

## ATTACHMENT 2

**From:** Michael Burch  
**To:** [Rose, William](#); [Jones, Jessica](#); [Hartman, Clare](#); [Guhin, David](#)  
**Cc:** [Arents, Karen](#); [Pacheco Gregg, Patti](#)  
**Subject:** Resilient City Development Measures/Caritas Village  
**Date:** Friday, April 20, 2018 9:51:05 AM

---

Text of a letter I forwarded individually to each Council member this morning follows this note.

After last night's meeting I am further discouraged by the slapdash approach to design review reform in the proposed ordinance. I am convinced that in haste the CHB process and -H overlays were overlooked. I would like to ask PED to withdraw the proposed design review portion of the ordinance and get a group together to get this right.

That is essentially my recommendation to Council but I think PED could get out ahead of the problem.

See my note to Council below - Please make sure the video of the meeting is up asap. As of this moment it is not posted.

Thank you.

**Michael Burch**  
**ScottAG**  
Managing Partner

707 953 7157  
[mburch@scottag.com](mailto:mburch@scottag.com)

1275 N. Dutton Ave.  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Text of note written to all 7 Council members under separate cover - This is a communication from DRB Chair to Council representing my view as an individual on that Board and should not be entered into the public communication:

I hope you had a chance to watch the Caritas Village item or will be able to do so before the 24th. Our joint hearing with the Cultural Heritage Board was a disaster. The city's policies around historic preservation and this Cultural Heritage Board are blocks to forward progress in this time of housing crisis. How PED has not considered eliminating CHB review or developing policy which will truly impact the development of housing is beyond me.

Shouldn't a practical or crisis mode approach to the -H historical overlay have been part of the Resilient City measures? Why are we dropping design review to a meaningless level of oversight? Design Review impacts the social well-being of the city moving forward - Defending marginally justifiable historic resources is simply an academic (at best) or NIMBY tool to stop forward progress.

Every neighborhood in Santa Rosa needs to be part of the solution to the housing crisis. Beyond the housing crisis - a variety of housing types and diverse neighborhoods throughout the City creates a dynamic, livable place - Santa Rosa has fallen behind and this is the time for change. Marginalizing design review does not contribute to a good outcome.

PED is relying on interviews with developers that claim DRB is a block. Limited staff time to write staff reports for DRB is also used to justify diminishing design review. I was introduced to a new staff planner and was told there is another new hire. We are "fully staffed" I was told. Thank you as a Council Member for allowing this department to get back to operational levels. If staff is available let's write the staff reports, let's do the work together. Keep the DRB as the Council's eyes and ears. Please assess the record of this board for approving projects and the value this board has brought to the process.

If you have a chance to watch the Caritas Village hearing please recognize that this may be the only time DRB sees this project if the Council votes for diminished design review on the 24th. Assess the level of detail presented (very conceptual). Imagine what the public will think if a single City staff member - a planner - not an architect or design professional is the final action on this project.

I urge you send any design review reform back to staff. Let's get the key players together and develop a meaningful approach to how projects are approved in Santa Rosa. The current item is undercooked and fraught with political and social consequences.

**From:** [Noceti, Catherine](#)  
**To:** [Rawson, Alisa](#)  
**Cc:** [Guhin, David](#); [Jones, Jessica](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 15.1 PUBLIC HEARING - RESILIENT CITY DEVELOPMENT MEASURES  
**Date:** Monday, April 23, 2018 9:57:08 AM  
**Attachments:** [3.21.18 Meeting Notice 437 A St - 512 Morgan St demo.docx](#)

---

**From:** Denise Hill [mailto:[faire@sonic.net](mailto:faire@sonic.net)]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 22, 2018 8:11 PM  
**To:** \_CityCouncilListPublic <[citycouncil@srcity.org](mailto:citycouncil@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** 15.1 PUBLIC HEARING - RESILIENT CITY DEVELOPMENT MEASURES

Mayor and Council Members,

First, we want to express our thanks to those council members at the April 3 council meeting who so thoroughly analyzed the Resilient City Ordinance, championed protecting public input, and suggested measures to insure the public has a fair opportunity to provide public input once the Resilient City Ordinance is in place. Residents are just as much (if not more) customers of the city as developers.

We understand the final elements of this measure are coming before you again this Tuesday, 4/24. We would like to suggest the following to further insure the public isn't excluded from commenting on projects:

- Staff needs to clearly define the trigger for not notifying the public of a project and post same on the city website.
- The person designated as the staff member for the "Zoning Administrator" for the streamlined review process needs to be posted with contact information on the city's website.
- City council members should be able to suggest a project be elevated back to the regular process.

When there is public notice;

Notices easily get lost in the newspaper (both print and online) so, while required, this isn't an effective way to notify the public of project that may affect their neighborhood. A sign has a limited audience also. For that reason mailed (and emailed) notifications are best.

- Please consider a longer lead time on noticing. If a resident is on vacation for a week including weekends, then they may not see the notice till they return on day 10. While this is a code amendment, it is really needed with the busy lives everyone leads these days. A lead time of 21 days would be much less challenging for residents to have time to respond.
- A 5pm start time should be the earliest start time for public meetings. If someone works till 5pm, they still have to leave work early and allow time for traffic and parking. Setting public meeting start times at 5:30pm or 6pm is less impactful of residents trying to attend these meetings. In addition, it should be clearly stated how long a public meeting will run. We were in one recently that was ended abruptly after an hour by city staff. The public was not aware that this meeting was only going to last one hour.
- Expanding from the minimum 400 feet noticing requirement to a larger area would be another plus.
- Elevations for projects should be posted online when a project application is filed. That website location should be noted in the mailed notice. (This is way overdue. Especially, with the technology available today.)
- Google street view of the surrounding area should be linked to the project so staff, applicant, and the public are aware of what the area surrounding the project site looks like.
- List fees on notices and the city website that are required for residents to request a public meeting or appeal a decision. Note which fees are subsidized and by how much.
- The current mailed/e-mailed notices need to be modified so they are easier for the laymen to understand the content. An example is attached of a notice our neighborhood received for a project. The format of the Project Description is incredibly hard to read and should at the very least be separated so each numbered item is on a separate line. If I were reading this notice and attempting to understand it, I would not know the following:
  - the properties that are being demolished for this project are located in a Preservation (Historic) District
  - how the square footage of the proposed structures to be built relates to height or scale compared to other neighborhood structures
  - what accommodations are made for off-street parking
  - what efforts will be made to mitigate the increased traffic this project will generate

We could go on, but I think it obvious that overall, it is an excellent example of why these notices need to be more user-friendly and written for the layman – not city staff.

Sincerely,

*Denise Hill*  
*Joe Lilienthal*



## NOTICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

February 28, 2018

To Neighboring Property Owners and Interested Parties:

You are invited to attend a neighborhood meeting that is scheduled to introduce a project proposed at 437-465 A Street; and, 512-612 Morgan Street, Santa Rosa. The proposed project encompasses the majority of one city block, bordered by A, Morgan, Sixth, and Seventh Streets in downtown Santa Rosa. The meeting is scheduled as follows:

**Project Description:** This project proposes to demolish the existing Catholic Charities facilities and residential buildings on the project site; 1) Construct a 41,290-square-foot, three-story building at the southeast corner of A and Sixth Streets, which will comprise of a 23,206-square-foot emergency housing shelter for up to 52 families, a 6,071-square-foot daycare center, 2,300-square-feet of transitional housing, and 9,713-square-feet of ancillary service/medical facilities (Caritas Center); 2) Construct a 69,100-square-foot, four-story building with 91 residential apartment units along project site frontage of Morgan Street and the southeast corner of Morgan and Seventh Streets (Caritas Homes Phase 1); 3) Construct a 47,000-square-foot, four story building with 48 residential apartment units along the project site frontage of A Street and the southwest corner of A and Seventh Streets (Caritas Homes Phase 2); Project File No. PRAP18-017.

**Applicant:** Bert Bangsberg, representing Catholic Charities, (707) 258-9991

**Meeting Date:** Wednesday, March 21, 2018

**Meeting Time:** 6:00 pm

**Meeting Location:** Chamber Room, across from City Hall (635 First Street, near the corner of Santa Rosa Avenue and 1st Street and a large copper fountain in front)

The applicant will be at the meeting to answer questions about the project and a City representative will be present to answer questions about the City's participation and development review process.

The project file is available for public review in Room 3 at City Hall (100 Santa Rosa Avenue). The Planning and Economic Development Department is open Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Wednesdays from 10:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and Fridays from 8:00 a.m. to Noon.

Should you have any questions or comments, contact the applicant, Bert Bangsberg at (707) 258-9991, or Kristinae Toomians, the project planner at [KToomians@srcity.org](mailto:KToomians@srcity.org) or (707) 543-4692.



The City of Santa Rosa does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admissions or access to, or treatment of or employment in, its programs or activities. Requests for alternate formats may be made by contacting Planning & Economic Development at (707) 543-3200.



Caritas Center & Caritas Homes  
Neighborhood Meeting  
Project File No. PRAP18-017



2/26/2018

Scale 1: 4,800

0 Miles 0.08

**From:** [Morgan, Marcy](#)  
**To:** [Rawson, Alisa](#)  
**Cc:** [Lienau, Serena](#); [Guhin, David](#); [Jones, Jessica](#)  
**Subject:** FW: RESILIENT CITY DEVELOPMENT MEASURES - Emergency Shelters  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 24, 2018 11:57:56 AM

---

**From:** Hill, Denise [<mailto:denise.hill@pressdemocrat.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 24, 2018 11:46 AM  
**To:** \_CityCouncilListPublic <[citycouncil@srcity.org](mailto:citycouncil@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** RESILIENT CITY DEVELOPMENT MEASURES - Emergency Shelters

Mayor and Council Members:

It appears that some of the proposed areas that would allow Emergency Homeless shelters without a public hearing or CUP, could be in or near residential areas. As a family who lived within two blocks of the encampments that were under the freeway for one and half years we find this concerning. As council member Schwedhelm has stated at many of our neighborhood meetings with Catholic Charities, there are different categories of homeless. There are those that would like to get off the streets, are willing to abide by rules, and pose no threat to the public. Then sadly, there are those that are mentally ill or addicted to alcohol or drugs. During the time the encampments were active on 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets, the surrounding neighborhoods made numerous calls to the police reporting theft of packages and other items from porches and cars, fights, brandishing of weapons, drug, activity, and even auto theft. It was not a safe situation for young students walking to and from school or seniors out walking their dogs. These are quality of life challenges no



residential area should have to be exposed to on a regular basis. Calls to police in our neighborhood have dropped exponentially since these homeless encampments were disbanded.

Our experience highlights why public input and a Major CUP should be required for Emergency Shelters that are made available to everyone living on the streets if they are going to be in our near residential areas. We know the council wants to keep our city's neighborhoods safe and hope you will thoroughly review and discuss this area of the proposed Resilient City Development Measure at tonight's city council meeting.

Best,

Denise Hill

St. Rose Neighborhood



**From:** Bob  
**To:** [\\_CityCouncilListPublic: Jones, Jessica](#)  
**Subject:** POLICIES AND UPDATES  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 25, 2018 5:42:20 PM

---

Dear Council Members and Planning Commissioners,

Thank you for discussing housing policies and updates to the General Plan and Downtown Station Area Plan. We look forward to the possibility these will led to a more resilient and affordable city.

In the proposed Resilient City Code, I hope you will **narrow provisions for new development, particularly commercial projects, to downtown, priority development areas, and affordable housing.** Neighborhoods and developers need to know where we want new homes, child care facilities, emergency shelters, hotels and other lodging.

This will allow essential new construction with reduced public review – in advance of more comprehensive measures.

Thanks for your continued leadership and committment to Santa Rosa,

Bob and Nancy Higham