

From: [George McKinney](#)
To: [Lyle, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Butte County General Plan
Date: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 4:18:54 PM

I will mention the Butte County General Plan Housing Element Draft Thursday.
https://www.buttecounty.net/Portals/10/Docs/GP2040/BUTTECOUNTY_2022-2030_Housing_Element_Public_Review_Draft_June%202022.pdf?ver=2022-06-01-105242-350

A couple of quotes:

"Therefore, it is crucial for the Housing Element to consider the potential threat of wildfires when identifying sites in the county that may be adequate for new housing." p. 55

"Environmental conditions, including flooding and dam inundation, seismic and geological issues, and wildfires can limit where it is appropriate to locate housing" p. 173

"The County has confirmed the sites included in the Sites Inventory of this Housing Element are not in High or Very High Fire Hazard Zones, as identified by CalFire." p. 174

Note that Butte is somewhat like Santa Rosa and Sonoma. It lost 7,000 homes in two wildfires (Camp - Paradise, and North Complex) and has a program to allow rebuilding of lost homes while minimizing new homes in the high wildfire risk zones.

George

--

Sent from [Postbox](#)

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 4:12:18 PM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Kathleen Ramazzotti
Organization: resident
Email: rdskr10@gmail.com

Comment:

Comment: I agree we have a housing problem. I agree the homeless and disadvantage need help in housing.

However.....have you heard about the ongoing drought and water shortage?? Why, in Heaven's name would you put thousands more residents here to draw on the limited - or disappearing - water supply. We have restrictions on water now. Currently, you have several mega apartment complexes under construction. How many more residents - even just counting 2 per apt. - will you be adding to the diminishing water supply? And, then, you raise the water rates to compensate for the increased draw!!

Please, put your brains back in gear and look at what you're doing.....instead of what income it will put in your pockets.

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 7:40:33 AM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Hedley Lawson
Organization: Resident/home owner
Email: hedleylawson@gmail.com

Comment:

Comment: For some time, the use of the term "Affordable Housing" implies more homes in our community. Instead, it really means more "Lego-style" apartments dispersed throughout the city. Families have no yards for their children to play, they live within a complex with people they do not know --- and likely won't know, their parking is not sheltered, but in streets and lots, etc. This is the worst form of living for families and it has become unaffordable.

Santa Rosa should develop plans on the undeveloped land for true affordable homes. In doing so, identify lands throughout Santa Rosa that are suitable for home developments. And not to be left off of the table, form a coalition with the No. Coast Builders Exchange, home supply companies (Friedman Bros., Meade Clark and others), and labor groups to build these affordable developments of homes, not to continue building "Lego-style" apartments and condos for families.

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Saturday, June 18, 2022 8:32:17 PM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Wendy Krupnick
Organization: Several
Email: wlk@sonic.net

Comment:

Comment: The cheapest and fastest way to create large numbers of housing units for the housing that is most needed - low and very low income - is to rezone most commercial parcels to mixed use. There is an abundance of retail and office buildings with "for rent" signs on them and both strip malls and shopping centers have many vacancies. These buildings are generally close to transit and other services and would be far less expensive to remodel into small apartments than new construction. Coddington mall alone could accommodate dozens if not hundreds of units.

These conversions could also make it possible for Santa Rosa to absorb some of the County's RHNA numbers, which is critical as building in the rural areas is contrary to all of our climate and land preservation goals.

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 9:32:18 AM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Dan Roberts, Ph.D.
Organization: resident, homeowner
Email: dan2222@sonic.net

Comment:

Comment: City and state officials believe that building more housing units increases affordability. Officials need to understand that building more housing units does not increase affordability unless population increases at a slower rate than housing units.

Since 1950 Santa Rosa has increased its population, and presumably its number of housing units, tenfold, as compared to twofold for the US. However housing affordability in Santa Rosa has not improved. We're just increasing population and population density; we are not increasing affordability.

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 11:16:19 AM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Brenda Adelman
Organization: None Given
Email: wwguru@comcast.net

Comment:

Comment: With global warming upon us, it is likely that we will have more and more years of drought. The river is drying up more and more each summer and severe limitations on water use are being imposed. Demand hardening is likely before long as more and more people are reaching their maximum conservation goals. Even with water saving devices, the number of new units is so extreme, it is likely that it will become more and more difficult to meet health and safety needs. The Russian River this summer will go down as low as 25 cubic feet per second while normal levels are 125 cfs and higher. The cost of any new growth takes away from water supply. What are you going to do about that? What analysis have you conducted, using actual water available, to show how much water is available to build ANY new housing? This is a survival issue and will not have a happy outcome if you don't cut back on new development. Brenda Adelman - Russian River Watershed Protection Committee

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:08:11 PM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Tony Martin
Organization: homeowner
Email: tonymartin314@yahoo.com

Comment:

Comment: Dear Santa Rosa

I read that you want input from people who live here in Santa Rosa about the future of Santa Rosa and how the best add housing

I encourage you all to fully embrace new urbanism and move Santa Rosa towards a European style City center model, and rezone to allow retail within subdivisions!

Build up and tall in downtown Santa Rosa, as tall as the ground can support and get as many units in as dense an area as possible. Anything downtown near the bus lines and the Smart train is suitable!

Remove any parking expectations from the zoning requirements, and let the existing City structures serve for parking, as your own paper noted, we are subsidizing parking and not housing by requiring so much

We could easily triple or quadruple the population of downtown creating an economic powerhouse of local residents shopping at the local restaurants or riding on the Smart train to nearby cities

In all other suburban neighborhoods, and zoning restrictions and allow for retail within residential areas

People from Europe laugh at our ridiculous zoning expectations, they can't believe we have to walk 5 mi to a grocery store!

I want bodegas on every corner, no more giant subdivisions, it's a broken way of thinking

In Old Town's in Old cities, many residences have been converted to grocery stores or convenience stores, we need to do the same or put up new face fronts on a residential house to convert

No one should be more than a mile from a gallon of milk!

In addition, we need to integrate our transit systems with neighboring cities better, but this is about building, density is where it's at!

At one time people denigrated New York City for using so much power and water!

Until they actually divided that amount by the number of people and

found out that dense Urban living uses the least power and water of any possible way to live!

Make sure all of those buildings have green space on patios or within the complex, we can both build high density and build a livable space!

Work on more green roofs, plant more trees, and make Santa Rosa the right place to live for the next 150 years and more.

I'm sure you have consultants but if you need another one give me a ring. I can cover everything from solar energy to solar mass design. Enphase energy has me to thank for continuing to work! I also help at SunPower!

Also, really hope the city can foster community solar that allow us to invest or buy power instead of on roofs as some people have trees and shading

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: info@santarosaforward.com
To: info@santarosaforward.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment from SRGP Website
Date: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 9:00:36 AM

Comment Submitted by:

Name: Dan Oxley
Organization: None Given
Email: oxleydaniel@msn.com

Comment:

Comment: The City and County needs more family homes. No more dense condo and apartments! stricter laws one taxes on Air BnB. Our supervisors need to stop these corporations from buying homes and turning them into vacation rentals. it's sicken to know this conditioned to happen at alarming rates after the fires destroyed so many homes. My daughters have graduated school and leaving the County & State due to the high cost of housing. More hotels for visitors less vacation rentals..

See all comments.

https://www.santarosaforward.com/mail_forms/listing

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Santa Rosa Forward" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@santarosaforward.com.

From: [Warren Wiscombe](#)
To: [Lyle, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: comment on Housing Element draft -- mobile homes
Date: Sunday, June 5, 2022 1:05:34 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Warren Wiscombe** <warren.j.wiscombe@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 5, 2022 at 1:03 PM
Subject: comment on Housing Element draft -- mobile homes
To: <srforward@srcity.org>

Hi,

I searched the draft for instances of "trailer" (1) and "mobile" (many) to see if any new or creative policies were being proposed, and I didn't find any. It is of course nice to follow the law and not break up existing mobile home parks, but I had expected more focus on this housing type since it offers a very useful option for working our way out of the growing housing crisis.

I have watched as a variety of mobile housing types have been used to try to address the homeless crisis, and even the tents out at Los Guilicos, and it all seems like a kind of patchwork quilt with no guiding philosophy or plan, just a sort of knee-jerk reaction to the crisis of the moment. I would have expected a more long term view in The Draft, and I don't see one.

Right now, mobile home parks are scattered almost randomly around Santa Rosa. There doesn't seem to be any plan. The Draft should offer such a plan, not just say "we are going to continue doing what we are doing". If ever Santa Rosa is to work its way out of the housing crisis, an organized plan for mobile homes, widely construed, has to be an integral part.

Note that the cost argument is central here. Mobile homes can be purchased for \$50K or so, some more, some less, while the median price for a single-family house has soared to more than ten times that figure. Single-family houses are now beyond the reach of most middle-class people, and apartments are quickly following. Without a big plan to expand mobile homes -- beyond "just keep doing the same thing" -- we are dead on housing costs and unwittingly committing to an increasing traffic problem as people are forced to live out in the boonies, in more fire-prone areas, to escape skyrocketing SR housing costs.

I will close by noting that when I asked our old real estate agent about mobile homes, she said that hers and other realty companies don't even consider them houses, and don't include them in the multiple listings or in the assessments of median house prices. They are just hidden from view (until they burn) and they are largely condemned to remain so in your current Draft.

Warren Wiscombe
1850 Velvetleaf Ln
Santa Rosa 95404

From: [Katherine Austin](#)
To: [Lyle, Amy](#); [SR Forward](#); [Guerrero Auna, Beatriz](#); [Nicholson, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Draft Housing Element comments
Date: Saturday, June 11, 2022 1:55:29 PM

All, thank you for including me in your request for comments on the Draft Housing Element for Santa Rosa. I attended one of your public outreach meetings on the H.E. and also visited your website to give comments on the virtual open house. I have a few questions and comments based on my 30 year career of working as an architect designing housing in Santa Rosa.

I was involved in the beginning of the creation of growth management in Santa Rosa. I have designed and seen built over 50 ADUs in Santa Rosa as part of subdivisions. Most of my work was dedicated to small lot subdivisions, affordable housing for Burbank Housing, town houses and pushing the envelope on density. I noticed that three of my un-built subdivisions were listed as potential new housing in your draft including Katherine Subdivision that my client named after me.

At the end of this message I'll list a few of the projects I've designed in Santa Rosa so you get a better idea of my experience and it may help inform your understanding of my questions and comments.

1. **Regarding Growth Management:** I helped revise the program to allow all permits coming out of the "A" pool if a subdivision contained at least 50% A homes within one so that there could be a mix of unit sizes in small lot subdivisions. "A" being 1200 sf for a one story and 1250 sf for a two story on a lot not to exceed 4,000 sf. Is this still the proposed program? If not please consider retaining this to allow for a mix of unit types and to allow a developer to essentially subsidize the cost of the smaller units with the cost of the larger to average out their costs.
 1. Also I would like to recommend revising the 2 story maximum to 1300. The amount of SF dedicated to a stair is generally more than 50 sf. If it's a switch back with a landing it's closer to 90 sf. Allowing a max of 1300 sf is much easier to design and would not be a deal breaker for size of units remaining small.
2. **With regard to designing above the midpoint in density,** this completely negates the ability to design to the low to midpoint and it is debatable if this is really the best way to increase density or provide varied unit types. In three of my subdivisions, Hidden Creek, Hickory Village and Maple Village I complied with this requirement to approach 15 u/a by considering each lot as a duplex lot, while the small unit and ADU above garage were considered detached duplexes.
 1. This allowed each unit to be rented without the requirement of ownership on site. I suggest that all three of these developments are very successful but frankly I was "gaming" the system to do it. My clients needed the flexibility of not requiring on site ownership in one of the units and still provide a home ownership product.

2. In Hidden Creek we had a slight reduction due to the creek setback but still provided attached product (duplexes and a four-plex).
 3. In Hickory Village I had a slight reduction because of a major aqueduct that diagonally cut through the site and retention of the large hickory tree.
 4. Maple Village was in fact designed to 15 u/a and it probably the most dense detached product project I ever designed. It was very difficult to build for staging and infrastructure.
 5. All of these projects were built to avoid the liability of building condominiums which is what the density was designed for. No builder, architect or contractor will build condos and keep their insurance. Please understand the reality of the legal and insurance atmosphere in which we must work in California. We would have built the same product if we could have built at 8 u/a and not considered the two units as duplexes but as a home with an ADU IF we could also have avoided the requirement that an owner live in one of the units. I believe that has been removed but if not that requirement should definitely be removed. Rentals are very much needed in Santa Rosa and few can afford to own these kinds of properties at this point.
3. **With regard to required parking minimums:** To be perfectly honest there is a movement to eliminating parking minimums entirely. It is the progressive thing to do. Let the developers decide how much parking to provide. Believe me if the feel they cannot sell or rent their product without adequate parking they will provide required parking. I know I work with them and have heard this many times. But eliminating the minimum will allow flexibility in design and move us to a less car dependent future.
1. Short of eliminating parking minimums I highly recommend **de-coupling parking** from rental units. Many renters do not own a car but wind up subsidizing those other tenants that do when parking minimums are enforced. This is not fair or equitable and impacts lower income individuals the most. Find a way to allow parking to be a separate entity from rental units and provide a way for tenants without cars to not subsidize those that do.

These are my comments/questions. I'd like to reserve the right to look more closely at the draft and make further comments as I see them. I'd like to offer myself as a resource to you if you have any questions of me. I am working on a town house project in the North Station Area and hope to bring in an application within the next month or so for a Preliminary Review. So I do continue to work in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County.

Examples of built work in Santa Rosa designed by Katherine Austin, AIA:

1. Affordable Housing:
 1. Sloan House, CAP Sonoma County
 2. Timothy Commons, Burbank Housing
 3. Carillo Place, Burbank Housing
2. Town Houses
 1. Northcoast Village (Iriquois, Lance and Northcoast)

3. Accessory Dwelling Units - 50+ in multiple Subdivisions
4. Sample Infill Small Lot Subdivisions throughout Santa Rosa
 1. Dennis & Barnes in north
 2. Hidden Creek in east (multiple ADUs)
 3. Maple Village, central (multiple ADUs)
 4. Hickory Village, south west/central (Multiple ADUs)
 5. Meadow Park (Piner, Waltzer, Bay Meadow -Multiple ADUs) north west
 6. Zuur at College (multiple ADUs) north west
 7. Marlow Court, west (retention of heritage oaks)
 8. Giffen/Buss Drive in south west

Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Katherine Austin, AIA, Architect
179 SE Rice Way
Bend, OR 97702
And
524 South Main Street
Sebastopol, CA 95472
P 707-529-5565
kaaustin@pacbell.net
www.austinaia.com

From: [Annette Fashauer](#)
To: [SR Forward](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] General Plan
Date: Thursday, June 9, 2022 12:50:00 PM

I commented to someone, "why is sonoma county building so much?". The person said, "Oh, they are just replacing housing that burned."

Who is Sonoma County deciding to steal the water from? I keep hearing we are in a drought. If we are in a drought, why are you approving so much housing? The infrastructure needs to be in place before building. the brilliant idea of zero clearance housing and the green spaces. (Piner Rd., Fulton Rd, Stony Point Rd). I don't this County learned everything they needed to learn in 2017.

If you are having green spaces on the road side, someone needs to manage the brush and trees.

I have other comments, that is it for now.
Annette O'Brien-Fashauer

From: [Rue](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [Rogers, Chris](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [Sawyer, John](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Schwedhelm, Tom](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#); [Hartman, Clare](#); [Jones, Jessica](#); [Lyle, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Santa Rosa's Housing allocations
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:34:41 PM
Attachments: [SonCo - SR HousingRqust 6.22.pdf](#)

Hello there,

Before all else, I need to thank you for your constancy and dedication to the future on behalf of the rest of us. It's a huge effort and we all rely on you to think ahead and apply your best judgement on so many fronts.

Santa Rosa (and other jurisdictions) have received RHNA allocations that feel overwhelming, as you are painfully aware.

So much of our future depends on our working cooperatively in order to meet what's required of us in balance with our capacities; taking into account impacts and benefits as we proceed.

I'm attaching a letter of request from the County of Sonoma that asks for a level of cooperation that the City/County jurisdictions have achieved in the past - but not often. Perhaps, given the forces we face these days - not often enough.

Please consider a collaborative approach to meeting all our RHNA allocations, and what else needs to be done in sharing what seems like a burden. I doubt any of us would dispute the urgent necessity for more housing.

In consideration of impacts that intensification of uses creates, I hope the City of Santa Rosa will work with the unincorporated area of Sonoma County to provide housing where services and infrastructure are appropriate, thus reducing so many problems created by scattershot development such as VMT reduction, groundwater limitations, greater dangers from building in WUI areas and so much more.

Thank you again for your time, and especially for your commitment to a prosperous and sustainable future.

have a wonderful summer week,
Rue

From: [Victor Delpanno](#)
To: [SR Forward](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] YINMBY
Date: Saturday, June 11, 2022 9:24:40 PM

Thank you for taking steps to address the housing affordability crisis. Permits, zoning regulation, historical preservation rules, and environmental reviews have been used and abused by people who oppose new construction.

For affordability and livability, we need new multi-family units in central locations, with access to modes of transportation other than cars.

Just a warning: Most of the input you're likely to receive will come from those that have the time and financial motivation to insert themselves in the process.

This means homeowners whose houses have appreciated because of the housing shortage, and have the option to attend these meetings (e.g. wealthy retirees and single-income families). They are not representative of the much larger amount of people that would benefit from high density, affordable housing units.

-Victor



February 28, 2022

Policy Recommendations for 6th Cycle Housing Element

Dear Planning staff:

YIMBY Law submits this letter to share our policy goals and recommendations for the Policies and Programs section of your Housing Element. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Housing Element process.

The Policies and Programs section of the city's Housing Element must respond to data, analysis and findings presented in the Housing Needs section. We repeatedly see findings that housing prices are high, segregation exists, and there is a lack of housing for special populations, but the Policies and Programs don't respond to these findings or try to change outcomes. The overview of the city's housing environment should set the scene, and the policies and programs should explain what the city is going to do to fix it.

Our policy goals are as follows:

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

- 1. Prioritize rezoning in high resource, historically exclusionary neighborhoods.** Many of the highest resource neighborhoods with the best access to jobs, good schools, and other amenities have histories of exclusion which are still reflected in their zoning. Cities should rezone to allow more housing opportunities in those neighborhoods, particularly those with low Vehicle Miles Traveled, as part of their

Housing Elements.

- 2. Establish a strong tenant protection ordinance so that new housing benefits everyone.** Development should not permanently displace current residents. Housing replacement programs, temporary housing vouchers, right of return, and demolition controls will create stability for renters while allowing new homes to be built for new households and to accommodate the growth associated with RHNA. In your sites inventory and rezoning programs, you should prioritize development on sites with owner-occupied housing & commercial uses over those with existing rent-controlled apartments or other rental housing with lower income residents.

- 3. Support homeownership opportunities for historically excluded groups.** Homeownership continues to be a path to building financial security and inter-generational wealth, which has been systematically denied to many Americans. As a society, we need to make this right by intentionally offering opportunities to communities who have been excluded. The housing element should identify opportunities to create a variety of for-sale housing types and create programs to facilitate property ownership among excluded groups.

Site Capacity

- 4. Adequately plan for density.** Ensure that a site's density will accommodate the number of homes that are projected to be built. In addition, make sure height limits, setback requirements, FAR, and other controls allow for adequate density and the ability to achieve a site's realistic capacity. Housing will not be feasible if you have a high density paired with low height limits. This density should be emphasized around jobs and transit and should go beyond the Mullin density in those areas.

- 5. Provide sufficient zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels, including a minimum No Net Loss buffer of 30%.** Not every site will be developed at maximum density during the eight-year planning period. Identify an ample amount of opportunity sites and zone the sites to accommodate lower-income housing types (usually a statutory minimum of 30 dwelling units per acre) to give the city the best chance at meeting its RHNA.

- 6. Use data from the 5th Cycle to calculate the likelihood of development for your 6th Cycle site inventory.** Likelihood of development is a measure of the probability of an inventory site being developed during the planning period. The median likelihood of development across the state is 25%, meaning only one of every four sites will likely be developed during the planning period for the median city. Incorporating the likelihood of development into the zoned capacity will set the city up to successfully achieve their RHNA, making the housing element less of a paper exercise and more of an actionable, functional document.

Accessory Dwelling Units

- 7. Commit to an automatic mid-cycle adjustment if ADU permitting activity is lower than estimated in the housing element.** We highly recommend complying with HCD's standards of using one of its "safe harbor" methodologies to anticipate future ADU production. However, if the city is optimistic about ADU growth, then creating an automatic mid-cycle adjustment will automatically facilitate alternative housing options (i.e., a rezoning program, removing development constraints, ADU incentives, etc.) if the city falls behind the estimated ADU production.
- 8. Incentivize new ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted for moderate- or lower-income households or that are prioritized for households with housing choice vouchers.** Consider offering low- or no-interest loans, forgivable loans, impact fee waivers for ADUs that are 750 square feet or larger, allowances to facilitate two-story and second-story ADU construction, etc.

Zoning

- 9. Allow residential to be built in areas that are zoned for commercial use.** There are a myriad of ways to do this, but a housing overlay is one common policy. Additionally, consider eliminating new commercial space in mixed-use developments where there is not a strong demand or there is otherwise a glut of commercial space that is unused or frequently vacant.
- 10. Allow flexibility in inclusionary zoning.** Cities should require different percentages for different AMI levels. Additionally, we urge cities to incentivize land

dedication to affordable developers in order for market-rate developers to meet their inclusionary requirements. Avoid getting trapped into thinking that the affordable units must be “sprinkled throughout” the market-rate units, or require the market-rate units to look exactly the same as the affordable ones. This should be balanced against not locating all of the affordable units in one place and ghettoizing neighborhoods by creating or perpetuating racially concentrated areas of poverty.

Better Entitlement Process & Reducing Barriers to Development

- 11. Ensure that the city has a ministerial process for housing permitting, especially multi-family housing, and remove impact fees for deed-restricted housing.** A discretionary process for housing development creates uncertainty and adds to the cost of construction. For example, multi-family housing should not require a conditional use permit or city council approval unless the builder is asking for unique and extraordinary concessions. Right-sizing governmental constraints, entitlement processes, and impact fees will help the city successfully meet its RHNA.
- 12. Reduce parking standards and eliminate parking minimums.** Minimum parking requirements are a major constraint on housing, especially for lower cost housing types. They can cost in excess of \$30,000 per spot and can raise rents by as much as 17%, and eliminating them is particularly important for smaller & other spatially constrained sites. Consider adopting a parking maximum.
- 13. Cap fees on all new housing.** Most construction costs are outside the City’s control, but reducing impact fees can demonstrate that a city is serious about building new housing. At a minimum, cities should delay the collection of impact fees until the issuance of the certificate of occupancy to reduce financial impacts on new housing and make the units cheaper by not asking the developer to carry impact fee charges or debt throughout the construction phase.
- 14. Provide local funding.** One of the largest barriers to building new affordable homes is the lack of city/county funds available to assemble sites, provide gap funding, and to pay for dedicated staff. Without new funding, especially at the local level, we will not be able to build more affordable homes. There are three

new revenue streams that should be considered: 1) **Transfer tax**, a one-time payment levied by a jurisdiction on the sale of a home, may be utilized to raise much needed revenue to fund affordable homes; 2) **Vacancy tax** may be collected on vacant land to convince landowners to sell their underutilized properties and be used to fund the construction of affordable homes; 3) **Commercial linkage** fees should be adopted or revisited for increases on new commercial developments.

We urge you to include these policies in your 6th cycle Housing Element.

Best regards,

Sonja Trauss

Executive Director

YIMBY Law

sonja@yimbylaw.org

From: [Renee Schomp](#)
To: [Lyle, Amy](#); [Nicholson, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Santa Rosa: Feedback on draft Housing Element
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 5:27:15 PM
Attachments: [Menu of incentives to invest in development of affordable ADUs Apr 2022.pdf](#)
[Jurisdictional Support for ADU Services Napa Sonoma ADU Center Apr 2022-Version 3.pdf](#)

Hi Amy and Amy!

I'm reaching out to provide input on your Housing Element process as you continue the iterative drafting process. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions whatsoever, or want to hop on the phone to chat! **Can you share this with your consultants as well?**

- When outlining ADU program plans in your HE for the beginning of the cycle versus two years into the cycle (if you're not hitting your ADU numbers) my recommendation is that you make a commitment from Day 1 to:
 - (1) collaborate with a local entity "such as the Napa Sonoma ADU Center or other organization providing ADU help to homeowners," and
 - (2) link to the [Standard Plans Program](#) from your website and offer expedited permit approval and/or capped permit fees for pre reviewed ADU plans (for example, [Cloverdale guarantees a 4 week ADU permit turnaround for pre reviewed plans and advertises that on their website here](#)). Reminder: ***The Napa Sonoma ADU Standard Plans Program features 50 diverse ADU plans sets, half of which are pre reviewed based on input from YOU, our local jurisdictions -- and these plans help your city or county affirmatively further fair housing, including housing that is specifically designed to be accessible.***
- Then I recommend that in your Housing Element you indicate that if you are not hitting your target ADU numbers two years into the HE cycle, you plan to change your ADU ordinance to make it easier to build ADUs. Key changes I recommend are below.

We have detailed [recommendations for how to include ADUs in your Housing Element effectively available here](#) plus attached are the two sets of recs we have for financial support of ADUs -- and I am available to answer any questions you may have at any time. We are here to support you!

PLUS - if you really want to incentivize [affordable](#) ADU development, reach out to me for info on the [San Diego model](#) that has contributed already to development of WAY more deed-restricted affordable ADUs. It stands out from the crowd.

Warmly,
Renée

Adopt pro-ADU policies that go beyond state law

State law sets the minimum standards, but many homeowners do not build ADUs because local standards are still too restrictive. In fact, the State's original intent was that jurisdictions go above and beyond the bare minimum that the state law sets out and enact local ADU ordinances that are more permissive than the state mandates. Successful options for adopting pro-ADU policies include:

Allowing two-story ADUs (including with minimum setbacks)

- ADUs on corner lots (or specifically having a four feet setback on street-facing side)
- Front yard setbacks that match the main house
- Reduced side or rear yard setbacks
- No parking replacement required for any ADUs
- Larger ADUs
- Greater FAR
- Allow JADUs in an attached garage and define “attached” as “connected by a common wall, or by a common roof, covered walkway, carport or garage, not more than twenty feet (20') wide.”
- Allow more ADUs than permitted by state law

Some successful local examples of pro-ADU local ordinances include:

- *Cloverdale - allows 2 ADUs per parcel*
- *Rohnert Park - no parking replacement is required*
- *American Canyon - allows 3 foot setbacks*
- *Sonoma County offers a Cottage Housing Development program that allows multiple detached units clustered around a common open space. These proposals can be approved by staff with no hearings if they meet the relevant standards.*

- *Sonoma County defines Junior ADUs as being allowed as a conversion of existing space in the primary home or an attached garage and defines “attached” as “connected by a common wall, or by a common roof, covered walkway, carport or garage, not more than twenty feet (20') wide.”*
- *Multiple local jurisdictions (but not all) allow electronic submissions & payment of fees electronically*
- *Multiple local jurisdictions (but not all) don’t charge homeowners for time meeting with the planning department or other agencies regarding ADU rules and processes*

Similarly, jurisdictions may want to eliminate other barriers where appropriate by reconsidering costly and/or challenging obstacles to building an ADU that may not need to be applied to every single project. **For example, many homeowners struggle with the cost and logistics of having a soils report or even a soils waiver** completed for their ADU build. Consider whether this or other requirements are necessary for all projects. In addition, soils waivers alone (just the WAIVER) still generally cost over \$1,000 and are challenging for some homeowners to obtain as VERY few professionals are willing to complete a soils waiver. To that end, jurisdictions may want to consider whether there is a soils waiver process that does not require the expense and challenge of hiring an outside professional.

Similarly, sewer connection fees, while generally waived for ADUs of less than 500 square feet, **remain a very significant financial impediment to some homeowners on ADU projects over 500 square feet.** Currently, Napa Sanitation District charges approximately \$1,000 per 100 square feet over 500 sf. Our recommendation is that this fee should be waived for ADUs that are less than 800 sf and lowered for ADUs over 800 sf.

--

Renée J. Schomp, J.D.

Director, Napa Sonoma ADU Center | [[she/her](#)]

Email: renee@napasonomaadu.org

Website: napasonomaadu.org

Phone: 707.804.8575



Donate [here](#) to our nonprofit, the Napa Sonoma ADU Center.

Menu of Ideas: Incentives to invest in the development of affordable ADUs

The goal of this document is to provide concrete ideas for local jurisdictions regarding how they can invest in the development of affordable ADUs. Some jurisdictions may be overwhelmed by the potential cost of investing in ADU development, and this menu of options illustrates a wide range of investments jurisdictions can make without having a large impact on budget, staff time or other resources.

The menu includes options ranging from an investment of as little as \$150 per ADU to as much as \$50,000 per ADU or more, with those funds going **directly** to the homeowner to incentivize ADU development. Each incentivization can be tied to an affordability restriction on the ADU that *matches* the level of incentive. Best practices for such affordability restrictions are discussed below.

The document covers the following:

1. Best practices for affordability restrictions on ADUs
2. Menu of incentives for development of affordable ADUs

Best practices for affordability restrictions on ADUs

The menu of ideas below are all developed with a few crucial best practices in mind based lessons learned from prior ADU programs developed in CA. Those overarching best practices are:

- Avoid long term affordability restrictions – Homeowners do not want to make long-term, particularly multi-decade, commitments
- Offer an out for homeowners – Ensure they can pay back the loan and exit the system when desired
- Match the incentives to the requirements – If a jurisdiction wants to offer more restrictive conditions (e.g., renting to a Section 8 tenant, etc.), the incentives need to be large
- Reduce uncertainty in the process for the homeowner -- The more fixed costs and clarity in the permitting process, the better

For further background, we spoke with a prefab company recently that shared these thoughts, which resonate very much with what we've seen statewide:

- The simpler the better when it comes to a successful affordable ADU program. All of these conditions (must be rented to low income tenant, homeowner must be 80% of median income, etc.) are discouraging and confusing for homeowners, and that confusion prevents qualified homeowners from even applying to use it. So simpler and straightforward will generate more interest, and in addition more qualified usages.

- Grants have seen much more success than loans. The model is the recent changes to the CalHFA ADU grant. First version, almost no interest nor applications. Second version, everyone is sprinting and scrambling to get access to it, and people couldn't previously build an ADU now can.
- \$10k not only covers significant up front hard costs, but will also move the needle much more for customers than \$5k.

Affordability requirement options to mix and match with the menu of incentive options

- Requirement to rent ADU to Sec 8 tenant
- Requirement to rent ADU to low-income tenant
- Requirement that homeowner be lower income

Characteristics to consider:

- Limit requirement timeline to 5 - 7 years
- Option to opt out of requirement by paying off loan or paying back grant
- Match the requirement to the incentive appropriately

With this in mind, below are some ideas we have (which may be mixed and matched).

Menu of Affordable ADU Incentives:

Incentive 1: Cover costs ancillary to the new RCU ADU loan product (~\$3,500 - \$4,500 per ADU)

Cover ancillary costs for the homeowner associated with [Redwood Credit Union's ADU construction loan product](#), which is designed to help homeowners who don't have sufficient income or equity in their existing home finance building an ADU. These costs are normally paid by the homeowner directly to RCU. These ancillary costs for the loan range from about \$3,500 - \$4,500 depending on the project. This total includes an origination/processing fee (\$120 fixed fee), lender fee paid to 3rd party (includes tax service contract & flood zone check)(\$60), title insurance (~\$500), notary fees (~\$150-200), government recording fee (~\$400), property appraisal (~\$1,000), RCU construction management & 3rd party inspection fees (\$1,500 fixed fee).

Incentive 2: Fee waiver for use of [Napa Sonoma "pre-reviewed" ADU plan](#) (prefab or site built) (~\$5,000 - \$47,000 per ADU)

The fee waiver amount can vary but could include coverage of: Sewer district connection fees (can be ~\$5,000-\$12,000); impact fees (varies widely but could be up to ~\$30,000); school district fees (varies

but can be up to ~\$5,000). This has the added benefit of incentivizing homeowners to use "pre-reviewed" plans which will also save time and money for the jurisdiction itself (reduced staff time spent on ADU permit processing).

Incentive 3: Cover license fee for use of [Napa Sonoma "pre-reviewed" ADU plan](#) (prefab or site built) (~\$500 - \$2,000 per ADU)

This has the added benefit of incentivizing local homeowners to use "pre-reviewed" ADU plans which then saves the jurisdiction staff time and resources during the plan check process. The license fee is paid directly from the homeowner to the designer, architect or prefab company that created the plan so this can be a reimbursement from the jurisdiction to the homeowner.

Incentive 4: Free ADU Feasibility Consult (\$150 - \$500 per ADU)

At the moment, the Napa Sonoma ADU Center provides free [ADU feasibility consults](#) but soon we will be beginning to charge homeowners a flat fee of around \$150 to cover partial costs of the consults. The consults themselves cost our nonprofit around \$500 and costs can be higher as well depending on the consult. The jurisdiction could reimburse the fee paid by the homeowner directly to the homeowner.

Incentive 5: Capped ADU fees (~\$0 - \$42,000 per ADU)

One of the deterrents for homeowners to build ADUs is that it is often impossible for them to get concrete information from a jurisdiction upfront about the likely fees they'll have to pay for the ADU. If the jurisdiction could guarantee that ADU fees would be capped at ~\$5,000 and any additional fees would be waived or subsidized, that would be a significant help to homeowners by reducing uncertainty and risk in the ADU process.

Incentive 6: Grants to cover upfront costs of a prefab ADU (~\$1,000 - \$20,000 per ADU) (note that some prefab options may not fit on smaller city parcels, sloped properties, or properties with access barriers)

One of the key barriers for homeowners to build ADUs is the level of risk and uncertainty in terms of cost, timeline, complexity, and unforeseen obstacles that can arise during site built construction. As prefab ADU companies take off, we're seeing prefab options as a key way to overcome these barriers and thereby foment ADU development/increase innovation in construction practices. One of the best elements of prefab is that most companies offer a turnkey solution ("concierge service") that takes the time, cost and energy of construction management and getting through the permitting process off the shoulders of the homeowner. If the jurisdiction covered some of the upfront costs of prefab ADUs it could help incentivize homeowners to build ADUs:

- \$1,000 refundable charge for an estimate and proposal from the prefab company
- \$9,000 service charge for the prefab company to manage design and permit submittal

- \$5,000 - \$10,000 possible additional costs to submit permit e.g., soils report, survey, foundation engineering costs
- And then permit costs which can range up to \$47,000

I'll just note of course that prefab ADUs won't work on every lot -- e.g., they don't work well if there are challenges with site access or a slope. They also won't work on smaller lots -- more common in city limits where we really want to increase density from a climate resiliency standpoint -- because on smaller city lots we really should be building up, not out (e.g., above garage, 2 story units, etc.) For this reason, I think it makes most sense to apply financial assistance to [any pre-reviewed plans in the Napa Sonoma ADU Standard ADU Plans Program](#) since this includes both prefab and pre-reviewed site built plans.

Incentive 7: ADU Rescue Program & fee waivers or grants for unpermitted ADUs (~\$500 - \$80,000 per ADU)

As we know there are a number of unpermitted ADUs that need to be brought up to code in order to be permitted. Sonoma County recently instituted a new "ADU Rescue Program" which allows homeowners to submit a request for a 5 year stay of enforcement on their unpermitted unit (based on the Jan 2020 state law that states a homeowner can be granted a 5 year stay of enforcement on an unpermitted ADU if the jurisdiction determines there is no health & safety issue with the unit). Sonoma County's program allows the homeowner to hire a licensed professional (architect, contractor or engineer) to conduct a 3rd party assessment of the unit for habitability and submit a form to the county requesting the state of enforcement. Other jurisdictions could institute a similar program, with the added benefit of (1) reimbursing the cost of the 3rd party professional to conduct the habitability assessment & submit the required form; and/or (2) covering the costs of the fees to get the ADU permitted (~\$5,000 - \$47,000); and/or (3) covering the cost of the architect/designer to draw up plans and submit the ADU Permit Application required to get the unit permitted (~\$5,000 - \$20,000). Note that none of these options includes the cost of any other professionals required to do the work to actually bring the unit up to code, which can include plumbers, electricians, GC, structural engineers, etc. (I bring this up to note the extremely high cost of getting an ADU permitted for some projects.)

Please feel free to reach out to Renée J. Schomp, Director, Napa Sonoma ADU Center with any questions: renee@napasonomaadu.org.

Jurisdictional Support for ADU Services

The Napa Sonoma ADU Center was launched as a three-year pilot in 2020 by Napa Valley Community Foundation, with support from Community Foundation Sonoma County, to catalyze ADU development across the 16 jurisdictions in Napa and Sonoma Counties. This pilot project was designed to identify and test services that would address the barriers that prevent homeowners and jurisdictions from ADU development. Funding during the pilot phase was provided mostly by philanthropy, with key initial support from a few jurisdictions. Planning has begun for continuation of the services to jurisdictions and homeowners that have proven most effective beyond the pilot period of 2020 - 2023. The intent of this nonprofit pilot project was that sustainability of these ADU services beyond the pilot phase would rely on financial support from jurisdictions that find such services useful.

This document covers three key topics:

1. How we've helped our local jurisdictions build ADUs so far
2. ADU services we envision continuing with your support
3. Potential funding structure to support ongoing ADU services

“Honestly, if it weren't for the Napa Sonoma ADU organization, I doubt this project would get off the ground. The feasibility report is such a vital stepping stone for everyday people confronting a complicated ADU world. Please keep doing this great work!” – *Local homeowner*

How we've helped our local jurisdictions build ADUs so far

The nonprofit Napa Sonoma ADU Center provides technical assistance to homeowners on their ADU projects and also does significant proactive community outreach and education to ensure that local homeowners across all 16 jurisdictions in Napa and Sonoma Counties are aware of their local ADU rules, processes, and resources. It also serves as an innovative public/private partnership that bridges the government, philanthropic, nonprofit and private sectors in order to advance ADUs.

The Napa Sonoma ADU Center has a comprehensive [ADU website](#) with many ADU tools and resources available on it today, including an [ADU Workbook](#), [ADU Calculator](#) tool, frequent [ADU webinars](#), [ADU feasibility consults](#), [ADU Home Match](#), [ADU newsletter & blog](#), [spotlights](#) of Napa and Sonoma County neighbors who have built ADUs, forthcoming Napa Sonoma Standard ADU Plans program, and much more. Homeowners and jurisdictions can [Contact Us](#) for more information or help with ADU questions. **Our educational information for local homeowners helps reduce jurisdiction staff time expended on answering questions about the ADU permitting process.** One local building official recently commented, “If it wasn't for the Napa Sonoma ADU Center, my phone would be ringing off the hook!”

In collaboration with multiple Napa and Sonoma County jurisdictions, in May 2022 we will launch a comprehensive [Napa Sonoma Standard ADU Plans Program](#) (“pre-reviewed” plans program) with a gallery of diverse ADU plan sets available at low cost to homeowners. This program stands to **significantly reduce jurisdiction time and resources expended on the ADU permitting process**. Not only will your staff become more familiar with streamlined ADU plan sets submitted, we have also set up a relationship with a third party consulting firm that will be available to conduct the individual plan check review process for submittals on an as-desired basis for your jurisdiction.

As of April 2022, the Napa Sonoma ADU Center has helped over 400 unique homeowners across Napa and Sonoma counties with one-on-one assistance, and 180 homeowners have received a completed individualized ADU feasibility consultation (another 37 are currently in the pipeline, with more being added every day). A survey of 53 homeowners who have received ADU feasibility consultations in the 3-6 months prior to survey indicated that 70% of them were moving forward with their ADU projects. **Applying this success rate to the total number of ADU consults we’ve conducted so far, that equates to over 125 potential new ADUs being built coming out of just the first 18 months of our pilot program.**

So far, the Napa Sonoma ADU Center has already supported our local jurisdictions with:

- [Housing Elements ADU Recommendations](#) including sample language
- Technical assistance on understanding complex new ADU state laws
- Technical assistance and development of webpage copy to educate local homeowners about your ADU planning, permitting and building process, including a customized:
 - ADU Process Map
 - ADU Building Checklist
 - Jurisdictions also routinely refer homeowners to the Napa Sonoma ADU Center to answer ADU questions and link directly to our web tools and resources such as our ADU Calculator tool
- Holding 20 webinars with 1,790 registrants to educate local residents about ADUs including:
 - How to Build an ADU in Napa & Sonoma Counties
 - ADUs 101 for Napa & Sonoma County Homeowners
 - How to Create an ADU Permit Application
 - How to Finance Your ADU
 - And many more – view our full [on-demand webinar library](#)
- A subscriber list of 1,640 individuals who receive our monthly educational ADU newsletter and blog

“If it weren’t for the Napa Sonoma ADU Center, my phone would be ringing off the hook!”
– *Local Building Official*

ADU services we envision continuing with your support

With funding support from local jurisdictions, as part of our planning for the next iteration of ADU services we are considering the following:

- Ongoing development & management of the Napa Sonoma ADU Standard Plans program (including “pre-reviewed” plans)
- Public education & community engagement in multiple languages with local homeowners on ADUs
- Continued provision of 1:1 assistance to homeowners via our ADU feasibility consults and ADU office hours
- Development of improved ADU educational & reference materials for your website
- Proactive education & community engagement to local residents about your ADU planning, permitting & building processes and the benefits of building ADUs
- Trainings for your staff on ADU laws and best practices
- Partnership in the rollout and maintenance of the Napa Sonoma ADU Standard Plans Program
- Support with improving your ADU processes & programs
- Support with interpretation of state laws applicable to ADUs
- Ongoing updates and improvements to our comprehensive toolkit of [ADU resources & information](#) for local residents

Nonprofits can be more nimble than local government and once formed can **help reduce the number of hours expended by jurisdiction staff on educating homeowners about local rules and the ADU permitting and building process**. Countless homeowners and other stakeholders recently interviewed about our services have stressed that the fact that we are a neutral third party resource separate from government or for-profit institutions is key for building trust in our services. Nonprofits are beneficial in that they serve as a neutral resource for local homeowners who may be mistrustful of local government agencies and housing professionals alike. We hope our local jurisdictions will join us to continue advancing our local RHNA targets for ADUs and create housing for our community.

“We received some very valuable feedback [from your ADU feasibility consult] and we DEFINITELY intend to proceed.” – *Local homeowner*

Potential funding structure to support ongoing ADU services

Jurisdiction	Total Residential Parcels	Annual Funding Proposal
X Small Jurisdiction	750 - 1,500	\$5,000
Small Jurisdiction	1,500 - 3,000	\$10,000
Medium Jurisdiction	3,000 - 5,000	\$15,000
Large Jurisdiction	5,000 - 12,000	\$20,000
X Large Jurisdiction	12,000 - 30,000	\$30,000
XX Large Jurisdiction	30,000 - 50,000	\$40,000
Total Annual Funding		\$300,000

Please feel free to reach out to Renée J. Schomp, Director, Napa Sonoma ADU Center with any questions: renee@napasonomaadu.org.

#001

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:41am** [Comment ID: 55] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Overall a great job. My major issues are related to the lack of housing-specific outreach during preparation of the document, especially related to the contributing factors/fair housing assessment. My major (and very strong) suggestion is that this Element plan for the additional 1400-1600 RHNA units coming with 6th cycle annexation. Planning for these units now and accepting the RHNA transfer up front will save the City from the need to amend the housing element and go through this whole thing again with each annexation.

I request that all of our comments, with their proper context and the City's response, be provided to the City Council and made available to the public prior to transmittal of the Draft to HCD.

#002

Posted by **Darlene Anderson** on **06/24/2022** at **3:14pm** [Comment ID: 15] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Our beautiful city of Santa Rosa is being overrun by violence and gangs. The more building that happens brings more people flooding into the city bringing more crime not to mention the ugly apartment buildings that look like prisons. Please stop!!

#003

Posted by **Paige Chandler** on **06/27/2022** at **6:15pm** [Comment ID: 21] - [Link](#)

Type: Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

There certainly is a lot of building going on in SR. I do hope the city is accounting for how much more traffic there will be and are accounting for that. Yolanda is going to become very congested as well as I already see that getting to the highway on Hearn is already quite congested. As well Old Petaluma Hill Road is very congested and backs up at Kawana Springs and Old Petaluma Hill Road.

#004

Posted by **rene** on **06/23/2022** at **10:21pm** [Comment ID: 13] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I am very concerned that the infrastructure in Santa Rosa will NOT and does not support the housing. There is not enough water and too many people already. We need people to move out of the area or choose another location. There are TOO many apartment buildings being put up and WHERE will all these people drive to? Our roads are terrible as it is, how will we maintain the roads for so many additional people; where will the water come from for this population? We don't have enough parking already, where will they park? Maybe put money into granny units (HUD's?)

on private property. We do not need to be building more units until we can provide decent water; safety; roads; power; fire department; police; for the people who are here

#005

Posted by **Darlene** on **06/16/2022** at **8:48pm** [Comment ID: 11] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Our once beautiful city is being ruined. Quit building on every available piece of land!

#006

Posted by **jim pedgrift** on **06/25/2022** at **3:22pm** [Comment ID: 16] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I attended two of the recent Community Alternatives Workshops sponsored by CAC and I have been giving a lot of thought to all I have read and heard from the citizens who attended. I have come up with a couple of ideas I would like to share with my colleagues on the Community Advisory Committee.

We are all familiar with the questions that have been presented to us. What is our recommendation for the future distribution of residential growth for Santa Rosa extending into the future to 2050? We have been given three sample alternatives to consider with the proviso that we need not be wedded to any one of them, as we are free to 'mix and match.' A simplified set of our alternatives are, 1) Central Corridors, i.e. city centered growth, 2) Neighborhood Main Streets, i.e. neighborhood centered growth, and 3) Distributed Housing, or uniformly distributed housing throughout the city.

I had a discussion with a former Director of Planning for SR. He was working for the City when I served on the City Council, and I remembered several projects for high rise housing in the down town that were brought before the Council seeking approval. He said that during his tenure in the Planning Department there were fifteen (15) high rise project that were approved for development by the City that were never built for lack of financing. The proposals had passed through the entire approval process and died for lack of there being a market to make the projects financially viable. I continue to support the concept of housing in the down town but I am afraid we could unanimously agree high rise residential in the down town would be nice and then learn its realization is dependent on circumstances beyond our control. There is some good news as I believe there are several low rise projects under development right now.

The City Centered alternative is credited with being the proposal which reduces car trips the most among the various alternatives we are considering. I have serious doubts that is accurate. If you lived in the downtown now, say in the Rosenberg Building, you have to get in your car to get groceries. Other amenities may be within

walking distance but many of your needs cannot be found within walking distance. I am not sure the miles traveled by car is significantly reduced by living in the downtown as it is currently configured. There is a lot more than housing alone needed to make Alternative One work as proposed and envisioned.

What if the current General Plan, without any alterations, was just renamed General Plan 2050, or in other words, we did nothing. I think we would end up with what we are calling Alternative Three, uniform dispersion. That is what we have been doing for the past half century. If you think we can do better than how you see Santa Rosa developing today, then we need to do something differently. I do not support Alternative Three.

Remember the slogan, "It takes a village to raise a child". Without diminishing the appropriate role for families, I would reframe that slogan to be, "it takes a neighborhood to raise a child." When I grew up in SR I knew the name of every family on my block, including the names of their dogs, and every family on the block knew me and where I lived. If I got into trouble my mom was going to hear about it and then I was going to hear about it. Santa Rosa is no longer a village, but the idea of designing our growth so as to encourage the development of strong neighborhoods, I believe is an idea worthy of support. Neighborhoods should develop so that as you walk out your front door, a public park with open space and a place to play, a neighborhood school, possibly a coffee shop and a place to get groceries should be no further than a quarter mile from your front door, i.e. within walking/bicycling distance. We should help build a city in which residents are encouraged to get out of their cars and get to know their neighbors.

One last related recommendation I would ask you to consider. Santa Rosa is blessed with a set of natural amenities that have largely been ignored. We have several creeks that could serve as bicycle/pedestrian corridors. Brush Creek and Piner Creek have been preserved for possible use, but Santa Rosa Creek and Matanzas Creek present a more formidable challenge. If we are planning for a future which we hope is an improvement over what we have today, we should have the imagination and courage to consider an idea we believe could make SR a more livable place. These creeks comprise a natural group of Class One trails that connect with one another and provide a safe alternative to on street transportation. Where possible these creek trails should be supplemented by on street Bicycle Boulevards that coordinate the trail system and make it whole. It is doable if we believe it is doable.

#007

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:23am** [Comment ID: 25] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Again, no focus on the housing element only on the larger GP update

#008

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:41am** [Comment ID: 28] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The City's public engagement during preparation of the housing element was woefully inadequate, consisting of a single survey monkey that garnered less than 500 responses and a single zoom meeting with only 16 participants. All other outreach described here was for the GP update and did not discuss the housing element update. True engagement was only invited once the public review draft had already been released, and now it is "to late" because the Element has already been prepared! The City has not met its statutory obligation to make a diligent effort to reach all of its community members to guide preparation of the Housing Element. Great effort has gone into these efforts for the General Plan update, but these efforts EXCLUDED THE HOUSING ELEMENT. Public engagement during the actual preparation of the Element was disingenuous and an afterthought.

#009

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:27am** [Comment ID: 26] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

All GP update, none on the housing element

#010

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:22am** [Comment ID: 24] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

A single survey was conducted

#011

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:19am** [Comment ID: 22] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Stakeholder consultations are not public

#012

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:30am** [Comment ID: 27] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Single, online survey reached less than 2% of the City's population.

#013

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:21am** [Comment ID: 23] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

With the exception of a single zoom meeting Ccommunity, Community workshops were related to the overall GP update and did NOT discuss the Housing Element

#014

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:43am** [Comment ID: 29] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

How did the regional effort tie into Santa Rosa and its equity issues?

#015

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:45am** [Comment ID: 30] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This was NOT housing-specific outreach - sorry, I was there.

#016

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:50am** [Comment ID: 32] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Since there has been zero inclusion of public input specific to the housing element in this draft, I request that the revised draft that actually incorporates and responds to public comment be circulated publically prior to submittal to HCD.

#017

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:47am** [Comment ID: 31] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

How was this session advertised to the public at large? Was any attempt made to invite an audience who were not the usual participants in City meetings? If so, please describe.

#018

Posted by **David Kittelstrom** on **06/27/2022** at **4:19pm** [Comment ID: 18] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

From 34.5 to 39.2 is not a slight increase. Indeed, in the next paragraph, the same increase is labeled "significant." Are the median and average really identical? That seems unlikely.

#019

Posted by **David Kittelstrom** on **06/27/2022** at **4:21pm** [Comment ID: 19] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

"Other Non-Family" should not be under "Family" but its own category.

#020

Posted by **Calum Weeks** on **06/21/2022** at **11:14am** [Comment ID: 12] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Table 3-9 Total Percentage Change is incorrect. I believe the total should reflect a 3.11 percent change.

#021

Posted by **David Kittelstrom** on **06/27/2022** at **4:25pm** [Comment ID: 20] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

"Detached" and "Attached" should be indented as sub-categories of "Single-Family"

#022

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **6:58am** [Comment ID: 33] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Please include ag employee housing under the Employee Housing Act

#023

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:03am** [Comment ID: 34] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

While the HE period ends in 2031, 10 years from due date is January 2033

#024

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:18am** [Comment ID: 35] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This discussion fails to mention the County Fund for Housing (CFH), which furthered City-centered growth by providing funding for multiple affordable housing projects in Santa Rosa during the 5th cycle. The CFH is funded by inclusionary fees generated in unincorporated County and by BOS contributions from the County's General Fund. Because the County's RHNA increased by over 450% for the 6th cycle while the City's RHNA decreased, County must now focus on its own RHNA and will no longer be able to fund projects within City limits unless 1) RHNA credits accrue to the County; OR 2) City agrees to take responsibility for a portion of County's RHNA under an agreement approved by the ABAG Executive Board prior to January 31, 2023. PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE PUBLIC AND THE CITY COUNCIL ARE AWARE OF THIS FACT.

#025

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:21am** [Comment ID: 36] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The same comments apply here as above re: the utter lack of community outreach related to the Housing Element in particular and to the Fair Housing Assessment in particular.

#026

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:25am** [Comment ID: 37] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I like the way that references to the specific programs that address identified needs are called out in the text ☐☐ I can't tell if they are usable links because the commenting function is turned on, but if not it would be super helpful to the public and to HCD if they were provided as links.

#027

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:26am** [Comment ID: 38] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This is a great inclusion

#028

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:28am** [Comment ID: 39] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Roseland annexation was before the Tubbs fire

#029

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **12:14pm** [Comment ID: 5] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This sentence about Suisun and Benicia doesn't entirely make sense. 4-10 units/acre could still be SF zoned...

#030

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **12:17pm** [Comment ID: 6] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

What is this map showing? Is it necessary?

#031

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:33am** [Comment ID: 40] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Census tract 15320?

#032

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:38am** [Comment ID: 42] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This seems to have jumped into sites without discussion.

#033

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:37am** [Comment ID: 41] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I'm not sure what this map is or what the dots are showing; sources not provided, TCAC (composite) opportunity area overlaid with - what? Are these population dots, building permits issued, ?

#034

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:40am** [Comment ID: 43] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Why only vacant sites?

#035

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:42am** [Comment ID: 44] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

So this shows that the vast majority of the above moderate sites are in higher resource areas, perpetuating existing patterns of discrimination?

#036

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:44am** [Comment ID: 45] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Census tract 15320? Please coordinate with the County and with the city of Rohnert Park to address issues within this tract.

#037

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **7:49am** [Comment ID: 46] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Same comment as above! By limiting your opportunity sites to vacant parcels you are putting that vast majority of your above mod sites into higher resource, higher income areas and perpetuating existing patterns of segregation and exclusion. Please use dots that reflect units in inventory rather than just vacant parcels.

#038

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **12:32pm** [Comment ID: 7] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Typo

#039

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **1:15pm** [Comment ID: 8] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Remind what DSASP stands for...

#040

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **1:21pm** [Comment ID: 9] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Typo

#041

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:02am** [Comment ID: 47] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

"The City" has done so. What about the affected communities? How were they involved in identifying and prioritizing the contributing factors? I never saw this or heard about any opportunities to assist with this and I've lived in and been involved with housing matters in Santa Rosa for more than 20 years. It is vitally important to have affected populations assist in the identification and prioritization of contributing factors that affect their access to securing and maintaining housing of their choice, otherwise this is just a paper exercise. Please describe how this was accomplished.

#042

Posted by **Elliott Pickett** on **06/14/2022** at **1:28pm** [Comment ID: 4] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This section would be more meaningful to readers if the programs were described (even a short title/couple words)

#043

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:17am** [Comment ID: 48] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

As the City is well aware, this represents an actual REDUCTION in the City's RHNA while the unincorporated areas received a more than 450% increase. This was in large part caused by a change in methodology: while in past cycles the RHNA responsibility for lands within a City's SOI was assigned to the respective cities, in this cycle that responsibility was assigned to counties with the assumption that each annexation would result in a RHNA transfer from the County to the City. As authorized by Government Code section 65584.07(a), the unincorporated County has requested that this RHNA transfer occur via agreement made and approved by ABAG prior to the due date of the Housing Element such that THIS Housing Element would plan for the additional 1600 RHNA units that will be theirs in the next 5-6 years. If this agreement is not reached and approved prior to January 31, 2023, then each future annexation and RHNA transfer will result in the need for a new agreement, a new housing element update with new HCD review and new CEQA. I STRONGLY suggest that the City address and plan for these additional RHNA units within this Housing Element and General Plan EIR, both because it's fiscally responsible and because it's just good planning.

#044

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:19am** [Comment ID: 49] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

These are fantastic numbers! Great job.

#045

Posted by **Lesli Lee** on **06/27/2022** at **3:37pm** [Comment ID: 17] - [Link](#)

Type: *Suggestion*

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Regarding the addition of housing beyond infill areas, please seriously and thoroughly consider the element of safe and efficient wildfire evacuation, not only of the residents of the proposed added housing, but also of the existing nearby residents. Because of the currently limited exit (only 1 lane each way of Hwy 12) available to Oakmont, additional housing in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and NEAR the WUI needs to be adequately researched. This is a huge concern for many current residents of this area.

Limited additional housing outside public or bike transportation zones would also contribute to less vehicle miles travelled and greenhouse gas emissions - thereby having a significant sustainability benefit.

#046

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:26am** [Comment ID: 53] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Then why assume that only vacant sites could be developed over the next 8 years?

#047

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:21am** [Comment ID: 50] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This is a great plan and accommodates significantly more housing units than are assumed in this Housing Element.

#048

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:23am** [Comment ID: 51] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Which far exceeds the City's 6th cycle RHNA.

#049

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:27am** [Comment ID: 54] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Super conservative assumptions.

#050

Posted by **Jane** on **07/03/2022** at **8:25am** [Comment ID: 52] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Reliance on only vacant sites greatly underestimates the capacity for units in the DSA which is where they should go per the GP update.

#051

Posted by **Elliott Pickett** on **06/14/2022** at **1:21pm** [Comment ID: 3] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The Northern Santa Rosa SMART Station seems to be vastly underutilized and has proved to be impractical/unusable as a resident who lives nearest to that station. Many of these issues will be better tackled outside of the Housing Element but I would love that at least discussed as a resource and its relationship to housing/ TOD/ the City's vision for future development

#052

Posted by **Karen** on **06/16/2022** at **1:48pm** [Comment ID: 10] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

'however' is unnecessary here

#053

Posted by **Andrew** on **06/24/2022** at **1:49pm** [Comment ID: 14] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

There should be zero residential parking minimums. This dramatically increases costs for construction and encourages vehicle use.

#054

Posted by **Elliott Pickett** on **06/14/2022** at **1:11pm** [Comment ID: 2] - [Link](#)

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

As a Santa Rosa resident who cares for an aging disabled family member, I have some concerns about the lack of specific commitments related to housing for persons with disabilities, including the following:

Program H-17 does not specifically commit to these actions, only to the development of a targeted marketing plan. Perhaps this should reference H-32 (Reasonable Accommodations: The City will also review and revise findings for approving reasonable accommodation requests to ensure they do not pose any barriers to housing for persons with disabilities.) Either program does not feel sufficient to address barriers.

The \$1,908 fee for a request for reasonable accommodations is a barrier to housing for disabled residents and I would encourage this program to specifically implement a no cost or low cost (ie, half an hour staff time) cost for a request for reasonable accommodations.

Date	Name	Email	Comment
July 03 2022, 12:07	Mark Hall	markhsf@gmail.com	I like the work that's been done! My only suggestions/questions: Limiting WUI development to "what's already allowed"... what's allowed? Is it smart to allow development still, given climate change and the danger of losing such housing within a few years? Why not just stop any new building there? Bikes: Build more separated, safe lanes. Santa Rosa is so flat, it could have a bike culture like flat Amsterdam, where people young and old look at their bikes as a preferred means of transportation. I love the idea of building high density in SR downtown AND simultaneously in neighborhood centers around the city. We need a healthy, lively downtown and healthy, lively neighborhoods.
July 03 2022, 10:37	Margaret DeMatteo, Housing Policy Attorney	mdematteo@legalaidsc.com	Legal Aid of Sonoma County provides the following commentary: With their Needs and Fair Housing Analyses, cities consider housing needs that are going unmet under status quo local regulations. Cities are required to proactively seek input from all segments of the community in order to inform their needs and fair housing analyses. See Government Code section 65583, subd.(c)(8). As stated in the plan, those efforts should focus particularly on "low-income and racial and ethnic households that might otherwise not participate in the process." (p. 2-1). The plan must include a description of the diligent efforts the jurisdiction made to include all economic segments of the community and/or their representatives in the development and update of the housing element. Unfortunately, the March 10th community workshop had only 16 members of the public in attendance. Planning staff obtained only 478 survey responses out of the total population of 178,391. Only two percent of the responses were from Spanish speakers, "even though 25 percent of Santa Rosa residents speak only Spanish." (See p. 2-4). Additionally, it does not appear that LASC, California Rural Legal Assistance, North Bay Organizing Project, or the Sonoma County Tenant's Union were consulted for input. (See p. 2-2). These organizations work directly with the "low-income and racial and ethnic households that might otherwise not participate in the process." LASC is funded to provide a right to counsel to low income families and individuals facing displacement through eviction, and is the primary agency providing these services. The lack of response and authentic community input jeopardizes Santa Rosa's compliance with Gov. Code Section 65583(c)(8). Relying on public commentary on the proposed housing element plan (as planning staff indicated they are doing at the June 9th Planning Commission meeting) does not satisfy the requirements of Gov. Code Section 65583(c)(8), since the public input should inform the development and update of the housing element. Recommendation LASC recommends that staff create and implement an additional outreach plan to engage the entire Santa Rosa community in the housing element process, including all households, local employees, and advocacy groups. Such a plan requires additional housing element-specific meetings and workshops as well as renewed mailers and other forms of outreach to contact segments of the Santa Rosa community that the city has not adequately heard from. Additionally, Santa Rosa recognized that 46% of its residents are tenants. Yet the plan fails to indicate a plan to adequately preserve and maintain existing rental housing. Tenants have been subject to rampant abuse, especially via eviction for the no-fault just cause of the Ellis Act, as indicated by FHANC. Local implementation of Ellis Act protections is necessary to prevent landlords from taking advantage of the loopholes in the Tenant Protection Act. Many jurisdictions are implementing local tenant protections as part of their housing element plan, including Petaluma and Concord. Anti-harassment, just cause eviction protection and rent control ordinances are all necessary means to preserve existing rental housing at an affordable rate. As a heads up, of the 33 jurisdictions in southern CA who have submitted their HE plan and received letters indicating the deficiencies therein, the most frequent comments can be grouped into five major categories (including the percentage of letters that contained comments on each topic): • Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH) (94%); • Public Participation (67%); • Sites Inventory (94%); • Government Constraints (58%); • Policies and Programs (55%) Additional notes on Santa Rosa's Housing Element Plan are as follows: -Does not address disparities in access to opportunity or disproportionate housing needs fully in the Assessment of Fair Housing -A significant amount of Santa Rosa's vacant lots are located in the WUI - many of these sites sit vacant because they burned down in the 2017 fire. It seems unwise to continue to build housing within the WUI and cyclical fire pattern. The City has not been able to meet the pervious RHNA housing allocation – likely due to the fact that many city resources and funding went towards rebuilding post fire. If the City allows for more building in fire prone areas. LASC would be happy to assist with improving the housing element plan to comply with the CA Gov Code.
June 30 2022, 14:57	Kaitlyn Garfield	kaitlyn@housinglandtrust.org	Hello, My name is Kaitlyn Garfield, I am the Housing Administrator at Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County. Unfortunately, I was unable to comment directly on the Housing Element draft, I'm not sure if this has been a problem just for me, so I am writing to you instead. Thank you for taking the time to read this comment. -In regard to Santa Rosa's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (previously HAP), on page 187 of the Housing Element draft it is mentioned that fee payment is currently the primary method of compliance. Onsite development should instead be the default option once the minimum 6 unit trigger is hit. Santa Rosa should prioritize onsite development as it prevents concentration of affordable units in areas considered less desirable and with fewer resources, reduces pushback and stigma around creating affordable housing while still hitting RHNA numbers, and creates a holistic community with diversity and stronger ties. In-lieu fees and other offsite alternatives should be considered only when the project isn't otherwise feasible and should be up to the discretion of the City. Onsite alternatives, such as changing the mixture of income levels required, should take precedent over offsite. Onsite inclusionary units should also be comparable to the development's market rate units in size, exterior, basic finish packages, and design, and they should be scattered throughout the development. Inclusionary units should be indistinguishable within the development. Affordability covenants for for-sale units should also be in perpetuity rather than 55 years, and existing affordable for-sale housing stock should be converted to an affordable in perpetuity model upon expiration, such as a community land trust model. This way, the investment in affordable housing is protected and serves generations. A fund should be considered with the purpose of saving and converting affordable units as they expire. - Thank you again for your time and for your consideration. Kaitlyn Garfield Housing Administrator Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County (HLT)
June 29 2022, 18:32	Lauren Smith	serpenthe9@aol.com	Dear Santa Rosa Forward, I applaud the city of Santa Rosa for building some of the most hideous, ugly garbage I have ever seen in my life. The monstrous contraptions being built on Yolanda, Kawana Springs Rd., and Santa Rosa Ave., look like prison camps in the Gulags. Lenin, Stalin, and even Mao would be proud of Santa Rosa's cultural uglification. I can hardly wait for the overcrowded streets, drug addicts, gangs, and crime that comes with this kind of suffocating encampment. Since I feel like vomiting every time I have to see this cr*p as I drive by, I assume your intention was just that. To repel those with any sense of beauty left in their souls, to leave as soon as possible to go to some other place that actually does have at least a slight sense of beauty left in their sights. A neighbor of mine recently moved to Hawaii exactly because of that. He hated what Santa Rosa has become. I hate what it's becoming too. Are you sure you are not in competition with China's re-education camps, designed by communists who dream in drab grays, and chains of prisoners bound in hell? The city completely ruined our once attractive Courthouse Square, so I won't even go downtown anymore. I know many, many people that feel exactly the same. I am sorry to see that Santa Rosa has not been capable of creating any kind of beautiful architecture, or public space for quite a long time. I have given up any hope of Santa Rosa ever being capable of creating any kind of beauty ever again. Sincerely, Lauren Smith

Date	Name	Email	Comment
June 23 2022, 19:46	Larry Scharf	lsantarosa@aol.com	We send the city hundreds of thousands (millions?) of dollars to pay for the public buses which criss-cross this town, they're pretty much empty. Some have 2 or 3 riders (with vouchers). The transit budget pays for maintenance, salaries, and pensions for retired drivers for decades after they move on. We know federal funds contribute, but this is a waste of money. We are being taken for a ride. Providing taxi service for those going to work or school or coming home, would be much less expensive, or trading in these \$250,000 vehicles for Honda vans. Santa Rosa is pretty much ridiculous, all these prison-like apartment complexes under construction while we're being asked to use less water?
June 23 2022, 19:18	Marianne Tamm	mtamm8844@icloud.com	How is the city going to provide water and other infrastructure like schools, fire protection, police, etc for all this new housing?
June 23 2022, 17:54	Diane Galiardi	swan222dg@gmail.com	Build up, not out. You will turn this city into San Jose. Lower income projects, crime, no new roads. I know you all plan to do what you want despite what the public wants. But I can tell you I won't spend my retirement years going into your city for my business needs. We can't house EVERYONE! There ARE other places to live that are cheaper! Does Danville and San Ramon lower their housing prices to accommodate a certain income bracket? NO
June 20 2022, 18:17	Shauna Larsen	bigskyhorse@hotmail.com	
June 20 2022, 12:08	Tony Martin	tonymartin314@yahoo.com	Dear Santa Rosa I read that you want input from people who live here in Santa Rosa about the future of Santa Rosa and how the best add housing I encourage you all to fully embrace new urbanism and move Santa Rosa towards a European style City center model, and rezone to allow retail within subdivisions! Build up and tall in downtown Santa Rosa, as tall as the ground can support and get as many units in as dense an area as possible. Anything downtown near the bus lines and the Smart train is suitable! Remove any parking expectations from the zoning requirements, and let the existing City structures serve for parking, as your own paper noted, we are subsidizing parking and not housing by requiring so much We could easily triple or quadruple the population of downtown creating an economic powerhouse of local residents shopping at the local restaurants or riding on the Smart train to nearby cities In all other suburban neighborhoods, and zoning restrictions and allow for retail within residential areas People from Europe laugh at our ridiculous zoning expectations, they can't believe we have to walk 5 mi to a grocery store! I want bodegas on every corner, no more giant subdivisions, it's a broken way of thinking In Old Town's in Old cities, many residences have been converted to grocery stores or convenience stores, we need to do the same or put up new face fronts on a residential house to convert No one should be more than a mile from a gallon of milk! In addition, we need to integrate our transit systems with neighboring cities better, but this is about building, density is where it's at! At one time people denigrated New York City for using so much power and water! Until they actually divided that amount by the number of people and found out that dense Urban living uses the least power and water of any possible way to live! Make sure all of those buildings have green space on patios or within the complex, we can both build high density and build a livable space! Work on more green roofs, plant more trees, and make Santa Rosa the right place to live for the next 150 years and more. I'm sure you have consultants but if you need another one give me a ring. I can cover everything from solar energy to solar mass design. Enphase energy has me to thank for continuing to work! I also help at SunPower! Also, really hope the city can foster community solar that allow us to invest or buy power instead of on roofs as some people have trees and shading With global warming upon us, it is likely that we will have more and more years of drought. The river is drying up more and more each summer and severe limitations on water use are being imposed. Demand hardening is likely before long as more and more people are reaching their maximum conservation goals. Even with water saving devices, the number of new units is so extreme, it is likely that it will become more and more difficult to meet health and safety needs. The Russian River this summer will go down as low as 25 cubic feet per second while normal levels are 125 cfs and higher. The cost of any new growth takes away from water supply. What are you going to do about that? What analysis have you conducted, using actual water available, to show how much water is available to build ANY new housing? This is a survival issue and will not have a happy outcome if you don't cut back on new development. Brenda Adelman - Russian River Watershed Protection Committee
June 20 2022, 11:16	Brenda Adelman	wwguru@comcast.net	City and state officials believe that building more housing units increases affordability. Officials need to understand that building more housing units does not increase affordability unless population increases at a slower rate than housing units. Since 1950 Santa Rosa has increased its population, and presumably its number of housing units, tenfold, as compared to twofold for the US. However housing affordability in Santa Rosa has not improved. We're just increasing population and population density; we are not increasing affordability.
June 20 2022, 09:32	Dan Roberts, Ph.D.	dan2222@sonic.net	For some time, the use of the term "Affordable Housing" implies more homes in our community. Instead, it really means more "Lego-style" apartments dispersed throughout the city. Families have no yards for their children to play, they live within a complex with people they do not know --- and likely won't know, their parking is not sheltered, but in streets and lots, etc. This is the worst form of living for families and it has become unaffordable. Santa Rosa should develop plans on the undeveloped land for true affordable homes. In doing so, identify lands throughout Santa Rosa that are suitable for home developments. And not to be left off of the table, form a coalition with the No. Coast Builders Exchange, home supply companies (Friedman Bros., Meade Clark and others), and labor groups to build these affordable developments of homes, not to continue building "Lego-style" apartments and condos for families.
June 20 2022, 07:40	Hedley Lawson	hedleylawson@gmail.com	The cheapest and fastest way to create large numbers of housing units for the housing that is most needed - low and very low income - is to rezone most commercial parcels to mixed use. There is an abundance of retail and office buildings with "for rent" signs on them and both strip malls and shopping centers have many vacancies. These buildings are generally close to transit and other services and would be far less expensive to remodel into small apartments than new construction. Coddington mall alone could accommodate dozens if not hundreds of units. These conversions could also make it possible for Santa Rosa to absorb some of the County's RHNA numbers, which is critical as building in the rural areas is contrary to all of our climate and land preservation goals.
June 18 2022, 20:32	Wendy Krupnick	wlk@sonic.net	I agree we have a housing problem. I agree the homeless and disadvantage need help in housing. However.....have you heard about the ongoing drought and water shortage?? Why, in Heaven's name would you put thousands more residents here to draw on the limited - or disappearing - water supply. We have restrictions on water now. Currently, you have several mega apartment complexes under construction. How many more residents - even just counting 2 per apt. - will you be adding to the diminishing water supply? And, then, you raise the water rates to compensate for the increased draw!! Please, put your brains back in gear and look at what you're doing.....instead of what income it will put in your pockets.
June 16 2022, 16:12	Kathleen Ramazzotti	rdskr10@gmail.com	

Date	Name	Email	Comment
June 15 2022, 09:00	Dan Oxley	oxleydaniel@msn.com	The City and County needs more family homes. No more dense condo and apartments! stricter laws one taxes on Air BnB. Our supervisors need to stop these corporations from buying homes and turning them into vacation rentals. it's sicken to know this conditioned to happen at alarming rates after the fires destroyed so many homes. My daughters have graduated school and leaving the County & State due to the high cost of housing. More hotels for visitors less vacation rentals..
May 6 2022, 17:07	Christina Kemmer	christinakemmer@gmail.com	Hi – Thank you very much for your excellent work in putting together the Alternatives Workbook. I support combining Alternatives 1 & 2. Christina
May 6 2022, 17:01	Sohrab Dorabji	sdorabji@gmail.com	Hi – Thank you very much for your excellent work in putting together the Alternatives Workbook. I support combining Alternatives 1 & 2. Sohrab
May 6 2022, 16:50	Sohrab Dorabji	sdorabji@gmail.com	Hello - I reviewed the Alternatives Workbook, and thought I had until 5/6/22 to submit my inputs on the online survey. It seems the survey is closed. I'm an Oakmont resident, and would appreciate it if I can still give my inputs. Please advise how I might do this. Thank you very much!
April 30 2022, 17:02	Jeannette Luini	jeannelu@aol.com	Seniors in Oakmont have already had two terrifying evacuation experiences. I'm surprised that there were no hospitalizations or deaths from the horrifying traffics jams trying to exit via Highway 12 in recent wildfires. Some residents were stuck for hours with flames burning and embers flying. In the Glass Fire Highway 12 was closed in the direction of Santa Rosa. In the Tubbs fire it was closed in the direction of Sonoma leaving only one way for 4,000 people to evacuate Oakmont. Oakmont needs exits other than those that feed into highway 12. Even if highway 12 is widened, all lanes could be closed by a fire sweeping down from the Mayacamas. I think additional exit roads for the residents of Oakmont should be included in the General Plan. An additional exit road could be built through Elnoka to Melita. Because there is already a road planned by the developer, Santa Rosa would only have to build a short extension of Stonebridge Road to connect the two communities. Such a road would be useful all the time, not just in evacuations. It would remove a lot of traffic from Oakmont drive and Highway 12. As it is now, when residents of West Oakmont want to go to Spring Lake or Montgomery Village, they must drive along Stonebridge Road to Oakmont Drive, make a left on Oakmont Drive adding to congestion at the intersection, make a left onto Highway 12 and then make a left into Melita. Residents of the new Elnoka Community will have to do the same in reverse if they want to go to the Golf Club or shops and banks in Oakmont Village. Another possibility is a road connecting East Oakmont to Lawnsdale. Perhaps Santa Rosa could work with the State of California and County to find a route for such a road. I hope Santa Rosa takes some action to improve the evacuation plans for Oakmont before there is a disaster. We never know when the winds could blow a raging wildfire through Oakmont.
April 28 2022, 07:24	Lynn Bell	lynnbell@monroest.com	I think that any modern renovation to our downtown should definitely include a European-style market building near it's heart. We have visited them in all large European cities and east coast cities in the US. Philadelphia has two downtown and one can barley get into them at lunchtime. This would draw visitors to Santa Rosa's downtown and encourage people to want to live there. It is intended to give all county growers, vintners, restaurants, and vendors access to buyers all day, everyday of the week. If you want people to live downtown, and visitors to choose Santa Rosa as their destination, something like this would be an additional draw. Better than a simple grocery store, it can have coffee houses, wine-tasting bars, fresh vegetables and ready-made meals. Any empty, multi-story building, close to easy parking could be converted into a major draw for our downtown.
April 21 2022, 12:58	tim blair Transformational Housing	ecoeartyacht@gmail.com	I am a affordable housing consultant based in Petaluma having just retired out of active design building remodelling of in law units and other small space projects. I am a passionate advocate for affordable housing. and ADU development. THere are planning and political issues at play beyond the matters of regulations, code compliance, and permitting in approving ADU's and small house - cottage cluster projects and I would like to talk with planners about planning issues and plans for easing the permitting approval and cost impacts to build these units. Preapproved plans is one pathway that other cities have done so far like Chico and LA. I do represent several modular and panelized builders as well as doing site and build for clients who may build such units. I welcome any discussion and further education on the city regulations and planning and promotions and initiatives and protocols for permitting and approvals of ADU's. Thank you for your efforts and getting back to me with a planner who is focussed on ADU development. 415 713 6876 Tim Blair
April 11 2022, 19:51	Katie Michel	kmichel.ar@gmail.com	Hi there, My name is Katie, I'm a resident of SR and someone who would love to be involved in the general plan update. I have a few comments: 1) Ease of communication: It is SO hard to find a way to participate and give feedback if you can't go to any of the meetings! This site is hard to find and as a user, you're not even sure that it's getting to the right people. 2) Public awareness: A lot of people don't even know that this is happening, the only way that I knew is because I'm subscribed to City emails! 3) PLEASE consider both what the people want AND what the current academic and social literature says on best practices for planning in the context of climate change and equity. I urge you to do this not only because there is an amazing wealth of information (I'm more than happy to share sources) but also because the younger generation (myself included) is going to be the group that really feels the impacts and implications of these updates more than any other group, but we're the most left out voice (see comments 1 and 2). Therefore, if public will is not balanced with known and current best practices, it will be far too likely that we fall into the cycle of perpetuating old ideas that benefit a minority of vocal but unrepresentative citizens. TL;DR: keep us Gen Zers in mind! 4) My feedback on the alternatives currently presented: Option 1 (and some aspects of 2) are BY FAR the best ideas available. Option 3 is essentially doing what we have been doing for 50 years, and is the known source of inequity, sprawl, and environmental damage! Here are my thoughts in detail: - Yes, we should absolutely focus on preventing sprawl and #1 does that, but it can't be at the expense of downtown's character. If residents wanted highrises, we'd have moved to Oakland a long time ago. - The VMT calculation results for all three plans are terrible! Please consider the conditions of existing ped/bike infrastructure (eg: Santa Rosa Ave., Mendocino Ave.) and how that increases VMT, scheduling, safety, and interconnectivity with public transit, zoning changes to encourage mixed use (and maybe put useful things like pharmacies and a grocery downtown instead of tons of empty banks?), encouraging "middle housing", focusing on the integration of greenways into bike/ped infrastructure, etc. There's no way we, as a city, can be sustainable if we keep VMTs almost the same. It's time for Santa Rosa to rethink the way we use our streets. - Please dedicate someone to looking into compiling best practices literature on these issues! Again, I'd love to be involved in this process, but I just don't know how. Who can I talk to at city hall? From an environmental policy graduate student, concerned citizen, and proud resident, Katie
April 11 2022, 10:11	Janet Barocco	jbarocco@gmail.com	I've already attended one of the informational meetings and I've filled out the Alternatives Survey. I would like to recommend Santa Rosa Forward have a look at this organization, Strong Towns, as a worthy addition to your toolbox: Strong Towns https://www.strongtowns.org

Date	Name	Email	Comment
January 11 2022, 15:57	Dan	damsden@migco m.com	Test von test
December 15 2021, 00:51	Michael Toschi	michaelatoschi@g mail.com	Hi. Can I please still get e-mailed a response to my comments I made during my brief appearance the virtual General Plan Update meeting on just this past Monday night like I was told was going to happen for sure? I hope to hear back via e-mail reply with the response to my comments from then soon like I was told was going to happen for sure.
November 30 2021, 02:41	Michael Toschi	michaelatoschi@g mail.com	Another comment that I need submitted for Santa Rosa's General Plan Update for my comment to be responded to is regarding for The City of Santa Rosa to stop discouraging new drive-thru establishments within Santa Rosa city limits as The City of Santa Rosa currently per the existing drive-thru establishment discourages new drive-thru establishments within Santa Rosa city limits and that has got to stop and that ordinance has got to be changed to encourage that again especially with the current COVID pandemic going on right now and there being that existing one way of people at this very moment in time dying from COVID is all by them just leaving the safety of their cars to go inside places without drive-thru facilities as if only those places had drive-thru facilities then their lives would have been saved all by them simply having the option of them having not having to leave the safety of their cars to go inside where COVID was contained. So can this other comment of mine please also be added to Santa Rosa's General Plan Update and it makes sure that other comment of mine for Santa Rosa's General Plan Update receives a response to especially when this one is really that important all because of that existing one way that people have been dying of COVID during the current COVID pandemic? Please respond to me via e-mail reply about this as soon as possible.
November 21 2021, 05:10	Michael Toschi	michaelatoschi@g mail.com	Hi. Can I please receive an e-mail response at the e-mail address I have provided with this contact form regarding who do I register my complaint to regarding me being against the existing Highway 12 freeway not being extended east of where it currently terminates at Farmers Lane through the Southeast Greenway like was originally going to happen? As the reason why I as a resident of Santa Rosa am against that so strongly is because the existing Highway 12 freeway being extended from where it currently terminates at Farmers Lane through the Southeast Greenway would relieve existing magnificent traffic congestion through that particular area of Santa Rosa so hugely and I just cannot believe it that there would be such strong opposition of that happening by so many people despite their awareness of the magnificent traffic congestion problem in that particular area of Santa Rosa. And those people who are opposed to that have got to to change their minds and just let the existing Highway 12 freeway get extended from it terminates currently at Farmers Lane through the Southeast Greenway anyway just to relieve traffic congestion no matter how ugly the freeway extension of Highway 12 there would make the Southeast Greenway look like. As that existing magnificent traffic congestion problem in particular of Santa Rosa is just going to get worse and worse and worse especially when the population in that particular area of Santa Rosa is expected to increase magnificently throughout many more years to come.
September 27 2021, 18:14	Shana L Van Cleave	nokandy@gmail.co m	I live on Doughty Way. There is currently a proposal to subdivide a 1.3 acre lot into 10 homes in my neighborhood (Jones Acre Project). I am concerned with how densely populated this side of town is becoming. It feels like every plot of land with anything remotely resembling room to grow gets crammed with houses. As it is, it took us an hour and a half to get to the freeway during fire evacuations (from Fulton and Guerneville Roads). I have narrowly avoided accidents pulling out onto Fulton Road because the traffic is so dangerous. We are already suffering from inadequate infrastructure in that we are having to curb our water usage and endure rolling blackouts. Our parks are full of vagrants and their trash. We hear sideshows screeching down the main thoroughfares. Our cars get broken into--even on dead end streets like ours. PLEASE stop shoving as many houses as possible into these little lots. This kind of growth is unsustainable and is contributing to an environment that is driving people to leave the area in droves.
July 20 2021, 11:44	Woody Hastings	woodyhastings@g mail.com	Everything you do regarding future planning needs to be considered through the lens of the climate crisis, per the Climate Emergency Resolution you adopted. All of these categories need to have some kind of evaluation of climate impacts infused throughout. The key measure urged by CONGAS is to stop pouring fuel on the climate crisis fire and cease permitting fossil fuel infrastructure, including gasoline/diesel stations. Thank you.
July 15 2021, 16:27	Michael Toschi	michaelatoschi@g mail.com	Hi. Is the existing drive-through ordinance going to change to prohibit new drive-thru establishments to be located within Santa Rosa city limits as part of the General Plan Update or no?
June 16 2021, 13:30	Megan Kaun	Megan.kaun@gma il.com	Hello SR, When do you expect the General Plan Alternatives reports to be published to the public website? I see they are expected anytime May/June 2021. Please let me know, thank you! Megan
June 11 2021, 08:46	Jonathan Lawal	jonathanl@repboo storm.com	Hello, Wanted to reach out to you about our software application that helps local electrician companies like yours get more 4 & 5 star reviews on Google , Facebook , Yelp and industry review sites and bury your 3 stars and below reviews. Therefore helping to boost your rank in the search engines as well as helping you gain more leads & sales. We set the software up for you and it runs on autopilot. We're so confident that our software will help your business that we are willing to give you a FREE demo. You have everything to gain including New Customers. Get in touch with us to acquire a demo. Jonathan L jonathanl@repboostorm.com
June 8 2021, 04:34	Winston	winston@gomail77 7.com	Hey guys, Winston here from Iowa. I just wanted to see if you need anything in the way of site editing/code fixing/programming, unique blog post material, extra traffic by getting others to start sharing your site across their own social media accounts, social media management, optimizing the site, monetizing the site, etc. I have quite a few ways I can set all of this and do this for you. Don't mean to impose, was just curious, I've been doing this for some time and was just curious if you needed an extra hand. I can even do Wordpress and other related tasks (you name it). Stay Safe, Winston tel:1-319-382-0597
June 3 2021, 19:37	Sonia Taylor	great6@sonic.net	Link is broken -- at least for the English version. Opens a new window that wants me to sign up to create surveys... ????
June 2 2021, 10:57	Steve Birdlebough	scbaffirm@gmail.c om	Over the next two decades, we will need to reduce driving significantly. It looks like a significant percentage of current car trips are less than 3 miles, and could be made by bicycle, or on foot. However, too many parts of the City are not really safe for cycling, and have poor/unattractive sidewalks. State law is likely to be updated to allow for lower speed limits. Can we follow Barcelona's example, and create 9-block neighborhoods with 15-MPH speed limits that are very pedestrian-bicycle friendly? Many neighborhoods are not within easy walking distance of markets. Can we allow a grocery store in every 9-block neighborhood?

Date	Name	Email	Comment
April 21 2021, 09:45	Arthur E Deicke Jr	aedeicke@gmail.com	Could you look into this link. I'm trying to obtain the schedule, but it provides an error. https://www.santarosafoward.com/files/managed/Document/283/SRGPU_Schedule_Revised_03-11-2021.pdf
April 15 2021, 20:30	Tony White	tonwhite@sonic.net	Besides efforts to mitigate the threat of wildfires, SR needs to address the housing shortage by building affordable housing which low income workers can afford. As long as housing is expensive, workers will have to commute long distances, undermining efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Local government should make sure that their workers earn a living wage for Sonoma County so they can afford to live and work in our community and raise a family with all the opportunities and benefits of middle class families. How can we pay our employees who take care of our city and county less than a living wage. Without a living wage with benefits, city and county employees cannot take part of or take part in their community. To get cars off the road, city transit should be electrified, using smaller vans and offering free transit to low income or all residents. Given the amount of waste we create and cannot manage, we are a long way from sustainability. Zero waste is as important as Net Zero emissions!
April 2 2021, 15:52	Karen L Weeks	klweeks55@gmail.com	I am not able to access the recording of the latest meeting
April 1 2021, 10:11	Robert Gaiser	rgaiser@aol.com	There are over 500 existing multi-family housing units along Hoen Avenue and other streets surrounding the Southeast Greenway from Farmers Lane to Summerfield Road. Most of these dwellings are currently designated and zoned as Medium Density Residential with an allowed maximum density of 18 units per acre, but some of this area is developed with single family homes and duplexes at a much lower density than 18 units per acre. The Southeast Greenway is planned to be a community park with walking and bike paths, play areas, picnic areas and natural open space. We believe its development will increase interest in developing more housing in the area. We therefore request that the City's General Plan Update consider increasing the allowed densities in some of the area to the Medium High Density level of 30 units per acre.
March 31 2021, 17:10	Steve Birdleough	scbaffirm@gmail.com	The Rincon Valley event scheduled for June 4th would be a Friday, not a Tuesday Weekdays are not great for people with jobs to gather; and what about COVID?
March 13 2021, 19:53	Wendy Krupnick	wlk@sonic.net	I'm particularly interested in the issues listed above and can provide examples of other General Plans in CA that address these issues wisely. For now, see https://www.sccgov.org/sites/opa/nr/Documents/HealthElement_20150825_A_dopted_Final.pdf
March 12 2021, 09:12	Michelle M Brady	michellegabrielle7@gmail.com	Good morning, I'm inquiring as to receiving an application to become a member of the new Redistricting Commission. I recently read on SmartNews/Santa Rosa where the city is accepting applications. However, I haven't been able to find the site to download the PDF of the application. If you can, let me know what site I should use to receive this information. Thank you very much. Regards, Michelle M. Brady
March 6 2021, 22:21	Michael eklund	mitasha@sbcglobe.net	I do not see how converting Bennett Valley Golf Course and/or Galvin Park to housing can in any way improve the quality of life in this city. There are plenty of other places where housing can be built in this city without taking away some of the last remaining recreation spots in the city. A couple of examples for where housing would be more appropriate...the site of the burned down KMart, the site of the burned down Fountaingrove Inn, the old Sutter Hospital on Chanate, the freeway right of way that will never be used for the highway 12 extension from 101 to the East, as well as plenty of properties between Petaluma Hill Road and Santa Rosa Avenue or many places off Fulton Road or off Highway 12 across from Oakmont. Building on any or all of these sites would not have a negative impact on the quality of life that destroying the golf course and the park would have on our city.
March 6 2021, 17:02	Tres McKinney	tres@tresmckinneydesign.com	Street trees are essential for a welcoming downtown and neighborhoods as well as combating climate change. There needs to be a more comprehensive street tree plan with a dedicated watering and maintenance schedule for all new and older city plantings. Too often trees and median strips are planted by the city and then under watered and neglected so they do not thrive. This is wasteful of city resources. I would like Santa Rosa to be considered a green city (one tree for every resident). Broad sidewalks should be encouraged with any new development and allowing space for street trees. Cities that have the most successful and thriving shopping districts have well maintained street trees and seasonal plantings. Unfortunately our 4th Street shopping corridor's deciduous trees are stunted and in pathetic shape and the planters are not well conceived. There needs to be a more equitable plan for maintaining sidewalks in neighborhoods where there are residents that can least afford it. We all walk on these streets.
March 4 2021, 21:20	Sue Hoey	auntsueh@aol.com	The map section did not ever work! I would like to complete the survey.
February 26 2021, 20:32	Jim Pedgrift	pedgrift@icloud.com	The greatest unrecognized amenities in the City are the creeks, Santa Rosa and Matanzas, which are owned to the center of the creek by adjacent property owners and remain unused and unmaintained. They could be developed by the City to provide bicycle and pedestrian pathways connecting the downtown to the neighborhoods. Encouraging citizens to get out of their cars and walk or use bicycles is difficult at best when bicyclists have to contend with motorists. Safety is always the number one concern of both pedestrians and bicyclists and the use of our natural waterways would provide class one alternatives to having to deal with the challenge of staying in one piece. This is a long-term project. Maybe fifty years to complete. The better reason to start investigating the possibility today.
February 24 2021, 21:50	Jennifer	saintjgm@yahoo.com	I would like to see more opportunities for people with chronic mental health issues to assist others, and get paid a decent wage. Funding gets dropped, limited, changed constantly for peer support services and other mental health services and puts great stress on people for people depending on, and employed in those services. Now, especially with the stress that covid has placed on everyone, there needs to be a renewed sense of the worth of seeking help, and the stability of those resources.
February 24 2021, 17:29	Constance van Groos	conconvg@gmail.com	Gangs, drugs. Crime and homelessness must be better addressed. We can not blindly continue with growth plans. We must improve the quality of life here. I never thought I'd see the day when whole neighborhoods were dangerous to drive through for fear of gangs. Guns and threats to one's safety. Let's get a "Quality of Life " plan instead of progrowth at all costs for those of us here!!!

Date	Name	Email	Comment
February 23 2021, 21:07	Diane Schoenrock	dianes@sonic.net	Santa Rosa is prideless . Trees are not replaced downtown. Sidewalks are not cleaned. Weeds are not cut on street islands or often in front of public buildings.
February 23 2021, 16:59	JOAN GERMESHHAUSEN	germeshaj@gmail.com	We do NOT need more low income housing, but rather better job opportunities. Also, homeless need to either accept the improvement opportunities provided by already existing services or move away. We do not need to support homeless for free. They need to work for food/housing etc. This may be as simple as sweeping the downtown, cleaning up after an event. Europe does this all the time. People choose the way they want to live and need to take responsibility. I do not want to live in a third world town or country 1. Housing is needed for not just the low income residents but middle class. The well to do take care of themselves. The push for an urban core is misguided considering that people drive cars. Where do they park and how bad will it be with traffic? If cars take 15-20 to bet to the highway, that means more carbon pollution in our city that can be avoided. Need to use the open space in the Western area as there is much out there. And going too high downtown is unwarranted. 2. The Bus Transit system needs to be merged with Sonoma County and Petaluma Bus Transit. This is the only county in California that has so many overlapping bus systems. Never enough money to get the right amount of buses on the streets so people use cars. Get rid of the duplicating overhead and put the savings into more buses. 3. There is no need for more than five (5) city council persons. Sonoma County has five supervisors for 500,000 residents while Santa Rosa has 180,000 residents. Spread the extra money of \$800/month per councilperson to the remaining five council persons.
February 23 2021, 09:52	Andrew Smith	a.asmith@comcast.net	And we don't need overpaid council persons in Santa Rosa! Some city council persons have complained about the low monthly stipend paid. It is what it is. So when the redistricting is done and looks like it won't meet the deadline for the 2022 elections, then elect all 5 council persons at once. Don't need a permanent mayor at least at this time.
February 23 2021, 07:45	Randy Mack	randy@mack-faulkner.com	Rezone infill parcels to accommodate higher density projects such as apartments or Senior housing.
February 23 2021, 06:31	david bannister	davidban@sonic.net	pin drop not working Was interested in looking over the survey that was announced on your website but like everything else involved with this city, it doesn't work. I have lived here for 60 years and am completely disgusted at the lack of pride for what was once "the city designed for living". The supervisors don't have any backbone and are only good at one thing: bs lip service. Take a look at how the homeless are allowed to call the shots. They get free handouts, are allowed to break numerous laws, infringe on tax paying citizens and business owners and yet this city says "what else can we do for them"!! Santa Rosa is filthy, too far left and killing off any pride I once had for living here. Copy and paste onto your little survey once you figure out how to make it work.
February 23 2021, 05:57	Caryn	ctognozzi@yahoo.com	
February 23 2021, 05:32	Trisha Meisler	tmeisler@sbcglobal.net	Hi JSYK the map tool is not loading. I couldn't complete survey with my location information. Please either improve the golf course and Galvin Park (maybe convert a tennis court into pickleball courts) or leave them as is! In 2017 our son's memorial with the Montgomery High School baseball team of 1991 was held at Legends and it would be personally heartbreaking to our family to lose that facility. A multi-purpose restaurant could be profitable and draw more customers to the golf course as well. It could include an updated restaurant/sports bar with a healthy modern menu. There could also be a take out section for families using the driving range and the facilities at Galvin Park that would include sandwiches, snacks, ice-cream and beverages at reasonable prices. This location is a highlight of the city and a destination point for golfers and families. Turning it into another development when it is already developed for recreation would be very short-sighted. Thank you for being open to suggestions and opinions.
February 22 2021, 22:50	Pamela Ord	pord2@comcast.net	Just took the short survey . Thanks for the opportunity t participate. I look forward to more chances to contribute. A good longer-term plan for Santa Rosa's future would be an intra-city light rail (trolley/streetcar) system similar to New Orleans', https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=new+orleans+light+rail and Los Angeles', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Los_Angeles_Metro_Rail , and Portland's https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=Portland+light+rail Start small : Mendocino Ave /West College/Fulton or Marlowe RD/ Guerneville Road quadrant would serve as a good starting place. An electrified system would reduce short car trips, encourage pedestrian traffic, decrease auto traffic and be an economical, more equitable transportation for suburban -urban residents.
February 19 2021, 14:41	Janet Barocco	jbarocco@gmail.com	
February 10 2021, 12:27	Michael Toschi	michaelatoschi@gmail.com	Are there plans for a new second Costco store in Santa Rosa? Hi! I just learned the city recently removed parking minimums for downtown Santa Rosa. Yay, great news! Parking reform is important if you care about affordable housing and multimodal transportation, and I'm delighted to hear that the city cares about these topics. But at the same time, I learned there aren't any plans yet to remove minimum parking requirements for the rest of the city. Fortunately, you're planning the new general plan, hurray! Can you tell me what steps I can take to make sure the rest of the minimum parking requirements are removed? A couple good resources for this topic if needed include: Parking Reform Network - http://parkingreform.org/ and Distinguished Research Professor Donald Shoup - Reforms https://www.shoupdogg.com/reforms/ Thanks!
February 9 2021, 20:24	Angel York	aniola@gmail.com	