

SDC Redevelopment Specific Plan

SELECTED ASPECTS: Publicly Stated Positions

* = endorsed NSVMAC letter; ** = endorsed both Springs and NSVMAC letters

(See: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/incomelimits> for annual income data)

	Max Housing #	Affordable Housing (Households of 3)	Hotel (as proposed in Specific Plan—120 rooms)	Historic Preservation
COUNTY SPECIFIC PLAN Preferred Alternative Permit Sonoma draft	1106	25% 30-120% AMI: \$32 – 122k 50% 121 - 160% AMI: \$122 - 162k	Yes	Loss of Historic District Significance and Status
MUNICIPAL BODIES				
North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council LETTER, Jan 6	450	50% -75% (AMI not defined)	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission**	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Springs Municipal Advisory Council, LETTER Sept 14	not mentioned	75%	No	not mentioned
Sonoma City Council**	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
NON-PROFIT/ COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS				
Sonoma Land Trust*	450	50 – 75%	“depends on scale and site constraints”	Preserve Historic District Status
Sonoma Mountain Preservation*	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Sonoma Ecology Center, LETTER, Nov 27, 2021	“impact more important than units”	75%	not mentioned	“maintain historic campus landscape feel”
Glen Ellen Historical Society*	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Sonoma Valley Housing Group, LETTER, Nov 28, 2021	“dense Valley infill development is appropriate”	75%	No	Not mentioned
Eldridge for All*	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
continued				

SDC Redevelopment Specific Plan
SELECTED ASPECTS: Publicly Stated Positions

(continued from page 1)

* = endorsed NSVMAC letter; ** = endorsed both Springs and NSVMAC letters
(See: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/incomelimits> for annual income data)

	Max Housing #	Affordable Housing (Households of 3)	Hotel (>100 rooms)	Historic Preservation
Valley of the Moon Association*	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Oakmont Village Association*	450 units	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Disability Services & Legal Center, LETTER no date	> 1290: “more housing than the alternatives”	50 – 100%	No	“some preservation”
Preserve Rural Sonoma* County, LETTER Jan 18	450	50 – 75%	No	Preserve Historic District Status
Center for Biological Diversity, LETTER March 4	“reduce scale and footprint of...Plan”	Not mentioned	“reduce scale and footprint of...Plan”	Not mentioned
Bennett Valley Community Association, LETTER Sept 19	“recommend drastically reducing...number of housing units”	Not mentioned	No	Not mentioned
La Luz Center, LETTER Nov 22, 2021	“maximize the number of affordable housing units”	“maximize the number of affordable housing units”	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Sonoma Valley Hospital, LETTER Dec 14, 2021	“support the development of ...affordable housing throughout Sonoma Valley.”	“support the development of ...affordable housing throughout Sonoma Valley.”	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Sierra Club, LETTER Jan 13	50 – 100	“need...affordable housing”	mentioned, no clear opinion	mentioned, no clear opinion
Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition, Letter Sept 23	450 “Prioritize Historic Preservation Alternative”	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	“Prioritize Historic Preservation Alternative”
COUNTY SPECIFIC PLAN DRAFT Preferred Alternative Permit Sonoma For reference	1106	25% 30-120% AMI: \$32 – 122k 50% 121 - 160% AMI: \$122 – 162k	Yes	Loss of Historic District Significance and Status