APPEAL FORM

RECEIVED
FEB 06 2023
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Walked-In @ 2:45pm

Date Received: FEB 06 2023

Fee: $583.00 per Connor

City Clerk's Office/Rec'd by: L. Wiley

Name of Appellant: Charles M. Schulz Creative Associates

TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL:

The above named appellant does hereby appeal to your Honorable Body the following:

The decision of the: (List Board/Commission/Dept.) Zoning Administrator

Decision date: January 25, 2023

Decision: (approval, denial, other) Approval

Name of Applicant/Owner/Developer: McBride Lane Apartments, LLC

Type of application: (Rezoning, Tentative Map, etc.) Project Approval

Street address of subject property: 1650 West Steele Lane, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

The grounds upon which this appeal is filed are: (List all grounds relied upon in making this appeal. Attach additional sheets if more space is needed.)

1. See attached.

2.

The specific action which the undersigned wants the City Council to take is: (Attach additional sheets if more space is needed.)

Appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision of January 25, 2023.

Appeals shall be submitted in writing…….on a City application form within 10 calendar days after the date of the decision. The time limit will extend to the following business day where the last of the specified number of days falls on a day that the City is not open for business.

By: On behalf of Charles M. Schulz Creative Associates — February 6, 2023

Applicant's Signature ERIN B. CARLSTROM, Attorney — Date

Charles M. Schulz Creative Associates — One Snoopy Place, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Applicant's Name (type or print) — Address

707-483-2888

Daytime Phone Number — Home Phone Number

ZONING CODE PROVISIONS RELATING TO APPEALS:

NOTE: "DRB" refers to the Design Review Board, "CHB" refers to the Cultural Heritage Board, and "Commission" refers to the Planning Commission.

ARTICLE 20-62 - APPEALS

20-62.030 - Filing and Processing of Appeals

A. **Eligibility.** Any action by the……DRB, CHB, or the Commission in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Zoning Code may be appealed by any aggrieved person in compliance with this Article….

B. **Timing and form of appeal.**

1. **General appeals.** Appeals shall be submitted in writing, and filed …..on a City application form within 10 calendar days after the date of the decision. The time limit will extend to the following business day where the last of the specified number of days falls on a day that the City is not open for business.

20-62.030 - Filing and Processing of Appeals

3. **Place for filing**

c. Appeals from the decisions of the DRB, CHB, or Commission shall be addressed to the Council and filed with the City Clerk.

4. **Pertinent facts.** The written appeal shall state the pertinent facts of the case and shall specify the following:

a. The decision appealed from (e.g., City assigned case number).

b. The basis for the appeal.

c. The specific action which the appellant wants taken in the appeal.

d. Each and every ground upon which the appellant relies in making the appeal.

5. **Filing fee.** Appeals shall be accompanied by the required filing fee, in compliance with the Council's Fee Schedule.

LAW OFFICES OF
CLEMENT, FITZPATRICK & KENWORTHY
INCORPORATED
3333 MENDOCINO AVENUE, SUITE 200
SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA 95403
FAX: 707 546-1360

TELEPHONE: (707) 523-1181

ERIN B. CARLSTROM

ATTACHMENT TO APPEAL OF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR DECISION OF JANUARY 25, 2023

1650 WEST STEELE LANE, SANTA ROSA, CA 95403
APN: 041-042-012
FILE NO. PRJ21-010

The appellants, Charles M. Schulz Creative Associates, Children's Museum of Sonoma County, the Redwood Empire Ice Arena ("Snoopy's Home Ice") and the Charles M. Schulz Museum and Research Center ("Appellants"), do hereby appeal the Zoning Administrator's decision issued on January 25, 2023 ("Zoning Administrator Decision") regarding the following:

1. The Zoning Administrator's adoption of an addendum to the certified North Santa Rosa Station Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 20111022034) for the W. Steele Lane Apartments Project located at 1650 W. Steele Lane, Santa Rosa, APN 041-042-012 (File No. PRJ21-010); and

2. The Zoning Administrator's approval of a minor conditional use permit to allow a supplemental density bonus and minor design review of the construction of a 36-unit multifamily residential development for the property located at 1650 W. Steele Lane, Santa Rosa, APN: 041-042-012, File No. PRJ21-010.

This appeal is based on the City's approval of much-reduced parking for the project. The Appellants look forward to welcoming their new neighbors, and hopefully new members. However, the project approval ignores significant traffic and parking compaction already present in the area. Failing to provide adequate parking for the new residents will exacerbate the existing safety issues in the area, and poses a great likelihood of worsening traffic. Simply put, the residents will need to put their cars somewhere, and the project as proposed ignores this reality and the impact it will pose on the neighborhood.

The traffic and parking study conducted by W-Trans demonstrates quite clearly that "the proposed parking supply would be deficient (pursuant to City standards) **by 16 spaces.**" (Julia Walker, W-Trans; Traffic Study for the 1650 West Steele Lane Project (2020); p. 5.) (emphasis added) While the report goes on to explain that the project's proximity to public transportation renders it eligible for parking reductions, the sterile application of standards and codes fails to account for the conditions in the area.

Any on-site inspection of traffic levels for the 2020 report would have occurred at the height of COVID-19 related business restrictions. The Children's Museum, Schulz Museum and Ice Arena were all closed for significant periods of time in order to comply with County Health regulations. Traffic counts during that time period would, as a result, be significantly diminished from traffic under current conditions and fulltime operations. Adding vehicles driven by residents looking for somewhere to park will only serve to increase the dangerous conditions in the area.

The report refers to existing housing units on Meadowbrook Court as a basis for comparison to the proposed project. Here again the report misses the mark. Every curb space on Meadowbrook is already occupied by the existing residents. With the introduction of new housing units, and the cars that necessarily accompany the appellants' soon-to-be neighbors, the project as proposed will present these new neighbors with an untenable question: where to put their cars.

The Applicant incorporates so-called "unbundled" parking options for their would-be lessees. Surely, a prospective tenant given the option to pay less rent will take advantage of that economic opportunity. However, not paying for a parking space does not equate to not having a vehicle or vehicles to park. So, these tenants will be forced to seek out street parking in a neighborhood already bereft of it. Or, and more likely, residents will park across the street in one of the Appellants' parking lots. While the Appellants are eager to serve their new neighbors, it is unacceptable that the City would impose the risk of additional pedestrian crossings of West Steele, a "major collector" according to the W-Trans report. (Walker; p.1)

Appellants acknowledge the limitations imposed on the City following the passage of AB-2079. What bears further review, however, is the City's ability to impose minimum parking requirements where, as here, **failure to do so would have a substantially negative impact... on residential or commercial parking within one-half mile of the proposed housing development**. Government Code §65863.2. All of the Appellants are located within one-half mile of the proposed project, and indeed, the Ice Arena and Schulz Museum Appellants are directly across the street from the proposed project. The visitors and employees of the Appellants' various organizations utilize the entirety of existing parking at their locations. The project as proposed will have an immediate impact on the parking availability at the Appellants' locations, which the City has thus far ignored.

The Appellants thus appeal the Zoning Administrator's approval of the addendum to the North Santa Rosa Station Area Specific Plan EIR, and the Zoning Administrator's approval of a minor conditional use permit, File No. PRJ21-010, and request that the project be conditioned to require construction of minimum parking pursuant to City code.

Sincerely,

Erin Carlstrom, Esq.

/ebc