

From: [Montoya, Michelle](#)
To: [_DRB - Design Review Board](#)
Cc: [Murray, Susie](#)
Subject: 8.1 - Brookwood Medical - Late Correspondence as of 9.1.2022 as of 3.30pm
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 3:25:00 PM
Attachments: [Late Correspondence as of 9.1.2022 at 3.30pm.pdf](#)

- PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO ALL -

Chair Weigl and members of the Design Review Board,

The reason for this email is to provide you with new public comments received for item 8.1, Brookwood Medical, scheduled for today's meeting. This will also be added to the agenda.

Thanks,

Michelle Montoya | PACE | Administrative Secretary

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-4645 | mmontoya@srcity.org



From: [Murray, Susie](#)
To: [Montoya, Michelle](#); [Nicholson, Amy](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Comment on proposed Brookwood Medical Building
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 2:45:31 PM

Late correspondence. I'll address it during my presentation. Michelle, any chance you can post it?

Please note that I will be on vacation beginning September 15, 2022, and returning to work on October 11, 2022.

Susie Murray | Senior Planner | Staff Liaison to the Cultural Heritage Board

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4348 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | SMurray@srcity.org



From: Eric Chazankin <echazan@sonic.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:04 PM
To: Murray, Susie <SMurray@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on proposed Brookwood Medical Building

Hello Ms. Murray -

Greetings. I am writing with some comments on the proposed medical office building and parking garage at 101 Brookwood Avenue and 884 & 1000 2nd Street.

My family trust owns Creekside Medical Plaza, 95 Montgomery Drive - a 23,500sf (+/-) medical office complex right across Brookwood Avenue from this proposed project (I am trustee of that trust). My family has owned and managed this property since 1976. We also own and manage the retail building a few blocks away at 65 Brookwood Avenue (which my family developed from the ground up in 1987).

I have some serious concerns with the proposed Brookwood Medical Building project based on our long hands-on experience with medical offices in this neighborhood, as follows:

1. This project will overload our adjacent parking lot: The project proposes a new multi-story parking lot directly across the street from our property with its surface parking lot. Parking is already at a premium in this neighborhood. Typical driver behavior will be to take the "path of least resistance" when looking for parking. I'm concerned that many visitors to the proposed new building will tend to park in our surface parking lot rather than wanting to take the extra time and trouble to find their way through a multi-story parking structure. This will mean the doctors and patients in our building will have difficulty finding places to park. We've already had problems with people using our lot for hospital parking in the past when Memorial Hospital was doing construction which limited their parking a few blocks away; the new project raises the specter of an even worse parking problem on a permanent rather than temporary basis.

2. Hospital access will primary happen across our property: One of the major factors in developing a medical office building is proximity and ease of access to a hospital. The most direct path from the project to Memorial Hospital lies directly through our parking lot and past our building. Its not realistic to imagine that people are going to walk an extra block or two to take a longer route between the two on public streets / sidewalks, when they can look across our parking lot and see a direct path from the

proposed new building to the hospital. This will present hazards of pedestrians interacting with drivers trying to park at our building, raise liability concerns and add wear and tear to our property.

3. This high-rise project will alter the density and character of the neighborhood: As I understand it the new project proposes a four-story building and six-story parking garage. I understand the desire of any developer to maximize the amount of square footage on their property; but this level of density is out of character for the neighborhood, and given the surrounding low-rise properties with surface parking lots will inevitably place greater stress on the parking and traffic to all those surrounding properties. Our building being right across the street will bear the highest impact. In particular, a six-story parking structure is simply too high for the dimensions of the land it would be built on; just look at the illustration on the postcard you sent - this project would be a towering monstrosity compared to all the surrounding buildings.

4. The market does not need this additional amount of medical square footage: Its important to maintain good medical services to the community, we need doctors and they need offices. However the proposed 93,270-sf medical office building would add much more medical space than there is demand for right now. The recent major construction projects by Memorial Hospital a few blocks away have already added a lot of net medical space to the market. While medical office occupancy levels are generally good, there is already some medical office vacancy in the area (including at our property); this size of project would dump more square footage onto the market than can readily be absorbed in the short term, perhaps longer.

5. This project would prioritize large practice groups over individual local doctors: The proposed layout and plate size (I'm going from the developer's marketing materials since I have not seen any of the plans submitted to your office) of this project appears to favor large practice groups. A shared reception area and several thousand square foot space is great for a large practice group, but in our long experience is much larger than most local, small-practice doctors are able to take on - they need much smaller spaces with their own entrances and reception areas (not shared). Local physicians in small practices are already pressed by many financial and regulatory factors, and many are struggling to keep up. They need help. They don't need a project which can only work by bringing in large practice group tenants, further squeezing the small local practitioners.

I would be pleased to discuss this further and answer any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

- Eric

Eric Chazankin, CEO / General Counsel
Bay Tree Properties
Santa Rosa, California
<echazan@sonic.net>
707-576-0777 office
707-575-6900 fax
707-292-4714 cell
Cal DRE Broker Lic. 01240499
Cal State Bar #197055