

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

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

A couple of quotes:

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

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

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

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

George

--

Sent from [Postbox](#)

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

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

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

Comment: Dear Santa Rosa

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

Comment Submitted by:

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

Comment:

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

See all comments.

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

--

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

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

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

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

Hi,

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

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

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

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

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

Warren Wiscombe



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Katherine Austin, AIA, Architect



kaaustin@pacbell.net
www.austinaia.com

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

Hello there,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

have a wonderful summer week,
Rue

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

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

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

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

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

-Victor

#001

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

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

#002

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

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

#003

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

What is this map showing? Is it necessary?

#004

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Typo

#005

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Remind what DSASP stands for...

#006

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Typo

#007

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

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

#008

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

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

#009

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

'however' is unnecessary here

#010

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

Type: Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

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

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

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