

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CITY COUNCIL

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: GABE OSBURN, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
SUBJECT: LAGO FRESCA APARTMENTS APPEAL

AGENDA ACTION: RESOLUTION

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Economic Development Department recommends that the Council, by two resolutions: 1) deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Planning Commission to approve a Conditional Use Permit; and 2) deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Design Review and Preservation Board to approve Design Review for the Lago Fresca Apartments Project located at 2445 Summerfield Road and 4744 Hoen Avenue. This item has no impact on current fiscal year budget.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Lago Fresca project involves a multifamily residential development consisting of 50 units. Out of these, four (4) units will be designated as very low-income affordable units, for supportive housing. On November 12, 2025, the Planning and Economic Development Director issued an approval letter for a Density Bonus, and associated incentives and concessions, for the Lago Fresca Apartments Project (Project). The Density Bonus was approved in accordance with California Government Code Section 65915 and Zoning Code sections 20-31.050 and 20-31.060, which allows developers to construct more housing units than typically permitted if they adhere to specific criteria for creating housing that is affordable to lower- or moderate-income households. The site is zoned Office Commercial (CO), consistent with the General Plan Land Use for Office. Zoning Code Section 20-23.030, Table 2-6, allows multi-family use through a Major Conditional Use Permit, and Section 20-23.040, Table 2-7, establishes a density of 30 units per acre for commercial zoning districts. On December 11, 2025, the Planning Commission unanimously approved a Major Conditional Use Permit for the Project to allow a 50-unit multifamily residential development within an Office zoning district. On December 18, 2025, the Design Review and Preservation Board approved Design Review for the Project by a vote of 4-1-1, with one member voting no and one member absent. Concerns were raised during both public hearings from surrounding property owners regarding potential impacts to traffic circulation, parking and future

evacuation needs as a result of the Project. On December 19, 2025, the City Clerk's Office received an Appeal on behalf of the Bennett Valley Community Against Lago Fresca Project, appealing approvals of both the Conditional Use Permit and Design Review.

GOAL

The project will add 50 new residential units, including four deed-restricted affordable units for very low-income households, introducing a new and diverse housing type to the area. This item relates to Council Goal #5 - Plan for and Encourage Housing for All and Reduce Homelessness by introducing a new and diverse housing type to the neighborhood.

BACKGROUND/PRIOR COUNCIL REVIEW

On September 29, 2021, a Pre-application Neighborhood Meeting was held to introduce the project and receive feedback from interested members of the public.

On March 3, 2022, a Concept Design Review package was considered by the Design Review Board.

On August 18, 2022, Conditional Use Permit and Design Review applications were submitted to the City.

On September 16, 2022, a Notice of Application was distributed to property owners and tenants within 1,000 feet of the project site.

On November 12, 2025, the Planning and Economic Development Director issued an approval letter for a Density Bonus, and associated incentives and concessions.

On December 11, 2025, the Planning Commission unanimously approved a Conditional Use Permit to allow a multifamily residential development within an Office zoning district (Resolution No. PC-RES-2025-018).

On December 18, 2025, by a vote of 4-1-1, with one member voting no and one member absent, the Design Review and Preservation Board approved a Design Review application for the Project (DRPB-RES-2025-003).

On December 19, 2025, the City Clerk's Office received an Appeal from Khashayar Ghazzagh, on behalf of the Bennett Valley Community Against Lago Fresca Project, appealing approvals of both the Conditional Use Permit and Design Review.

ANALYSIS

The Planning Commission and Design Review and Preservation Board staff reports (Attachments 12 and 14) include the Project analysis, including documentation of

General Plan and Zoning Code consistency. The following analysis focuses on the grounds for appeal included in the Appeal form, along with responses to each.

Appeal

The following are the grounds for appeal provided by the appellant in their December 19, 2025, Appeal form, followed by City staff's response to each. W-Trans, the applicant's traffic consultant, has also provided a memo, dated January 22, 2026 (Attachment 17), in response to the appellant's comments regarding traffic impacts.

1. **Grounds for Appeal:** "The traffic study (by W-Tran), commissioned and paid for by Mr. Holly (the developer) shows that the data gathered for their report was obtained during Covid's shut down era of 2021. This report clearly shows traffic and parking data was obtained during a time when many were working remotely and while most offices were shut down, hence not many were parking on Hoen Ave and going to their offices. The traffic through this area was also much lighter at that time than it is today. The builder has requested and received ALL concessions (less setback, half the required parking and much bigger height limit to mention a few) in this project by offering the bare minimum amount of units for "low income housing" required under the SBDL. The report seems to rely on street surface parking on Hoen Ave which in reality is not as available today with offices open as the report seems to prove. Even City of Santa Rosa Traffic Engineers admitted to me on us and recognize that the parking for this project is inadequate and that the residents and visitors and services will most likely park in other adjacent properties and various street surface parking. This will undoubtedly create a dangerous and usage precedent for pedestrians, bikes and vehicles traveling through the area."

Response: The project includes a Final Focused Traffic Study for the Lago Fresca Project, dated December 28, 2023, and an associated Addendum, dated December 1, 2025, prepared by W-Trans (both included in Attachment 9), as well as a letter from W-Trans, dated January 22, 2026. The Study, Addendum, and letter, which were all reviewed and found to be accurate by the City's Traffic Engineering Division, used traffic volume data collected in 2019, prior to the Covid-19 pandemic (the City Council adopted a proclamation of existence of a local emergency related to the pandemic on March 3, 2020, approximately one year after the noted 2019 traffic counts were collected). As referenced in the Study, the daily traffic volume on Hoen Avenue, between Yulupa Avenue and Summerfield Road, on 2/19/2019 was measured at 15,093 vehicles. The most recent traffic volume collected on that same section of road was conducted on 3/26/2024 and was measured at 12,013 vehicles. It should be noted that both traffic counts, in 2019 and 2024, were collected on Tuesdays and covered a 24-hour period on both days. The data indicates that the Study's traffic volumes were higher in 2019 than the 2024 traffic conditions, and thus the conclusions related to queue analysis in the study are valid.

Related to parking, because the proposed project includes four affordable units for very low-income households, it is eligible for a Density Bonus under California Government Code Section 65915. Under California Government Code Section 65915, a housing project that provides at least 10 percent of its units affordable to very low-income households is entitled to receive two incentives or concessions and unlimited waivers or reductions of development standards under the State Density Bonus Law. Incentives or concessions are defined as reductions or modifications of development standards that result in identifiable cost savings to the project, such as reduced parking requirements or modified design standards. These incentives or concessions supersede local zoning standards and must be granted by the City upon request, unless the City can make specific findings allowed under state law. According to Section 65915(p)(5), an applicant may request reduced parking ratios as part of the Density Bonus application. Additionally, the statute allows requests for further parking incentives or concessions. Therefore, the applicant's request for a greater parking reduction than the standard limits is consistent with the rights granted under the state Density Bonus Law.

The parking conclusions in the Traffic Study, which are affirmed by the letter from W-Trans dated January 22, 2026 (Attachment 17), remain valid. There is no evidence of safety impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists or vehicles as a result of the proposed parking. Based on the ITE parking demand analysis, the Project would need 64 spaces. The Project proposes 63 on-site parking spaces. As documented in the Traffic Study, while on-site parking would not meet estimated demand by one parking space, there are 52 on-street parking spaces on Hoen Avenue within the study area. The Parking section of the Study concludes that the combination of the proposed on-site spaces and existing street spaces would be adequate to meet demand based on the ITE parking demand rates. Because the street parking includes spaces on the north side of Hoen Avenue, the Traffic Study recommends that a crosswalk be provided. As such, the Project will include a crosswalk, enhanced with RFBs, on Hoen Avenue, approximately 300 feet west of Summerfield Road.

2. **Grounds for Appeal:** "W-Tran's study indicates that the firm obtained their "collisions data" from the city of Santa Rosa from periods between 2017 to 2022. ***Not only 2 years of this data is compromised because of Covid era's lighter traffic from 2020 to 2022, in 2023 we had some significant incidents that are conveniently omitted from their report.*** In March of 2023 a 19 year old female pedestrian was struck by a car and put in CRITICAL CONDITION. This transpired on Hoen Ave, near Sierra Creek's crosswalk which is only a few feet away from this proposed project and yet a new crosswalk. ONLY 43 DAYS BEFORE THIS INCIDENT, Atticus Peason, a 13-year-old boy, was hit by another car in the same crosswalk and subsequently was put in a COMA! Unfortunately, Atticus Pearson passed away a few months later in the hospital after months of being in a coma."

Response: As stated above, the traffic volume data collected in February 2019 indicates that the Study's traffic volumes were higher than current traffic conditions. The Collision History section of the Traffic Study focuses on the intersection of Hoen Avenue and Summerfield Road. The referenced collisions at Hoen Avenue and Sierra Creek Lane are not part of the study. Sierra Creek Lane is a minor local street intersection with a crosswalk that services a bus stop on either side of Hoen Avenue as well as an unmarked trail through the Southeast Greenway Right-of-Way. The proposed development would not add trips to Sierra Creek Lane, nor would it be expected to increase pedestrian crossings at that location, which is why it was not required to be part of the Traffic Study. With that said, the intersection of Hoen Avenue and Sierra Creek Lane has since been improved with a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) warning system to bring awareness to pedestrians crossing Hoen Avenue at that location.

Also, W-Trans has provided updated collision data (Attachment 17) for the intersection of Summerfield Road/Hoen Avenue, covering 2020 through 2024 (the 2025 data has not been finalized yet). Based on the data, the collision rate is 0.25 collisions per million vehicles entering (c/mve), which is lower than the statewide average for similar intersections of 0.33 c/mve. Though a collision rate for the roadway segment was not calculated for the previous study, crashes for the segment between Yulupa Avenue and Summerfield Road were evaluated, as shown in attachment 17. The collision rate for the segment was determined to be 0.94 collisions per million vehicle miles (c/mvm), which is substantially less than the statewide average for three-lane facilities of 1.61 c/mvm. It is noted that while the overall crash rate and the fatality rate were below average, the injury rate was above the average, indicating that while fewer crashes occurred than on average, more of those that occurred resulted in an injury than would be typical.

3. **Grounds for Appeal:** "Lack of adequate parking for residents and **NO PARKING AT ALL FOR VISITORS** pose a serious concern for collisions. Many services such as: USPS, Amazon, UPS, FedEx, food delivery services such as Dominos and Door Dash, or simply family and friends visiting residents is another huge concern. By having inadequate surface street parking on Hoen Ave and no parking on Summerfield Rd, it is absolutely clear to us all that many future residents and visitors will not only park in nearby private business parking lots and even residential roads nearby, the additional crosswalk proposed on Hoen Ave is simply not going to be deter them from jaywalking and dangerous behavior."

Response: The Project provides short-term loading and unloading parking for delivery vehicles and services, which is shown as space number 53 on the

site plan. As mentioned above, since the proposed project includes affordable units, it is eligible for a Density Bonus under California Government Code Section 65915, and an applicant may request a greater parking reduction than the standard limits, which is consistent with the rights granted under the State Density Bonus Law. Further, as discussed above in the response to Grounds for Appeal number 1, the combination of the proposed on-site parking and existing street parking would be adequate to meet demand based on the ITE parking demand rates. As a result, there is no evidence of safety impacts due to the proposed parking.

Further, the letter from W-Trans (Attachment 17) states that pedestrians are legally allowed to cross roadways at locations other than marked crosswalks, unless specifically prohibited. It also mentions that Assembly Bill 2147 (2023) has decriminalized jaywalking in California, allowing pedestrians to cross outside of crosswalks as long as there is no immediate risk of collision. Therefore, while pedestrians can legally cross anywhere along Hoen Avenue between Sierra Creek Lane and Summerfield Road, the proposed marked crosswalk with flashing lights aims to encourage crossings at a designated, visible, and safer location adjacent to the project site.

4. **Grounds for Appeal:** “The developer has not given any consideration for the safety of pedestrians or bikes entering or exiting Lago Fresca via Hoen Ave driveway. Current design is for cars only. That seems to be highly hypocritical to the core of this project’s claims that it is promoting a “public transportation” lifestyle.”

Response: The Traffic Study evaluated the adequacy of site access for all modes of transportation and addressed potential sight distance issues, and found no evidence of impacts to safety of pedestrians or bicyclists. According to the Study: *“Sight distance along Hoen Avenue at the project driveway was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual, 6th Edition, published by Caltrans. The recommended sight distance for driveway approaches is based on stopping sight distance, with the approach travel speed used as the basis for determining the recommended sight distance. Hoen Avenue, which has a posted speed of 35 mph, requires a minimum stopping sight distance of 250 feet. Based on a review of existing field conditions, sight lines for the proposed project driveway at Hoen Avenue extend more than 400 feet to the west and more than 250 feet to the east, both of which are adequate for the posted speed limit.”* The study concludes that the *“Sight distance at the project driveway is adequate for existing conditions and can be retained by ensuring that new landscaping does not impede sight lines from existing or proposed driveways or side streets.”*

The Project is within walking distance of the bus stop on Summerfield Road. Santa Rosa CityBus Route 8 runs approximately every half hour and can be accessed on Summerfield Road just south of Hoen Avenue. Additionally, Route 18 has a bus stop on Hoen Avenue just west of Yulupa Avenue, which operates hourly. This option promotes the use of public transportation.

Also, a crosswalk with enhanced warning devices (rectangular rapid flashing beacons, or RRFBs) will be installed approximately 300 feet west of Summerfield Road to facilitate additional crossings that will occur between the signal at Summerfield and the RRFB at Sierra Creek.

Two 5-foot-wide pedestrian and bicycle paths are provided on both sides of the entry driveway, linking the project site to the sidewalk on Hoen Avenue. The Project architect has provided a site plan showing the location of the two paths (see attachment 18).

5. **Grounds for Appeal:** “The proposed driveway entrance/exit of this project has huge concerns for us all. In reality, vast majority of residents will be exiting the driveway going west on Hoen Ave to go to HWY 12 or HWY 101 or downtown for work, school or shopping and there is no safe or practical way for them to exit. Those cars will have to cross two eastbound lanes and hope to not get hit by that traffic, ONLY IF the lane is not backed up by traffic. We believe City of Santa Rosa has not studied this issue well enough.”

Response: See response below that provides a combined response to Grounds for Appeal 5 and 6.

6. **Grounds for Appeal:** “The proposed Driveway on Hoen Ave is only a few feet away from an existing driveway into 4750 Hoen Ave. That driveway is already highly dangerous, and this project’s new driveway will most certainly make the conditions far worse. Currently, when a patron of 4750 Hoen attempts to slow down and enter the driveway, many times the driver behind assumes that the driver in the front is going to turn south on Summerfield Rd. We have had so many near collisions there because of this existing condition. Now there will be an additional driveway and an additional crosswalk to contend with. This will absolutely make the conditions less safe for residents and patrons in the area.”

Response: The Sight Distance section of the Traffic Study, as well as the January 22, 2026 letter from W-Trans, focuses on the project driveway entrance/exit. Sight distance exiting the project was measured to be adequate for the posted speed limit on Hoen Avenue in both directions. Note also that the project is expected to generate only 19 a.m. peak hour trips and 20 p.m. peak hour trips. During the morning peak, trips from the project driveway would mostly be exiting. During the a.m. peak, the study shows a shorter

queue length. During the p.m. peak, project trips would mostly be entering the driveway. There is no evidence that the Project would impact safety as a result of the proposed driveway location.

7. **Grounds for Appeal:** “The DBL (Density Bonus Laws) were intended to promote high density and low income housing in areas where you find “MAJOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION” and where jobs are plentiful. There is no “major public transportation” anywhere near this project for residents to rely on. Nor is the location of this complex near major job opportunity areas. There is only one bus stop, one route, and the bus only goes by once an hour and not 24/7! Additionally, the bike routes are very unsafe. The bike lane going towards Farmers Lane is cut off by a dangerous “on ramp” of HWY 12 west bound, and the bike lane on Summerfield Rd going to Montgomery Dr abruptly ends at Montgomery drive, exposing riders to significant danger of cars traveling east on Montgomery Dr. We firmly believe that this developer is more concerned with ROI in their project than the safety of its residents and neighbors.”

8. **Response:** A Project that is eligible for a State Density Bonus is not required to be located near major transit stops or near centers of employment. The State Density Bonus Law allows density bonuses for projects providing affordable housing and applies Citywide per [Zoning Code Section 20-31.010](#). However, as noted in the response to Grounds for Appeal 4, the Project is within walking distance of the bus stop on Summerfield Road. Santa Rosa CityBus Route 8 runs approximately every half hour and can be accessed on Summerfield Road just south of Hoen Avenue. Additionally, Route 18 has a bus stop on Hoen Avenue just west of Yulupa Avenue, which operates hourly.

The concerns regarding bike lanes are not related to this Project. The Santa Rosa Active Transportation Plan, adopted in July 2025, does not propose changes to the existing Class IIB bike lanes on Hoen Avenue or on Summerfield Road. Class IIB bike lanes are considered lower stress facilities for bicycle riders, while still maintaining necessary street parking. The proposed development will not change the condition of the Class IIB bike lanes, meaning there is no conflict with the Active Transportation Plan nor with existing street parking. The project applicant is only responsible for any applicable frontage improvements along their property line unless determined otherwise by City staff. Therefore, the project applicant is not responsible for improvements or conditions at the intersection of Summerfield Road and Montgomery Drive.

9. **Grounds for Appeal:** “We believe, and despite the comments by the fire department representative during planning commission meeting on 12/18, the wildfire evacuations which are NEVER ORDERLY in frantic situations is another grave concern. We all have been through many wildfires in our community. And we have all seen the chaos. The fire department seems to

contend that they can control traffic lights and signals to help the exit and do it in phases and areas. In reality, many of us flee in fear in those situations. Also, the reality is that often times there is NO POWER for this cute idea of the fire chief to control traffic signals. There is simply no safe way to exit 200 anticipated residents in this complex as it is designed.”

Response: Critical intersections as determined by the City that will aid in large scale evacuations are now on backup power. The traffic signals that are being used for the “Flush Plan” to aid in evacuations are controlled by Transportation and Public Works staff in coordination with Santa Rosa Police, Fire and Emergency Management. During the 2017 wildfires, areas around the general project area were congested with evacuation traffic. This was as a result of people evacuating from areas that were not required or requested to be evacuated and prior to formal evacuation zones being utilized. During the 2020 Glass Fire, a majority of east Santa Rosa was successfully evacuated. This was because of improvements made by the City since 2017. The City has continued to evaluate and improve the alert and warning systems to help ensure for successful evacuations in the future. City staff from Santa Rosa Police, Santa Rosa Fire and Emergency Management train annually on evacuation procedures and the implementation of phased evacuations.

10. **Grounds for Appeal:** “Traffic patterns have increased on Hoen Ave since merging Slater Jr. High into Montgomery high school. This is a recent change and again, not factored into the traffic study which it’s calculation data were obtained from Covid era!”

Response: While the City does not have traffic count data from the current school year, the closure of Herbert Slater Middle School, which had 577 students enrolled, is not expected to have significant impacts to the traffic volume on this segment of Hoen Avenue, especially given the reduction in traffic volume from 2019 to 2024. As referenced in the Study, and in response to Grounds for Appeal 1, the daily traffic volume on Hoen Avenue, between Yulupa Avenue and Summerfield Road, on 2/19/2019 was measured at 15,093 vehicles. The most recent traffic volume collected on that same section of road was conducted on 3/26/2024 and was measured at 12,013 vehicles.

FISCAL IMPACT

Denial of the Appeal and approval of the Conditional Use Permit and Design Review will not impact the General Fund.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The proposed Project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and qualifies for an exemption under CEQA

Guidelines Section 15332, Class 32 (Infill) exemption. The applicant has submitted a memorandum for the infill exemption environmental analysis, detailing how the Project aligns with the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (subds. a-e) as follows:

- a. The Project site is located in an area designated by the General Plan as Office, which provides sites for administrative, financial, business, professional, medical, and public offices. The Project is within the CO (Office Commercial) zoning district, consistent with the General Plan land use designation, where Multifamily Housing is allowed through a Conditional Use Permit. The 2035 General Plan, which was in place when the project was submitted and deemed complete, included Policy LUL-E-6 that allowed residential or mixed-use development in the Retail and Business Services or Office designations. Additionally, the current General Plan 2050 includes numerous policies and actions in support of residential development and complete neighborhood, as well as Action 2-3.1 that calls for updating the Zoning Code to permit residential and mixed-use development by right in certain nonresidential zoning districts, as mandated by state law.
- b. The Project site is located within Santa Rosa City limits, does not exceed five acres, and is surrounded by urban uses.
- c. The Project site is not within regions designated for special habitats or protected species. The biological assessment report prepared by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 6, 2023, and updated June 18, 2024, indicates that the project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened (including candidate, sensitive, or special status) species due to the absence of suitable habitat conditions and use of surrounding areas.
- d. The Project will not result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impact as explained below:
 - o **Traffic:** A traffic study was conducted by W-Trans on December 28, 2023, to evaluate the proposed project. Subsequently, and addendum by W-Trans dated December 1, 2025, as well as a response to the appeal grounds by W-Trans dated January 22, 2026, were received. The traffic study, addendum and response conclude that the proposed project would generate a low number of new trips, would not substantially impact the City's circulation system and that parking would be adequate. The City's Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the report and did not raise any issues.
 - o **Noise:** The Noise Impact Assessment, dated June 12, 2024, analyzed different sources of noise such as construction activities, traffic, operational/stationary sources, and groundborne vibrations. The

assessment indicates that the project would not result in significant noise effects on the surrounding environment and will maintain acceptable noise levels for nearby residents.

- **Air Quality:** An Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG), and Energy Impacts Analysis Memorandum was prepared for the proposed project on October 17, 2023, and updated on June 14, 2024. The memorandum indicates that the project is consistent with local zoning and does not require a General Plan amendment, as population growth has been considered in the 2017 Clean Air Plan. The project meets the BAAQMD criteria for air quality impacts, with construction emissions controlled through Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to limit dust. Operationally, the project involves 50 apartment units, well below the 451-unit threshold for air quality impacts. As such, the project will not generate significant emissions or air quality impacts. Further, the project is below acceptable thresholds for air quality impacts on sensitive receptors. The proposed project includes all-electric construction, reduced vehicle miles traveled, EV charging infrastructure meeting CALGreen Tier 2 standards, and adherence to the Santa Rosa CAP (Climate Action Plan). Therefore, the project aligns with a Qualified GHG Reduction Plan and will not have significant effects.
- **Water Quality:** The proposed project will be developed in accordance with Low Impact Development (LID) requirements and all relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding stormwater management and runoff. The Engineering Development Services and the Water Department have reviewed the Preliminary Drainage Analysis and the Initial Storm Water Low Impact Development (SWLID) plan. The project has been conditioned to ensure that it does not cause significant impacts on water quality.
- e. The project site is situated in an area where all necessary utilities and public services are accessible. It is located within half a mile of Fire Station 4. Also, the plans have been reviewed and appropriately conditioned by the Fire Department, Water Department, and Engineering Development Services.

The City has further determined that no exceptions to the exemptions apply, and there is no reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances (CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2.) This determination is based on the current development of the site and surrounding area.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted above, both the required Conditional Use Permit and Design Review were approved by the Planning Commission and Design Review and Preservation Board,

respectively. Staff's analysis of the required findings for approval of the Project remains unchanged.

The Planning Commission supported the project unanimously and provided comments that were generally supportive. The Commission noted that the Traffic Study was prepared per industry standards and reviewed by the City Traffic Engineering Division. The Commission identified that the Project addresses multiple needs in one area and aligns with the City's General Plan, as well as the City's goal of providing a variety of housing types.

As mentioned in the Background section of this report, the Design Review and Preservation Board approved the Design Review application by a vote of 4-1-1, with one Board member voting no and one absent. The majority of the Board supported the design of the Project, and provided additional conditions meant to enhance the visual appearance and internal circulation for pedestrians. While the Board member who voted no did not clearly state the reason for his dissent, his comments and suggested conditions focused on the building façade design and pedestrian connectivity from Hoen Avenue entrance to through the Project site, which were included in the final adopted resolution.

NOTIFICATION

The Appeal was noticed as a public hearing for the February 24, 2026, City Council meeting per the requirements of Chapter 20-66 of the City Code. Notification of the public hearing was provided by posting an on-site sign, publishing notice in a newspaper of general circulation, mailed notice to surrounding property owners and occupants, electronic notice to parties that had expressed interest in projects taking place in this geographic area of Santa Rosa, and bulletin board postings at City Hall and on the City website.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65091, where necessary, the City has incorporated notice procedures to the blind, aged, and disabled communities. These procedures include audio amplifier/assistive listening device support at public meetings, closed captioning, and optical character recognition conversion of electronic notices.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – Disclosure Form
- Attachment 2 – Location Map
- Attachment 3 – Project Narrative
- Attachment 4 – Architectural Plans
- Attachment 5 – Landscape Plan
- Attachment 6 – Density Bonus Letter Request
- Attachment 7 – Approved Density Bonus Letter
- Attachment 8 – CEQA Class 32 Memorandum
- Attachment 9 – Traffic Study
- Attachment 10 – Parking Management Plan

LAGO FRESCA APARTMENTS APPEAL
PAGE 13 OF 13

Attachment 11 – Public Comments
Attachment 12 – Planning Commission Staff Report
Attachment 13 – Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2025-018
Attachment 14 – Design Review and Preservation Board Staff Report
Attachment 15 – Design Review and Preservation Board Resolution No. DRPB-RES-2025-003
Attachment 16 – Appeal Package
Attachment 17 – W-Trans Responses to Appeal, January 22, 2026
Attachment 18 - Applicants' Responses to Appeal, January 26, 2026

Resolution 1 – Conditional Use Permit
Resolution 2 – Design Review

PRESENTER

Monet Sheikhal, Supervising Planner