

**From:** [Planning Shared](#)  
**To:** [Murray, Susie](#); [McKay, Conor](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Administrator Agenda Item #6.2: Arthouse  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 4, 2025 4:48:47 PM

---

Hi you two,

Please see the following email from Eric Fraser.

Thank you,

**Sheila Wolski, City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development  
100 Santa Rosa Ave., Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-4705 | [swolski@srcity.org](mailto:swolski@srcity.org)

Hours | Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:30pm

**Coming soon in 2025, the Planning, Building, and Engineering Divisions of the City of Santa Rosa's Planning and Economic Development Department will fully transition to an online application submittal process through the Accela Citizen Access platform. Learn more about the Online Permitting System [here](#). Additional information will be available soon!**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 4, 2025 4:45 PM  
**To:** Planning Shared <[planning@srcity.org](mailto:planning@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Zoning Administrator Agenda Item #6.2: Arthouse

Dear Zoning Administrator;

Watching the “Arthouse” project play out as a drama with many acts, showing the twists and turns of power and money in the backrooms and under the tables of what should be the public’s domain – our local government.

How did a project permitted and partially funded by the City of Santa Rosa as affordable condominiums (for artists) become luxury hotel rooms? Or condos that can also be offered as short-term rentals? Or apartments with allowable short-term uses?

Are these condos, apartments, or hotel rooms? The information is unclear. Is the information provided by the applicant meant to be deceptive?

The applicant apparently misstates that “the asset” operated as a hotel “under prior city approvals”, but records indicate differently. Responsive documents show written guidance that the property’s owners were restricted from operating as a hotel, but they did anyway – for more than a year. This application is incomplete and misleading by omission. The responsive documents were posted to <https://cityofsantarosaca.nextrequest.com/requests/22-274>, the City’s site for responsive public documents, before being destroyed by the City just a few weeks ago. Did the City choose to destroy public documents to hide or obfuscate the permitted use of this property?

If the applicant had prior City approval to operate as a hotel, why is this application necessary now?

If the apartments are also offered as short-term rentals, how does that conflict or align with the City’s short-term rental (STR) ordinance? Prohibitions against apartments being used as STRs, corporate ownership of the STR property, and owning more than one STR unit are just some of the examples where this intended use does not align. There are also restrictions against whole house (“non hosted”) STRs being too close to one another and to provide adequate parking, for neighborhood notifications, permitting and licensing requirements and fees to the City. And much more. This application is asking for different rules even though the City spent an incredible amount of time and hundreds of thousands of dollars on these questions just a couple years ago when crafting the STR ordinance. \*

Are these condominiums? Who owns the condos? The applicant’s disclosure form was incomplete. Was this meant to deceive?

Researchers inadvertently stumbled upon information from the County that there was a delay in the occupancy permit being received (or recorded) by the County to assess property taxes in a timely and accurate manner on 620 7<sup>th</sup> St., taxes which provide funding to our local schools. The assessor’s office claimed a backlog, but that statement doesn’t align either. Was the “delay” just on the applicant's properties? Politically connected operators? All properties?

\*we know from research that the City’s STR policies were borne from corrupt acts and intentions. Information shows where the interim City Manager at the time the policies were crafted was also employed by a City contractor, with active multi-million-dollar contracts with the City of Santa Rosa for permitting, code enforcement services and the like. The STR ordinance is revealing itself more as an exercise in creating competitive advantages and

largesse for politically connected folks, as shown by facts still getting out despite the City doubling down on censorship, CPRA violations, propaganda and so on, in these lean times.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Eric Fraser

[TRUTHINTOURISM@gmail.com](mailto:TRUTHINTOURISM@gmail.com)

cc: investigators' files