

Ross, Adam

From: Dan Eikenberry <eikedan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 9:04 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Cc: mhp@hitec4u.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave Subdivison

Mr Ross, I wish to state my support for the contents of an email sent to you from my neighbor, Mark Parrish. We live on the corners of Burbank Ave and the proposed southern entrance street and are concerned about the three story apartments being planned for the subdivision. They are not a positive from our point of view. Not only will they contribute to the congestion on Burbank but also will be aesthetically unattractive. I also am concerned that the southern access road will be directly adjacent to our property line. The developer, from what I understand, stated the the proposed sidewalk will actually be on our property when and if we decide to sell. Is this the case? The illustrations put forth at the Design Review Bd. show the sidewalk and trees along this corridor on the developments side of our property line. Please address our concerns as soon as possible!

Yours Dan and Linn Eikenberry

Sent from my iPad

Ross, Adam

From: Mark Henry Parrish <mhp@hitec4u.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision

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

Ross, Adam

From: Alex Sebastian <rivermountainphoto@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2019 2:21 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Schellinger's Burbank Avenue Subdivision

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

Ross, Adam

From: Tyler Pearson <tyler@munsellecivil.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 12:56 PM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2019-11-05_Burbank Ave Subdivision Letter with MCE-RD Comments.docx
Attachments: 2019-11-05_Burbank Ave Subdivision Letter with MCE-RD Comments.docx

Hi Adam, here are some initial thoughts to discuss during our meeting.

Thanks,
Tyler

Ross, Adam

From: Lozada, Caryn
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 2:09 PM
To: Allen, Shelli; Ross, Adam; Sprinkle, Rob
Subject: RE: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue
Attachments: 00 CURRENT Guide to Water and Waste Water Aug 14_Rev_GResponse.pdf

Adam,

Are you wanting a response to come from SR Water, or would you like the response to provide?

The City of Santa Rosa does not extend/provide water and or sewer services to parcels. Any property owner wanting to connect will have to extend any services not available and pay any associated demand fees.

Currently, there is not water available to the properties mentioned below. If the proposed development extends water service across their frontage, typically the party extending the main will enter into a "Reimbursement Agreement" (see attached "Guide" -section regarding Reimbursement Agreements starts on page 9) and anyone that would benefit from the extension will get notified via a public hearing notice. The developer of the main and the property owner can come to some sort of agreement as to whether or not they want to provide any services and or financial incentives to assist with their connection, however, Santa Rosa Water cannot.

One of the three parcels, AP#125-421-017, is already connected to sewer. Sewer is currently available to the other two parcels (one appears to be a vacant lot).

Let me know if you need any other information or if you'd like me to respond.

Caryn

Caryn Lozada | Development Review Coordinator

Santa Rosa Water, Engineering Services | 35 Stony Point Rd., Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Tel. (707) 543-3959 | clozada@srcity.org



www.srcity.org/water | Facebook/SRWater | Twitter@SantaRosaWater

FIRE REBUILD RESOURCES <https://srcity.org/2675/Rebuilding>

Please consider the environment before printing this message.



From: Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:53 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Cc: Lozada, Caryn <CLozada@srcity.org>
Subject: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi Adam

Caryn sent emails to them yesterday regarding the water and sewer connection requirements. I am forwarding this to her.

Thank you

Shelli

From: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2019 1:25 PM
To: Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi Shelli,

I have a concern about a housing development on Burbank Ave in Santa Rosa. Can you provide a response to item #5 for how connecting to water service works in the City?

Rob,

Can you help me out with a written response on how Traffic Engineering looks to handle that future street in item #4?

Thanks!

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



From: Mark Henry Parrish <mhp@hitec4u.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision

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

Ross, Adam

From: Lozada, Caryn
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 2:11 PM
To: Ross, Adam; Allen, Shelli
Subject: RE: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue
Attachments: RE_ [EXTERNAL] 1422_1450 Burbank Avenue Water_Sewer .pdf

Adam,
Attached is the message that was provided to 1422/1450 Burbank yesterday.

Caryn

From: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 2:03 PM
To: Lozada, Caryn <CLozada@srcity.org>; Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Subject: RE: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi Caryn,

Can you Cc me so I can provide that response as well? I have a Public Meeting for this item tomorrow.

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



From: Lozada, Caryn <CLozada@srcity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:58 PM
To: Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>; Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Subject: RE: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi
Thanks Shelli. I will respond to them. The parcels that contacted me yesterday were 1422/1450 Burbank.

Caryn

From: Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:53 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Cc: Lozada, Caryn <CLozada@srcity.org>
Subject: Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi Adam

Caryn sent emails to them yesterday regarding the water and sewer connection requirements. I am forwarding this to her.

Thank you

Shelli

From: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>

Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2019 1:25 PM

To: Allen, Shelli <smallen@srcity.org>; Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision 1400 Burbank Avenue

Hi Shelli,

I have a concern about a housing development on Burbank Ave in Santa Rosa. Can you provide a response to item #5 for how connecting to water service works in the City?

Rob,

Can you help me out with a written response on how Traffic Engineering looks to handle that future street in item #4?

Thanks!

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



From: Mark Henry Parrish <mhp@hitec4u.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 1:14 PM

To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave. Subdivision

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

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: [Beverly Buras](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1400 Burbank Ave PC Public Hearing
Date: Monday, January 13, 2020 11:30:55 AM

Unfortunately I am not able to attend the public hearing meeting on January 23, 2020 however I want to express my concerns of the apartment complex proposed by Schellinger Brothers across the street from my residence at 1811 Burbank Avenue. Several years ago when the Schellingers purchased the property across from me, they approached me and I asked them their intention of building on this site. They assured me they would build single family dwellings but they would have to be two stories due to density laws.

In 2018 we sold my aunt's property at 1400, 1690 and 1720 Burbank Avenue to the Schellinger Brothers after they showed us their plans to build SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS on the properties. When escrow closed and I heard they had changed their plans and were going to build condominiums and apartment buildings I called our realtor, Rich Corwin, to express my displeasure. Rich told me they would be "upscale" buildings! Really in the Roseland District!!! I don't think so. I was told there was nothing I could do about it.

This area is not designed for multi-family apartment buildings. The traffic is already out of control with the new school that was built and the "low cost housing" recently built.

I feel the Schellinger Brothers need to go back to their original plan of building one family dwellings. That alone will increase traffic considerably; with apartments and condominiums that will only multiply the traffic and crime in our area.

I trust you will listen to the homeowners that live in this area and keep our somewhat rural area free from Apartment Buildings and Condominiums.

Thank you,

Beverly Buras

From: [Beverly Buras](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rezoning of Burbank Avenue
Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 11:05:02 AM

It has come to my attention that now you are having a meeting to rezone Burbank Avenue for High Density Zoning in order for the building of a 3 story apartment building to be built across from me at 1811 Burbank Avenue.

In my previous email, I gave you my concerns regarding this construction. Please consider the families that live in this area and only allow one family dwellings to be built. It's bad enough to have one family dwellings built, but apartment buildings is an avenue for disaster.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bev Buras

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: [Paige Elise](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 1400 Burbank Ave
Date: Thursday, January 23, 2020 4:54:59 PM

Dear Adam Ross,

I am a citizen concerned that the developments being built in Santa Rosa are not being held to the highest standard of environmental stewardship. Given the state of our climate, we must require new buildings (and potentially retrofitting) to be LEED-certified, to have solar panels, to be built in accordance with the sun so as to preserve heat and cool in the homes, etc., there are numerous practices that I am not seeing the City of Santa Rosa require developers to employ in the currently built houses. While using materials that help humans and the earth may cost more, it is worth it to the future generations of this City. I am speaking of a dire need to adapt to a changing time. There are other residents who agree with me.

I have written a letter regarding the 1400 Burbank plot as a specific case example where technologies for sustainable development can exemplify the city's commitment to the recently adopted RCPA. Below is the letter (also attached) addressing the Mayor and Council, whom I highly respect. I am only trying to do my due diligence as a constituent. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paige Hotchkiss-Needleman

Dear City Council,

Thank you very much for all the work you have done. I am proud that the Santa Rosa City Council unanimously voted "yes" to create a Regional Climate Protection Authority to support countywide climate action and recognize Climate Emergency. Making the new homes built in Santa Rosa required to be LEED-certified, (Leadership in Environmental Engineering and Design) solar-paneled, and sustainably built, you can show your constituents that you stand by that resolution.

Several cookie-cutter dwellings are rapidly being built around Roseland from Sebastopol to Wright. I am concerned with the use of the lot located at 1400 Burbank Avenue. Another development was recently built right next door, and another one across the way on West Ave.

Mandate the Schellinger Brothers to construct using sustainable materials. These homes need to last into the future and be healthy for residents, not just shareholders' pockets.

Neighbors and non-profits in the region would love the opportunity to farm here. Consider reappropriating funds from the Roseland Community Creek Park project to fund a community farm on 7 acres close to the McMinn fence line on the 1400 Burbank plot. This beautiful parcel of land is habitat to nesting birds, hawks, raptors, spawning frogs, raccoons, rabbits, skunks and the endangered Red Tiger Salamander. This is one of the few greenways animals have left in this area. It was once farmland and can be again. Support education and fight for food sovereignty by making a stand for development that

will sustain our city into the future—not into the past.

Furthermore, the city's General Plan requires a certain percentage of open space be preserved. Roseland district is not meeting this standard. There are more buildings than open space. We as a city need to preserve what little valuable open land we have left.

Support your residents with sustainable agriculture and building. We will hold you accountable to following your own commitments. While we do have a housing crisis, cheaply made unsustainable homes are no longer a solution. We also have a hunger crisis and a lack of greenery crisis in Roseland. Respect our part of the city and develop responsibly, or don't develop at all. The community farm at West is not enough—we need more sustainable agriculture in Roseland.

If you would like to support your constituents, why not make the plan for the Roseland Park realistic by using the nearby acres accommodate a nature center and a community farm? The Roseland Park is not very big and a larger parcel is slated for development. The neighbors don't want it. The animals don't want their home destroyed. Protect the animal greenway and support neighbors.

If you can't do that, then please only build one-story homes on the fence borders so as to protect the long-standing residents who moved here so they could see and feel nature. Adopt stricter requirements for buildings to be retrofitted to support the future.

Most Sincerely,

Paige Hotchkiss-Needleman

From: [Arlie](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank & other projects
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 4:55:36 PM

Hello,

I have serious concerns about developers getting project approval for projects that tout an affordable housing element, (which, in many cases, is a primary reason for approval).

I have heard that this bait and switch process of just building the most lucrative portion of a project and changing the design/build plan that offers affordable housing to one that leaves less income-producing portions behind is a widespread practice to get initial approval. The default claim used for modifying the plan is said to be based on lack of continued financing. Unacceptable. The planning departments of the City and County should be held accountable. It might help to do research on how other communities have had success in combating these "developer-managed" and short-sighted "profit for the cities" practices."

I certainly hope this is not a prevalent practice in the planning departments of the City of Santa Roas.

Regards,

Arlie Haig

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: [Geoff Jones](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#); [Gustavson, Andy](#)
Cc: [Cisco, Patti](#); [Weeks, Karen](#); [Carter, Charles](#); [Kalia, Akash](#); [Duggan, Vicki](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Peterson, Julian](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Avenue Project
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 10:56:14 AM
Attachments: [ORIGINAL CONCEPT.jpg](#)
[ORIGINAL CONCEPT REVISION 1.jpg](#)
[ORIGINAL CONCEPT REVISION 2.jpg](#)

2/3/2020

Dear Staff and Planning Commission Members.

Zoning and Planning exists to ensure that existing communities and neighborhoods are not at the mercy of developers when it comes to maintaining the integrity of their neighborhoods.

Sadly, in the case of this project, the developer's wishes seem to be paramount vs those of the neighbors or the majority of future tenants of the project. Maximizing their profit is clearly the goal and it seems as if Planning has rolled over to their every wish which was never my personal experience developing restaurant properties in Santa Rosa before I retired in 2008.

As you well know from the Attachments 12 and 13 of the Planning Commission Agenda Notes Burbank Avenue is never going to be wide enough to have Bus Service, unlike the roads immediately to the North, South, East or West due to the rural nature of the street. Even with planned improvements the travel paths will be just 10 feet wide not the 11 feet required for buses, let alone places for them to stop to pickup passengers.

This has never been an issue as density such as three story housing has never been proposed for this area and, indeed, the General Plan designates it as a " *scenic road because of its special, scenic qualities. Burbank Avenue has a unique quality characterized by a rural aesthetic, with large trees, deep front yards, and an absence sidewalks and on-street parking.*" Sidewalks and bike paths are to be added but travel lanes will remain narrow with no barrier between bicyclists and automobiles. As a bicyclist I can tell you that this not a street I will feel safe riding on even after it is "improved" as your average box truck is 8 feet wide with a UPS truck being slightly wider. That hardly leaves any room for a bicyclist in a lane designated in the plans as being from 0 to 3 feet wide.

From your Attachment 12, " *by concentrating housing, civic uses, and shopping along Sebastopol Road and adjacent to the Southside Bus Transfer Center, the Specific Plan is intended to increase transit ridership and reduce dependence on private automobile travel. Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue.* "

This Burbank Project goes against both those Planning goals not only by allowing an unprecedented 3 story structure in the area, rather than only in areas clearly designated for such tall imposing structures, but by allowing it to be placed directly on Burbank Avenue itself abutting the rural single family homes of existing residents who have lived there for decades.

Such placement maximizes the negative impact on (1) those using Burbank Avenue itself, (2) the existing neighbors who inexplicably will bear the noise impact of 30 or so cars driving in and out, garbage trucks backing up, (as there is no exit and no sound wall), and (3) the tenants of the planned structure. Its placement on an increasingly busy, congested and noisy road is hardly ideal for these future tenants.

The only motive for such negative placement is to minimize costs to the developer as central placement, or East Most placement of this portion of the development, even if 2 stories, would clearly better meet the goals and policies of your planning documents. Reducing costs to the developer should not be the priority of Zoning or Planning especially when there is no Affordable Housing piece of this project.

If one looks at the Visual Dictionary for the different areas of Roseland, (where I own a rental property on

Ross, Adam

From: Janet Lorraine Paul <jlorraine@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, February 3, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Ross, Adam
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2-2-20 Burbank Ave Subdivision

2-3-20

To: Santa Rosa city staff members
Adam Ross ARoss@srcity.org
Andy Gustavson agustavson@srcity.org

Re Burbank Ave Subdivision

In my 40 some years at 2003 Burbank Ave, I have seen some unethical actions taken by the city of SR. The above referenced subdivision would be another. I hope you will reject this one.

The Crossroads development was recently built a little further south on Burbank, across from my driveway. They added an east/west road so people could access West Ave from Burbank. The traffic increase was more than I could have imagined. At 7:30am on this one lane previously rural road, cars are standing for a half mile, polluting the air. The air quality in this neighborhood has become significantly worse since that came. Many people are driving very fast on this 25mph street, they often pass on the double yellow line, and become aggressive if one does not get out of their way. I wish that SR would police this problem, the street is dangerous now.

Santa Rosa did not give the residents much in the way of amenities with what has been developed on this street so far. Especially bike lanes and sidewalks are needed with the development already done. The promised park would be nice. Altho it will not be enough to serve the amount of people that this development proposes. You do know, I expect, that services like libraries and parks are lacking in this area. If Santa Rosa were to locate that many people in one spot, I would want to see infrastructure and services planned and provided this time.

I know we need more housing. I would like to see it spread around the city, rather than cram too much into this one little road, likely creating a slum, destroying our clean air further.

This developer should not be allowed to take advantage of rules bent for victims of the fires. I really insist that there should be full environmental studies done for this development. Full everything.

Sincerely,

Janet Lorraine Paul

--

Janet Lorraine Paul

De Meo), you can see the development types for each area with Burbank Avenue characterized by "*Large-lot detached single-family homes with deep setback*" and "*Single-family detached and attached homes with deep setback*," not a single three story structure with minimal setback is pictured unlike for the photos of the Sebastopol Road and Hearn Avenue areas. The project as envisioned does not conform with your stated policy to "*maintain rural residential character along Burbank Avenue as new development occurs*" and "*encourage community pride by promoting beautiful and safe neighborhoods and quality of life.*"

The 100 percent Market Rate project as planned and laid out has ensured that the developer maximizes the noise, traffic and visual impact of the higher density housing components to existing community members while minimizing its impact upon their own market rate single family home parcels thereby enhancing profits to the detriment of my friends in the area.

They had planned to build as part of their retirement plan small affordable granny units on their property at my urging as I already provide affordable housing in Santa Rosa. Likely they will be unable to do so once their property values are negatively impacted by the three story structure planned along their back fence. Their ability to borrow will be severely impacted.

Oddly I'm being told this project will be expedited with minimal oversight under Resiliency despite there being no affordable housing component to address the needs of Coffey Park renters who were displaced during the fires and are likely now paying far higher rents than they used to.

Lastly, and also troubling, is the phased nature of this project with, apparently, the first two phases being the most impactful on the community. What is the assurance that the project won't simply end there?

A logical look of the project would have the highest density components centralized in the project area or up against the East border of the project area which abuts Sheppard Elementary School rather than existing rural single family homes. To place a three story structure in a manner that it looms over the back yards of existing neighbors is a gift to the developer and a disservice to the citizens you have been tasked to protect through mitigation measures that are well within reach.

Please refer to attachments showing the Project as currently planned and 2 scenarios where the Apartments are moved to a more central area of the project area and impacts upon Burbank and existing residents are mitigated to reduce noise and visual impact.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey A. Jones

1727 Terrace Way, Santa Rosa (home since 1984) 707-525-8541
1174 De Meo Street, Santa Rosa (below market rental)
985 Stanislaus Way, Santa Rosa (below market rental)
1837 Little John Lane, Santa Rosa (below market rental)

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

From: [Mark Henry Parrish](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Cc: [rivermountainphoto@gmail.com](#); [Lorraine Papp](#); [Ramiro Ortiz](#); [kansasunflower64@yahoo.com](#); [thomasdarling@comcast.net](#); [sanfordburress@gmail.com](#); [eikedan@sbcglobal.net](#); [jim-jody@att.net](#); [cesar707murillo@yahoo.com](#); [santa_rosa707@hotmail.com](#); [Beverly Buras](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Avenue Subdivision-PRJ19-031, MAJ19-003, DR19-054, CUP19-095
Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 6:12:41 AM
Importance: High

Hello Adam-

I have reviewed the amended design plans. I appreciate that the developers seemed to have listened to the neighbors concerns and as a result have made some changes to the design of this development. However, I still have the following concerns that should be added and heard at the Planning meeting scheduled for Thursday 1/23/2020:

- A project that has one component that is of very high density relative to the other project components should have that high density centered in the project boundaries, not purposely placed against the fencing of existing low density rural single family housing. Placement of this high density component should be to minimize the visual and noise impact on existing neighbors living in rural single family dwellings.
- The multi story, 62 family building crammed against the south property line, masquerading as affordable housing, is out of character with traditional single family homes in the actual development and in the neighborhood. Squeezing this three story building along the property line places all the negative aspects of a poorly planned, high density housing squarely onto the adjacent property owners who get to bear the stresses of constant traffic, dumpsters, light, noise, and a couple hundred people lurking overhead. If the project is to be approved, no single feature should have a disproportionate negative impact on one adjacent property owner versus any other. Any negative impact on any adjacent properties should be uniform/equal rather than greater on certain adjacent properties. That is inherently unfair impact and can be remedied.
- The first two phases in a development that is to be done in multiple phases should not violate the zoning density designation for this area which Phase 1 and Phase 2 cumulatively do. If the developer chooses to "run out of money" at that point the neighborhood is left with high density housing directly on Burbank and directly adjacent to the fencing of low density rural single family housing. Placement guaranteed to maximize the visual and noise impact on existing citizens living in a rural single family dwelling.
- Multi-story, multi-family, high density housing should bookend Burbank Avenue, at the northwest corner of Hearn and Burbank and the southwest corner of Sebastopol Road and Burbank. Natural transitional, high density housing with close access to transit and major traffic arteries, a park, and other amenities, belongs in this kind of location, not squatting in the middle of lower density, long established neighborhoods. This is a semi-rural area, without any existing multistoried towers, which are entirely out of character with the entire neighborhood. They would be suitable for downtown Santa

Rosa but not this neighborhood.

- More traffic overwhelming two-lane Burbank Avenue which has a large community park at the south end at Hearn Avenue, Burbank housing in the middle, an elementary school to the north and high traffic Sebastopol Road at the north end. Drivers already use Burbank Avenue as an alternate to Stony point and regularly exceed the posted 25 mile per hour limit by more than double. Before this area was annexed into the city, the CHP would monitor and cite traffic violations. Now that we are part of the city, we have yet to see the SRPD perform these same duties which are desperately needed to protect the children as they walk to and from school.
- I still have a serious concern over my family's safety fearing someone will inadvertently press the accelerator instead of the brakes and plow thru the 'good neighbor' wooden fence. If a cement barrier is cost prohibitive then some other preventive measure must be installed such as the barrier used to keep opposing traffic on the freeways from crossing over.
- With regards to the future planned road that will cross my property and connect to the Burbank housing development to the south; what will prevent drivers from using my private easement road, which is not currently maintained by either the city or county as an alternate access to these housing developments?
- Years ago when another development was planned there was concern about Tiger Salamanders as this area is a known habitat; how will that be mitigated?

Best regards,

Mark Parrish
(707) 696-3227

From: [Amity Hotchkiss](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Information on 1400 Burbank Ave Project
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 6:34:39 PM

Hello Adam --

I went to the Website but I could not get any information on this project, because I didn't know where on the website I should look. Could you please point me to the additional information?

The Project is a ridiculous size (density), and will plow over the remaining open wild space in Central Roseland. The Design also does not fit into the existing neighborhood's design -- not that Santa Rosa ever cares about crappy designs! These will be multiple storied buildings and our current buildings are one-story buildings. It does not fit into the basic designs already here.

The neighbors are getting together to protest this Project due to these and other reasons, and I need some additional information before attending the meeting on Wednesday.

One thing I would like to know is : Does Schellinger Brothers also have the contract for the Park that is go to next to this Project? I would also like to know if anyone has filed an objection or objections to this Project? And then, how many neighbors would it take for us to turn back this ridiculous Project?

Everyone agrees that you didn't even do traffic studies -- these would have easily shown that the traffic in this area is already a parking lot most of the day -- and you plan to add hundreds of new residents? Seems like poor planning, indeed. Thank you for any additional information which might help me present my ideas to the Commission tomorrow evening.

Amity Hotchkiss

--

Amity Hotchkiss
1421 McMinn Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA

From: hanovernh66@aol.com
To: [Ross, Adam](#); [Gustavson, Andy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Avenue Subdivision project
Date: Sunday, February 2, 2020 2:29:14 PM

Gentlemen,

Resilient City zoning was created for northeast and northwest Santa Rosa areas damaged or destroyed by fire to begin rebuilding their communities as quickly and efficiently as possible. It was not passed to minimize/reduce building or real estate project standards city wide, for all real estate developers throughout Santa Rosa with real estate projects in non affected parts of Santa Rosa. To accept this proposition is a perversion of the original intent of Resilient City Zoning in response to a tragic event affecting a sizeable part of Santa Rosa community. But it was not designed to be applicable to the entire community of Santa Rosa. To attempt to do so is a cynical and greedy act by this developer to take advantage of a unique situation to maximize their profit and receive reduced scrutiny for a project that will impact Santa Rosa and the surrounding adjacent properties for decades, while those same developers pocket their profits and move on, at Santa Rosa's lasting expense. There is no rational responsible reason why this development should receive less scrutiny than any other project. The people of Santa Rosa deserve that these developers adhere to the same standards as have their predecessors. This is not a hardship. They do not merit special treatment.

This project also has a disproportionate negative impact upon property directly adjacent to this project, and held by members of our family, that is seriously disproportionate to that imposed on other adjacent property holders. This is due to poor design which was focused on maximization of developer profit rather than a design the City of Santa Rosa and its citizens could be proud of.

Your obligation in the performance of your duties is to the residents of Santa Rosa first, not these developers who have shown themselves to be unscrupulous.

Clarke Gentry