

Subject: FW: Farmers Lane Senior Housing - Questions & Answers

Information only – please do not reply to all

Chair Cisco and Members of the Planning Commission;

Question 1: Why, if it is senior housing, do only 80% of the units have to be occupied by one person 55 or older.

Answer: The Senior Housing Ordinance, Section 20-28.08 of the Zoning Code, implements federal regulation set forth in the Housing for Older Persons Act (HOPA), which requires a minimum of 80% of the Senior units be occupied by households where at least one person is age 55 or older.

Question 2: How does that ratio apply to the affordable units? Could all five affordable units be occupied by non-seniors (persons younger than 55 years of age)?

Answer: Yes. Housing and Community Services will have two agreements:

- a. The HOPA agreement requiring 80% of the total units to be occupied by at least one household member age 55 or older. A biennial audit will be conducted to ensure these requirements are adhered to.
- b. The Density Increase Agreement (aka: Affordably Housing Agreement), which will require the initial and subsequent buyers of the five income-restricted units to qualify at 80% or less of area median income based on household size. The agreement will be in effect for a period of 55 years. A note shall be included on the Tentative Map ensuring these requirements are adhered to.

Question 3: Is the affordability structure agnostic as to wealth where we are picturing an ownership model for the at-market and affordable units alike. I am concerned that affordable units tied to income could become accessible only to relatively cash rich buyers who are retired but who have ready cash for a down payment (or for the entire purchase price). Even those buyers may be needy, but affordable units to cash-rich buyers in a time of scarcity seems potentially wasteful.

Answer: The affordability contract falls under the purview of the Housing Authority. The contract will be drafted in collaboration with the City Attorney's Office. Housing and Community Services will perform the income verification for the initial and subsequent buyers of the five units affordable to moderate income households (at or below 80% of area median income). Income verification will require buyers (including all members of the household age 18 or older) to submit the following documents, if applicable, to determine income eligibility:

- a. Proof of Income:
 - i. Federal and State Income Tax Returns – previous two years
 - ii. Recent pay stubs – previous three pay periods
 - iii. Recent award letters for pension or benefits (includes social security, SSI, unemployment, disability, etc.)

- iv. Proof of all other income sources (spousal support, child support and regular draws taken from assets, etc.)
- v. Documentation of rents collected from any rental property(ies)
- b. Proof of Assets – For assets that exceed \$5,000, 0.10% of the value in excess of \$5,000, is applied to income pursuant to Section 8 income verification guidelines established.
 - i. Copies of all checking and savings account statements – previous three months
 - ii. Copies of statements for investments, trust and retirement accounts – three most recent
 - iii. Real Estate - Three current market analyses of the property(ies) and documentation of any outstanding debt secured by property

Representatives from Housing and Community Services and the City Attorney's Office will be present at the meeting for further clarification if needed.

Question 4: What is the City's ability to control conditions at the 4th Street & Farmers Lane intersection; specifically, whether Caltrans or any other entity would prevent the City from making the west crosswalk across 4th Street more friendly to seniors.

Answer: The City of Santa Rosa shares jurisdiction with the State at the intersection of Farmers Lane and 4th Street. This is a state route, but the City maintains and operates the signal at that location. City staff have worked with seniors who use this crossing and have increased the walking times here on multiple occasions, most recently in May 2017. Current crossing time is 37.6 seconds (five seconds of walk, 28 second countdown, 3.6 seconds of yellow and one second of red). A representative from Traffic Engineering will be present at the meeting for further clarification if needed.

Question 5: Should ingress/egress be a most southern point on Farmers Lane. Tight site, heavily congested Farmers Lane dictate cautionary approach. Given right turn only egress, for those residents wishing to go easterly direction (say Sonoma, St. Francis Center, etc.) is there sufficient distance available to gain access to the left turn collector lane at Montgomery and Farmers?

Answer: Vehicles turning right out of the site have ample space to traverse to the southbound left turn pocket at Montgomery Drive if desired. Both the applicant's traffic consultant and Traffic Engineering have reviewed this design and will be present at the meeting if further clarification is needed.

Question 6: Though the 29 spaces, by code, may be appropriate on a tight site, is it the responsibility of residents and neighborhood to form a parking zone? Would/could developer consider negotiating excess off-site parking with local churches, shopping centers and other area private parties? Though this may not be within the Commission's purview, when one considers Creekside and Farmers Lane Senior Housing, on-street and other off-site parking will be at an increasing premium. Some seniors may be put off by one vehicle restriction irrespective.

Answer: The project meets the City's parking requirements for Senior Housing. The applicant has also identified parking as one of two concessions allowed by the Density Bonus, which precludes the review authority from requiring more parking, unless required findings are made to deny the Density Bonus. That said, the applicant may act independently to negotiate alternative off-site parking.

Regarding neighborhood concerns of street parking along Gilbert Drive, a parking zone may be established through the Parking Division of the Finance Department, which would require a permit to park in that

neighborhood. Residents from the area have been in communication with the Parking Manager, and have been provided with the materials to establish a parking zone. A representative from the Parking Division will be present at the meeting for further clarification if needed.

Question 7: When one visits the site, it appears there is considerable sun/shade currently available (early-mid-morning sun) on the Gilbert Ave properties. With the four-story building setting on an East-West axis, would the early-mid-morning sun/shading be severely impacted and cause undo damage to the neighbor's existing landscaping? Shading study needs further explanation.

Answer: The applicant has identified building height as the second of two concessions allowed by the Density Bonus, which precludes the review authority from denying the additional height unless required findings are made and the Density Bonus is denied. The applicant team will address the shadow study more thoroughly during their presentation to the Planning Commission.

Question 8: Sound/Shade: Does the inclusion of the four-story structure and the two single condominium units assist in buffering road noise to the Gilbert Avenue residents benefit? Otherwise, by adopting consultant recommendations, noise abatement seemingly works.

Answer: The sound study does not address the effects of sound buffering or deflection for the Gilbert Avenue properties. The sound engineer will be available for further clarification during the Planning Commission meeting on July 13, 2017.

Question 9: Building Height/Line of Sight: Was the extension a request or a requirement (to 47')?

Answer: During Concept Review, the Design Review Board expressed concern regarding the visibility of rooftop equipment. In response, a two-foot parapet was added to the building design.

Question 10: Given the 4 story heights and related line of sight concerns, is there an option of reducing the number of 4th floor units by two at the west end and combining each of the two deleted units with each of the two separate single units? Would this help alleviate some line of sight concerns while reducing sun/shading issues for the two Gilbert Avenue residences? Or does it complicate siting issues for the two separate units?

Answer: The applicant has applied for a Density Bonus that qualifies the project for two concessions. The applicant has identified building height as one of those concessions. As such, no changes may be required regarding building height.

Question 11: The plans and consultant reports seemingly suggest that all existing trees (even the 7 to be preserved) will be removed from the site. Of special concern are the historic landmark oaks. Should tree preservation, removal and relocation requirements be added to DAC conditions (Tree Ordinance Section 17-24.050) to this and any project where so many trees (including heritage Oaks) are destined to be preserved, relocated or removed?

Answer: The tree inventory report, prepared by Horticulture Associates, dated October 31, 2014, was provided to the Design Review Board (Board) during the Concept Review meeting. In response to an inquiry made by the Board, the last three pages, prepared by Quadriga Landscape Architecture and Planning, Inc. were added clarifying which trees would be removed and which would remain. This summary is supported by the Concept Landscape Plan (found on the last three pages of the project plans). Note that the Landscape

Plan does not include trees that are exempt the City's Tree Ordinance. Conditions relating to tree preservation have been added to Tentative Map resolution.

Question 12: Will replacement and relocated trees, in fact, be (re)planted in public areas or within the watershed to alleviate known health impacted "hotspots" per recent County of Sonoma Health Department reports to both the City Council and the Planning Commission?

Answer: Replacement trees will be planted on the subject site, including within the creek setback area. Page L1.1 identifies replacement tree locations. Due to minimal space on the site, several of the replacement trees have been upsized to comply with the City Tree Ordinance.

Question 13: Though this would be largely a DRB issue, the Farmers Lane traffic and sight lines (including Highway 12 site lines) begs for a distinctive and inviting design given the location of this particular site. Will the schematic design eastern facade retain the two curvilinear shapes at its southern and northern intersects?

Answer: Staff is not aware of any design changes.

Question 14: Right-of-way setbacks were identified on an Issues Letter sent to the applicant during the project review and there was no response. Is this still an issue?

Answer: Initially there was concern that the building placement would interfere with the future widening of Farmers Lane. Upon further review, staff has determined that the project will not preclude any future plan to widen Farmers Lane. The project meets all required setbacks.

Susie Murray | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-4348 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | smurray@srcity.org

