

## Staff Response to Comments - Stony Point Flats - PRJ21-012

McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Thu 6/3/2021 8:35 AM

To: Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>

Cc: michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>; Loren Brueggemann <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>; Anjela Ponce <anjela@integrityhousing.org>

Bcc: lfong@srcs.k12.ca.us <lfong@srcs.k12.ca.us>; info@generationhousing.org <info@generationhousing.org>; sloowlearner@yahoo.com <sloowlearner@yahoo.com>; jenniferlaporta1@gmail.com <jenniferlaporta1@gmail.com>; ellie2000@comcast.net <ellie2000@comcast.net>; krissia.f@gmail.com <krissia.f@gmail.com>; Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>; Lorna Edits <lornaedits18@gmail.com>; erinrineberg@gmail.com <erinrineberg@gmail.com>; lburtis@sbcglobal.net <lburtis@sbcglobal.net>; maygol.yavaribe@gmail.com <maygol.yavaribe@gmail.com>; natashalockwood2131@gmail.com <natashalockwood2131@gmail.com>; alaina415@gmail.com <alaina415@gmail.com>; David Bannister Home <davidban@sonic.net>; Dennis Hagemann <dennish@sonic.net>; STEVAN HUNTER <gaurdello@hotmail.com>

### Subject Project: Stony Point Flats – 2268 Stony Point Road (PRJ21-012/DR21-023)

Hello,

Thank you for your comments about the proposal to develop a 50-unit affordable housing development located at 2268 Stony Point Road (Stony Point Flats). The information below responds to potential issues or concerns raised by members of the public during a Neighborhood Meeting held on May 3, 2021, in response to public notification of Concept Design Review by the Design Review Board to be held on June 3, 2021, and generated by availability of project information submitted as part of required applications. If you are receiving this email, then Planning staff has record of email correspondence received from you.

Stony Point Flats proposes to construct a new 50-unit affordable multifamily development on a 2.9-acre parcel currently developed for single-family use. The project includes the construction of bike storage, laundry facilities, tech center, fitness facilities, and outdoor amenities such as barbecue and playground facilities. Solar panels will be installed on top of the two main residential structures which will allow the project to operate at net zero energy in accordance with Title 24. The proposed Multi-family land use is a permitted use, and the project requires a discretionary Minor Design Review entitlement. To facilitate a more comprehensive review of the proposed *Stony Point Flats* application (DR21-023), the Planning Director is acting to elevate discretionary review of DR21-023 from Zoning Administrator to Design Review Board at a public hearing. This decision to elevate is based upon authority granted to the Planning Director by [Section 20-60.080](#). Minor Design Review by the Design Review Board will be scheduled upon completion of Planning review.

A Neighborhood Meeting and Concept Design Review are also required. While these activities are public meetings and inform the project's Planning review, no decision is made at these meetings. A Neighborhood Meeting was held on May 3, 2021, and Concept Design Review by the Design Review Board is scheduled for Thursday – June 3, 2021.

#### ***Potential issues or concerns raised by members of the public:***

#### ***Potential impacts to seasonal wetlands, open space, and protected plants and wildlife***

The project's General Plan land use designations are residential, and the zoning is residential as well. The current General Plan and Zoning Code provide for Open Space designations and zoning. This property is neither designated nor zoned as open space. However, environmental review under CEQA is required for this discretionary project. The applicant is currently preparing an Initial Study in compliance with CEQA to determine potential impacts to on-site wetlands, current undeveloped areas, and observed plants and wildlife

as a result of the proposed project. The applicant will be required to comply with all State laws related to mitigation of any potential impacts identified, and the project is being reviewed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The project will be subject to all mitigation measures and conditions of approval that are deemed adequate in mitigating any potential impacts to wetlands.

### ***Potential Impact(s) to Roseland Creek***

The project is being reviewed for compliance with the City of Santa Rosa Creek Master Plan in consultation with the City of Santa Rosa Water Division. The project will also be presented at the Waterways Advisory Committee, who will provide review and comments on the project as it relates to and complies with creekside related City plans and policies, including Zoning Code [Section 20-30.040 \(Creekside development\)](#). Additionally, the project is being reviewed by the USACE and will be subject to all mitigation measures and conditions of approval that are deemed adequate in mitigating any potential impacts to Roseland Creek.

### ***Proposed Tree Removal***

The proposed project would require removal of twelve (12) Heritage or non-Heritage trees. This removal will be subject to [Chapter 17-24](#) of the City Code, which allows the removal of trees on property proposed for development subject to Director approval. This chapter also requires all tree removals to be mitigated and specifies re-planting mitigations for trees approved for removal by the Director. In compliance with this regulation, the project will be required to mitigate for any removal of trees pursuant to Chapter 17-24.

### ***Construction in a Flood Plain Hazard Zone/Site Drainage***

The project is being reviewed by the City of Santa Rosa Building Division, which will review the project for compliance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidelines for construction within a floodplain. Also, the project will be subject to all mitigation measures deemed adequate in reducing the impacts posed by floodplain development to a level of less than significant. The proposed project requires compliance with City Code Chapter 18-52 (Flood Damage Protection) which outlines standards of construction to reduce potential impacts related to site drainage and floodplain.

### ***Water supply***

Drought and water supply shortages and have occurred regularly throughout California's history. Santa Rosa has a plan in place to address short-term effects of the drought, which are incorporated into our long-term water supply planning efforts. Prudent and cost-effective long-term planning for water supply means that occurrences of single and multiple dry years do not automatically mean water supply capacity is limited for planned development. However, all customers are being asked to conserve due to the potentially historic dry period we are facing. Additionally, all new development is required to be extremely water efficient. All new development is required to comply with City Code [Chapter 14-30 \(Water Efficient Landscape\)](#) and the CALGreen building code, which requires new development to be 20% more water efficient than existing development. To determine the water supply needs of the City's 2035 General Plan, the Water Department calculated water demand and water supply projections. The current projections are included in the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan and will be updated as part of the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. The demand projections use a robust model that incorporates historical water use, population projections, employment projections, plumbing code and future conservation savings to project future water demand.

### ***Aesthetic, Air Quality, and Noise Impacts***

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is currently being prepared for the project. The City will review the impact analysis and technical studies related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Noise, and determine if the proposed mitigation, if applicable, is sufficient in reducing these impacts to a level of less than significant. The proposed project requires compliance with City Code [Chapter 17-16 \(Noise\)](#) which establishes standards for noise generation.

***Density***

The Gross Site Area is 2.93 acres. The developable area is 2.63 acres, and the area to be dedicated for Northpoint Parkway is 0.3 acres. The General Plan Land Use Designation map aligns the Medium Density designation with the developable area and the Low Density designation with the ROW dedication area. Density is calculated as 2.63 acres @ 18 units/acre = 47.34 + 0.3 acres @ 8 units/acre = 2.4, which **totals 49.74 maximum allowable units**. Based upon Staff's analysis of the City's Density Bonus and/or Inclusionary Housing Ordinances, it appears that this 100% affordable to low income household project would be eligible for density bonus, which would allow it to achieve its proposed density. This eligibility includes rounding the **maximum allowable units** up to the greatest whole number of units, which is 50 units.

***Building Height***

The subject property is located within the R-3-18 Zoning District, which establishes a maximum building height of 45' pursuant to City Code Section 20-22.050 (Residential district general development standards). (Note: Planning staff has identified a discrepancy between the print and online versions of the R-3 zoning district development standards. Staff has confirmed that the print version is correct.)

***Northpoint Parkway Extension***

The City does not have an official plan line for the extension of Northpoint Parkway on record. City Engineering and Traffic-Public Works are reviewing the proposed Right-of-Way dedication for the future Northpoint Parkway for compliance with General Plan and Specific Plan maps describing the future Northpoint Parkway extension.

***Parking***

The proposed project includes the provision of 97 parking spaces, where 113 would typically be required by City Code Chapter 20-36 (Parking and Loading Standards) for market rate units. Because the project is an affordable project, it is subject to reduced parking requirements for Multifamily affordable housing projects [Section 20-36.040 (Table 3-4)]. The provision of 97 spaces exceeds the requirement of 88 spaces established by the City's Density Bonus and California State Law.

***Traffic impacts and Emergency Site Egress***

The proposed project is being reviewed by the City of Santa Rosa Engineering Development Services Division and Fire Department for compliance with all applicable traffic and emergency access standards. The environmental review of the proposed project will also analyze for potential impacts pursuant to CEQA.

***Inadequate equity in geographical distribution of new development***

Development of the City of Santa Rosa is dictated by the General Plan's land use policies and Land Use Designation map, which are implemented by City Code Title 20 (Zoning) that assigns land use and development standards for specific properties. The establishment and/or distribution of General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts and is not within the purview of the Stony Point Flats Project Review.

***Balconies allowing invasion of privacy of nearby residents***

There are no specific Zoning Code regulations that prohibit the establishment of balconies in multi-family residential developments. Design Guidelines Section 3.2 (Multi-Family Residential) calls for the establishment of "semi-private open space" areas for each unit of a proposed new multi-family development.

***Illegal Driveway on Hearn***

Due to the location of the discussed driveway, this issue is not within the purview of the Stony Point Flats project review.

***Eviction of current resident tenant***

The existing tenant of the property has submitted a letter that describes his awareness that the property is for sale and is proposed for development. The tenant supports the plan for developing the property into a "higher

and better use."

Thank you,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).*

06/03/21

Dear members of the Design Review Board,

I encourage the Design Review Board to support Stony Point Flats Apartments proposed for 2268 Stony Point Road.

Stony Point Flats will be available to households earning less than 60% of area median income (AMI). This translates to \$43,380 per year for a single occupant, or \$61,980 for a family of four. This category of affordable housing is the hardest to secure, and the most urgently needed to ensure that people like restaurant workers, agricultural workers, child care workers, seniors, and veterans in our community have a place to call home.

The Stony Point Flats project's urban design maximizes the site and buffers prospective residents from a proposed extension of Northpoint Parkway. Meaningful amenities planned for the site include a community center, swimming pool, basketball court, barbecue area, playground, fitness center, and bike storage. Protection of Roseland Creek is an important priority, and we are confident that this solar-powered project can be implemented with minimal disruption to the natural environment.

I encourage you to support this project and expand affordable housing in Santa Rosa.

Thank you for your service.

-Logan Pitts

**FW: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats support**

Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>

Thu 6/3/2021 6:49 AM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

FYI

---

**From:** Laurie Fong <lfong@srcs.k12.ca.us>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 9:18 PM

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

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats support

Dear Chair Weigl and Santa Rosa Design Review Board,

This is to ask for your approval and support for the Stony Point Flats project, a vitally important project that will help many get into housing.

In our schools, housing insecurity is a big contributor to student absences, poor academic achievement, poor engagement; ultimately interrupting young people's education. Too many of our students must work to contribute to the household income: these are young teens who should be concentrating on their studies and extra-curricular activities that contribute so greatly to one's full education.

Young people who must live two or more blended families in a housing unit have no privacy, no quiet space, no study space. Already they were struggling with school achievement before the pandemic; you can imagine how difficult it has been with distance learning.

Schools should not be the only safe spaces for so many students. They need houses to be homes. Secure, affordable housing has a critical role to play for our students, and for the well-being of our community.

Please approve the Stony Point Flats project: it is critical, now.

Sincerely,

Laurie Fong  
President | Santa Rosa City Schools Board of Education  
[lfong@srcs.k12.ca.us](mailto:lfong@srcs.k12.ca.us)



1275 4th Street #179  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

(707) 900-4364  
info@generationhousing.org

June 2, 2021

City of Santa Rosa Design Review Board  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

**RE: Letter of Support for Stony Point Flats**

Dear Chair Weigl & Santa Rosa Design Review Board,

After a thorough analysis driven by our project endorsement criteria, Generation Housing **strongly endorses** the Stony Point Flats development proposed at 2268 Stony Point Road.

The partnership between Phoenix Development and Integrity Housing has already resulted in shovels in the ground in Santa Rosa. Dutton Flats, currently rising at Dutton Avenue & 3rd Street, is tangible progress for very low-income and low-income Santa Rosans. Generation Housing is excited that Phoenix & Integrity are continuing the work to provide more housing for our community members in great need.

The Stony Point Flats project's urban design maximizes the site and buffers prospective residents from a proposed extension of Northpoint Parkway. Meaningful amenities planned for the site include a community center, swimming pool, basketball court, barbecue area, playground, fitness center, and bike storage.

Members of this Board have recently called for developments to avoid monotonous neutral tones, and embody the vibrancy of Santa Rosa with bold pops of color. Vibrant lime green accents promise to eschew the banal.

Solar panel installation will ensure sustainable energy production for years to come. Protection of Roseland Creek is an important priority, and we are confident that this project can be implemented with minimal disruption to environmental conditions. We encourage your consideration of cost-effective solutions to further enhance the quality of this development and protect the riparian corridor.

We appreciate the Design Review Board's thoughtful feedback, and know that the Board shares our commitment to expeditious approval of 100% affordable housing developments.

Generation Housing encourages you to support this project and expand affordable housing in Santa Rosa.

Respectfully,

Jen Klöse

Executive Director, Generation Housing

cc: Clare Hartman, Acting Assistant City Manager  
Bill Rose, Acting Deputy Director - Planning  
Andrew Trippel, Acting Supervising Planner - Development  
Conor McKay, City Planner



**FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Stony Pt Flats Development 2268 Stony Pt Rd. Santa Rosa**

Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>

Wed 6/2/2021 3:37 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

fyi

---

**From:** t <sloowlearner@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:31 PM

**To:** \_DRB - Design Review Board <\_DRB@srcity.org>; Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Stony Pt Flats Development 2268 Stony Pt Rd. Santa Rosa

Dear Design Review Board,

I oppose the development of this parcel at 2268 Stony Pt Rd.

This is only one of several developments in southwest Santa Rosa. Southwest Santa Rosa is being over-developed, when what we need are more parks and open spaces for recreation and to preserve the rural character in this part of town.

There are many problems with this proposal:

1. Traffic concerns: egress and ingress are inadequate to accommodate over 100 residents' vehicles. The entry/exit point does not have either a turn lane, stop light nor south bound exit, and will pose traffic hazards, congestion and lengthy backups for north flowing traffic on Stony Pt Rd.
2. Creek damage: The developer's planning application states "stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new onsite stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system. . .which discharges into Roseland Creek." The ducks, egrets, salamanders, turtles, snakes, birds, etc have a right to clean water.
3. Flood plain: this development is proposed for a 100-year flood plain, and includes almost 100% hardscape on slab construction. This will displace the natural absorption of rainfall, potentially diverting it to flood nearby residences and neighborhoods.
4. Endangered species: such as the tiger salamander will be harmed or eradicated. And a fine to the city is NOT ok as a mitigation step!!!
5. Backfill: Hundreds of tons of backfill on top of seasonal wetlands **will destroy the habitat** of a number of species found here, such as ducks, egrets, salamanders, turtles, snakes, birds, etc.
6. Environmental racism?: *Why does SW Santa Rosa have 13 parks on 17 acres, while the other 3 quadrants of Santa Rosa have 25-40 parks on 256 to 428 acres each????*

I ask that you deny this application!

Sincerely,

Tim Lantarna

Santa Rosa CA

95407



**FW: [EXTERNAL] Stony Pt Flats Development 2268 Stony Pt Rd. Santa Rosa**

Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>

Wed 6/2/2021 3:00 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

fyi

---

**From:** Jennifer LaPorta <jenniferlaporta1@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:00 PM

**To:** \_DRB - Design Review Board <\_DRB@srcity.org>; Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stony Pt Flats Development 2268 Stony Pt Rd. Santa Rosa

Dear Design Review Board,

I strongly oppose the development of this parcel at 2268 Stony Pt Rd.

This is only one of several developments in southwest Santa Rosa. It's a shame that southwest Santa Rosa is being over-developed, when what we need are more parks and open spaces for recreation and to preserve the rural character in this part of town.

There are many problems with this proposal:

1. Traffic concerns: egress and ingress are inadequate to accommodate over 100 residents' vehicles. The entry/exit point does not have either a turn lane, stop light nor south bound exit, and will pose traffic hazards, congestion and lengthy backups for north flowing traffic on Stony Pt Rd, **especially in times of evacuation.**
2. Creek damage: The developer's planning application states "stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new onsite stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system. . .which discharges into Roseland Creek." I can vouch as a **creek steward** for the past 5 years on both the Colgan and Roseland creeks: the **amount of garbage** I pick out of these creeks is extreme. The ducks, egrets, salamanders, turtles, snakes, birds, etc have a right to clean water!
3. Flood plain: this development is proposed for a 100-year flood plain, and includes almost 100% hardscape on slab construction. This will displace the natural absorption of rainfall, potentially diverting it to flood nearby residences and neighborhoods.
4. Endangered species: such as the tiger salamander will be harmed or eradicated. And a fine to the city is NOT ok as a mitigation step!!!
5. Backfill: Hundreds of tons of backfill on top of seasonal wetlands **will destroy the habitat** of a number of species found here, such as ducks, egrets, salamanders, turtles, snakes, birds, etc.
6. Environmental racism?: Why does SW Santa Rosa have 13 parks on 17 acres, while the other 3 quadrants of Santa Rosa have 25-40 parks on 256 to 428 acres each???

Please deny this application!

Sincerely,

Jennifer LaPorta

B.S. Environmental Health

548 Bellevue Av.

Santa Rosa CA

95407

**FW: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats Development**

Pacheco Gregg, Patti <PPachecoGregg@srcity.org>

Wed 6/2/2021 2:40 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

[FYI](#)

---

**From:** Lore Goodnight <ellie2000@comcast.net>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:40 PM

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

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats Development

I am a resident living on Lathrop Dr. off of Giffen Ave. west, and I'm concerned about several things with the Stony Point Development.

1. The traffic on Stony Point Rd. is at a standstill at commute times. This project will just increase this. My home is one of 80+ in the section of Giffen Ave. that has but one way in and one way out. Stevens school traffic is bad enough, we don't need u-turn traffic there, too.

2. I'm also concerned with the elevation of this project with fill dirt being used. I and my neighbors live in a flood plain. Flooding will effect all of us. We have had flooding in the past, and it will be increased by the use of fill. The increased burden on Roseland Creek is not acceptable.

Thank you,  
Lore Goodnight

## Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats

Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>

Wed 6/2/2021 1:21 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Krissia Santos <krissia.f@gmail.com>

**Date:** June 2, 2021 at 1:12:30 PM PDT

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

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats

Hello, my name is Krissia Santos I am a resident at 1286 Trombetta St, Santa Rosa. I am writing because I have concerns about the current plan for Stony Point Flats. I would like a comprehensive environment review so we can have responsible development in this neighborhood. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Krissia Santos

**Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Design Review Board - postponement required**

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Tue 6/1/2021 10:55 AM

To: Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

Cc: Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Mr. Trippel,

I also wanted to check-in and see if there has been further discussion to delay the DRB meeting for Thursday at 4:30pm. Again, there still are pertinent items the community is being kept in the dark about, and it is unreasonable to assume the community is able to give any sort of quality informed input when there are so many items that still have not been addressed.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Monday, May 31, 2021, 01:40:47 PM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Trippel,

I discussed with several others, and we would greatly appreciate a zoom discussion. Would you be free for 30 minutes tomorrow at 5pm? If so, we can send out the zoom link/invitation.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Thursday, May 27, 2021, 06:00:46 PM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Trippel,

Thank you for reaching out. I appreciate it. I will coordinate with others and we can have a discussion. Related to the design review board meeting, there's a huge discrepancy as to what the size of the project will actually be. It's nearly 1/3 over the allotted units per the acres recorded with the county assessors office. This project is getting fast tracked and many of us are not appreciating the lack of transparency especially with the development team. None of us can make an educated decision of what the design elements should be when an important piece of the puzzle is missing.

Thanks,  
Ryan

> On May 27, 2021, at 5:38 PM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

>

> Hi Ryan,

>

> Thanks for your email, as well as your previous emails. I believe this email and Conor's recent email addressing your concerns may have crossed paths. I've attached it in the event that you didn't receive it.

>

> Conor's email makes two primary points. First, no action is being taken on the item on this date - this is strictly an opportunity for the DRB to provide comments. The applicant will be required to respond to DRB's review comments and recommendations through their project's design plans. Second, Conor noted that the required documentation/forms for a Concept Design Review application do not include a survey as a part of the required documents for this type of application. As such, the lack of submittal of a survey does not necessitate the removal of the item from the June 3rd, 2021 DRB agenda. The standard of completeness for the required Minor Design Review entitlement is different than that of a Concept Design Review application. It's up to the DRB to determine if it has enough information to provide meaningful comments.

>

> You make comments that the Planning Division does not take lightly. Planning staff are happy to meet with you and other members of the community to discuss concerns about distrust within the community and to clarify the differences between Concept Review and Minor Design Review. Please let me know if you would like to arrange a meeting. Bill, Conor and I will be out of the office this Friday (tomorrow) and next Monday; however, I am happy to follow up on any communications next week.

>

> Best,

>

> Andrew

>

> Andrew Trippel, AICP | Acting Supervising Planner – Current Planning

> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

> Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ryan Schwab <[rschwab123@yahoo.com](mailto:rschwab123@yahoo.com)>

> Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:07 PM

> To: McKay, Conor <[CTMcKay@srcity.org](mailto:CTMcKay@srcity.org)>; Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>

> Cc: Rose, William <[WRose@srcity.org](mailto:WRose@srcity.org)>

> Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Design Review Board - postponement required

>

> Hello All,

>

> We were notified that the developer submitted an incomplete application for this project and fails to provide the necessary documentation. Yet, the public notice billboard was still placed on the property today notifying the public of the design review board meeting on June 3rd. I highly encourage you to rescind the public announcement until the developer has completed the city's requirements. Moving forward is breaking several state statutes and distrust within the community is mounting.

>

> Ryan

> <mime-attachment>



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

## Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Design Review Board - postponement required

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Mon 5/31/2021 1:40 PM

To: Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

Cc: Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Mr. Trippel,

I discussed with several others, and we would greatly appreciate a zoom discussion. Would you be free for 30 minutes tomorrow at 5pm? If so, we can send out the zoom link/invitation.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Thursday, May 27, 2021, 06:00:46 PM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Trippel,

Thank you for reaching out. I appreciate it. I will coordinate with others and we can have a discussion. Related to the design review board meeting, there's a huge discrepancy as to what the size of the project will actually be. It's nearly 1/3 over the allotted units per the acres recorded with the county assessors office. This project is getting fast tracked and many of us are not appreciating the lack of transparency especially with the development team. None of us can make an educated decision of what the design elements should be when an important piece of the puzzle is missing.

Thanks,  
Ryan

> On May 27, 2021, at 5:38 PM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

>

> Hi Ryan,

>

> Thanks for your email, as well as your previous emails. I believe this email and Conor's recent email addressing your concerns may have crossed paths. I've attached it in the event that you didn't receive it.

>

> Conor's email makes two primary points. First, no action is being taken on the

item on this date - this is strictly an opportunity for the DRB to provide comments. The applicant will be required to respond to DRB's review comments and recommendations through their project's design plans. Second, Conor noted that the required documentation/forms for a Concept Design Review application do not include a survey as a part of the required documents for this type of application. As such, the lack of submittal of a survey does not necessitate the removal of the item from the June 3rd, 2021 DRB agenda. The standard of completeness for the required Minor Design Review entitlement is different than that of a Concept Design Review application. It's up to the DRB to determine if it has enough information to provide meaningful comments.

>

> You make comments that the Planning Division does not take lightly. Planning staff are happy to meet with you and other members of the community to discuss concerns about distrust within the community and to clarify the differences between Concept Review and Minor Design Review. Please let me know if you would like to arrange a meeting. Bill, Conor and I will be out of the office this Friday (tomorrow) and next Monday; however, I am happy to follow up on any communications next week.

>

> Best,

>

> Andrew

>

> Andrew Trippel, AICP | Acting Supervising Planner – Current Planning  
> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa,  
CA 95404

> Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ryan Schwab <[rschwab123@yahoo.com](mailto:rschwab123@yahoo.com)>

> Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:07 PM

> To: McKay, Conor <[CTMcKay@srcity.org](mailto:CTMcKay@srcity.org)>; Trippel, Andrew  
<[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>

> Cc: Rose, William <[WRose@srcity.org](mailto:WRose@srcity.org)>

> Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point - Design Review Board - postponement  
required

>

> Hello All,

>

> We were notified that the developer submitted an incomplete application for this project and fails to provide the necessary documentation. Yet, the public notice billboard was still placed on the property today notifying the public of the design review board meeting on June 3rd. I highly encourage you to rescind the public announcement until the developer has completed the city's requirements. Moving

forward is breaking several state statutes and distrust within the community is mounting.

>

> Ryan

> <mime-attachment>



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](https://www.avg.com)



**FW: [EXTERNAL] New Development and Waterway Concerns - Stony Point Flats**

Lyle, Amy <ALyle@srcity.org>

Fri 5/28/2021 3:06 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hi Conor, can you make sure this comment is included in the record and distribution please?

Thanks,  
Amy

**Amy Lyle | Supervising Planner- Advance Planning**

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

Cell (707) 791-5533 | Office (707) 543-3410 | [ALyle@srcity.org](mailto:ALyle@srcity.org) (Currently Working Remotely)

---

**From:** Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:46 AM

**To:** Lyle, Amy <ALyle@srcity.org>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] New Development and Waterway Concerns - Stony Point Flats

Hello Ms. Lyle,

My name is Ryan Schwab, and I am contacting you today regarding the proposed Stony Points Flats Project (2268 Stony Point Road) set to break ground in September of this year. I wanted to discuss the multiple environmental and waterway concerns that I have.

The project abuts the Roseland Creek which as you know is fragile and cannot afford any additional damage. Many of us in the community walk the Roseland Creek trail frequently and know how magical this area truly is. Part of the parcel set to be developed is designated as a seasonal wetland by the Army Corps of Engineers and backs up to the Roseland Creek Open Space Preserve. This is frequented by the tiger salamanders, frogs, egrets, ducks, foxes, hawks, owls, and an abundance of other life. Approximately 80% of the parcel is designated by FEMA as a "Special Flood Hazard Area" which is the riskiest area to develop in. The project requires importing a tremendous amount of backfill soil on top of this seasonal wetlands, which will permanently eradicate the habitat of this wildlife. No amount of mitigating "credits" can compensate for the loss of habitat due to this project and the other numerous developments coinciding within two square miles.

Additionally, according to the developer's Universal Planning Application, "Stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new on site stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm drain system..., which discharges into the Roseland Creek." This has potential for additional irreparable damage to the Roseland Creek. This would increase the enormous amounts of trash and debris that is collected annually by the Cesar Chavez Language Academy and Roseland Creek elementary schools during their Roseland Creek Clean-Up days. The most recent creek clean-up was April 18th of this year where they collected over an astounding 200 pounds of trash. They also claimed that over the years they have totaled over 1,000 pounds of trash removed from this beautiful stretch of creek. This environmentally sensitive area cannot handle new development and any new pollution, especially during the frightful drought we are in which is also stressing the wildlife in the area.

Thank you for taking the time and reading my concerns. I truly hope you take this message to heart and help us concerned citizens take action before it is too late. I would greatly appreciate a response

with any additional guidance.

Thank you,  
Ryan Schwab

**[EXTERNAL] Acreage discrepancy re: proposed Stony Point Flats project**

Lorna Edits <lornaedits18@gmail.com>

Thu 5/27/2021 8:28 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>

With all due respect Mr. McCay,  
Lack of a legitimate survey is absolutely relevant to design criteria and review of this project, because if the total acreage of the subject property is 2.31 acres (as all public documents reflect), then the total number of units allowed by law is only 41.58 units (far less than the 50 proposed), thus altering the architectural silhouette of the subdivision. It appears that the developer, who stated in a public meeting that a verifiable survey was commissioned, seems to be obstructing its disclosure. It is ethically incumbent upon you and other city officials to require evidence of their stated 2.9 acres as fair process and full public disclosure. At this point, the integrity of the applicants and the project is in question.

Lorna Mc Bade

>

Cc: Loren Brueggemann <[lorenb@phoenixdevco.com](mailto:lorenb@phoenixdevco.com)>, michelle olson <[michelleb@phoenixdevco.com](mailto:michelleb@phoenixdevco.com)>, Phil Wood <[phil@integrityhousing.org](mailto:phil@integrityhousing.org)>

Hello,

Thank you for your comments regarding the Stony Point Flats project, a proposed 50-unit affordable housing development to be located at 2268 Stony Point Road. The June 3rd, 2021 Design Review Board (DRB) meeting is an opportunity for the DRB to provide the applicant team with recommendations about the site design and building architecture, which is achieved through the Concept Design Review process. No action is being taken on the item on this date - this is strictly an opportunity for the DRB to provide comments.

The required documentation/forms for a Concept Design Review application can be found at the following link: <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/29217/UA---Concept-Design-Review-Checklist>. As you will find, no survey is listed as a part of the required documents for this application. As such, the lack of submittal of a survey does not necessitate the removal of the item from the June 3rd, 2021 DRB agenda.

Thank you,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

[CTmckay@srcity.org](mailto:CTmckay@srcity.org)

email signature cropped

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please*

contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).

**Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: 2268 Stony Point Road - Stony Point Flats Concept DRB**

Erin Rineberg <erinrineberg@gmail.com>

Sat 5/29/2021 7:46 PM

To: Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>

Cc: Rose, William <WRose@srcity.org>; Loren Brueggemann <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>; michelle olson <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>; Phil Wood <phil@integrityhousing.org>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Gallagher, Sue <Sgallagher@srcity.org>; sagallagher@srcity.org <sagallagher@srcity.org>; CA Office <CAOffice@srcity.org>

Dear Mr. Trippel,

With all due respect, this is a poor response and does not address my questions on why you asked the applicant team to be included in my personal request for information and comment to the city. What greater good does that serve other than to show a clear bias and favoritism to the applicant team from the city?

While I am aware that all communication is public record and the process for making a public records request, it would seem most ethical and equal that the applicant would need to make a public record requests for my communications instead of just being included in as if they have more power than the citizens of Santa Rosa. This is not equal treatment and a potential 14th amendment violation as concerned citizens like myself have not been CC'd on communications your team has had with the applicants.

Furthermore, our concerns over an incomplete application are applicable to the Design Review Board meeting as it has yet to be clarified and made part of public record how the lot size for this project was calculated. Therefore knowing the actual acreage is required to calculate the number of units that can be placed prior to any concessions from the city. This is part of the missing surveys and should be public record. You can not provide ready to approve designs and get comments on a proposal for something if the actual space has yet to be fully vetted and surveyed. These are questions Mr. McKay has been presented with multiple times and which no concrete answer has yet to be provided.

I appreciate a response prior to the June 3rd meeting in regards to all of my concerns. I have included City Attorney, Sue Gallagher, in this email so she is aware of the blatant favoritism to applicants/developers and the unequal treatment this office is showing the citizens of Santa Rosa.

Thank you,

Erin Rineberg

On Thu, May 27, 2021 at 7:41 PM Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Good evening Ms. Rineberg,

I will step in on the email communication as I am the one who asked Conor to include applicant team members on the response. City policies allow staff discretion when preparing, distributing,

and responding to all forms of communication. We will review your request within the context of our current policies and I will provide a response to you next week. Please keep in mind that most communications with City staff are public record, and public records requests can be made online at <https://cityofsantarosaca.nextrequest.com/>.

Best,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel, AICP | Acting Supervising Planner – Current Planning**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



---

**From:** Erin Rineberg <[erinrineberg@gmail.com](mailto:erinrineberg@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:29 PM

**To:** McKay, Conor <[CTMcKay@srcity.org](mailto:CTMcKay@srcity.org)>

**Cc:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>; Rose, William <[WRose@srcity.org](mailto:WRose@srcity.org)>; Loren Brueggemann <[lorenb@phoenixdevco.com](mailto:lorenb@phoenixdevco.com)>; michelle olson <[michelleb@phoenixdevco.com](mailto:michelleb@phoenixdevco.com)>; Phil Wood <[phil@integrityhousing.org](mailto:phil@integrityhousing.org)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: 2268 Stony Point Road - Stony Point Flats Concept DRB

Hello Mr. McKay,

Thank you for your response.

I am curious why you saw the need to CC' the developers on my email to you? They are not workers of the city and were not a part of my conversation with you.

If this is standard practice then I would like to be CC' on any of their communications with you as an equally involved party. I would appreciate clarification on this practice.

Thank you,

Erin Rineberg

On Thu, May 27, 2021 at 5:05 PM McKay, Conor <[CTMcKay@srcity.org](mailto:CTMcKay@srcity.org)> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your comments regarding the Stony Point Flats project, a proposed 50-unit affordable housing development to be located at 2268 Stony Point Road. The June 3rd, 2021 Design Review Board (DRB) meeting is an opportunity for the DRB to provide the applicant team with recommendations about the site design and building architecture, which is achieved through the Concept Design Review process. No action is being taken on the item on this date - this is strictly an opportunity for the DRB to provide comments.

The required documentation/forms for a Concept Design Review application can be found at the following link: <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/29217/UA---Concept-Design-Review-Checklist>. As you will find, no survey is listed as a part of the required documents for this application. As such, the lack of submittal of a survey does not necessitate the removal of the item from the June 3rd, 2021 DRB agenda.

Thank you,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
[CTmckay@srcity.org](mailto:CTmckay@srcity.org)

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).*

## [EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats Housing Project - Request for a Meeting

lburtis@sbcglobal.net <lburtis@sbcglobal.net>

Thu 5/27/2021 6:48 PM

To: CMOOffice <CMOffice@srcity.org>

Cc: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello Mr. McGlynn,

We are a group of homeowners in Roseland, and we are reaching out to you regarding the proposed Stony Point Flats housing project at 2268 Stony Point Rd.

First, we understand the housing crisis, the need for affordable housing, and the pressure the City is under to address this crisis. However, the response to this crisis cannot be that the City rush proposed projects through the process without proper evaluation and its impact on the residents and quality of life.

We are greatly concerned about the development of this property and extremely worried about the entry/exit to the property and its danger in the event of an emergency. When the Town of Paradise burned down a couple of years ago, many residents lost their lives because there is only one way in and out of the Town of Paradise. This tragedy should not go unnoticed, and no municipality should willingly risk losing lives in response to a crisis.

The environmental issues are enormous, and it's our understanding an environmental impact report will not be required nor a comprehensive traffic study. How can a project with this magnitude of impact be considered without proper evaluation?

We are asking for the opportunity to share our concerns with you in more detail and would greatly appreciate it if you would meet with us (3 - 5 people) in person or via conference call. It will also allow us to hear the City's perspective on this proposed development and understand the process better.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Lizette Burtis



## [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Rd - 6/3/2021 Design Review Board Meeting

lburtis@sbcglobal.net <lburtis@sbcglobal.net>

Thu 5/27/2021 3:48 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello Mr. McKay,

I'm a homeowner in Roseland and recently learned quite a bit about the proposed Stony Point Flat's housing project at 2268 Stony Point Rd.

I understand the need for affordable housing and the pressure the City is under, but this particular site seems to be the wrong location for such a project.

I'm greatly concerned about the environmental issues and the lack of an Environment Impact Report, lack of a comprehensive traffic study, and the danger and potential loss of life in the event of another major fire or other types of disaster. The proposed egress and ingress are inadequate and should raise significant concern for the City of Santa Rosa.

There is a Design Review Board Meeting scheduled for June 3rd. I understand the City has confirmed the applicant's application is incomplete. Why is this meeting scheduled to take place when the application is incomplete? Could this possibly be a violation of the Brown Act?

It would be greatly appreciated if you can address my two questions.

Thank you,

Lizette Burtis

**[EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Road - Stony Point Flats**

Maygol Yavari <maygol.yavaribe@gmail.com>

Thu 5/27/2021 2:14 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>

Good Afternoon Planning Division,

I was informed that the developer of this project failed to timely produce important documents for his application including the property survey. I ask that you postpone any meetings, including the Design Board Meeting on June 3, 2021. It is not fair or ethical for any additional presentations to occur when a complete application has not been received by the city.

Kindly,  
Maygol Yavari-Behrouz



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](https://www.avg.com)

**[EXTERNAL] Stony Point Flats Irregularities**

Lorna Edits <lornaedits18@gmail.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 10:16 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>; lorenb@phoenixdevco.com <lorenb@phoenixdevco.com>; michelleb@phoenixdevco.com <michelleb@phoenixdevco.com>; anjela@integrityhousing.org <anjela@integrityhousing.org>; phil@integrityhousing.org <phil@integrityhousing.org>

Mr. Mc Kay,

During the public neighborhood meeting on May 3, 2021, I specifically requested a copy of the applicants' survey, because according to all public records there is over 1/2 acre discrepancy, thus changing the parameters regarding the number of units legally allocated for this development. We were told at that meeting by Mr. "B" that the survey, traffic report and EIR have been completed and "available". When I requested access through a public documents request, it appears that is not so. I was then advised by your department that it is the applicants' responsibility to supply these documents/reports. If I correctly understand the legality of this, the applicants' submission is incomplete and therefore legally prohibited from moving forward in this process. It appears that on multiple levels, there is a lack of transparency by all concerned. The fact that North Point Parkway was moved, extended, and changed to benefit this project without public notification is another major concern. I am discouraged and frankly, appalled that these irregularities continue without regard to potential encumbrances and audits. I ask that the SR city planning and permits department monitor these indiscretions and act accordingly, as there are over 150 concerned residents now actively vested in this process.

Sincerely,

Lorna Mc Bade

**[EXTERNAL] Fire Safety - Roseland**

Natasha Van Houten Lockwood <natashalockwood2131@gmail.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 6:45 PM

To: Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>; Fleming, Victoria <VFleming@srcity.org>; Schwedhelm, Tom <tschedhelm@srcity.org>; CMOOffice <CMOffice@srcity.org>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; **\_DRB - Design Review Board** <\_DRB@srcity.org>

To committee members of the Design Review Board, City Officials and Council Members,

As I write this letter of concern to appeal to your sense of moral ethics and civic responsibility, I have received on my cell phone, two nixle alerts for fires in SR. The proposed *Stony Point Flats* project is ill-conceived for multiple reasons. While I understand the state's mandate for additional housing in California, I think it advisable to construct housing that benefits the entire community rather than compromising the safety of many. I have lived in Roseland for close to 16 years and to date, have been evacuated three times due to fires. Two of them because a fire was set in the field behind my house. During the 2017 fires, the gut clutching effect of having to evacuate at 3:00AM onto log jammed Stony Point is a nightmare I'll never forget. As we attempted to turn onto Stony Point from our subdivision all we saw was a road block of bumper to bumper cars stalled in both North and South directions. As for most of us in the area between Sebastopol Rd and Todd the main evacuation route to the freeway is from Stony Point to Hearn. The Tubbs fire was almost 5 years ago and since then, several subdivisions have been constructed and many more planned within a 3-mile radius of my home.

Specifically, the planned 50 units (approximately 100 residents) for *Stony Point Flats* poses a potential calamity for not only those residents, but those living in the surrounding neighborhoods. It is inconceivable that in spite of a drought and the high fire danger that all Santa Rosans face, the city is moving forward with approving over 300 more units into a 3-mile radius. Most subdivisions along the Stony Point corridor have either a left turn lane, two ways to enter or egress and/or stop lights to assist with traffic flow. *Stony Point Flats* proposes an entry/exit point from only the easterly side of Stony Point, so residents trying to evacuate during a fire or other disaster, have only one option - to exit North. If like 5 years ago, Northerly and South bound traffic is long jammed how will those residents escape? Additionally, during a normal day, traffic in both directions on Stony Point and Hearn is severely impacted. *Stony Point Flats* residents driving south bound must travel past Hearn in order to make a u turn and travel north for entry. Residents leaving the sub division to go south must travel all the way up to Giffen to make a U-turn, which during peak hours is very unsafe or drive through the Stony Ranch subdivision (Trombetta Street) to access the light on Giffen. Trombetta is the only street that serves residents in two subdivisions. It was never intended as a thorough fare and access point for other subdivisions where the blind curve at the southern end possesses a hazard.

Additionally, it appears that only 84 parking spots are allotted for the residents and guests of Stony Point Flats. The average amount of vehicles per household in Sonoma County is 2.4, so where is the overflow of cars expected to park? There is no parking on North Point Parkway, Stony Point of the adjacent street. Stony Point Flats residents and guests would be forced to travel north in order to park within the Stony Ranch subdivision, which is already highly impacted by inadequate parking.

These two major concerns for the residents, as well as my concern for the ecology that would be disrupted along Roseland Creek makes this a very poorly planned project. I and many other Roseland residents want to go on public record that if this project is allowed to be constructed and there is loss of property or even worse, life, due to a fire or other emergency, we hold the officials who approved this project, Phoenix Development and Integrity Housing responsible. Before moving forward, we demand that the city require a comprehensive traffic study be commissioned by the developer (inclusive of the additional impact from the other three subdivisions that are planned for that area). Safe evacuation routes and a more accessible egress and exit must be added to ensure the safety for all residents.

Thank you for your consideration to remedy these critical issues,

Sincerely

Natasha H. Lockwood

1424 Trombetta Street

Santa Rosa, California 95407

## [EXTERNAL] 6/3 Design Review Board Meeting - Stony Point Flats Project

Erin Rineberg <erinrineberg@gmail.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 5:47 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Dear Mr. McKay,

It has been brought to our attention that the developer of Stony Point Flats is being served by you with a letter of incomplete application because they have not submitted all necessary surveys.

It would seem prudent to postpone the Design Review Board meeting happening on Thursday, 6/3 until a complete application is received and the public has time to review all materials.

As a resident with multiple concerns about this project, including the city's insistence to fast track this development without completed comprehensive studies and reviews as well as a multitude of incomplete public records requests for this project still in play, I am very upset that an incomplete project would even be scheduled for a Design Review Board meeting and continue along the approval process.

Has the city considered postponement and review so that the public can fully participate with all necessary materials required in the application process?

Thank you for your time and response.

Erin Rineberg

## [EXTERNAL] Concerns to be recorded for the proposed Stony Point Flats project

Lorna Edits <lornaedits18@gmail.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 8:04 PM

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

Cc: Alvarez, Eddie <EAlvarez@srcity.org>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>

26 May 2021

To the Members of the Design Review Committee,

Regarding: the proposed *Stony Point Flats* project

As a long-time resident of Roseland, I am writing to you about the disregard that Phoenix Development and Integrity Housing have shown for the surrounding neighbors and adjoining neighborhoods. Within their pre-application project description for *Stony Point Flats*, they claim that it, "is designed with sensitivity to the surrounding neighborhood." I assert that while the developers may be "sensitive" to the future residents of *Stony Point Flats*, they show disregard for the current residents of adjoining properties.

Firstly, the parking lot does not have any screening along its perimeter, so noise, headlights and parking lot lamps will outwardly project into existing homes along the northern and eastern sides. A 10-foot sound wall with ivy (to prevent graffiti, which is prevalent in the area) and a copse of mature trees need to be incorporated along the entire northerly and easterly perimeters to aesthetically mitigate light and sound penetration into the adjoining sub divisions and homes.

Secondly, the over 40 feet height of the residential portion is well over the maximum of 35 feet as allowed by city code. It will be out of character with the neighborhood and an unsightly domination of the surrounding rural ecology. The aesthetics of this project with its towering mass of blocked architecture is better suited for an urban environment, where it would blend with other structures of similar height and mass. To be "sensitive" with the Roseland environment, *Stony Point Flats* needs to conform with the characteristics of surrounding neighborhoods, which are stucco, tile roofs and (a maximum) of two stories that conform to SR city codes.

Thirdly, the balconies planned for each unit will intrude upon the privacy of nearby residents. All balconies need to be eliminated.

Fourthly, the project is located in a FEMA designated 100-year flood zone. "Stormwater flows will be directed to the southwest through a new one site stormwater drainage system to the existing public storm system..., which discharges into the Roseland Creek." This inadequately addresses potential run off into adjoining parcels. The four feet of required infill noted in the plans essentially obliterates the wetlands' natural absorption of rainwater. Because the majority of this project is hardscape, permeable pavers need to be incorporated throughout, especially as the foundation for the parking lot.

Fifth, all windows need to be tinted as to not cause glare onto the houses on the northern side.

I attended the first public Neighborhood meeting, where many residents voiced opinions, but notes

taken by project planner, Conor McKay insufficiently captured detailed concerns. I would like this letter to be included in the project file and noted as a public concern.

Sincerely,  
Lorna McBade  
1422 Trombetta Street



**Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point**

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Wed 5/26/2021 6:20 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

Hello Conor,

I am dismayed that the project has even made it this far without this very important piece of documentation. There is currently a 26% discrepancy in acreage, which has not yet been explained to us. The community is unable to give meaningful input for design aspects when the entire picture has not yet been painted for us. I ask that you consider postponement until all the crucial facts and documentation has been provided.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 03:15:01 PM PDT, McKay, Conor <ctmckay@srcity.org> wrote:

Hello Ryan,

The application for Concept Design Review is being reviewed by the Design Review Board, but no formal action is taking place. This meeting will serve to provide the DRB an opportunity to provide comments about the conceptual design of the project.

Thanks,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

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

CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).*

---

**From:** Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 26, 2021 3:07 PM

**To:** McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

Hello Conor,

Thank you for keeping me informed with the current status. The Design Review Board Meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 3, 2021 should be rescheduled until a compliant application is received.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 02:08:09 PM PDT, McKay, Conor <ctmckay@srcity.org> wrote:

Hello Ryan,

The survey discussed by the applicant has not been submitted to the City. This is being requested on a letter of incomplete application being sent to the applicant this week.

The most recent design plans are attached.

Thanks,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only](#). The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its [Planning Application Portal](#) which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application [here](#). For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).*

---

**From:** Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 25, 2021 4:17 PM

**To:** McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>

**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

Hello Conor,

I wanted to follow up on the survey that was requested on 7/7/2021.

Thank you,  
Ryan

On Monday, May 10, 2021, 12:14:54 PM PDT, McKay, Conor <ctmckay@srcity.org> wrote:

Hello Ryan,

Please see the attached PDF document.

Thank you,

**Conor McKay** (he/his) | **City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
CTmckay@srcity.org

email signature cropped

*I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is [offering in-](#)*

*person City Hall support by appointment only. The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its Planning Application Portal which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application here. For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).*

---

**From:** Ryan Schwab <[rschwab123@yahoo.com](mailto:rschwab123@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 7, 2021 1:30 PM  
**To:** McKay, Conor <[CTMcKay@srcity.org](mailto:CTMcKay@srcity.org)>  
**Cc:** Loren Brueggemann <[lorenb@phoenixdevco.com](mailto:lorenb@phoenixdevco.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

Conor,

My apologies for piece mailing you. Many people that were on the zoom call on Monday are requesting a copy of the meeting notes. Are those going to be posted to the legistar or should I obtain directly from you?

Thanks,  
Ryan

> On May 7, 2021, at 1:13 PM, Ryan Schwab <[rschwab123@yahoo.com](mailto:rschwab123@yahoo.com)> wrote:

>

> Hi Conor,

>

> Thanks for the response. I appreciate it. Loren, I look forward to reviewing the survey.

>

> Regards,

> Ryan

>

>

>

>

>

> On Friday, May 7, 2021, 12:35:47 PM PDT, McKay, Conor <[ctmckay@srcity.org](mailto:ctmckay@srcity.org)> wrote:

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Hello Ryan,

>

> I am not sure why the link would be deactivated. I will attach the design plans to this reply.

>

>

>

>

> You should check with Loren about the survey, I do not believe the survey was submitted with the application.

>

>

>

>

>

>

> The applicant team is currently developing an IS / MND. I believe what Loren was discussing was that the IS/MND will incorporate mitigation present in the Roseland Area / Sebastopol Road Specific Plan EIR, which can be found here: <https://srcity.org/2437/Roseland-Area-Projects-Environmental-Imp>.

>

> Next steps: The City will be reviewing the submitted minor Design Review application and the applicant will finalize the IS / MND which will be circulated publicly for comments. The project will require Concept Design Review at the Design Review Board, with final Design Review and adoption of the IS MND being provided by the Zoning Administrator. Both of these would be public hearings.

> Thanks,

> Conor McKay (he/his) | City Planner  
>  
> Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
>  
> CTmckay@srcity.org

> I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only. The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its Planning Application Portal which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application here. For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).

5/27/2021, 11:02 AM



>> Hello Ryan,

>>

>> No EIR or traffic study has been conducted. In accordance with standard CEQA process, the City is requiring the preparation of an Initial Study. Once this has been prepared and reviewed, the full level of required environmental review will be determined.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Thanks,

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Conor McKay (he/his) | City Planner

>>

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

>>

>> CTmckay@srcity.org

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> I am working remotely during this time. The City of Santa Rosa has restricted City facilities to the public and is offering in-person City Hall support by appointment only. The Planning and Economic Development Department has recently launched its Planning Application Portal which contains process checklists for the majority of planning entitlements. Please check on the status of your submitted permit application here. For general planning inquiries, please contact [planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org). To submit permit application materials, please submit all required documents to [permitsubmittal@srcity.org](mailto:permitsubmittal@srcity.org).

>>

>>

>>

>>

[illegible]

>> From: Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>  
>> Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 11:22 AM  
>> To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>  
>> Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

>> Hello Conor,

>> Can you please provide me the EIR and the traffic study that was conducted.

>> Thank you,  
>> Ryan

>> On Thursday, April 29, 2021, 04:11:05 PM PDT, McKay, Conor <ctmckay@srcity.org> wrote:

>> Hello Ryan,

>> This project is not seeking SB 35 streamlining. Regarding the site acreage, I have noticed that the County assessor's office and our GIS system have a discrepancy in measurement. I have notified the project applicant team of this discrepancy and we will address this in the meeting.

>> Thank you,

$\gg$ 

22

>>

>>> Best.



>>>  
>>> Jesse  
>>>  
>>> Jesse Oswald |Chief Building Official  
>>> Planning & Economic Development |100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
>>> Tel. (707) 543-3249 | Fax (707) 543-3219 | joswald@srcity.org  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>  
>>> Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 1:16 PM  
>>> To: Lorna Edits <lornaedits18@gmail.com>; McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Oswald, Jesse <JOswald@srcity.org>  
>>> Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point  
>>>  
>>> Hello Jesse,  
>>>  
>>> I haven't been able to get a response from Conor. Do you mind telling me if the project is seeking SB35 streamlined approval?  
>>>  
>>> Thank you,  
>>> Ryan  
>>>  
>>>>> On Apr 28, 2021, at 2:17 PM, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Hello Conor,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I wanted to follow up with you again on this. At this point, if you don't know the answer to the parcel acreage discrepancy (2.31 vs 2.9) we can address at a later time. I would appreciate the answer to the first question related to SB35. Please advise if a streamlined review application was submitted for this project. With the community meeting quickly approaching, these details are important to us.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Thank you,  
>>>>> Ryan  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>> On Apr 27, 2021, at 12:21 PM, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Hello Conor,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> I'm sure it is a busy time for you! I also went ahead and left you a voicemail at (707) 543-4351. If you can go ahead and respond to this email or give me a call back at (805) 338-6341 it would be much appreciated.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Thanks!  
>>>>>>> Ryan  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> On Monday, April 26, 2021, 10:48:31 AM PDT, Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com> wrote:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Thank you, Jesse. I look forward to Conor's response.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>> Ryan

>>>>>

>>>>> On Monday, April 26, 2021, 10:37:03 AM PDT, Oswald, Jesse <joswald@srcity.org> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Good morning Ryan,

>>>>>

>>>>> I am including the project Planner on this email to respond. The mailer may have included his contact information: Conor McKay - CTmckay@srcity.ord - (707) 543-4351.

>>>>>

>>>>> Best,

>>>>>

>>>>> Jesse

>>>>>

>>>>> Jesse Oswald |Chief Building Official

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

>>>>> Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3249 | Fax (707) 543-3219 |

>>>>> joswald@srcity.org

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>> From: Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

>>>>> Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 10:33 AM

>>>>> To: Oswald, Jesse <JOswald@srcity.org>; Lorna Edits

>>>>> <lornaedits18@gmail.com>

>>>>> Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

>>>>>

>>>>> Hello Jesse,

>>>>>

>>>>> We received a mailer several days ago with information on the development plan for 2268 Stony Point, which if developed, will be called Stony Point Flats. I have several questions that I would greatly appreciate you answering.

>>>>>

>>>>> 1) Is this project receiving SB-35 funding?

>>>>> 2) This property was advertised as a 2.31 acre parcel with a potential to build up to approximately 40 residential units. The Pre-Application Project Description indicates that it is a 2.9 acre parcel with 50 units being developed. Can you tell me which is accurate?

>>>>>

>>>>> Thank you,

>>>>> Ryan

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> On Monday, March 8, 2021, 01:14:47 PM PST, Oswald, Jesse <joswald@srcity.org> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Hello Ryan,

>>>>>

>>>>> Nothing to date.

>>>>>

>>>>> Regards,

>>>>>

>>>>> Jesse Oswald |Chief Building Official Planning & Economic Development

>>>>> |100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707)

>>>> 543-3249 | Fax (707) 543-3219 | [joswald@srcity.org](mailto:joswald@srcity.org)

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>> From: Ryan Schwab <[rschwab123@yahoo.com](mailto:rschwab123@yahoo.com)>

>>>> Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:03 PM

>>>> To: Oswald, Jesse <[JOswald@srcity.org](mailto:JOswald@srcity.org)>

>>>> Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point

>>>>

>>>> Hello Jesse,

>>>>

>>>> I wanted to check in again to see if there have been any submittals for 2268 Stony Point.

>>>>

>>>> Thank you,

>>>> Ryan

>>>>

>>>>>> On Dec 1, 2020, at 11:17 AM, Oswald, Jesse <[JOswald@srcity.org](mailto:JOswald@srcity.org)> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Hello Jesse,

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I wanted to check to see if there have been any submittals for 2268 Stony Point.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Thank you,

>>>>>> Ryan

>>>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>

>

>

>

## [EXTERNAL] 2268 Stony Point Flats Project - North Point Parkway Extension and Traffic Concerns

Ryan Schwab <rschwab123@yahoo.com>

Sun 5/23/2021 9:34 PM

To: McKay, Conor <CTMcKay@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>

Cc: Hunter.McLaughlin@sonoma-county.org <Hunter.McLaughlin@sonoma-county.org>

 1 attachments (252 KB)

Altered Noth Point Parkway Design Concerns.pdf;

Hello Santa Rosa Planning Department,

I would greatly appreciate your input related to the proposed Stony Points Flats project and the North Point Parkway extension. Our community members have noticed that the proposed North Point Parkway extension outlined in the Stony Ranch Subdivision (Record Plans - dated June 2015) does not match the proposed extension as outlined by the Stony Point Flats design team. The curve of the road appears to occur approximately 120 feet further than previously planned. Not only is the projected path now in alignment with a majestic 70 foot Eucalyptus tree frequented by many birds of prey, but it also affects homeowners on Trombetta Street who purposely purchased homes on the most eastern part of the street ensuring there would be a buffer between their homes and the future North Point Parkway extension. I have attached an infographic outlining the observed changes. Please confirm if these changes were approved by the city.

I also wanted to discuss the traffic related concerns with the project and would appreciate input if they are going to be addressed by the developer. This project poses considerable traffic concerns and evacuation hazards in the event of an emergency. There have been three fires over the past 10 years along the Roseland Creek trail directly surrounding the parcel to be developed. If one of these fires occurs again which is highly likely, the future residents would be in grave danger, since they would only be able to make a right turn out the property. It is exceptionally uncommon for

there to be only one way out of a dense community. This could force residents to try to escape a disaster with only one option and this one option could put them directly into the oncoming path of a fire or another hazard.

Additionally, egress and ingress is tremendously inadequate to accommodate over 100 residents' vehicular entry and exit to the property. The entry/exit point does not have either a turn lane, stop light nor south bound exit, thus posing traffic hazards, congestion and potential back ups for northerly flowing traffic up Stony Point. Residents wanting to drive south out of the apartment complex must make a right turn then either make a U-turn at the Northpoint Parkway intersection, or drive north to turn into the Stony Ranch subdivision to travel through the neighborhood onto Giffen in order to turn left at the light. Residents traveling southbound on Stony Point, will not be able to make a left turn into the property as there is a concrete median with no plans or space to turn it into a left hand turn lane. To enter the property southbound, residents would need to pass the property then either make an illegal U-turn at Hearn or continue driving until they are able to turn around. This is not only extremely inconvenient for the future residents, but downright dangerous for them and the surrounding neighborhoods. Many serious car accidents already occur on this treacherous stretch of Stony Point and approval of this project will exacerbate this known problem.

Day-to-day traffic will be even more severe and dangerous than what it currently is. Many neighbors can not imagine what it will be like in the event of another evacuation that has scarred everyone in the community. With most new developments now occurring in Roseland, neighbors are terrified that that they will be unable to escape the next disaster (fire, earthquake, etc). Many neighbors are still distraught from how jam-packed the roads were in the early morning hours when evacuation was demanded during the most recent fires. It took some households over three hours to leave town due to the tremendous amount of traffic and backup of people fleeing for their lives.

Thank you for reading our community's traffic related concerns and addressing them with us. We hope that the city and the developer carefully consider the multiple traffic related issues before proceeding

with the plan as is.

Thank you,  
Ryan Schwab