

## Manis, Dina

---

**From:** Eric Fraser <casabello432@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 3, 2020 1:08 PM  
**To:** \_CityCouncilListPublic  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] ADU/JADU ordinance

Dear Council:

The proposed ordinance contains further restrictions on short term occupancies in ADUs because the definition of an ADU was expanded to include dwellings without self-contained kitchens and bathrooms. This change allows guest houses, carriage houses, etc. to be considered ADUs. Without a grandfather clause, this might bring unfair restrictions to existing short-term hosts, without due process and by using underhanded methods of sneaking the restrictions into an urgency ordinance. (Staff knew of the updates required for the ADU/JADU well before they became effective under State law in January 2020.)

Please set-aside the short-term occupancy restrictions found in Paragraph B4 and F1c on ADUs and JADUs entirely from the urgency ordinance. However, given the reduction of permit fees, we can understand why you would not want to give an incentive to those looking to invest in ADU/JADU specifically to offer it for short term occupancy. But the arguments supporting any restrictions on short term occupancies actually does not ring true when applying any type of analysis including emergency prep and response, economic development, housing, community impacts, (and is also an additional imposition on private property rights).

So to be fair to Santa Rosa's property owners (and also some part of the approximately 240 home share hosts remitting TOT/SRTBIA using dwellings that are now defined by the proposed urgency ordinance as ADUs), we propose that the ordinance treat the short term occupancy restrictions with the following exclusions for both ADUs and JADUs:

- 1) **Owner Occupancy\***: no restriction on short-term occupancy for parcels with owner occupancy, and
- 2) **Grandfather Clause**: the ordinance only applies to parcels that have had a permit application filed after the date of the ordinance, since they are the owners receiving the benefit of the permit fee reductions, etc.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Fraser  
Community Organizer  
707.479-8247

\* "Owner Occupancy" is not allowed as a restriction for ADU/JADUs under State Law, however it may be allowed as a requirement for short-term occupancy.

## Manis, Dina

---

**From:** Toomians, Kristinae  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 3, 2020 10:59 AM  
**To:** Manis, Dina; Trupiano, Nicole  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Carpenter Urban cottages

I just received this for item 16.2 for tonight.

**Kristinae Toomians | Senior Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-4692 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [KToomians@SRCity.org](mailto:KToomians@SRCity.org)

**From:** Melissa Sabatino [mailto:[melissasabatino@gmail.com](mailto:melissasabatino@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 03, 2020 10:58 AM  
**To:** Toomians, Kristinae <[KToomians@srcity.org](mailto:KToomians@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Carpenter Urban cottages

Hello Kristinae,

I am a Writing again as a concerned resident living at 726 Tupper Street for 10.5 years now. I live directly across from David Carpenter's existing home/ lot which he is proposing to build on and connect to 25 Rae street.

I have many concerns about this project:

- the amount and size of homes to built
- the allowance of parking spaces
- David Carpenters capacity as a landlord
- The impact on the neighborhood
- the impact on my family's quality of life

I do not agree that multiple families and cars will all fit neatly in his lot, or that this building plan is beneficial to the city. Trying to situate as many people as possible into a small crowded area seems more of a plan to make money than to provide decent living space.

Carpenters design of crowded imposing size homes in a neighborhood of bungalows imposing on us.

We also only have parking on one side of the street on Tupper street, which is a narrow street with many homes without driveways, so overflow parking is a great concern

Carpenter also plans to put 2 pairs of duplexes, or 8 additional families into the lot that already has a single family dwelling. So a total of 9 families, I cannot even imagine 9 families living this close in such a small area, how can this be good for our Historical Neighborhood? Will Carpenter specify only 1 car allowed per family? No, who can impose this on a renter. But if not done, his plans are not showing the true impact of the parking situation. It is overwhelmingly crowded and obtrusive. It seems detrimental to our living situation as well. Carpenter does not choose to live in the neighborhood at his property. Who, if given the choice, would want to live near or on a property with this many homes in a tiny proximity?

I appreciate your time reading all my comments. Thank you for considering my opinion.