a physical separation of 100 to 200 feet between the agricultural land use and a residential use adjacent to an agricultural land use category.

If developed, Policy **AR-4f** could reduce land use conflicts by preventing residential intrusion into agricultural areas through the preparation of specific measures (to be considered by the Board of Supervisors) that would carry out voluntary purchase or transfer of development rights from agricultural areas to designated nonagricultural areas.

Policy **AR-4g** would continue to reduce land use conflicts between existing agricultural operations and proposed new ones by requiring that any anticipated conflicts be mitigated by the newer use or application. This would reduce land use conflicts between agricultural uses or between existing agricultural uses and proposed agricultural processing or visitor-serving uses.

Policies contained in the *Draft GP 2020* would reduce agricultural and urban land use conflicts by limiting the intrusion of residential uses into agricultural areas. This would be accomplished through the implementation of policies designed to promote compact urban development, limit the extension of urban services, maintain viable agricultural parcel sizes, and stabilize the urban fringe.

Policies **PF-1d** and **PF-1e** would avoid wastewater extension of public sewer services outside of either a LAFCo adopted sphere of influence (SOI) or an urban service area (USA) thereby establishing a boundary beyond which only uses compatible with preserving agriculture and open space resources are allowed. Policies **LU-3a** through **LU-3d** would continue to locate future growth within the cities and unincorporated USAs in a compact manner. Policies **AR-3a** through **AR-3d** would continue to reduce intrusion of residential uses into agricultural areas by limiting the amount of subdivision of new parcels and requiring units to be clustered. For instance, subdivision of lands located within the Land Intensive Agriculture (LIA) category would be restricted to parcels of 20 acres in size or greater. Allowing the clustering of small parcels would have the benefit of leaving larger economically viable agricultural parcels. Furthermore, the policy limits the number of small lots to minimize the potential for land use conflicts. Finally, policies **AR-2a** through **AR-2e** would continue to help stabilize agricultural use at the urban fringe by using transfer or purchase of development rights to limit residential intrusion and through consultation with LAFCo and the agricultural community regarding SOI and USA boundary changes.

In conclusion, development and population growth in the unincorporated areas consistent with the *Draft GP 2020* may increase land use conflicts and incompatibility in the County. However, policies of the *Draft GP 2020* and the RTF ordinance would address incompatibility issues between agricultural and urban / residential uses and continue to minimize the frequency at which nuisance complaints become lawsuits. While these policies would reduce such conflicts, complaints about existing agricultural operations from existing and new residents would likely continue. Further, new conflicts over the expansion of agricultural operations would also be likely. Therefore, this would be a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 4.1-2** No mitigation available beyond the *Draft GP 2020* policies discussed in the impact analysis above.

**Significance After Mitigation** This would be a significant unavoidable impact. (SU)

**Impact 4.1-3 Incompatible Land Uses in the Rural Area**

*Land uses and development consistent with the Draft GP 2020 would result in changes in land use type, density, and scale within rural areas and generate land use incompatibilities. While policies and programs contained in the Draft GP 2020 would reduce such incompatibilities, this would be a significant impact. (S)*

Since the preparation of the existing *General Plan*, the County has seen an increase in the construction of relatively larger structures including agriculture-related uses such as processing facilities (e.g., wineries), tasting rooms, and other visitor-serving uses in the rural areas.<sup>42</sup> As described in **Exhibit 4.1-4**, implementation of the *Draft GP 2020* could result in land use incompatibilities resulting from the introduction of new land uses of greater scale and / or increased density that would generate noise, exceed local transportation infrastructure capacities, be incompatible with existing agricultural operations, or visually degrade the rural character of Sonoma County. Adverse visual changes to the rural character are discussed in **Section 4.11 Visual Resources**. While such conflicts could occur from projected residential and commercial development, such changes would primarily result from the development of agricultural processing and visitor-serving uses.

Goals **AR-5** and **AR-6** of the Agricultural Resources Element would promote the development of new agricultural processing facilities (e.g., wineries), support services (e.g., vendors of farm supplies), and visitor-serving uses (e.g., tasting rooms) in rural agrarian areas as value added support to agricultural production. Development of these uses is discussed in greater detail in *Impact 4.8-2 Agricultural Processing and Support Uses* and *Impact 4.8-3 Agricultural Tourism*.

While the development of agricultural processing and visitor-serving uses would have many beneficial economic impacts and would protect against future loss of the county's agricultural base, these types of development result in land use conflicts. Such development could generate increased noise levels, increased truck and tourist traffic, pedestrian / bicyclist and vehicle conflicts, be at a greater intensity of use than that of surrounding areas, and / or require the modification of existing agricultural practices (e.g., to accommodate new visitor-serving uses). Therefore, projected agricultural processing and visitor-serving development could be incompatible with existing rural residential development, agricultural operations, and other land uses.

The *Draft GP 2020* contains policies and programs that would reduce these land use conflicts. Policies **AR-5a** through **AR-5g** and **AR-6a** through **AR-6h** of the Agricultural Resources Element would limit the size, location, and density of agricultural processing and visitor-serving uses.

If developed, adopted, and implemented, **Noise Program 2: Adopt a Noise Ordinance** and Policies **NE-1c**, **NE-1h**, **NE-1k**, and **NE-1m** would reduce noise impacts through the development and incorporation of noise standards into the zoning code as well as through potential acoustical monitoring of discretionary projects.

Policies **LU-4b** through **LU-4d** and **CT-5e** would continue to require that infrastructure improvements (e.g., traffic mitigations) be completed prior to, or in conjunction with, new development to meet the County's level-of-service criteria. This would reduce traffic impacts associated with the introduction

---

<sup>42</sup> *Rural Character Design Standards*, CAC Memo, Lisa Posternak, Sonoma County PRMD, December 19, 2003.

of new land uses. Policies **AR-5g** and **AR-6f** would regulate the density of agricultural processing and visitor-serving uses if the concentration of such uses would result in traffic levels that exceed the Circulation and Transit Element's objectives for level of service on a site-specific and cumulative basis. Policies **CT-2s**, **CT-2y** and **CT-2z** would reduce conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles by assuring development compatibility with bicyclists and pedestrians and by providing bicycle and pedestrian walkways. Policy **CT-3e** would reduce safety problems that could arise from such development by requiring proposed projects to implement safety improvements as a condition of approval for such projects.

The *Draft GP 2020* also contains policies specific to individual Planning Areas that would reduce land use conflicts from such development as well as commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas. For example in the Sonoma Coast / Gualala Basin Planning Area, Policies **LU-12a**, and **LU-12d** through **LU-12f** would maintain low development densities in rural areas while generally restricting the location of commercial uses to locations within the unincorporated USAs. Policy **LU-12k**, would avoid the location of recreation and visitor-serving and resource related commercial and industrial uses in close proximity to one another.

Implementation of the above policies and programs and mitigation measures would reduce land use conflicts but would not fully prevent future complaints in rural areas. Therefore this would be a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 4.1-3** No mitigation available beyond the *Draft GP 2020* policies discussed in the impact analysis above.

**Significance After Mitigation** This would be a significant unavoidable impact. (SU)

**Impact 4.1-4 Affordable Housing**

*Development of affordable housing projects consistent with the Draft GP 2020 may be incompatible with established land uses adjacent to the proposed locations. This would be a less-than-significant impact. (LTS)*

As described in the environmental setting, Objective **HE-3.2** of the Housing Element would provide sites for an additional 500 affordable housing units for very low- or low-income households on parcels in Urban Service Areas designated on the land use maps. These projects could result in land use conflicts as some of the proposed sites would have the potential for incompatibility between existing land uses and residential development. While it is acknowledged that development of affordable housing would be of substantial public benefit, preliminary review of the proposed sites identified potential adverse environmental impacts.<sup>43</sup>

Of the ten proposed sites, three (A2, A6, and A8) would be located in close proximity (within 100 feet) of heavy industrial uses. Two sites, A1 and A6, would be located within 100 feet of the 65 dB CNEL contour at Sonoma County Airport and from a significant stationary noise source, respectively.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> *Affordable Housing Combining District*, CAC Memo, Denise Peter, Sonoma County PRMD, December 4, 2003.

<sup>44</sup> *Affordable Housing Combining District*, CAC Memo, Denise Peter, Sonoma County PRMD, December 4, 2003.

The location of these sites within the commercial and industrial areas could result in incompatibilities between residents and manufacturing and similar uses. Although housing in these locations would offer the potential benefits of workers living in close proximity to jobs, siting, and design of this housing could raise noise, traffic safety, and other problems for residents. Careful design control at the project level would be important in order to reduce these conflicts.

The *Draft GP 2020* contains a number of policies that would reduce such impacts. Policies **NE-1b** and **NE-1g** would enforce State Noise Insulation Standards and avoid noise sensitive land use development in noise impacted areas unless effective measures are included to reduce noise levels. Policy **AT-3g** identifies appropriate mitigations that could be undertaken in the event noise standards from airport operations are exceeded including purchases assurances and acoustical treatments.

While analysis of site-specific impacts is beyond the scope of this EIR and would be evaluated as part of a separate environmental review for the individual project, it is important to note that if a proposed site were found to be unacceptable during such review, alternate sites better suited to residential use would be available as the proposed sites represent approximately 133 percent of the amount of land needed to accommodate the goal of 500 units (i.e., at 20 units per acre). As a result, at a programmatic level of analysis, the policies of the *Draft GP 2020* would be adequate to reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 4.1-4** None required.