

County of Sonoma Permit & Resource Management Department

PLANNING COMMISSION / BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENTS APPEAL FORM

PJR-021

To: Board of Supervisors County of Sonoma, State of California File No.: PLP 24 - 0012
Appeal is hereby made by Protect San Antonio Valley Katheen Lava
Mailing Address 1250 San Antonio Rd.
City/State/Zip Petaluma, Calif. 94952
Phone: 707 953 4425 Email: 17/255e9mail: com
The Sonoma County OP Planning Commission / Board of Zoning Adjustments on
(date)4-24-2025
Dapproved / Odenied a request by mario and Katherine Chilotti
for Use Permit
Located at 4485 D. ST. Ext. Peta Luma Pa 9499
APN 020-130-037 Zoning: LEA 60 Supervisorial District: 2
This appeal is made pursuant to Sonoma County Code Chapter Section 26-92-160 for the following specific reasons:
Please See attached materials
Appellant Signature Math (een) halligna) Date: 5.2.2025
DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE - TO BE COMPLETED BY PERMIT SONOMA STAFF
This appeal was filed with Permit Sonoma on this date $05-05-25$
receipt of which is hereby acknowledged
Permit Sonoma Staff Signature

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403-2829 (707) 565-1900

Version: 02/07/2020

Page 1 of 1

Attachment to Appeal of File No. PLP24-0012

Submitted May 5, 2025

The reasons for appeal include, but are not limited to, those listed below:

Reasons for Appeal

- 1) Scale and Purpose: While the BZA reduced the number of allowed events, they remain out of scale with the agriculture being envisioned. The number, frequency, and primary purpose of the proposed events fail to meet the criteria for permitted uses in LEA zones as "secondary and incidental to agriculture"
- 2) Williamson Act Violation: The building's large size, luxury finishes and primary use as an Event Center constitutes a material breach of the Williamson Act. The applicant receives significant property tax breaks through the Act. Given the size and frequency of the events allowed, Sonoma County taxpayers are effectively subsidizing the revenue the applicant earns from events. That is not consistent with the purposes and intentions of the Act.
- 3) Enforcement Concerns: Given the applicants' documented history of violating county restrictions, there are concerns about compliance and enforceability of the imposed limitations on the use permit if granted. There are discrepancies between the promotional materials recently distributed to neighbors and the actual use permit application.
- 4) Precedent Setting: Approving this use permit sets a problematic precedent, potentially encouraging other landowners to ignore County and State rules, as well as exploit agricultural exemptions for commercial purposes.