


Q1 What are some standards for temporary housing that should be added, revised, or removed in this new ordinance? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 228 Skipped: 39



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Number of Units per Site	39.04% 89
On-Site Management	39.47% 90
Allowable Zoning Districts	28.95% 66
Type of Housing Structure	33.33% 76
Duration of Use	56.58% 129
Requirement to be a Natural Disaster Effectuated Property	32.02% 73
Other (please specify)	22.81% 52
Total Respondents: 228	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Parking - 2 spots off the street.	8/18/2023 11:03 PM
2	Electrical services	8/18/2023 5:56 PM
3	Parking	8/18/2023 5:19 PM
4	Number of bathrooms/showers	8/18/2023 10:48 AM
5	Requirement to be personally effected by a Natural Disaster in our County.	8/18/2023 9:51 AM
6	Impact on those living in the area	8/18/2023 9:39 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

7	Number of units for families with disabled children	8/17/2023 11:38 PM
8	remove parking requirements	8/17/2023 9:23 PM
9	Removing parking requirements	8/6/2023 9:54 PM
10	removal of parking requirements, to match new climate-friendly city standards for housing (ie. less than one parking space per site)	8/4/2023 6:35 PM
11	Parking on a case by case	7/28/2023 3:52 PM
12	Development standards	7/26/2023 7:58 AM
13	Parking, and exit and entrance of vehicles from locations	7/24/2023 8:05 PM
14	Privacy fencing added to site	7/24/2023 2:17 PM
15	Refuse removal, no dead vehicles	7/23/2023 8:09 AM
16	Restrict to no more additional units	7/22/2023 8:04 PM
17	waste disposal requirement(s)	7/22/2023 9:59 AM
18	The need for all connecting services to be on site once a week. Mental health, EBT, Drug addiction serve sets, AA, NA, Medical, etc...	7/22/2023 6:34 AM
19	Cost!	7/21/2023 8:52 PM
20	Minimum of two off-street parking spaces per residential unit.	7/21/2023 6:56 PM
21	Trash collection	7/21/2023 6:17 PM
22	1 year at most.	7/21/2023 2:55 PM
23	none applies, Residential prop, "single family", 95403	7/21/2023 12:54 PM
24	nnnn	7/21/2023 10:54 AM
25	Affordability	7/21/2023 10:45 AM
26	Non-residential parcels	7/21/2023 8:50 AM
27	management to insure rules and regulations are in force	7/21/2023 7:54 AM
28	How do you know which I want to be added and which should be removed?	7/21/2023 7:50 AM
29	None,keep housing people	7/21/2023 7:43 AM
30	I'm so sick of homeless cars, trailers, etc. parked by the SRMS.	7/21/2023 5:57 AM
31	not too crowded. restraint on parking, access to parks	7/20/2023 8:52 PM
32	Garbage services and cleanliness	7/20/2023 8:46 PM
33	None of the requirements should be removed.	7/20/2023 7:59 PM
34	ALL new structures, temporary or otherwise, should have roof water collection setups. It's ridiculing in this age of drought, climate change, heat, and limited water resources all over the western USA, that roof water collection isn't REQUIRED for every single rooftop in CA, most especially including Santa Rosa. There should be govt help for those who can't afford to implement water collection. Regarding zoning for temp housing, it should be limited by current zoning. If no multi family units are allowed on a rural residential street, then only one temp housing unit should be allowed. Same as ADU laws. There needs to be strict restrictions regarding crowding and multiple units, which should only be allowed where apartments are allowed. On streets that are not zoned for more than one ADU, likewise, either one temp house OR one ADU. Not both.	7/20/2023 7:06 PM
35	Guidelines for occupying	7/20/2023 7:00 PM
36	why	7/20/2023 6:19 PM
37	Maximum of three years, with renewable for an additional 2 years	7/20/2023 6:15 PM
38	Plenty of outside lights not only for residents but for patrols to have the ability to see areas of	7/20/2023 5:51 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

	concern. Anything new is a target for tagging.	
39	Clean and sober	7/20/2023 5:34 PM
40	Pet policy, number of residents per unit, garbage and recycling, noise, aggressive behavior	7/20/2023 3:26 PM
41	Allow micro housing. Outlaw sleeping on streets	7/20/2023 3:09 PM
42	Personal housing qualifications. Drug testing, proof of looking for employment, education	7/20/2023 3:05 PM
43	More safe parking for RVs.	7/20/2023 2:49 PM
44	I don't think we should allow trailers and RVs on these parcels. Semi permanent structures as opposed to trashy and dilapidated vehicles. I am against the entire ordinance but I realize you will pass this ordinance regardless of the fact that the majority of citizens don't want this.	7/20/2023 2:45 PM
45	more parking for a couple, 2 cars with jobs that commute	7/20/2023 2:43 PM
46	parking	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
47	none	7/20/2023 2:41 PM
48	Garbage service.	7/20/2023 2:06 PM
49	Parking requirements are an undue burden and contribute negatively effect the walk ability of the city.	7/19/2023 12:44 PM
50	eliminate parking minimum, provided sufficient public transit.	7/19/2023 12:08 PM
51	Do not make people that are disabled or unable to move from their camping spot if they clean up. Di not accuse them of littering, take them to jail and throw away their personal belongings..Leaving them at another police station when their phone and money taken make them go to court for months. And please do not threaten the pets. Thank you.	7/18/2023 2:17 PM
52	I think the way it is written up is perfect	7/18/2023 1:02 PM

Q2 Please share your thoughts on the choice(s) you selected for changes and improvements?

Answered: 156 Skipped: 111

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Temporary housing on disaster lots should apply to owner occupied housing and to the person who lost the dwelling. People should not be able to fill their neighborhood lot with rvs and charge rent for 5 years.	8/18/2023 11:03 PM
2	It should be allowable to have generators On site managers f r om 8 -5 depending on the type of unhoused group of people. Having someone to call or is sv a il as ble s e versl yimes a week. Duration needs t o be longer. 5 years after Tubbs not everyone affected is in permanent hou s ing	8/18/2023 5:56 PM
3	Two off street parking spaces per unit should be required. If a supervisor is needed during the day, it seems even more important for a supervisor to be there at night - I don't understand the need for a supervisor. Semi-permanent camping should not be allowed in residential neighborhoods, although a guest in an rv visiting for a couple of days and parking on the street seems reasonable. There must be adequate weekly garbage pick up. I personally don't want to have deteriorating rvs and tents in the neighborhood. Temporary dwellings are not a solution to a lack of permanent housing unless it's directly after a natural disaster (within 5 years or so)	8/18/2023 5:19 PM
4	None	8/18/2023 4:40 PM
5	Some leniency s/b allowed for type of structures, and bathroom/shower count s/b somewhat flexible	8/18/2023 10:48 AM
6	People taking advantage of this ordinance should be required to prove they were directly impacted by a natural disaster. Our neighborhood has been impacted by people taking advantage of the ordinance who moved here from another county after the fires. They have negatively impacted our neighborhood and we have no recourse because of the ordinance. These people are not rebuilding anything- just causing a bad situation for neighbors with impunity.	8/18/2023 9:51 AM
7	a	8/18/2023 9:47 AM
8	Less units to reduce traffic congestion	8/18/2023 8:28 AM
9	To avoid tax increases	8/18/2023 8:16 AM
10	In favor of the above.	8/18/2023 6:32 AM
11	I am homeless and couch surfing with a 4 year old son with autism. You would think that there would be some kind of help but there is absolutely nothing and it makes life harder on myself and especially my son to not have a routine of where we will sleep that night	8/17/2023 11:38 PM
12	Don't arbitrarily limit how long housing can be used.	8/17/2023 9:56 PM
13	Parking spaces are inappropriately restricting urban density required for efficient mass transit services and convenient walking distances to schools and shopping	8/17/2023 9:23 PM
14	Please only consider natural disaster issues	8/17/2023 8:42 PM
15	Other than properties impacted by natural disasters, there should be zone restrictions as well as duration and unit limits.	8/17/2023 6:48 PM
16	Affordable homes are mandated.	8/17/2023 6:30 PM
17	There needs to be firm rules in place. Sanitation and healthy living ordinances need to be enforced.	8/17/2023 6:29 PM
18	Time frame should always be defined to set accurate expectations. Type of house should be clear and parameters well defined.	8/17/2023 6:24 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

19	On-site management can be expensive. The City may consider increasing the number of units to 10 or more units. Duration should go hand-in-hand with the time to rebuild/recover units. Or at least remain flexible.	8/15/2023 11:25 AM
20	streamline more units allows more affordable housing	8/8/2023 1:51 PM
21	Temporary housing could be useful to many house builders, not just those affected by a disaster. 7 years would be better than 5. Parking requirements decrease potential density, increase costs, assume everyone has a private vehicle, and are unnecessary for those that will add them anyway.	8/6/2023 9:54 PM
22	less parking space requirements could allow for more housing	8/4/2023 6:35 PM
23	Get rid of homeless housing if you feed stray cats they will stay	8/3/2023 1:08 PM
24	24 hr on site management	7/30/2023 8:27 AM
25	Santa Rosa is too congested. With the water shortage and fire evacuation problems PLEASE STOP adding more problems. Crime has gotten worse by the day. Help the residents who are paying high taxes as things continue to decline.	7/29/2023 3:28 PM
26	Could be even one unit per site depending on the site?	7/28/2023 3:52 PM
27	We need housing solutions, so I want to keep the threshold for creative solutions to get up and running low, not put the standards up so high they are effectively out of reach. But I also want recourse for adjacent neighborhoods to be able to rein in abuse of the privilege when such housing incurs excessive noise, illegal or dangerous activity, and piles of garbage.	7/27/2023 2:17 PM
28	Limiting temporary structures to parts of the city impacted by disaster creates an impediment when basic services such as electricity, water, wastewater, storm drainage, etc may not be available in these areas. It would make more sense to allow temporary housing within a significant radius (or even include the entire city) for a period following a major disaster.	7/26/2023 3:55 PM
29	The temporary housing is great while it is truly temporary. There are many instances that the "temporary" portion of the housing has long passed its intended benefit.	7/26/2023 3:18 PM
30	Having someone on-site to address issues quickly is important.	7/26/2023 2:24 PM
31	If the temporary housing ordinance was designed to help residents after a Disaster, then there should be no need to extend the ordinance. Property owners should not take advantage of this ordinance to house those who were NOT impacted by the fire.	7/26/2023 12:57 PM
32	Add flexibility. Allow uses to continue longer or be eligible to renew permits	7/26/2023 7:58 AM
33	Due to lack of housing, I think this should continue beyond the five year limit.	7/25/2023 3:03 PM
34	Five years is a long time for a temporary structure. Perhaps there should be annual inspections to make sure property is maintained. IE: sanitation, hoarding, etc.	7/25/2023 9:02 AM
35	Due to a lot of construction there is a lack of thoughts on how many vehicles are now in condensed areas. If a disaster happens there is a long delay for people to exit these areas due to the increase of vehicles	7/24/2023 8:05 PM
36	Adapt the rules to accommodate the needs for all types of housing in order to eliminate homelessness.	7/24/2023 4:38 PM
37	Provide more privacy both for the temporary residents and obstruct view from traffic.	7/24/2023 2:17 PM
38	We have thousands of homeless citizens. We should make it easier to create encampments and other temporary housing situations in a secure manner..	7/24/2023 1:50 PM
39	I would allow any type of unit that is congruent with the CBC. Include tiny homes, RVs, vans, etc. Make it as flexible as possible.	7/24/2023 7:29 AM
40	Those checked require diligent expedited and compromised discussion. I have no knowledge of those not checked.	7/23/2023 4:15 PM
41	I'm not clear on the continuing need for 5 or more units, and think that 5 years is too long. I think 2 years would be fair under non disaster circumstances.	7/23/2023 10:33 AM
42	Many homeless encampments are rife with refuse, drawing in rats. People in "ruts" typically	7/23/2023 8:09 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

bring their lifestyle with them. Does the S.R. City dead vehicle program cover the deadvehicles most like to appear at the temp housing facilities?

43	Placement of units should not be allowed in City Historic Districts or neighborhoods that have been proposed for Historic Districts (i.e. Benton Addition).	7/22/2023 5:26 PM
44	Remove this requirement	7/22/2023 2:24 PM
45	loss of domicile due to fire,storm--not necessarily "natural disaster"	7/22/2023 9:59 AM
46	The continual lack of mental health care and addiction recovery, these services are pivotal to change. Have office close by that allows access to health care, mental health, addiction services, EBT, HUD, etc...	7/22/2023 6:34 AM
47	This is already a disaster. Don't build something. Bring in small trailers (100 sq ft useable space). Allow for 1 year maximum.	7/21/2023 8:52 PM
48	Get rid of #5 (minimum parking). Housing is a basic human right, car storage is not! Also strike #8.	7/21/2023 7:07 PM
49	Frequent trash and unused-item-pick ups; some type of location-compatibility consideration (even if through fencing or other visual enhancements), consistency in structures at a location (e.g., all similar tents, size limitations on RVs and tiny homes); defined duration-of-use periods adhered to	7/21/2023 6:17 PM
50	All multi unit facilities should have basic needs met. They should provide temporary housing for a limited time to encourage graduation to permanent housing.	7/21/2023 6:10 PM
51	To make sure temp housing stays as temp housing	7/21/2023 4:29 PM
52	Explore higher density with less financial overhead per unit for city of Santa Rosa	7/21/2023 4:23 PM
53	I am believe that the timeline should be three years because at that point people should be able to get their life together	7/21/2023 3:30 PM
54	On-site to enforce laws for safety of all.	7/21/2023 2:55 PM
55	More then a few units per site appear to create other social issues. Types of structure should be regulated and on site management required.	7/21/2023 1:54 PM
56	Extend duration of use until such housing is no longer needed. Allow temporary housing closer to services.	7/21/2023 1:07 PM
57	More serious actions taken on Builders work by City&County	7/21/2023 12:54 PM
58	the city doesn't need to encourage homeless persons except for this reason.	7/21/2023 12:49 PM
59	Sounds better than good	7/21/2023 12:48 PM
60	Keep what we have, I like the addition of a reasonable time period for residents. Safety and basic needs are a must.	7/21/2023 12:37 PM
61	These all affect the neighbors around them. We want to make sure everyone is safe.	7/21/2023 12:31 PM
62	I don't think 5 or more housing units should *automatically* call for on-site management, which increases the cost. For example, if the sites are occupied by quiet, law-abiding, responsible citizens a manager would not be required.	7/21/2023 12:02 PM
63	nnnn	7/21/2023 10:54 AM
64	If the city allows temp housing units, they should be restricted affordable. Affidavit or proof of contract that tenants and the City is aware of and that is UNDER market rate. Otherwise, operators can just charge whatever the market will bear (a lot) for substandard housing and no permanent improvements. 5 years is too long for temp housing- operators should have to renew annually, even if there's no cost, similar to STR	7/21/2023 10:45 AM
65	needing wrap around services to address systemic issues	7/21/2023 10:33 AM
66	Keep the noise down	7/21/2023 10:10 AM
67	Getting tired of seeing temporary homeless shelters in our city. Makes me want to move	7/21/2023 9:31 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

68	I would think people wouldn't want the temporary housing near certain existing residential communities	7/21/2023 8:58 AM
69	This could get out of hand should an old RV be parked on a property and then slowly fall to pieces as it is surrounded by mounds of trash.	7/21/2023 8:50 AM
70	I'm okay with temp permits on residential parcels that meet the codes. I want to see long-term street parking of inhabited RV's cease.	7/21/2023 8:50 AM
71	If there are going to be security issues such as unwanted guests they will most probably take place between 5pm-8am. That should be the on-site management hours.	7/21/2023 8:04 AM
72	The 5 yr duration of use should be removed, too many extenuating circumstances exist.	7/21/2023 7:50 AM
73	Managed sites would hopefully keep things safe and clean.	7/21/2023 7:32 AM
74	Should this be 24/7 for multiple units?	7/21/2023 6:49 AM
75	I support the city providing temp housing to help make it so we have fewer people sleeping outside, in tents and in RVs in non-designated areas.	7/21/2023 6:19 AM
76	Temp use only for fire victims	7/21/2023 6:11 AM
77	I pay property taxes. These nomads do not, yet I have to deal with their noise and garbage every day. My neighborhood is not safe with feral people everywhere.	7/21/2023 5:57 AM
78	I feel as a homeless disabled senior we are forgotten. I have been waiting for 3 years! We should have a program in housing on seniors who will not be around in the years you have chosen. I have worked hard and raised my family , we just want to be in a place of my own to put my things in my house and out of storage. We need housing for disabled seniors a priority.	7/20/2023 10:06 PM
79	Added, revised or removed? How do we reply to a question that can be evaluated in so many opposing ways??	7/20/2023 9:55 PM
80	The term "temporary" should mean exactly that. Not renewable at the end of its term. These types of housing facilities have a useful purpose within the community, especially in emergent situations, but they should not be allowed to remain past the term of their original permit without extenuating circumstances.	7/20/2023 9:51 PM
81	If families are living there, why force them to move?	7/20/2023 9:44 PM
82	Number of units per site being decided through TUP process is not good enough. You need to have specific limits in place for the type of permitted use on the property, whether it's in line with the zoning. Duration of use being "up to 5 years" is not acceptable. There has to be a plan in place for what the duration will be and how the temp housing will be dismantled or removed.	7/20/2023 9:43 PM
83	They should be distributed evenly across the city.	7/20/2023 8:52 PM
84	Cleanliness requirements not only for aesthetic purposes, but also for health & safety and to avoid permanent damage to the landscape.	7/20/2023 8:46 PM
85	24 hour management. Residents must have a job. 5 years is too long to be considered temporary	7/20/2023 8:28 PM
86	Temporary housing when the owner is onsite doesn't hurt the neighborhood as do houses that are always temporary housing. That's like having a hotel next door, not a neighbor	7/20/2023 8:27 PM
87	No improvements needed	7/20/2023 8:05 PM
88	Temporary housing is HOUSING and should meet all the requirements that land use and permitting requires of a permanent house with the exception of on site security unless it is a sanctioned encampment.	7/20/2023 7:59 PM
89	dont build ghettos and manage heavily	7/20/2023 7:18 PM
90	Same as "other" answer to above question #1. I will add that roof water collection devices should be a free permit. This is obligatory in ÇA and nothing should stand in the way of water collection and storage for fire fighting, garden irrigation, and if RO filtered, drinking water. It needs to be mandatory. Please check out Bermuda's water system, which is 100% dependent on roof water because there are no water sources on the island. Every house has roof water	7/20/2023 7:06 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

collection and storage tanks- whether buried or free standing next to homes and businesses. please see zoning and density comments in the answer to "other" in question 1 above.

91	So many folks in need and a safe environment, I believe, comes from consistent terms for occupying.	7/20/2023 7:00 PM
92	I believe there should be 24/7 on site management.	7/20/2023 6:42 PM
93	whatever happened to the housing for homeless out by Oakmont?	7/20/2023 6:19 PM
94	Temporary housing should be limited to specific areas, zones and number of years.	7/20/2023 6:15 PM
95	People are moving here to take advantage of our 'services. The homeless population is exploding because of your 'generous' exploited services. Make these people prove they were homeless due to the fires	7/20/2023 6:01 PM
96	I believe too big of a housing development is a Petrie dish waiting for problems. Too much to keep up with. Certain elements can settle in before you know it. Then you are stuck with it until you can go through the lengthy process of removal. I happen to live in an area close to one of your new construction projects and there are a not so great element or two in the area nearby. There are the occasional car gathering issues the police have been having issues with, quite often gunshots are heard at nights (quite often), more and more tagging, and I live in a senior park that I can't afford to move from and no one mentioned it before I purchased my MH. Just a heads up. Lots of lighting and patrols at night. Because we don't have that and aren't taken very seriously by the dispatchers, so we rarely call anymore. Make sure earthquake is totally up to date and fire safety too.	7/20/2023 5:51 PM
97	I didn't see the two I selected as being addressed currently	7/20/2023 5:47 PM
98	We need to have better transparency about recidivism of inhabitants: have they previously been provided with permanent housing solutions? Why did that not work out? Why are they back in temp housing (if not related to natural disaster)?	7/20/2023 5:44 PM
99	Require manager present for more units 5 is not necessary for onsite management.	7/20/2023 5:35 PM
100	what is the duration of staying?	7/20/2023 5:30 PM
101	would like some language that clarifies what is/is not allowed.	7/20/2023 5:30 PM
102	These should not be permanent for homeless residents, but what else can you do with them? They need MANDATORY drug and alcohol tx. and mandatory tx. for mental illness.	7/20/2023 5:20 PM
103	The Land must bear the weight, and 5he management must do all to preserve the resource.	7/20/2023 5:19 PM
104	The Zoning Code should require (without loopholes) that temporary housing is ONLY allowable on natural disaster effected property for no longer than 1 year from the date of the disaster & is limited to 1 unit per legal dwelling on the property & limited to trailers, RV or legally manufactured tiny homes	7/20/2023 5:19 PM
105	Remove the time limit.	7/20/2023 5:01 PM
106	I'm not averse to having one in my neighborhood, but I'm concerned about the lack of adequate organizations out there to manage them. SAVS is not qualified as far as I'm concerned, so I think my biggest worry is size and management oversight.	7/20/2023 4:57 PM
107	Longer hours into the evening say 10pm.	7/20/2023 4:56 PM
108	Duration of use should be ongoing	7/20/2023 4:53 PM
109	There needs to be more on site management of there are many temporary units, and there needs to be managerial supervision at night for the safety of residents and for accessible contact for neighbors.	7/20/2023 4:50 PM
110	Must have a job	7/20/2023 4:36 PM
111	More units per site. More sites allowed everywhere	7/20/2023 4:33 PM
112	Condo or apartment with adequate parking- limited occupants per California code	7/20/2023 3:48 PM
113	On-site management MIGHT alleviate concerns residents will raise and ensure better outcomes for all residing at the site	7/20/2023 3:45 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments


114	Eliminate all of them. New projects like Chanate will allow developers to use these to justify their project.	7/20/2023 3:43 PM
115	Structures must be kept clean and in working order. If wheels are part of the structure, wheels and vehicle must be in operable running condition. Single family occupancy only.	7/20/2023 3:41 PM
116	There should be a qualifiable number of units that can be managed and not a over saturation in one location. Maintaining the requirement for on-site management as currently defined is critical. We should comply with the General Plan and Zoning Codes	7/20/2023 3:32 PM
117	Temporary housing is often needed by people based on their personal situations, not necessarily natural disasters. Pets allowed but not allowed to run free, garbage and recycling removal services needed, noise at night regulated, aggressive behavior addressed with restorative justice practices.	7/20/2023 3:26 PM
118	Housing should meet some sort of habitability standard.	7/20/2023 3:22 PM
119	5 years seems like a long time and while I appreciate the need for the temporary housing, some of this looks very bad and feels dirty.	7/20/2023 3:22 PM
120	On site management for 5 units? to few units to require this. With the labor shortage for construction or other essential workers land other than that which was effected by a disaster other land available should be considered.	7/20/2023 3:11 PM
121	Lower permit costs. Streamline paperwork, stay out of the way	7/20/2023 3:09 PM
122	On-site management for as few as five units is feasibly irresponsible. I could see at 25 units. So make the minimum for temporary housing 25 units. And there should be a maximum as well.	7/20/2023 3:05 PM
123	These changes are necessary to replace and contain the homeless camps. With the issue of safety for the homeless and the community at large, I believe there should be a proactive approach that controls the seeming anarchy of homeless camps.	7/20/2023 2:57 PM
124	On-site management should be for 20 or more units. zoning limits otherwise viable sites, setbacks should be minimal, duration of use needs to be 5 years with another 5 year extension in order to make the improvements financially viable and allow tenants to stabilize within the community.	7/20/2023 2:53 PM
125	There needs to be a restriction on where the residential parcels are located	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
126	i think all are necessary	7/20/2023 2:50 PM
127	RVs are all over the City. More safe parking needed.	7/20/2023 2:49 PM
128	5 years is too long and allows the city to delay getting a real solution.	7/20/2023 2:45 PM
129	I personally would need extra cars to be with my family in temporary housing is there is not enough street parking	7/20/2023 2:43 PM
130	The threshold requirement for on-site management should be higher. Staffing is a major and continuing cost that can make development of temporary housing unaffordable. Parking should not be required in areas well-served by public transit.	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
131	3. Extend on site presence to 11.00PM. 8.No temporary housing in residential zones	7/20/2023 2:41 PM
132	Number onsite: Limit number onsite to the septic systems capacity, unless on city sewer, then limit to one 'extra' living quarters.	7/20/2023 2:40 PM
133	To actually impact lives for the better, a limit to 1 year as to be able to help more people overall. The same people get stuck relying 100% on others and not becoming self sufficient in any way shape or form and in actuality enabling them to continue in their addiction and not taking any responsibility for themselves	7/20/2023 2:39 PM
134	Just because we need more temporary housing does not mean we should not require they be aesthetically pleasing and fit within the surrounding area.	7/20/2023 2:38 PM
135	Putting temporary structures on a property needs to have a sunset date that is enforced.	7/20/2023 2:29 PM
136	Permit required; limit of 1 unit per site in residential zones unless affected by natural disaster.	7/20/2023 2:29 PM
137	People who need temporary or transitional housing are in a traumatic situation and need all the	7/20/2023 2:27 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

	help they can get.	
138	All these measures seem reasonable, makes you wonder what was the standard before??	7/20/2023 2:26 PM
139	If the housing is temporary than a duration of use seems obvious.	7/20/2023 2:23 PM
140	On site management 24/7. Max 15 units. Max stay 60 days.	7/20/2023 2:22 PM
141	Need reasonably decent housing that can be easily removed. Make sure that it doesn't become permanent.	7/20/2023 2:22 PM
142	Should have only been used for the fires. The city should not allow the long term use of trailers and should not be letting people build multiple residential units on one property in what where established neighborhoods	7/20/2023 2:21 PM
143	should add/revise code to include all of above, specifically increase number of units per site, add mixed use housing to increase both housing and shops, services and other amenities.	7/20/2023 2:19 PM
144	No more than one per site. No longer than one year. Should not be citywide.	7/20/2023 2:13 PM
145	The ordinance looks good to me. We will continue to have natural disasters and we should be as ready as possible.	7/20/2023 2:12 PM
146	Temporary is temporary. I have a mobile home park next door now, thanks to this "temporary" allowance. People have had enough time to rebuild - it's time to go back to normal, and cancel the temporary housing allowance -otherwise Santa Rosa is going to become a giant, unmanaged, slum.	7/20/2023 2:11 PM
147	I feel that management should be onsite to ensure that the facilities and residents are within compliance and that a "stated" stay of residence be dictated limiting the stay legally so as not to become permanent housing.	7/20/2023 2:11 PM
148	Providing flexibility is important. But also putting some firm boundaries around the types of structures and duration of use is critical. Temporary Housing does not mean shoddy or of poor construction housing. It should be housing with dignity and design, but allowed to be provided in ways that include expediency for immediate needs.	7/20/2023 2:10 PM
149	Significant in disease and pest control.	7/20/2023 2:06 PM
150	To help with people who are disabled who gets kicked out of apt when there a disaster going on	7/19/2023 11:16 PM
151	Would like to see these as permanent solutions. Create a real campground that is permanent. Get the people living in cars & RVs on the street to stay in the campgrounds.	7/19/2023 9:49 PM
152	Everyone has a right to housing. Until we can provide that as a government, we need to keep temporary housing sites running.	7/19/2023 2:09 PM
153	Parking requirements reflect a regressive car first mentality. Better to mandate secure bike storage or sidewalks.	7/19/2023 12:44 PM
154	Parking minimums, especially for small residences, raise the price floor and encourage increased traffic. Provide frequent and efficient transit instead.	7/19/2023 12:08 PM
155	PLEASE DO NOT PRACTICE POLICE GUN FIRE TRAINING BY THE CHILDRENS CENTER. AND PLEASE DRAIN THE SWIMMING POOL ONTHE OLD LOS GUILUCOS	7/18/2023 2:17 PM
156	The way it is written up is perfect covers all grounds in supporting ant disaster	7/18/2023 1:02 PM

Q3 Should these temporary structures and activities continue to be allowed? If so, should the timeline for approval be changed? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 251 Skipped: 16



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes - Less than 5 years	32.67%	82
Yes - 5 years	51.39%	129
No	15.94%	40
TOTAL		251

Q4 If you selected yes and less than 5 years, please identify the timeframe you think would be appropriate for these temporary structures and uses?

Answered: 95 Skipped: 172

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The uses should be allowed as long as progress is being achieved toward replacing affected structures.	8/18/2023 9:52 AM
2	2	8/18/2023 9:47 AM
3	5 is good	8/18/2023 6:32 AM
4	About 5 years seems realistic unfortunately due to wait list times	8/17/2023 11:40 PM
5	1 year or less, Santa Rosa is not the beautiful place it used to be	8/17/2023 8:43 PM
6	1 year	8/17/2023 7:13 PM
7	2 yrs	8/16/2023 11:16 AM
8	Until no longer needed	8/16/2023 5:12 AM
9	I think we could consider 5-10 years based on type of temporary facility. WE know for a fact that certain schools are using temp facilities for more than 5 years, lets reflect reality.	8/14/2023 1:52 PM
10	provides more affordable housing	8/8/2023 1:52 PM
11	7 years	8/6/2023 9:54 PM
12	2yrs	7/30/2023 8:28 AM
13	Why stop it at five years if a solution is working?	7/27/2023 2:18 PM
14	They should be allowed concurrently with active building permits submitted to move toward permanent housing	7/26/2023 3:37 PM
15	Exceptions if they are still waiting for an insurance or PG&E settlement.	7/26/2023 12:59 PM
16	3 yrs	7/26/2023 10:18 AM
17	Due to lack of housing, I think all temporary structures should be allowed to continue beyond five years.	7/25/2023 3:04 PM
18	No time limits. Meet the needs.	7/24/2023 4:39 PM
19	3 years, assuming that the City is helping those in temporary facilities to find more permanent solutions.	7/24/2023 7:30 AM
20	2 years.	7/23/2023 10:33 AM
21	Five years would allow sites with better utilities and inherent ADA compliance (i.e. existing site slopes/paving would require minimal re-grading/paving) are developed.	7/22/2023 5:29 PM
22	It would seem that most issues could be settled within 3years and an exemption for more time could be applied for in "critical" circumstancesto avoid abuse of exemption.	7/22/2023 10:04 AM
23	They should have been permanently built years ago. They should be concrete, traditional housing. Showers, laundry, and body care services should be always available and close by. Not temporarily support, but long term. Many of the homeless have mental health issues , medical issues and addiction issues. They may not be ready for transitioning and require more services. These are and should be longer than 5 years; to facilitate access to services and cognitively approach to the mindset to accepting services and aid. Some can accept services in time, some can be addressed, but their status may never change. An example is when a couple seek divorce, the standard is for every year married, it will take half this time to recover. So if they have been homeless for 20 years, it may take 10 years to cognitively	7/22/2023 7:04 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

change the clients mindset. Having services in place to help can cognitively help speed the adoption of a new mindset and success. I have observed a couple of third world countries, and their approach is permanent. Placing a client into apartments setting can be catastrophic destructive to the client's success, the property's owners, the mindset of accepting facilities in a negative way. Prepare the clients for success, not a cheap solution that will come up short.

24	6 months with 1 month extensions for up to 1 year.	7/21/2023 8:52 PM
25	Three years, with no extensions to be granted.	7/21/2023 7:01 PM
26	Three years should be adequate to determine if the businesses will "make it" to permanent status.	7/21/2023 6:18 PM
27	5 years or less is more than enough time to deal with losses and rebuilding.	7/21/2023 6:15 PM
28	2 years	7/21/2023 4:29 PM
29	3 years	7/21/2023 3:31 PM
30	1-2 years at most.	7/21/2023 2:57 PM
31	Two years as part of disaster recovery. Depending on the type and length and severity of the disaster. Five years was good time frame for the Tubbs fire but only two years was needed for the Glass fire.	7/21/2023 1:56 PM
32	two years	7/21/2023 12:50 PM
33	3years	7/21/2023 12:48 PM
34	For the next 10 years it should be revisited every two years for adjustments and improvements as situations change and evolve.	7/21/2023 12:39 PM
35	Just curious if anyone is taking advantage of this- seems like something for Covid, but has anyone gotten permits for a temp office? Is this even necessary?	7/21/2023 10:48 AM
36	24-36 months. If temporarily re approval is needed than can be extended.	7/21/2023 10:25 AM
37	Three years or less	7/21/2023 10:23 AM
38	two years	7/21/2023 9:27 AM
39	1 years with auto renewal should the site generate no complaints.	7/21/2023 8:51 AM
40	2	7/21/2023 8:51 AM
41	Two years.	7/21/2023 8:08 AM
42	3 years	7/21/2023 6:50 AM
43	Build some permanent housing and services for these people. All the money spent on band-aid solutions is a waste. Laws need to be changed in order to put them in institutions even if they'd rather sleep and poop on the sidewalk.	7/21/2023 6:00 AM
44	Until they have their life together and find where they can live or new construction has finished and they can afford to live in a decent life and in peace	7/20/2023 10:08 PM
45	5 years or less	7/20/2023 9:56 PM
46	When can permanent structures be built? Are there plans for permanent structures?	7/20/2023 9:46 PM
47	After 5 years, there has to be a re-application for continuance, or a submitted plan for more permanent structures. It's stupid to put up things like "temporary" classrooms without a commitment to raise funding for permanent structures.	7/20/2023 9:46 PM
48	no more than 18 months	7/20/2023 8:53 PM
49	2.5 years	7/20/2023 8:46 PM
50	2 years should be enough to arrange for more permanent structures or arrange for consolidation	7/20/2023 8:30 PM
51	Two years as that gives ample time to find a solution for permanent housing or for the temporary housed tenants to obtain permanent housing or make a move to a place that their	7/20/2023 8:03 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments


	income supports.	
52	2 years	7/20/2023 7:15 PM
53	2 years	7/20/2023 7:13 PM
54	Providing more permanent structures takes time for permits, approval, perhaps available materials so it should move along as quickly as possible. The temporary structures should be emptied and removed and with a deadline comes an effort to achieve the goal.	7/20/2023 7:07 PM
55	Dependent on need in response to a natural disaster	7/20/2023 6:40 PM
56	who pays for all this? doesn't make sense please explain reasoning	7/20/2023 6:21 PM
57	3 years wit a possible extension of two more years	7/20/2023 6:17 PM
58	Two years max.	7/20/2023 5:52 PM
59	Let's say 3 years	7/20/2023 5:48 PM
60	At least 5 years because FEMA can take at least that long.	7/20/2023 5:44 PM
61	3yrs	7/20/2023 5:34 PM
62	3 years should be enough to raise financing for upgrades and to navigate the permitting process	7/20/2023 5:22 PM
63	4 yrs	7/20/2023 5:19 PM
64	1 year from the date of the disaster	7/20/2023 5:19 PM
65	Ideally, less than 5 years, but I also understand the lack of affordable housing and the timeframe involved in getting it created	7/20/2023 4:59 PM
66	Upto 3 years.	7/20/2023 4:57 PM
67	18 months to two years.	7/20/2023 4:51 PM
68	All temporary structures should be taxed at the rate of appraised property value of the land under them and the potential commercial value.	7/20/2023 4:47 PM
69	6 months	7/20/2023 4:37 PM
70	assess when emergency is declared	7/20/2023 4:03 PM
71	They should be allowed to be in place as long as they are occupied and kept clean and in good running condition.	7/20/2023 3:42 PM
72	Yes, less than 2 years.	7/20/2023 3:27 PM
73	4 years	7/20/2023 3:22 PM
74	2 years	7/20/2023 3:15 PM
75	As soon as these zillion new apartments increase the supply and the housing prices go down.	7/20/2023 2:59 PM
76	2-3 years	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
77	they should be moving toward permanency	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
78	3 years.	7/20/2023 2:50 PM
79	Depending upon the reason for the need of a temporary structure the time line should be adjusted and a plan in place to address how the need will be resolved.	7/20/2023 2:47 PM
80	2 more years	7/20/2023 2:46 PM
81	2 years	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
82	1 year	7/20/2023 2:40 PM
83	Renewable on an annual basis after site inspection determines temporary use structure and activity are in compliance with permit.	7/20/2023 2:30 PM
84	One to two years. If you wait 5 years, people are going to feel that they are permanent.	7/20/2023 2:24 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

85	5 years should be minimum, ideal range would be 5-10 years	7/20/2023 2:20 PM
86	3 years	7/20/2023 2:15 PM
87	No more than three years. Perhaps an opportunity to re-review for an extension of two additional years.	7/20/2023 2:14 PM
88	Emergency measures should not become standardized. It is not in compliance with previously established health, safety, and zoning laws.	7/20/2023 2:12 PM
89	Two years	7/20/2023 2:09 PM
90	3 years	7/20/2023 2:07 PM
91	may need to be more than 5 years	7/20/2023 2:05 PM
92	3 years	7/20/2023 2:04 PM
93	2 years	7/19/2023 2:41 PM
94	IT DEPENDS ON HOW MUCH HOUSING IS MADE AVAILABLE.	7/18/2023 2:18 PM
95	3 years they these type of structures should be permanent before 3 years is up especially childcare	7/18/2023 1:04 PM

Q5 Has Santa Rosa benefited from reduced review authority on Child Care permits and Housing land use permits since 2017?


Answered: 198 Skipped: 69



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	56.06%	111
No	43.94%	87
TOTAL		198

Q6 Do you think the City should continue to streamline the permit process for childcare facilities?


Answered: 225 Skipped: 42



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	70.67%	159
No	29.33%	66
TOTAL		225

Q7 Do you think the City should continue to streamline the permit process for housing projects?


Answered: 232 Skipped: 35



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	65.09%	151
No	34.91%	81
TOTAL		232

Q8 Should the City keep the reduced Design Review process? (Select All that Apply)


Answered: 209 Skipped: 58



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	56.46%	118
No	43.54%	91
TOTAL		209

Q9 If the reduced Design Review process is retained, should the City keep the process just for properties within the Priority Development Areas (shown above)?

Answered: 193 Skipped: 74



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	51.30% 99
No - (Do you have ideas for what areas of the City should be included?)	48.70% 94
TOTAL	193

#	NO - (DO YOU HAVE IDEAS FOR WHAT AREAS OF THE CITY SHOULD BE INCLUDED?)	DATE
1	Why not throughout the City?	8/18/2023 11:10 PM
2	Expand far NE boundries	8/18/2023 5:59 PM
3	All areas	8/18/2023 5:27 PM
4	We should have stricter processes for all development in all parts of the city.	8/18/2023 1:57 PM
5	Riebli-Wallace neighborhood should be included.	8/18/2023 10:23 AM
6	The city should stop developing and construction projects. Financially the city is in debt.	8/18/2023 8:24 AM
7	Too much building is taking place in SR, go back to more formal review board analysis	8/18/2023 8:20 AM
8	None	8/17/2023 7:20 PM
9	The impact in Roseland, and along Sebastopol Road is overwhelming. Please spread out development.	8/16/2023 10:54 AM
10	The City and its residents would be better served to include this for ALL areas citywide.	8/15/2023 11:29 AM
11	fire zones I suppose	8/14/2023 1:55 PM
12	should be applied to all areas of the city.	8/11/2023 10:24 AM
13	All areas of the city	8/8/2023 1:53 PM
14	all areas	8/8/2023 1:27 PM
15	Housing is crisis at the national, state and local levels as evidenced by the significant increase in regional housing need allocations seen across the state, in most jurisdictions. The city	8/8/2023 1:18 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

should streamline processes regardless of geographic location in order to expedite housing development.

16	All of the city. Housing is desperately needed everywhere in the city, although transit corridors should still have priority.	8/6/2023 10:23 PM
17	WE BEG YOU TO STOP adding more people from other states and countries that the CA working class taxpayers have to take care of and PLEASE INCREASE law enforcement. Crime has become a huge growing problem due to the number of people living free off the backs of hard-working taxpayers. Taxpayers are currently trying to get out of California which is so poorly run as we are going broke.	7/29/2023 3:36 PM
18	Make it larger. I think zoning is overly restrictive in general. There should be more mixed-use zoning in general, more small businesses allowed to operate in what is currently single-family zones.	7/27/2023 2:22 PM
19	It's a huge oversight that all the priority development areas are located west of downtown. The City should focus on expanding these types of uses throughout the city. Provided these projects are generally compliant with the zoning designation, they should face reduced design review citywide.	7/26/2023 4:03 PM
20	The design review process has gone from an upholding of city standards to a personal preference committee. The problem is not the geographic areas of enforcement but the process to get through them.	7/26/2023 3:49 PM
21	Not along Santa Rosa Ave	7/26/2023 9:28 AM
22	Extend along 12 into Montgomery village and South of 12	7/26/2023 8:01 AM
23	Need to expand to other areas that are suitable for low-income housing and daycare in Santa Rosa where the need is warranted with the continued high-cost of housing and daycare for most all working-class families and housing options for retired seniors with low-income.	7/24/2023 2:33 PM
24	all public and active transportation rich neighborhoods	7/24/2023 9:01 AM
25	This is a big deal and requires much more study.	7/23/2023 4:31 PM
26	I believe that the priority development areas are too large. In particular, I'm concerned about areas such as the Mendocino Avenue corridor, which has never had a specific plan, or any real community planning efforts. I think where priority development with reduced approvals takes place, there needs to have been a community planning effort first, such as has taken place in downtown. Also, with regard to the Mendocino Avenue corridor, parts of it are in SR's WUI, and there should never be priority for areas in or immediately adjacent to the WUI. Look at Journey's End, for example, which is not in the WUI, but burned to the ground...	7/23/2023 10:39 AM
27	No reduction for any area	7/22/2023 8:08 PM
28	Any zone. We don't really get exceptional design with the existing system anyway. Staff can carry out the DRB conceptual comments, and applicants can appeal to DRB if there is disagreement	7/22/2023 3:24 PM
29	None	7/22/2023 12:51 PM
30	I'm mostly concerned with the south Santa Rosa Ave corridor. That area is undergoing massive housing development yet there are no services, eg. grocery stores, pharmacy, post office, schools and parks in that region. Nothing with walking distance and very limited public transit. I consider much of this development to be sprawl with very little to no evidence of urban planning.	7/22/2023 12:04 PM
31	My opinion, is that many land developers did not meet the conditions that were placed by housing agencies and conditions of contracts when areas were constructed. I.E. low income housing to be built by contract and may have not been built. I suggest that any developer that does not want to build low income housing into their units pay what it cost to build and run said unit for 40 years in todays standards plus a 100% penalty on that cost for adjustments of inflation and cost if they do not hold to contract. Giving an easy way for them to not have low income units but give the city or county funds to build low income housing.	7/22/2023 7:28 AM
32	Design review for housing should be suspended city wide until the housing emergency is over.	7/21/2023 7:16 PM
33	The permitting process though valid and necessary many times creates delays. A reduced	7/21/2023 6:30 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

design review would highlight obvious problems and get changes made. All builders know the rules and regulations and that by getting a reduced design process does not mean that rules, regs and building safety will be ignored.

34	Northeast Santa Rosa surrounding Maria carillo high.	7/21/2023 3:56 PM
35	It should not be kept. Designs are being approved that do not meet minimum design review board standard. We will forever be stuck with the buildings that are on the fringes of the historic districts that detract from the style and characteristics of the original intent of the district.	7/21/2023 2:06 PM
36	city-wide	7/21/2023 1:18 PM
37	no	7/21/2023 12:57 PM
38	For equity purposes, it should be the same for all properties within the city limits. When this happens only in the middle or lower class areas, the home owners are denied the equity building of home ownership while upper class areas are able to grow their property values disproportionately causing more stratification of the cities districts.	7/21/2023 12:54 PM
39	No	7/21/2023 12:50 PM
40	I don't have specific areas in mind, but think that any area desperately short of housing and/or child care should be offered the opportunity for quick and uncomplicated review.	7/21/2023 12:11 PM
41	All	7/21/2023 10:12 AM
42	no	7/21/2023 9:41 AM
43	The Design Review Board is at best a bad use of time and at worst an extreme hindrance to building needing housing and other projects. Should Santa Rosa keep a design review process the Zoning Administrator is the appropriate level of review. Virtually all of Santa Rosa's notable buildings were built without the input of a DRB.	7/21/2023 9:30 AM
44	They should be throughout the city	7/21/2023 9:20 AM
45	I've seen its abuse and rigidity and favorability towards developers over existing residents. A simple request that 3 story apartments be placed in the center of a large development and single family homes that are part of that development about existing one story single family homes in a rural setting was summarily thrown out. This seems ridiculous as the request would have had no affect on the size or number of units on Burbank Avenue.	7/21/2023 8:59 AM
46	All of the city	7/21/2023 7:32 AM
47	all incorporated areas should be subject to the same process	7/21/2023 7:08 AM
48	Not wirh tax dollars	7/21/2023 6:14 AM
49	Stop building all these damned high rise structures. I used to look out my downtown window to see mountains. Now I see a damned apartment building. I've lived here 30 years. Santa Rosa is no longer the little city it used to be. Stop kowtowing to developers. Someone in the city must be lining their pockets by allowing all this building to occur. It is NOT affordable, no matter what anyone says.	7/21/2023 6:10 AM
50	In vacant land or homes abandoned hotels, motels	7/20/2023 10:20 PM
51	No areas of the city should be included. This process is biases towards developers and not the communities.	7/20/2023 9:54 PM
52	Even distribution throughout the city.	7/20/2023 8:56 PM
53	Fairgrounds Near County Offices	7/20/2023 8:23 PM
54	The existing city limits and areas for development naturally are going to dictate where the city is going to look to expand. Just because it is not yet developed does not mean that neighbors should not be notified and asked to participate in a meeting before the Zoning Admin. Meeting.	7/20/2023 8:16 PM
55	unsure	7/20/2023 8:07 PM
56	are you following the cities planning thats in place or are you going to change to fit your new thoughts?	7/20/2023 6:30 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments


57	All	7/20/2023 6:02 PM
58	I think there should be a PAUSE on all development until further support is given to infrastructure city-wide. Many of the new residential are at least a mile from any resources such as full-service grocery store, there have been no new police sub-stations or fire stations added, and the streets/pavement are in horrible disrepair with more cars being added with each new development. Also, there is not adequate parking for any new developments. Streamlining the process allows for lack of oversight to some of these core issues.	7/20/2023 5:50 PM
59	Reduced design review for properties near mass transit, the SMART line (extended), and major bicycle corridors.	7/20/2023 5:14 PM
60	Full review	7/20/2023 5:12 PM
61	Hwy 12 along farmers lane and Montgomery village area.	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
62	All	7/20/2023 4:37 PM
63	All of Santa Rosa should be included in the reduced Design Review process.	7/20/2023 3:47 PM
64	No answer.	7/20/2023 3:46 PM
65	There should be no priority areas. Treat all areas equally.	7/20/2023 3:33 PM
66	why isn't all of the incorporated city included?	7/20/2023 3:28 PM
67	No	7/20/2023 3:24 PM
68	city wide	7/20/2023 3:18 PM
69	City wide-Probusiness and colorblind approach. Let market make needed changes. Maintain infrastructure. Allow building SFH for all people. Mixed housing. Family friendly. Small Medium and Large. Less woke.	7/20/2023 3:17 PM
70	The processs should be for all areas.	7/20/2023 3:03 PM
71	A full analysis is required	7/20/2023 2:59 PM
72	why not expand the footprint?	7/20/2023 2:57 PM
73	Within City limits.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
74	I don't know of specific areas but a study should be completed to where there am be better or equal locations.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
75	I think the entire city should have limited review. The amount of time and cost is ridiculous.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
76	there are most likely area's outside the development areas that would benefit from the reduced design review as well with the housing shortage as long as its on city water and sewer and has infill area thats zoned for reasonable development (not the 20 units per acre under review currently, thats too much) things that fit with the look of a neighborhood.	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
77	The current reduced Design Review process is not adequate for assessment of large, multi-use, mid-high density housing projects in the Priority Development Areas, most of which are in, or border, historic districts. The process for ANY development in historic districts needs to be restrictive and include Cultural Heritage Board review.	7/20/2023 2:50 PM
78	Don't know, they city as a as whole is going to hell in a hand basket	7/20/2023 2:45 PM
79	should have robust review for all building.	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
80	Any multiunit housing development should be reviewed.	7/20/2023 2:40 PM
81	The City benefits from Design Review	7/20/2023 2:31 PM
82	All of Santa Rosa.	7/20/2023 2:29 PM
83	The process should be simplified wherever possible.	7/20/2023 2:28 PM
84	None	7/20/2023 2:26 PM
85	The map is not clear	7/20/2023 2:25 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

86	Areas effected by fire only.	7/20/2023 2:17 PM
87	all	7/20/2023 2:13 PM
88	Design Review is a critical component of any project in the city. The DRB should be reviewing everything at a concept level at a bare minimum. DRB is not an obstacle to projects, it is a valuable tool to ensure that our community continues to develop with good quality projects and dignity in their designs to elevate all residents of the City.	7/20/2023 2:13 PM
89	If done it must be city wide	7/20/2023 2:11 PM
90	all properties should be considered	7/20/2023 2:07 PM
91	We should increase housing in all urban areas of the city, particularly anything which is easily accessible to mass transit, but that shouldn't be a requirement.	7/19/2023 2:13 PM
92	Should be expanded to the Highway 12 corridor east of 101. OR Limited to just down town for high density housing near mass transit only.	7/19/2023 12:54 PM
93	The entire city can benefit from increased housing.	7/19/2023 12:13 PM
94	no	7/18/2023 2:32 PM

Q10 If the reduced Design Review process is retained, should the City consider creating a review body, other than the Zoning Administrator (which is a one person review body)?

Answered: 195 Skipped: 72



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
No	44.62% 87
Yes (What ideas for an alternative review body do you have?)	55.38% 108
TOTAL	195

#	YES (WHAT IDEAS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE REVIEW BODY DO YOU HAVE?)	DATE
1	It could be a panel representing all parts of the city. It shouldn't just be one person reviewing the zoning	8/18/2023 11:10 PM
2	A representative from each area of town AND neighborhood meetings	8/18/2023 5:27 PM
3	Create a larger body that has multiple people with stricter processes about approving developments.	8/18/2023 1:57 PM
4	Put it in a ballot for the residents to vote	8/18/2023 8:24 AM
5	probably some members of the Design Review board and Fire and Building Code inspectors. These projects need to have input from the Fire and Building departments since they will ultimately have to deal with any future issues at these locations---like for access and water supply for the fire dept.	8/18/2023 7:55 AM
6	ADA	8/17/2023 11:46 PM
7	Design review team important. The apartments and buildings with not enough resident and guest parking have to stop. It is like housing projects in SF, Marin and other cities with people to packed in. It is an example of what sociologists worry about in packed human environments. The buildings with bedroom and living space windows opening right onto sidewalks and major traffic zones is unhealthy and unsafe and nobody on the City Council or design review would want to live like that. For example: The apartments at Cleveland and West College, the new apartments by the ninth Street deli and market and the apartments at 3rd and Dutton. We need to do better. More trees and nature, not packed in like big cities. Please.	8/17/2023 8:57 PM
8	A panel comprised of environmental, city and citizens.	8/17/2023 7:20 PM
9	More cheap homes are a must.	8/17/2023 6:32 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

10	Think it should be more than one person	8/17/2023 6:33 AM
11	Be sure neighbors are informed and allowed to comment on any future development.	8/16/2023 10:54 AM
12	Multiple zoning administrators working independently to expedite review. They should be empowered to provide zoning waivers when the opportunity cost (social, environmental) of a denial is high.	8/6/2023 10:23 PM
13	A citizen's advisory board.	8/4/2023 6:41 PM
14	3 people	8/2/2023 3:28 PM
15	I support a general "sustainability, environmental, aesthetic" review that has recommendation authority (sign off required for their report) - With a mandate (and budget) to inform the public via social media and mailings	7/31/2023 8:03 AM
16	Don't know	7/30/2023 8:32 AM
17	Really, I have no idea.	7/27/2023 2:22 PM
18	A one person review committee is fine but there seems to be too much on the ZA's plate already to effectively move projects through.	7/26/2023 3:49 PM
19	3 qualified persons	7/26/2023 2:26 PM
20	But only as an appeal authority to ensure cultural competency	7/26/2023 8:01 AM
21	I believe there should be a group of people to discuss each persons thoughts so there is more opinions and judgements decided	7/24/2023 8:08 PM
22	Non-invested, neutral parties with specific background in Urban Planning and Design as well as parties with specific knowledge of environmental planning and even childcare. They should be citizens and not political appointees.	7/24/2023 2:33 PM
23	I don't know if this is already in use, but I have seen pre-development conferences work well in other areas	7/24/2023 9:01 AM
24	Perhaps a few folks from the DRB on an ad-hoc basis. While I really appreciate streamlined processes, I also worry that in 50 years we'll look back on this period and feel frustrated with design choices we make today. For instance, we can look at buildings constructed in the 70s and feel disheartened with their design, lack of street-interface, etc., and wish we did better. I worry we'll look back and realize we didn't build in a way that fosters community development, reinvestment, and pride. It would be great if we can assure we have enough say/review to not regret our choices later.	7/24/2023 7:36 AM
25	I think so, subject to further discussion.	7/23/2023 4:31 PM
26	Include representation from neighborhood groups, the Cultural Heritage Board (if applicable) and DRB.	7/22/2023 5:34 PM
27	A group representing the special zones	7/22/2023 12:51 PM
28	Include key community members from impacted neighborhoods	7/22/2023 12:04 PM
29	A one person review is problematic for me. Neighborhood requirement for input is highly relevant as these are the people, housing/land values that are affected. Recruit neighborhood volunteers (2-3) to sit in on zoning reviews and provide input/concerns of the area being considered. Zoning seems to be something easily manipulated/violated in my view.	7/22/2023 10:31 AM
30	A review board of 10, 2 homeless or past homeless advocates, 2 contractor advisors, 2 mental health advocates and 2 addiction advocates, and 2 community advocates. In this configuration at all times.	7/22/2023 7:28 AM
31	A one person review body is fine as long as there is an appeal process that is disconnected from original review body.	7/21/2023 8:56 PM
32	Improve transparency. Involve current residents of the affected neighborhoods in a more thorough and inclusive manner of consideration and determination than is currently afforded.	7/21/2023 7:31 PM
33	Create a special board with the mission of creating as much housing as possible.	7/21/2023 7:16 PM
34	Yes, more qualified reviewers need to be hired as well as building inspectors	7/21/2023 6:30 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

35	Representatives from the geographic communities affected, representatives of the non-profit housing sector, and representatives from the housing developer sector. A committee, rather than a Board, so there is more flexibility in how tasks are handled.	7/21/2023 6:24 PM
36	Board made up by members of each community, zipcode	7/21/2023 5:19 PM
37	Not really sure but a group that can make sure a bunch of inferior buildings don't get built across Santa Rosa	7/21/2023 4:34 PM
38	Qualified nongovernmental appointees of city council	7/21/2023 4:26 PM
39	People interested in modeling Santa Rosa after Healdsbird, raising the level of beUty, and safety of Santa Arosa.	7/21/2023 3:47 PM
40	One person can easily be swayed by the developer. that is not a good idea at all. The Design review board needs more guidance. Stricter guidelines as to what they can and cannot ask for. they need to make a decision in no more then two sessions. this is not meant to be a process that takes years to accomplish.	7/21/2023 2:06 PM
41	In addition to the zoning administrator there should be a construction professional and a neighborhood representative to pass final approval.	7/21/2023 1:18 PM
42	one person should not have the authority	7/21/2023 12:57 PM
43	One person is unable to gave a fruitful discussion of all ramifications of a project.	7/21/2023 12:54 PM
44	Add at least 3 people with some expertise	7/21/2023 12:38 PM
45	Just add a couple of people to the Zoning Administrator's office for a committee three. One person should not be the sole decision maker for such an important building effort.	7/21/2023 12:11 PM
46	A three- person review body	7/21/2023 11:58 AM
47	For larger project, there could be a 3 member ZA body (ZA, DRB member, and some other appointed person with qualifications- PC member, for instance)	7/21/2023 10:50 AM
48	5 member	7/21/2023 10:45 AM
49	Three person body	7/21/2023 10:25 AM
50	no	7/21/2023 9:41 AM
51	Another person would be good. So it's not up to the opinion of one person.	7/21/2023 9:03 AM
52	Someone willing to listen to common sense from existing neighbors.	7/21/2023 8:59 AM
53	Add another 1-2 persons and a process that provides checks/balances so there is anti-corruption oversight.	7/21/2023 8:56 AM
54	Creating another board or commission when you already have access to the DRB, CHB, etc.and the challenges of filling volunteer positions so there is a quorum for voting seems illogical.	7/21/2023 8:20 AM
55	The body should consist of a balanced group of members affected by the process.	7/21/2023 7:59 AM
56	No more impediments	7/21/2023 7:32 AM
57	A citizen advocate with a focus on neighborhoods, not just catering to developers, to ensure that the integrity and character of the existing neighborhood is not ignored, nor existing property owners rights infringed upon. An advocate that would help promote responsible, neighborly, property development.	7/21/2023 7:08 AM
58	Someone who understands that changing the city's skyline negatively affects residents' enjoyment of their homes. I'm starting to hate it here. I had planned to live in my home until I pass, but looking out at the homeless vehicles parked across the street, the apartments that block my view of the mountains, etc. makes me want to leave.	7/21/2023 6:10 AM
59	Incorporate the individuals who have been homeless as a board to look if they would live there and is it safe for them.	7/20/2023 10:20 PM
60	3 person review teams representing the involved neighborhoods if possible.	7/20/2023 10:00 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

61	Group with multiple specialties: social services, infrastructure (power, water, traffic, parking, emergency/police), environmental, as well as making sure to consider current AND future effects.	7/20/2023 8:54 PM
62	The review body should be composed of like business owners and operators to be sure the new business would not be detrimental to operating businesses	7/20/2023 8:36 PM
63	None	7/20/2023 8:29 PM
64	Community members who live near proposed sites	7/20/2023 8:23 PM
65	One person should not be making the decision on the DRP. Have a review body that includes people who live in the area and limit the city participation to ONE person who is going to oversee the DRP and not multiple. It is unbalanced to think that the city would have one reduced Design Review Person to make decisions without including stakeholders.	7/20/2023 8:16 PM
66	there needs to be MORE attention paid to the infrastructure; POWER, WATER, sewer, TRAFFIC.	7/20/2023 8:07 PM
67	It's always better to have at least two people on any sort of decision-making body.	7/20/2023 6:45 PM
68	There should be at least three persons involved with a background in the appropriate related field.	7/20/2023 6:21 PM
69	Design Review Board	7/20/2023 6:02 PM
70	one representative from the local community, one architect, one current or retired person with specialty background in city/community design/planning.	7/20/2023 5:37 PM
71	Several people with diverse professional backgrounds should be involved	7/20/2023 5:29 PM
72	Concerned citizen review	7/20/2023 5:21 PM
73	Yes. The body should consist of three people to reduce the chance that one administrator will introduce bias, discrimination, or politics into the decision-making process.	7/20/2023 5:14 PM
74	not sure, some kind of neighborhood input. There is a new home being constructed near me in an existing neighborhood, that is entirely out of scale with the surrounding structures. There needs to be better input/review than this.	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
75	More eyes and perspectives are needed.	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
76	Add more people to the review body.	7/20/2023 5:00 PM
77	It should be an ethnically and economically diverse committee	7/20/2023 4:56 PM
78	Add a body or whatever resources are needed. But why not just go back to Design Review?	7/20/2023 4:40 PM
79	5 to 10 more	7/20/2023 4:37 PM
80	None	7/20/2023 3:52 PM
81	Hire many more people (50 people minimum) and pay them a livable salary of at least \$80k each.	7/20/2023 3:47 PM
82	Design Review Boars. That's why we have it.	7/20/2023 3:46 PM
83	The Design Review Board should review all construction projects.	7/20/2023 3:33 PM
84	outside of zoning someone needs to consider/look at support systems for the development - i.e. parking/transportation/access	7/20/2023 3:28 PM
85	Too much bearacracy	7/20/2023 3:24 PM
86	Small as possible. Focus on safety not woke policies	7/20/2023 3:17 PM
87	Have citizens from the neighborhood be on the review body	7/20/2023 2:59 PM
88	more people	7/20/2023 2:53 PM
89	Whatever is done, streamline and lower costs.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
90	odd number committee size (3 or 5) to review design submissions.	7/20/2023 2:51 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

91	The current reduced Design Review process is not adequate for assessment of large, multi-use, mid-high density housing projects in the Priority Development Areas, most of which are in, or border, historic districts. The process for ANY development in historic districts needs to be restrictive and include Cultural Heritage Board review.	7/20/2023 2:50 PM
92	A three-person review board, perhaps one city employee, one person with development expertise, and one community member. Keep it simple, but don't put too much power in the hands of one person.	7/20/2023 2:49 PM
93	Not sure	7/20/2023 2:45 PM
94	The zoning committee has enough to do.	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
95	More than 1 individual should be tasked with review	7/20/2023 2:31 PM
96	Traffic studies, sufficient green space. The Santa Rosa Avenue corridor is nothing but high density housing and retail space. There is no green space or open spaces left. This should change and some open space should be considered by a review board.	7/20/2023 2:29 PM
97	Yes. The zoning administrator has too much power right now. We need more than one person deciding what happens in an existing neighborhood.	7/20/2023 2:26 PM
98	Min 3 people.	7/20/2023 2:25 PM
99	City Council. City Government does not need to get larger and even less efficient	7/20/2023 2:25 PM
100	a body made of community members that is 100% diversity equity inclusion, i.e those with lived experience of homelessness, mental health, those who are low income, people of color, lgbtq, people with disabilities etc. This should be done given how these groups may be most negatively affected by the current housing crisis.	7/20/2023 2:25 PM
101	If there is only one person, and they are overwhelmed, or unable to perform their duties, then add additional personnel.	7/20/2023 2:17 PM
102	Rotating members of the DRB could be utilized to fill a smaller committee role.	7/20/2023 2:13 PM
103	hire more people to review	7/20/2023 2:07 PM
104	I don't know	7/19/2023 9:53 PM
105	The city should designate the types of activities which are permissible by right for housing construction. This should include all flat urban parcels. Building permits should be automatic in these areas when abiding by a clearly defined set of rules. The city should work with a vendor to build software that determines if the application meets the by right requirements and approve it without human intervention.	7/19/2023 2:13 PM
106	Keep the one person body, but add a holistic, high-level periodic review of the decisions made by the zoning administrator each quarter. Focus on trends and process improvement of the decision not re-hashing individual decisions.	7/19/2023 12:54 PM
107	Increase neighborhood participation. Actively invite residents within ~2000 feet to public meetings with mailers.	7/19/2023 12:13 PM
108	poll the readers	7/18/2023 2:32 PM

Q11 What has been your experience as a community member living near these projects during the review process and after approval?

Answered: 133 Skipped: 134

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The City has attempted to communicate with residents, but it's difficult to get updates.	8/18/2023 11:10 PM
2	Difficult to get up-to-date info. Difficulty getting neighborhood meeting	8/18/2023 5:27 PM
3	None	8/18/2023 4:43 PM
4	It has been very negative. I don't think the city is taking community input into account at all. It is one sided in favor of just pushing all development projects through no matter what the cost is to the surrounding community.	8/18/2023 1:57 PM
5	Minimal impact - seems to be working fairly well to me.	8/18/2023 10:55 AM
6	Progress realized from the Resiliency project efforts has clearly made our community a much better place to live. Benefits to participants in the various components of the plan have enabled them to much more quickly revitalize and build a community for everyone to be very proud of.	8/18/2023 10:23 AM
7	As stated earlier, grifters have taken advantage of the ordinance and have impacted our community. We are told we have no recourse.	8/18/2023 9:56 AM
8	over crowded	8/18/2023 9:49 AM
9	NA	8/18/2023 8:24 AM
10	once these are in place, who is tracking the time that they are there? Is there a consistent review process of the duration of the project so they don't exceed the time frame they were approved for???	8/18/2023 7:55 AM
11	Unknown	8/18/2023 6:35 AM
12	I have had terrible experiences with housing. I have been removed from waitlists bc my son unexpectedly had to go to urgent care or he could not return to school. I am a single mom and his care giver, so I feel we got punished for me taking my child to the doctor	8/17/2023 11:46 PM
13	No experience.	8/17/2023 9:57 PM
14	I have been disappointed to see rebuilding with wooden structures rather than fire-safe materials like tip-up concrete with steel roofing.	8/17/2023 9:31 PM
15	We had to live in a townhome off College Ave while rebuilding post Tubbs fire and there was never parking for guests.	8/17/2023 8:57 PM
16	As a Santa Rosa homeowner I am deeply concerned that projects are being fast tracked with no real evaluation of impact on the ability of Santa Rosa to adequately serve these new developments with city resources, utilities and waste. In addition the impact to traffic areas, fire escape corridors and water and waste availability in drought years. The city is so focused on building affordable housing these vital resources are being de-prioritized and the current residents will pay higher costs and will be adversely impacted by the existing review process when we return to a drought, and when the fires rage again.	8/17/2023 7:20 PM
17	It's dirty and attracts people who commit crime and litter our streets.	8/17/2023 6:31 PM
18	Only been marginally affected but just of the opinion that better to have more than one person reviewing things like that.	8/17/2023 6:33 AM
19	Increased traffic.	8/16/2023 10:54 AM
20	There is more than adequate review embedded in the process. There has also been good consistency and compatibility.	8/15/2023 11:29 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

21	projects are adequately reviewed and conditioned to be compatible, the existing process is ok.	8/11/2023 10:24 AM
22	projects are reviewed and are being built - supplying more affordable housing	8/8/2023 1:53 PM
23	These projects have been thoroughly vetted and well executed through the detailed review process currently in place under the RC standards; this process should be retained.	8/8/2023 1:18 PM
24	Notices should be in both Spanish and English to allow for a majority of residents to have access to the information about projects.	8/4/2023 6:41 PM
25	Very little info makes it my way	7/31/2023 8:03 AM
26	more congestion downtown	7/30/2023 8:32 AM
27	Lots of congestion resulting in more water shortage, lack of funds, and dangerous fire evacuation conditions. California schools have deteriorated due to overcrowding.	7/29/2023 3:36 PM
28	I am all in favor of all the new housing being constructed and options for getting folks off the streets.	7/27/2023 2:22 PM
29	the city does a good job of notifying appropriate parties	7/26/2023 3:49 PM
30	The city is making poor choices for its land use and roadways.	7/26/2023 9:28 AM
31	Neutral	7/26/2023 8:01 AM
32	I was consulted for a housing project in my neighborhood recently. I said yes to the project but no to any tree removal. Enormous old growth redwood trees were removed which is deplorable! Do not ever remove these huge old trees from any neighborhood! Build around them. We must keep our heritage trees and old growth redwoods. Housing is important, but not more important than the ecosystem that our survival relies on, as well as the habitat of entire neighborhoods.	7/24/2023 4:46 PM
33	Most often complete disregard with being a good fit for the neighborhood in terms of design aesthetics, reasonable parking and safe road access during busy times or in the event of natural disasters. Also, incorporating more green space when at all possible.	7/24/2023 2:33 PM
34	I live in east SR, but work in southwest SR. It feels like the public/alternative transportation options are not keeping up with development	7/24/2023 9:01 AM
35	Have not experienced this in my neighborhood.	7/24/2023 7:36 AM
36	We live in Coffey Park, not close enough to these areas to speak intelligently without further study.	7/23/2023 4:31 PM
37	I don't live near those projects, at least not yet.	7/23/2023 10:39 AM
38	I am unsure if the review process is the reason some projects seem to languish, but it would be nice to see projects expedited to quicker occupancy	7/23/2023 8:14 AM
39	It is heartbreaking to see will thought-out Zoning and Cultural ordinances/guidelines being put aside for projects that are unlikely to age well, serve the occupants well, accommodate neighborhood needs, acknowledge limited water/power resources and pose a danger to occupants if (heaven forbid) an emergency evacuation is required and the tenants do not have appropriate transportation or routes by which to self-evacuate.	7/22/2023 5:34 PM
40	N/A	7/22/2023 12:51 PM
41	I have seen Home neighborhoods with large scale commonwall apartments/condos built right across the street from these homes--destroyed the neighborhood.	7/22/2023 10:31 AM
42	Community will always have negative neighbors who will complain about anything and everything, with no merit. I can say, most agree if it cleans up the neighborhoods and downtown, they are in favor.	7/22/2023 7:28 AM
43	Resident off Tubbs firestorm decimated area. Have witnessed both out of state and in state/city entities take predatory and rapacious profiteering advantage of City's otherwise well intended emergency accommodations. Results; denigration of beauty and nature of residential neighborhoods, irresponsible failure to require reasonable off street or on street parking accommodations that result in severely increased numbers of vehicles and street traffic congestion points resulting in increased impediments to efficient emergency egress.	7/21/2023 7:31 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

44	No problems, except drive-through restaurants should have never been approved because they increase traffic and carbon emissions.	7/21/2023 7:16 PM
45	I have had no personal experience	7/21/2023 6:30 PM
46	Familiar with two projects: with one, people felt they had no real chance of changing project parameters ("it was a done deal"); with the second, much smaller project, people felt heard	7/21/2023 6:24 PM
47	None that I know of	7/21/2023 4:34 PM
48	They would have benefited from more people business people and law enforcement weighing in. If business and law enforcement are not prioritized, the town will erode.	7/21/2023 3:47 PM
49	Poor behavior of people. Mental illness, drug addiction.	7/21/2023 3:34 PM
50	No one is listening to the objections of the neighbors. Even when the neighbors are educated on what are applicable concerns are they are ignored over the concerns of the developer. We could have had some really cool architecture in down town. The City caved to the developer and it looks like the color wheel threw up. All of those really cool drawing we were shown in the 80's, 90's ,00's of an idyllic down town where the buildings flowed from historic to new with the same styles are forever gone.	7/21/2023 2:06 PM
51	No problem	7/21/2023 1:18 PM
52	less regulations increases rates of crime and unkept residential neighborhoods. local laws are not enforced like fireworks! More oversight is needed.	7/21/2023 12:57 PM
53	The onus is heavily placed on the citizen to seek out potential projects. In the 20 years of living in the Kawana Springs area, only two projects sent notices of meetings by mail. Of the ones I attended, I have yet to see any concerns expressed by community members addressed in the finished project. I have also noticed necessary infasturce changes are not implemented before or during the projects, but post project. The city should anticipate the obvious changes essential when adding more housing. For instance. It used to take me 5 minutes to get from my house to the Kawana Spring/Petaluma Hill intersection. It now takes an average of 12 minutes due to insufficient road expansion to accommodate the 100s of additional high density housing units in the area.	7/21/2023 12:54 PM
54	No experience. However as someone who had to rebuild after the Tubbs fire I appreciated the attempt to permit rebuilds with quick reviews. I happen to be in the process of building a cabin in Washington state and now have the opposite kind of experience---a year and a half since submission of the application for a building permit and we still don't have it.	7/21/2023 12:11 PM
55	No experience	7/21/2023 11:58 AM
56	None	7/21/2023 10:50 AM
57	The process is difficult.	7/21/2023 10:45 AM
58	None	7/21/2023 10:25 AM
59	You are turning this city into a ghetto.	7/21/2023 9:47 AM
60	There is little notification and very minimal awareness of these kind of projects. The city likes to keep their large proposals that they know impact local neighborhoods and most residents would disagree or be very upset with such proposal. For example, I live in harvest park community and I wasn't even aware that they approved an enormous pot growing facility on the corner of petaluma hill road/yolanda. I don't think anyone in this entire community was even aware that the city approved everything and granted the building of the structure to commence within 3 years. How about at the minimum going around the neighborhoods and taping on the door the proposed project if it will be impacting the neighborhood. Getting tired of board members in this city doing what they want. They aren't the ones that live next to this crap. We are..	7/21/2023 9:41 AM
61	Totally fine.	7/21/2023 9:30 AM
62	The city approved construction of a residence on our street that: 1) was based upon incorrect base zoning (the lot was zoned based upon being 5,000 sq feet when it was actually 23,000 sq ft.); 2) the city failed to enforce setback requirements; 3) they city failed to recognize the side walk easement on top of the incorrect setback requirements.	7/21/2023 9:20 AM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

63	I have no experience.	7/21/2023 9:03 AM
64	See above. Disgust.	7/21/2023 8:59 AM
65	Developers typically come to the first meeting with a final plan (rather than a draft plan) and don't expect to make modifications based on community input. Somewhere in the City process it needs to be made clear to them that the initial plan may need to be modified.	7/21/2023 8:20 AM
66	Living in Rincon Valley, I'm not that near to new projects other than the apartments being built on the corner of Calistoga Rd & Hwy 12. I worry about the increased traffic and the ability to evacuate if necessary.	7/21/2023 7:59 AM
67	We attended a DRB meeting regarding a project which proposes to put a 4 story apartment building behind our house. Not only is it incongruent with the neighborhood, it would serve no beneficial purpose - not enough space, parking or low-income units to benefit the community. The personal impact on our properties (we own 2 houses that would be effected) would be loss of light (hours of morning light), view, and privacy. The DRB board did not address any of our concerns, but rather seemed to think that a 10 foot setback was a good use of space. I would like to know how they would feel about a 4 story building built 10 feet from their fence.	7/21/2023 7:08 AM
68	See comments above. Traffic and parking is a nightmare. I stay home more to avoid dealing with it, which means merchants and restaurateurs are losing my business. I don't go out after dark because it is too dangerous. Coming home at dark means I have to check for feral people, then dash from the car to my door . I want my old Santa Rosa back.	7/21/2023 6:10 AM
69	I haven't been in projects to give an answer. But 3 years on a wait list and they said 6-10. I will not live that long. At 73 this is just the time I found being homeless to no fault of mine. The seniors disabled should have a opinion as we are just passed up	7/20/2023 10:20 PM
70	It's been fine.	7/20/2023 10:00 PM
71	This reduced design review process means that any developer wanting to build multifamily units can do so with a minimum of due diligence by the city. If this makes the city's job harder, too bad. Do your job. I've seen the city allow developments that destroy the unique character of neighborhoods skate through the system with no orders from the city to do proper ecological review and neighborhood collaboration.	7/20/2023 9:54 PM
72	One of the big issues not addressed is noise pollution from auto exhaust enhanced for loud noise. This is a cause of tension, anger, animosity and stress through out the City.	7/20/2023 8:56 PM
73	Would like to have better communication and access to information regarding timeline, traffic disruptions, future projects, etc.	7/20/2023 8:54 PM
74	None	7/20/2023 8:36 PM
75	none	7/20/2023 8:29 PM
76	None	7/20/2023 8:23 PM
77	It has not been good as there is a serious lack of communication and transparency unless you track each and every commission and what they are proposing or doing. Unless I look at social media or if an article is in the PD or the notice is sent by USPS mail, it is often not known. Why can't the city of SR use all forms of communication?	7/20/2023 8:16 PM
78	Processes are streamlined and items are missed/neglected.	7/20/2023 8:07 PM
79	funny you should ask now	7/20/2023 6:30 PM
80	I do not live near any of these projects. Therefore, I have had no practical experience.	7/20/2023 6:21 PM
81	increased traffic and congestion	7/20/2023 6:08 PM
82	I live near one and I knew nothing about it before it was being built. But I do like where they are building it.... next to College Ave Safeway.	7/20/2023 6:02 PM
83	Signage for public meetings are often posted in such a place that does not allow the public to be able to safely read them -- for example for the project at Yolanda/PetHillRd the signs were placed along a stretch of PetHillRd with no parking and unsafe place to pull over or even walk to read the sign. I wonder if the surrounding communities have really had a chance to respond due to the inability to actually read these notices of public input. Are the signs provided in	7/20/2023 5:50 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

Spanish? I think not. I appreciate the ability to provide input both via email to planners and in attending virtual planning commission meetings.


84	Lots of unmanaged persons with alcohol and drug miss use.	7/20/2023 5:37 PM
85	A lot of these multi-unit, multi storied residential projects (though needed) are frankly ugly. Most are too high cutting off sunlight for other businesses and residents.	7/20/2023 5:29 PM
86	Reducing, limiting or expediting the review process has lead to structures being built that are poorly designed, planned or located	7/20/2023 5:23 PM
87	None	7/20/2023 5:21 PM
88	Some good some bad. The people next to these projects should have some say	7/20/2023 5:12 PM
89	that when things are rushed, without enough oversight and input, mistakes are made. It's quite a tension to manage the need for expediency and the need to get it right	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
90	On line voting	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
91	I have not noticed a difference directly from the temporary house Ming by courthouse, which I've heard is there. However, the park near my house has had an influx of people and dogs.	7/20/2023 4:56 PM
92	General PLan has been tossed into the trash in the downtown area. NO parking requirements slid through during covid and the PARKING wars will now Commence..	7/20/2023 4:52 PM
93	Santa Rosa has turned into a Vallejo or oakland	7/20/2023 4:39 PM
94	I had no issues. Lets get people housed, childcare for kids, we need to fill every spot	7/20/2023 4:37 PM
95	projects need thorough review to ensure proper long term planning	7/20/2023 4:06 PM
96	No experience	7/20/2023 3:52 PM
97	Everything has been great.	7/20/2023 3:47 PM
98	No spepcific experience	7/20/2023 3:34 PM
99	The Zoning Administrators have too much discretion. The Design Review Board is much more thorough, balanced and fair.	7/20/2023 3:33 PM
100	My experience has been limited to seeing the new structures going up and wondering where everyone is going to park, how it will impact traffic flow on a daily basis and what it would be like during an evacuation. Also with the water shortage, where is all of the water coming from.	7/20/2023 3:28 PM
101	We need these projects desperately so I am sure my experience will be good in the long run.	7/20/2023 3:25 PM
102	no true impact	7/20/2023 3:18 PM
103	Any city does is bad.	7/20/2023 3:17 PM
104	Zero	7/20/2023 3:08 PM
105	Frustration	7/20/2023 3:03 PM
106	N/A	7/20/2023 3:00 PM
107	We are not listened to. The resukts from the neighborhood meetings are 180 degrees from what the neighbors are saying.	7/20/2023 2:59 PM
108	Takes a long time for projects to be "Shovel Ready." Would like to see housing, especially 10-15 floors, streamlined even quicker.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
109	too early to tell at this point..	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
110	Better signage about what is proposed ahead of time so we can add input as a community.	7/20/2023 2:52 PM
111	I think most people seem reasonable with their concerns even if it's not going to change the outcome. Its important that they can share their opinions and be heard	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
112	I live in a historic district and the reduced Design Review process allowed near development of non-historical district architectural design at the DeTurk Winery building just to accelerate a density bonus for the developer. Your review process needs a complete overhaul.	7/20/2023 2:50 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

113	Public review of proposals can be critical to informing the City of public sentiment, bringing a diversity of perspectives on a proposal, and bringing to the attention of the reviewing entity any errors that may have been made in the work of the staff or consultants evaluating the proposal.	7/20/2023 2:49 PM
114	not living near temporary housing	7/20/2023 2:48 PM
115	These neighborhoods are becoming bad, more crime, drugs and gang activity. No one wants to move into that kind of area with children	7/20/2023 2:45 PM
116	Similar to the regular project development and build out.	7/20/2023 2:44 PM
117	You indicate the public has a say in things. While the public raises a lot of concern, it appears the committees give those concerns little to no weight much of the time. Perhaps it is perception, but you know, perception is reality.	7/20/2023 2:42 PM
118	The City looks at the money they will get and not the impact to its residents. Its unfortunate that such high density housing is the norm with little thought to the benefits of single family residential neighborhoods which appear to be a thing of the past. Also there is no green space, just concrete.	7/20/2023 2:29 PM
119	The review process takes too long.	7/20/2023 2:28 PM
120	Very upsetting. Neighbors are encouraged to voice concerns, BUT zoning and planning say they are powerless to help existing residents. Density bonuses, parking reductions etc... are destroying existing neighborhoods. We need someone to help the existing homeowners. Right now, the city is helping only the developers. Stop being afraid of possible legal action from developers. Recently, the county had 2 "Builders Remedy" cases. The developers lost both cases. Don't be bullied by developers.	7/20/2023 2:26 PM
121	Nobody listens or cares. More about lining pockets of friends and donors.	7/20/2023 2:25 PM
122	No comment	7/20/2023 2:25 PM
123	They are a good beneficial	7/20/2023 2:22 PM
124	None	7/20/2023 2:19 PM
125	I don't believe I have any experience with this.	7/20/2023 2:18 PM
126	I have ended up living next to a property that has one permitted, and two illegal mobile homes on it. There are already numerous people living in the main house, and now there is a non-permitted mobile home park next to me. The City of Santa Rosa has created a situation where people are bending the rules (and being allowed to) which will lead to unsafe living conditions within the city limits. Zoning and permitting were established for a reason - return to enforcing the building/zoning codes - unless the City wants to be managing a ghetto.	7/20/2023 2:17 PM
127	The review process is robust, however, I have noticed the execution of workmanship on some of these projects has been substandard and in some cases downright horrible. There should be a mechanism that the city's building inspectors should have to allow them to reject poor workmanship on these projects.	7/20/2023 2:13 PM
128	It's been good 👍😊	7/19/2023 11:25 PM
129	Just stop with the Airbnbs	7/19/2023 9:53 PM
130	We haven't build nearly enough of them.	7/19/2023 2:13 PM
131	Indirect - hard to prove a negative, but the positive impact on homelessness and rental rates that increased housing stock is a plus.	7/19/2023 12:54 PM
132	I haven't been involved with or informed of these projects before they started construction.	7/19/2023 12:13 PM
133	Vineyards/ fish. HUMAN TRAFFICING. POLICE TRANSPARENCY..	7/18/2023 2:32 PM

Q12 Should this reduced review authority for changes to an approved project be retained? (Select all that apply)


Answered: 196 Skipped: 71



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	64.29%	126
No	35.71%	70
TOTAL		196

Q13 Do you have any concerns with allowing the additional 6 months, for a total of 12 months, for buildings/spaces to be reoccupied with a similar nonconforming use?


Answered: 201 Skipped: 66



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	36.32% 73
No	63.68% 128
TOTAL	201

Q14 Are you in support of allowing mobile food vending to continue to be located in most of the City’s commercial and industrial zoning districts beyond the sunset date of the Resilient City Development Measures Ordinance of December 31, 2023?


Answered: 199 Skipped: 68



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	85.93%	171
No	14.07%	28
TOTAL		199

Q15 What are some other regulations that can be added, removed, or revised for Mobile Food Vending? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 159 Skipped: 108



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Distance between Vendors	30.82%	49
Amplified Sound	64.15%	102
Proximity to Residential Sites	59.12%	94
Hours of Operation	52.83%	84
Number of Vendors on a Single Site	45.28%	72
Selling of Alcohol	55.97%	89
Total Respondents: 159		

Q16 Please share your thoughts on the choice(s) you selected for changes and improvements?

Answered: 120 Skipped: 147

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	They shouldn't sell alcohol and they shouldn't make a lot of noise	8/18/2023 11:13 PM
2	Mobile vendors on commercial properties are awesome and should continue without alcohol and no loud music	8/18/2023 5:33 PM
3	No selling of alcohol in a Mobile Vending setting please!	8/18/2023 4:46 PM
4	These concern me - disruption to nearby residents s/b minimized, many people work non 9-5 shifts and deserve quiet.	8/18/2023 11:00 AM
5	b	8/18/2023 9:50 AM
6	Let them earn a living	8/18/2023 8:27 AM
7	No amplified sound, hours of 10-8	8/18/2023 8:21 AM
8	These units need to comply with similar requirements for stationary restaurants or be located in an approved location where they can be inspected and monitored for compliance with regulations	8/18/2023 7:58 AM
9	*Sound should be consistent w/ current noise ordinance. *Vendors should not set up in neighborhoods only commercial sites. *As long as they are permitted to sell beer/wine. No hard liquor.	8/18/2023 6:40 AM
10	I would not want it to interfere with family residence	8/17/2023 11:49 PM
11	Let vendors respond as fully as possible to the needs of their potential customers without causing problems for local residents.	8/17/2023 10:00 PM
12	I think the most important issue for food vending (both mobile and fixed) is elimination of plastic packaging and utensils - with a high priority for requiring deposits in amounts sufficient to motivate return of any container removed from the location.	8/17/2023 9:39 PM
13	People should not be selling flats of fruit they purchased from Costco on street corners.	8/17/2023 6:32 PM
14	Think it's probably better to keep alcohol out of the equation, cap number near residential sites as too many may be too much noise/traffic, not number allowed should be appropriate to the site	8/17/2023 6:39 AM
15	allow more. great for city	8/16/2023 11:18 AM
16	accommodate more vendors where needed	8/8/2023 1:55 PM
17	Wider hours of operation. No restriction at all is needed if nuisances are otherwise minimized.	8/6/2023 10:28 PM
18	I am all for allowing mobile food vending everywhere and with minimal restrictions. It encourages entrepreneurship for hard-working people.	8/4/2023 6:46 PM
19	allow alcohol and music	8/2/2023 3:57 PM
20	I am in favor of liberalization of all food vendor regs ACCEPT health inspections!	7/31/2023 8:06 AM
21	amplified sound should not be allowed	7/30/2023 8:36 AM
22	Please stop overcrowding what was once a beautiful state. We cannot support the entire world. Reduce government as much as possible as we are spending too much money supporting people making bad decisions. If everyone paid their own way this nonsense could be resolved.	7/29/2023 3:39 PM
23	I would be wary of over-regulating, hampering creative food pop-ups.	7/27/2023 2:27 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

24	I'd like residential living not to be impacted by more traffic or noise before 8am and after 10pm	7/26/2023 2:29 PM
25	my main one is the selling of alcohol. I feel like it is already something that is not entirely watched over. Too many kids are able to get their hands on booze.	7/24/2023 8:10 PM
26	Food vendors add to the diversity and enjoyment of our city.	7/24/2023 4:48 PM
27	I think food vendor offer a more vibrant options for dining options and should be allowed to expand as long as they meet reasonable conditions as outlined above to be mindful of their location to residential neighborhoods, schools, and safe traffic access.	7/24/2023 2:38 PM
28	I am generally supportive of mobile food vending and would like to see it supported in the City. Additional sites like Mitote elsewhere in the City would be ideal.	7/24/2023 9:03 AM
29	I would reject any amplified sound in residential areas, would hope that there are restrictions on proximity to residential units. Perhaps 100 or 150 feet to provide space for residents that don't want it, and would not support serving of alcohol unless there is designated seating (i.e. not grab and go alcohol sales).	7/24/2023 7:39 AM
30	All are reasonable but use caution and discretion when allowing alcohol sales.	7/23/2023 4:41 PM
31	First, I'm unfamiliar with the mobile food vending ordinance, so sorry. However, I do recall that when SR allowed mobile food vending downtown in the White House parking lot, the downtown restaurants were very unhappy. I think the possibility for conflicts with noise are always an issue, and think that amplified sound, for instance, should only be allowed in areas where residences aren't going to have to listen to it. Hours of operation and alcohol sales are, I think, always going to be controversial. Hours are probably easier to resolve -- no sensitive uses near them. Alcohol consumption, though, never has good results, and I have a dim view of allowing it. Drunk people litter, get in trouble, and generally are lousy "neighbors." Yeah, not all of them, but enough of them....	7/23/2023 10:43 AM
32	Being that vehicular restaurants are mobile, they can be easily moved, so having them close together should not be a problem. Selling alcohol is not advisable being the mobile restaurants could move wherever they wanted (within the designated zones) & sell alcohol, even next to a school or day care center	7/23/2023 8:19 AM
33	Don't believe we need food trucks in any area of Santa Rosa	7/22/2023 8:10 PM
34	Food trucks are generally a boon, but not if uncontrolled.	7/22/2023 5:38 PM
35	Traffic backup [Dutch Bros at Mendo/Pacific], parking, ingress and egress	7/22/2023 3:28 PM
36	Amplified music needs to be monitored and enforced to conform with hours and decibel level. Enforcement is key.	7/22/2023 2:30 PM
37	no. of vendors should be able to congregate for major events, but not in residential sites (birthdays,weddings,etc.)--that is, public events.	7/22/2023 10:41 AM
38	Strong enforcement.	7/22/2023 7:31 AM
39	Further discussions and elaborations are necessary to be held in another forum for responsible consideration of this and for accommodations previously referred to.	7/21/2023 7:39 PM
40	Food trucks should be allowed everywhere, they are about the only affordable dining option left for working people.	7/21/2023 7:20 PM
41	These operations should be available, but tightly regulated to avoid blight and nuisance situations.	7/21/2023 6:26 PM
42	Sound should be kept in check. No alcohol. Not in residential areas.	7/21/2023 4:37 PM
43	Should not hinder downtown core businesses except for special events	7/21/2023 4:28 PM
44	All regulations should protect privace, quiet noise level, and peace in the area.	7/21/2023 3:53 PM
45	I'd like to see vendors distributing only what they are license for not illegal substances. I'm not saying that's pervasive. However, if you're reducing the hours I think you would see less of it.	7/21/2023 3:37 PM
46	Need to add a restriction for amplified sound, to include generators. Hours of operation should be limited to the same as the business in the surrounding area. Not sure how many mobile vendors outside of Metote have a license for alcohol, but would not add it.	7/21/2023 2:12 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

47	amplified sound should not be allowed without a separate permit. Hours of operation should be decided based on site # of vendors allowed should be determined by site No alcohol sales except by special permit	7/21/2023 1:24 PM
48	vendors should be far enough away from residential properties so parking is not a problem for residents.	7/21/2023 1:01 PM
49	Reasonable standards should be implemented to ensure they don't diminish the value or viability of existing businesses	7/21/2023 12:58 PM
50	I live in a residential neighborhood. I don't expect to find a restaurant next door	7/21/2023 12:43 PM
51	I think street vendors actually bring a city alive, but noise and other disturbances should be limited.	7/21/2023 12:15 PM
52	Some restrictions (no alcohol, not extended hours, not too near residences) seem reasonable.	7/21/2023 12:02 PM
53	I think these should be closer to residential areas so people don't have to drive too far to get prepared food.	7/21/2023 10:52 AM
54	Outlaw all of them	7/21/2023 10:13 AM
55	Assuming any of these border residential sites, it is appropriate to limit nuisance concerns - hours of operation, noise, and drug and alcohol use.	7/21/2023 9:31 AM
56	I think the food vendors are wonderful, especially at breweries and other locations.	7/21/2023 9:06 AM
57	I think it's important to strike a balance between the needs of indoor restaurants that invest heavily in our neighborhoods vs mobile vendors that should ONLY fill in gaps where there are not restaurants. I'm also concerned about mobile food vendors being given permits for areas that have poor city sanitation because of increased trash and attracting rats. I'd like to see mobile vendors get support to open indoor dining restaurants, as I think that will benefit the community the most.	7/21/2023 9:05 AM
58	All of those marked should be regulated so nearby residential residents don't experience negative quality of life issues.	7/21/2023 8:25 AM
59	I don't want a fleet of food vendors outside my home, blasting music.	7/21/2023 8:02 AM
60	Too many vendors in one area with alcohol sales into the night can create more crime, noise, safety issues, etc in those areas.	7/21/2023 7:59 AM
61	I don't have any mobile kitchens near me, but if it featured loud music and drunk patrons, I would be furious that it is allowed. They should have to rent a porta-potty in any case, so patrons don't pee on the street.	7/21/2023 6:14 AM
62	No alcohol use unless a liquor license is obtained and not sold in residential areas!	7/20/2023 11:32 PM
63	No loud sound. No alcohol sold. A food park as in Roseland could be supported in areas where there's a big enough community space allowing for people to sit at a table & eat, visit with friends & enjoy the beauty of their neighborhoods. PLEASE PROVIDE FOR SAFE, DESIGNATED PARKING SPACES IN THE EVENINGS.	7/20/2023 10:06 PM
64	As long as amplified sound doesn't exceed legal limits, and selling of alcohol is licensed and patrons have to stay on premises in the same manner as bars and restaurants, I'm fine with this. We love the mobile food vendors and what they bring to the community.	7/20/2023 9:57 PM
65	No alcohol. No noise. No late nights.	7/20/2023 9:49 PM
66	Mobile vendors operate at a financial advantage over fixed address restaurants. They also can be a magnet for gangs, noise, drugs and late night gatherings.	7/20/2023 9:00 PM
67	Can't be within two blocks of an existing brick and mortar business selling the same products	7/20/2023 8:41 PM
68	none	7/20/2023 8:31 PM
69	Noise is an issue for those who live close to where the food trucks park as the generators are loud and music is played to add to the ambience of a food truck. It would help to know what the existing muni code is for distances currently allowed within proximity to a residential site as it doesn't seem to be working or you'd not be asking this question. The food truck site on	7/20/2023 8:26 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

Seb. Rd. is good as it one SPOT where trucks can go rather than random spots around the city.

70	Hours of operation should definitely be limited and I do not feel that food trucks should sell alcohol	7/20/2023 8:09 PM
71	No changes needed	7/20/2023 8:07 PM
72	I think food trucks are a great idea. Everywhere on main streets, parking lots, business sites, etc. They should not be allowed on small residential streets. But no "ice cream-truck-like" music should be allowed and no loud music ever. It's a food truck not a bar. No alcohol should be allowed, as it's far too dangerous for drivers who stop and get food and alcohol to keep driving. It's not safe. They can take their food home and drink there if they want alcohol.	7/20/2023 7:24 PM
73	i find it odd to now have so many food trucks in city as what happens to spaces deemed already for food services they go under?	7/20/2023 6:34 PM
74	The adjacent area should not be negatively affected by Mobile Food Vending.	7/20/2023 6:25 PM
75	1. I believe it would be hugely fruitful that for new multi-family units or family units being built should have a daycare/preschool center as a part of the build in the building(s). One per housing development. Less stress for parents knowing where their kids are, older kids can come later in the day to do homework (in another room so not to disrupt the younger kids). Price would be on sliding scale depending on income levels. Kids are close to home for parents at days end, and hiring would be depending on enrollment. I believe this is a must as part of the building as a whole. The vendors are a wonderful thing. They should be allowed to be closer to where folks work, where they can walk to and not have to drive to and take up their lunch hour waiting and drive back. They put out good food, some even really healthy food.	7/20/2023 6:17 PM
76	NO amplified sound for the sake of nearby businesses and residences. Make sure there is not crowding of vendors, causing traffic congestion to and from the vendors by patrons. NO alcohol, period.	7/20/2023 5:52 PM
77	no amplified sound without a special event permit and sound off before 11 am and after 8 pm. number of vendors and sale of alcohol should be limited by location and size of each site. ok if close to residential sites but should move vendor trucks by 8 pm and not return until 7 am.	7/20/2023 5:47 PM
78	improved	7/20/2023 5:40 PM
79	Sebastopol Rd frankly looks junky. Too many vendors packed in too tightly. A few of these are welcome. I use them myself. Noise after 10 p.m. should be addressed	7/20/2023 5:35 PM
80	Mobile vendors should no longer be allowed on Sebastopol Ave and should only be allowed on General Commercial property, with consideration to proximity away from residential neighborhoods. Dedicated, designated sites should be established to create "food truck camps" and discourage mobile vendors from occupying one off locations. Neither amplified sound or selling of alcohol should be allowed	7/20/2023 5:33 PM
81	No brainer no alcohol	7/20/2023 5:23 PM
82	Amplified sound should not disturb residential neighbors.	7/20/2023 5:16 PM
83	No food trucks near restaurants	7/20/2023 5:15 PM
84	I love the vending sights overall, but time and size limits are necessary for those too near dense residential areas	7/20/2023 5:06 PM
85	Food truck harm local restaurants and should be very limited.	7/20/2023 5:05 PM
86	alcohol sales should be limited and strictly regulated	7/20/2023 5:05 PM
87	I think that vendors who are in residential areas or close to residential homes should have sound level restrictions. I also don't think the trucks should be close to homes as they bring traffic and high possibility of rodents/insects.	7/20/2023 5:02 PM
88	Food Trucks have destroyed the restaurant business, brick and mortar, here in Santa Rosa... Since HUGE amounts of immigrants from countries that are used to this kind of vending are replacing our populace, they should continue to destroy all regular businesses in favor of their black market under the table style of vending.	7/20/2023 4:56 PM
89	Pack them close, play good music sell drinks in neighborhoods open til 4 am lots of vendors	7/20/2023 4:40 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments


90	regulations needed for goodwill	7/20/2023 4:10 PM
91	I love food trucks. I think they add options to the area and get people out. I do not like food truck that allow pre ordering by phone or app. They should be allowed to park in the city around work and gathering places.	7/20/2023 3:56 PM
92	Add selling of alcohol to mobile food vendors. Everyone deserves a beer with their tacos!	7/20/2023 3:49 PM
93	Use Mitote Park as an example if how to do it right.	7/20/2023 3:48 PM
94	Mobile Food Vending can alter the character of a neighborhood that has mixed use and/or several residential units nearby. Hours of operation should be consistent with the hours of operation of nearby commercial or public buildings. Norms established in a neighborhood, such as suppression of gang activities and misdemeanor crimes, graffiti abatement, prevention of homeless encampments, and general cleanliness and trash removal should be required of food vendor management.	7/20/2023 3:43 PM
95	Any opportunity to reduce requirements (bureaucracy) would be an improvement	7/20/2023 3:41 PM
96	Great idea but needs strict guidelines and monitoring	7/20/2023 3:36 PM
97	Need to keep order	7/20/2023 3:26 PM
98	If you allowed cheaper building permits and better regulations less truck would be needed. Too many regulations. Need to sunset your regulations and allow more freedom.	7/20/2023 3:20 PM
99	If it's going to be opened up, citywide there need to be more regulations. You're talking to adjacent to some residential areas.	7/20/2023 3:11 PM
100	No amplified sound!	7/20/2023 3:06 PM
101	Awareness of residential homeostasis and also the safety issue of alcohol creating the need for further Law Enforcement interventions.	7/20/2023 3:05 PM
102	allow food vendors more flexibility to serve the community. We use to have a taco stand near our community park and on Friday we played Bocce and gathered together, the taco stand was part of the attraction. why not expand where food vending can take place?	7/20/2023 3:01 PM
103	Vendors on a single site should be a ratio relative to the size of the site.	7/20/2023 2:57 PM
104	There should be no amplified music or selling of alcohol...creates problems. Should not be by residential areas.	7/20/2023 2:56 PM
105	Not later than 10pm on weekends, and 9pm on weekdays (amplified sound).	7/20/2023 2:54 PM
106	see above	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
107	Fully support Mobile Food vending, just not late at night adjacent to residential sites.	7/20/2023 2:51 PM
108	Mobile food vending should not be creating new restaurant districts	7/20/2023 2:32 PM
109	In trying to not drive brick and mortar restaurants out of business should be the over arching goal.	7/20/2023 2:31 PM
110	Need to be respectful of residents.	7/20/2023 2:30 PM
111	No amplified sound. Specify distance to residential. 200 yards? Done by 9pm. No alc.	7/20/2023 2:28 PM
112	NO alcohol or amplified sound. Not adjacent to residential sites unless they close by 9 p.m.	7/20/2023 2:27 PM
113	Food vending "trucks" need to operate in publicly designated areas with no amplified sound that would disturb local residents.	7/20/2023 2:26 PM
114	I have several co-workers who eat from food trucks parked on the side of the street so I think the regulations should remain the same.	7/20/2023 2:21 PM
115	We need mobile food vending in Santa Rosa. Downtown restaurants need competition, and locals need alternatives to the monopoly of restaurants downtown. It will make Santa Rosa more lively, attractive to tourists, and more sustainable and usable for locals - as well as stimulating local businesses.	7/20/2023 2:20 PM
116	Alcohol sales should be allowed. Sound should meet City rules	7/20/2023 2:14 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

117	keep sound levels down	7/20/2023 2:08 PM
118	We should build more food courts, and they should be spread across the city, and not necessarily only in industrial zones. We should want more dense housing with things that people can walk to. Additionally, we should legalize alcohol consumption at all of these parks and permanently in the courthouse sq like Sonoma and Healdsburg already do.	7/19/2023 2:15 PM
119	Relax restrictions on distance between vendors, proximity to residential sites, hours of operation, and number of vendors on a single site. (Maintain existing regulations, if any, on amplified sound and selling of alcohol.)	7/19/2023 12:34 PM
120	We should encourage both temporary and permanent vendors within neighborhoods to improve walkability and fill in food deserts. Limits on hours are fine, but end commercial/residential segregation.	7/19/2023 12:16 PM

Q17 Should the City update this section of the Code to allow it to apply to any property that is impacted by a natural disaster?


Answered: 194 Skipped: 73



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	82.99%	161
No	17.01%	33
TOTAL		194

Q18 What are some standards that should apply to properties impacted by a natural disaster?

Answered: 187 Skipped: 80



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Allowance for rebuilding non-conforming structures (can build to the exact footprint/height even if it wouldn't be allowed under current standards)	56.68%	106
Clear landscaping requirements (when and if landscaping is installed)	55.08%	103
More streamlined process for Design Review, Hillside Development Permits and Landmark Alteration permits	62.03%	116
Prioritization of rebuilding review by City Staff	75.40%	141
Total Respondents: 187		

Q19 Please let us know any other comments

Answered: 94 Skipped: 173

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Thanks for gathering input from residents.	8/18/2023 11:14 PM
2	-	8/18/2023 11:01 AM
3	This program has provided so much benefit to our community! It needs to continue.	8/18/2023 10:35 AM
4	c	8/18/2023 9:51 AM
5	Stay out of the unincorporated neighborhood. There is plenty of other open spaces.	8/18/2023 8:30 AM
6	It is important to help people affected by natural disasters to rebuild easily and affordably to help maintain livable and affordable housing in the community. That said, it is also important to improve deficient structures and not allow rebuilding that would encourage a similar outcome in the future.	8/18/2023 8:00 AM
7	None at this time	8/18/2023 6:40 AM
8	The waitlists for all these new housing structures need to be made more available to the public	8/17/2023 11:51 PM
9	Limit re-development to new units less subject to future disasters.	8/17/2023 10:02 PM
10	Please, please ALWAYS consider how you and your families would feel about any changes made	8/17/2023 9:02 PM
11	I want to buy a small land and to build a modular house in a lovely area.	8/17/2023 6:34 PM
12	Please clean up our city!	8/17/2023 6:34 PM
13	Parking minimums and low-density zoning mandates should be eliminated or highly reduced. They increase construction and infrastructure costs without providing much of any social benefit. Higher-density housing (especially market rate) is how you increase housing stock, reduce GHG emissions, and improve city finances in one go.	8/6/2023 10:38 PM
14	For areas impacted by wildfires, rather than trying to rebuild as quick as possible, we should really consider whether it is smart to rebuild at all. And, if areas are being rebuilt, to do so in a way that will discourage future destruction by wildfires.	8/4/2023 6:49 PM
15	It's hard for citizens to know the right questions to ask - proactive communication helps the regulars like myself know what's going on with development in the city	7/31/2023 8:09 AM
16	This is a very hard survey for the average citizen to complete; issues are technical and ramifications are difficult to understand in such a simplistic survey.	7/30/2023 8:38 AM
17	Please hire fewer and people who have actually run businesses and understand how to work profit and loss statements in government. Too many government workers have never worked outside of government & have guaranteed benefits & salaries the rest of the world doesn't receive. We need working class citizens making wise decisions. There is too much waste.	7/29/2023 3:42 PM
18	I can't really say what regulations exactly are going to make the most sense. I am wary of going overboard out of regulatory zeal and preventing creative solutions. That said, there should be capacity to revoke permission if a temporary residence or a food truck becomes a nuisance.	7/27/2023 2:33 PM
19	The Resilient City program was a smart response to natural disasters. It's time we apply the same mindset to the ongoing housing affordability and homelessness crisis. The City would be smart to relax design review requirements for multi-family housing citywide.	7/26/2023 4:10 PM
20	Thanks for seeking input	7/26/2023 2:30 PM
21	Put money into home hardening for all residents in fire-prone areas. Limit defensible space to a reasonable distance per home. Defensible space beyond 100' from homes is useless. No to all	7/24/2023 4:51 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

	prescribed burns. Harden homes instead!	
22	Please have oversight but also limit unnecessary bureaucracy and redundancy when it is reasonable under the conditions of the project(s).	7/24/2023 2:42 PM
23	I really support streamlining and hope that it helps the us attract development and commercial activity into the future! I also hope that our Planning Dept and other groups have enough discretion to make sure that design and other choices made have a positive impact on our community.	7/24/2023 7:40 AM
24	Move promptly, with fairness to all. Give every consideration to those less fortunate than you!	7/23/2023 4:50 PM
25	Good luck!	7/23/2023 10:44 AM
26	Anything to help those unfortunate souls negatively impacted by a natural disaster merits at least some attention	7/23/2023 8:21 AM
27	First and foremost, ALL ELECTRIC house is NOT RESILIENT. By definition, resiliency is the ability to function by use of alternatives. Natural gas and propane allowed households to remain self sufficient (i.e. not requiring City or taxpayer assistance) following natural and man-made disasters/power failures. Forcing all electric dependency means new tenants/homeowners will be dependent on City Services for undetermined periods and for which there is no budget. End all-electric housing ASAP.	7/22/2023 5:43 PM
28	Adopt more of a 'triage style' review process for disaster rebuilding of like structures. Current review process significantly delayed non disaster applications.	7/22/2023 3:32 PM
29	Don't neglect aesthetics and street trees in your effort to encourage building. Don't create low income heat islands. Trees should be planted in multiple unit areas. Childcare fprograms require stringent safe guards.	7/22/2023 12:59 PM
30	I am concerned about the recent increase in housing and have not heard any comments about water; yet we are required to "conserve". Your thoughts?	7/22/2023 10:46 AM
31	Build up, not out!	7/22/2023 7:34 AM
32	Living in the Tubbs fire zone it seems that developers have complete control over what they build. Every lot on FG now holds a monstrous, ugly apartment-building-like structure. No one has planted any shrubs or trees to make the hillside natural again.	7/21/2023 9:00 PM
33	Increase transparency and access to information residents and interested parties require to intelligently engage with City personnel having authority to grant accommodations to applicants. City should more effectively/efficiently inform public in a greater/increased geographic radius likely to be affected by accommodations being considered/granted.	7/21/2023 7:50 PM
34	Build more housing NOW, and retrofit the streets for active transport. De-prioritize cars! We are facing a climate emergency that will only get worse if we stick with the old NIMBY, car dependent model of development.	7/21/2023 7:28 PM
35	The abundance of housing being built without adequate parking will likely result in a blight of cars parked on neighboring streets, hazardous illegal parking, and increased car vandalism. These are antithetical to my definition of a "resilient city."	7/21/2023 6:30 PM
36	I understand there needs to be more housing in Santa Rosa but don't let it get out of hand and ruin "the feel" of Santa Rosa.	7/21/2023 4:39 PM
37	Please allow more building and encourage denser construction. Reduce or eliminate parking minimums city-wide	7/21/2023 4:00 PM
38	Good luck	7/21/2023 3:38 PM
39	Pretty long survey on a variety of subjects. Might want to shorten it to two or three next time to gain more participation.	7/21/2023 2:13 PM
40	Santa Rosa's permit process is unnecessarily complex and slow. The process should be modernized and streamlined without losing the ability to control quality and progress towards a more sustainable city	7/21/2023 1:28 PM
41	ask the Governor to revise AB-800(to include 2017 Tub-fire victims).	7/21/2023 1:05 PM
42	nonconforming structures can cause problems for neighbors.	7/21/2023 1:05 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

43	Be equitable citywide	7/21/2023 1:02 PM
44	Thank you - I don't want to evacuate again. I'm 83 and happy where I'm at. I certainly don't want to move!	7/21/2023 12:47 PM
45	I'm pleased that you are getting community comments. Anything you can do to simplify and expedite the permitting process will benefit our unhoused population, provide affordable housing for people working here, and increase the tax base for the city.	7/21/2023 12:17 PM
46	None	7/21/2023 12:03 PM
47	Fountaingrove is an example of what went wrong with -RC. The rebuild allowance to default to the underlying zoning district has changed the look of this development so it no longer blends with the hillside. Building envelopes and setbacks should have been retained here to allow for new landscaping to fill in the gaps and create a well-planned hillside development. Instead, there are many home designs that do not follow the ridgeline and the massing is overwhelming and does not respect the hillside	7/21/2023 10:57 AM
48	The city made base zoning errors on our street that allowed non-conforming residences to rebuilt on our street after the Tubbs fire. As homeowners, we were NEVER informed of the zoning changes that affect our street. We received notices on all sorts of matters from the city. But not the lessening of zoning standards, which was done by the city council in October 2017 -- we found out years later.	7/21/2023 9:27 AM
49	Historic structures and historic districts need existing codes and guidelines enforced or Santa Rosa's built history will be further destroyed resulting in a generic community with no connection to its past.	7/21/2023 8:31 AM
50	Do the taxes the city receives from homes rebuilt in fire prone zones, outweigh the cost to the city of first responders, utility and road reconstruction, etc when a fire happens?	7/21/2023 8:07 AM
51	thanks for this survey.... the people of the community need to have their opinions and concerns addressed	7/21/2023 8:00 AM
52	I would like to see a review of the practice of allowances/concessions for low-income units. It seems like the calculations are off. Desingnating 5 units out of 45 should automatically allow you the bonus of lot-line adjustments, minimal parking, and height allowances.	7/21/2023 7:19 AM
53	The vehicle alarm of a feral person's camper just went off for the 100000th time. The police won't do a damn thing. This has been going on for MONTHS because he is allowed to park wherever the F* he wants. The alarm goes off multiple times a day, all hours of the day. THIS HAS TO STOP.	7/21/2023 6:17 AM
54	Original standards in Fountaingrove should have been retained so that only earth tone colors were approved by the City. No white paint was allowed so as to make hillside homes less visible from the valley floor. Now 80% or more homes in Fountaingrove are painted white.	7/20/2023 11:39 PM
55	PARKING! PARKING! PARKING! provisions for nighttime community events so walking home in the dark is not required.	7/20/2023 10:08 PM
56	Do better.	7/20/2023 10:04 PM
57	More education is needed on the impacts of these things. I have no idea how these things played out so I have no opinion on things I don't know about.	7/20/2023 9:50 PM
58	The city needs far more adaptation to climate change and the new circumstances residents are facing. We need more protection for trees and parks as these provide cooling and buffering from climate change.	7/20/2023 9:02 PM
59	Do not operate in a vacuum and keep the questions coming and publish the entire survey results and notify the people of SR of what the results are. Also helpful to see the raw data and comments from others and not just the final analysis. If we are to remain a unified city, we need to know all the details from our neighbors and not just a simplified version. Some of us are engaged and want to know what others think and why.	7/20/2023 8:30 PM
60	With ANY new building, there should be setbacks and height limits according to the most restrictive zoning on each place in question. Rebuilding should not mean constructing a mansion where there was once a 2 bedroom house, where zoning would not permit that. There is a distinct lack of discussion about ecologically sound practices. Paving should be	7/20/2023 7:34 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

minimized. Trees and native plants should be maximized on every new construction, in every little corner possible, most especially for businesses and apartments/condos/ etc. Roof water collection should be mandatory for all new building construction. Solar energy, geothermal or wind energy (whatever is appropriate for the area) should be absolutely non-negotiable for EVERY new business and industrial construction. Roof water collection should be instituted on every new and existing home. New roads going tonnes construction should have a SEPARATE protected walk/bike lane. Cats should be separated. This city needs to become more pedestrian and bike friendly and shoulders on roads are entirely inadequate. This should apply to ALL new construction- temporary or permanent.


61	ok thanks	7/20/2023 6:35 PM
62	I applaud the survey and help our city to continue to move in a positive direction.	7/20/2023 6:26 PM
63	Main thought is the daycare in every new construction of lower income family units.	7/20/2023 6:20 PM
64	"Affordable housing" is not adequate to the needs of our community. There need to be less luxury/high-end units and MORE really affordable opportunities. There is a huge disparity between what is available as "affordable" and the income levels of the people who need housing to continue to support our communities. The more people who have to commute to our area to work because they can't afford to live here means we have higher level of CO2 emissions from commuting traffic as well as being unsupportive of those who work here.	7/20/2023 5:56 PM
65	Get more surveys out to the masses 😊	7/20/2023 5:24 PM
66	Rather than making it easier to rebuild in areas impacted by natural disaster, we should be moving toward prohibiting rebuilding in these areas. We need to stop building in the WUI and floodplains.	7/20/2023 5:24 PM
67	thanks listening	7/20/2023 5:07 PM
68	Make the permitting process as user friendly as possible for those who have suffered the loss of, or damage to, their home or business.	7/20/2023 5:06 PM
69	I wish the short term rental rules came to our email as this did. It's too cumbersome to be involved in those meetings, but short term rentals have a negative impact on my neighborhood and I didn't know they would be in my neighborhood and would be so long and hard a process to get the City to modify the rules in hindsight	7/20/2023 5:05 PM
70	Santa Rosa is a crashing town. The bureaucrats are living high on the hog with their fat guaranteed paychecks and golden parachute retirements. Keep up the pressure until downtown is a ghost town of Zombie druggies and street people. That's what supports government workers. More socialist style, sap the productive people, tax and spend, drum up more racist ideology and conflict surrounding sexuality issues. The administration is doing a GREAT job of this so far. Only the decent people are being forced out, so Keep making it hard on everyone to do business.	7/20/2023 5:03 PM
71	I have lived here all my life and the change in this city is very sad, it isn't a special city any more, the homeless and gang bangers have run over this old small family town, when able I can't wait to leave this I'll run city.	7/20/2023 4:43 PM
72	Very difficult to follow questions and complicated issues	7/20/2023 4:37 PM
73	Get rid of the camping ordinances that don't require permits - camping in the city with out proper permits has not been good for Santa Rosa.	7/20/2023 3:59 PM
74	Streamline air b-n-b permits so that additional housing is available immediately. Our guests can't afford to stay in local hotels/motels, and the air b-n-b's near us are always full.	7/20/2023 3:52 PM
75	It is not clear from this survey whether or not there is a formal governmental designation of "natural disaster". Also, what if the disaster is caused by humans, such as arsen, gun fire, vandalism, or even owner neglect?	7/20/2023 3:48 PM
76	We need to streamline the removal of trees near (25 feet) of our homes. We should not be paying for permits to keep our homes in compliance with fire safety defensible parameters	7/20/2023 3:43 PM
77	I appreciate your efforts and hope we can continue to provide expediated services to our citizens that have been impacted by disasters.	7/20/2023 3:38 PM
78	NA	7/20/2023 3:27 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

79	Cut paperwork. Allow more freedom. Stay out of the Way.	7/20/2023 3:22 PM
80	We have building codes for a reason. For safety with the occupants, and for assurances, when there is a new owner that things were done right. Do not waver away from this.	7/20/2023 3:12 PM
81	None at this time.	7/20/2023 3:07 PM
82	The cities effort to collect, AND CONSIDER public input is encouraged	7/20/2023 2:56 PM
83	Primary concern is the expedited permitting in historic districts to expedite density bonuses without surveying the residents of those neighborhoods/neighborhood associations.	7/20/2023 2:56 PM
84	Need to do something about the homeless population. Now with the Caritas Center, seems more homeless are camping downtown to be right next to those services.	7/20/2023 2:55 PM
85	Thank you for asking for opinions, its already so traumatic to lose your home in a fire, any way to make it easier on these homeowners is much appreciated.	7/20/2023 2:55 PM
86	IF measures are passed for streamlining of processes for properties affected by natural disaster it should ONLY be if the rebuild is by the same owner as the destroyed/damaged property.	7/20/2023 2:28 PM
87	Stop building big ass building all over our city. There are to many people here with the infrastructure that we have to work with. It is ashame what this place has become	7/20/2023 2:27 PM
88	Please complete the Greenway project. A tremendous value for the city is waiting.	7/20/2023 2:24 PM
89	I believe there should still be rules that are followed about building within the City Limits, but making the permit process faster benefits everyone.	7/20/2023 2:23 PM
90	I have been dealing with neighbors on all three sides who are using illegal/non-permitted structures for living spaces. It is a blight on the city, and reduces the quality of living for local tax paying property owners. It reduces home values, and sets a tone of lawlessness in the city. Restore rigorous standards for construction and living spaces and restore sanity to Santa Rosa.	7/20/2023 2:22 PM
91	Just get rid of the Airbnbs.	7/19/2023 9:55 PM
92	The city should eliminate side setbacks in downtown, cherry st, junior college, luther burbank, etc, and allow by right construction of row houses in all of these areas as long as it a) splits the parcel at least once. b) Includes at least twice as many bedrooms. c) Includes a space with a separate entrance, bathroom, and wiring for a kitchenette that either could be from the start an ADU, or easily converted into one. Additionally, at least corner lots should be granted at least 4 floors of height for multifamily units with commercial/retail space.	7/19/2023 2:19 PM
93	Risk based review of permits. Streamline the entire process with governance and process improvement that include periodic review of decisions and trending to identify area of improvement	7/19/2023 12:59 PM
94	End the relaxed standards for lodging. The number one priority must be long term residents, and they must have opportunities to become homeowners. Be willing to reduce house prices! Increase density and bring mixed use back throughout the city! Use the increased density to support public transit. Discourage private autos and provide street cover to make walking pleasant.	7/19/2023 12:21 PM

Q20 Which of the following describes you best? Select all that apply.

Answered: 190 Skipped: 77



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I live in Santa Rosa	86.84% 165
I work in Santa Rosa	45.26% 86
I own a business in Santa Rosa	18.95% 36
I go to school in Santa Rosa	2.63% 5
Other (please specify)	11.58% 22
Total Respondents: 190	


#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	I live in unincorporated Santa Rosa area.	8/18/2023 4:48 PM
2	I own property in Santa Rosa and am building a new home there.	8/18/2023 10:37 AM
3	My child goes to school in Santa Rosa.	8/4/2023 6:49 PM
4	I retired at 72 years of age after working my way through college & earning every dime I have through hard work.	7/29/2023 3:45 PM
5	I live in Larkfield-Wikiup.	7/24/2023 1:55 PM
6	I am retired in Santa Rosa	7/23/2023 8:23 AM
7	concerned citizen	7/22/2023 10:48 AM
8	I hope to retire here.	7/22/2023 7:38 AM
9	My son has a business in Santa Rose and I often am in Santa Rosa	7/21/2023 3:40 PM
10	Owned/very successful business for major developer(27yr),,	7/21/2023 1:12 PM

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

11	I live 1/2 mile outside the city limits, in the NE.	7/21/2023 12:18 PM
12	My kids go to school in Santa Rosa	7/21/2023 9:07 AM
13	I live in a "county pocket" inside the city	7/21/2023 8:01 AM
14	I have lived in the Roseland area for over 30 years and own 2 properties here	7/21/2023 7:22 AM
15	I own a commercial property in Santa Rosa	7/20/2023 6:27 PM
16	Homeowner, resident since 1967	7/20/2023 5:56 PM
17	I left Santa Rosa because of high cost and the red tape. No natural gas appliances	7/20/2023 5:19 PM
18	I also work in other parts of The Bay Area	7/20/2023 3:49 PM
19	I am just outside the city limits, but lived there for 20 years	7/20/2023 3:14 PM
20	I am retired and live in unincorporated Santa Rosa.	7/20/2023 3:08 PM
21	daughter goes to HS in Santa Rosa	7/20/2023 2:57 PM
22	I rent in Santa Rosa, and want to buy.	7/19/2023 12:22 PM

Q21 What is your gender?


Answered: 189 Skipped: 78



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Woman	54.50%	103
Man	35.45%	67
Non-binary	0.00%	0
I prefer not to say	8.99%	17
I prefer to self-identify. (If you prefer to "self-identify), please describe yourself.	1.06%	2
TOTAL		189

Q22 What is your race and/or ethnicity? Choose all that apply.


Answered: 188 Skipped: 79



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
White/Caucasian	71.81%	135
Black/African American	2.13%	4
Hispanic/Latinx	5.32%	10
Asian	3.72%	7
Native American	0.00%	0
Pacific Islander	0.53%	1
I prefer not to say	17.02%	32
I prefer to self-identify. (If you prefer to "self-identify), please describe yourself.	4.79%	9
Total Respondents: 188		

Q23 What is your age?

Answered: 182 Skipped: 85




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
17 years old or younger	0.00%	0
18-24 years old	1.65%	3
25-34 years old	5.49%	10
35-49 years old	17.58%	32
50 to 64 years old	37.91%	69
65 years old and over	37.36%	68
TOTAL		182

Q24 What languages do you speak at home? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 185 Skipped: 82

Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments




Santa Rosa Resilient City proposed amendments

ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES
English		98.92% 183
Spanish		10.81% 20
Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese)		1.08% 2
Tagalog (incl. Filipino)		1.08% 2
Ilocano, Samoan, Hawaiian, or other Austronesian languages		0.54% 1
Vietnamese		0.54% 1
Thai, Lao, or other Tai-Kadai Languages		1.08% 2
Khmer		0.54% 1
Amharic, Somali, or other Afro-Asiatic Languages		0.54% 1
French (incl. Cajun)		2.70% 5
Swahili or other languages of Central, Eastern, and Southern Africa		0.54% 1
German		1.62% 3
Korean		0.54% 1
Italian		2.70% 5
Asian Indian Languages		1.08% 2
Persian (incl. Farsi, Darsi)		0.54% 1
Russian		0.54% 1
Sign Language		2.16% 4
Other (please specify)		1.62% 3
Total Respondents: 185		
#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Farsi.	7/21/2023 1:12 PM
2	Several Scandinavian languages	7/20/2023 7:36 PM
3	Portuguese	7/20/2023 2:30 PM

Q25 What is your voting district? (Don't know? Find your district)

Answered: 183 Skipped: 84



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
District 1 – Eddie Alvarez	5.46%	10
District 2 – Mark Stapp	14.75%	27
District 3 – Dianna MacDonald	8.20%	15
District 4 – Victoria Fleming	23.50%	43
District 5 – Chris Rogers	15.30%	28
District 6 – Jeff Okrepkie	9.29%	17
District 7 – Natalie Rogers	5.46%	10
No district – I have a Santa Rosa address and live outside city limits	10.93%	20
No district – I do not live in Santa Rosa	7.10%	13
TOTAL		183