

[EXTERNAL] Stony point flats

Alaina Probst <alaina415@gmail.com>

Mon 5/3/2021 8:43 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello,

As an environmental educator who has worked countless hours with volunteers on restoration projects in Sonoma county, I would like to voice my concern regarding the proposed apartments at 2268 stony point rd.

This is a seasonal wetlands and would gravely impact already struggling species including, but not limited to, frogs, great blue herons and other water fowl. Not to mention the grasslands that support the food for these larger species. I recognize that maybe to a developer this is an open parcel that lacks community "involvement" or "purpose", but our growing community needs open spaces, however small, to keep our various ecosystems and wellbeing alive.

If we continue to develop every plot of open space Santa Rosa will become unrecognizable. People are not the only inhabitants of this city and we should be able to share the space for future generations to learn about and observe wildlife!

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Alaina Probst

Sent from my iPhone

[EXTERNAL] Fwd: Stony point flats

Alaina Probst <alaina415@gmail.com>

Tue 5/4/2021 1:59 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello,

As directed by Michelle Olson I am redirecting my concern and question regarding water sourcing directly to you.

Please see email below.

Thank you,

Alaina Probst

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Date: May 4, 2021 at 8:43:45 AM PDT

To: Alaina Probst <alaina415@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Stony point flats

Alaina,

Please direct questions like these to the City of Santa Rosa, our planner is Conor McKay, his contact info is ctmckay@srcity.org.

Thank you,
Michelle J. Olson-Brueggemann
Vice President

PLEASE NOTE MY CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS BELOW IN BOLD



30 Meyers Ct.
Novato, CA 94947
michelleb@phoenixdevco.com
612-743-3252 cell/text

707-528-3631 office
707-806-2564 fax

www.phoenixdevco.com

On Tue, May 4, 2021 at 8:17 AM Alaina Probst <alaina415@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you!

I'm also concerned where you plan to get all this needed water for new development and supply to residents in an ever increasing drought with fires starting sooner than ever?

Best,

Alaina Probst
Sent from my iPhone

On May 4, 2021, at 7:10 AM, michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com> wrote:

Alaina,

I have forwarded your comments and concerns to the city planner Conor McKay to be add to the record of last evenings meeting.

Thank you for your input,

On Mon, May 3, 2021 at 8:46 PM Alaina Probst <alaina415@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,

As an environmental educator who has worked countless hours with volunteers on restoration projects in Sonoma county, I would like to voice my concern regarding the proposed apartments at 2268 stony point rd.

This is a seasonal wetlands and would gravely impact already struggling species including, but not limited to, frogs, great blue herons and other water fowl. Not to mention the grasslands that support the food for these larger species. I recognize that maybe to a developer this is an open parcel that lacks community "involvement" or "purpose", but our growing community needs open spaces, however small, to keep our various ecosystems and wellbeing alive.

If we continue to develop every plot of open space Santa Rosa will become unrecognizable. People are not the only inhabitants of this city and we should be able to share the space for future generations to learn about and observe wildlife!

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Alaina Probst


Sent from my iPhone

--

Michelle J. Olson-Brueggemann

Vice President

PLEASE NOTE MY CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS BELOW IN BOLD



30 Meyers Ct.

Novato, CA 94947

michelleb@phoenixdevco.com

612-743-3252 cell/text

707-528-3631 office

707-806-2564 fax

www.phoenixdevco.com

Re: [EXTERNAL] stony pt flats

McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Fri 5/7/2021 12:45 PM

To: David Bannister Home <davidban@sonic.net>

Hello David,

Thank you for reaching out. The applicant is currently developing an Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration. When this is completed, it will be circulated publicly pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

I believe they will be incorporating some biological resources mitigation measures from the Roseland Area / Sebastopol Road Specific Plan EIR, which can be found here: <https://srcity.org/2437/Roseland-Area-Projects-Environmental-Imp>

Thank you,

Conor McKay (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact planning@srcity.org. To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to permitsubmittal@srcity.org.

From: davidban@sonic.net <davidban@sonic.net>**Sent:** Sunday, May 2, 2021 2:23 PM**To:** McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] stony pt flats

Hey Connor

Is there an EIR for this project? How can I access it? I am interested in whether there are wetlands on the property and if so how the loss of them is being mitigated.

David Bannister
615 Healdsburg Ave #413
Santa Rosa, 95401

[EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Dennis Hagemann <dennish@sonic.net>

Fri 5/21/2021 2:58 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

No more building until the we have water. You are not being responsible to the residents who will be suffering with the drought.

Dennis

[EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Road

Jennifer LaPorta <jenniferlaporta1@gmail.com>

Mon 5/17/2021 8:54 AM

Please do not develop this parcel. Southwest Santa Rosa is under a huge development process currently. We cannot handle more traffic, noise, pollution (air, litter, etc). The local creeks cannot handle any more trash! I'm a creek steward and the trash is getting worse. I clean up 1.5 mile of the Colgan Creek each year all by myself, just because I care, from Stony Pt Rd across Bellevue Av to a little E of Dutton Meadows. I've noted far fewer hawks, kites and egrets in this area since the new housing went in just N of Bellevue, between Dutton Meadows and Burgess Dr.

Sincerely,

Jennifer LaPorta

Santa Rosa 95407

BS Environmental Health

[EXTERNAL] Fwd: Stony Point Flats Environmental Impact

michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Sun 5/2/2021 8:00 AM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

FYI from a neighbor at Stony Point, see below.

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

From: **Maygol Yavari** <maygol.yavaribe@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, May 1, 2021 at 8:35 PM

Subject: Stony Point Flats Environmental Impact

To: <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>, <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Dear Mr. Brueggemann, and Ms. Olson,

I wanted to introduce myself as I live on Trombetta Street with my house overlooking the proposed development of Stony Point Flats. I am contacting you today as I spend countless hours looking out over "The Sheep Farm" from our kitchen and bedroom windows. It's not only the sheep that we see, but it's the hawks, the egrets, the mockingbirds, the swallows, the frogs, the salamanders, the foxes, and the turkeys. As the former owners of Oaks of Olivets, I can see you are passionate about animals and their wellbeing. On Ms. Olson's LinkedIn, you mention that you were a docent for the Laguna de Santa Rosa where you helped children learn about "our wonderful local wetland area." I know you understand the importance of protecting our beautiful and natural habitat!

As you are aware, the proposed development of Stony Point Flats is located within a seasonal wetland. When Santa Rosa set records for rainfall in February 2019 (when the Barlow flooded in Sebastopol), the parcel you plan to develop was several feet deep in water for months. There was the loudest "frog symphony" we have ever heard, with some of the frogs and salamanders even visiting us in our backyard. Even when we receive standard rainfall for the year, the parcel and the Roseland Creek is bustling with life. Whether the development is mitigated with environmental impact credits or not, there will be irreversible damage to this fragile environment. We invite you to spend some time on the property to examine for yourself. I know many of the neighbors feel the same way and are disheartened with the potential tragic loss to the environment and to the community. In addition, an overwhelming majority of the proposed development is hardscape with little or no reprieve for these animals that will have nowhere else to go.

I appreciate your review of my letter and your consideration to move the project elsewhere. All of us tend to get wrapped up in the day to day life and forget the impact and responsibility that we have to our community and to our environment. Please also consider sharing this letter with the owner of the property, Steve Olson. Thanks again for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Best wishes,

Maygol Yavari



Virus-free. www.avg.com

--

Michelle J. Olson-Brueggemann

Vice President

PLEASE NOTE MY CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS BELOW IN BOLD



30 Meyers Ct.

Novato, CA 94947

michelleb@phoenixdevco.com

612-743-3252 cell/text

707-528-3631 office

707-806-2564 fax

www.phoenixdevco.com

Re: [EXTERNAL] Modification of Front Setback Lots 13/14 Of Summerfield Hills Subdivision #8

McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Wed 5/5/2021 12:13 PM

To: Peter M Banks <pb2@sonic.net>

Cc: cjohnke@pacunion.com <cjohnke@pacunion.com>; Cheney Betty <chaney5576@sbcglobal.net>

Hello Peter,

Thank you for reaching out about the proposal to modify the Final Map. I appreciate your dedication to pedestrian safety in the neighborhood.

In looking at the setbacks for the surrounding parcels, the properties on either side of the subject property have a front setback of 20', pursuant to the Zoning District development standards for RR-20. Across the street at 5495 and 5497 Newanga, a Final Map establishes a 40' setback similar to the subject Final Map proposed for modification. However, the remaining rural parcels on either side of Newanga heading west away from the park are all located in the RR-20 district as well, which establishes a 20' setback. The proposal would achieve consistency between the final map and zoning code front setbacks.

At this time, there has been no discussion between the City and the applicant about splitting the lot. This would require a Tentative Parcel Map to be filed, which is a completely separate application that would require a different planning process. This would also take place at a public meeting during which you would be able to express your thoughts about the proposal.

Future development of the lot would be required to comply with all zoning code regulations. If maintained as a single-family dwelling, only one detached accessory dwelling unit would be allowed to be constructed. The accessory structure maximum height is 16' in the RR-20 zoning district.

You will be receiving another notice regarding the public hearing at the Planning Commission about the proposed project which will demonstrate methods of participating in the meeting.

Thank you, and best wishes.

Conor McKay (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact planning@srcity.org. To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to permitsubmittal@srcity.org.

From: Peter M Banks <pb2@sonic.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 10:42 AM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Cc: Banks Peter <pb2@sonic.net>; cjohnke@pacunion.com <cjohnke@pacunion.com>; Cheney Betty <chaney5576@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Modification of Front Setback Lots 13/14 Of Summerfield Hills Subdivision #8

Dear Conner McKay,

I have been a resident of Santa Rosa and owner of a home at 5602 Newanga Ave. for the past 22 years. I am strongly opposed to the proposed modification of front setback fo Lots 13 and 14 of the Summerfield Hills Subdivision No. 8 Final Map. My reasons are given below:

1. Background. Newanga Avenue is not a normal city street. It is narrow, has no sidewalks along most of its way and provides the ONLY access to the south end of Spring Lake Park to the rest of Santa Rosa.. From my observation, each day several hundred Santa Rosa residents use Newanga Ave. to walk to and to return from the Park to their homes.
2. Situation. The properties on either side of Newaga Ave. were mandated 40' setbacks on larger than normal-sized lots. This created a visual transition from the more densely populated areas of the city to the park and its facilities. It's also likely that the city planners foresaw the desire of some residents to purchase properties to maintain stables for horses that could easily use Park trails. Hence, the larger sized lots and setbacks.
3. I feel the likely reason for a change in the proposed set back is requested simply to enable the owner or owners to subdivide lots 13 and 14 for the reason of building a additional homes for personal economic gains on a splitting of the existing lots. This gain, of course, comes along with a lessening of the ambience of environment, an economic reduction for the existing property owners. and increased danger for pedestrians using Newanga Ave. for access to Spring Lake Park.
4. Thus, I feel that the proposed change in setback of lots 13 and 14 has the strong potential to: (1) degrade the visual environment along Newanga Avenue via homes very close to the street, (2) increases the density of traffic along Newanga Avenue and (3) reduction the economic value of homes fexisting property owners. Because of these effects, I opposed the proposed modification of front setbacks.

I'd be happy to discuss my thoughts with you by phone.

Peter Banks
5602 Newanga Ave.

707 326-1767 cell
707 539-7378 phone
pb2@sonic.net

[EXTERNAL] Fwd: Stony Point Flats

michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Tue 5/4/2021 7:11 AM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

FYI, for the record.

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

From: **Ryan Schwab** <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:37 PM

Subject: Stony Point Flats

To: lorenb@phoenixdevco.com <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>, michelleb@phoenixdevco.com <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Hello Loren and Michelle,

I wanted to let you know after the zoom call today that numerous people have reached out to me to see how they can get involved to stop this flawed development. We understand that housing is important but not when it severely impacts our animals and our natural environment. I know you understand why we are upset. My apologies if my comments earlier caused offense, but it is important that we all do our due diligence. Before you and Integrity Housing invest additional resources in this project, I wanted to let you know that it will be a challenging effort.

Regards,
Ryan

--

Michelle J. Olson-Brueggemann
Vice President

PLEASE NOTE MY CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS BELOW IN BOLD



30 Meyers Ct.

Novato, CA 94947

michelleb@phoenixdevco.com

612-743-3252 cell/text

707-528-3631 office

707-806-2564 fax

www.phoenixdevco.com

[EXTERNAL] Fwd: Stony Point Flats - Community Disapproval

michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>

Sun 5/16/2021 8:51 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

FYI,

See below.

Thank you,

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

From: **Ryan Schwab** <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Date: Sun, May 16, 2021 at 6:21 PM

Subject: Stony Point Flats - Community Disapproval

To: Loren Brueggemann <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>, Michelle Olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>, anjela@integrityhousing.org <anjela@integrityhousing.org>, phil@integrityhousing.org <phil@integrityhousing.org>

Hello Phoenix Development, Integrity Housing, and fellow alarmed citizens (blind CCed),

My name is Ryan Schwab and some of you already know me as a concerned citizen for the development proposed at [2268 Stony Point Road](#), also known as Stony Point Flats. At the first community meeting on Monday, May 3, 2021, there was a large attendance of individuals with many voicing thoughtful and legitimate concerns with the project. Not one community member in attendance spoke positively of the development, which is a good indicator that thorough due diligence was not performed prior to selecting the site.

We have recently been joined by additional members of the community with backgrounds in land use law, architecture, engineering, environmental science, agricultural, media, and auditing. This is on top of the countless others who are active citizens looking to take action and attend every possible public meeting and examine all material related to this project. We have met many neighbors and bonded with them over our mutual dissatisfaction for this project and the hypocrisy of the development team that was uncovered during our research.

An example of this hypocrisy of the husband and wife development team is that Michelle Olson's LinkedIn volunteer experience indicates that she was a docent for the Laguna de Santa Rosa working with children and "helping them learn about our wonderful, local wetland area", but pursues developing on a parcel that backs up against the Roseland Creek Open Space Preserve and also contains documented seasonal wetlands. This is with full knowledge that the excavation of the site and fill that will be required to raise the parcel out of the FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Zone will destroy then bury all precious life there. From documents we have obtained from our public records request, "Excavation will redistribute approximately 7,800 cubic yards of soil. Of the excavated soil, 7,000 cubic yards will be used as fill; and a net 800 cubic yards of soil will be hauled off for disposal. Approximately 3,900 cubic yards of new soil are anticipated to be imported to the site."

Additionally as part of our communal due diligence, the business address for Phoenix Development displayed on their website was also their residence of 16 years that was just recently sold. The public listing from December 2020 boasts about the following:

- A gated entry with a long private driveway and graced with majestic Oaks.
- A slice of country living on over 6 acres with vineyard views, privacy, room for animals, and an orchard.
- Additional details highlight that is in a "prime location" and that "every window provides postcard perfect views."

We all now know how much the developers valued THEIR trees, THEIR privacy, THEIR farmland, THEIR open space, and THEIR views. Why is it that their former residence is considered a "prime location" to preserve all of

these important aspects but our Roseland neighborhood is not?

The tree inventory plan for the Stony Point Flats project indicates that 12 trees will be removed from the property including 4 oak trees (2 different species), 3 pine trees, and 2 coast redwoods. Not only are these trees beautiful, but these trees are frequented by a multitude of species including our many notable birds of prey.

Our Roseland community's windows also boast "postcard perfect views," but the Stony Point Flats project plans indicate that the building will be 3 stories and an incredible 39 feet tall, completely blocking out our skyline. The building type and height is certainly not customary for the area and will alter the semi-rural skyscape indefinitely. We have reviewed the other ongoing Integrity/Phoenix collaboration, Dutton Flats, which we all have concluded is a much more sensible location for similar dense multi-story housing developments where the urban-like setting is not disruptive to the local habitat and the semi-rural aesthetic.

The communal voices of the surrounding neighborhood are already brimming with activism to halt this development. I am not going to reveal every detail for all the reasons we strongly oppose this development, as that will be documented on a substantial petition that is being prepared. We as a united unit implore you to reconsider this project so both sides can refocus their efforts before enormous amounts of energy and money are expended. Revaluating will also assist with mitigating any reputational risk that is currently under public scrutiny.

Sincerely,

Ryan Schwab

Trombetta United & Residents First Roseland

--

Michelle J. Olson-Brueggemann

Vice President

PLEASE NOTE MY CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS BELOW IN BOLD



30 Meyers Ct.

Novato, CA 94947

michelleb@phoenixdevco.com

612-743-3252 cell/text

707-528-3631 office

707-806-2564 fax

www.phoenixdevco.com

FW: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Stony Points Flats - Flood Plain Issues

Enright, Michael <MEnright@srcity.org>

Mon 5/24/2021 4:52 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Conor – Who is Ryan Schwab and why is he sending me an email about comments I did not provide to him?

From: Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 4:48 PM

To: Enright, Michael <MEnright@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Stony Points Flats - Flood Plain Issues

Hello Mike,

I wanted to discuss with you some of the issues related to the Stony Point Flats project, as you know being built on a flood plain ripe with many species of life. Our community knows that this is not the proper location for this proposed dense apartment complex. Thank you for reviewing our communities concerns:

1. By importing hundreds of tons of backfill soil on top of designated seasonal wetlands, this development would permanently eradicate the habitat of a plethora of wildlife; inclusive of riparian, raptor, plant life and the known endangered tiger salamander species. No amount of mitigating “credits” can compensate for intentional smothering of these fragile amphibians, plants and animals.
2. Stony Point Flats proposes construction upon FEMA’s designated 100 year flood plain. With almost 100% hardscape on slab construction, this development would displace the natural absorption of rainfall, potentially diverting it to flood nearby residences and neighborhoods. The neighbor next-door to the property at 2222 Stony Point Road still deals with flooding to her property, and this project will be especially catastrophic for her property.
3. According to the developer’s The Universal Planning Application, “Stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new on site stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system..., which discharges into the Roseland Creek.” This has potential for irreparable damage to Roseland Creek.
4. Stony Point Flat lacks the integration of a green belt, but relies solely upon abutting Roseland Creek. This lack of a designated public park or greenbelt places additional pressure upon Roseland Creek’s fragile ecosystem by allowing additional water diversion and potential pollutants from both the initial construction and ongoing pollutants such as, discarded trash, off gasses, oil runoff from their parking lot and toxins from the site.

Regards,
Ryan Schwab



Virus-free. www.avg.com

[EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Flats Project - North Point Parkway Extension and Traffic Concerns

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Sun 5/23/2021 9:34 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>

Cc: Hunter.McLaughlin@sonoma-county.org <Hunter.McLaughlin@sonoma-county.org>

 1 attachments (252 KB)

Altered Noth Point Parkway Design Concerns.pdf;

Hello Santa Rosa Planning Department,

I would greatly appreciate your input related to the proposed Stony Points Flats project and the North Point Parkway extension. Our community members have noticed that the proposed North Point Parkway extension outlined in the Stony Ranch Subdivision (Record Plans - dated June 2015) does not match the proposed extension as outlined by the Stony Point Flats design team. The curve of the road appears to occur approximately 120 feet further than previously planned. Not only is the projected path now in alignment with a majestic 70 foot Eucalyptus tree frequented by many birds of prey, but it also affects homeowners on Trombetta Street who purposely purchased homes on the most eastern part of the street ensuring there would be a buffer between their homes and the future North Point Parkway extension. I have attached an infographic outlining the observed changes. Please confirm if these changes were approved by the city.

I also wanted to discuss the traffic related concerns with the project and would appreciate input if they are going to be addressed by the developer. This project poses considerable traffic concerns and evacuation hazards in the event of an emergency. There have been three fires over the past 10 years along the Roseland Creek trail directly surrounding the parcel to be developed. If one of these fires occurs again which is highly likely, the future residents would be in grave danger, since they would only be able to make a right turn out the property. It is exceptionally uncommon for there to be only one way out of a dense community. This could force residents to try to escape a disaster with only one option and this one option could put them directly into the oncoming path of a fire or another hazard.

Additionally, egress and ingress is tremendously inadequate to accommodate over 100 residents' vehicular entry and exit to the property. The entry/exit point does not have either a turn lane, stop light nor south bound exit, thus posing traffic hazards, congestion and potential back ups for northerly flowing traffic up Stony Point. Residents wanting to drive south out of the apartment complex must make a right turn then either make a U-turn at the Northpoint Parkway intersection, or drive north to turn into the Stony Ranch subdivision to travel through the neighborhood onto Giffen in order to turn left at the light. Residents traveling southbound on Stony Point, will not be able to make a left turn into the property as there is a concrete median with no plans or space to turn it into a left hand turn lane. To enter the property southbound, residents would need to pass the property then either make an illegal U-turn at Hearn or continue driving until they are able to turn around. This is not only extremely inconvenient for the future residents, but downright dangerous for them and the surrounding neighborhoods. Many serious car accidents already occur on this treacherous stretch of Stony Point and approval of this project will exacerbate this known problem.

Day-to-day traffic will be even more severe and dangerous than what it currently is. Many neighbors can not imagine what it will be like in the event of another evacuation that has scarred everyone in the

community. With most new developments now occurring in Roseland, neighbors are terrified that that they will be unable to escape the next disaster (fire, earthquake, etc). Many neighbors are still distraught from how jam-packed the roads were in the early morning hours when evacuation was demanded during the most recent fires. It took some households over three hours to leave town due to the tremendous amount of traffic and backup of people fleeing for their lives.

Thank you for reading our community's traffic related concerns and addressing them with us. We hope that the city and the developer carefully consider the multiple traffic related issues before proceeding with the plan as is.

Thank you,
Ryan Schwab



Green – North Point Parkway extension as outlined in the Stony Ranch Subdivision (Record Plans - dated June of 2015).

Red – North Point Parkway extension as provided by the Stony Point Flats design team with no public input regarding its change of course.

Yellow – Many neighbors on Trombetta Street deliberately selected their residences with the proposed North Point Parkway as outlined in the Stony Ranch Subdivision plans in mind. The Stony Ranch Subdivision plans indicate that the road would start to curve away from these residences approximately 120 feet sooner providing an increased buffer for the expected noise and environmental pollution.

[EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Stories from the Community

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Fri 5/21/2021 10:52 AM

To: anjela@integrityhousing.org <anjela@integrityhousing.org>; phil@integrityhousing.org <phil@integrityhousing.org>; Loren Brueggemann <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>; Michelle Olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>
Cc: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello Phoenix Development and Integrity Housing,

We have received numerous emails from our community over the last 3 weeks. Other neighbors have reached out to discuss with us face to face and tell their story for how saddened they are. The one thing everyone has in common is the hope that this project is moved where the environmental impact would be less severe. I wanted to share with you an email I recently received:

That is a special stretch of creek and I was just out there this week with real kids from Roseland Creek exploring and enjoying being together and the lively creek. We were treated to dragonfly, butterflies, lizards, ladybugs, many birds, feral cats and more as we looked around. I have been on this creek for many years with the community and with Roseland Creek students/classes. This past/latest cleanup was done by Cesar Chavez Language Academy but usually (annually) it is the final project we do with Roseland Creek elementary. All together over the past many years we have picked up over 1,000 pounds of trash from that stretch of creek!

I am always so sorry to see our community continuing to build on the sweet open spaces we have left. Personally, it just tears me apart as you so keenly observe the replacement of open space with development has a big impact and I agree. I offer you my support in your efforts to try and help the creek by addressing the development of that parcel.

Regards,
Ryan

[EXTERNAL] Community Concerns - Stony Point Flats Development Project

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 9:29 AM

To: Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>; Fleming, Victoria <VFleming@srcity.org>; Schwedhelm, Tom <tschwedhelm@srcity.org>; CMOOffice <CMOffice@srcity.org>
Cc: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Dear Elected Officials of Santa Rosa,

My name is Ryan Schwab, and I greatly appreciate your time during your busy schedules. I am contacting you today regarding the proposed Stony Points Flats Project (2268 Stony Point Road) with a Design Review Board meeting scheduled for June 3, 2021 at 4:30pm. I wanted to discuss the multiple evacuation, traffic, and environmental related concerns that our community has.

I first off wanted to discuss the evacuation hazards this project poses and the considerable concerns we have in the event of an emergency. The proposed egress and ingress to the property is tremendously inadequate to accommodate over 100 residents' entry and exit to the property. The only entry/exit does not have a turn lane, stop light, nor a southbound exit, posing traffic hazards, congestion, and potential back-ups for northerly flowing traffic up Stony Point Rd.

There have been three fires over the past 10 years along the Roseland Creek trail directly surrounding the parcel set to be developed. If one of these fires occurs again, which is highly likely, the future residents would be in grave danger. Future residents can only make a right turn (north) out the property with a median blocking any possible southbound travel. Development plans do not adequately address this life-threatening hazard. It is exceptionally uncommon for there to be only one exit and one way to turn out of a dense community. This could force residents to attempt to escape a disaster with only one option and this one option could put them directly into the oncoming path of a fire or another hazard. The amount of cars that would be required to drive towards a potential disaster then make U-turns to go southbound would not be realistically feasible during a time of mass evacuation and panic. Many neighbors are still distraught from how jam-packed the roads were in the early morning hours when evacuation was demanded during the most recent fires. It took some households over three hours to leave town due to the tremendous amount of traffic and backup of people attempting to flee for their lives.

The additional traffic related hazards are also quite concerning. As mentioned above, residents wanting to drive southbound out of the apartment complex must first make a right turn (north). They then will either need to "play it safe" and turn into the narrow streets of the Stony Ranch subdivision on Trombetta Street to travel through the neighborhood onto Giffen Ave in order to turn left at the light. The other option is to make a potentially unsafe U-turn at the Giffen Ave/Stony Point intersection. The Giffen/Stony Point intersection is kitty-corner to Robert L. Stevens Elementary School (2345 Giffen Ave). The Giffen/Stony Point intersection was never meant to have this type of frequent U-turn activity at this hectic intersection frequented by children and their parents. The Giffen/Stony Point intersection prohibited U-turns up until recently, however this decision was made prior to school related traffic and regular traffic returning to peak levels now that the pandemic is subsiding.

Additional noted concerns are that future residents traveling southbound on Stony Point to return to their residences will not be able to make a left turn into the property, as there is a concrete median with no plans or space to turn it into a left hand turn lane. To enter the property southbound, residents would need to pass the property, then either make an illegal U-turn at Hearn or continue driving until

they are able to turn around. This is not only extremely inconvenient for the future residents, but downright dangerous for them and the surrounding neighborhoods. Many serious car accidents already occur on this treacherous stretch of Stony Point, and approval of this project will exacerbate this known problem.

If this project moves forward as planned, day-to-day traffic will be even more severe and dangerous than what it currently is. Many neighbors cannot imagine what it will be like in the event of another evacuation that has scarred everyone in the community. With most new developments now occurring in Roseland, neighbors are terrified that they will be unable to escape the next disaster (fire, earthquake, etc).

There are also a multitude of environmental concerns with this development as well. The Roseland Creek is fragile and cannot afford any additional damage. Many of us walk the Roseland Creek trail frequently and know how magical this area truly is. Part of the parcel set to be developed is designated as a seasonal wetland by Army Corps of Engineers and backs up to the Roseland Creek Open Space Preserve. This is frequented by the tiger salamanders, frogs, egrets, ducks, foxes, hawks, owls, and an abundance of other life. Approximately 80% of the parcel is designated by FEMA as a "Special Flood Hazard Area" which is the riskiest area to develop in. The project requires importing a tremendous amount of backfill soil on top of this seasonal wetlands, which will permanently eradicate the habitat of this wildlife. No amount of mitigating "credits" can compensate for the loss of habitat due to this project and the other numerous developments coinciding within two square miles.

Additionally, according to the developer's Universal Planning Application, "Stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new on site stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system..., which discharges into the Roseland Creek." This has potential for additional irreparable damage to the Roseland Creek. This would increase the enormous amounts of trash and debris that is collected annually by the Cesar Chavez Language Academy and Roseland Creek elementary schools during their Roseland Creek Clean-Up days. The most recent creek clean-up was April 18th of this year where they collected over an astounding 200 pounds of trash. They also claimed that over the years they have totaled over 1,000 pounds of trash removed from this beautiful stretch of creek. This environmentally sensitive area cannot handle new development and any new pollution, especially during the frightful drought we are in which is also stressing the wildlife in the area.

There is large and growing number of residents saddened and talking about how reckless a development would be on this parcel with nearly 100% of it being hardscape on slab construction with no reprieve for the wildlife that calls that area home. Many are also terrified at the prospect of the numerous traffic and evacuation related issues and the PTSD that many residents suffer from whenever fire and evacuation concerns enters their minds. We all know that affordable housing is needed, but we shouldn't be forcing every square peg into every round hole. Rural open space is needed to keep us and our environment safe.

Again, thank you for taking the time and reading our concerns. We truly hope you take this message to heart and help us concerned citizens take action before it is too late. I would greatly appreciate a response with any additional guidance.

Sincerely,

Ryan Schwab

Trombetta United & Residents First Roseland

RE: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Road - Request for Tentative Map for North Point Parkway Extension

STEVAN HUNTER <gaurdello@hotmail.com>


Wed 5/26/2021 1:59 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Cc: Jamie McKenna (Hotmail) <mckenna1214@hotmail.com>

Sure, thanks for the update.

All these Stony Ranch Subdivision buyers (including my wife & I = lot #17) were shown these drawings prior to purchasing the parcels. They wanted to let us know in advance about the North Point Parkway Extension. It's difficult to see the full picture without an overall plan that relates the Stony Ranch Subdivision plan-set to the proposed project at 2268 Stony Point Rd, this is why I've been trying to locate additional information. When we purchased we were hoping that when North Point Parkway Extension project was underway that the triangular section east of NP Parkway (and directly behind our house) could be made into a park with a community garden, we also considered purchasing it ourselves and developing it.



FYI, the lots west of #19 have a more robust sound wall (which I believe is higher, possibly thicker) and then from lot #17 easterly it's shorter. That section of wall wasn't intended to block traffic noise. It's possible the current project developer shifted the North Point Parkway Extension easterly to maximize space for his project, I don't know. If that were to have occurred then that could also explain the acreage discrepancy so

many people have commented on. I don't know what happened so without seeking more information I can't really comment. On the subject of acreage, I'm not sure how City of Santa Rosa calcs. acreage for development purposes, but I've spoken to the County planners and they seem to have settled on 'net acreage' over 'gross acreage'. Essentially when a parcel is encumbered roads or Right of Way (ROW) limits then the acreage for development is calculated as (gross acreage – ROW acreage = net acreage). Then net acreage is what's used to calc. # of units. I'd like to see how the developer calculated acreage & units for this development.

I also noticed on the developers drawings that the Northpoint Parkway extension now conflicts with a 70' tall (68" diameter) Eucalyptus tree. It would be a shame to lose this tree as it's home to hundreds of birds including Red Tail Hawks. I frequently see Red Tail Hawks perched on the tree along with hundreds of other birds. People here love seeing the natural beauty of such a unique tree home to so many birds.

Let me know if you discover any more info on the North Point Parkway Extension. It appears there would be many benefits to having North Point Parkway Extension be conditional to the 2268 Stony Point Rd project.

One last thing, I'm about to get solar panels installed, the panels are going on a standing seam metal roof structure which is lower than my house roof. I'm concerned that if North Point Parkway Extension were to deviate from the Stony Ranch Subdivision plans we've been using that street trees or lamp standards could shade the panels and reduce their efficiency.

Stay in touch, thanks for the continued research!

Stevan Hunter & Jamie McKenna
707-387-6343

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [McKay, Conor](#)
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 4:14 PM
To: [STEVAN HUNTER](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Road - Request for Tentative Map for North Point Parkway Extension

Hello Stevan,
Thank you for your patience. The City is currently identifying and reviewing all documents that discuss this extension. Please reach out to me in a couple weeks to check in to see where we are at with review of this issue.

Thank you,

Conor McKay (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department

has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact planning@srcity.org. To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to permitsubmittal@srcity.org.

From: STEVAN HUNTER <gaurdello@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 1:05 PM


To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Road - Request for Tentative Map for North Point Parkway Extension

Hi Conor,


Can you forward the Tentative Map (or any other planning docs) which show the proposed extension for North Point Parkway. There appears to be a discrepancy between the drawings from Stony Ranch Subdivision and the proposed 2268 Stony Point Rd projects.

Below is a screen capture from the **Stony Ranch Subdivision** (Record Plans - dated June of 2015). Notice that the beginning of the curve is occurring approximately 250 LF from Stony Point Rd.




NOTE:
REMOVE EXISTING 12KV OVERHEAD POWER LINE BETWEEN POINTS 'A' & 'B'. REPLACE WITH UNDERGROUND CONDUIT ALONG SAME HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT. AT POINT 'A' UNDERGROUND CONDUIT TO RETURN TO OVERHEAD TRANSMISSION LINE AT EXISTING POWER POLE. AT POINT 'B' UNDERGROUND CONDUIT TO RETURN TO OVERHEAD TRANSMISSION LINE WITH INSTALLATION OF NEW POWER POLE.

APR 125-461-013 03.13.21 10:40 AM



Below is a screen capture of the proposed project at **2268 Stony Point Road** (Minor Design Review - dated March 2021). The beginning of the curve appears to be at about 370 LF from Stony Point Road.



Please forward the following so I can assess the project's impacts:

- 1) the proposed extension plan for North Point Parkway (PDF preferred)
- 2) the topographic survey conducted for 2268 Stony Point Road (PDF preferred)

Thank you,

Stevan Hunter
707-387-6343

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Steve Olson

2409 Dunaway Dr., Santa Rosa, Ca. 95403
707-595-4640 (L) 707-481-1456 (C) olsonsa@sbcglobal.net

May 14, 2021

Mr. Conor McKay, City Planner
Mr. Andrew Trippel, Acting Supervising Planner
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave.
Santa Rosa, California 95404

Dear Mr. McKay & Mr. Trippel:


I'm writing as a follow-up to the May 3, 2021 Neighborhood Meeting dealing with the Stony Point Flats project. There was a considerable amount of misinformation presented at the meeting by members of the public that I would like to correct. The property located at 2268 Stony Point is owned by my deceased mother's estate and I am the designated administrator of the estate. I grew up on the property and lived there from 1948 until 1963 when I left to attend college. I returned to Santa Rosa in 1970 and raised livestock on the property for another 30 years. I doubt there is anyone that has more first-hand experience with the property than myself.

I recall someone stating the property has poor drainage and there was 2' of water on the property during rainy weather. This is absolutely false. The realignment of Roseland Creek many years ago and the drainage required with the widening of Stony Point more recently insures good drainage on the property. I also heard someone describe the damage to project would have on wildlife including deer. I've never seen a deer on the property in 70 years.

Someone also talked about tenant being evicted from the property. The property is currently rented to two parties. There is a tenant in the house and another tenant rents the pasture. Both tenants have been regularly informed about the impending sale and potential development. They are both prepared to move when the time comes.

If you have any questions about the history of the property, its use or characteristics please feel free to contact me.

Best Regards,



Steve Olson
Administrator
M.W. Olson Trust



May 15, 2021
Mr. Connor McKay
Mr. Andrew Trippel
Planning Department
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA. 95404

Gentlemen,

I am a tenant in the house located at 2268 Stony Point Rd. and have resided there under a month-to-month rental agreement since April 2015. I'm fully aware the property is for sale and will likely be developed into affordable housing within a few months. I'm also aware of some of the inaccurate information shared by nearby residents about the property especially about flooding and wildlife habitat. In the six years I've lived here I have never seen a deer, fox or other four-footed critters on the property. I have also not seen the flooding that some people have described.

I have enjoyed my time on the property but the house and outbuilding are very tired. It is time for them to go and the property utilized for a higher and better use.

Respectfully,

Craig Halmhofer
2268 Stony Point Rd.
Santa Rosa, Calif. 95407

From: Erin Rineberg
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya_Michelle); steverabino@aol.com; aedeicke@gmail.com; Carter, Charles; [Parker Sharron, Adam](mailto:Parker_Sharron, Adam); kevinsea@yahoo.com; gleyshull@gmail.com; cquandt@comcast.net
Subject: [EXTERNAL] June 24, 2021 Waterways Advisory Committee Meeting Public Comment Regarding Item 6.1 - STONY POINT FLATS APARTMENTS - 2268 Stony Point Road - DR21-023
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 12:22:25 PM

June 24, 2021 Waterways Advisory Committee Meeting Public Comment Regarding Item 6.1 - STONY POINT FLATS APARTMENTS - 2268 Stony Point Road - DR21-023

June 23, 2021

To the members of the Waterways Advisory Committee,

I request the Waterways Advisory Committee to require and reserve any comments on the effects of this proposed development until a full and appropriate EIR is completed as required by CEQA. The proposed development at 2268 Stony Point Road is directly in the “areas where sensitive species might be present” pursuant to figure 7-2 of the Santa Rosa General plan, which according to the email we received from Conor McKay, dated June 22, 2021, is under your purview. It is my understanding at this time that the EIR has not been completed and the developer plans to use the existing 2016 Roseland Specific Plan’s EIR in lieu of their own, in violation of the CEQA regulations.


The current plans for this proposed development also indicate that the entire project will be inundated with hardscape, including tons of compacted infill dirt to raise the project out of the flood plain, and will potentially divert rainwater away from the creek and the current seasonal wetlands that inhabit this parcel, which is a direct violation of OSC-D-9, that requires “natural topography and vegetation is preserved along the creek, and that construction activities do not disrupt or pollute the waterway.” The project plans to divert drainage directly into the creek and thus polluting the waterway. This plan is also in direct conflict with the Committee’s mandate under OS-2-2 which is the committee’s duty to “Ensure floodplain protection by retaining existing open areas... needed to retain stormwater, recharge aquifers, and prevent flooding.” Here we have an existing floodplain and seasonal wetland that is proposed to be destroyed and covered with hardscape. Furthermore, this hardscape plan would eliminate portions of the land surrounding the creek thus preventing recharge of the ground water and Roseland Creek.

Since this proposed project lies within the 100 year flood plain and established riparian wetland habitat, it is also in violation of OSC-E, which requires development to “ensure local creeks and riparian corridors are preserved, enhanced, and restored as habitat for fish, birds, mammals, and other wildlife.” Paving over instead of preserving sensitive riparian corridors and seasonal wetlands on this property limits the restoration efforts of “habitat for fish, birds, mammals, and other wildlife” in the area, which is in direct violation to the General Plan goals. This destroys instead of preserves as required in Section 4.4 of

the Design Guidelines II.A.7 that “where riparian growth extends outside the Creek Setback Line, preserve and protect this important part of the creek corridor.” It also ignores key parts of the Creek Master Plan, including HA-1-2 to “recognize the 100-year floodplain, and allow for stream corridor restoration” and WQ-2-1 “to reduce drainage system discharge of non-point source pollutants.” Instead the project's plan is to divert runoff from the parking lot into the creek and to build the building up out of the floodplain with tons of compacted hardscape, permanently destroying the ecological and water recharge systems on the site. These actions jeopardize the health of Roseland creek and potentially cause catastrophic flood issues to neighboring open spaces.

The applicant's proposed development site at 2268 Stony Point Road is close in proximity (0.4 miles) to Hearn avenue. It is noted on the October 28, 2002 Summary design for the Conceptual Design for Colgan Creek Stream Restoration project, on page 6 of 17, the note that “[r]esidences in the vicinity of Hearn have shallow wells” and that “[i]t is important to consider that flood conveyance can decrease groundwater recharge.” The current design has similar effects to the area including the potential to convey flood waters downstream given the current hardscape design. The plan also lacks “filtering recharge techniques” as required under Design Guidelines Section 4.4 part II.B.2, threatening water health and safety.

Furthermore, Mr. McKay's presentation indicates the setback for 30 feet because 2268 Stony Point Road is surrounded by properties developed using zoning guidelines established prior to 2004; however, this fails to adequately consider that all but one of the structures that directly surround this property have no encroachment within the 50 foot setback as shown in the photo below. To grant a 30 foot setback to applicants because there is a single parcel that has structures using a 30 foot setback violates one of the fundamental purposes of the Waterways Advisory Committee's duties to preserve Rosland Creek, the species that inhabit it, and the protection of the flood plains as is mandated as the objectives of the Waterways Advisory Committee by its own Master Plan. As such the Waterways Advisory Committee should require a 50 foot setback.



This hearing should be postponed and recommendations reserved until the applicant has completed the proper studies necessary for this committee to properly assess the environmental impacts to Roseland creek, as is your mandate. In the alternative, a subsequent hearing should be scheduled after the completed EIR is received so additional and revised recommendations can be provided to the Design Review Board.

Sincerely,

Erin Rineberg
2225 Burbank Ave
714-260-5734

From: Devina Douglas
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya.Michelle)
Cc: steverabino@aol.com; cquandt@comcast.net; gleyshull@gmail.com; kevinsea@yahoo.com; [Parker Sharron, Adam](mailto:Parker.Sharron.Adam)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats public comment
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 12:31:59 PM
Attachments: [Waterways Comm. Public Comment.pdf](#)

Please see attached.

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.

June 23, 2021

To the members of the Waterways Advisory Committee,

I request the Waterways Advisory Committee require and reserve any comments on the effects of this proposed development until a full and appropriate EIR is completed as required by CEQ, and to carefully evaluate the issues presented below.

The proposed development at 2268 Stony Point Road is directly in the “areas where sensitive species might be present” pursuant to figure 7-2 of the Santa Rosa General plan. It is my understanding at this time that the EIR has not been completed and the developer plans to use the existing 2016 Roseland Specific Plan’s EIR in lieu of their own, in violation of the CEQA regulations.

The current plans for this proposed development also indicate that the entire project will be inundated with hardscape, including tons of compacted infill dirt to raise the project out of the flood plain, and will potentially divert rainwater away from the creek and the current seasonal wetlands that inhabit this parcel. The project plans to divert drainage directly into the creek and thus polluting the waterway. This plan is also in direct conflict with the Committee’s mandate under OS-2-2 which is the committee’s duty to “Ensure floodplain protection by retaining existing open areas... needed to retain stormwater, recharge aquifers, and prevent flooding.” Here we have an existing floodplain and seasonal wetland that is proposed to be destroyed and covered with hardscape. Furthermore, this hardscape plan would eliminate portions of the land surrounding the creek thus preventing recharge of the ground water and Roseland Creek.

Paving over instead of preserving sensitive riparian corridors and seasonal wetlands on this property limits the restoration efforts of “habitat for fish, birds, mammals, and other wildlife” in the area, which is in direct violation to the General Plan goals. This destroys instead of preserves as required in Section 4.4 of the Design Guidelines II.A.7 that “where riparian growth extends outside the Creek Setback Line, preserve and protect this important part of the creek corridor.” It also ignores key parts of the Creek Master Plan, including HA-1-2 to “recognize the 100-year floodplain, and allow for stream corridor restoration” and WQ-2-1 “to reduce drainage system discharge of non-point source pollutants.” Instead the project’s plan is to divert runoff from the parking lot into the creek and to build the building up out of the floodplain with tons of compacted hardscape, permanently destroying the ecological and water recharge systems on the site. These actions jeopardize the health of Roseland creek, and potentially cause catastrophic flood issues to neighboring open spaces.

The applicant’s proposed development site at 2268 Stony Point Road is close in proximity (0.4 miles) to Hearn avenue. It is noted on the October 28, 2002 Summary design for the Conceptual Design for Colgan Creek Stream Restoration project, on page 6 of 17, the note that “[r]esidences in the vicinity of Hearn have shallow wells” and that “[i]t is important to consider that flood conveyance can decrease groundwater recharge.” The current design has similar

effects to the area including the potential to convey flood waters downstream given the current hardscape design. The plan also lacks “filtering recharge techniques” as required under Design Guidelines Section 4.4 part II.B.2, threatening water health and safety.

Furthermore, the setback fails to adequately consider that all but one of the structures that directly surround this property have no encroachment within the 50 foot setback. To grant a 30-foot setback to applicants because there is a single parcel that has structures using a 30 foot setback violates one of the fundamental purpose of the Waterways Advisory Committee’s duties to preserve Roseland Creek, the species that inhabit it, and the protection of the flood plains as is mandated as the objectives of the Waterways Advisory Committee by its own Master Plan. As such the Waterways Advisory Committee should require a 50 foot setback.

I concur with others who have written in on this project, namely that this hearing should be postponed and recommendations reserved until the applicant has completed the proper studies necessary for this committee to properly assess the environmental impacts to Roseland creek, as is your mandate. In the alternative, a subsequent hearing should be scheduled after the completed EIR is received so additional and revised recommendations can be provided to the Design Review Board.

Sincerely,

Devina Douglas and Matthew Pierce
Rising Moon Lane, Santa Rosa

From: Ryan Schwab
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya_Michelle); steverabino@aol.com; aedeicke@gmail.com; Carter, Charles; [Parker Sharron, Adam](mailto:Parker_Sharron, Adam); kevinsea@yahoo.com; gleyshull@gmail.com; cquandt@comcast.net
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Waterways Advisory Committee Meeting - STONY POINT FLATS APARTMENTS - 2268 Stony Point Road
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 2:54:05 PM

Dear Waterways Advisory Committee,

My name is Ryan Schwab, and I am contacting you today regarding the proposed Stony Points Flats Project (2268 Stony Point Road) set to break ground in September of this year. I wanted to discuss the multiple environmental and waterway concerns that I have.

The project abuts the Roseland Creek which as you know is fragile and cannot afford any additional damage. Many of us in the community walk the Roseland Creek trail frequently and know how magical this area truly is. Part of the parcel set to be developed is designated as a seasonal wetland by the Army Corps of Engineers and backs up to the Roseland Creek. This is frequented by the tiger salamanders, frogs, egrets, ducks, foxes, hawks, owls, and an abundance of other life. Approximately 80% of the parcel is designated by FEMA as a "Special Flood Hazard Area" which is the riskiest area to develop in. The project requires importing a tremendous amount of backfill soil on top of this seasonal wetlands, which will permanently eradicate the habitat of this wildlife. No amount of mitigating "credits" can compensate for the loss of habitat due to this project and the other numerous developments coinciding within two square miles.

Additionally, according to the developer's Universal Planning Application, "Stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new on site stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system..., which discharges into the Roseland Creek." This has potential for additional irreparable damage to the Roseland Creek. This would increase the enormous amounts of trash and debris that is collected annually by the Cesar Chavez Language Academy and Roseland Creek elementary schools during their Roseland Creek Clean-Up days. The most recent creek clean-up was April 18th of this year where they collected over an astounding 200 pounds of trash. They also claimed that over the years that they have totaled over 1,000 pounds of trash removed from this beautiful stretch of creek. This environmentally sensitive area cannot handle new development and any new pollution, especially during the frightful drought we are in which is also stressing the wildlife in the area.

Furthermore, rainwater that would otherwise penetrate the soil and help recharge the city's precarious ground water supply will now be mixed with pollutants and be carried downstream by the creek. It is important that the city understands the detriments that will occur to the strained water supply if new developments continuously get approved in the area. It will be a sorrowful day when we look back and the recently announced "20% Voluntary Community-Wide Reduction in Water Use" becomes mandatory, and that 20% reduction continues to increase to keep up with demand of this lacking water supply. The city should carefully consider the double-detriment that is being caused when semi-rural land is covered by hardscape preventing groundwater recharge while at the same time increasing the city's population by the thousands on this very same land.

Thank you for taking the time and reading my concerns. I truly hope you take this message to heart and help us concerned citizens take action before it is too late.

Thank you,

Ryan Schwab

From: Maygol Yavari
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya_Michelle); steverabino@aol.com; aedeicke@gmail.com; Carter, Charles; Parker Sharron, Adam; kevinsea@yahoo.com; gleyshull@gmail.com; cquandt@comcast.net
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats - 2268 Stony Point - Water Concerns
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 4:31:48 PM

Hello Waterways Advisory Committee,

My name is Maygol Yavari-Behrouz, and I have specific concerns related to the proposed Stony Points Flats Project (2268 Stony Point Road) that will be discussed at the Waterways Advisory Committee meeting tomorrow, June 24th, 2021. Many people in the community are saddened to see this precious land be developed when there is so much at stake. We are disheartened that dense projects such as this one are considered when abutting this beautiful creek.

The drought is threatening not only the susceptible wildlife that call that area home, but also the wellbeing of residents that surround that parcel. We have several friends that back up to the property from Burbank Ave that are on well-water. With this frightful drought, there are major concerns that their well will eventually go dry. There simply is not going to be enough water to go around for all, especially when new developments continue to be approved on a large-scale basis. There are major concerns that paving over wetlands is not allowing our precious groundwater to recharge. Instead of the water being able to saturate and penetrate the soil, it will simply be mixed with debris and pollutants and be carried off by the Roseland Creek. We are scared to consider what the next 5, 10, 20 years and beyond means for the future of Santa Rosa and Roseland. We hope we can preserve this parcel with its documented seasonal wetlands and the developers seriously consider a property that when developed will not be as detrimental to the wildlife, the creek, and the future water supply of Roseland residents.

Thank you,

Maygol Yavari-Behrouz



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: Devina Douglas
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya.Michelle)
Cc: steverabino@aol.com; cquandt@comcast.net; gleyshull@gmail.com; kevinsea@yahoo.com; [Parker Sharron, Adam](mailto:Parker.Sharron.Adam)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats public comment
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 12:31:59 PM
Attachments: [Waterways Comm. Public Comment.pdf](#)

Please see attached.

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.

June 23, 2021

To the members of the Waterways Advisory Committee,

I request the Waterways Advisory Committee require and reserve any comments on the effects of this proposed development until a full and appropriate EIR is completed as required by CEQ, and to carefully evaluate the issues presented below.

The proposed development at 2268 Stony Point Road is directly in the “areas where sensitive species might be present” pursuant to figure 7-2 of the Santa Rosa General plan. It is my understanding at this time that the EIR has not been completed and the developer plans to use the existing 2016 Roseland Specific Plan’s EIR in lieu of their own, in violation of the CEQA regulations.

The current plans for this proposed development also indicate that the entire project will be inundated with hardscape, including tons of compacted infill dirt to raise the project out of the flood plain, and will potentially divert rainwater away from the creek and the current seasonal wetlands that inhabit this parcel. The project plans to divert drainage directly into the creek and thus polluting the waterway. This plan is also in direct conflict with the Committee’s mandate under OS-2-2 which is the committee’s duty to “Ensure floodplain protection by retaining existing open areas... needed to retain stormwater, recharge aquifers, and prevent flooding.” Here we have an existing floodplain and seasonal wetland that is proposed to be destroyed and covered with hardscape. Furthermore, this hardscape plan would eliminate portions of the land surrounding the creek thus preventing recharge of the ground water and Roseland Creek.

Paving over instead of preserving sensitive riparian corridors and seasonal wetlands on this property limits the restoration efforts of “habitat for fish, birds, mammals, and other wildlife” in the area, which is in direct violation to the General Plan goals. This destroys instead of preserves as required in Section 4.4 of the Design Guidelines II.A.7 that “where riparian growth extends outside the Creek Setback Line, preserve and protect this important part of the creek corridor.” It also ignores key parts of the Creek Master Plan, including HA-1-2 to “recognize the 100-year floodplain, and allow for stream corridor restoration” and WQ-2-1 “to reduce drainage system discharge of non-point source pollutants.” Instead the project’s plan is to divert runoff from the parking lot into the creek and to build the building up out of the floodplain with tons of compacted hardscape, permanently destroying the ecological and water recharge systems on the site. These actions jeopardize the health of Roseland creek, and potentially cause catastrophic flood issues to neighboring open spaces.

The applicant’s proposed development site at 2268 Stony Point Road is close in proximity (0.4 miles) to Hearn avenue. It is noted on the October 28, 2002 Summary design for the Conceptual Design for Colgan Creek Stream Restoration project, on page 6 of 17, the note that “[r]esidences in the vicinity of Hearn have shallow wells” and that “[i]t is important to consider that flood conveyance can decrease groundwater recharge.” The current design has similar

effects to the area including the potential to convey flood waters downstream given the current hardscape design. The plan also lacks “filtering recharge techniques” as required under Design Guidelines Section 4.4 part II.B.2, threatening water health and safety.

Furthermore, the setback fails to adequately consider that all but one of the structures that directly surround this property have no encroachment within the 50 foot setback. To grant a 30-foot setback to applicants because there is a single parcel that has structures using a 30 foot setback violates one of the fundamental purpose of the Waterways Advisory Committee’s duties to preserve Roseland Creek, the species that inhabit it, and the protection of the flood plains as is mandated as the objectives of the Waterways Advisory Committee by its own Master Plan. As such the Waterways Advisory Committee should require a 50 foot setback.

I concur with others who have written in on this project, namely that this hearing should be postponed and recommendations reserved until the applicant has completed the proper studies necessary for this committee to properly assess the environmental impacts to Roseland creek, as is your mandate. In the alternative, a subsequent hearing should be scheduled after the completed EIR is received so additional and revised recommendations can be provided to the Design Review Board.

Sincerely,

Devina Douglas and Matthew Pierce
Rising Moon Lane, Santa Rosa

From: Maygol Yavari
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya_Michelle); steverabino@aol.com; aedeicke@gmail.com; Carter, Charles; Parker Sharron, Adam; kevinsea@yahoo.com; gleyshull@gmail.com; cquandt@comcast.net
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats - 2268 Stony Point - Water Concerns
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 4:31:48 PM

Hello Waterways Advisory Committee,

My name is Maygol Yavari-Behrouz, and I have specific concerns related to the proposed Stony Points Flats Project (2268 Stony Point Road) that will be discussed at the Waterways Advisory Committee meeting tomorrow, June 24th, 2021. Many people in the community are saddened to see this precious land be developed when there is so much at stake. We are disheartened that dense projects such as this one are considered when abutting this beautiful creek.

The drought is threatening not only the susceptible wildlife that call that area home, but also the wellbeing of residents that surround that parcel. We have several friends that back up to the property from Burbank Ave that are on well-water. With this frightful drought, there are major concerns that their well will eventually go dry. There simply is not going to be enough water to go around for all, especially when new developments continue to be approved on a large-scale basis. There are major concerns that paving over wetlands is not allowing our precious groundwater to recharge. Instead of the water being able to saturate and penetrate the soil, it will simply be mixed with debris and pollutants and be carried off by the Roseland Creek. We are scared to consider what the next 5, 10, 20 years and beyond means for the future of Santa Rosa and Roseland. We hope we can preserve this parcel with its documented seasonal wetlands and the developers seriously consider a property that when developed will not be as detrimental to the wildlife, the creek, and the future water supply of Roseland residents.

Thank you,

Maygol Yavari-Behrouz



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: Lorna Edits
To: [Montoya, Michelle](mailto:Montoya.Michelle)
Cc: steverabino@aol.com; [Parker Sharron, Adam](mailto:Parker.Sharron.Adam); [Arthur Deicke](mailto:Arthur.Deicke); gleyshull@gmail.com; [Carter, Charles](mailto:Carter.Charles); cquandt@comcast.net; kevinsea@yahoo.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comments regarding proposed Stony Point Flats
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 4:59:46 PM

Dear Ms. Montoya,
Please ensure that my following comments are inserted into the file for the proposed Stony Point Flats Project.
Thank you

22 June 2021

To the Waterways Advisory Committee,
Regarding: *Stony Point Flats* proposal

It appears that Integrity Housing and Phoenix Development are not adhering to several key provisions within the City of Santa Rosa's 2013 Creek Master Plan. The incorporation of a "new on-site drainage system.....that discharges into Roseland Creek" violates the requirement for stream corridor restoration and requirements that, "reduce drainage system discharge of non-point source pollutants." OSC-E requires that "local creeks and riparian corridors are preserved, enhanced and restored as a habitat for fish, birds, mammals and other wildlife." More than ever, WAC should consider requiring additional habitat preservation and stewardship.

As you aware, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on April 27, 2021, declaring emergency drought conditions in Sonoma County. The decimation of declared wetlands upon which this proposed project sits would further exacerbate the already stressed condition of Roseland Creek upon which wildlife and ecosystems depend for survival. As per Conor McKay's review comments dated May 19, 2021, "This project will **create** (author's bold) and/or replace more than 10,000 SF of impervious surface." Situated on a 100-year flood plain, this proposed project's mostly hardscape violates OS-2-2 requiring the retention of, "open areas needed to retain stormwater, recharge aquifers and prevent flooding."

Relying upon *Roseland's Specific Plan's* antiquated *EIR* from 2016 as a guide to approve this project is a wholly inadequate model. It does not address our current emergency drought condition (which is expected to last for several years) and the extraordinary demands placed upon the recharge areas, aquifers, wells, and wetlands that provide sustenance for humans, wild life and fragile ecosystems.

As a long time Roseland resident and 3rd generation Californian, I revere the land upon which I reside. As Mr. David Rabbitt, board liaison to Sonoma Water stated, "Immediate water savings are needed from all members of our community, including urban, commercial, industrial and agriculture. We can only beat this drought if we act together." I implore WAC to

compel developers of *Stony Point Flats* to commission an independent, comprehensive and extensive, EIR. It is a privilege to live in this beautiful area and it is our duty to preserve it. Let us not take for granted the ecosystem and waterways that provide for our good health and well-being.

Sincerely,

Lorna Mc Bade

1422 Trombetta Street

Santa Rosa, California 95407

From: Ryan Schwab
To: [McKay, Conor](#); [Rose, William](#); [Trippel, Andrew](#); [Sprinkle, Rob](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Staff Response to Comments - Stony Point Flats - PRJ21-012
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 8:33:41 AM
Attachments: [B4820C4A65E940E3801417A36BB7D814.png](#)
[663DB11CDA2045D38EC3974D92526409.png](#)
[B3B484CCC1E544ABA380F770AAD61D0B.png](#)
[AD7AC94AF2134B279E711F0C4FCA4A91.png](#)

Hello Conor,

We wanted to check back in and see where the project currently stands. The community has been patiently waiting for updates as there has been little new information made available since the last WAC meeting. With the many inquiries that we have received from concerned citizens over the last 6 weeks, we have asked them to hold off contacting you for now. I advised I would reach out to obtain an update that I would share with them. I hope that help eases you needing to respond to multiple emails.

Thank you,
Ryan

On Tuesday, July 13, 2021, 10:55:45 AM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello Conor and Team,

I am checking back in as it has been several weeks since we have touched base. I wanted to see if you could address my questions in the below email regarding fencing and the Northpoint Parkway Ext.

We have also been reviewing the Roseland Creek Restoration Plan found at the link below. Per the restoration plan map attached, the recommended creek setback per zoning code 20-30.040 for 2268 Stony Point Road is 50 feet (the purple dashed line.) Will you be requiring the recommended 50 foot setback instead of the 30 foot setback as discussed on the Waterways Advisory Committee call?

<https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/13806/Appendix-I---Roseland-Creek-Restoration-Concept-Plan->

Thank you,
Ryan

On Thursday, June 24, 2021, 11:56:56 AM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello Conor,

At the Waterboard Advisory Committee meeting today, the developer indicated that due to public comment that they would be removing all fencing from the project. While the community has mentioned fencing is not as pertinent on the southern creek facing side of the property, we have always advocated for solid fencing on the northern and eastern boundaries to assist with light and noise pollution mitigation. I do not believe removing all fencing was anybody but the developer's idea.

I also wanted touch on the new plans provided by the development team. It appears that their project no longer will connect with the future Northpoint Parkway extension. We are worried that this project will now permanently have inadequate ingress/egress to the property which will now be perpetually inadequate if evacuation of the property is ever needed. We have touched on many traffic related inadequacies in previous emails, and it appears that the project now not connecting to the future Northpoint Parkway extension would exacerbate these issues. Thank you for advising on the new Northpoint Parkway extension plan specific to this project and how it correlates to the new development plans.

Thank you,
Ryan