

From: [Sheikhali, Monet](#)
To: [Carrie Anabo](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Project Vessel-914 Ripley St.
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 1:34:00 PM

Carrie,

Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments regarding the proposed project. The project site is zoned R-3-18 (Multi-family Residential), and per zoning code Section 20-22.030, Table 2-2 (https://qcode.us/codes/santarosa/view.php?topic=20-2-20_22-20_22_030&frames=on), some commercial uses are allowed in the R-3 zoning district through a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

Although the applicant requested a dedicated ADA parking space in their project proposal, it has been determined that the street dimensions do not meet the requirements to dedicate an ADA parking space. Even if it did meet these requirements, it would be for public use, not assigned to any specific business or residence.

I have included a copy of this email conversation in the public record and will provide a copy to the Zoning Administrator before any action is taken.

Thanks.,

Monet Sheikhali | City Planner
Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org

Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Carrie Anabo <annisb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 9:34 AM
To: Sheikhali, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project Vessel-914 Ripley St.

I am asking that a conditional use permit be denied for this project. The zoning for this neighborhood is residential and this project is not compatible with the existing zoning. Why would we in the neighborhood want a business in our midst?

There is also the issue of parking. Many people in this neighborhood do not have a garage attached to their home. Therefore parking is often an issue. I am rarely able to park in front of my own home here on 11th Street. As to a dedicated parking space, wouldn't we all like one of those!

Please deny this request and allow our neighborhood to remain strictly residential as it is presently zoned.

Thank You,

Carrie Anabo
120 11th Street
Santa Rosa CA 95401

Sent from my iPad

From: [Sheikhali, Monet](#)
To: [Cindy Toran](#)
Cc: [Bill Myers](#); [Christian Toran](#); [Kelly Allyn](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Project-Vessel, 914 Ripley Street
Date: Wednesday, November 3, 2021 11:27:00 AM

Please review the entire phrase that I referred to in LU1.1 or LU4.12, rather than taking the highlighted parts out of context. I've highlighted the relevant parts in aqua this time.

LU-1.1 - Provide a Downtown Station Area land use and development framework that establishes a vibrant big city urban core centered around Courthouse Square, and a network of **mixed-use village centers** that offer an array of housing options for people at all income levels and stages of life, **mixed with retail and services catering to residents' daily needs.**
LU-4.12 Facilitate opportunities to incorporate innovative design and program features into **affordable housing developments**, **such as on-site health and human services**, community gardens, car-sharing, and bike facilities. Support the development of projects that serve homeless and special needs populations.

Per zoning code [Section 20-22.030](#), some commercial uses are allowed within the residential zoning district through a Minor Conditional Use Permit such as integrated medical health center, libraries, health fitness facilities, meeting facilities, schools, child daycare, etc. and residential uses are allowed in commercial zones. These uses meet the goals and policies of our General Plan.

Also, please consider that since the lower floor of this property has been commercial and vacant for some time, perhaps it is not desirable for the applicant to be used as a residential space.

Regards,

Monet Sheikhali | City Planner

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org



Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

From: Cindy Toran <cktoran@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 9:25 PM

To: Sheikhali, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>

Cc: Bill Myers <fmi@sonic.net>; Christian Toran <cdtoran@gmail.com>; Kelly Allyn <kellallyn@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Project-Vessel, 914 Ripley Street

Hello Monet,

Thanks for the clarifications, especially about the dedicated parking space.

I still do not see how granting this MUP fits into the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan goals and policies. This is neither a **mixed-use village center** (such as Pullman Loft) nor an **affordable housing development**, as you referred to in LU1.1 or LU4.12.

In the DSASP, Map LU-3 clearly shows our neighborhood as Medium Residential defined as:

Medium Density Residential - Housing densities from 8.0 to 18.0 units per gross acre. This designation permits a range of housing types, including single family attached and multifamily developments, and is intended for specific areas where higher density is appropriate. New single-family detached housing is not permitted except in historic preservation districts and historic neighborhoods where single family detached units are allowed.

In addition, we have a real need for affordable housing. The downstairs of this property could accommodate that need with no impact on neighborhood parking since there are 8 parking spaces in the rear of the building.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sheikhali, Monet** <msheikhali@srcity.org>

Date: Mon, Nov 1, 2021 at 3:49 PM

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Project-Vessel, 914 Ripley Street

To: Cindy Toran <cktoran@gmail.com>

Cc: Christian Toran <cdtoran@gmail.com>, Kelly Allyn <kellallyn@gmail.com>, Bill Myers <fmi@sonic.net>

Cynthia,

I will let the applicant know about your withdrawal so we can proceed with the consideration of this item at the upcoming Zoning Administrator meeting this coming Thursday.

The review authority for this permit is the Zoning Administrator (ZA), see [Section 20-60.090](#) from Zoning Code about Zoning Administrator's duties. The ZA evaluates staff's recommendations and considers the testimony of the public comments and all the information presented at the meeting.

When the Planning Division receives a planning application, the staff will review the permit and the required documents. Planning staff will send the project materials to other departments for reviews, such as Fire Department, Traffic Division, Engineering Division, and Building Division. All these departments review the project and provide comments or conditions. If

there is an issue with the project, the applicant will usually revise the plans to address it.

The project site is zoned R-3-18 (Multi-family Residential), and per zoning code Section 20-22.030, Table 2-2 (https://qcode.us/codes/santarosa/view.php?topic=20-2-20_22-20_22_030&frames=on), some commercial uses are allowed in the R-3 zoning district through a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

The Downtown Station Area Specific Plan goals and policies envision creating a vibrant downtown and a network of pedestrian-friendly mixed-use village centers. Some of these policies are:

LU-1.1 - Provide a Downtown Station Area land use and development framework that establishes a vibrant big city urban core centered around Courthouse Square, and a network of **mixed-use village centers** that offer an array of housing options for people at all income levels and stages of life, mixed with retail and services catering to residents' daily needs.

LU-4.12 Facilitate opportunities to incorporate innovative design and program features into **affordable housing developments**, such as on-site health and human services, community gardens, car-sharing, and bike facilities. Support the development of projects that serve homeless and special needs populations.

Although the applicant requested a dedicated ADA parking space in their project proposal, it has been determined that the street dimensions do not meet the requirements to dedicate an ADA parking space. Further, even if it did meet these requirements, it would be for public use, not assigned to any specific business or residence.

I will include this email in the project file as well and provide a copy to the Zoning Administrator.

Also, I will forward your email to the applicant team to know about your comments and concerns.

Monet Sheikhali | City Planner

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org



Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

From: Cindy Toran <cktoran@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 29, 2021 3:47 PM

To: Sheikhal, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>

Cc: Christian Toran <cdtoran@gmail.com>; Kelly Allyn <kellallyn@gmail.com>; Bill Myers <fmi@sonic.net>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Project-Vessel, 914 Ripley Street

Hello Monet,

After a phone discussion with Kimberly Hopwood yesterday, I will withdraw my request for a formal public hearing based on the additional cost and staff requirements.

However, I have the following question:

You mention providing a copy of my concerns to the "review authority prior to action being taken". From the links you provided it appears the review authority is the Zoning Administrator. Is that correct? What is the process other than the Zoom meeting for approval/denial of the application for this project? Does the Zoning Administrator primarily rely on your recommendation? If so, are you currently in favor of this project?

I also have the following comments after review of the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan:

1. It seems to me that this property does not fall into the goal of maintaining the use of Medium Residential (Map LU-3) in this area. As I stated in my previous message, this is primarily a residential area. There are many other areas where business development is encouraged by the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan. Proposals in this area of Santa Rosa should be encouraged to provide increased residential housing with adequate parking.

Best regards,

Cynthia Toran
932 Ripley St.
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
707-321-3262

On Wed, Oct 27, 2021 at 2:11 PM Sheikhal, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org> wrote:

Thank you for taking the time to write your questions and comments and send them to me. I will include your comments in the project file (public record) and give a copy to the applicant. A copy will be provided to the review authority prior to any action being taken.

Please see my answers to your questions below in red.

Monet Sheikhal | City Planner

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org



Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

From: Cindy Toran <cktoran@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2021 5:03 PM

To: Sheikhal, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>

Cc: Christian Toran <cdtoran@gmail.com>; Kelly Allyn <kellallyn@gmail.com>; Bill Myers <fmi@sonic.net>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project-Vessel, 914 Ripley Street

Hello,

I am a homeowner at 932 Ripley Street and received a Notice of Public Meeting for November 4th regarding Project Vessel at 914 Ripley Street.

First, I have the following questions:

1. What is a "Minor Conditional Use Permit"? *Per Zoning Code [Section 20-70.020](#), "Authority granted by the City to use a specified site for a particular purpose. "Land Use Permit" includes Minor Conditional Use Permits, Conditional Use Permits, Temporary Use Permits, Minor Variances, Variances, Design Review, and Zoning Clearances, as established by Division 5 (Land Use and Development Permit Procedures) of this Zoning Code. A City land use review and entitlement process where the review authority exercises discretion in deciding to approve or disapprove the permit. Includes Minor Conditional Use Permits, Conditional Use Permits, Minor Variances, Variances, Design Review approval, and Subdivision Maps." Please see [Section 20-52.050](#) Minor Conditional use permit procedure.*

What is a "single live/work unit"? ***Live/Work and Work/Live Units.** An integrated housing unit and working space, occupied and utilized by a single household in a structure, either single-family or multi-family, that has been designed or structurally modified to accommodate joint residential occupancy and work activity, and which includes:*

- 1. Complete kitchen space and sanitary facilities in compliance with the City building code; and*
- 2. Working space reserved for and regularly used by one or more occupants of the unit.*

The difference between live/work and work/live units is that the "work" component of a live/work unit is secondary to its residential use, and may include only commercial activities and pursuits that are compatible with the character of a quiet residential environment, while the work component of a work/live unit is the primary use, to which the residential component is secondary.

Please see [section 20-42.080](#) for Live/work and work/live units regulations.

The proposed use is not a live/work unit; the applicant proposes operating an Integrated Medical Health Center use on the first floor of the building. Per Zoning Code [Section 20-](#)

22.030, an Integrated medical health center land use requires a Minor Conditional Use permit in the R-3 (multifamily) zoning district. Live/work or work/live use is not allowed in the R-3 zoning district. The project site is located within the boundaries of the [Downtown Station Area Specific Plan](#).

I will let the applicant know about your request for a formal public hearing. We will send out new notices for the Zoning Administrator Public Hearing, and the applicant will have to pay an additional fee of \$2,026 to cover the hearing costs, as well as post an on-site sign notice 10 days prior to the Zoning Administrator hearing. Also, a notice will be published in the newspaper of general circulation within the local agency at least 10 days before the scheduled hearing.

I reviewed the Project Information and have the following comments/objections:

1. Parking: I have a concern about the parking on this busy residential street. If the hours were shortened to 9 am to 4 pm the observation that there are "typically 15-25 parking spaces open" might be accurate. Once residents return from work very little parking is available. Many return home well before 6 pm. The proposal for one dedicated accessible space in front also seems unfair to neighbors. We would all like a dedicated space in front of our homes but often have to find an open space elsewhere since the parking space(s) in front of our home are already occupied.
2. Zoning #1: This project does not seem to fall into the category of "single live/work unit". To me this would mean the same type of use as in the past, i.e., the owner lives upstairs and operates a business downstairs. In this project the owners do not live on the property.
3. Zoning #2: I have lived at 932 Ripley Street since 2009 and there has not been an active business at this location at any time. This is primarily a residential area. i.e., while located near "downtown", this is not "downtown".

Finally, please consider this a request for a more formal public hearing.

Best regards,

--

Cynthia K. Toran
932 Ripley St.
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
707-321-3262

--

Cindy Toran

From: [Larry Martin](#)
To: [Sheikhali, Monet](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] conditional use permit for 914 Ripley Street
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 4:07:13 PM

Monet,

Thank you for your reply clarifying the issues I mentioned, particularly about the ADA parking space. Understanding the acronyms and nuances of zoning, permitting, etc. is daunting for a layman like myself.

I understand that the building used to be commercial, but hasn't been for the last many years. I would be less concerned if it were to be a live/work space by a low traffic business, such as a photo studio or artists studio, where the business owner lived upstairs and worked downstairs. That would make the tenant more invested in the neighborhood. Three offices in the downstairs is a completely different matter. My preference, of course, would be to see the entire building residential.

That said, my concerns about parking still stand.

Thank you again,
Larry Martin

> On Nov 1, 2021, at 2:18 PM, Sheikhali, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org> wrote:

>

> Larry,

>

> Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments regarding the proposed project.

> The proposed project is not a rezoning application. Instead, the permit is a Minor Conditional Use Permit. Minor Conditional Use Permit provides a process for reviewing land use activities that may be desirable in the applicable zoning district but whose effect on the site and surroundings cannot be determined before being proposed for a particular location. The project site is zoned R-3-18 (Multi-family Residential), and per zoning code Section 20-22.030, Table 2-2 (https://qcode.us/codes/santarosa/view.php?topic=20-2-20_22-20_22_030&frames=on), some commercial uses are allowed in the R-3 zoning district through a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

>

> The second floor is proposed to continue as residential use.

> It is worth noting that the ground floor where this Integrated Medical Health Center is proposed was previously used for commercial space and has been vacant for some time.

>

> Although the applicant requested a dedicated ADA parking space in their project proposal, it has been determined that the street dimensions do not meet the requirements to dedicate an ADA parking space. Further, even if it did meet these requirements, it would be for public use, not assigned to any specific business or residence.

>

> I have included a copy of this email conversation in the public record and will provide a copy to the Zoning Administrator before any action is taken.

> Also, I will forward your email to the applicant team to know about your comments and concerns.

>

> Monet Sheikhali | City Planner

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

> Tel. (707) 543- 4698| Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org

>

>

> Counter Hours

> Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

> Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

> Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

>

>

>

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

> From: Larry Martin <larry@mcn.org>

> Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 8:00 AM

> To: Sheikhal, Monet <msheikhal@srcity.org>

> Subject: [EXTERNAL] conditional use permit for 914 Ripley Street

>

> I have a couple of concerns about the application for a change in zoning of the residential property at 914 Ripley Street. I have owned and occupied the property at 837 Ripley Street for over 20 years. This is a wonderful little residential enclave within walking distance of downtown and Railroad Square. It is a diverse neighborhood racially, economically, and age-wise. By and large the neighbors are friendly and look out after each other. I would like to keep it that way. It seems such neighborhoods are becoming rarer by the day.

>

> It doesn't make much sense to me to rezone a residential unit for business use since Santa Rosa currently has an acute housing shortage as well as plenty of available commercial space available nearby that could be used for medical offices. I would hate to see the neighborhood slowly convert to commercial use.

>

> The other issue is parking. I think it is optimistic to claim 15-25 on street parking spaces available within a one block radius. Parking is a premium in the neighborhood. I would expect three offices to require at least 6 parking spaces. The idea of granting the business a dedicated parking spot in front of the building I find almost insulting. Wouldn't we all like a dedicated parking space for our own use in front of our own house? In addition, once the new apartments at Cleveland and College as well as those at the Pullman Lofts located at 9th and Wilson are occupied (within the next few months) I would expect street parking in the neighborhood to be next to impossible. I see no good reason to make matters even worse.

>

> In light of the above I urge you to reject the application for a zoning change.

>

> Thank you,

> Larry Martin

>

From: [Sheikhali, Monet](#)
To: [Larry Martin](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] conditional use permit for 914 Ripley Street
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 2:18:00 PM

Larry,

Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments regarding the proposed project.

The proposed project is not a rezoning application. Instead, the permit is a Minor Conditional Use Permit. Minor Conditional Use Permit provides a process for reviewing land use activities that may be desirable in the applicable zoning district but whose effect on the site and surroundings cannot be determined before being proposed for a particular location. The project site is zoned R-3-18 (Multi-family Residential), and per zoning code Section 20-22.030, Table 2-2 (https://qcode.us/codes/santarosa/view.php?topic=20-2-20_22-20_22_030&frames=on), some commercial uses are allowed in the R-3 zoning district through a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

The second floor is proposed to continue as residential use.

It is worth noting that the ground floor where this Integrated Medical Health Center is proposed was previously used for commercial space and has been vacant for some time.

Although the applicant requested a dedicated ADA parking space in their project proposal, it has been determined that the street dimensions do not meet the requirements to dedicate an ADA parking space. Further, even if it did meet these requirements, it would be for public use, not assigned to any specific business or residence.

I have included a copy of this email conversation in the public record and will provide a copy to the Zoning Administrator before any action is taken.

Also, I will forward your email to the applicant team to know about your comments and concerns.

Monet Sheikhali | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org

Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Martin <larry@mcn.org>

Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 8:00 AM

To: Sheikhali, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] conditional use permit for 914 Ripley Street

I have a couple of concerns about the application for a change in zoning of the residential property at 914 Ripley Street. I have owned and occupied the property at 837 Ripley Street for over 20 years. This is a wonderful little residential enclave within walking distance of downtown and Railroad Square. It is a diverse neighborhood racially, economically, and age-wise. By and large the neighbors are friendly and look out after each other. I would like to keep it that way. It seems such neighborhoods are becoming rarer by the day.

It doesn't make much sense to me to rezone a residential unit for business use since Santa Rosa currently has an acute housing shortage as well as plenty of available commercial space available nearby that could be used for medical offices. I would hate to see the neighborhood slowly convert to commercial use.

The other issue is parking. I think it is optimistic to claim 15-25 on street parking spaces available within a one block radius. Parking is a premium in the neighborhood. I would expect three offices to require at least 6 parking spaces. The idea of granting the business a dedicated parking spot in front of the building I find almost insulting. Wouldn't we all like a dedicated parking space for our own use in front of our own house? In addition, once the new apartments at Cleveland and College as well as those at the Pullman Lofts located at 9th and Wilson are occupied (within the next few months) I would expect street parking in the neighborhood to be next to impossible. I see no good reason to make matters even worse.

In light of the above I urge you to reject the application for a zoning change.

Thank you,
Larry Martin

From: [Sheikhali, Monet](#)
To: [Sonya](#)
Cc: cktoran@gmail.com
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] VESSEL PROJECT - 914 RIPLEY STREET
Date: Wednesday, November 3, 2021 10:30:00 AM

Thank you for taking time to provide your comments regarding the proposed project.

It seems that most of your concerns are predicated on comments in the project proposal. Please let me clarify and hopefully allay your concerns. Although the applicant requested a dedicated ADA (American Disability Act) parking space in their project proposal, it has been determined that the street dimensions do not meet the requirements to dedicate an ADA parking space. Even if it did meet these requirements, it would be for public use, not assigned to any specific business or residence. Apologies for the misunderstanding.

A public meeting has been scheduled for this Thursday at 10:30 am. Post card noticing to the neighborhood was completed. Meeting information is included on the post card, and is also available online. These post cards were sent to all residents in a 600 ft radius of the property, as well as property owners who may not be occupying the residence. The Zoning Administrator, Andy Gustavson, will have opportunity to review all public correspondence, including yours, in advance of the meeting. There will also be opportunity for live public comment during the meeting.

If you want to request a public hearing, you can email me and request it before the end of the day. The only difference between the Zoning Administrator Public Meeting and the Zoning Administrator Public Hearing is that the applicant has to pay an additional \$2,026 to cover the hearing costs and post an on-site sign notice ten days before the meeting. In addition, a notification will be published in the newspaper of general circulation within the local agency at least ten days before the scheduled hearing. The review authority is still the Zoning Administrator, and the notices will be mailed out to all residents in a 600 ft radius of the property again.

Regards,

Monet Sheikhali | City Planner

Planning and Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543- 4698 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | msheikhali@srcity.org



Counter Hours

Monday/Tuesday/Thursday: 8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Wednesday: 10:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. (No new permits are accepted after 3:30 p.m.)

Friday: 8 a.m. to noon (No new permits are accepted after 11:00 a.m.)

From: Sonya <sonyas@sonic.net>

Sent: Tuesday, November 2, 2021 8:45 AM

To: Sheikhal, Monet <msheikhali@srcity.org>; Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>

Cc: cktoran@gmail.com

Subject: [EXTERNAL] VESSEL PROJECT - 914 RIPLEY STREET

Project Name: Vessel

Project Address 914 Ripley St, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

To Whom it may concern,

This email is written for the purpose of commenting on the proposed commercial space at 914 Ripley. As the owner occupant of 944 Ripley St for the last 20 years I am positioned offer a perspective that accurately addresses the day-to-day impacts proposed by the commercial use of to the space.

Parking. There is a more than adequate offsite space behind this building for the commercial use described. No reserved street parking of any kind should be allocated for the commercial use of the proposed space.

I am offering our own experience with the City of Santa Rosa for seeking sufficient off-site parking for comparison to the cavalier offer being made to the owner of the proposed project.

Shortly before our acquisition of the property at 944 Ripley as owner/occupant the City of Santa approved and permitted a project that effectively removed the potential for any reasonable and planning compliant on-site parking solution. So for 20 years we have relied on having sufficient off-site parking simply to make use of my property as the owner/occupant. To date we have tried to resolve this situation but to no avail:

The City of Santa Rosa has never considered our request to install on-site parking that is safe but does not conform to the current planning code (variance).

The City of Santa Rosa has never considered our request to reserve a space adjacent to our property even though they are the party that allowed removal of on-site parking for this property in the first place.

So to offer a business interest and owner that is not in residence better treatment than you have given us is a patently unfair practice.

Further, the entire parking situation of the neighborhood is grossly congested already. Many of these older properties are rentals with either no or wholly inadequate off-street parking--the City should not be seeking to add to this problem. Ideally, the City should be ADDRESSING this problem and finding creative ways to move parked cars off the street. We personally observed a large truck get stuck trying to turn from Lincoln on to Ripley St--the driver was forced to knock on doors to find the owner of a parked car to move out of his way. My own car, while parked on the street in front of my house, was totaled by a school bus attempting to make the turn onto Lincoln. While this is not the area described for the project, pressure on one part of the street inevitably creates pressure on the whole area as tenants and visitors move up the block.

I further request that the City hold a proper public meeting and fully notice the community about this project. It is unclear to me from reading the City's website who the Zoning Administrator is or how to contact said staff person. I

found Mr. Gustavson's name on the page, and have included him in hopes that he is the right person.

Thank you for your consideration of this information and my request.

Sophia Selivanoff, Property Owner/Occupant
944 Ripley Street, Santa Rosa
707-573-8560