

From: [Hugh Futrell](#)
To: [Candelaria, Christian](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reduced Review Authority Feedback
Date: Monday, July 3, 2023 3:00:01 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Christian:

1. The reduced fee provisions should be made permanent.
2. As a practical matter, applicants can handle design review in one of three ways: (i) concept design review followed by ZA; preliminary design review, to be heard by the Board, later followed by final to be heard by Board or staff; or (3) a submission for final design review from the outset, with sufficient detail, heard by the Board. An applicant can choose how best to proceed based on applicant/design team's varied experience, confidence and risk assessment. This flexibility should be maintained. (By way of example, with our recent 10 E Street project, we chose to go directly to final design review (successfully) – this was by far the shortest timeline for us. Agendizing for CDR, followed by plan detailing followed by application submittal, followed by the conditioning process and then agendizing for ZA, would have been slower.)
3. Establishing in ordinance a thirty calendar day time period from design review application to issuance of proposed development conditions – from all departments -- would be extremely helpful. Establishing a deadline in policy does not have the same force as incorporating it into ordinance.
4. Where the Board is the decision-making authority, revising the appropriate code sections to allow the Board to act even where there is not a quorum, by majority vote of those members present and allowed to vote, is extremely important.

Hugh

HUGH FUTRELL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
520 Third Street, Suite 390
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
o 707 568 3482 ext 111
HUGHFUTRELLCORP.COM



From: Candelaria, Christian <ccandelaria@srcity.org>
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2023 2:10 PM
To: Hugh Futrell <hf@hughfutrellcorp.com>
Subject: Reduced Review Authority Feedback

Dear Hugh,

I hope you are doing well. We wanted to reach out to get your thoughts on the City's reduced review authority process for Design Review applications. As you know, [Zoning Code Chapter 20-16, Resilient City Development Measures](#), provides a process for taking multi-family residential projects that are located in one of the City's Priority Development Areas (PDAs) to the Zoning Administrator for Design Review, rather than the City's Design Review Board. We are looking for your feedback and input on that process.

The City is currently in the process of reviewing and codifying sections of the Resilient City Development Measures Ordinance. Given your experience with projects you have worked on that have utilized this section of the Code, can you let us know what you like or dislike about the process? This might include:

- The requirement for Concept Design Review with the Design Review Board
- Reduced Fees
- Review and Approval Timeline
- Review by a Single Person Body (Zoning Administrator) vs 7 Member Body (Design Review Board)

City staff is hoping to gather feedback on this process before a feedback session with the Design Review Board on July 20, which I would also encourage you to participate in.

The City is currently considering a few options:

- Three Member Committee to review these projects rather than the Zoning Administrator;
- Keeping the process as it currently works with the Zoning Administrator; or
- Removing the process entirely.

What are some of your thoughts on these options?

If you could respond by July 10th that would help me prepare for the scheduled Design Review Board meeting on July 20th.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Christian Candelaria, MUP | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-3232 | ccandelaria@srcity.org



From: [Ingrid Anderson](#)
To: [Candelaria, Christian](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reduced Review Authority Feedback
Date: Monday, July 10, 2023 2:08:06 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Hi Christian,

I am sorry for the delay getting back to you.

We were away for the last week and are just back in town.

The Reduced Review Authority provision for projects in the Priority Development Area promised some relief for developers seeking to build housing and mixed use projects in PDA districts. The Design Review Board members, however, do not appear to be well educated in the purpose of this provision in the Resilient City Measures, to make more efficient the entitlement process. Projects which were presented for Concept Design Review under the Reduced Review Authority, were evaluated by the board members for provision of parking, application of the Density Bonus Law's provisions for concessions and waivers of development standards, site planning decisions and other numerous other characteristics that were outside the authority of Design Review. Projects were permitted to be continued into a second view by the Design Review Board after they were submitted for Minor Design Review.

Ministerial review by the City's Planning Staff, using its Objective Design Standards, would be a more efficient way to evaluate projects in PDA districts, particularly those which include affordable housing.

For projects in Specific Plan Districts, the application of an EIR that covers Specific Plan Districts to include anticipated increases in density, height, and reduction of parking, and would preclude the need for the applicant to produce an Addendum to EIR, would also be meaningful time and cost savings for developers of housing projects.

Some of my suggestions are:

- Projects in Specific Plan Areas could qualify for ministerial review under objective design standards, by Staff
- Guaranteed maximum duration of Minor Design Review process through prioritization of qualified housing projects
- Limit ability of projects in Specific Plan Areas or PDA's, especially those with affordable housing, to be subject to appeals that are not substantiated by State Density Bonus Housing Law
- Allow moderate income dwelling units to qualify as affordable housing
- Upzone parcels that are zoned for single family, but are in Specific Plan Areas, in PDA's, or have other neighborhood qualities that make them conducive to missing middle and multifamily housing projects
- Minimize the number of public hearings
- Consolidate approvals from multiple departments, particularly Fire, Engineering and Planning
- Reduce impact fees on housing, and eliminate impact fees on affordable units
- Allow deferred fees on housing projects

If I had more time to give this some thought, I am sure I could come up with more specific ideas. I appreciate your inquiry to our office – this is a subject that has been challenging for both the design community and their clients; ultimately the difficulty of obtaining project entitlements and permits hurts the economic vitality of our community.

Thank you,
Ingrid



Ingrid Anderson

Principal Architect

Anderson Architecture & Planning

Phone 707-523-7010 x103 **Mobile** 707-318-3162

Email: ingrid@andersonarchplan.com

4752 Stonehedge Dr., Santa Rosa, CA 95405

From: Candelaria, Christian <ccandelaria@srcity.org>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2023 1:23 PM
To: Ingrid Anderson <ingrid@andersonarchplan.com>
Subject: RE: Reduced Review Authority Feedback

Hello,

I just wanted to follow up if you had any feedback on the process in the email described below.

Thank you!

Christian Candelaria, MUP | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-3232 | ccandelaria@srcity.org



From: Candelaria, Christian
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 2:10 PM
To: ingrid@andersonarchplan.com
Subject: Reduced Review Authority Feedback

Dear Ingrid,

I hope you are doing well. We wanted to reach out to get your thoughts on the City's reduced

review authority process for Design Review applications. As you know, [Zoning Code Chapter 20-16, Resilient City Development Measures](#), provides a process for taking multi-family residential projects that are located in one of the City's Priority Development Areas (PDAs) to the Zoning Administrator for Design Review, rather than the City's Design Review Board. We are looking for your feedback and input on that process.

The City is currently in the process of reviewing and codifying sections of the Resilient City Development Measures Ordinance. Given your experience with projects you have worked on that has utilized this section of the Code, can you let us know what you like or dislike about the process? This might include:

- The requirement for Concept Design Review with the Design Review Board
- Reduced Fees
- Review and Approval Timeline
- Review by a Single Person Body (Zoning Administrator) vs 7 Member Body (Design Review Board)

City staff is hoping to gather feedback on this process before a feedback session with the Design Review Board on July 20, which I would also encourage you to participate in.

The City is currently considering a few options:

- Three Member Committee to review these projects rather than the Zoning Administrator;
- Keeping the process as it currently works with the Zoning Administrator; or
- Removing the process entirely.

What are some of your thoughts on these options?

If you could respond by July 10th that would help me prepare for the scheduled Design Review Board meeting on July 20th.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Christian Candelaria, MUP | City Planner

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

Tel. (707) 543-3232 | ccandelaria@srcity.org



From: [Zach Berkowitz](#)
To: [Candelaria, Christian](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Reduced Review Authority Feedback
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2023 2:03:26 PM

Christian,
Below are some thoughts from my partner for the 420 Mendocino Project, Matthew Keipper at Related CA.
Zach

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Keipper, Matthew" <Matthew.Keipper@related.com>
Subject: RE: Reduced Review Authority Feedback
Date: July 10, 2023 at 5:22:14 PM PDT
To: Zach Berkowitz <berkowitz.zach@gmail.com>
Cc: "Nolan, Grace" <gnolan@related.com>

Zach,

The City has been helpful in our efforts to move 420 Mendocino through the approval and permitting process in an expeditious manner, which has encouraged us to look at developing more sites in Downtown Santa Rosa. As we've concluded in recent months after looking at multiple potential sites, new projects in Downtown do not pencil in today's elevated rate and cost environment (land has negative value when solving to elevated minimum return thresholds); anything the City can do to streamline / shorten its review, approval, and permitting processes, reduce uncertainty in the overall process, and lower the cost of building and operating new housing through impact fee incentives and property tax incentives / TIFs will be received favorably by the development community and help accelerate the production of new housing to help the City and region hit its RHNA goals. Now is the time to think big. We would love to do more business in Santa Rosa but need support to do so.

Thanks,

Matt

—

MATTHEW KEIPPER
Vice President

RELATED CALIFORNIA
44 Montgomery Street, #1300
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 677-9000 Office
(415) 653-3170 Direct
(415) 594-3200 Mobile

matthew.keipper@related.com



From: Zach Berkowitz <berkowitz.zach@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2023 2:22 PM

To: Keipper, Matthew <Matthew.Keipper@related.com>

Cc: Nolan, Grace <gnolan@related.com>

Subject: Re: Reduced Review Authority Feedback

Matt,
What are your thoughts on this?
Zach

On Jul 3, 2023, at 2:09 PM, Candelaria, Christian
<ccandelaria@srcity.org> wrote:

Dear Zach,

I hope you are doing well. We wanted to reach out to get your thoughts on the City's reduced review authority process for Design Review applications. As you know, [Zoning Code Chapter 20-16, Resilient City Development Measures \[library.qcode.us\]](#), provides a process for taking multi-family residential projects that are located in one of the City's Priority Development Areas (PDAs) to the Zoning Administrator for Design Review, rather than the City's Design Review Board. We are looking for your feedback and input on that process.

The City is currently in the process of reviewing and codifying sections of the Resilient City Development Measures Ordinance. Given your experience with projects you have worked on that has utilized this section of the Code, can you let us know what you like or dislike about the process? This might include:

- The requirement for Concept Design Review with the Design Review Board
- Reduced Fees
- Review and Approval Timeline
- Review by a Single Person Body (Zoning Administrator) vs 7 Member Body (Design Review Board)

City staff is hoping to gather feedback on this process before a feedback session with the Design Review Board on July 20, which I would also encourage you to participate in.

The City is currently considering a few options:

- Three Member Committee to review these projects rather than the Zoning Administrator;
- Keeping the process as it currently works with the Zoning Administrator; or
- Removing the process entirely.

What are some of your thoughts on these options?

If you could respond by July 10th that would help me prepare for the scheduled Design Review Board meeting on July 20th.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Christian Candelaria, MUP | City Planner

Planning and Economic Development Department | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-3232 | ccandelaria@srcity.org



[\[santarosafoward.com\]](http://santarosafoward.com)

The information contained in this message and any attachment(s) may be privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise protected from disclosure and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this message and any attachment is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to this email and permanently delete the message from your computer. Nothing contained in this message and/or any attachment(s) constitutes a solicitation or an offer to buy or sell any securities.