

88-42

Laguna report amended APRIL 14th 1988 TIMES

Planning recommends Laguna report to council

By Mike Jasper

After enduring one three-hour public hearing and two hour-long study sessions in the past few weeks, the Sebastopol Planning Commission has recommended that the City Council adopt the recommendations in the Laguna Report as city policy — but not without a few changes.

Using the "Executive Summary" portion of the report as the basic text, the commission responded to

recommendations made by the Laguna Advisory Committee.

The biggest issue was the report's recommendation of "no net fill" below the 76-foot flood plain and its recommendation of no further development.

The commission said that the city needed to develop long-range plans to address development below the flood elevation, but thought that the development restriction on properties below 76 feet which are currently being developed or are in

an urbanized setting would be inappropriate.

The commission believed those

(continued on page 8A)

Planning . . .

(continued from front page)

areas included properties west of Morris St. and north of Sebastopol Ave. and fronting Morris St.

Also excluded from the 76-foot limitation were properties east of Morris St. and north of Sebastopol Ave., properties south of Sebastopol Ave. and north of the railroad tracks, including properties from the Laguna or east city limit line to 76-foot elevation.

Properties north of Sebastopol Ave. and west of properties fronting Morris St. to 76-foot elevation were also excluded.

As for the "no net fill" provision

of the report, the Planning Commission generally recommended the guidelines. But many questions were raised, such as: How is this accomplished on properties totally below 76 feet? If there is to be a borrow area, who knows if the quality of borrow material is appropriate for structural fill?

"This is probably something we could discuss all night and still not change the text," Commission Chairman Don Davis said.

Another point discussed was enforcement. The report encouraged occasional spot checks or visits by the Environmental Protection Agency, but the commission thought this sounded too "Big Brotherish." Instead, the language was changed to encourage the EPA to enforce its own regulations.