

CITY OF SANTA ROSA  
CITY COUNCIL

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
FROM: GABE OSBURN, DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
SUBJECT: SPRING LAKE VILLAGE EAST GROVE

AGENDA ACTION: INTRODUCTION OF TWO ORDINANCES AND ADOPTION OF  
THREE RESOLUTIONS

---

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission and the Planning and Economic Development Department recommend that the Council: 1) by resolution, certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adopt the CEQA findings of fact and mitigation monitoring and reporting program; 2) introduce an ordinance entitled Ordinance of the Council of the City of Santa Rosa adopting a text amendment to the planned development 0308 Policy Statement for the property located at 5555 Montgomery Drive – Assessor’s Parcel Number 013-080-034, File Number MJP14-012 (REZ14-016), to amend the text of the Spring Lake Village Planned Development Policy Statement (PD-0308); 3) introduce an ordinance entitled Ordinance of the Council of the City of Santa Rosa amending Title 20 of the Santa Rosa City Code by reclassifying the property for the Spring Lake Village East Grove project, located at 225 Los Alamos Road from RR-40-SR (Rural Residential – Scenic Road) to the PD-0308-SR (Planned Development-Scenic Road) Zoning District – Assessor’s Parcel Number 031-101-026, File Number MJO14-012 (REZ14-016), to rezone the property located at 225 Los Alamos Road from Rural Residential-Scenic Road (RR-40-SR) to Planned Development-Scenic Road (PD-0308-SR); 4) by resolution, approve a Minor Conditional Use Permit for a 32-unit Community Care Facility; and 5) by resolution, approve a Hillside Development Permit. This item has no impact on current fiscal year budget.

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The applicant for the Spring Lake Village East Grove Project proposes to expand the existing Spring Lake Village Continuing Care Retirement Community at 5555 Montgomery Drive onto adjacent parcels at 225 Los Alamos Road and 5803 and 5815 Melita Road (7.28 acres total). The project includes 32 independent senior living units, a community building, outdoor common areas, parking, walking paths, landscaping, drainage, lighting, fencing, retaining walls, and related off-site pedestrian, bicycle, stormwater, and utility improvements. Project approvals requested include: EIR

certification; rezoning of 225 Los Alamos Road from RR-40-SR to PD-0308-SR; a zoning text amendment to PD-0308; a Minor Conditional Use Permit for a large community care facility; and a Hillside Development Permit for development on slopes of 10 percent or greater. On March 26, 2026, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the Council certify the EIR, adopt the associated rezoning ordinances, and approve the required entitlement permits.

### GOAL

This item relates to Council Goal #5 – Plan for and Encourage Housing for All and Reduce Homelessness. The proposed project accomplishes this goal by providing a new community care facility in Santa Rosa, offering another option for housing and care for seniors and those with special needs.

### BACKGROUND/PRIOR COUNCIL REVIEW

The Project application was submitted to the Planning and Economic Development Department on December 25, 2014, for 24 independent living units. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that discretionary decisions made by public agencies undergo environmental review. To comply with CEQA requirements, the City of Santa Rosa has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project.

Between the project submittal and initiation of the EIR process, the City developed a Request for Proposals and worked to retain a consultant for the preparation of the EIR and supporting technical documents.

On February 23, 2016, the City Council, by resolution, approved and authorized the Mayor to sign the Agreement for Professional Services with GHD, for the preparation of the Spring Lake Village East Grove Environmental Impact Report.

On May 11, 2016, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR to Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, the Office of Planning and Research, Native American tribes, and neighboring property owners. A public scoping meeting was held on May 23, 2016, at Whited Elementary School, 4995 Sonoma Highway, Santa Rosa, California. Fifteen people signed in at the meeting, with 10 of them speaking on the project. Additionally, nine written comments were received during the 30-day scoping period.

After May 11, 2016, the applicant made changes to the proposed Project by including two single-family lots at 5803 and 5815 Melita Road and increasing the number of units to 32. Following the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Santa Rosa issued a second NOP on August 30, 2017, to update agencies and interested parties about the modified Project and the City's plan to prepare an EIR. During the 30-day scoping period for the second NOP, the City received one comment letter.

Following extensive consultations with the Tribes (Lytton Rancheria and Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria) regarding the project and the required technical studies for

preparing the EIR, the Draft EIR was prepared. The Draft EIR was released for public review on June 1, 2021, with a 45-day circulation period. A Notice of Availability (NOA) and notice of public hearing for the Draft EIR was provided to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (renamed in 2024 to the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation), the Sonoma County Clerk, Responsible and Trustee Agencies, Native American Tribes, organizations and individuals who previously requested such notice in writing, and through direct mailing to owners and occupants of property within 600 feet of the Project site. The NOA was also posted at the Project site and was published in the Press Democrat on June 6, 2021. The Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to State agencies, and the City posted the Draft EIR and NOA on its website. A physical copy of the Draft EIR was made available at the front counter of the Planning and Economic Development Department and the Rincon Valley Branch of the Sonoma County Library. The Draft EIR is also available on the City's website at <https://srcity.org/425/Plans-Studies-EIRs>.

The 45-day review and comment period, and the Planning Commission public hearing meeting on June 24, 2021, aimed to gather feedback on the document's adequacy in identifying and analyzing potential environmental impacts and ways to avoid and minimize the project's significant effects in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15204. Per City Code Section 17-04.180, the Planning Commission must conduct a public hearing to review and comment on the Draft EIR.

On June 24, 2021, the Planning Commission reviewed the Draft EIR and provided comments. Three members of the public and five Planning Commissioners provided comments during the public hearing.

During the 45-day public comment period, the City also received two agency comment letters and 26 emails. The comments received on the Draft EIR primarily focused on concerns about wildfire risks, traffic congestion, water supply, and the adequacy of infrastructure to support the Project during emergencies. Commenters expressed concern about potential emergency evacuation challenges, and the impact on local traffic and safety. There were also concerns about the Project's water usage and its compatibility with existing community resources.

The Draft EIR and Final EIR identify Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative) as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. This alternative would cause less direct disturbance at the Project site and have a smaller overall footprint compared to the original proposal. Specifically, Alternative 2 would keep the two existing single-family homes at 5803 and 5815 Melita Road and reduce the development footprint, thereby decreasing excavation and ground-disturbance work.

Several Planning Commissioners expressed interest in Alternative 2, and on January 9, 2024, the Project applicant resubmitted the project to reflect this alternative. After reviewing the plans, the City shared them and the Draft EIR with the Tribes on October 16, 2024. The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) requested a meeting with the City to discuss tribal cultural resources.

Following this meeting, the applicant made additional modifications to the project based on feedback from the FIGR and submitted revised plans on July 24, 2025. The submitted revised plans on July 24, 2025, reflect the modified version of Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative), which is now the proposed project analyzed in the final EIR.

On March 11, 2026, the Final EIR, which provides responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, as well as revisions to the Draft EIR, was released for public review.

On March 26, 2026, the Planning Commission reviewed the modified version of Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative), which is the project before the City Council, and unanimously recommended approval to the City Council on all the entitlements and certification of the Final EIR.

### Tribal Consultation Background

From April 7, 2016, through September 23, 2025, the City conducted an extensive and ongoing tribal consultation process with representatives from Lytton Rancheria and the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, beginning with formal notification under AB 52 and continuing through multiple meetings, site visits, and iterative review of project materials and environmental documents. Early consultation included requests for cultural resource studies, such as a Phase I archaeological survey, and was followed by site meetings in 2017 and 2018, as well as the preparation and refinement of consultation packages and mitigation measures incorporated into the Draft EIR.

Consultation resumed in 2024 after a temporary project pause, with additional meetings in 2025 to review updated plans, address Tribal concerns, and provide requested materials. Throughout this multi-year process, Tribal input directly informed the evolution of the project, resulting in several substantial design modifications and enhanced mitigation strategies specifically aimed at avoiding, minimizing, and reducing impacts to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources.

On June 27, 2025, the City sent a pre-closure letter to the FIGR to notify the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (Tribe) of the City's intent to conclude the AB 52 Tribal Consultation process.

On July 16, 2025, the City received an email response from the FIGR stating that the concluding consultation on the project is premature and requesting an additional consultation to discuss the project modifications. Following the request, the City met with the tribe on September 23, 2025, for further consultation.

On March 22, 2026, the City sent a closure letter to FIGR concluding tribal consultation, and provided FIGR with links to the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

On March 25, 2026, the City received a letter from the FIGR objecting to the closing of the AB 52 consultation and requesting an additional consultation meeting.

On April 20, 2026, the City sent a final closure letter advising FIGR that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2(b), the City considers the AB 52 consultation to be concluded because the City, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

### ANALYSIS

The project site consists of three parcels totaling 7.28 acres. The parcel at 225 Los Alamos Road is an approximately 5.77-acre vacant lot that contains annual grasslands that are more or less ruderal in character, as well as trees. The two other parcels, located at 5815 Melita Road and 5803 Melita Road, are currently developed with a single-family home and accessory structures.

The proposed Project has been reviewed for General Plan consistency and has been found consistent with both General Plan 2035, which was in effect at the time the project application was submitted and deemed complete, and General Plan 2050, which was adopted in June 2025. The project will add 32 new residential units for seniors, adding new and diverse housing types to the area. The project aligns with the goals and policies of both Plans by contributing to the City's housing stock, and offering diverse housing options in the neighborhood, particularly for seniors and individuals with special needs. The Planning Commission staff report (Attachment 12) includes the Project analysis, which documents consistency with the General Plan and Zoning Code.

### **Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) and Zoning Code Text Amendment**

The proposed project includes a rezoning of the parcel located at 225 Los Alamos Road from RR-40-SR (Rural Residential – Scenic Road) to PD-0308-SR (Planned Development – Scenic Road), which is the zoning district for the existing Spring Lake Village complex located at 5555 Montgomery Drive. Also, the project includes a zoning text amendment to modify the policy statement for PD-0308. The proposed text amendment will default to the City's Zoning Code for land use permitting requirements consistent with the associated General Plan land use designation. As demonstrated in the two attached draft ordinances, staff's analysis has determined that the required findings for the proposed rezoning and text amendment can be made.

### **Conditional Use Permit**

Pursuant to Zoning Code [Section 20-42.060](#), the Project requires a Minor Conditional Use Permit to accommodate the 32-unit community care facility. This Zoning Code Section identifies spacing and concentration of community and health care facilities from other similar facilities. Specifically, the Code prohibits such uses from being located within 300 feet of another such facility, measured from any point on the exterior walls of both structures. The purpose of regulating the concentration of community care and health care facilities is to ensure that these services are available at and convenient to the public, as mandated by State law, while ensuring the preservation of the health,

safety and general welfare of the community and the neighborhood where the facility is proposed.

The closest large community care facility (7 or more clients) is located approximately 900 feet from the proposed facility and is located at 5555 Montgomery Drive, which is the Spring Lake Village facility that is part of this project. As demonstrated in the attached draft resolution, staff's analysis has determined that the required findings for the conditional use permit can be made.

### **Hillside Development Permit**

The Project requires a Major Hillside Development Permit (HDP) pursuant to [Chapter 20-32](#) of the Zoning Code. This regulation applies to any proposed development on a site with a slope of 10 percent or greater. Since the proposed project will alter parts of the lot with slopes exceeding 10 percent, an HDP is necessary. The permit mandates that any development on sites featuring significant natural landforms or characteristics must be designed to minimize alterations to the topography, drainage patterns, and vegetation on slopes of 10 percent or more. As outlined in the attached draft HDP resolution, staff has determined that the findings can be made.

### FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of these actions does not have a fiscal impact on the General Fund.

### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been prepared, circulated, and completed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the project, identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant effects, and analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives. The FEIR, together with the CEQA Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, provides the basis for the Council's consideration of the project.

Section 15126.6 of CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify and discuss a no project alternative, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts.

Alternatives to the proposed project considered for analysis in the EIR are:

- a. No Project Alternative
- b. Maximum Avoidance Alternative

A thorough analysis can be found in section 4.0 Alternatives Description and Analysis. A summary of each project alternative is provided below:

#### ***a. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative***

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the no project alternative

be described and analyzed, “to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project.” The no project analysis is required to discuss “the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (Section 15126.6(e)(2)).”

The No-Project Alternative would leave the existing site as it is without improvements. The existing residences at 5803 and 5815 Melita Road would continue to operate, with no anticipated change in use or to the existing site layout. The property at 225 Los Alamos Road would remain as a RR-40 zoned property that may be developed in the future. There would be no improvement of off-site pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Highway 12, Los Alamos Road, or Melita Road, or off-site storm drain facilities along Los Alamos Road or Melita Road.

Under the No Project Alternative, the vacant parcel at 225 Los Alamos Road, totaling 5.77 acres, could be developed under current land use and zoning designations, subject to discretionary approval by the City of Santa Rosa. Based on the existing zoning designation of the vacant parcel (RR-40), the parcel could potentially be subdivided into five lots, with each lot supporting one single-family residence, one accessory dwelling unit, and one junior accessory dwelling unit (total of 15 dwelling units). Alternatively, the vacant RR-40 zoned parcel could also support a 2 units/acre multifamily residential development, or approximately 10 multifamily residential units. Any future development would be subject to discretionary approval and environmental review by the City of Santa Rosa.

While the no project alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources, it would not meet the project objectives.

***b. Alternative 2 – Maximum Avoidance Alternative***

The Maximum Avoidance Alternative would be located in the same location as the originally proposed project. The total residential units would remain the same at 32 units, but the mix would change from 12 Villa units and 20 cottage units to 18 Villa units and 14 cottage units. The residential Villa building would be located in the same location as under the originally proposed Project, however, it would be a three-story building as opposed to a two-story building. The resident community building would be the same as in the originally proposed Project. The alternative would also include the same vehicle access, and off-site pedestrian, bicycle, storm water and utility improvements as the previously proposed project.

To be considered, an alternative must be potentially feasible. While several alternatives were rejected from further analysis as being infeasible, Alternative 2- Maximum Avoidance Alternative was carried forward in the alternatives

analysis as a potentially feasible alternative in the draft EIR.

After the circulation of the draft EIR, the applicant made further modifications to Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative) to further reduce impacts on cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. The modified version of Alternative 2 is the project currently under consideration.

The City of Santa Rosa Fire Department and Planning and Economic Development Department have concluded that secondary emergency access is not necessary for the modified Alternative 2. According to the 2022 California Fire Code adopted by Santa Rosa, two fire apparatus access roads are only required for developments with more than 50 multi-family units or more than 30 single-family units. Alternative 2 proposes 14 single-family and 18 multi-family units, which are below these thresholds. Additionally, the tallest building in Alternative 2 has a roof-to-wall height of 29 feet 9 inches. Therefore, aerial access requirements do not apply to modified Alternative 2. As such, under modified Alternative 2, the secondary access route passing through the southern portion of the site to Melita Road has been narrowed in width and would serve as a pedestrian pathway. Furthermore, under modified Alternative 2, the pedestrian pathway and associated utility corridor have been slightly relocated to the east. The footprint of Cottage 7 has also been adjusted to better avoid potential sensitive resources. Finally, the on-site rain garden and retention basin have been moved to the north of their previous location. Revisions to the Draft EIR are presented in Chapter 5 of the Final EIR.

### **Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives**

The EIR concludes that the significant impacts of the Maximum Avoidance Alternative would be substantially lessened to a less-than-significant level by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. The Maximum Avoidance Alternative would result in less direct disturbance at the Project site and a smaller overall Project footprint. The reduction of development and avoidance of deeper ground-disturbance elements under the Maximum Avoidance Alternative would substantially reduce direct disturbance, and with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 3.4 and Section 3.13 relative to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, the impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. This alternative would have equivalent impacts to all other resource areas.

### **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an “environmentally superior alternative.” The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative are summarized in Table 4-2 of the Draft EIR. To quantitatively identify an environmentally superior alternative, a value has been applied to each environmental effect. The alternative with the fewest number of impacts and the ability to achieve the most project objectives is the environmentally superior alternative.

The Draft EIR and Final EIR identified Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative) as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. This alternative would meet all of the

project objectives and would cause less direct disturbance at the Project site and have a smaller overall footprint compared to the original proposal. Specifically, Alternative 2 (Maximum Avoidance Alternative) would avoid removing the two existing single-family homes at 5803 and 5815 Melita Road, and also minimize improvements on a portion of the property, thereby reducing the extent of excavation and ground disturbance.

### BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On March 26, 2026, the Planning Commission, in compliance with the City's General Plan and Zoning Code, reviewed the project and unanimously adopted five resolutions, recommending that the City Council 1) certify the Final EIR, and adopt related CEQA Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; 2) approve a Minor Conditional Use Permit; 3) approve a Hillside Development Permit; 4) rezone the property at 225 Los Alamos Road to PD-0308-SR; and 5) adopt a text amendment to PD-0308 for 5555 Montgomery Drive.

### NOTIFICATION

The Project was noticed as a public hearing per the requirements of Chapter 20-66 of the City Code. Notification of this 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 - Project Plans
- Attachment 5 - Landscape Plans
- Attachment 6 - Existing Planned Development 0308 (PD) Policy Statement
- Attachment 7 - New Planned Development 0308 (PD) Policy Statement
- Attachment 8 - Design Review Board Resolution 2024-005
- Attachment 9 - Draft EIR
- Attachment 10 - Final EIR
- Attachment 11 - Planning Commission minutes June 24, 2021
- Attachment 12 - Planning Commission Staff Report March 26, 2026
- Attachment 13 - Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2026-010
- Attachment 14 - Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2026-011
- Attachment 15 - Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2026-012
- Attachment 16 - Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2026-013

- Attachment 17 - Planning Commission Resolution No. PC-RES-2026-014
- Attachment 18 - Public Comments
- Resolution 1/Exhibit A and Exhibit B – EIR
- Ordinance 1/Exhibit A - Zoning Text Amendment
- Ordinance 2/Exhibit A - Rezoning
- Resolution 2/Exhibit A - Conditional Use Permit
- Resolution 3/Exhibit A - Hillside Development Permit

PRESENTER(S)

Monet Sheikhal, Supervising Planner