

## **RESOLUTION NO.**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA  
MAKING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS AND APPROVING A HILLSIDE  
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A THREE-STORY SELF-STORAGE  
FACILITY IN AN AREA THAT CONTAINS SLOPES GREATER THAN TEN PERCENT AT  
4465 STREAMSIDE DRIVE; FILE NUMBERS PRJ21-028 (HDP22-094)**

WHEREAS, the previously approved Recess Storage Project, including a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Tentative Map, a minor Conditional Use Permit, and a Hillside Development Permit, was approved by the Planning Commission on August 8, 2019. At a subsequent meeting of the Design Review Board, held on January 16, 2020, the project was granted Design Review; and

WHEREAS, the previously approved Recess Storage Project involved the construction of a four-story self-storage facility, an eight-unit multifamily structure, and a six-unit multifamily structure; and

WHEREAS, the previously approved personal self-storage facility has been constructed; the multifamily housing structures have not; and

WHEREAS, an application was submitted to Planning and Economic Development requesting the approval of a Hillside Development Permit for a Personal Storage Facility, to be constructed in an area with slopes greater than ten percent at 4465 Streamside Drive, also identified as Sonoma County Assessor's Parcel Number(s) 032-530-002; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the application at which all those wishing to be heard were allowed to speak or present written comments and other materials; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered the application, the staff reports, oral and written, the General Plan and zoning on the subject property, the testimony, written comments, and other materials presented at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered the previously ratified Mitigated Negative Declaration and addendum addressing any additional impacts for this use and project; and

WHEREAS, the matter has been properly noticed as required by Section 20-32.060.E.1.a.c; and;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 20-32.060.F, the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Rosa finds and determines that:

1. Site planning minimizes the visual prominence of the hillside development by taking advantage of existing site features for screening including tree clusters,

depressions in topography, setback hillside plateau arrears, and other natural features. The building design appears to step with the slope. The landscaping will include several native trees, evergreen and deciduous, which, when established, will screen the structure from bicycle and pedestrian traffic along the Santa Rosa Creek Trail, existing structures to the west, and eastbound traffic on Streamside Drive.

2. Site development minimizes alteration of topography, drainage patterns, and vegetation on land with slopes of 10 percent or more. The project site has been fully graded in anticipation of the previously approved Recess Storage Project. The proposed self-storage building is placed in approximately the same footprint of the previously approved multifamily residential structure, and revised drainage patterns have been reviewed by Engineering and Building staff and the project conditioned appropriately.
3. Site development does not alter slopes of 25 percent or more except in compliance with Section 20-32.020.B (Applicability-Limitation on hillside development). There is a small area with greater than 25 percent slope that will be covered by the proposed structure. Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 20-32.020(B)(3), a visual analysis has concluded that the sloped area is not significant or visually sensitive. As such, alterations determined by the review authority to be minor may be approved.
4. Project grading respects natural features and visually blends with adjacent properties. As a result of a previously approved project, the site has already been graded and the sloped area generally maintained. The proposed self-storage structure has been designed to step with the sloped grade.
5. Building pad location, design, and construction avoids large areas of flat pads and building forms will be stepped to conform to site topography in that the building has been designed to step with the existing slope.
6. The proposed project complies with the City's Design Guidelines. The project has been conditioned contingent upon Design Review. On October 7, 2021, the Design Review Board reviewed the project as a concept item at which point the Board was generally in support of the current project.
7. The proposed project complies with the requirements of this Chapter and all other applicable provisions of this Zoning Code. The project is in compliance with all sections of the Zoning Code, except 20-42.180 which requires 20-foot front and rear setbacks. The entitlement package includes a Variance for this requirement. As such, the project is in compliance with the Zoning Code.
8. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan. The site is within an area designated as Retail and Business Services on the General Plan Land Use Diagram which allows retail and service enterprises including personal storage facilities, offices, restaurants, and housing. Personal storage facilities are allowed through the approval of a minor Conditional Use Permit, for which an application is included. The project is not located within the boundary of a specific plan area.

9. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use will not under the circumstances of the particular case be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare.
10. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). On August 8, 2019, the Planning Commission adopted the Recess Storage Project Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) that considered a mixed-use development including the recently constructed self-storage structure at 4224 Hwy 12 and two multifamily residential structures on the subject properties. An addendum, prepared by Arcadis, dated July 2022, considered the differences between the approved and proposed projects, where the multifamily residential structures would be replaced with self-storage units. The Addendum concluded that “there have been no significant changes in circumstances that would involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. None of the “new information” conditions listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3] are presented here to trigger the need for a subsequent MND.” The Addendum was adopted by the Planning Commission on August 11, 2022.

This entitlement would not be granted but for the applicability and validity of each and every one of the below conditions and that if any one or more of the below conditions is invalid, this entitlement would not have been granted without requiring other valid conditions for achieving the purposes and intent of such approval. The approval of the project is contingent upon compliance with all the conditions listed below. Use shall not commence until all conditions of approval have been complied with. Additional permits and fees are/may be required. **It is the responsibility of the applicant to pursue and demonstrate compliance.**

#### Conditions of Approval

1. Compliance with all conditions of approval as shown on Planning Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ for the project-related minor Conditional Use Permit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission finds and determines this entitlement to use would not be granted but for the applicability and validity of each and every one of the above conditions and that if any one or more of the above said conditions are invalid, this entitlement to use would not have been granted without requiring other valid conditions for achieving the purposes and intent of such approval.

REGULARLY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Rosa on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of August 2022 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY