

**Doug Bush**

---

**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:**

**Follow Up Flag:**  
**Flag Status:**

Sonoma County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing you this letter to provide individual background on my family's property at 1760 Sanders Rd. in Sebastopol, that is being considered for removal from the Z zoning designation.

My wife and I have lived at this property for 30 years, raising our children while enjoying the community spirit in our neighborhood.

Now we are at the stage of life where our kids are launching their careers and developing full lives outside of our home. They are discovering that they cannot afford to live in Sebastopol and are challenged to find housing anywhere in Sonoma County at all.

One of our daughters, Elise Carroll, is a land use planner with Denovo Planning in Sacramento, which helped prepare the Sebastopol General Plan. She took the job in Sacramento because housing was too expensive in her home county. All of our 5 children are struggling to afford to live here and we have a chance to help them by building an ADU on our property at 1760 Sanders RD, if the zoning is changed to accommodate this.

Our property is 4 acres, and is in the area that the planning commission recommended to be rezoned. We are on a private road that I have maintained with my farm tractor ever since we bought the property. We continue to farm apples in the Sebastopol tradition and support our community whenever we can. We love our neighborhood and frequently get together with our neighbors to share the sweet life that we all respect and enjoy.

Our oldest daughter gave us the gift of a granddaughter a couple months ago. She has mentioned many times how wonderful it would be for her daughter to attend the schools that she attended and loved in the Sebastopol area, and be able to provide her daughter with the same academic opportunities that she enjoyed. That could be a real possibility if our property was rezoned to allow ADUs.

Just as farmers prepare the soil for planting and carefully tend the crops for a successful harvest in the future.....Sonoma County has a chance to create a more successful future by approving zoning changes today that will lead to more affordable housing, more children remaining in the County they love, and more children contributing to the success of the County in the future.

Thank you for entertaining this hopeful opportunity.

Sincerely, Jon Carroll

**From:** Chris Grabill [<mailto:cgrabill@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, May 02, 2019 8:35 AM

**To:** Jane Riley <[Jane.Riley@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Jane.Riley@sonoma-county.org)>; Doug Bush <[Doug.Bush@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Doug.Bush@sonoma-county.org)>

**Cc:** Efren Carrillo <[ECarrillo@burbankhousing.org](mailto:ECarrillo@burbankhousing.org)>

**Subject:** Re: Z exclusion.

Mr. Bush,

Please accept my letter of support for the resolution and Removal of the Z designation, and ending the exclusion of permitted ADU's on these specific parcels. Sonoma County is an aging community, especially in our rural areas, and with the exodus of many young families due to lack of affordability and availability of permanent housing, any land use/zoning tools to increase the propensity and possibility for 'aging in place' and co-locating are welcome parts of a greater policy solution. We need to do so much more as a community, to recognize the needs of both our aging seniors and our working families, including many more incentives and funding streams for affordable housing in cities, and urban service areas. We are in a moment where 'all of the above' is necessary, so please accept this letter of support, And continue the important work.

Best wishes,

Chris Grabill

- Co-Chair, Santa Rosa Housing Recovery
- Board of Directors, Sonoma County Conservation Action
- Executive Board, Legal Aid of Sonoma County

Sent from my iPhone

## REMOVE Z ZONING ON AG PARCELS

When Sonoma County is claiming to be trying to allow more housing why are some large west county Land Extensive Ag zoned parcels saddled with a Z zoning second unit exclusion when many smaller parcels are allowed to have second units?

Having a second unit also helps with occasional work needing done in exchange for some rent on Ag properties that might not quite qualify for ag employee housing, which is of increasing importance to aging agriculturists still working in their 70's, 80's and even 90's. So often something that may take 15 minutes help when help is there is a project if someone needs to come from a distance. Additional eyes on the ranch can help keep livestock safer from predators, and spot animals in distress, especially if the second unit is located so that different areas of the ranch can be seen from the second unit. Having a second unit instead of dividing the property also helps keep land in agriculture as the tenant is more likely to be aware of agricultural concerns than someone with no ties to the ranch or farm.

So many urban planners and regulators are unaware of the effect some regulations have on rural areas especially. It seems the county has a preference to have long time Ag properties sold to new high income residents that pay a new higher property tax and can afford to spend several hundred thousand, or much more, on a driveway required to be built to higher standards than many county roads.

I have heard that a planner thought large parcels were less fire safe. I believe the opposite is often true. Grazing is a big help and many fire lines stopped at vineyards and were slowed or stopped on grazed parcels.

We were puzzled by a Press Democrat article listing Valley Ford as a high fire danger area. There are few trees and mainly ranches and dairies that value and utilize their grass. Most of those businesses also have large tractors immediately available for fire fighting. Hay is cut and baled at the time it is drying out and silage put up even earlier. By most of fire season pastures are grazed down.

I have an 80 acre parcel bordered by smaller, mostly 5-10 acre parcels, on 3 sides, which with my other 2 parcels total a ranch of 410 acres. Only one neighbors parcel bordering the 80 acres is grazed. One neighbor mows some years but several have tall grass and brush.

Larger parcels are usually grazed by livestock and are more fire safe than many smaller 1-10 acre parcels that are too big to easily mow but usually not fenced for livestock and often not utilized for anything but a house site. There are 4 parcels next to each other joining another parcel I have livestock on that are each about 5 acres. One owner keeps the brush down but the other 3 parcels, 2 have large newer homes, are not grazed and very overgrown with brush 10 feet tall close to the houses. At the fenceline where there are livestock this changes to grass, which is gets shorter the later the season as the livestock graze it down. When it comes to fire danger please consider that large parcels can often be more fire safe. There are also more options on where to build with less cost or proximity to hazards on a larger parcel.

Cost, including the numerous regulatory hurdles such as the amount of engineering now required even on flatter parcels, is an issue that is driving home construction away. I realize some of this is state mandate driven but counties contribute to building difficulties. Road requirements require a better road than the county road the parcel I want to build on is accessed by. Driveways and ranch roads should not need to be so costly. To build the house where I would prefer would be far greater than the cost of the house itself due to the paving requirement.

It does not seem that the county can continue to place Z zoning on parcels that are otherwise buildable because they are "too big" and seriously claim to be concerned about adding housing. Urban buildout is a nice idea but when one son worked at a Bodega Bay restaurant, most of his coworkers had to go to Santa Rosa area for housing.

Thank you,  
Sharon Harston



475 Aviation Blvd., Suite 220 ■ Santa Rosa, CA 95403 ■ 707-542-1579 ■ northbayrealtors.org

May 2, 2019

Sonoma County Planning Commission  
2550 Ventura Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403-2887

**Subject: ZCE 18-0001, Z Combining District Removal (Accessory Dwelling Units)**

Members of the Sonoma County Planning Commission,

On behalf of the North Bay Association of REALTORS® (NorBAR), I am writing to share our support for the proposed removal of the Z (Accessory Dwelling Unit Exclusion) Combining District from identified agriculture district parcels and establish new objective standards for review of ADU applications countywide.

Rezoning the proposed parcels to remove the Z Combining District will remove significant barriers for the production of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) while ensuring the application of uniform, ministerial standards. ADUs can help support small farms by providing supplemental income and agricultural worker housing for farming families when their properties do not qualify for other agricultural housing types. Allowing accessory units on agricultural properties may also reduce commute times and associated traffic and pollution by providing rural housing near rural jobs.

This proposal takes significant precautions to ensure the exclusion of high-risk areas and excludes parcels located within high/very high fire hazard severity zones or critical biotic habitat areas for the CTS, where the potential for groundwater contamination is present or groundwater levels would be compromised, and so on.

Finally, jurisdictions throughout California – including our service area of Sonoma, Napa, Mendocino and Lake - have taken great strides to facilitate the creation of ADUs and other forms of affordable, and affordable workforce housing – this proposal aligns with those worthy those efforts and we appreciate your leadership on the local housing crisis.

Thank you for considering our input. Should you have any questions regarding our position, please do not hesitate to contact our Government Affairs Director, Lisa Badenfort, at 707-636-4294, or [lisa@northbayrealtors.org](mailto:lisa@northbayrealtors.org).

Respectfully,

  
Carol A. Lexa, Chair  
Local Government Relations Committee

**The North Bay Association of REALTORS® is a four-county trade association representing over 3,500 real estate professionals and affiliates. We serve as an advocate for housing and homeownership, the preservation of property rights, and a thriving real estate economy. In addition to advocacy, we serve as a collaborator and resource to decision-makers and the public on the persistent quality of life issues facing the North Bay.**

cc:

Commissioner Greg Carr	1st District
Commissioner Dick Fogg	1st District
Commissioner Larry Reed	2nd District
Commissioner Todd Tamura	2nd District
Commissioner Paula Cook	3rd District
Commissioner Komron Shahhosseini	3rd District
Commissioner Ariel Kelley	4th District
Commissioner Cameron Mauritson	4th District
Commissioner Pamela Davis, Chair	5th District
Commissioner John Lowry	5th District

Tennis Wick, Director, Permit Sonoma (PRMD)  
Jane Riley, Comprehensive Planning Manager, Permit Sonoma (PRMD)  
Doug Bush, Project Planner, Permit Sonoma (PRMD)

## Lucia Fincher

---

**From:** Jane Riley  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 02, 2019 11:52 AM  
**To:** Lucia Fincher  
**Subject:** FW: Z (Accessory Dwelling Unit Exclusion) Combining District Removal

---

**From:** Efren Carrillo [mailto:ECarrillo@burbankhousing.org]  
**Sent:** May 02, 2019 11:44 AM  
**To:** Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>  
**Cc:** Doug Bush <Doug.Bush@sonoma-county.org>; Jane Riley <Jane.Riley@sonoma-county.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Z (Accessory Dwelling Unit Exclusion) Combining District Removal

On behalf of Burbank Housing, I am writing to express our support for the recommendation to remove the Z Combining District from identified agricultural district parcels and establish new objective standards for review of Accessory Dwelling Unit applications county-wide. In order to increase the supply of affordable housing, ADU's have been seen as an alternative in representing a promising strategy to address our housing affordability challenges.

There are many potential benefits and key advantages for ADU's in design and usage, and can be tailored to meet individual housing and financial needs. Additionally, ADU's can assist homeowners/property owners offset their own property costs with rental income. This is especially important in the agricultural community. A significant number of ADU's could also be offered for free or in exchange of work in the agricultural community, potentially filling a particular need for low-income households. ADU's can provide a critical supply of affordable housing in communities like ours experiencing high rents.

Regulatory reform, technical assistance, political will and community support are key in moving good ADU policies forward. We appreciate the County's focus on this, and other housing affordability policies.

Burbank Housing is a nonprofit dedicated to building quality affordable housing in the North Bay. We create vibrant local communities that are carefully designed, professionally managed, and sustainable both financially and environmentally, to foster opportunities for people with limited-income of all ages, backgrounds and special needs. For over 37 years, we have led the region in creating and maintaining quality, sustainable housing and rental opportunities for more than 10,000 people in over 60 communities.

Kindly,

Efren

Efren Carrillo, Director of Government and Community Affairs

**From:** [Dennis Rosatti](#)  
**To:** [Jane Riley](#)  
**Cc:** [Doug Bush](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Comments please!  
**Date:** Thursday, May 02, 2019 12:18:09 PM

---

May 2, 2019

Dear County of Sonoma Planning Staff,

Reading the staff report for today's 5/2/2019 Meeting on the removal of Z status zoning for select parcels, I see this is aimed at parcels under 10 acres and as proposed by Staff Recommended Option 1, unlocks 1,377 parcels to make them eligible for ADU's, where a dwelling unit already exists first. This is not applied to the full 3,985 parcels that Z District currently applies to because it appears you are use this filter to determine eligible parcels on a site specific basis:

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->  
<!--[endif]-->

- The property is not located within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone;
- The property is not within a critical biotic habitat area for the California Tiger Salamander;
- An ADU on the parcel does not present the potential for groundwater contamination;
- An ADU on the parcel will not affect groundwater levels;
- The property is not located in a Traffic Sensitive Combining Zone;
- The property is not subject to a Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) or other open space contract, or other recorded agricultural easements; and
- The property is not located in the Coastal Zone.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->  
<!--[endif]-->

I don't see the real problem with removing the Z District designation from these parcels, especially with the use of the above filter. The "full build out" of the 1,377 units is very unlikely to happen, and it would be incremental additions of units over time. Where appropriate, I think people should be allowed to build a granny unit on their property (a unit under 1,200 sq ft) so they can potentially age in place, share property with children whom are just entering adulthood or starting a family or returning home for whatever life crisis, for caretakers for property or health, and for potential ag workers. I do think it would be good to have a restriction on Air B+B/vacation rentals for ADUs without approval by the County, and perhaps a time restriction so that these potential "affordable" housing units will actually be build to help deal with our housing crisis now (so a 5 year restriction where the new units would not be eligible for vacation rental status).

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->  
<!--[endif]-->

We need the affordable, and other, housing in Sonoma County. I don't like the idea of building housing outside the UGB's/USA's in general; however I don't see this as a big problem with a potential for 1,377 units (unlikely to get to

that full build out as stated earlier) spread out around the county. It's a far superior option than pushing our affordable housing to Lake or Mendocino Counties and making the housing "someone else's problem." I would like to see a restriction or at minimum a process for ADU's to have to go through to gain temporary vacation rental status (ie- for 5 years vacation rental status is prohibited for new ADU's in these parcel types (or anywhere!)), then an application process is used that is rigorous and open to public input).

Thank you for your consideration of my personal comments. (Representing only my own opinion in these correspondence).

Dennis Rosatti  
Sebastopol, CA

**THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.**  
**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,  
**do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.



COMMUNITY ALLIANCE WITH FAMILY FARMERS

SONOMA COUNTY CHAPTER

**April 30, 2019**

**To: Sonoma County Planning Commission**

**From: The Policy Committee for CAFF/Farmers Guild Sonoma County**

Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF)/ the Farmers Guild, are united in a statewide organization of farmers, ranchers and sustainable food system advocates who work to create more resilient family farms, communities and ecosystems.

Our Sonoma County chapter has been actively involved with local land use issues for many years. We provided substantial input during the General Plan 2020 update process and to the subsequent ag zoning revisions. We have advocated for protections for agricultural lands, upholding zoning standards and increasing support for diverse ag especially on smaller parcels.

The need for more affordable housing has impacted the farming community significantly as many who would like to farm here – including from local farm families – cannot afford to live here.

But we have many concerns about the proposal to remove restrictions on ADUs in Ag zones as is currently being proposed. There are a number of assertions in the staff report that we do not think are accurate. The ag community should have been consulted when drafting this proposal and request that more time be given for adequate outreach and discussion prior to any decisions being taken by the Planning Commission

The proposal to allow significantly more ADUs in ag zones would have a significant and long term impact on those rural areas. We very surprised to learn of this with very short notice and feel that the ag community and surrounding neighbors need and deserve to be included.. No one I have contacted had any idea that this was being proposed and all were very concerned.

The staff report points to farm worker housing standards as not providing for adequate housing for farm workers. We agree and have been advocating for updating these standards for several years. Row crops, flowers and other high value labor intensive crops are not even listed and it has been a long time since there were many acres of prunes or pears in the county. Multi-species livestock rotations are not considered as well. In addition, today's families are often not the historic nuclear blood relations that farm family housing historically had.

The solution to this problem is to update the farm worker housing standards. The current proposal has no restrictions that would limit the housing to those working the land. We would be happy to help convene a group of ag stakeholders and work with staff to update these standards.

Affordability of ADUs due to the 1,200 sq. ft. limitation is assumed in the staff report but there are no affordability restrictions proposed. As anyone who has been looking for rentals in recent years knows, size does not indicate affordability. Most smaller homes are renting for much higher prices than most

farm workers, (or other low to moderate wage workers), can afford.

We feel that the current proposal will lead to increased traffic burden on already congested roads not built for this volume of traffic. We do not agree that many of the roads in the proposed areas have "light" traffic. The County is supposed to use vehicle miles traveled to evaluate new development proposals and the cumulative impact of all these new units needs to be subject to the same evaluation. We feel that the vast majority of these ADUs will be used by non-farmers and for more Air B&Bs and vacation rentals, impacting neighborhoods with noise, traffic and further exacerbating rental prices.

We also agree with many of the concerns regarding this proposal submitted by Greenbelt Alliance.

We are grateful that Doug Bush contacted us but are dismayed at the very short time frame and ask that any decisions be postponed until much more thorough outreach can be done and farm worker housing standards updated.

Thank you for considering our views.

Wendy Krupnick

Vice President, CAFF Sonoma County

**From:** [Teri Shore](#)  
**To:** [Gregory N Carr](#); [Sonomafogg](#); [Todd Tamura](#); [larry@reedgilliland.com](#); [Paula Cook](#); [komronshahhosseiniSCPC@gmail.com](#); [arielkelley707@gmail.com](#); [Cameron Mauritson](#); [Pamela Davis](#); [John Lowry](#)  
**Cc:** [Jane Riley](#); [Arielle Kohn](#); [Doug Bush](#)  
**Subject:** Z (Accessory Dwelling Unit Exclusion) Combining District Removal - May 2  
**Date:** Monday, April 29, 2019 12:25:39 PM

---

Dear Sonoma County Planning Commissioners and Permit Sonoma,

The proposed removal of the Z (Accessory Dwelling Unit Exclusion) Combining District Removal has the potential to provide affordable housing for people who work on agricultural properties across the county.

However, it also has the potential to increase the number of people in Sonoma County who live in rural areas that are distant from towns and cities with public services, jobs and schools.

Without further environmental analysis, it is likely, though difficult to know for sure, that by removing the Z zoning as proposed, that Vehicle Miles Traveled are likely to increase and work against the county's ongoing desire to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and focus on city-centered growth.

Today the county allows ADUs up to 1,200 square feet - which is the size of a double-wide mobile home - that easily accommodate a family of four. If all the identified parcels build the maximum size ADU with the maximum number of people, that would equal up to 5,500 more people on ag lands in rural areas.

Clearly, the County of Sonoma is intent on moving this forward, though perhaps it should really be considered as part of the General Plan Update not as a fast-tracked stand-alone ordinance. Doing so would provide rural landowners and the public to weigh in and consider the long-term impacts of this far-reaching change in zoning.

In any case, as you move forward to allow more residential development via ADUs in the rural areas, you may want to consider the following:

1. How many of the parcels are in community separators? It looks at first glance that there are some in Sonoma Valley and probably outside of Petaluma and Healdsburg. At the least, please request that staff provide an overlay of the CS, where people voted by 81 percent to prevent increased development.
2. Will these ADUs be limited to farm workers and ag employees or open to anyone?
3. Is there any affordability requirement?
4. Is there any reason they couldn't be used as vacation rentals or air b and bs or hospitality?
5. Will these ADUs be allowed for marketing and other promotional purposes?
6. Will removing the Z zoning then conflict with LAFCO policies that prohibit adding more units and/or rooms to Outside Service Agreements (Cortese-Knox)?

Thank you for your consideration.

Teri Shore

--

Teri Shore  
Regional Director, North Bay

**Greenbelt Alliance**

555 Fifth Street, Suite 300 A | Santa Rosa, CA 95401

1 (707) 575-3661 office | 1 (707) 934-7081 cell | [tshore@greenbelt.org](mailto:tshore@greenbelt.org)

[greenbelt.org](http://greenbelt.org) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

*P.S. [Join me for happy hour May 16](#) in San Francisco to support local farms.*

**THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.**

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,  
**do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

## Loss of Homes to Wildfire

### High Risk of Wildfire Tied to Density of Homes and WUI


Researchers studying devastating firestorms in California and beyond have found that medium housing density is more highly correlated with loss of life and home from wildfires *than any other factors*.

Topography, fuel, defensible space, building construction; all are less important in determining risk from wildfires than the medium density typical of subdivisions that sprawl beyond the urban edge into wildlands.

Researcher Alexandra Syphard of the Conservation Biology Institute presented this finding on development and wildfire at the Living with Fire Symposium at Sonoma State University. This science was based on several studies of wildfires across California and the United States.<sup>1</sup>

This work is illustrated in the bell-curve graph which shows the highest wildfire risk in medium densities often seen in the wildland urban interface. The lowest wildfire risk is in the urban areas of high density and in very-low density ranch or farm lands with one or two houses surrounded by large acreage.

This information needs to be incorporated into County policies and the General Plan in order to advance fire-safe land use polices.



1

Syphard et al. 2012, and others. Housing Arrangement and Location Determine the Likelihood of Housing Loss Due to Wildfire.

**From:** [Jean Powers](#)  
**To:** [PermitSonoma](#)  
**Subject:** Attn: Jane Riley Re: Z Zoning Reexamination  
**Date:** Monday, November 05, 2018 2:30:06 PM

---

Hello,

This may land on someone else's desk before Jane Riley's. She spoke @ the housing meeting in Sebastopol on Sunday, Nov 4. We exchanged e-mails, but hers gets bounced by my server. Tried her office phone #. Announcement said she's out for a week or so. Please forward to her on her return & if you have any information on upcoming zoning meetings or similar Z properties that have been rezoned or zoning confirmed, please advise.  
Thank you!

Good morning, Jane,

I attended the housing day @ Sebastopol Community Center Sunday, Nov 4, & listened to 1st panel that you were on. Very interesting! You mentioned that about 1000 Z zonings were being reexamined.

I'd like to put my parcel forth as an example of the Catch 22 Z has put me in.

I own 15+ acres, about 8 are in dry farmed heritage apples. I plan to keep my apples, but expansion isn't logical due to slope. The sloped areas are wild habitat for oaks, manzanita, owls, hawks, song birds, woodpeckers, bobcats, skunks, raccoons, possum, fox, deer.

I admit that due to the \$ in vineyards, I did contact a company interested in adding to their rented acreage. My parcel did not interest due to small size, difficulty operating equipment on slopes & need for new well.

There is one house on the 15 acres, the original built by my farming ancestors around 1880. Since I have been living here, I've wanted to build an Accessory Dwelling Unit- just about exactly as the County has outlined today! Current well is excellent & septic allows for 4 bedrooms- I have 2.

When I took idea to planning department in past, I was given a set of regulations which if I passed, I could build a 2nd unit of ANY size, presuming I'd rent to farm workers. The agricultural requirements were all beyond current or future possibility, giving # of trees, acres in vegetables, # of geese or goats, etc., & limiting capacity of my well & slopes of land.

**That meant that on my 15 acres I could only build a tiny "guest house" (no kitchen) within 300 feet of home.**

My long held desire is to build a 2 car garage with a rental studio above, quite within the Accessory Dwelling Unit requirements.

It would not impact my apple tree farming acreage, neighbors, nor do I wish to subdivide.

**Address: 3520 Sullivan Rd, Sebastopol.**

**Parcel #: 104-060-040-000**

**Tax Rate Area: 130-013**

You told me there are subsets of Z zoning , but I don't know which I have. Sorry, Jane.

Sincerely-  
Jean Powers

**From:** [Jennifer Mann](#)  
**To:** [Doug Bush](#)  
**Subject:** Z Overlay  
**Date:** Thursday, November 01, 2018 11:31:16 AM

---

Dear Doug,

Thank you for including me in the notification list for updates on the removal of the antiquated Z Overlay in West Sebastopol.

My adult children and I bought this home at 2035 Blucher Valley Rd Sebastopol 95472 parcel no. 025-012-002 in July 2018 with the intention of building an ADU for me, the Grandmother to our 3 and 5 year old children. We have adequate water, strong septic and nearly 3 acres of sunny, landscaped building space. We were happily making progress to obtain plans and permits when we were completely STOPPED by a friend who researched our property online and discovered that our parcel falls under the Z Overlay zoning ADU exclusion. I checked with the Planning Commission yesterday and learned for the first time that what he found was true, even though the criteria do not fit our situation.

My son and daughter in law and I each sold our homes to create this family compound WITH NO DISCLOSURE by anyone about this antiquated restriction. I am willing to help support the removal, without having to apply for a parcel specific exemption, in any way that I can. Thank you for your shepherding of the proposal to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to remove this restrictive zoning in times of such dire housing needs in Sonoma County.

Very truly yours, Jennifer Mann  
2035 Blucher Valley Rd  
Sebastopol, CA 95472  
707-583-6548

--

Jennifer Mann,  
"I am open to life beyond my wildest dreams."

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.  
Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,  
do not click any web links, attachments, and never give out your user ID or password.