

Nicholson, Amy

From: Eric Ritz <Eric.Ritz@sonoma-county.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:06 PM
To: Nicholson, Amy
Subject: RE: City Council Meeting, 7/9

Thank you Amy!

I will put my bullet points below:

~Developer wants to build 130 new apartments, but clearly did a faulty, misleading survey to determine how many parking spaces to include. He surveyed San Francisco, so that he can falsely claim that our area is “walkable” and “we found that most people don’t use cars and instead opt for public transport”. This is likely more accurate when describing SF, but is completely false about our area, and he knows this. He purposely surveyed SF so that he could build more apartments on the lot instead of providing adequate parking. As currently allotted, there are barely under 2 spaces per apartment in his proposal.

~There is literally no more parking left in our area. Once the new condos went up 2 years ago, you might be shocked to know that tenants have MORE than 1.5 cars per apartment. The assigned parking is always filled, and cars are forced to park far down nearby street Tuxhorn. If we add 130 new apartments, with wholly inadequate spaces available, I genuinely have no idea where these cars are going to go

~This was a disingenuous cash grab by the developer, and after surveying owners of the condos/townhouses on Pebblecreek and Tuxhorn Dr. (the townhouses located directly next to this site), I can fairly assess that average car per unit is ***minimum*** 2.5 (3 per unit was a much more common answer, but I’m cheating down to try to even pretend that the developer was being anywhere close to honest). That would mean this new complex would need at least 325 parking spots to accommodate all of the new cars added to the community, and I believe his plan accounted for less than 190 cars.

~This is clearly a cash grab, which will force an already untenable parking situation to worsen, in ways I honestly can’t imagine. Again, there is already no room for the cars presently in the neighborhood, and adding 130+ cars with no designated parking spaces is a flat out absurd proposal brought on by a purposely misleading land survey done in a totally different city environment

~He also plans to have two driveways exiting directly into a school zone, which – due to it being a one lane road with ZERO shoulder – already backs up during school drop off and pick up. The school’s turnout is very shallow, allowing only 6 cars max to be in the school drop off zone, meaning all other cars are waiting on Dutton Meadow, backed up. His driveway exits directly into where the traffic is already backed up, which would make an already bad situation even worse.

~This development was not planned in any way for the convenience of the neighborhood, and is merely an attempt to cram as many units as possible onto the parcel.

ERIC RITZ
ACCOUNTING ASSISTANT

[County of Sonoma](#)
[Auditor-Controller Treasurer-Tax Collector Dept.](#)
Phone: 707.565.3280

Dear Dr. Nicholson,

As a local resident currently living with my wife near the project address of 2684 Dutton Meadow in Santa Rosa, I will like to recommend that this construction project remain on hold until a suitable traffic and congestion plan can be formally reviewed and approved by the local community.

I have grave concerns regarding the increasing vehicular congestion in this area, particularly along Hearn Ave and Dutton Meadows and the immediate neighboring streets that would be directly impacted by the proposed Dutton Meadows Subdivision project.

Prior to approving this project, we need to see a feasible traffic and congestion plan that specifically accounts for the increase in vehicular traffic flow from this project.

Based on what information has been available, I am requesting that this Dutton Meadow Subdivision project be denied approval to move forward until I and the local Santa Rosa community can review and approve a feasible, practical plan addressing the increased traffic congestion specifically related to this project.

Thank you,

Tulio and Maria Vasquez