

## Pacheco Gregg, Patti

---

**From:** Pacheco Gregg, Patti  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 07, 2019 8:58 AM  
**To:** \_DRB - Design Review Board  
**Cc:** Ross, Adam  
**Subject:** FW: DR19-053 - Burbank Ave Subdivision Late Correspondence  
**Attachments:** Burbank Ave Subdivision Public Correspondence.pdf  
  
**Importance:** High

**Dear Board Members:**  
**Please Do Not Reply to All**

Please see the message below from City Planner Adam Ross, and attached correspondence.

---

**From:** Ross, Adam  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 07, 2019 8:56 AM  
**To:** Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>  
**Subject:** DR19-053 - Burbank Ave Subdivision Late Correspondence

Design Review Board Members:

Please find the attached Public Correspondence for the Burbank Avenue Subdivision Concept Design Review. It is being sent as Late Correspondence.

Thank you,

**Adam Ross | City Planner**

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-4705 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [aross@srcity.org](mailto:aross@srcity.org)



November 5, 2019

Adam Ross, City Planner  
Planning & Economic Development  
City of Santa Rosa  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue #3  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Re: Burbank Ave Subdivision

Dear Mr. Ross,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding the proposed Burbank Avenue Subdivision project (proposed Project or Project). I'm writing this letter on behalf of my family who are the property owners of 1422/1450 Burbank Avenue - the approximately 3.0-acre parcel directly north of the Project site. It is our understanding that a Design Review Board Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 7, 2019 at 4:30 p.m. We apologize for the letter being submitted only two days prior to the hearing; however, we needed time to formulate our items of discussion.

As such, we respectfully would like to have the questions and/or comments within this letter considered as part of the record and for consideration by City Staff and decision-makers. Moreover, we welcome a follow-up meeting with City Staff and/or the applicant/developer to discuss the items herein, if warranted. We are not opposed to development and understand the City's need and desire to grow, especially in the wake of recent housing legislation; however, we want that growth to occur in a responsible manner.

In reviewing the attachments to the agenda for the November 7, 2019 Design Review Hearing, we had questions, concerns, and/or clarifications on the items below. For organization and ease of reference by Staff and/or the decision-makers, I've numbered the comments and grouped them into broader categories.

**LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING**

1. According to Attachment 8, Landscape Plan, the north side of the "Public Road 1" as labeled, does not indicate the setback or identify landscaping. What is the proposed setback on the north side of the road between our property line?
2. According to Chapter 20, Section 34.040 of the Santa Rosa Zoning Code, setbacks that are visible from public streets shall be landscaped. As a follow up to Question 1 above, the proposed landscape plan does not show landscaping on the northernmost setback, north of "Public Road 1".

3. We understand that the Project is conceptual; however, where is lighting proposed throughout the site and when can a conceptual lighting plan be provided? Because the Public Road 1 directly abuts our property, we would like to ensure that the area is lit for safety, but in a manner that is unobtrusive to our residents and our users of the storage facility.
4. What sort of barrier/fence is proposed along the perimeter of the site and at what height? (i.e. will the wall be a wood fence or masonry wall?). This would greatly help to reduce potential for noise related impacts and maintain privacy to the extent feasible.

#### **SITE CIRCULATION AND ACCESS**

5. Attachment 3, Site Analysis Neighborhood Concept Map, of the agenda packet indicates a note to “provide access to adjacent parcel and future park” –
  - a. What type of access is this referring to?
  - b. Pedestrian access only or vehicle access?
  - c. Will there be a stub street or just pedestrian access?
  - d. When would this access occur?
  - e. According to the Specific Plan for the area, it appears a local street is planned – is the City anticipating acquiring right-of-way from our property or an easement of sorts?
6. Will parking be permitted along the northern access road or will this be painted as a fire lane/curb? If the former, vehicles would be parked almost directly along our property line.
7. With regards to the location of Public Road 1, we do have a concern that right-turns into the Project would shine headlights directly into the existing residence on our property unless adequately screened. We would like to work with City Staff and the applicant to come up with an amenable solution.

#### **NOISE**

8. Because the road (Public Road 1) is directly adjacent to an existing residence in which we currently rent out, along with storage units, there is a concern for noise impacts to residents from the storage use, and concerns of noise from the traffic to the existing residence to the north due to the close proximity of Public Road 1. We respectfully request that it be considered to propose options for adequate noise buffering, including but not limited to, a masonry wall, additional landscape along the northernmost property line, or some other measures.
9. What is the proposed plan for solid waste pick-up? Will the duplexes have toters or a common trash enclosure? Our concern is that if toters are placed along “Public Road 1” the noise from the refuse vehicles could cause noise due to its proximity to our property. On that note, noise from street sweeping vehicles as well.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

10. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) has there been environmental analysis prepared? If not, what level of review is anticipated?
11. Has Native American consultation been conducted per Assembly Bill 52 (AB52)?
12. Have any of the following technical studies been prepared such as:
  - a. Noise Study
  - b. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study
  - c. Traffic Study
  - d. Biological Resources Study (for presence of California Tiger Salamander)
  - e. Cultural Resources Study
13. Based on Mitigation Measure 3.3.5 of the Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan and Roseland Annexation EIR, projects greater than 5 acres and scheduled to last more than 2 years shall be required to prepare a site-specific construction pollutant mitigation plan in consultation with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Has this been prepared and if not, when will it be prepared?
14. Based on Mitigation Measure 3.3.6 of the Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan and Roseland Annexation EIR, future developments that includes sensitive receptors shall require site specific analysis to determine the level of health risk. There is an elementary school across the street – has a health risk assessment (HRA) been prepared?
15. Based on Mitigation Measure 3.5.2a, a Phase 1 Archaeological Resource Study shall be prepared when specific projects are proposed within the project area (Roseland Area). Has this been prepared?
16. Based on Mitigation Measure 3.8.4a, a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment shall be required for each property developed. Has this study been prepared?

Thank you for your consideration of the items above, and we look forward to response and to keeping the dialogue open as the Project moves forward. Also, we would like to be informed as to future meetings and/or hearings regarding the Project, as well as when the environmental analysis is completed and ready for public review.

I can be reached at (707) 228-9807 or jim-jody@att.net.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jody A. Fairfield*

Jody A. Fairfield

**From:** [Mark Henry Parrish](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:13:53 PM

---

Hello Adam-

Thank you for speaking with me. As per our conversation the following is a list of my concerns:

1. The planned location of the 3-story apartments directly behind my three parcels 125-421-017, 016, and 015 will result in a loss of my privacy as the second and third floors will easily see down into my single story, single family home. **THE TWO STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOMES WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE ABUTTING EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES THAN THREE STORY APARTMENTS WHICH SHOULD FACE BURBANK, NOT EXISTING HOMES.**
2. A major increase of noise due to the road serving these apartments and parking spaces planned to be right behind my property lines. **ONCE AGAIN, THE TWO STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOMES WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE ABUTTING EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES THAN THREE STORY APARTMENTS WHICH SHOULD FACE BURBANK, NOT EXISTING HOMES.**
3. A serious concern over my family's safety fearing someone will inadvertently press the accelerator of their car instead of the brakes and end up plowing right thru a flimsy fence resulting in the death of a family member or friend. I would expect at a minimum a concrete safety barrier to be installed between my parcels and these parking spaces. **ONCE AGAIN, THE TWO STORY SINGLE FAMILY HOMES WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE ABUTTING EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES THAN THREE STORY APARTMENTS WHICH SHOULD FACE BURBANK, NOT EXISTING HOMES.**
4. The future plan for a road connecting this new development with the Burbank Housing development south of our location. This appears to cross my parcel 125-421-015 as well as the easement road that serves my parcels and the other five homes. **I HAD MY OWN PLANS TO ADD SMALL RENTAL HOMES TO MY PARCELS AND DON'T WANT THE CITY TO "TAKE" MY FUTURE RETIREMENT PLAN AWAY FROM ME. I ESTIMATE THAT PARCEL, IN CONJUNCTION WITH MY OTHER PARCEL, COULD SITE AT LEAST FOUR HOMES, IF NOT MORE, AND GENERATE WELL OVER \$10,000/MONTH IN NET INCOME TO ME ONCE THE PROJECT IS COMPLETED IN A FEW YEARS.**
5. We have been waiting on water service for many years and thought with the recent annexation of this area into the city limits that it would happen sooner than later. But still no water...**I WOULD HOPE THAT AS PART OF THIS PLAN EXISTING HOME OWNERS MIGHT BE REWARDED FOR LOSS OF PRIVACY WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF 2 AND 3 STORY STRUCTURES THAT HAVE NOT EXISTED PRIOR THAT WATER HOOKUPS WOULD BE**

**PROVIDED FOR FREE AS MITIGATION OF THESE NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON THEIR PEACE AND  
PRIVACY.**

I understand the desperate need for housing in Santa Rosa but I feel this project can be designed better with the existing neighbors in mind. It would be much more acceptable to me and my neighbors for single family dwellings be installed next to our properties which are single family dwellings. Place the apartments in the center of this new project facing Burbank as we have already been impacted severely by the apartments in the Burbank Housing development to the south of our location.

Best regards,

Mark Parrish

707 696-3227

**From:** [Alex Sebastian](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Schellinger's Burbank Avenue Subdivision  
**Date:** Monday, October 28, 2019 2:21:45 PM

---

Hello Adam,

I understand that this project at 1400 Burbank Ave is now your project.

I am requesting a pdf copy of concept drawing plans to be emailed to this address please. I would also like to ensure I get noticed regarding any public meetings (I attended one for this project's earlier incarnation).

I don't know what details are available at this stage but I am interested in the dimension from the southeast corner of the project to edge of east edge of sidewalk adjacent to the future stub-out road that points south from the southern edge of the project. I live at 1830 Burbank Ave and immediately adjacent to the project at the east end of the southerly border. I'd like to know where the future road extension hits the small neighborhood between this proposed project and what may be a corresponding stub-out pointing north from the Crossroads housing development to the south. Please comment on plans the City may have to extend a road between the two subdivisions.

I am also interested in what fencing may be proposed between myself and the project. I am happy to note that there are single-family homes proposed adjacent to me.

I assume CEQA applies to this project. Could you please advise me where that process is at. At a minimum I would assume a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be likely. Traffic is already at issue with recent projects including Roseland Creek School and the Crossroads Project.

Thank you Adam.

Alex Sebastian