

From: [Erin Rineberg](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Cc: [Cisco, Patti](#); [Carter, Charles](#); [Kalia, Akash](#); [Weeks, Karen](#); [Duggan, Vicki](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Peterson, Julian](#); [Gustavson, Andy](#); [Nick Rineberg](#); mhp@hitec4u.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Dense Apartment Development on Burbank Avenue
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 1:26:12 PM
Attachments: [Attachment 12 - Roseland Area Sebastopol Road Specific Plan Circulation.pdf](#)
[Attachment 13 - Roseland Area Sebastopol Road Specific Plan Land Use and Housing.pdf](#)

Erin & Nick Rineberg
2225 Burbank Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
(707) 861-0906

February 5, 2020

Dear Mr. Ross,

We are writing today to express concern and propose a compromise to the planned development on Burbank Avenue. We find the city's disregard for zoning restrictions and willingness to build without consideration to the neighborhood and characteristics that make our street a unique rural landscape disheartening. While housing is a need in Sonoma County, it must be done in a way that does not take away from the agricultural and rural roots that uniquely define our community here. Adhering to zoning requirements is the city's duty and the specific plan for Burbank Avenue must not be overlooked.

We would ask you all to pause for a moment and think of what you want future Sonoma County and Santa Rosa to look like. Do you envision urban sprawl, cement walkways, and towering complexes or do you still picture rolling green hills and fields dotted with oaks, the sounds of frogs in the evening, and space where people can still see the mountains? We hope it is the latter, and it is that image that keeps you from overdeveloping neighborhoods like those on Burbank Avenue.

However, it is our fear that you do not share this same desire to preserve our open and spacious lot, and instead wish to create neighborhoods mirroring those of Los Angeles and Orange County, where once open spaces and farms are now cement jungles of smog and over dense housing. We are all too familiar with these communities, and we purposely left the Southern California land of cement and over trimmed trees for open spaces and farm life in Sonoma County four years ago. But now, that development has followed us here and while our plea will most likely fall on the deaf ears of city planners and developers looking to address a housing shortage, we hope we can at the very least paint a picture of how dense development on rural streets like Burbank Avenue will destroy the open spaces Sonoma County should be fighting so hard to preserve.

We bought our first home on Burbank Ave in November 2018. What drew us to this neighborhood was the scenic and rural landscape of the street and the opportunity to have a farm of our own. It is a well proportioned street with a mix of larger farm properties like ours and smaller single family homes that fit the resources of the neighborhood. Old trees line the road way and a lack of sidewalks enhances the rural charm. This morning we woke up to the sounds of owls hooting in the distance and will end the day with frogs and toads croaking in the yard. In the spring we have deer in our

yards and an abundance of other wildlife looking for a space to coexist in our city. This planned development borders along the creek and animal habitats will be impacted just as much as our neighbors. With our endangered species, such as the spotted salamander, how can we allow development like this?

Yes, housing is a need. But it must be done in a way that preserves our open spaces and community character. A three story apartment complex has no place in the middle of our street. If the lot must be subdivided it needs to follow the original plan of single and duplex style units. Please review the following ways the city and developer have disregarded the master plan and zoning restrictions for Burbank Avenue. This disregard is noted by all neighbors and is why we are against this development moving forward.

- Initially, the Project was going to enter into an agreement with the City's Housing Authority by designating the multi-family units as available to low-income residents to satisfy the Inclusionary Housing requirement adopted by City Council in October 2019. However, on Tuesday, January 21, 2020, the Applicant team informed Staff that the project will no longer be designating the multi-family units as affordable. As this project used to have an affordable housing component which was part of the reason they are taking short cuts and avoiding obvious issues such as placing the largest building ever built in the neighborhood right on the fence line with parking noise and garbage pickup noise all purposely faced towards the existing neighborhood rather than towards the developments other tenants. It is clear that the developer is focused on profit first and the neighborhood second. Build-in phases with the highest density being built first with the opportunity to not have to build the rest if they run into "financial difficulties. Build at the lowest cost by placing the largest structure right on the road and on the fence line of existing tenants. Decide not to build affordable housing. Decide that it is best in the interest of profit to put the highest density component on the project in the back yards of existing residents and away from their own single-family lots thus making the new lots more profitable despite the effect of reducing property values for existing neighbors behind said structure.
- Staff is recommending approval of the project based on compliance with Zoning Code requirements and consistency with the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan policies associated with land use compatibility, range of housing types, and proximity to services and amenities This, for example, is a lie as Phase 1 and Phase 2 do not meet these criteria and there is no guarantee the other phases will be completed: General Plan, The project density is rounded up from 9.5 units per acre to 10 units per acre pursuant to the City of Santa Rosa's Density Bonus Ordinance (Zoning Code 20-31.020) and is therefore at the midpoint of the allowed density range. It most certainly violates this for our neighborhood while they say it does not and have gone to great pains to make sure it doesn't do this to other neighbors but they could do it for the entire community if the apartment building were in the center of the project. The densest parts are to be built first, so if phases 3, 4 and 5 never happen you are left with very high-density housing in an area not designated for that within the scenic corridor of Burbank Avenue having 3 story apartments and duplexes.
-

Urban Design UD-F-3 Encourage creative subdivision design that avoids walling to neighborhoods abutting regional/arterial streets with long monotonous stretches of fencing or walls. And while they included the summary from the more general "Roseland/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan" in their recommendation the staff did NOT include the information from the Burbank Avenue specific plan. This is a lie when it comes to the apartments and they purposely do NOT mention the Burbank Guidelines the Staff has cherry-picked the guidelines to approve the project as presented but has not mentioned the guidelines specific to the very area within which the project exists.

- The project design orients units facing inward toward the development. Overall the project site incorporates small lots that include single-family detached and single-family attached units, while the 64 multi-family units further the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan's goals and policies with a variety of housing types. This is what they did not put in their Staff Report; Burbank Avenue Street Design The General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 absence sidewalks and on-street parking. GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue. Those are found here in attachment 12:
http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf
- Staff failed to refer also to their "visual dictionary" which is the photos in the link below which makes our arguments clear: KEY CORRIDORS A following table is a visual dictionary of building product type examples typical for each of the General Plan land use classifications where new development is anticipated to occur. Vacant areas and underutilized lots offer the greatest opportunities for new development. These include Sebastopol Road, Burbank Avenue, Hearn Avenue, Dutton Meadow, and south of Hearn Avenue east of Dutton Meadow. The pictures are local examples where available; otherwise non-local photos are shown. Table 3-2: Development Type Imagery Development Types along Burbank Avenue Large-lot detached single-family homes with deep setback (Low-Density Residential land use designation) See page 3-6 which shows photos of what Burbank Avenue is supposed to look like and 3-7 and 3-8 which shows where the Apartment Buildings should be and it is NOT Burbank. GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue.
http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf
- See attachment-12: The city is planning upgrades to Burbank Avenue to address bicycling and

walking: A new roadway design for Burbank Avenue, illustrated in Figure 4-2, provides greater safety for pedestrians and bicyclists while maintaining the rural aesthetic. The new design includes bike lanes, sidewalks, and a tree-lined and landscaped bioswale between sidewalks and travel lanes along both sides of the street. A similar street design was recently constructed in front of Roseland Creek Elementary School and is depicted in the Burbank Avenue Scenic Roadway Guidelines document. This same roadway treatment is proposed across from the school along the planned community park and along the rest of the length of Burbank Avenue to Hearn Avenue. The roadway portions to the north of the school are either urbanized with curb, gutter, and sidewalk or too narrow to accommodate this scenic landscaped bioswale treatment. Therefore, two designs are proposed for the roadway, one to the north of the school and the other from the school to Hearn Avenue. But, here are their words which again says a three-story structure for this project is inappropriate: 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. The 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan for Sonoma County (CTP) also includes upgrades to City Bus operations, including implementation of 15-minute bus headways on Sebastopol Road.

- Also, note in Attachment 12 they show the new design for Burbank Avenue with 10' transit lanes. If you go down further in the document you find this: GOAL T-1 Promote the use, efficiency, safety, reliability, and convenience of public transit in the plan area. Policy T-1.1 Provide 11-foot travel lanes on streets with transit service. So even the "new" Burbank Avenue will not meet the policy of 11-foot travel lanes and thus is not designated for transit service which is where density should be concentrated as per the 2009 CTP and the Roseland area planning documents. Note that on this map no buses go down Burbank and the new street design with only 10' travel lanes precludes its use in the future as buses need 11' wide travel lanes as per the plan. <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/20514/CityBus-System-Map--LARGE>

The city is under pressure to produce dense housing and quickly. But are planning to do that in an area without readily available transit options other than cars when clearly the documents show that density is most appropriate in the Roseland area on "Sebastopol Road, the Dutton Avenue extension south of Hearn Avenue and along Hearn Avenue WEST of Burbank Avenue and EAST near Dutton Meadow." Three-story density is not appropriate for this project because, in your words, "the General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 of sidewalks and on-street parking."

Again, we ask that you think of our neighborhood and think of the unique qualities that make Burbank Avenue a special place to live. Our neighborhood is not against more housing, but we are against dense housing that does not fit our landscape, that jeopardizes the safety of our street, and takes away our rural character. We look forward to discussing this further at the upcoming review meetings.

Sincerely,

Erin and Nick Rineberg

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 retrofiting) 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

From: [Christina Tours Royston](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Two meetings?
Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 8:41:25 AM

Good morning,

I was wondering what the "zoning" meeting tonight will consist of? It's for the 1400 Burbank Ave Subdivision that is going in. Will it be for traffic impact?

Thank you,

Christina Tours Royston
Staff Accountant
Marietta Cellars | Marietta Vineyards
[707-433-2747](tel:707-433-2747)

On Sun, Jan 19, 2020 at 9:35 AM Christina Tours Royston <christina@mariettacellars.com> wrote:

Hi Adam

I received two notices of public hearing, one on the 22nd and one on the 23rd. What is the difference between zoning and planning?

Thank you!

Christina Royston

--

Christina Tours Royston
Staff Accountant
Marietta Cellars | Marietta Vineyards
[707-433-2747](tel:707-433-2747)

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

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 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: [Mark Henry Parrish](#)
To: [Cisco, Patti](#); [Weeks, Karen](#); [Carter, Charles](#); [Kalia, Akash](#); [Duggan, Vicki](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Peterson, Julian](#); [Ross, Adam](#); [Gustavson, Andy](#)
Cc: [kansassunflower64@yahoo.com](#); [rivermountainphoto@gmail.com](#); [Lorraine Papp](#); [Ramiro Ortiz](#); [thomasdarling@comcast.net](#); [sanfordburruss@gmail.com](#); [eikedan@sbcglobal.net](#); [jim-jody@att.net](#); [cesar707murillo@yahoo.com](#); [santa_rosa707@hotmail.com](#); [Beverly Buras](#); [Erin Rineberg](#); [Janet Lorraine Paul](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Avenue Subdivision-PRJ19-031, MAJ19-003, DR19-054, CUP19-095
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 5:38:02 PM
Attachments: [Attachment 12 - Roseland Area Sebastopol Road Specific Plan Circulation.pdf](#)
[Attachment 13 - Roseland Area Sebastopol Road Specific Plan Land Use and Housing.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Please add the following comments to be heard at the **Zoning Administrator Public Hearing Wednesday February 5, 2020 and Planning Commission Meeting Thursday, February 13, 2020**

I am not against new housing projects as I understand we desperately need housing in our city, however, this project as currently designed is not appropriate for our rural neighborhood. The primary objection is the current plan to install a massive three stories (39.5' tall), 62 unit, multi-family apartment complex fronting Burbank Avenue and abutting my three parcels. This project will also include duplexes and single-family homes all to be built in five different phases with the apartments to be built in the first phase and no guarantee the other phases will ever be built. Also, the fact that the densest part of it is on the perimeter of the project which most affects its current citizens. Ideally, these apartments should be located on Sebastopol road or Hearn avenue NOT in the middle of our rural neighborhood of Burbank Avenue. If they are to be installed they should at least be located in the core of the project where the majority of any visual/noise impact would be centralized within the project and affect the new tenants the most.

- **Initially, the Project was going to enter into an agreement with the City's Housing Authority by designating the multi-family units as available to low-income residents to satisfy the Inclusionary Housing requirement adopted by City Council in October 2019. However, on Tuesday, January 21, 2020, the Applicant team informed Staff that the project will no longer be designating the multi-family units as affordable.** As this project used to have an affordable housing component which was part of the reason they are taking short cuts and avoiding obvious issues such as placing the largest building ever built in the neighborhood right on the fence line with parking noise and garbage pickup noise all purposely faced towards the existing neighborhood rather than towards the developments other tenants. It is clear that the developer is focused on profit first and the neighborhood second. Build-in phases with the highest density being built first with the opportunity to not have to build the rest if they run into "financial difficulties. Build at the lowest cost by placing the largest structure right on the road and on the fence line of existing tenants. Decide not to build affordable housing. Decide that it is best in the interest of profit to put the highest density component on the project in the back yards of existing residents and away from their own single-family lots thus making the new lots more profitable despite the effect of reducing property values for existing neighbors behind said structure.
- **Staff is recommending approval of the project based on compliance with Zoning Code requirements and consistency with the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan policies associated with land use compatibility, range of housing types, and proximity to services and amenities** This, for example, is a lie as Phase 1 and Phase 2 do not meet these criteria and there is no guarantee the other phases will be completed: **General Plan, The project density is rounded up from 9.5 units per acre to 10 units per acre pursuant to the City of Santa Rosa's Density Bonus Ordinance (Zoning Code 20-31.020) and is therefore at the midpoint of the allowed density range.** It most certainly violates this for our neighborhood while they say it does not and have gone to great pains to make sure it doesn't do this to other neighbors but they could do it for the entire community if the apartment building were in the center of the project. The densest parts are to be built first, so if phases 3, 4 and 5 never happen you are left with very high-density housing in an area not designated for that within the scenic corridor of Burbank Avenue having 3 story apartments and duplexes.

- **Urban Design UD-F-3 Encourage creative subdivision design that avoids walling to neighborhoods abutting regional/arterial streets with long monotonous stretches of fencing or walls.** And while they included the summary from the more general "Roseland/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan" in their recommendation the staff did NOT include the information from the Burbank Avenue specific plan. This is a lie when it comes to the apartments and they purposely do NOT mention the Burbank Guidelines the Staff has cherry-picked the guidelines to approve the project as presented but has not mentioned the guidelines specific to the very area within which the project exists.
- **The project design orients units facing inward toward the development. Overall the project site incorporates small lots that include single-family detached and single-family attached units, while the 64 multi-family units further the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan's goals and policies with a variety of housing types.** This is what they did not put in their Staff Report; **Burbank Avenue Street Design** The General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 absence sidewalks and on-street parking. **GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue.** Those are found here in attachment 12:
http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf
- Staff failed to refer also to their "visual dictionary" which is the photos in the link below which makes our arguments clear: **KEY CORRIDORS A following table is a visual dictionary of building product type examples typical for each of the General Plan land use classifications where new development is anticipated to occur. Vacant areas and underutilized lots offer the greatest opportunities for new development. These include Sebastopol Road, Burbank Avenue, Hearn Avenue, Dutton Meadow, and south of Hearn Avenue east of Dutton Meadow. The pictures are local examples where available; otherwise non-local photos are shown. Table 3-2: Development Type Imagery**
Development Types along Burbank Avenue Large-lot detached single-family homes with deep setback (Low-Density Residential land use designation) See page 3-6 which shows photos of what Burbank Avenue is supposed to look like and 3-7 and 3-8 which shows where the Apartment Buildings should be and it is NOT Burbank. **GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue.**
http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf
- See attachment-12: The city is planning upgrades to Burbank Avenue to address bicycling and walking: A new roadway design for Burbank Avenue, illustrated in Figure 4-2, provides greater safety for pedestrians and bicyclists while maintaining the rural aesthetic. The new design includes bike lanes, sidewalks, and a tree-lined and landscaped bioswale between sidewalks and travel lanes along both sides of the street. A similar street design was recently constructed in front of Roseland Creek Elementary School and is depicted in the Burbank Avenue Scenic Roadway Guidelines document. This same roadway treatment is proposed across from the school along the planned community park and along the rest of the length of Burbank Avenue to Hearn Avenue. The roadway portions to the north of the school are either urbanized with curb, gutter, and sidewalk or too narrow to accommodate this scenic landscaped bioswale treatment. Therefore, two designs are proposed for the roadway, one to the north of the school and the other from the school to Hearn Avenue.
But, here are their words which again says a three-story structure for this

project is inappropriate: 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. The 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan for Sonoma County (CTP) also includes upgrades to City Bus operations, including implementation of 15-minute bus headways on Sebastopol Road.

- Also, note in Attachment 12 they show the new design for Burbank Avenue with 10' transit lanes. If you go down further in the document you find this: **GOAL T-1 Promote the use, efficiency, safety, reliability, and convenience of public transit in the plan area. Policy T-1.1 Provide 11-foot travel lanes on streets with transit service.** So even the "new" Burbank Avenue will not meet the policy of 11-foot travel lanes and thus is not designated for transit service which is where density should be concentrated as per the 2009 CTP and the Roseland area planning documents. Note that on this map no buses go down Burbank and the new street design with only 10' travel lanes precludes its use in the future as buses need 11' wide travel lanes as per the plan.
<https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/20514/CityBus-System-Map--LARGE> The city is under pressure to produce dense housing and quickly. But are planning to do that in an area without readily available transit options other than cars when clearly the documents show that density is most appropriate in the Roseland area on "Sebastopol Road, the Dutton Avenue extension south of Hearn Avenue and along Hearn Avenue WEST of Burbank Avenue and EAST near Dutton Meadow." Three-story density is not appropriate for this project because, in your words, "the General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 of sidewalks and on-street parking."

More traffic overwhelming two-lane Burbank Avenue which has Southwest Community Park to the south at Hearn Avenue, Burbank housing in the middle, Roseland Creek Elementary School to the north and high traffic Sebastopol Road at the north end. Drivers already use Burbank Avenue as a freeway to avoid Stony Point Road and exceeding Burbanks posted 25 miles 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 or the park. Where are the needed city services?

With regards to roads; currently, we have busy Burbank Avenue to the west, my private easement road to the south. These project apartments include a service road along with 32 parking spaces just on the other side of my properties fence line to the north, and then there is a plan for a future road to the east that will cross my private property and easement road connecting this new project to the existing Burbank housing to the south. Thus creating an island by encircling my home and properties with high traffic roads. What will prevent cars from using my private easement road as another access point in and out of these two housing projects?

While I appreciate the attempt by the developers to make changes to the project based on comments heard at the design review meeting; these are superficial in a futile attempt to disguise the location and mass of these apartments.

Best regards,

Mark Henry Parrish
(707) 696-3227
mhp@hitec4u.com

From: [SUSAN HOGE](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave development
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 5:03:32 PM

Santa Rosa needs housing period so I guess I will have to say go for it, even at the expense of the upset and angry property owners in the area. I have lived in Sonoma County since 1968 and have seen the problems that have developed over the decades, a major one being "no new housing".

The city must know that middle class working folks, like me, are leaving in droves...I for one so not want to but unless the city gets its act together and really works and works and works to rectify this issue this place will not be suitable for the working class. At present, I work in the public school arena at rents are so high that I do not know where your teachers and staff workers will live. All of my grown children have left the area as it is not feasible for them to raise a family here.

...thoughts from a lady that grew up here and is not sure if she can afford to stay.

Thank you kindly for listening.

S. Hoge.2348 Brookwood Avenue
707-484-5534

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: [Amity Hotchkiss](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Information on 1400 Burbank Ave Project
Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2020 9:48:14 PM

Hello and Thank you --

Amity Hotchkiss
Santa Rosa -- Roseland area

On Tue, Feb 4, 2020 at 3:55 PM Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Hi Amity,

Thank you for your Public Comment. I have added this to Public Record and it will be weighed in the decision making process. I am working on responding to your inquiry and will have one ready for the Public Hearing tomorrow and will provide it to you prior to the hearing if I can complete it before then.

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: Amity Hotchkiss <amity2244@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 3, 2020 6:34 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Information on 1400 Burbank Ave Project

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

--

Amity Hotchkiss
1421 McMinn Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA

From: [Erin Rineberg](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Cc: [Nick Rineberg](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Dense Apartment Development on Burbank Avenue
Date: Thursday, February 6, 2020 12:04:14 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Dear Mr. Ross,

Thank you for discussing further with me how zoning works and the plan for Santa Rosa. I am still disheartened by the outcome of last night's meeting and a clear disregard shown for the the community's concern towards this project. While you said this was out of your control and you are there to just do the paperwork I hope our comments resonated with you in some way. I am also hoping you could answer some follow up questions for me regarding the city master plan and purpose for development? Please see below:

1. Is it possible to contact the planning commissioner directly? And I apologize for my ignorance here, but was that who presided over the meeting yesterday?
2. Is it the city's plan to develop all open spaces for the greatest population density? Meaning, looking at Todd Road to Sebastopol Road from Stony Point to Dutton is the plan to encourage and support development of those rural lots for high density housing similar to the project on Burbank Avenue?
3. If the answer is yes to that first question, why does the city think it is in the best interest of the community to take farm land for development in this way? What is the greater benefit in increasing housing density at the expense of open spaces? And what data (surveys, etc.) supports this as a desired outcome from the community?
4. Why is the city concentrating development in rural areas like Burbank Avenue, instead of building up larger complexes in the city proper and around industrial zones? For instance the new development along the train tracks at Olive and Sebastopol Road fits that landscape and scale better than the neighborhoods with larger spaces and open land.
5. I am still unclear on the relationship between environmental studies and impact, and your office. Will/has an environmental report been done on the impact this development will have on our local wildlife and ecosystems? How would one get this report if so? If not, is there any restriction that would require this report to be done prior to breaking ground? We have an abundance of riparian, avian and raptor life, including the protected tiger salamander, in this area and I am worried this point is being ignored.
6. What safeguards will the city provide to ensure that the housing size for this property is enforced? For instance, a single family unit should not have multiple families living in it that will clog roadways. Likewise, what is to stop the plan from changing to all apartments if the developer chooses to rework the phases?
7. With the decision at last night's meeting being reached, what is the purpose of the meeting on 2/12?
8. Is it city policy to callously state to the local residents that change is inevitable, that big housing projects are coming, and that current residents need to just deal with it? This comment from the planning commissioner really struck me as cold and heartless to the residents trying so hard to preserve their way of life. Yes, change is inevitable but it should not be done as a slap in the face to residents concerns. This one is probably out of your realm of comment as well but if there is someone that can answer I would appreciate it.

I appreciate you taking the time to answer any of these questions. I am trying to better understand the city's long term goals and the identity it wishes to create in the coming years. As it stands it is less to be Sonoma County open spaces and farmland and is looking more and more like the next Fullerton, Garden Grove, and Santa Ana. You may admire these places but they should not be the goal to replicate here.

Sincerely,

Erin Rineberg

On Wed, Feb 5, 2020 at 1:34 PM Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Erin and Nick,

Thank you for your Public Comment. I have added this to the Public Record and it will be weighed in the decision making process. I am also working on a response to your comments for the Public Hearing tonight at 5:00 P.M.

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

email signature cropped



From: Erin Rineberg <erinrineberg@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 1:25 PM

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

Cc: Cisco, Patti <PCisco@srcity.org>; Carter, Charles <CCarter@srcity.org>; Kalia, Akash <akalia@srcity.org>; Weeks, Karen <KWeeks@srcity.org>; Duggan, Vicki <VDuggan@srcity.org>; Okrepkie, Jeff <JOkrepkie@srcity.org>; Peterson, Julian <jpeterson@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>; Nick Rineberg <nrineberg@gmail.com>; mhp@hitec4u.com

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Dense Apartment Development on Burbank Avenue

Erin & Nick Rineberg
2225 Burbank Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
(707) 861-0906

February 5, 2020

Dear Mr. Ross,

We are writing today to express concern and propose a compromise to the planned development on Burbank Avenue. We find the city's disregard for zoning restrictions and willingness to build without consideration to the neighborhood and characteristics that make our street a unique rural landscape disheartening. While housing is a need in Sonoma County, it must be done in a way that does not take away from the agricultural and rural roots that uniquely define our community here. Adhering to zoning requirements is the city's duty and the specific plan for Burbank Avenue must not be overlooked.

We would ask you all to pause for a moment and think of what you want future Sonoma County and Santa Rosa to look like. Do you envision urban sprawl, cement walkways, and towering complexes or do you still picture rolling green hills and fields dotted with oaks, the sounds of frogs in the evening, and space where people can still see the mountains? We hope it is the latter, and it is that image that keeps you from overdeveloping neighborhoods like those on Burbank Avenue.

However, it is our fear that you do not share this same desire to preserve our open and spacious lot, and instead wish to create neighborhoods mirroring those of Los Angeles and Orange County, where once open spaces and farms are now cement jungles of smog and over dense housing. We are all too familiar with these communities, and we purposely left the Southern California land of cement and over trimmed trees for open spaces and farm life in Sonoma County four years ago. But now, that development has followed us here and while our plea will most likely fall on the deaf ears of city planners and developers looking to address a housing shortage, we hope we can at the very least paint a picture of how dense development on rural streets like Burbank Avenue will destroy the open spaces Sonoma County should be fighting so hard to preserve.

We bought our first home on Burbank Ave in November 2018. What drew us to this neighborhood was the scenic and rural landscape of the street and the opportunity to have a farm of our own. It is a well proportioned street with a mix of larger farm properties like ours and smaller single family homes that fit the resources of the neighborhood. Old trees line the road way and a lack of sidewalks enhances the rural charm. This morning we woke up to the sounds of owls hooting in the distance and will end the day with frogs and toads croaking in the yard. In the spring we have deer in our yards and an abundance of other wildlife looking for a space to coexist in our city. This planned development borders along the creek and animal habitats will be impacted just as much as our neighbors. With our endangered species, such as the spotted salamander, how can we allow development like this?

Yes, housing is a need. But it must be done in a way that preserves our open spaces and community character. A three story apartment complex has no place in the middle of our street. If the lot must be subdivided it needs to follow the original plan of single and duplex style units. Please review the following ways the city and developer have disregarded the master plan and

zoning restrictions for Burbank Avenue. This disregard is noted by all neighbors and is why we are against this development moving forward.

- Initially, the Project was going to enter into an agreement with the City's Housing Authority by designating the multi-family units as available to low-income residents to satisfy the Inclusionary Housing requirement adopted by City Council in October 2019. However, on Tuesday, January 21, 2020, the Applicant team informed Staff that the project will no longer be designating the multi-family units as affordable. As this project used to have an affordable housing component which was part of the reason they are taking short cuts and avoiding obvious issues such as placing the largest building ever built in the neighborhood right on the fence line with parking noise and garbage pickup noise all purposely faced towards the existing neighborhood rather than towards the developments other tenants. It is clear that the developer is focused on profit first and the neighborhood second. Build-in phases with the highest density being built first with the opportunity to not have to build the rest if they run into "financial difficulties. Build at the lowest cost by placing the largest structure right on the road and on the fence line of existing tenants. Decide not to build affordable housing. Decide that it is best in the interest of profit to put the highest density component on the project in the back yards of existing residents and away from their own single-family lots thus making the new lots more profitable despite the effect of reducing property values for existing neighbors behind said structure.
- Staff is recommending approval of the project based on compliance with Zoning Code requirements and consistency with the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan policies associated with land use compatibility, range of housing types, and proximity to services and amenities This, for example, is a lie as Phase 1 and Phase 2 do not meet these criteria and there is no guarantee the other phases will be completed: General Plan, The project density is rounded up from 9.5 units per acre to 10 units per acre pursuant to the City of Santa Rosa's Density Bonus Ordinance (Zoning Code 20-31.020) and is therefore at the midpoint of the allowed density range. It most certainly violates this for our neighborhood while they say it does not and have gone to great pains to make sure it doesn't do this to other neighbors but they could do it for the entire community if the apartment building were in the center of the project. The densest parts are to be built first, so if phases 3, 4 and 5 never happen you are left with very high-density housing in an area not designated for that within the scenic corridor of Burbank Avenue having 3 story apartments and duplexes.
- Urban Design UD-F-3 Encourage creative subdivision design that avoids walling to neighborhoods abutting regional/arterial streets with long monotonous stretches of fencing or walls. And while they included the summary from the more general "Roseland/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan" in their recommendation the staff did NOT include the information from the Burbank Avenue specific plan. This is a lie when it comes to the apartments and they purposely do NOT mention the Burbank Guidelines the Staff has cherry-picked the guidelines to approve the project as presented but has not mentioned the guidelines specific to the very area within which the project exists.
- The project design orients units facing inward toward the development. Overall the project site incorporates small lots that include single-family detached and single-family attached units, while the 64 multi-family units further the General Plan and Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan's goals and policies with a variety of housing types. This is what they did not put in their Staff Report; Burbank Avenue Street Design The General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 absence sidewalks and on-street parking. GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue. Those are found here in attachment 12:

http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf

- Staff failed to refer also to their "visual dictionary" which is the photos in the link below which makes our arguments clear: KEY CORRIDORS A following table is a visual dictionary of building product type examples typical for each of the General Plan land use classifications where new development is anticipated to occur. Vacant areas and underutilized lots offer the greatest opportunities for new development. These include Sebastopol Road, Burbank Avenue, Hearn Avenue, Dutton Meadow, and south of Hearn Avenue east of Dutton Meadow. The pictures are local examples where available; otherwise non-local photos are shown. Table 3-2: Development Type Imagery Development Types along Burbank Avenue Large-lot detached single-family homes with deep setback (Low-Density Residential land use designation) See page 3-6 which shows photos of what Burbank Avenue is supposed to look like and 3-7 and 3-8 which shows where the Apartment Buildings should be and it is NOT Burbank. GOAL RN-4 Maintain the rural quality of Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.1 Implement the new street design in order to balance new improvements with the existing rural character along Burbank Avenue. Policy RN-4.2 Balance the desire to maintain the rural character with pedestrian and bicycle safety along Burbank Avenue.

http://legistar.granicus.com/santarosa/meetings/2019/11/2820_A_Design_Review_Board_19-11-07_Regular_Meeting_Agenda_and_Summary_Report.pdf

- See attachment-12: The city is planning upgrades to Burbank Avenue to address bicycling and walking: A new roadway design for Burbank Avenue, illustrated in Figure 4-2, provides greater safety for pedestrians and bicyclists while maintaining the rural aesthetic. The new design includes bike lanes, sidewalks, and a tree-lined and landscaped bioswale between sidewalks and travel lanes along both sides of the street. A similar street design was recently constructed in front of Roseland Creek Elementary School and is depicted in the Burbank Avenue Scenic Roadway Guidelines document. This same roadway treatment is proposed across from the school along the planned community park and along the rest of the length of Burbank Avenue to Hearn Avenue. The roadway portions to the north of the school are either urbanized with curb, gutter, and sidewalk or too narrow to accommodate this scenic landscaped bioswale treatment. Therefore, two designs are proposed for the roadway, one to the north of the school and the other from the school to Hearn Avenue. But, here are their words which again says a three-story structure for this project is inappropriate: 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. The 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan for Sonoma County (CTP) also includes upgrades to City Bus operations, including implementation of 15-minute bus headways on Sebastopol Road.
- Also, note in Attachment 12 they show the new design for Burbank Avenue with 10' transit lanes. If you go down further in the document you find this: GOAL T-1 Promote the use, efficiency, safety, reliability, and convenience of public transit in the plan area. Policy T-1.1 Provide 11-foot travel lanes on streets with transit service. So even the "new" Burbank Avenue will not meet the policy of 11-foot travel lanes and thus is not designated for transit service which is where density should be concentrated as per the 2009 CTP and the Roseland area planning documents. Note that on this map no buses go down Burbank and the new street design with only 10' travel lanes precludes its use in the future as buses need 11' wide travel lanes as per the plan.

<https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/20514/CityBus-System-Map--LARGE>

The city is under pressure to produce dense housing and quickly. But are planning to do that in an area without readily available transit options other than cars when clearly the documents show that density is most appropriate in the Roseland area on "Sebastopol Road, the Dutton Avenue

extension south of Hearn Avenue and along Hearn Avenue WEST of Burbank Avenue and EAST near Dutton Meadow." Three-story density is not appropriate for this project because, in your words, "the General Plan designates Burbank Avenue 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 of sidewalks and on-street parking."

Again, we ask that you think of our neighborhood and think of the unique qualities that make Burbank Avenue a special place to live. Our neighborhood is not against more housing, but we are against dense housing that does not fit our landscape, that jeopardizes the safety of our street, and takes away our rural character. We look forward to discussing this further at the upcoming review meetings.

Sincerely,

Erin and Nick Rineberg

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: [SUSAN HOGE](#)
To: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank Ave development
Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020 5:03:32 PM

Santa Rosa needs housing period so I guess I will have to say go for it, even at the expense of the upset and angry property owners in the area. I have lived in Sonoma County since 1968 and have seen the problems that have developed over the decades, a major one being "no new housing".

The city must know that middle class working folks, like me, are leaving in droves...I for one so not want to but unless the city gets its act together and really works and works and works to rectify this issue this place will not be suitable for the working class. At present, I work in the public school arena at rents are so high that I do not know where your teachers and staff workers will live. All of my grown children have left the area as it is not feasible for them to raise a family here.

...thoughts from a lady that grew up here and is not sure if she can afford to stay.

Thank you kindly for listening.

S. Hoge.2348 Brookwood Avenue
707-484-5534

From: [Alexander Templeton MEd MA](#)
To: [Peter Schellinger](#)
Cc: [Ross, Adam](#)
Subject: Re: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 3:04:33 PM

Thank you for the clarity, what is your predication and timeline for this financing and is there another one in Sonoma County?

Please take time to answer should it not disrupt your productivity.

Alexander S. Templeton, M.Ed., M.A. (Pronouns: Him/He/His/)

Skype ID: live:alexstempleton

Cell: (707) 862-4677

[Online Portfolio](#)

[LinkedIn](#) Profile

On Tue, Jun 2, 2020 at 3:01 PM Peter Schellinger <prs@waterstoneecos.com> wrote:

Alex,

If successful in getting the apartment project financed as an affordable community, Waterstone would purchase the apartment site from the Master Developer and develop the property in partnership with Burbank Housing. Burbank Housing would be the property manager for the affordable housing community.

I'll pass along the message to Efren.

Hope this helps.

Best,

Peter

Peter Schellinger
WATERSTONE RESIDENTIAL, LLC

1270 Airport Blvd | Santa Rosa, CA 95403

m: (415) 710 - 4115



From: Alexander Templeton MEd MA <alexstempleton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Peter Schellinger <prs@waterstonecos.com>
Subject: Re: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee

Thank you both,

And who will manage the property? I ask because there are management companies such as those that run Americana Apartments that need improvement and have violated CA regulations to allow IHSS in-home care providers services to their clients.

Under which jurisdiction will they fall, (city, county, both?), and/or are they incorporated by the annexation?

Also, if Efren is working with you, please tell him I said, "hi!".

Genuinely,

Alex

Alexander S. Templeton, M.Ed., M.A. (Pronouns: Him/He/His/)

Skype ID: live:alexstempleton

Cell: (707) 862-4677

[Online Portfolio](#)

[LinkedIn](#) Profile

On Tue, Jun 2, 2020 at 10:40 AM Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Alexander,

Please see the applicant's response to your remaining questions below in red.

Adam Ross | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Peter Schellinger <prs@waterstonecos.com>

Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 3:52 PM

To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>; Joe Ripple <joe@schellingerbrothers.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee

Adam,

Please see below. Feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Schellinger
WATERSTONE RESIDENTIAL, LLC

1270 Airport Blvd | Santa Rosa, CA 95403

m: (415) 710 - 4115



From: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 2:39 PM
To: Peter Schellinger <prs@waterstoneecos.com>; Joe Ripple <joe@schellingerbrothers.com>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee

Public Correspondence. Do you know any of the answers regarding onsite management at this time? I already responded regarding insulation, flooring, plumbing, etc.

Adam Ross | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Alexander Templeton MEd MA <alexstempleton@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 11:05 AM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee

Thank you for the technical details but I must ask:

will they be well insulated?

will it be built by a field that will need to be mowed down so there are not a lot of insects and pests?

will there be adequate carpeting and interior?

Will there be a landlord who will take care of work orders and do time as well as allow for in home care support and families that support each other? **The apartments will be professionally managed by an experienced property manager.**

Will neighbors needing many human and social services be able to get them? **If the apartments are developed as an affordable community, resident services will be offered as part of the management program.**

These are all things that I dealt with growing up in the projects....

If sent from my cell phone, please excuse brevity and/or typos.

Do not accept pejoratives if offered within any inequitable context where you held a position of power and exploited intersections in attempt to create professional disparities.

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/literally-figurative-literacy>

On Mon, Jun 1, 2020, 10:31 AM Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org> wrote:

Hi Alexander,

Thank you for your public comment. I have added this to the public record and it will be weighed in the decision making process.

In response to your question, I can tell you that the density of the proposed project is 9 units per acre in an area that allows 8-13 units per acre. The project Entitlements have been appealed and will go to the Design Review Board via virtual meeting on June 4,

2020. Meeting access can be found here: <https://srcity.org/1323/Design-Review-Board>.

The appeal for the Minor Conditional Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2020, via virtual meeting. The link can be found here:

<https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=754938&GUID=8552507A-2A08-42FE-A88E-2CA2E40DA7D8&Options=&Search=>.

The appeal for the Tentative Map will be reviewed by City Council on June 16, 2020.

The link can be found here: [https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=746422&GUID=DE373F56-3121-44B0-B36B-](https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=746422&GUID=DE373F56-3121-44B0-B36B-F6778E1E10F9&Options=&Search=)

[F6778E1E10F9&Options=&Search=](https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=746422&GUID=DE373F56-3121-44B0-B36B-F6778E1E10F9&Options=&Search=).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Adam Ross |City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Alexander Templeton MEd MA <alexstempleton@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 31, 2020 5:03 PM

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

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank housing comment for committee

Adam,

I'm voicing my concern and advocacy growing up in the duplex low-income housing projects of Roseland myself, many of our voices are not heard or respected: my question for you, the community, and the committee who is planning is:

Is there a plan or ways to create duplexes or mid-density housing that does not lower the property value and provide ample opportunity for growing communities and residence to live in Roseland without falling into dilapidation of either neighbors' respect and acceptance, and the quality and the quality of life befitting citizens who will inhabit there?

If sent from my cell phone, please excuse brevity and/or typos.

From: [Ross, Adam](#)
To: mariaindindoli@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 11:57:00 AM

Hi Maria,

Thank you for your public comment. I have added this to the public record and it will be weighed in the decision making process.

This project included a Traffic Impact Analysis. In the analysis, the intersection at Hearn Avenue and Burbank Avenue was identified as insufficient in part because of this proposal. As a result, Traffic Engineering Conditioned the project to include a fair share portion of a new traffic signal at the intersection of Hearn and Burbank Avenue, which equates to \$96,000 or roughly one-third of the cost. The City will then cover the cost of the rest of the signal and install it within a 12-18 month timeframe as stated by the Deputy Director of Traffic Engineering in the last public hearing on this project. The difference will then be recouped by future developments when/if that happens.

I have also forwarded this to the Traffic Engineering Department for further review. Let me know if you have any additional questions.

Adam Ross | City Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: maria indindoli [<mailto:mariaindindoli@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 9:52 AM
To: _DRB - Design Review Board <_DRB@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development

I am writing to give my input as a resident of Roseland regarding the Burbank Avenue planned development.

Burbank Avenue is already highly impacted by traffic due to the elementary school on Burbank ave. , which my son attends, the recent Burbank housing development on Liana dr, and the recent opening of Liana Drive through from West Avenue to Burbank ave. Our neighborhood has high population density even in areas that do not contain “official” high density housing. This is due to the fact that it is a lower income area, housing is more affordable, and there is a high immigrant population which tends to mean multiple families in a dwelling. I know this to be true because I have worked extensively for years doing in-home visits for families with small children as my job.

Additionally a new development was recently completed on Roseland Avenue near the corner of Roseland and Burbank, another development has been partially completed and continues to be developed on Dutton Avenue at Hearn, and in the past five years two very large high density developments have been completed on Dutton Meadow. All this has led to extremely increased traffic throughout the Hearn Avenue to Sebastopol Road corridor. The main freeway overpass that feeds these neighborhoods going and coming from south is at Hearn

Avenue. If more development is going to continue in this area that overpass needs to be widened to 4 lanes, traffic is already extremely backed up at that overpass coming from all directions. This is also due to the Santa Rosa marketplace shopping center which has Costco, Target, Best Buy and other very popular stores and many, many new high density developments on the east side of the freeway from Hearn Avenue and in the Yolanda Road area.

We can't continue developing high density housing in the south Santa Rosa area without first addressing the traffic congestion issues. This is not just inconvenient it is unsafe. We have seen what happens when there are evacuations and people were not able to get out.

I am very disappointed with the level of incompetence in planning that has been done by the city of Santa Rosa leaders. We need thoughtful, experienced and better educated people guiding our city. Please consider scaling back the Burbank ave development to single family homes only.

Sincerely,

Maria Indindoli
717 Leo dr
707-799-7748

“Guard your heart above all else, for it determines the course of your life.”

Proverbs 4:23

From: [Ross, Adam](#)
To: mariaindindoli@yahoo.com
Cc: [Sprinkle, Rob](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 12:09:00 PM

Hello Maria,

Please see Engineering's response to you public comment as well.

Adam Ross | City Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 12:06 PM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development

Adam,

We do have plans and environmental completed for the Hearn Avenue Interchange. We are working on the funding for it. Additionally, we have conditioned this development to pay at portion of a signal at Hearn and Burbank Ave. Design for that should start this year.

Rob

From: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2020 11:58 AM
To: Sprinkle, Rob <RSprinkle@srcity.org>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development

FYI

From: Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 11:39 AM
To: Ross, Adam <ARoss@srcity.org>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development

Adam I forwarded this to you the other day. Did you see it?
I created a Late Correspondence folder on the E Drive, and put this in there.

From: maria indindoli [<mailto:mariaindindoli@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 9:52 AM

To: _DRB - Design Review Board <_DRB@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Burbank ave development

I am writing to give my input as a resident of Roseland regarding the Burbank Avenue planned development.

Burbank Avenue is already highly impacted by traffic due to the elementary school on Burbank ave. , which my son attends, the recent Burbank housing development on Liana dr, and the recent opening of Liana Drive through from West Avenue to Burbank ave. Our neighborhood has high population density even in areas that do not contain “official” high density housing. This is due to the fact that it is a lower income area, housing is more affordable, and there is a high immigrant population which tends to mean multiple families in a dwelling. I know this to be true because I have worked extensively for years doing in-home visits for families with small children as my job.

Additionally a new development was recently completed on Roseland Avenue near the corner of Roseland and Burbank, another development has been partially completed and continues to be developed on Dutton Avenue at Hearn, and in the past five years two very large high density developments have been completed on Dutton Meadow. All this has led to extremely increased traffic throughout the Hearn Avenue to Sebastopol Road corridor. The main freeway overpass that feeds these neighborhoods going and coming from south is at Hearn Avenue. If more development is going to continue in this area that overpass needs to be widened to 4 lanes, traffic is already extremely backed up at that overpass coming from all directions. This is also due to the Santa Rosa marketplace shopping center which has Costco, Target, Best Buy and other very popular stores and many, many new high density developments on the east side of the freeway from Hearn Avenue and in the Yolanda Road area.

We can't continue developing high density housing in the south Santa Rosa area without first addressing the traffic congestion issues. This is not just inconvenient it is unsafe. We have seen what happens when there are evacuations and people were not able to get out.

I am very disappointed with the level of incompetence in planning that has been done by the city of Santa Rosa leaders. We need thoughtful, experienced and better educated people guiding our city. Please consider scaling back the Burbank ave development to single family homes only.

Sincerely,

Maria Indindoli
717 Leo dr
707-799-7748

“Guard your heart above all else, for it determines the course of your life.”

Proverbs 4:23

From: [Ross, Adam](#)
To: [Janet Lorraine Paul](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] 5-26
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 10:49:00 AM

Janet,

I meant to include this information for the upcoming appeal hearings:

The project Entitlements have been appealed and will go to the Design Review Board via virtual meeting on June 4, 2020. Meeting access can be found here: <https://srcity.org/1323/Design-Review-Board>.

The appeal for the Minor Conditional Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2020, via virtual meeting. The link can be found here: <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=754938&GUID=8552507A-2A08-42FE-A88E-2CA2E40DA7D8&Options=&Search=>.

The appeal for the Tentative Map will be reviewed by City Council on June 16, 2020. The link can be found here: <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=746422&GUID=DE373F56-3121-44B0-B36B-F6778E1F10F9&Options=&Search=>.

Adam Ross | City Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Ross, Adam
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Janet Lorraine Paul <jlorraine@sonic.net>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] 5-26

Good Morning Janet,

Thank you for your public comment. I have added it to the public record and it will be weighed in the decision making process. Please read below for my response to your comment.

The proposed Burbank Avenue Subdivision's General Plan Land Use Designation is Medium-Low Density Residential, which allows 8-13 units per acre. The proposed subdivision density is 9 units per acre. The proposed public right-of-way improvements required in the Roseland Area/Sebastopol Road Specific Plan includes a 62-foot right-of-way where each side of the street includes a 6-foot sidewalk, 8.5-foot bioswale, a 6-foot bicycle lane, and a 10-foot travel lanes (image attached for reference). There is no plan for a bus route to north and south on Burbank Avenue but public right-of-way improvements to provide a safe route to the transit stations is required. The impact of this project does require the developer to pay a fair share contribution to install a traffic signal on Hearn

Avenue and Burbank Avenue to ease the congestion in that intersection. The City will pay for the rest of the traffic signal.

It is true that the developer removed the affordable housing component from the project prior to the first public hearing. However, they have indicated that they still intend to provide the multi-family units as affordable housing and are pursuing State funding sources.



Adam Ross | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-34705 | aross@srcity.org

From: Janet Lorraine Paul <jlorraine@sonic.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 2:00 PM

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

Subject: [EXTERNAL] 5-26

May 26, 2020

To: ARoss@SRCity.org

Re: Burbank Avenue Subdivision

I live on a rural two lane road with gullies on each side in an area that the City General Plan deems "scenic and rural" with an emphasis of any future development to not ruin that character. They say they want to maintain that ambiance and make the quality of life of existing residents a priority. To make our lives here unhealthy and overcrowded seems a gross error.

This lane is not wide enough to ever have a bus on it, let alone a bus stop or a dedicated bicycle lane. Its name is Burbank Avenue, but that is a misnomer. It is a rural lane. This lane is dangerous to walk, always has been. The result of the recent Burbank Housing development and a new Elementary School has led to commute gridlock here,

and significantly increased air pollution.

SR is supposed to put density near transportation and streets wide enough to accommodate it. And I would like SR to resolve the problems the above mentioned developments have created before they challenge our previously healthy neighborhood more.

The developer proposed it as "affordable housing" to have Planning approve that location, but changed it to "market rate" the day before the Zoning Administrator meeting. That is a sleazy trick and it makes me wonder about corruption and crooks in the administration in SR. Same wonder I had when SR surrounded our area, leaving it a county island, contrary to agreements with other bay area cities.

I do request a response in writing. I hope you can address my concerns with some transparency.

Very truly yours,
Janet Lorraine-Paul

From: Janet Lorraine-Paul, 2003 Burbank Ave, Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Email: jlorraine@sonic.net

RECEIVED

MAR 09 2020

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Endangered Species Disregard/Insufficient Study:

The Schellinger Brothers have an extensive history of attempting to skirt the environmental regulations for their residential projects. As recent as 2016, in an appellate court decision, the court cited in the history of the case that the Schellinger Brothers' constant changing of their plans and that the CEQA's decision was still pending was causing them undue delay in their project. The court rejected this argument and stated that the CEQA's jurisdiction did not occur outside of the statute of limitations due to the constant changing of the development plans. This was a clear attempt by the Schellinger Brothers to circumvent the environmental protections allotted by the CEQA in an attempt to profit from the destruction of the environment. A simple Google search found this appellate decision as it was the third item on the first page. The appellate decision found no merit in the Schellinger Brother's arguments that the delays caused by the city and or members of the community were justified and must be processed. The following link will take you to the Court's decision: <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2016/a142201.html>.

It appears that the Schellinger Brothers are again attempting to skirt environmental protections again. Several years ago, during their last study of the endangered California Tiger Salamander, the neighbors observed Schellinger Brothers equipment tilling up the earth during the study in the exact areas where the study was taking place. This appears to be in an attempt to reduce the number of Tiger Salamanders in the area for a subsequent count. Furthermore, the Schellinger Brothers are using the current housing crisis to again skirt the environmental requirements set out to protect this endangered species.