

December 2, 2021

Dear Mr. Ross and the City of Santa Rosa,

I have written to you before with many of these same concerns, but in order to assure my message is being heard, I will reiterate them once again for this upcoming meeting. **In short, I vehemently oppose approval of the Dutton Meadows development as is it planned right now, and urge you to deny it for the time being.**

As I have before, I wanted to take a moment to remind you of the obligations the City has to us. In October 2020, the City Council created a statement that their mission is “to provide high-quality public services and cultivate a vibrant, resilient and livable City,” and the City has a stated 2030 Vision which includes ensuring the City has “thriving neighborhoods, a multi-cultural community, and breathtaking stretches of open space, creeks, and greenbelts.” The proposed Dutton Meadows development seems to stand in stark contrast to these goals and this Vision.

The City *must* find a way to prioritize upgrading and maintaining infrastructure in this area before it builds more housing in southwest Santa Rosa.

Sonoma County finds itself in another drought, and water levels in Lake Sonoma are reaching historic lows. The City must ensure its growth doesn't outpace its resources. Further, water rationing will certainly become more frequent in the coming years. This affects us not only in the sense that every new house moves the City closer to reaching its water allotment, it can hit us in the wallets as the City assesses a “water shortage” surcharge between 5-30% during mandatory water conservation periods. Those of us in southwest Santa Rosa are among the City's most financially strained residents already. Also, not only does the City have an obligation to make sure there's adequate water coming out of our kitchen faucets, given the devastating fires we have had throughout our region, it has an obligation to ensure there is enough water to successfully fight fires. With what appears to be yet another drought in California's future—which will likely last several years—our water supply and distribution system will be critical. Increasing demands this system should be done very carefully, yet the Dutton Meadows Master Development does not seem to take the current situation into account.

In fact, approval of the Dutton meadows subdivision would end up doing great harm to the City's water resources. In years in which we get “normal” or higher than “normal” rainfall, many areas in the area currently sought to be developed end up with standing water, meaning that this water is slowly being captured by the ground, and allowed to percolate back into the water table, replenishing or groundwater. Should this area be developed, and that same rain water captured via storm drains, the water will be washed away to sea.

The traffic on Hearn Avenue is horrendous *as is*. During busy times, the drive from Dutton Meadow to Santa Rosa Avenue can take up to 25 minutes, despite it taking only one minute and five seconds to make that same drive when traffic is light. Residents around here are horrified to think what could happen to one of us if we suffer a medical emergency and ambulances cannot get to us in time, or get us to the hospital in time, because they get stuck in traffic. Of special

importance to the proposed Dutton Meadows development, the intersections of West Ave and Sally Ann Street¹ with Hearn are especially problematic and dangerous. There is only 80 feet between these roads, and the center turn lanes to access both these roads are comprised of the same physical space on Hearn, resulting in traffic confusion, backups, accidents, and more near-accidents than I can count. The “mouth” of the access to Sally Ann Ave is far too narrow to accommodate a safe turn into the subdivision via Sally Ann, and from westbound traffic, waiting to cross over Hearn can occasionally take up to minutes and risks causing a complete backup on Hearn.

Once a car has turned onto Sally Ann, the only option is to turn left onto Aloise Avenue, which, under the proposed plan, will extend into the new development. Unfortunately, Aloise Avenue is far too narrow to accommodate increased traffic flow. To demonstrate this in a manner we thought you’d find informative, we captured a video showing just how tight the road is—that video can be seen at <https://youtu.be/SoqnamIy6MY>. With cars lawfully parked on either side of the street, it is possible there would be only 18 feet between the parked car’s side mirrors. As a result, it is difficult, if not downright dangerous, for cars try to pass one another within this tight space. We have been told that, per code, firetrucks need 20 feet between parked cars to pass. Come trash day, once trash, recycling and green waste containers are put out for collection, the amount of space available for cars to drive on is further reduced.

It is our understanding that the access to the house currently accessed off of Aloise Avenue were *never* meant to be accessed from Hearn via Sally Anne, and that this entry into the development was supposed to be a “temporary” stop-gap measure put in place until the City could acquire the land needed to properly connect our area to Hearn Ave via an extension of Dutton Ave. Well over a decade, if not nearly two, have passed and the City still has not acquired that land. This “stop-gap” measure is working okay as the access point and Aloise Ave service 24 homes, but it will not work when that same access point when burdened with the added strain that will come when that road allows access *for 137 additional homes*.

A nagging issue here in SW Santa Rosa is the difficulty surrounding access to, and departure from, US 101. The Hearn Avenue overcrossing is insufficient to meet the demands of traffic currently, which one can’t help but notice in the afternoons—*every* afternoon, weekday or weekend—as traffic on the US 101 southbound Hearn Avenue exit backs up on to the freeway, sometimes backing up almost to Corby. Of note, the City recently approved the high-density housing near the intersections of Petaluma Hill Road, Yolanda and Kawana Springs Road—totaling over 600 new housing units; the residents of that housing will soon be adding more congestion to the 101 on/off ramps. Until the overcrossing is widened, or another overcrossing is put in in the SW Santa Rosa area, the City cannot allow more housing to go into south Santa Rosa.

I also have concerns about the levels of service we can expect to receive from the police. Already, our area feels neglected by law enforcement. Our mailboxes and cars get broken into, the police won’t even respond. Police officers who have been assigned to patrol our area for years tell us they “didn’t even know [our subdivision here] existed.” Our homes get broken into, and the police come out to provide us with written reports to hand off to our insurance

¹ The only access from Hearn to this new development is via Sally Ann Ave.

companies, informing us they don't have the time to actually investigate the crimes. This has to stop. The City cannot not increase the areas over which law enforcement needs to patrol until it can provide us with some real level of policing service.

We have seen so much population growth within our area, without any real improvement in infrastructure and support services, leading to a deterioration in our quality-of-life. In urge you to drive through the relatively new "Pebblecreek" housing development, (at the intersection of Tuxhorn and Dutton Meadows Road,) also nearby herein southwest Santa Rosa. You'll see the area is so over-congested with parked cars it is hard to navigate the streets.

The City is supposed to be providing six acres of park per 1000 residents in an area. Right now, southwest Santa Rosa has a total of 24 acres of parks for approximately 18,000 residents. Yes, the new development—in later phases—includes park space, but it is not enough. Related, it is our understanding that the developer doesn't even yet own the property upon which it intends to build the park. How can we believe the park will be forthcoming, when the developer may never be able to acquire the land where the park is to exist? We are falling woefully behind with regards to places in which we can recreate close to home.

The Dutton Meadows Master subdivision plan went before the Planning Commission and City Council just two years ago, and was denied. Little has changed in the developer's plan since then that should make the City believe it's in the City's best interest to move forward with this development now, especially in light of how many ways the development conflicts with the City's goals and vision. The strain it will place on the infrastructure diminishes the quality of the public services we receive and makes the City less resilient. It makes our area feel less "livable." It makes riding our bikes and walking along the streets more dangerous to our safety and health. And it takes away yet another open space. So tell us, how can the City believe this development, under the current circumstances, is what is best for us right now?

Honor the commitments you made to this City, and deny the Dutton Meadows Master subdivision until the infrastructure, and health and safety issues have been addressed first. Until the infrastructure issues have been addressed, deny the Dutton Meadows subdivision.

Thank you for your time,



Devina Douglas
Southwest Santa Rosa resident

Ross, Adam

From: Pat St. Clair <stclair@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2684 Dutton Meadow Avenue

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Adam,

This 19 acre subdivision does not appear to include housing for very low- and low-income people There are no ADU's included. This seems to be very much against the housing issues cited yesterday and today and many times before that in The Press Democrat. These should be included. There should be no parking reduction. Any housing that includes two adults usually includes two cars or more these days. This is not in the Downtown Station area plan and should address transportation issues. Parking should remain at 100%. Any streets should remain at standard size (see the Doubles subdivision for what to avoid.). How are any wetlands being taken care of? This project needs to have significant revisions and inclusions to meet the current guidelines.

Pat St. Clair

Ross, Adam

From: The Law Office of Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2021 12:58 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] DENY Dutton Meadows
Attachments: Dutton meadows 2021.pdf

Please see the attached letter.

Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
250 D St., Suite 234
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2021 12:51 PM
To: Ross, Adam; Sprinkle, Rob
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Development within the SW SR area

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good day,

A few small questions have arisen as our group digs deeper into trying to work with the City to ensure more City growth happens only after the current issues within our area have been addressed.

1. Folks have heard rumors that the City is contemplating widening Hearn so that the entire road is two lanes in each direction.
 1. Is there any truth to that?
 2. If so, when is this work anticipated to be accomplished? Have funding sources been identified and committed to the project yet?
2. Are either of you aware of any plans to put in a SMART train station in the SW SR area? If so, when is this work anticipated to be accomplished? Have funding sources been identified and committed to the project yet?
3. A later part of the overall Dutton Meadows subdivision involves connecting Dutton to this new area. Can either of you confirm whether either the City or the Developer has actually acquired the land where this roadway would be placed. We've been informed it has *not*.
 1. If not, what is the status of this land acquisition? Namely, who (City vs. Developer) is working to acquire it, and if it's the City, what is the status of negotiations with the current landowner?
 1. If the owner isn't willing to sell, have eminent domain proceedings begun?
 2. If such proceedings have not begun, when will that happen?

Thanks!

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
250 D St., Suite 234
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 5:00 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadow Subdivision Public Comment
Attachments: Dutton Meadows March 2021 Comment Letter.docx

Hi Adam,

Please see attached for my comment letter regarding Dutton Meadow Subdivision.

Regards,
Matthew Pierce

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 2:54 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows

Mr. Ross,

Having reviewed the materials recently added to the “Dutton Meadows” files in the City Planning Team database, I wished to offer the following comments in regards to why I urge the City to deny the development at this time:

- The fact that the developer is asking for, and reliant on, a variance asking for a reduction in width of certain streets within the development means that this development will lead to a “crowded” feeling within the development. The houses in Dutton Meadows are already on relatively small lots, with small yards. Our area of the City is woefully lacking in public open spaces and parks. Any variances with allow the area of feel more crowded only serve to reduce the quality of life for the residents. Further, and perhaps more importantly, **a reduction in road width leads to safety concerns for driving and riding one’s bike, and during any potential evacuation situations.** As currently designed, the ingress and egress to the development is rather limited, and so the effects of the traffic concerns will be felt more severely than in other areas of town.
- The fact that the developer is asking for, and reliant on, a variance asking for a reduction in width of certain street planters, for financial reasons, means that, once again, the Roseland area will see less greenery on its streets. While that may sound insignificant in and of itself, when viewed in the context of the other ways the Roseland area is constantly being shortchanged by the City—less parks, less policing, lower quality street and utility maintenance, higher density housing, worse traffic conditions—allowing a development with the requested valiance would be a slap in the face of the current residents of our area. ..And why is this request for a variance being made? So the developer can make more money. While we’ve said it before, and while I’m sure your department is vaguely aware of the fact, *the City is supposed to be looking after the best interests of its citizens. ...Not prospective citizens. ...And certainly not the developers.*
- The lack of complete pedestrian connectivity will impede the ability of pedestrians to safely navigate the roadways. Already most residents are fearful of, and hesitant to, walk the roads of the areas around Hearn as traffic is deemed so dangerous. Adding more houses, more people, and more traffic, without ensuring pedestrian safety is maximized only serves to endanger our community. Further, our area tends too be home to more lower-income folks who are, in turn, more reliant, on walking to their destinations than in other areas of town. Of note, many of the school children within our area walk to school, and a fair number seem to walk to school without adult supervision. Because of this, the City should err of the side of ensuring every safety measure is in place to protect our area’s children.
- I ask your department to deny the design with private parking spots. Not only does private parking increase tensions between neighbors, it depletes the amount of open space available for residents to plant a garden or

trees, and recreate on their own property. Further, it's just an ugly use of space; save "private" property for living uses, not parking.

- Should the development be approved, I urge the City to require striping on all the roadways in and around the Development. The roads the City might be approving are narrow, and will be heavily traveled. It is imperative that every roadway be properly and thoroughly marked for everyone's safety.

All of that said, I think the City should still flatly deny any more development within the general Roseland area until many of the "quality of life issues" previously brought to your attention by residents have been addressed. We need significantly more open, public spaces. We need the traffic situation (which is highly dependent on widening the Hearn/1091 overpass,) remedied. And we need to get more police resources devoted to our area.

I can't tell you enough what a mistake approving this development would be as so many facets of this development are in contrast to the City's stated goals.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Inconveniences Opportunities <jonasyt@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Development Zoom Follow-up

Hi Adam,

I'm a local for decades. I watched the public Zoom session on the Dutton Meadows development and just wanted to reiterate my comment there:

* Conventional landscaping should be eschewed for sneezeless and drought resistant. No one needs a traditional lawn. Let owners install themselves if they must.

* A street called Northpoint could easily be confused with Northpoint Parkway a short distance West. It should get a new name. How about something after the flat terrain or the wildfire resilience of the city?

Also: the revised plan seems to be missing the ADUs. Those should be kept if for no other reason to show the region and the state what is possible. Why are they missing?

Jonah

Ross, Adam

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 9:57 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Public Comment Period

Hello Adam,

I am requesting the City extends the public comment period for the Dutton Meadows Subdivision another 30 days. I participated in a Zoom meeting this evening where residents expressed concerns over continued development in SW Santa Rosa without infrastructure improvements. The extension would allow residents to submit more informed comments and recommendations.

Thank You,

Matthew Pierce
2524 Rising Moon Lane

Ross, Adam

From: Wendy Laby <wendy.laby@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 1:37 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Hi Adam

Thank you again for your time the other day to discuss my concerns on the Dutton Meadows Subdivision.

As noted, I am still very concerned about the additional traffic that will be added to Hearn Avenue, especially when people are able to return to work and the schools are open. I have had difficulty pulling onto the road during the hours that students are heading to and from school. In addition, in the late afternoon, the traffic to go over the freeway (heading east on Hearn Ave) has backed up from almost to the park! Right now it isn't that bad since school isn't in-person learning: yet.

If they are planning to add a light at Burbank & Hearn, this might add to making this street more difficult to use - especially if the lights aren't coordinated.

At one time there was talk of Bellvue Avenue either as a freeway entrance or an overpass to the east side of the freeway. With all the additional cars that the Rosland Projects will be adding to traffic on Hearn Ave, I truly hope the city will be proactive in keeping traffic moving!

Thank you for forwarding my traffic concerns to the right department.

Again thank you for your time and wishing you a great week off

Best regards
Wendy Laby
1467 Hearn Ave
707-888-7538

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 5:51 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Devina Douglas
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Mr. Ross:

On behalf of the residents of what has been referred to as Southern Gardens (Sally Ann/Aloise) neighborhood and adjoining neighborhoods in the Roseland area of the City of Santa Rosa, we request a 30-day extension on the public comment period, which ends on March 19, 2021 for the development of the Dutton Meadows Subdivision.

Due to COVID restrictions, we have only been able to meet as a group once since the City's Neighborhood Meeting on February 10, 2021 held on Zoom. We need more time to ensure residents in our neighborhood, which will be dramatically affected by Dutton Meadows Subdivision, are informed.

We have scheduled another Zoom meeting for this week, our second, to discuss, continue our research and prepare appropriate and pertinent comments to this development.

Residents in our neighborhood requesting this extension include:

Southern Gardens:

Devina Douglas (Rising Moon)
Matt Pierce (Rising Moon)
Andrea Rojas (Aloise)
Tulio Vasquez (Aloise)
Maria Vasquez (Aloise)
Ron Suess (Rising Moon)
Jane Suess (Rising Moon)
Art Deicke (Deep Harbor)
Solita Deicke (Deep Harbor)

And from neighboring areas in Roseland:

Fred Kreuger
Duane Dewitt

Thank you for your consideration. Please acknowledge receipt of this request and let us know if the extension is granted.

Sincerely,

Arthur Deicke
aedeicke@gmail.com
2513 Deep Harbor Ln
707-322-2015

Ross, Adam

From: Elivaldo Rodriguez <raidersrellik@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 2:11 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I would like too know if the house are for sale or rent ?

Sent from my iPhone

Ross, Adam

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision Comment
Attachments: dutton meadows comments.pdf

Dear Adam Ross,

Please see attached for my comment on the Dutton Meadow Subdivision.

Ross, Adam

From: Debra <debrabroner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:53 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

The more I learn about the plan for the Dutton Meadows Subdivision, the stronger my opposition. The plan to have Aloise Ave. be one of the major access streets into the subdivision is so wrong. Safety should be the main concern of the Santa Rosa City Council and there is no way possible to accommodate the traffic load from Hearn Ave to Sally Ann St then on to Aloise Ave.

I have joined in with my neighbors to oppose this project and signed onto a neighborhood letter with details of our opposition.

There is so much more wrong with this project and with NO responsible access, we should not even need to go into these additional details of opposition at this time.

The developer did not secure access to Hearn Ave at Dutton and even then there are major traffic flow and pollution issues.

A strong opposition to this project. Make it a park that all residents of RoseLand can enjoy. Keep the air clean from additional pollution and work on improving traffic flow for the residents already established in RoseLand

Debra Broner
1238 Aloise Ave
Santa Rosa , CA. 95407-8166
805-206-7809

debrabroner@gmail.com

Ross, Adam

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 1, 2021 4:08 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivison

Mr. Ross,

I am writing to you today to express my concerns with the proposed Dutton Meadows subdivision. The City should deny the application on the basis that existing infrastructure is inadequate for the current residents, and adding any additional housing will exacerbate existing problems with traffic congestion, parking, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and place additional stress on City services which are already woefully inadequate.

The City should require infrastructure improvements be completed, such as Hearn overpass improvements and implementing an improved traffic flow plan, prior to approving any additional developments in this area. Without addressing infrastructure first, the City will continue pushing S.W. Santa Rosa towards being an over-crowded and drastically under-served area of the City. S.W. Santa Rosa has been neglected by the City for far to long and this practice has to stop!

There are over 1,000 recently approved housing units where the Hearn Ave overpass and on/off ramps will be the nearest access to Hwy 101. The Hearn overpass and intersections on Hearn Ave were given the lowest possible ratings of "F" in a 2009 EIR, and things have only gotten worse. Is there such a rating of "worse than F"?

I know affordable housing is a priority, but approving a development of \$750,000 homes is not addressing the situation. Affordable housing for residents is a righteous goal, but people moving into the area with cash offers outbid Santa Rosa locals. The paradigm of building homes in our region to mitigate rising home prices is not supported by empirically data. A better approach would be to support a livable wage and attract industries that have well-paying jobs.

At this time, it is unfathomable that the planning committee and City Council would even consider approving the Dutton Meadows subdivision application; the evidence is clear that the planning committee and City Council should deny this development until infrastructure improvements have been completed to support thriving neighborhoods in S.W. Santa Rosa.

The new information submitted by the developer still uses Sally Anne, a very narrow entrance, as the only access from Hearn. This is already a dangerous intersection.

This development should be delayed until infrastructure improvements including the Hearn overpass is completed, and the City has increased its water supplies.

A concerned citizen of SW Santa Rosa,

Matt Pierce

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 1:06 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton meadows town hall presentation materials

Good day, Mr. Ross,

I'm wondering if there is any way to get a copy of the powerpoint materials that were shared at the 2/10 Town Hall meeting regarding the proposed Dutton Meadows construction. I was unable to find them anywhere on the city's website.

Also, for those of us who have more questions that are perhaps best addressed to the other speakers at that Town Hall, are you able to provide their contact info?

Thank you!

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
250 D St., Suite 234
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 2:54 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows

Mr. Ross,

Having reviewed the materials recently added to the “Dutton Meadows” files in the City Planning Team database, I wished to offer the following comments in regards to why I urge the City to deny the development at this time:

- The fact that the developer is asking for, and reliant on, a variance asking for a reduction in width of certain streets within the development means that this development will lead to a “crowded” feeling within the development. The houses in Dutton Meadows are already on relatively small lots, with small yards. Our area of the City is woefully lacking in public open spaces and parks. Any variances with allow the area of feel more crowded only serve to reduce the quality of life for the residents. Further, and perhaps more importantly, **a reduction in road width leads to safety concerns for driving and riding one’s bike, and during any potential evacuation situations.** As currently designed, the ingress and egress to the development is rather limited, and so the effects of the traffic concerns will be felt more severely than in other areas of town.
- The fact that the developer is asking for, and reliant on, a variance asking for a reduction in width of certain street planters, for financial reasons, means that, once again, the Roseland area will see less greenery on its streets. While that may sound insignificant in and of itself, when viewed in the context of the other ways the Roseland area is constantly being shortchanged by the City—less parks, less policing, lower quality street and utility maintenance, higher density housing, worse traffic conditions—allowing a development with the requested valiance would be a slap in the face of the current residents of our area. ..And why is this request for a variance being made? So the developer can make more money. While we’ve said it before, and while I’m sure your department is vaguely aware of the fact, *the City is supposed to be looking after the best interests of its citizens. ...Not prospective citizens. ...And certainly not the developers.*
- The lack of complete pedestrian connectivity will impede the ability of pedestrians to safely navigate the roadways. Already most residents are fearful of, and hesitant to, walk the roads of the areas around Hearn as traffic is deemed so dangerous. Adding more houses, more people, and more traffic, without ensuring pedestrian safety is maximized only serves to endanger our community. Further, our area tends too be home to more lower-income folks who are, in turn, more reliant, on walking to their destinations than in other areas of town. Of note, many of the school children within our area walk to school, and a fair number seem to walk to school without adult supervision. Because of this, the City should err of the side of ensuring every safety measure is in place to protect our area’s children.
- I ask your department to deny the design with private parking spots. Not only does private parking increase tensions between neighbors, it depletes the amount of open space available for residents to plant a garden or

trees, and recreate on their own property. Further, it's just an ugly use of space; save "private" property for living uses, not parking.

- Should the development be approved, I urge the City to require striping on all the roadways in and around the Development. The roads the City might be approving are narrow, and will be heavily traveled. It is imperative that every roadway be properly and thoroughly marked for everyone's safety.

All of that said, I think the City should still flatly deny any more development within the general Roseland area until many of the "quality of life issues" previously brought to your attention by residents have been addressed. We need significantly more open, public spaces. We need the traffic situation (which is highly dependent on widening the Hearn/1091 overpass,) remedied. And we need to get more police resources devoted to our area.

I can't tell you enough what a mistake approving this development would be as so many facets of this development are in contrast to the City's stated goals.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devinadouglas@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 8:23 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Extension of the public comment period for Dutton Meadows

Mr Ross,

I am writing to you today in hopes that you and your office would consider extending the public comment period for the Dutton Meadow's subdivision. Having looked through the city records there appear to be numerous issues we residence wish to address so that we may prepare a full summary of our concerns about this subdivision before the comment period. Unfortunately we are having difficulty getting all of the interested parties together due to Covid.

It is our desire to put together a simple straightforward statement of our concerns, in an organized fashion. However to accomplish that we believe we're going to need a little more time. I hope our request will be granted. Please let us know as soon as you're able.

Thank you,

Devina Douglas, 2524 Rising Moon Lane

Ross, Adam

From: itzel palomera <itzel827@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 12:23 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Meadow Subdivision homes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Adam, I have a question regarding The Meadow Subdivisions homes . What are the requirements to be able to qualify for these homes. I would like to know more information .

Sent from my iPhone

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 7:10 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Rose, William; Devina Douglas; ron.suess@gmail.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Park Mitigation Fee and Aloise Ave

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Adam:

Could you tell me if the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision has a park mitigation fee or is there a park to be built in their proposed phases? I understand a park is proposed in the development, but it appears to be in a future development.

Also, as the development is proposed, when would Aloise Avenue be opened eastward in relationship to the overall development? Will it be first and all construction equipment and vehicles be transiting Sally Ann St to Aloise Ave to get into the development?

Thank you,

Art

Arthur Deicke
707-322-2015
aedeicke@gmail.com

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 2:21 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Personal public comment email re: Dutton Meadows proposal

Dear City of Santa Rosa,

While I was a signatory on the group letter recently submitted to you, I wanted to follow up with a separate email to highlight the particular issues that are most concerning to me with regards to the Dutton Meadows subdivision, all of which seem to center around the same theme: the fact that the City is failing to do its core function: look after the well-being of its residents.

When Roseland was annexed into the City, the City made commitments to improve the level of service this area received. Yet our roads are still terrible. Traffic is still terrible, and only getting worse. Our schools are overcrowded. And the residents feel abandoned.

I won't beat the dead horse about the traffic issues in this letter; I think the "group letter" addressed that adequately. But I do want to ask what the City and the developer think will be accomplished with this new development *that actually addresses the issues* we face here in SW Santa Rosa? Is the developer going to pay for the previously-identified infrastructure upgrades that need to be addressed as part of the construction? If funds for those projects aren't available in the City's budget, make the developer chip in. Are we finding creative ways to get more money/resources for our schools, and protect the health of our children? Is the City working with CalTrans to make progress on expanding the Hearn overcrossing to help mitigate the traffic snafu that our area has become? Is that construction on the new/improved overpass imminently forthcoming? Is the city holding itself accountable to its stated "goals" and "vision" for the City? Or is the developer merely invited to become an accomplice to the City blindly leaping from one project that sounds good on paper, when viewed in isolation, to another. ...To another. ...To another. ...Which ultimately, however, results in more harm than good.

The City claims to want to work towards being green. If so, require the developer—if they are going to add cars to our streets—to do something that realistically abates traffic.

The City claims to want to improve the quality of life of its residents. If so, require the developer to build a subdivision that has *more than enough* parking, not only for the residents of that new subdivision, but to also combat the parking issues already plaguing the area. Require homes to have garages that are large enough that cars can be parked in the garages *when the garages are also used for general storage*. The reality is that people have excess "stuff" these days, and that "stuff" is stored in garages. The reality is that people want to enjoy their yards as places for relaxation, and for their kids to play; so stop approving designs on postage-stamp-sized lots. The City needs to hold itself accountable for providing adequate open space, be it with greenbelts or parks.

I urge you and every member of the planning department who deals with residential projects to drive through the areas of new, current development off Dutton Meadow road. There is so little parking that every available legal parking space is taken, with cars having to illegally park in bike lanes and "red zones." Look at the visual impact of that parking situation. Is that the type of neighborhood *you'd* want to live in? No? Neither do we! Are those the types of streets you want your kids riding their bikes on? And playing tag on? No? Neither do we!

The City claims it wants to help improve the lives of our children. Again, if so, give them safe places to play. Give them roads to walk/bike to school on that are not polluted. Give them schools that aren't overcrowded. Give them neighborhoods where neighbors aren't at one another's throats because everyone lives right on top of one another and there is so much competition for limited parking spaces that tensions arise.

I'm sure this proposed development could *someday* do great things for the City. That said, now is not the time. The appropriate time is only after the City can honestly tell us residents that they are certain it can provide (1) affordable and reliable water/wastewater service, (2) manageable traffic conditions, (3) safe neighborhoods, adequately patrolled by law enforcement, (4) quality schools with appropriate teacher/student ratios, and (5) neighborhoods that feel like "homes" not prison cells.

Thank you for your time,

Devina Douglas (Rising Moon Lane resident)

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
250 D St., Suite 234
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

Ross, Adam

From: Mauricio Bejar <chefmau012@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 1:39 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Thanks!! But I can't open the application

El miércoles, 3 de marzo de 2021, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> escribió:

Hi Mauricio,

I have attached an email which the applicant has provided a response to your request on whom to contact regarding purchase of a home should this project be approved.

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | [100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404](#)

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Mauricio Bejar <chefmau012@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 1:33 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Sounds great I appreciate your attention this is my phone number 7073228530

El martes, 2 de marzo de 2021, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> escribió:

Hi Mauricio,

This project is current being reviewed by City Staff and is not approved yet. However, I sent your request to the applicant. If they can provide any response, I will forward that to you.

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning and Economic Development | [100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404](#)

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org



From: Mauricio Bejar <chefmau012@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 12:45 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Dutton Meadows Subdivision

El martes, 2 de marzo de 2021, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> escribió:

Hi Mauricio,

I am happy to point you in the right direction. However, can you let me know where the new homes are located?

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | [100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404](#)

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Mauricio Bejar <chefmau012@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 11:12 AM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Hello Adam Ross I have a question how can I apply for the new houses and what's the requirements I rent in Amorosa Village apartments thanks!

Ross, Adam

From: The Law Office of Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 9:42 AM
To: Ross, Adam; Rose, William
Cc: Arthur Deicke; Ron Suess
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Meeting with Planning and Traffic Engineering Staff
Attachments: For May 17 TRAFFIC Outstanding Qs and issues.docx; Intersection of Sally Ann St & Hearn Ave.pdf; SR_VMTmaps HomeVMTsimple_202006111547383274.pdf; For May 17 Outstanding Qs and issues.docx

Good morning,

Attached is a document with a comprehensive list of traffic-related questions (and notations of a few concerns,) entitled "For May 17 Traffic Outstanding Questions"; this is the document from which we are hoping to draw discussion points on Monday. Also attached are:

-a few more documents which are referenced in the "Questions" document.

-a more comprehensive document summarizing traffic AND development-related questions we had, as many of the questions we had previously posed to the city on the topic have not yet been adequately addressed, and we wanted to ensure these questions did not fall off the radar.

Of note, we have uploaded a video (found at <https://youtu.be/OzOQKRcVXZc>) which we wanted to share with you to demonstrate just how bad the parking situation is in the Pebblecreek development which recently went in. The reason it was uploaded on youtube was that the file size is just too big to email. This video was recorded last Saturday, at about 1pm. You'll see that there are only 2 open legal parking spots, and quite a few cars parking in no parking areas. One has to imagine that there were people out and about Saturday, and that come evening the parking situation would be even worse.

Looking forward to talk to you all Monday.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
250 D St., Suite 234
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

On May 12, 2021, at 9:44 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Hi Devina,

I am following up on the meeting you were inquiring about. Right now, I have Monday, May 17, 2021, from 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm. Does that work for you? If so, I will send a Zoom meeting invite. At the same time, can you provide me with the following:

- Emails of those who you know wish to attend.
 - You can also forward them the forthcoming invite.
- Questions you have for Staff.
 - I have included questions I have received thus far for your review. If you could, can you consolidate them to one list so we can analyze them before the Meeting on Monday?

Thank you,

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

<Mail Attachment.eml><Mail Attachment.eml><Mail Attachment.eml><Final Group Letter.pdf>

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:30 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Arthur Deicke; Rose, William; Ron Suess
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Meeting with Planning and Traffic Engineering Staff

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good morning,

That time slot works well for us!

We're formulating list of questions for you, but are still sorting though some of the public records requests to see if (a) some of our existing questions have been answered, or (b) if any new questions have arisen.

We're hoping to get the list of questions to you Thursday.

The folks on "our side" of this discussion include me, Ron Suess, and Arthur Deike, cc'ed above.

Thank you so much,

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS: This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information.

It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender at (707) 408-3529 and destroy all copies of the e-mail.

On May 12, 2021, at 9:44 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Hi Devina,

I am following up on the meeting you were inquiring about. Right now, I have Monday, May 17, 2021, from 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm. Does that work for you? If so, I will send a Zoom meeting invite. At the same time, can you provide me with the following:

- Emails of those who you know wish to attend.
 - You can also forward them the forthcoming invite.
- Questions you have for Staff.
 - I have included questions I have received thus far for your review. If you could, can you consolidate them to one list so we can analyze them before the Meeting on Monday?

Thank you,

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

<Mail Attachment.eml><Mail Attachment.eml><Mail Attachment.eml><Final Group Letter.pdf>

Ross, Adam

From: Elivaldo Rodriguez <raidersrellik@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:39 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Want to buy a home

How do I purchase a home with you with the new project house I live in low income houses and I am a first time buyer .
What do I need too do how much is too put down on a payment? Like too know more information about the Dutton
Meadows Subdivision project love too purchase one of them do I have be on the list ?

Sent from my iPhone

15 March 2021

Ross Adams
Project Planner
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave, Room 3
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

**RE: Dutton Meadow Subdivision – File No. PRJ18-0392684
Dutton Meadow Santa Rosa, CA – Comments Against Application**

Dear Mr. Adams,

The City of Santa Rosa recently mailed (29 January 2021) a *Notice of Application* stating that its Planning & Economic Development Department had received an application for the Dutton Meadows Subdivision revised project proposal located at 2684 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa CA 95407 (**PRJ18-0392684**).

My wife and I live in the Southwest Santa Rosa area. We are responding to you via this letter that expresses our opposition and that of our neighbors who will be directly affected by the revised version of the proposed Dutton Meadows Subdivision. This opposition is based upon the numerous questions and concerns we have about this Subdivision, many of which remain as carryovers from the Subdivision application that was ultimately denied by the Santa Rosa City Council upon appeal on 07 July 2019. To date, nothing materially has been done to remedy the issues for which that denial was upheld. The modified traffic flow diagrams submitted to facilitate the Subdivision appear to be non-substantive so as to address the critical overall traffic flow issues.

Subsequently, another significant element upon which our opposition is founded is the mission statement whereby the City of Santa Rosa declared its obligation and vision to its citizens is "...to provide high-quality public services and cultivate a vibrant, resilient and livable City" (October 2020). The proposed Dutton Meadows development stands in stark contrast to City's proclaimed vision and obligation.

To the point, the three main areas of concern posed by this Subdivision, in particular, and any other project oriented within southwest Santa Rosa at this time, are: **1)** traffic, **2)** other non-traffic related infrastructure, and **3)** general over-population. Of these three aspects of concern, traffic is paramount. Specifically, the following points of concern are:

- The acknowledged traffic flow crisis affecting the Hearn Avenue section of Santa Rosa remains a major concern due to congestion and safety issues.

- Congestion and safety directly affect current residents in the Hearn-Dutton Meadow area.
- At key time periods, traffic flow off US 101 to Hearn Avenue creates substantial back-up on the freeway and often requires 20 or more minutes to reach Dutton Meadow Avenue and beyond. Reaching the freeway on Hearn encounters the same conditions. The Hearn Avenue overcrossing clearly remains insufficient to meet the demands of traffic.
- Current traffic conditions create truly unsafe circulation safety concerns when turning from Hearn to West Street, or Sally Ann, or Dutton Meadow Avenue as traffic that desires to make those turns share the same turn lane that is approximately 80 feet in length. This condition will be exacerbated by increased traffic created by contractors and future residents of the Dutton Meadow Subdivision. We narrowly avoided a head-on collision in this particular turn lane on 05 July 2019. Unfortunately, such occurrences have become routine.
- The extension of Aloise Avenue as a throughway access to the Subdivision is untenable because the implemented design of Aloise is inherently too narrow to facilitate any increase in traffic flow.
- These current conditions and any increase in traffic volume and speed affect the students that will be returning to the Dutton Meadow Elementary School as well. Student safety as a result of these increased traffic parameters is a crucial concern.
- No remedy for and relief from these aforementioned conditions appear on the immediate horizon.

Hence, much work needs to be done and, in some instances, re-done, as traffic studies for southwest Santa Rosa and CEQA Environmental Impact Reports specific to the Dutton Meadows Subdivision are more than a decade old. So much has changed in the intervening time so as to render all such existing data outdated and, thereby, irrelevant. It is imperative that all of this benchmark work be updated with new studies before any Subdivision applications are approved and issued and any physical work on this or any other project in SW Santa Rosa is commenced.

The Trumark Homes Dutton Meadow Subdivision or any other subdivision for this site should be deferred until the traffic circulation issues of the Hearn Avenue area are remedied and said remedies are constructed and operational. Additionally, other infrastructure issues and population demographics need to be identified, determined, and remedied prior to any permits relevant to the Subdivision are granted.

The need for new homes in Santa Rosa is real and fully acknowledged, but not at the expense of appropriate traffic circulation and absolute safety and health. The City has declared its own obligation to that end. To add additional homes to this area of Santa Rosa at this time, will surely exacerbate the traffic congestion and multiply the safety and health risks to residents and students.

Additionally, many questions remain about how and when the City will address traffic issues, potential water and sewage infrastructure matters, and population growth

projections. The sum impact of how and when the City can address these issues, and the manner and means by which to fund all that is required is the ultimate question. The City's commitment to fulfill its declared vision and obligation, in significant part, is at a critical juncture as manifest by how it responds to the needs of SW Santa Rosa.

Therefore, we strongly oppose the granting of application to Trumark Homes' Dutton Meadows Subdivision at this time. Construction of any new homes in the Hearn Avenue area should be delayed until new traffic infrastructure is in place and functionally operating to facilitate new homes and residents. This is the prudent decision and action for a safe and prosperous Santa Rosa going forward from the devastating fires and the changing times.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns toward this crucial matter.

Respectfully,

Ronald E. Suess

Ronald and Jane Suess
Rising Moon Lane
Santa Rosa, CA

Cc: Councilman Eddie Alvarez

March 19, 2021

Dear City of Santa Rosa,

I am writing to you today to express my concerns with the proposed Dutton Meadows subdivision. The City should deny the application on the basis that existing infrastructure is inadequate for the current residents, and adding any additional housing will exacerbate existing problems with traffic congestion, parking, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and place additional stress on City services which are already woefully inadequate.

The City should require infrastructure improvements be completed, such as Hearn overpass improvements and implementing an improved traffic flow plan, prior to approving any additional developments in this area. Without addressing infrastructure first, the City will continue pushing S.W. Santa Rosa towards being an over-crowded and drastically under-served area of the City. S.W. Santa Rosa has been neglected by the City for far too long and this practice has to stop!

There are over 1,000 recently approved housing units where the Hearn Ave overpass and on/off ramps will be the nearest access to Hwy 101. The Hearn overpass and intersections on Hearn Ave were given the lowest possible ratings of "F" in a 2009 EIR, and things have only gotten worse. Is there such a rating of "worse than F"?

I know affordable housing is a priority, but approving a development of \$750,000 homes is not addressing the situation. Affordable housing for residents is a righteous goal, but people moving into the area with cash offers outbid Santa Rosa locals. The paradigm of building homes in our region to mitigate rising home prices is not supported by empirically data. A better approach would be to support a livable wage and attract industries that have well-paying jobs.

At this time, it is unfathomable that the planning committee and City Council would even consider approving the Dutton Meadows subdivision application; the evidence is clear that the planning committee and City Council should deny this development until infrastructure improvements have been completed to support thriving neighborhoods in S.W. Santa Rosa.

Thank you for your time,

A concerned citizen of SW Santa Rosa,
Matt Pierce

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devinadouglas@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 8:23 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Extension of the public comment period for Dutton Meadows

Mr Ross,

I am writing to you today in hopes that you and your office would consider extending the public comment period for the Dutton Meadow's subdivision. Having looked through the city records there appear to be numerous issues we residence wish to address so that we may prepare a full summary of our concerns about this subdivision before the comment period. Unfortunately we are having difficulty getting all of the interested parties together due to Covid.

It is our desire to put together a simple straightforward statement of our concerns, in an organized fashion. However to accomplish that we believe we're going to need a little more time. I hope our request will be granted. Please let us know as soon as you're able.

Thank you,

Devina Douglas, 2524 Rising Moon Lane

Devina Douglas
2524 Rising Moon Lane
Santa Rosa, CA 94507

Adam Ross, Project Planner
City Hall
100 Santa Rosa Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Sent via email to aross@srcity.org

Re: Public Comment on the Dutton Meadows Subdivision

January 30, 2021

Dear City of Santa Rosa,

I am writing to you to urge you to deny approval for the Dutton Meadows Subdivision. The decision made on this same division in 2019 was the correct one.

While I can understand the City's desire to approve more housing for its residents, growth in this area, at this time, would be a mistake. The entire Roseland area, and the surrounding subdivisions, have become overcrowded and cluttered with cars. I couldn't offer you a better example of what our neighborhoods look like than to suggest you drive down Dutton Meadow drive, near the intersection of Tuxhorn, after work hours or on the weekend. Those new high-density housing units that went in on the east side of Dutton Meadow have caused a massive explosion of parked cars along the streets. Residents can't park in front of their own homes. Guests can't find parking anywhere near the homes of folks they wish to visit. And children have no where to play, especially as the City keeps approving smaller and smaller lot sizes, practically ruling out the possibility of kids being able to play in their own postage-stamp sized yards. Problem will only get worse once folks move into the developments currently under construction off of Dutton Meadow. It will be catastrophically bad if you allow for more housing, with assessor dwelling units.

Our neighborhood around here is struggling enough. The last thing we need is more problems because our kids have no where to play, tensions between neighbors becoming strained because families bicker over someone taking the parking in front of their home, and our limited police resources are already being spread far too thin (case in point: when our house was broken into in 2016, *both* the officers who responded commented that they had been assigned to this area for quite some time now but "didn't even know [our] subdivision existed.")

Further, having to drive through the general Roseland area is becoming more and more difficult because our roads simply cannot handle the amount of traffic they see daily. Not only is congestion getting worse, but the City is failing to care for the roads it already has. On weekday mornings it can take 20 minutes to drive the few blocks from Dutton Meadow to Corby. Until the City can properly care for the residents, roads, and the resources its got, it should not be allowing any more growth.

Stop allowing this city to outgrow its ability to effectively care for its infrastructure and the well being of its residents.

Stop allowing growth that discourages a “community” feel within out neighborhoods.

Do NOT approve this development.

Thank you for your time.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Devina Douglas". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a light blue background behind the text.

Devina Douglas

February 7, 2021

Re: Public Comment on the Dutton Meadows Subdivision Appeal

Dear Adam Ross,

I am writing today to support the Planning Commission prior decision decision to deny a General Plan Amendment, Tentative Map and Conditional Use Permit for Trumark Homes' project located at 2684 Dutton Meadow. The City has approved two nearby developments located by Elise Allen High School, and currently these developments are under construction. The current infrastructure in this area is inadequate to support the current population, let alone the two developments under construction. The City would be negligent in approving more development without first improving traffic, biking and pedestrian infrastructure.

Traffic congestion on Hearn Ave. is bad, and the delays can often exceed 20 minutes to drive from the intersection at West Ave. to Santa Rosa Ave. Hearn Ave. is not currently safe for pedestrians, especially children, and cyclists; the proposed development will exacerbate these problems. The traffic flow and the way vehicles are parked on Dutton Meadows make increasing traffic volumes dangerous.

The City should ensure adequate infrastructure is in place prior to approving *any* further developments, and ensure any development does not increase risk to the surrounding community including schools, public parks and existing residents.

Thank you.

Matthew Pierce

2524 Rising Moon Lane Santa Rosa, CA 94507



March 18, 2021

Dear City of Santa Rosa,

We are writing to you today on behalf of residents who live in the SW Santa Rosa area who will be affected by the proposed Dutton Meadows subdivision. We have many questions and concerns about this project, and thought it would be wise to prepare a joint statement summarizing our thoughts.

In short, we vehemently oppose approval of the development as is it planned right now.

Before presenting our specific concerns, we wanted to take a moment to remind you of the obligations the City has to us. In October 2020, the City Council created a statement that their mission is “to provide high-quality public services and cultivate a vibrant, resilient and livable City,” a “tier 1 goal” of which included addressing climate change. In January 2020, the City declared a climate emergency that “threatens humanity” and made a subsequent declaration that it is committed to reaching carbon neutrality by 2030. Relevant to this goal, the City’s most recent “bicycle and pedestrian masterplan” has goals including “designed bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are accessible and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to use” as to increase the percentage of citizens who walk and cycle to work/school. And lastly, the City has a stated 2030 Vision which includes ensuring the City has “thriving neighborhoods, a multi-cultural community, and breathtaking stretches of open space, creeks, and greenbelts.” The proposed Dutton Meadows development seems to stand in stark contrast to these goals and Vision.

Our concerns are centered around three main areas: (1) traffic, (2) other non-traffic related infrastructure, and (3) general over-population.

Traffic

Every single one of us has serious complaints about the traffic on Hearn Avenue *as is*. Per the traffic studies conducted by the City in 2019, during rush hour, sections of Hearn Avenue see over 2,200 cars per hour. Traffic sometimes slows to 3.5 mph. During busy times, the drive from Dutton Meadow to Santa Rosa Avenue can take up to 25 minutes, despite it taking only one minute and five seconds to make that same drive when traffic is light. As part of the 2009 Environmental Impact Report related to the proposed Walmart, the intersections on Hearn Avenue were given “F” ratings. ...And things have only gotten worse, traffic-wise, since then as the City continues to approve housing developments. We are horrified to think what could happen to one of us if we suffer a medical emergency and ambulances cannot get to us in time, or get us to the hospital in time, because they get stuck in traffic.

Of special importance to the proposed Dutton Meadows development, the intersections of West Ave and Sally Ann Street¹ with Hearn are especially problematic and dangerous. There is only 80 feet between these roads, and the center turn lanes to access both these roads are comprised of the same physical space on Hearn, resulting in traffic confusion, backups, accidents, and more near-accidents than we can count.

¹ The only access from Hearn to this new development is via Sally Ann Ave.

Once a car has turned onto Sally Ann, the only option is to turn left onto Aloise Avenue, which, under the proposed plan, will extend into the new development. Unfortunately, Aloise Avenue is far too narrow to accommodate increased traffic flow. To demonstrate this in a manner we thought you'd find informative, we captured a video showing just how tight the road is—that video can be seen at <https://youtu.be/SoqnamIy6MY>. With cars lawfully parked on either side of the street, it is possible there would be only 18 feet between the parked car's side mirrors. As a result, it is difficult, if not downright dangerous, for cars try to pass one another within this tight space. We have been told that, per code, firetrucks need 20 feet between parked cars to pass. Come trash day, once trash, recycling and green waste containers are put out for collection, the amount of space available for cars to drive on is further reduced.

A nagging issue here in SW Santa Rosa is the difficulty surrounding access to, and departure from, US 101. The Hearn Avenue overcrossing is insufficient to meet the demands of traffic currently, which one can't help but notice in the afternoons—*every* afternoon, weekday or weekend—as traffic on the US 101 southbound Hearn Avenue exit backs up on to the freeway, sometimes backing up almost to Corby. Of note, the City recently approved the high-density housing near the intersections of Petaluma Hill Road, Yolanda and Kawana Springs Road—totaling over 600 new housing units; the residents of that housing will soon be adding more congestion to the 101 on/off ramps. Until the overcrossing is widened, or another overcrossing is put in in the SW Santa Rosa area, the City cannot allow more housing to go into south Santa Rosa.

The stop-and-go traffic resulting from these traffic back-ups is not only bothersome, it's dangerous, affecting the health of residents, and adversely contributing to climate change. The exhaust generated from idling vehicles is poisoning our residents and adding greenhouse gases to our air. And the brake dust generated by stop and go traffic introduces lead and asbestos into the air. Many of our neighborhood kids walk or ride bikes to school, and they have the greatest exposure.

Lastly, with the addition of the just-installed stoplight at the SMART train tracks, there will be even more idling of cars on Hearn.

The City MUST conduct another traffic study before approving any new development in the South Santa Rosa area. That said, please be reminded that it would not be possible to do an accurate traffic survey now due to the COVID shelter in place orders drastically affecting road usage and schools being shut down. If a study were to be conducted during the pandemic, the analysis would be based upon assumptions and predictions for behavior dramatically altered during this period.

Other non-traffic infrastructure concerns

We have serious concerns that other infrastructure may not be adequate. Sonoma County finds itself in another drought, and water levels in Lake Sonoma are reaching historic lows. The City must ensure its growth doesn't outpace its resources. Further, water rationing will certainly become more frequent in the coming years. This affects us not only in the sense that every new house moves the City closer to reaching its water allotment, it can hit us in the wallets as the City

assesses a “water shortage” surcharge between 5-30% during mandatory water conservation periods. Those of us in SW Santa Rosa are among the City’s most financially strained residents already. Also, not only does the City have an obligation to make sure there’s adequate water coming out of our kitchen faucets, given the devastating fires we have had throughout our region, it has an obligation to ensure there is enough water to successfully fight fires. With what appears to be yet another drought in California’s future—which will likely last several years—our water supply and distribution system will be critical. Increasing demands this system should be done very carefully, yet the Dutton Meadows Master Development does not seem to take the current situation into account.

In discussions with Councilman Alvarez, we learned that the City has already made note of the fact that water and sewer infrastructure “needs attention” in our region. We urge you to not approve developments that place additional demand on the City’s finite water resources until after these improvements and replacements have been made.

We also have concerns about the levels of service we can expect to receive from the police. Already, our area feels neglected by law enforcement. Our mailboxes and cars get broken into, the police won’t even respond. Police officers who have been assigned to patrol our area for years tell us they “didn’t even know [our subdivision here] existed.” Our homes get broken into, and the police come out to provide us with written reports to hand off to our insurance companies, informing us they don’t have the time to actually investigate the crimes. This has to stop. We demand that the City not increase the areas over which law enforcement needs to patrol until it can provide us with some real level of policing service.

Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, every one of the schools in our area is overcrowded. Adding population to this area before ensuring the educational needs of the *current* resident school children are being met would only serve to place the residents of the South Santa Rosa at even more of a disadvantage in school, in their future careers, and their overall lives in comparison to residents of other areas of our City. Without appropriate access to quality education, students will fall further and further behind in achieving academic milestones. In “A Portrait of Sonoma County” a report prepared by Sonoma County Human Development in 2014, the researchers found that “[t]he range in the percentage of adult residents with less than a high school diploma [within the City] is huge, going from a low of 0.4 percent in North Oakmont/Hood Mountain to a high of 46.1 percent in Roseland Creek,” while “level of education is the single biggest predictor of earnings for racial and ethnic groups and for census tracts in Sonoma County” and, in sum, an “[a]nalysis of Sonoma County’s ninety-nine tracts shows a clear positive correlation between life expectancy and education: people in neighborhoods with higher educational attainment and enrollment have longer lives.”

General Overpopulation of this area

We have seen so much population growth within our area, without any real improvement in infrastructure and support services, leading to a deterioration in our quality-of-life. For example, community residents have reported that they drove through the area near a subdivision off Dutton Meadow, and felt the area was so over-congested with parked cars it was hard to navigate the streets.

The City is supposed to be providing six acres of park per 1000 residents in an area. Right now, our area has a total of 24 acres of parks for approximately 18,000 residents. Yes, the new development—in later phases—includes park space, but it is not enough. Related, it is our understanding that the developer doesn't even yet own the property upon which it intends to build the park. How can we believe the park will be forthcoming, when the developer may never be able to acquire the land where the park is to exist. We are falling woefully behind with regards to places in which we can recreate close to home.

It is the group's understanding that the Dutton Meadows Project Plan was initially put into place nearly 20 years ago, however there have been many changes to the City since then. Roseland has been annexed into the city. The population of the SW Santa Rosa area has grown substantially. Multiple subdivisions have been approved and built, and currently there are multiple subdivisions under construction. At the time of that General Plan, SW Santa Rosa did not have a representative on the City Council. All of this begs the question: should the city continue to work to achieve the development goals of an old and out-of-date plan?

The Dutton Meadows Master subdivision plan went before the Planning Commission and City Council just two years ago, and was denied. Little has changed in the developer's plan since then that should make the City believe it's in the City's best interest to move forward with this development now, especially in light of how many ways the development conflicts with the City's goals and vision. The strain it will place on the infrastructure diminishes the quality of the public services we receive and makes the City less resilient. It makes our area feel less "livable." It adds to problems with pollution, making it more difficult to achieve carbon neutrality. It makes riding our bikes and walking along the streets more dangerous to our safety and health. And it takes away yet another open space. So tell us, how can the City believe this development, under the current circumstances, is what is best for us right now?

Honor the commitments you made to this City, and deny the Dutton Meadows Master subdivision until the infrastructure, and health and safety issues have been addressed first.

Questions we have for the City and the Developer:

1. If Sally Ann Avenue is intended to be the main thoroughfare into the new developments, what measures will be taken to control the Hearn intersections with Sally Ann and West Streets, in a manner that allows more safety, and clear right-of-way solutions?
2. The City seems to be moving towards a vision for our city which seeks to accommodate alternative transportation options. What is being done to address the potential for class-1 bike lanes on Hearn Avenue, Dutton Avenue, and Dutton Meadow?
3. There are bike lanes planned for the new development area. Will there be parking allowed in those bike lanes?
 - a. Will that render the lanes essentially useless?

- b. If no parking is allowed in the bike lanes, is there still enough street parking that the cars associated with the homes in the new development aren't spilling into the Aloise area?
4. To accommodate its stated goal of encouraging bike travel, Is the city planning on putting bike lanes on Sally Ann Avenue and Aloise Avenue?
5. We note that Dutton Meadows will be somewhat rerouted in front of Meadow View Elementary. What will become of the current Dutton Meadow there? Is it going to be drop off/pick up for the school?
 - a. What will the speed limit be there?
 - b. It is our understanding that from the presentation by Trumark 2 years ago that the road will be designated as a 40mph zone, but is that proper given its proximity to the school?
 - c. It is our understanding that the entire portion of land from Hearn Avenue to where it's obviously "school" area at Meadow View Elementary is owned by the school, and thus is a "school zone," meaning that when children are present the speed limit there needs to be 25mph. This will drastically affect the movement of traffic during the morning commute, and in the afternoon. It is fair to have commuters be slowed down in such a manner given how few options we have for accessing 101?
 - d. Is that now going to be a 4-lane road (2 lanes in each direction)?
 - i. Are there going to be bike lanes?
 - ii. Given how many school children ride their bikes in the area, is it appropriate to have kids riding their bikes along a 40 mph road?
 - iii. When/if the phase of this project goes in that encompasses the grocery store, shops, etc., that will be a popular destination for bike riding, too. Will it be safe to have folks riding their bikes along a 40mph road?
6. The area of land proposed to be developed is currently open space, home to many wild animals such as rabbits, reptiles, turkeys, foxes, and coyotes. Our region is alleged to be a critical habitat for the endangered Tiger Salamander. Have there been any recent studies of the effect of this development on Tiger Salamander habitat?
7. Given the drought situations this year and the near-drought situations last year, can we be assured the City will be able to supply us with water?
 - a. How close are we to needing to upgrade our water distribution system in our area?
 - b. What needed repairs have been identified?
 - c. When are those expected to take place?
 - d. What impact will those have on traffic?
8. Is the infrastructure in place to provide water to the area in the event of a fire-type emergency?
9. Is the infrastructure in place to support providing sewer service to our area?

- a. How close are we to needing to upgrade the portions of the sewer system in our area?
 - b. What needed repairs have been identified?
 - c. When are those expected to take place?
 - d. What impact will those have on traffic?
10. What has been done to identify how this new development will affect our schools?
- a. How will classroom overcrowding be affected?
 - b. Does the school have truancy concerns with kids being late to school given how long it takes to get to school due to traffic backups?
11. Is there a commitment by the City and the developer regarding a time frame in which the other phases of the 5-stage development plan will be completed?
- a. When will the park be put in?

Thank you for your time,

The concerned citizens of SW Santa Rosa,
Devina Douglas (Rising Moon),
Matt Pierce (Rising Moon),
Andrea Rojas (Aloise),
Tulio Vasquez (Aloise),
Maria Vasquez (Aloise),
Ron Suess (Rising Moon),
Jane Suess (Rising Moon),
Art Deicke (Deep Harbor),
Solita Deicke (Deep Harbor),
Angela Gandez (Aloise),
Jeff Gandez (Aloise),
Dennis Hagemann,
Fred Kreuger,
Patricia Krueger,
Enrique,
Mary Goe Balcerak,
Debra Broner (Aloise),
Whitney Schieve (Aloise),
Taj Schieve (Aloise),
Nancy Lazark (Rising Moon),
Sean Correa (Aloise),
Carmela Biggs,
Emily Cadena (Aloise) and
Jose Cadena (Aloise).

Concerned Citizens for Dutton Meadows

Abbreviations:

DMS- Dutton Meadow Subdivision

MWR- Meadowood Ranch

Thoughts

- Still no reply from project manager of MWR questions
- Adam Ross's "side by side" comparison between the 2019 project and the current project left a lot to be desired. We were only given the old plans, with no notation of what had changed. Can we get more details about what has changed.

Questions: Those in red were previously posed to the City, but to which we do not have answers, the ones in black are new.

Traffic

1. **If Sally Ann Avenue is intended to be the main thoroughfare into the new developments, what measures will be taken to control the Hearn intersections with Sally Ann and West Streets, in a manner that allows more safety, and clear right-of-way solutions?**
 1. Currently, at the mouth of Sally Ann, the exit from the Southern Gardens subdivision, the space between the "yellow dots" and the mirrors on a parked car is, at best, 7'.
 1. What are the standards regarding the width of lanes like this?
 2. If the above-referenced situation does not meet standards, how is the City going to bring it up to standards?
 2. Has the City calculated the volume of traffic which will be flowing through the Hearn/Sally Ann/West intersections?
 1. Can the intersection handle the expected increase in the volume of traffic from the new proposed developments?
 3. Will crosswalks be put in at Sally Ann?
2. **The City seems to be moving towards a vision for our city which seeks to accommodate alternative transportation options. What is being done to address the potential for class-1 bike lanes on Hearn Avenue, Dutton Avenue, and Dutton Meadow?**
3. Is the City factoring into its decisions the effect of having idling cars adding more pollutants into the air when it adds housing to an area without addressing traffic backups?
4. **With regards to the DMS**
 1. **Will bike lanes be put in on Sally Ann and Aloise?**
 1. If so, will this come at the expense of current on-street parking?
 2. **Will there be enough parking be factored in within the DMS so that cars belonging to homeowners there aren't spilling over into the on-street parking of current neighborhoods.**
5. There is significant vehicle overcrowding in our area. Folks are often parking in the bike lanes, and the police are not responding, telling us they have bigger issues than enforcing parking rules.
 1. Knowing the police are not enforcing these laws, are the traffic engineers working to design/approve new development to minimize dangerous car/bike interactions?

6. We note that Dutton Meadows will be somewhat rerouted in front of Meadow View Elementary. What will become of the current Dutton Meadow there? Is it going to be drop off/pick up for the school?
 1. How will the ingress/egress to the drop off zones connect to Dutton Meadow.
 1. How will these intersections be controlled? Stop signs?
 2. If so, will the drop off/pick up traffic spill out onto Dutton Meadow, backing up traffic?
 3. What will the speed limit be there?
 4. It is our understanding that from the presentation by Trumark 2 years ago that the Dutton Meadow road will be designated as a 40mph zone, but is that safe given its proximity to the school?
 5. It is our understanding that the entire portion of land from Hearn Avenue to where it's obviously "school" area at Meadow View Elementary is owned by the school, and thus is a "school zone," meaning that when children are present the speed limit there needs to be 25mph. This will drastically affect the movement of traffic during the morning commute, and in the afternoon. It is fair to have commuters be slowed down in such a manner given how few options we have for accessing 101?
 6. Is that now going to be a 4-lane road (2 lanes in each direction)?
 1. Are there going to be bike lanes?
 2. Given how many school children ride their bikes in the area, is it appropriate to have kids riding their bikes along a 40 mph road?
 3. When/if the phase of this project goes in that encompasses the grocery store, shops, etc., that will be a popular destination for bike riding, too. Will it be safe to have folks riding their bikes along a 40mph road?
7. When will the DMS be connected directly to Hearn?
8. VMT-related
 1. Please explain the current evaluation tool for traffic analysis: VMT or LOS.
 1. How has SB743 impacted transition from LOS to VMT in City planning?
 2. Can LOS grades of D or F actually be effectively mitigated?
 2. Referencing draft VMT Final Guidance maps, please explain the difference between the Residential and Employment VMT pre-screening analysis. Specifically, what does it mean for the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision plan where Employment and Residential VMT pre-screening shading on the maps includes and excludes the proposed development area?
 3. Traffic studies seem perishable. I've heard the studies can be valid for up to 10 years, 2 years or if changes have occurred in the study area. Which is it?
 1. What traffic study or studies is the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision development based upon?
 2. What triggers a project-specific traffic study when the General Plan, area plans or specific plans are utilized for the evaluation of the probably traffic impacts?
 3. Are there any traffic studies planned in the immediate future for this area?
 4. The Hearn Avenue and Sally Ann Street intersection is currently problematic and will be exasperated with the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision. Please see attached narrative. We'd like to discuss this issue in detail.
 5. What is the area radius a project needs to evaluate for potential traffic impacts and mitigation?
 1. What is the specific area radius for Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision?
 6. Associated with Question 5, how are the overall impacts to the community assessed when the evaluation radius does not extend far enough. For example,

could the proposed Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision be placed on hold until the Hearn overpass improvement project is completed?

9. 101/Hearn overpass
 1. When will that be completed?
 2. Where is the funding coming from?
 3. How long will that take?
10. When it is anticipated Aloise would be opened up to the new development?
 1. Can the City condition the developer NOT to use Aloise to access the land as part of the construction process?

Water/Sewer

11. Given the drought situation this year, the near-drought situation last year, and the cyclic nature of droughts in California how can the residents be assured the City has a reliable water supply that is adequate to sustain the current population and future developments.
 1. Why is the City approving new developments while concurrently implementing water conservation measures?
 2. In this climate emergency where scientists are forecasting a hotter and dryer climate, how is it rational that the City approve new developments without building and/or securing new water supplies.
 3. How close are we to needing to upgrade our water distribution system in our area?
 4. What needed repairs have been identified?
 5. When are those expected to take place?
 6. What impact will those have on traffic?
12. Is the infrastructure in place to provide water to the area in the event of a fire-type emergency?
13. Is the infrastructure in place to support providing sewer service to our area?
 1. How close are we to needing to upgrade the portions of the sewer system in our area?
 2. What needed repairs have been identified?
When are those expected to take place?
 3. What impact will those have on traffic?
14. Is the City allowing the developers to pay water mitigation fee, similar to the Park mitigation fees?
15. What fees to developers pay to connect to utilities?

Parks

1. Did the DMS pay a park mitigation fee? Or is this the “park” obligation supposed to be satisfied by the park that is set to go in in phase 4/5?

Wildlife

1. The area of land proposed to be developed is currently open space, home to many wild animals such as rabbits, reptiles, turkeys, foxes, and coyotes. Our region is critical habitat for the endangered Tiger Salamander. Have there been any recent studies of the effect of this development on Tiger Salamander habitat?

Building/Planning?

16. Is there a commitment by the City and the developer regarding a time frame in which the other phases of the 5-stage development plan will be completed?

1. When will the park be put in?

17. Meadowood Ranch-specific

1. What percentage of each lot will be taken up by the footprint of the housing

2. How many parking spots are required, under City Code, per house in this development

3. How many parking spots are going to be available in this development?

4. Will bike lanes be put in this new development?

5. The general Roseland area experiences a lot of crime. With more houses to patrol, is the City going to be devoting more police resources to this area?

6. Will the City be increasing the speed limit on Dutton Meadow to accommodate having to move more cars through that area?

7.

Concerned Citizens for Dutton Meadows

Abbreviations:

DMS- Dutton Meadow Subdivision

MWR- Meadowood Ranch

Thoughts

- Still no reply from project manager of MWR questions
- Adam Ross's "side by side" comparison between the 2019 project and the current project left a lot to be desired. We were only given the old plans, with no notation of what had changed. Can we get more details about what has changed.

Questions: Those in red were previously posed to the City, but to which we do not have answers, the ones in black are new.

Traffic

1. **If Sally Ann Avenue is intended to be the main thoroughfare into the new developments, what measures will be taken to control the Hearn intersections with Sally Ann and West Streets, in a manner that allows more safety, and clear right-of-way solutions?**
 1. Currently, at the mouth of Sally Ann, the exit from the Southern Gardens subdivision, the space between the "yellow dots" and the mirrors on a parked car is, at best, 7'.
 1. What are the standards regarding the width of lanes like this?
 2. If the above-referenced situation does not meet standards, how is the City going to bring it up to standards?
 2. Has the City calculated the volume of traffic which will be flowing through the Hearn/Sally Ann/West intersections?
 1. Can the intersection handle the expected increase in the volume of traffic from the new proposed developments?
 3. Will crosswalks be put in at Sally Ann?
2. **The City seems to be moving towards a vision for our city which seeks to accommodate alternative transportation options. What is being done to address the potential for class-1 bike lanes on Hearn Avenue, Dutton Avenue, and Dutton Meadow?**
3. Is the City factoring into its decisions the effect of having idling cars adding more pollutants into the air when it adds housing to an area without addressing traffic backups?
4. **With regards to the DMS**
 1. **Will bike lanes be put in on Sally Ann and Aloise?**
 1. If so, will this come at the expense of current on-street parking?
 2. **Will there be enough parking be factored in within the DMS so that cars belonging to homeowners there aren't spilling over into the on-street parking of current neighborhoods.**
5. There is significant vehicle overcrowding in our area. Folks are often parking in the bike lanes, and the police are not responding, telling us they have bigger issues than enforcing parking rules.
 1. Knowing the police are not enforcing these laws, are the traffic engineers working to design/approve new development to minimize dangerous car/bike interactions?

6. We note that Dutton Meadows will be somewhat rerouted in front of Meadow View Elementary. What will become of the current Dutton Meadow there? Is it going to be drop off/pick up for the school?
 1. How will the ingress/egress to the drop off zones connect to Dutton Meadow.
 1. How will these intersections be controlled? Stop signs?
 2. If so, will the drop off/pick up traffic spill out onto Dutton Meadow, backing up traffic?
 3. What will the speed limit be there?
 4. It is our understanding that from the presentation by Trumark 2 years ago that the Dutton Meadow road will be designated as a 40mph zone, but is that safe given its proximity to the school?
 5. It is our understanding that the entire portion of land from Hearn Avenue to where it's obviously "school" area at Meadow View Elementary is owned by the school, and thus is a "school zone," meaning that when children are present the speed limit there needs to be 25mph. This will drastically affect the movement of traffic during the morning commute, and in the afternoon. It is fair to have commuters be slowed down in such a manner given how few options we have for accessing 101?
 6. Is that now going to be a 4-lane road (2 lanes in each direction)?
 1. Are there going to be bike lanes?
 2. Given how many school children ride their bikes in the area, is it appropriate to have kids riding their bikes along a 40 mph road?
 3. When/if the phase of this project goes in that encompasses the grocery store, shops, etc., that will be a popular destination for bike riding, too. Will it be safe to have folks riding their bikes along a 40mph road?
7. When will the DMS be connected directly to Hearn?
8. VMT-related
 1. Please explain the current evaluation tool for traffic analysis: VMT or LOS.
 1. How has SB743 impacted transition from LOS to VMT in City planning?
 2. Can LOS grades of D or F actually be effectively mitigated?
 2. Referencing draft VMT Final Guidance maps, please explain the difference between the Residential and Employment VMT pre-screening analysis. Specifically, what does it mean for the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision plan where Employment and Residential VMT pre-screening shading on the maps includes and excludes the proposed development area?
 3. Traffic studies seem perishable. I've heard the studies can be valid for up to 10 years, 2 years or if changes have occurred in the study area. Which is it?
 1. What traffic study or studies is the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision development based upon?
 2. What triggers a project-specific traffic study when the General Plan, area plans or specific plans are utilized for the evaluation of the probably traffic impacts?
 3. Are there any traffic studies planned in the immediate future for this area?
 4. The Hearn Avenue and Sally Ann Street intersection is currently problematic and will be exasperated with the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision. Please see attached narrative. We'd like to discuss this issue in detail.
 5. What is the area radius a project needs to evaluate for potential traffic impacts and mitigation?
 1. What is the specific area radius for Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision?
 6. Associated with Question 5, how are the overall impacts to the community assessed when the evaluation radius does not extend far enough. For example,

could the proposed Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision be placed on hold until the Hearn overpass improvement project is completed?

9. 101/Hearn overpass

1. When will that be completed?
2. Where is the funding coming from?
3. How long will that take?

10. When it is anticipated Aloise would be opened up to the new development?

1. Can the City condition the developer NOT to use Aloise to access the land as part of the construction process?





Pebblecreek Dr



The intersection of Sally Ann Street and Hearn Avenue poses numerous problems for leaving and returning home as the intersection is currently constructed. Planned future development does not mitigate these issues, but exasperates them.

The current situation for residences of the areas known as Northern Gardens and Western Gardens is described below.

Destination Home

Driving WB on Hearn Avenue, I activate my left turn signal before passing West Avenue, watching EB traffic to determine if vehicles will move into middle turn lane for left hand turn onto West Avenue. I've a short area based upon painted faded left and right turn arrows to enter the middle turn lane to turn onto Sally Ann Street. If I enter too early, according to City traffic engineers, I'm on wrong side. To enter properly, I've only a very short area to enter turn lane. If turn lane is full, I must slow or stop and stay in WB Hearn Ave lane, stopping traffic and waiting for EB traffic to clear.

Driving EB on Hearn Avenue, passing through Hearn Avenue/Dutton Meadow traffic-light intersection, I begin my SB turn onto Sally Ann Street by activating my right turn signal. I know I will have to slow to less than 5 mph to make the righthand turn due to multiple obstructions. The first obstruction is visual. A 3-foot fence, which increases in height further into Sally Ann Street is located on the westside of Sally Ann Street, effectively blocking my view onto Sally Ann Street. I'm unable to see if children are playing in the street, unable to see if a car is NB on Sally Ann Street and unable to see if cars are parked legally on the eastside of Sally Ann Street. Cars also, but rarely park illegally on the westside of Sally Ann Street. Also, rarely, but has occurred for me several times, are cars stopped in the NB lane of Sally Ann Street with the driver's side door open. The second obstruction is physical. The curbs of Hearn Avenue and Sally Ann Street protrude in 'humps' onto the lanes of travel narrowing Sally Ann Street to approximately 22 feet. The visual obstructions and narrowing of the street cause me to slow to less than 5 mph to safely enter Sally Ann Street. As I slow for the righthand turn, I nervously check my rearview mirror to ensure the car behind me is slowing. The width of Sally Ann Street opens to approximately 28 feet after the 'humps'.

The 28-foot width measurement includes the concrete gutters. Cars legally parked on the eastside of Sally Ann Street reduce the NB lane from 14 feet to 7 or 8 feet, depending on how close the cars park to the curb.

Destination variable, origin home

Driving NB on Sally Ann Street with intention of entering the WB Hearn Avenue lane, I must be aware of cars entering Sally Ann Street from both WB and EB Hearn Avenue. Then, it is a matter of the busyness of the traffic. Trees restrict my ability to see eastward for WB traffic. On a light traffic day, WB cars routinely exceed the speed limit and once enter my visual range obstructed by the tree, can pose a problem. If speed limit is obeyed, there is little problem entering WB Hearn Avenue. On a heavy traffic

day, it can be very difficult as few safe openings crossing the EB lane traffic and entering the WB lane traffic present themselves.

Driving NB on Sally Ann Street with intention of entering the EB Hearn Avenue lane is typically not an issue on a light traffic day. On a heavy traffic day, patience is required to await an opening. I need to be aware of the West Avenue traffic making a left turn onto Hearn Avenue EB as the cars will typically cut me off as I accelerate to the speed limit.

The Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision is a phased development. The current plan proposes to only develop some of the phases, which provide only two access points into the housing area. The first is from Hearn Avenue, onto Sally Ann Street then to Aloise Avenue. The second is from Dutton Meadow onto the proposed named Northpoint Parkway.

The full development plan titled Dutton Meadows Master Development Plan finalized in 2005 included several other access points into the housing development as follows:

1. Hearn Avenue and Dutton Avenue.
2. Dutton Avenue (from south) and Northpoint Parkway.
3. Dutton Meadow and Tuxhorn Drive.

The full developed as initially proposed, the entire development is to be completed within a 3 to 5-year timeframe. Due to economic and other factors, the development has yet to commence. It is proposed to build out Phases 1 and 2 only, leaving Phases 3, 4, 5 and 6 for a future date – a date that has been stated to be 20 years in the future.

In response to the Dutton Meadows Master Development Plan, CALTRANS, in their letter dated March 25, 2005 stated numerous concerns for traffic associated with the planned development including:

1. *Added trips to each freeway (US 101) direction in peak hours.*
2. *Absence of adequate analysis of intersections.*
3. *Confusion of mitigation measures with impacts.*
4. *Lack of mitigation measures for impacts to US 101.*
5. *Unsupported data for traffic improvement for WB Hearn Avenue to Stony Point Road.*
6. *Lack of continuity in document concerning Dutton Avenue/SR 12 interchange.*
7. *Lack of assignment to responsible party for implementation of transportation-related mitigations.*
8. *Other technical issues.*

There have been numerous documents prepared by City, County and State discussing proposed developments, traffic issues, impacts and mitigations.

The South Santa Rosa Area Plan (intermediate level of detail) adopted by Sonoma County BOS dated May 4, 1982 (Modified March 9, 1993, June 5, 2007, September 23, 2008). It stated:

“Insure that impacts are mitigated before approving subdivisions or rezonings which increase residential densities, especially those within proximity to existing agricultural operations.”

And proposed:

The following roads must be upgraded to the level indicated, to accommodate the increases in Land Use provided for in this plan.

Freeway. U.S. Highway 101 (6 lanes)

Principal and Minor Arterials. State Highway 12, Sonoma County Fairgrounds to Fulton Road (Rural Principal Arterial, 4 lanes), State Highway 12, Llano Road to boundary of South Santa Rosa Area Plan (Rural Principal Arterial, 3 lanes), Santa Rosa Avenue (Urban Principal Arterial, 4 lanes), Farmers Lane Extension (4 lanes), and Stony Point Road (Urban or Rural Principal Arterial, 4 lanes).

Major and Minor Collectors. Todd Road (Rural Major Collector and Minor Arterial), Llano Road (Rural Major Collector and Rural Minor Arterial), and Mountain View Avenue (Rural Major Collector).

Local Roads. West Avenue, Burbank Avenue, Wright Road, Colgan Avenue, Yolanda Avenue, East Todd Road (to existing easterly terminus), Bellevue Road, (between Corby, Moorland, and Dutton intersections), Dutton Avenue, Corby Avenue, Hearn Avenue, and Petaluma Hill Road.

The Board of Supervisors should establish a vehicle load limit ordinance on Moorland Avenue between Bellevue and Todd to preclude heavy truck traffic associated with nearby industrial developments from using this County Road.

Improvements to roads within the City of Santa Rosa Urban Service Area should follow the City of Santa Rosa General Plan and be consistent with city road classifications and design standards, unless these standards are less than County standards.

City of Santa Rosa Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan and Roseland Area Annexation Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program dated August 2016 by Michael Baker International in section Traffic and Transportation MM 3.14.9 and MM 3.14.12 (Page 14) required:

Prior to construction activities, applicants seeking to construct projects in the project area shall submit a construction traffic control plan to the City of Santa Rosa for review and approval. The plan shall identify the timing and routing of all major construction-related traffic to avoid potential congestion and delays on the local street network. Any temporary road or sidewalk closures shall be identified along with detour plans for rerouting pedestrian and bicycle traffic for rerouting pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The plan shall also identify locations where transit service would be temporarily rerouted or transit stops moved, and these changes must be approved by the Santa Rosa CityBus and Sonoma County Transit before the plan is finalized. If necessary, movement of major construction equipment and materials shall be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. (MM 3.14.9)

The City shall widen the Dutton Avenue westbound off-ramp to extend the right turn pocket to a minimum length of 550 feet to alleviate the adverse queuing onto the mainline freeway. The City shall monitor queuing conditions on the ramp through field observations and review of development traffic impact studies and add the widening project to the Capital Improvement Program once it is determined that queues are likely to exceed storage within a five-year time frame. The City shall collaborate with Caltrans in obtaining approvals to complete the widening project. (MM 3.14.12)

And stated:

For Northpoint Parkway. *Extend Northpoint Parkway eastward as a new regional/arterial street with one travel lane in each direction plus a center turn lane or median from Stony Point Road to Burbank Avenue, including a new bridge over Roseland Creek.*

For Hearn Avenue. *Widen to two lanes in each direction plus a center turn lane from just west of Dutton Avenue to the east side of the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) system railroad crossing.*

Once the Northpoint Parkway extension is in place, on Hearn Avenue retain existing one lane in each direction plus center turn lane between Burbank Avenue and Stony Point Road, but reclassify this segment as a transitional/collector street.

Dutton Avenue Extension. Provide one travel lane in each direction plus a center turn lane or median from Hearn Avenue to new bridge over Colgan Creek, maintaining regional/arterial classification.

Dutton Meadow southern extension to Dutton Avenue. Provide one travel lane in each direction plus a center turn lane or median, maintaining regional/arterial designation (aka "Southern New Street").

Dutton Meadow northern extension to Dutton Avenue. Provide one travel lane in each direction plus a center turn lane or median, maintaining transitional/collector designation (aka "Northern New Street").

You might ask, where is the current traffic study for the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision. The answer is there is not one. Numerous factors have changed since the 2004/2005 studies, including the annexation of Roseland, wildfires and associated evacuation routes, increased City population and heavier traffic on US 101. Plus, the COVID-19 pandemic has created traffic variables due to Shelter-in-Place orders, essential business restrictions and closure of schools. In addition, new CEQA requirements for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) replacing Level of Service (LOS) calculations; new requirements for reduction of vehicles while increasing pedestrian and bicycle pathways and opportunities and all of the unknowns and knowns of climate change.

Each of these issues is compounded by the apparent overarching need of more housing – more affordable housing. In southwest Santa Rosa, new developments have been recently completed, are under construction, in the application process or planned with seemingly no improvements for our freeways, arterials, collectors or local streets.

For example, the Hearn Overpass improvement is planned, but not funded. This project is phased with no anticipated date for completion of required arterials and collectors. Cumulative traffic impacts seem not to be considered and the overall radius of potential impacts seems to be ignored.

Housing development comes with more people and more cars, but seems to always precede the need for overall traffic improvements. The traffic improvements should come first, then the housing development. Current residents and citizens suffer for multiple generations in traffic congestion and pollution with no end in sight for this backwards development strategy.

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Devina Douglas
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Development

Thank you, Adam.

Arthur Deicke
aedeicke@gmail.com

> On Mar 25, 2021, at 11:21 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:
>
> Good Morning Arthur,
>
> I do not have a timeline at this point. Please check back with me in three weeks.
>
> Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner
> Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 |
> Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 6:44 PM
> To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
> Cc: Devina Douglas <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>
> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Development
>
> Adam:
>
> Could you let us know when you think the subject project would be presented to the Planning Commission?
>
>
> Arthur Deicke
> aedeicke@gmail.com
>
>
>

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 12:48 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision

Thank you.
Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS: This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information.

It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender at (707) 408-3529 and destroy all copies of the e-mail.

On Jun 17, 2021, at 12:09 PM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Hi Arthur and Devina,

Here is the main contact:

Robin Miller
rmiller@trumarkco.com
925-999-3975

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner
Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 3:52 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Cc: Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>; Devina Douglas <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>; Suess Ron

<ron.suess@gmail.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision

Adam:

Could you provide us the email and phone number contacts for the developer for the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision?

Thank you,

Art

Arthur Deicke
707-322-2015
aedeicke@gmail.com

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:37 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Rose, William; Devina Douglas; Suess Ron
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision

Thank you Adam.

Sincerely,

Art Deicke
707-322-2015
aedeicke@gmail.com

> On Jun 17, 2021, at 12:09, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

>
> Hi Arthur and Devina,
>
> Here is the main contact:
> Robin Miller
> rmiller@trumarkco.com
> 925-999-3975
>
>
> Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner
> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa
> Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
> Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 3:52 PM
> To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
> Cc: Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>; Devina Douglas
> <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>; Suess Ron <ron.suess@gmail.com>
> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision

>

> Adam:

>

> Could you provide us the email and phone number contacts for the developer for the Dutton Meadows Master Subdivision?

>

> Thank you,

>

> Art

>

> Arthur Deicke
> 707-322-2015
> aedeicke@gmail.com
>
>
>

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 1:04 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows next step

Thank you for the prompt reply.

Sincerely,
Devina

*this message was sent from my iPhone; please forgive any typos.

On Jun 9, 2021, at 12:52 PM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon Devina,

Great question and appreciate the consideration. At this time, I do not have a tentative date for a Planning Commission Public Hearing. The applicant just resubmitted their project and that has to be referred out to City Departments for review. Planning has to review that resubmittal as well. I still have not fully vetted the CEQA documents either, which has its own considerations. I do owe you a lot of information, which I have blocked out time to get through it all tomorrow and send to you and the others. I will also have everything I can post to the Project's development webpage as well. Once I can get through everything and have Conditions of Approval drafted, I can identify a tentative Planning Commission hearing date.

Again, thank you for your patience as I gather information in order to respond to your neighborhood's inquiry.

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 12:07 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Murray, Susie <SMurray@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows next step

Good afternoon,

Mr. Ross, I hope you don't mind the separate emails. I figure it would be easier for you to be able to handle one issue in an email at a time, especially as this email is also going to Ms. Murray as well. Long story short, our group is wondering if either of you had any more info for us on when the City expects the Dutton Meadows and the Meadowood Projects to be going before the Planning Commission next? We are trying to organize an event to help spread the message about these projects and are

wondering if there is any exigency in getting this event planned, or whether our still-very-informal proposed August date would work.

Thank so much for your time.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1

Ross, Adam

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 12:00 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows question

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good afternoon,
When you have the time, would it be possible for you to send us the name and contact info for the contact at Trumark for the Dutton Meadows project?

Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS: This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information.

It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender at (707) 408-3529 and destroy all copies of the e-mail.

On Jun 8, 2021, at 11:37 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Devina,

I will look for something I can provide to you. I know I am about 2 weeks behind with delivery of what I said I would. I am still going to have that together for you as soon as I can.

Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Devina Douglas <devina@devinadouglaslaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 11:33 AM

To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows question

Good morning,

I was wondering if you are able to send us a copy of (or a link to) the February 2021 Zoom Town Hall presentation on this development with the developer, or, in the alternative, a copy of the pdf presentation the developer gave during that session?

Thank you!

-Devina Douglas

The Law Office of Devina Douglas
700 College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 408-3529
Fax: (707) 948-6097
Sonoma County Courthouse Mailbox #1
Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS: This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information.

It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender at (707) 408-3529 and destroy all copies of the e-mail.

Ross, Adam

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:48 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision Comment
Attachments: IMG_9378.jpg; IMG_9379.jpg; IMG_9381.jpg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good Morning Adam,

Thank you for hosting the neighborhood meeting on 2/10. I have attached some pictures I took on Saturday 2/13 around 10:00am which show the *existing* issues on Dutton Meadows. We've got vehicles parking in bike lines, and vehicles being forced to park in a manner which blocks a lane of traffic. These are symptoms of greater issues in this region of town, signaling that this area doesn't need, and can't sustain, another housing development until the existing, woefully inadequate infrastructure which services the existing residents has been updated.

Also of note, this general area is used by a lot of kids who ride their bikes to school, often without parental supervision. Cars parking in the bike lane in neighborhoods so close to schools isn't just an inconvenience, it's a safety issue.

On Monday, February 8, 2021, 8:47:16 AM PST, Ross, Adam <aross@srcity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Matthew,

I have received your comment and added it to the public record. It will be weighed in Staff's review of the project carried over to any public meetings moving forward for review and included in the decision making process.

Adam Ross |Interim Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development |100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Matthew Pierce <sharkbaitpierce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision Comment

Dear Adam Ross,

Please see attached for my comment on the Dutton Meadow Subdivision.

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 10:27 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: Devina Douglas
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

Thank you, Adam

Art

Arthur Deicke
aedeicke@gmail.com

> On Mar 9, 2021, at 10:23 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

>

> Hi Arthur,

>

> Sorry for the confusion. Essentially, the deadline on the Notice of Application is not a hard deadline. Typically, we ask that initial comments be submitted to the project planner so we have sufficient time process the information and formulate some type of response in a timely manner. Essentially, the sooner the comments are received, the sooner a response can be drafted. However, comments can be submitted during the entire review process and are added to the public record. Additional noticing will go out when the project is scheduled for public hearing with the Planning Commission as well. I do not have a tentative date for that at this time.

>

> Did that clarify my previous email?

>

> Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner

> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa

> Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>

> Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 10:04 AM

> To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>

> Cc: Devina Douglas <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>

> Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision

>

> Ross:

>

> This is a bit confusing to me. I responded to your previous email, which stated there was no deadline. Now, we should get our comments to you sooner rather than later. Can you provide me with what you believe the tentative timeline for this project is for it to be reviewed at the Planning Commission?

>

> Thank you,

>
> Art
>
> Arthur Deicke
> aedeicke@gmail.com
>
>
>
>> On Mar 9, 2021, at 9:18 AM, Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:
>>
>> Hi Arthur,
>>
>> Just as a follow up, I would suggest that if you can get the letter in to me sooner rather than later, we can have enough time to review, respond, implement any changes as applicable, or have the applicant respond.
>>
>> Thank you,
>>
>> Adam Ross | Interim Senior Planner
>> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 |
>> Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-4705 | aross@srcity.org
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
>> Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 5:51 AM
>> To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
>> Cc: Devina Douglas <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>
>> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dutton Meadows Subdivision
>>
>> Mr. Ross:
>>
>> On behalf of the residents of what has been referred to as Southern Gardens (Sally Ann/Aloise) neighborhood and adjoining neighborhoods in the Roseland area of the City of Santa Rosa, we request a 30-day extension on the public comment period, which ends on March 19, 2021 for the development of the Dutton Meadows Subdivision.
>>
>> Due to COVID restrictions, we have only been able to meet as a group once since the City's Neighborhood Meeting on February 10, 2021 held on Zoom. We need more time to ensure residents in our neighborhood, which will be dramatically affected by Dutton Meadows Subdivision, are informed.
>>
>> We have scheduled another Zoom meeting for this week, our second, to discuss, continue our research and prepare appropriate and pertinent comments to this development.
>>
>> Residents in our neighborhood requesting this extension include:
>>
>> Southern Gardens:
>>
>> Devina Douglas (Rising Moon)
>> Matt Pierce (Rising Moon)
>> Andrea Rojas (Aloise)
>> Tulio Vasquez (Aloise)
>> Maria Vasquez (Aloise)

>> Ron Suess (Rising Moon)
>> Jane Suess (Rising Moon)
>> Art Deicke (Deep Harbor)
>> Solita Deicke (Deep Harbor)
>>
>> And from neighboring areas in Roseland:
>>
>> Fred Kreuger
>> Duane Dewitt
>>
>> Thank you for your consideration. Please acknowledge receipt of this request and let us know if the extension is granted.
>>
>> Sincerely,
>>
>> Arthur Deicke
>> aedeicke@gmail.com
>> 2513 Deep Harbor Ln
>> 707-322-2015
>>
>

Ross, Adam

From: Ron Suess <ron.suess@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 1:43 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Response to Notice of Application by Trumark Homes Dutton Meadows Subdivision File No. PRJ18-039
Attachments: Dutton Meadow Subdivision Ltr-RAAdams_15Mar2021.docx

Adam Ross
Project Planner
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Santa Rosa
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Dear Mr. Ross,

My wife and I are responding to your request to receive questions, comments, and recommendations for Trumark Homes' Dutton Meadows Subdivision, File Number PRJ18-039.

We've attached our letter that presents our concerns, questions, and comments related to that Dutton Meadows Subdivision project.

The opportunity to respond to this revised application notice is much appreciated.

As is appropriate and timely, we will look forward to providing additional comments, concerns, and questions related to what the City envisions for Southwest Santa Rosa.

This is where the growth of the City will expand and we are pleased to contribute to the beneficial manner in which the City addresses the manifold issues confronting this growth.

We appreciate the City's commitment to achieving the optimum level of quality of life for everyone that is Santa Rosa residents/citizens and doing this together.

Respectfully,

Ronald and Jane Suess

Ross, Adam

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 12:12 PM
To: Montoya, Michelle
Cc: Fellenbaum, Jan; Ross, Adam; Trippel, Andrew; Devina Douglas
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] (SW Area Citizens Group) City of Santa Rosa Referral - PRJ18-039

Michelle:

Thanks for your reply. Looks like the system worked as the area rep sent to us.

Have a great day.

Art

Arthur Deicke
aedeicke@gmail.com

On Sep 20, 2021, at 12:10 PM, Montoya, Michelle <MMontoya@srcity.org> wrote:

Good morning Art,

Jan forwarded me your message. When sending referrals, we send only to that area's representative. We have the expectation that each area representative will share the information with all interested parties. We get the area representative information from a list that Danielle in Community Engagement keeps updated. If that information needs to be changed, or another person added, we can do that as well as share the updates with Danielle. I would, however, ask that we keep the number of people receiving our referrals to a minimum as we do not have the staff capacity to manage multiple list serves for each area of Santa Rosa, on top of the various other entities and people that need to receive our referrals.

If you have any other questions, please let me know, and I will do my best to answer them or get them to those who can.

Hope you are having a good day.

Michelle Montoya | Administrative Secretary

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4645 | mmontoya@srcity.org (Currently Working Remotely)

<image004.jpg>

From: Fellenbaum, Jan <jfellenbaum@srcity.org>
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 11:58 AM

To: Montoya, Michelle <MMontoya@srcity.org>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: (SW Area Citizens Group) City of Santa Rosa Referral - PRJ18-039

Hello Michelle, Just checking with you – in case there is anything you would want me to do – or reply to.

See below.

Thanks!

Jan Fellenbaum | Senior Administrative Assistant (temporary)

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-4650 | jfellenbaum@srcity.org

<image001.jpg>

From: Arthur Deicke <aedeicke@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 11:49 AM

To: Fellenbaum, Jan <jfellenbaum@srcity.org>; Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>

Cc: Devina Douglas <Devina@DevinaDouglasLaw.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: (SW Area Citizens Group) City of Santa Rosa Referral - PRJ18-039

Jan and Ros:

Could you tell us why our group or at least individuals from our group were not included with this notification? Is there a list we should have been on?

Arthur Deicke
707-322-2015
aedeicke@gmail.com

Subject: (SW Area Citizens Group) City of Santa Rosa Referral - PRJ18-039

Date: 2021-09-17 17:38

From: "Fellenbaum, Jan" <jfellenbaum@srcity.org>

To: "fred@ecostewards.org" <fred@ecostewards.org>

Cc: "Ross, Adam" <ARoss@srcity.org>, "Montoya, Michelle" <MMontoya@srcity.org>

Good morning,

-You are receiving this email as the SW Area Citizens Group representative-

Attached please find the referral letter for planning project PRJ18-039.

The planning documents are available electronically for you to review here:

<image002.png>

[PRJ18-039](#)

Please contact Planner, Adam Ross Aross@srcity.org, for questions and comments.

Revised Project: The revised project proposal includes the subdivision and development of an approximately 19-acre site with 137 single-family detached 2-story

homes for the purposes of a small-lot subdivision. See project description for further information.

Thank you,

Jan Fellenbaum | Senior Administrative Assistant (temporary)

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA
95404

Tel. (707) 543-4650 | jfellenbaum@srcity.org

<image003.jpg>

Ross, Adam

From: Pat Delaplane <mauimermaid@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 9:10 PM
To: fred@ecostewards.org
Cc: Ross, Adam; Alvarez, Eddie; Nutt, Jason; Sawyer, John; Tibbetts, Jack; Schwedhelm, Tom; Press Democrat; manda.brower@pressdemocrat.com; rick.green@pressdemocrat.com; Lynda Hopkins; Devina Douglas; Fleming, Victoria
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: The Dutton meadows proposed housing development: Why can't the City listen to residents?

I agree 100 %. Stop all this building without adding appropriate access.

Pat

On Sep 21, 2021, at 8:23 PM, fred@ecostewards.org wrote:

Good morning Adam Ross,

Hello members of the Santa Rosa City Council,

There is a morally wrong methodology in how the Santa Rosa Planning Dept is handling the proposal for a housing development on Dutton Meadows.

Just two years ago, neighbors gathered at a City Council meeting and clearly and strongly told city Administration "NO," we do not want further housing development in the Dutton Meadows area.

Why can't you listen?

Why are you now making virtually the identical proposal? Citizens in the south Roseland area could not have spoken in a stronger or more emphatic manner as neighbors lined up to tell you and the entire city that for a variety of reasons, we do not want a housing development on that land.

Your knee-jerk policy of repeatedly pushing and pressing against the will of the neighborhood undermines the very premise of democratic government.

The issues have not changed one wit! We are still faced with terrific traffic congestion on Hearn Avenue during rush hours. The acute need for parks in our area is still strong and way below the level of what the General Plan allocates for residential areas; the medical hazard of the inability to get to a hospital during times of peak traffic is still present; plus many others reasons that residents have cited.

For perspective, since the 2009 (or 2010) DEIR for the proposed WalMart at Stony Point and Sebastopol Road, we have documented evidence that the intersections along Hearn are a LOS (Level of Service) F. In the intervening decade, the city has continued to expand housing

throughout the SW, but without a corresponding or proportional increase in infrastructure and amenities.

The neighbors have already spoken. We need parks, not more housing. It is not right to repeatedly push your own will against what citizens have already strongly demanded. It seems like you are listening more to realtor and developer pressure than the virtually unanimous voice of citizens.

Another major issue is drought and continuing drought. Columbia University's Earth Institute is forecasting a likelihood of 50% to 100% of continued drought in California next year. History is no longer a reliable guide to future weather or precipitation. The Water Agency is requesting that neighbors cut back on water use by 20%. We had that identical 20% cut back request last year. Can't you see the hypocrisy in asking residents to reduce water use, while you in City administration continue to promote new water connections? It is just not right.

Besides, you are making a risky gamble with future water supplies for both citizens and agriculture at a time when water levels are low and a possibility remains of further drought in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Fred Krueger

(707) 573-3160 (1 pm - 9 pm daily)

cc: City Council members, neighbors and others