

From: [Adrian Covert](#)
To: [Guerrero Auna, Beatriz](#); [SR Forward](#); [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter
Date: Friday, February 10, 2023 5:12:57 PM
Attachments: [2023.02.08_SRHE.pdf](#)

Greetings everyone,

Please see the attached letter from Santa Rosa YIMBY and Bikeable Santa Rosa. Please let me know if you will forward to the Council from here or if I should email individually.

Best,

Adrian Covert
Santa Rosa, CA



February 8, 2023

The Honorable Natalie Rogers
Mayor
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Re: Housing Element

Dear Mayor Rogers and Councilmembers,

Santa Rosa YIMBY is an all-volunteer, grassroots organization of local residents with a passion for growing Santa Rosa into the affordable, accessible, and sustainable city we all want it to be. Overall, we find much to commend about the draft Housing Element, including the focus on new development in the downtown core and the pursuit of HCD's Pro-Housing Designation. However, we also found at least three significant deficiencies we respectfully request the city change course on.

- 1. Replace the Housing Tax (program H-18).** Inclusionary zoning requires renters and buyers of market-rate housing units to subsidize below-market-rate units. In recent years, many California cities, including Santa Rosa, have adopted inclusionary zoning with the expressed intent of increasing the development of affordable housing. However, research published by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Mercatus Center at George Mason University has found that inclusionary zoning increases housing prices relative to what cities would have experienced without the policy, exactly the opposite of the intended outcome.^{1,2} Santa Rosa cannot make housing more affordable by making it more expensive. The city should repeal program H-18 and

¹ Hamilton, Emily. "Inclusionary Zoning and Housing Market Outcomes." U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Office of Policy Development and Research. *Cityscape*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2021, pp. 161–94. JSTOR, <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/cityscpe/vol23num1/article6.html>. Accessed 3 Feb. 2023.

² Hamilton, Emily. "Inclusionary Zoning Hurts More than It Helps." Urban Economics, Policy Briefs. Mercatus Center, George Mason University. 23 September 2019. Accessed 3 Feb 2023. <https://www.mercatus.org/research/policy-briefs/inclusionary-zoning-hurts-more-it-helps>

focus on policies to increase overall housing production, including developing a new revenue stream—possibly via bond measure—to subsidize below-market rate units.

- 2. Eliminate car parking minimum requirements.** Minimum car parking requirements increase housing costs, increase car-dependency, violate the city's climate and Vision Zero goals, and are a relic of failed middle-20th century planning ideas. Santa Rosa already acknowledged the negative effects of car parking minimums when it abolished them in the Downtown Station Area. On January 1st this year, the benefits of no-car-parking-minimums were extended by AB 2097 to a half-mile radius of each SMART station. Santa Rosa should join cities like Sacramento, San Jose, Berkeley, and extend the benefits of this policy city-wide.
- 3. Increase bike parking and establish e-bike parking minimum requirements for new multi-family developments.** E-Bikes have emerged in recent years as an affordable, enjoyable, and sustainable alternative to most car-trips within the city. Enhanced bike infrastructure was also routinely ranked as a high priority for residents in the city's community engagement for the General Plan and Housing Element update. While we strongly encourage the city to ensure the General Plan's Circulation Element includes specific goals and locations for Class IV protected bike lanes, the Housing Element has a role to play as well. The Housing Element currently includes standards for providing bike parking at certain types of housing developments (Table 6-5, Page 6-11). However, these standards need to be increased to specify at least a 1:1 bike parking to dwelling unit ratio, and additional standards are needed to ensure households in multi-family dwellings can use e-bikes, which have unique security and electricity needs. City staff should work with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board to develop and include E-Bike parking standards and requirements for new multi-family dwellings.
- 4. Strengthen the Prohousing Designation Application.** The City Council recently approved a staff recommendation to pursue a Prohousing Designation by HCD. We are strongly in favor of this step and requested as much in our Housing Element letter dated July 3, 2022. However, because the Designation is awarded on a point scale, and because some state funding sources incentivize higher Prohousing Designations scores (like the newly launched Prohousing Incentive Pilot Program) it's critical that Santa Rosa achieve as many points as possible in the Prohousing Designation program to remain competitive for limited state dollars. We respectfully request that the Council provide ample support to the Planning Department staff by committing to clear, specific goals

and deadlines for each prohousing policy. This is essential in order to maintain the prohousing designation, as maintaining the designation is contingent on the successful implementation of these policies.

Going forward with the remaining Elements of the General Plan, we encourage the City Council and Planning Department to fully utilize the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board to develop policies for meeting the mobility needs of current and future residents, and to better integrate the city's housing, climate, and Vision Zero goals.

Thank you for your leadership and for considering our views.

Sincerely,



Adrian Covert
Local Lead
Santa Rosa YIMBY



Lauren Fuhry
Local Lead
Santa Rosa YIMBY

From: [Sonia Taylor](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [Hartman, Clare](#); [Lyle, Amy](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 16.1; Santa Rosa Housing Element
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 2:12:40 PM
Attachments: [2_13_23_srcc_housing_element_ltr_final_1.pdf](#)

Mayor Rogers, and Members of the City Council:

Attached please find my letter regarding Santa Rosa's Housing Element. Actually, to be honest, it's more about housing development in general, although was triggered by the Housing Element.

I urge you to adopt Santa Rosa's Housing Element tomorrow night.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sonia

Sonia Taylor



Sonia E. Taylor



13 February 2023

Mayor Natalie Rogers
Vice Mayor Dianna MacDonald
Eddie Alvarez
Victoria Fleming
Jeff Okrepkie
Chris Rogers
Mark Stapp

Via email

Re: Item 16.1, February 14th City Council Agenda
General Plan Amendment/Housing Element Update

Dear Mayor Rogers, and Members of the City Council:

I support and encourage you to adopt the Addendum to the 2035 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, as well as adopt the General Plan Amendment to update the General Plan Housing Element for the period from 2023-2031.

While I wish Santa Rosa had adopted their Housing Element for this period prior to the State's deadline, I believe that there is no question about Santa Rosa's substantial compliance with State Housing Element law.

There are two comments I want to make regarding housing in general, based on my review and earlier comments to staff regarding Santa Rosa's Housing Element – these are not comments that should alter the Housing Element in any way. Instead, the below comments instead are a reflection of two of my concerns about housing development as we move forward.

1. Service/Impact Fees

Program H-20 states that: “[C]onsider development fee exemption for projects that are 100 percent affordable to encourage affordable housing...”

Further, Policy H-5.2: states: “Periodically review the City's regulations, ordinances, and development fees/exactions to ensure they do not unduly constrain the production, maintenance, and improvement of housing.”

While I am not necessarily opposed to Program H-20, above, as you all know, it is a common complaint that both impact fees and development fees are “too high,” and should be reduced or waived entirely.

I want all of you to be absolutely clear no jurisdiction can ever charge more than 100% of what an impact or service costs. Nexus studies are periodically conducted and evaluate both the actual cost of impacts and services to establish that 100% recovery amount, and also evaluate the feasibility of charging those costs.

In other words, first the nexus study will tell you how much it costs for the City to provide impacts such as parks, water, wastewater and capital facilities (such as fire stations), and how much it costs to pay our City employees for specific tasks and types of development.

Then, second, the nexus study will evaluate the feasibility of charging 100% of those fees, because 100% cost recovery is, of course, the most fiscally superior alternative.

To the best of my knowledge, however, no jurisdiction charges 100% of either impact or development fees, largely because that would unduly burden development, and make the jurisdiction unattractive to developers.

As Santa Rosa's 2023 Fee Schedule states:

The purpose of these fees is to pay for the installation of public utilities and service facilities needed to serve the property being developed, to collect charges for the use of certain facilities from those benefitting by those services and to help pay the costs borne by the City in providing preconstruction, construction, inspection and public safety services.

The bottom line is that all fees not collected by the City from any development must still be paid, and are therefore paid by all the other existing residents of Santa Rosa, including our residents who qualify for legally affordable housing.

Therefore, while I am not necessarily opposed to a discussion about fee reductions or even fee waivers, I must demand that there is an adequate community benefit to even consider said fee reductions/waivers, since the fees still must be paid, including by some of Santa Rosa's poorest residents. Consideration of fee reductions or waivers for a housing development that consists of all legally affordable housing deed restricted for at least 55 years for low, very low and/or extremely low income individuals/families is worthy, in my opinion. However, I don't believe that either moderate income or market rate housing developments generally should receive fee waivers/reductions on the backs of our poorest residents, unless there is an extremely strong community benefit such as being in downtown.

2. Joint Powers Authorities

Program H-19 discusses partnering with a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to purchase existing market rate apartments for conversion to legally affordable housing and/or construct new deed restricted legally affordable housing.

I'm not opposed to this idea in theory, but not all Joint Powers Authorities are the same. There are, in fact, several Joint Powers Authorities who I have grave concerns about, including the California Community Housing Agency (hereinafter CalCHA).

If, however, the local Renewal Enterprise District were to form a JPA for these purposes where the members/vendors weren't out to get rich and instead really wanted to do good things in the community, and where the JPA was locally accountable, I'd be very interested in this concept.

For your reference, below, are some of the reasons I have grave concerns about at least some existing JPAs who exist for these alleged purposes.

CalCHA purchased the Annadal Apartments in Santa Rosa, and to the best of my knowledge that has turned out poorly for both CalCHA and for the City of Santa Rosa, and hasn't helped either the residents of that complex or those needing legally affordable housing.

First, that complex no longer pays property taxes and school bonds, at a significant cost to Santa Rosa, which could be acceptable if they provided any community benefit, which I do not believe they do. Second, they use California Tax Credit income limits for affordability determination, instead of HUD limits, which means that the incomes for the alleged moderate income units are higher than HUD limits. Third, they can charge up to 40% of income for rent, instead of the standard 30%, which would -- if they were charging those allowed rents -- cause people living at the complex to be rent burdened. Fourth, I do not believe that CalCHA has ever been able to make money with this complex, since the market won't allow them to charge the rents they thought they'd get.

See <https://www.apartments.com/annadel-santa-rosa-ca/5vzm0bq/> and scroll down to see the rents they're charging, and the income limits for residents. As an example, they have income limits for 2 people of \$139,650/year. At 30% of that income, they could charge \$3491.25/month for a 1 bedroom apartment. At 40% of that income (which their contract allows them to charge), they could charge \$4655/month for a 1 bedroom apartment. However, you can see that the maximum rents for 1 bedroom apartments are \$2331/month. Basically, they're "losing money" on this complex every single month because the market won't let them charge what they "could" make.

The Press Democrat did an article about CalCHA – see <https://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/news/central-valley-government-agency-jumps-into-sonoma-county-housing-market/>

Forbes also did an article about CalCHA – see <https://www.forbes.com/sites/schifrin/2021/12/02/california-scheming-municipal-bonds-workforce-housing-crisis-luxury-apartments/?sh=3862aefc3001>

Another JPA that I also have significant concerns about is the California Statewide Communities Development Authority (hereinafter CSCDA). I do not have nearly as much information/experience with CSCDA as I do with CalCHA, but they are mentioned (and not in a great light) in the Forbes article, link above, and in other less than favorable ways elsewhere. See <https://www.fullertonsfuture.org/2021/housing-scam-averted/> and <https://milpitasbeat.com/the-trouble-with-turing-milpitas-new-middle-income-housing-deal/>. This causes me to have equally grave concerns about CSCDA as a possible JPA the City could become involved with.

Remember, all properties purchased/built by these types of JPAs will pay no property taxes. This would be acceptable, if the community benefit they offer is adequate to compensate for the jurisdictional loss of property taxes, including school bonds. However, in my opinion, based on what I've seen so far,

these types of deals do NOT provide an adequate community benefit, although they certainly appear to enrich those behind the JPAs.

Briefly, my problems with these JPAs include that instead of using HUD affordability income levels, these types of deals use the California Tax Credit affordability income levels, which are higher than HUD levels, meaning that people end up paying more in rents. Further, federal, state and local guidelines state that no one in a legally affordable unit should be paying more than 30% of their income for rent/utilities, but both of these JPAs appear to be requiring that their tenants set aside between 35% to 40% of their income for rent. Additionally, oftentimes the alleged affordability levels of these deals, in combination with the higher rents that can be charged and greater percentage of income required for rents, means that the units are actually more expensive than market rate units, rendering them useless in helping to solve the affordability crisis.

I won't belabor this point in this letter, but I will go on record as strenuously opposing Santa Rosa's involvement in any JPA like this, with these types of terms/conditions and the negative results that flow therefrom.

I do hope that our local Renewal Enterprise District instead decides to form a JPA to perform these tasks/services, and will be watching closely.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Of course, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Very truly yours

Sonia E. Taylor

Cc: Clare Hartman
Amy Lyle

From: [andrew rich](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing element comment
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 8:54:56 AM

Santa Rosa needs to remove its inclusionary housing requirements. These requirements simply drive up costs rather than their intended goal.

The city needs to remove parking minimums for all of Santa Rosa.

The city needs to provide safe biking infrastructure. In the housing element there needs to be increased bike parking and bike infrastructure. The Transportation and Circulation Element of the general plan should emphasize bike use and infrastructure.

From: Samantha Feld [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 8:57 AM
To: SR Forward <srforward@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing Element Comments for 2-14-23

Dear City Council members,

As a resident of downtown Santa Rosa, I deeply hope you will address needed improvements to the Housing Element plan before adopting it. I'd like to raise three gaps that need to be addressed:

- Santa Rosa needs to build more homes to keep housing affordable. We need to shift away from the use of inclusionary housing requirements to provide affordable housing. Research shows "inclusionary" requirements perversely discourage new housing production by driving up costs. The City should instead focus on strategies that work.
- Santa Rosa needs to reduce car-dependency to meet climate and safety goals. City-mandated parking-minimums typically result in surplus parking that makes housing more expensive and conflicts with the city's climate and pedestrian safety goals. The city has already eliminated minimum parking requirements downtown. We recommend the city eliminate minimum parking requirements city-wide.
- Santa Rosa needs safe bike infrastructure to save lives and meet climate goals. We need to increase bike parking and e-bike infrastructure in the draft Housing Element. We're also using this opportunity to call attention to the unpublished Transportation & Circulation Element of the General Plan, which will be a crucial piece of supporting higher density in Santa Rosa without leading to increased car traffic, GHG emissions, and worsened air quality.

Thank you for your consideration and commitment to making Santa Rosa a healthier, more vibrant community for ALL.

Samantha Feld

From: Sandy Litzie [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 11:18 AM
To: SR Forward <srforward@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing Element Comment

Please include my comments in the public hearing process for the proposed Housing Element.

Thank you,

Sandy Litzie
13-year Santa Rosa resident

1. The draft document indicates there are adequate potable water sources for the proposed increased housing. The capacities of the Russian River and Lake Sonoma are cited as evidence supporting that conclusion. However, the capacities of these water sources are irrelevant; what is relevant is the amount of water realistically predicted to be available over the build-out period. For example, the Sonoma Water website indicates a ten-year average volume of approximately 65% to 90% of capacity for the lake (depending upon the month). In 2022, the volume ranged from approximately 45% to 60% of capacity, with a low of approximately 40% immediately prior to the recent heavy rains. Experts in the field caution that current drought conditions could continue indefinitely and perhaps worsen. Assessment of water availability for future development should take these factors into consideration, and not rely on full capacity that has historically been rarely achieved, and predicted to be rarely if ever achieved in the foreseeable future.

2. The draft document includes existing parking standards determined to be "sufficient but not excessive." Disregarding that determination, the document indicates the possibility of a new standard that could eliminate all parking space requirements. No reference citations or analyses are included to support the prudence of this potential standard. Imploring or expecting residents to use public transportation instead of their cars has been a marginally successful approach in the past, and no evidence is provided to demonstrate it will be more successful in the future. Current local mass transit systems are not convenient, nor adequate to meet the needs of thousands of new residents. The result will be cars parking haphazardly, illegally, and inconveniently for neighborhoods. Businesses will suffer as residents (vs. customers) fill parking spaces in commercial lots. Calls for enforcement will significantly increase, straining public safety resources. Parking-spot allocations should be based on analysis of actual human behavior rather than hopeful expectations.

From: [City Council Public Comments](#)
To: [Bolla, Rhonda](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] city council meeting Feb 14
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 5:13:49 PM

From: Whigham, Cliff <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 12:26 PM
To: Lyle, Amy <ALyle@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] city council meeting Feb 14

February 13, 2023

Santa Rosa City Council,

The Roberts District as described in the Housing Element Plan as a zoning of 6.0 FAR will not produce housing in the next 8 years or in the foreseeable future.

The creation of the new Roberts District as part of the DSASP has created an impediment to development of all types of housing both market rate and affordable housing in the Roberts District. The zoning of a 6.0 FAR density has created a constraint to development due to the high construction cost of high-density housing. page 71 figure 4-1 of the Housing Element Plan that describes the borders of Downtown Station Area and Southwest Area. It plainly shows that the Roberts District is in the Southwest Area and not in Railroad Square. The Roberts District is separated from Railroad Square by an elevated, solid earth 4 lane highway (HWY12) and is adjacent to and across a two-lane street from the Roseland district, an area that is in extreme need of affordable housing. The Roberts district was created from the Gateway Properties (10 acres) and adding the Lola's markets property (2.75 acres) and the properties between Rotada Trail and Hwy 12 (3 acres). The Gateway Properties, if developed at the previous zoning of TV-R 25-40 would produce 400+ housing units of all types (affordable, work force and market rate housing). This is what the property owners were expecting to happen since the formation of the Gateway Coalition in August 2016.

All the properties in the Roberts District are old light industrial properties that were rezoned to TV-R 25-40 units per acre in 2006. The property owners secured an EPA grant for the environmental assessments in 2018 with the assessments being completed in November 2020. There were several developers, both market rate and affordable, interested in developing the properties once there were environmental assessments in place.

The city increased the zoning to 6.0 FAR in January 2021 just three months after the completion of the environmental assessments. Since the zoning has been increased all interested developers have taken the position that rental rates in the area do not justify the development and construction cost of the higher density. This has been suggested will not change as rental rates increase over time, as the cost of development and construction will also increase.

Thank You,

Cliff Whigham

***Wire Fraud is Real*. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions.** Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

From: [Bolla Rhonda](#)
To: [Bolla Rhonda](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: FYI Santa Rosa Housing Element News / Noticias sobre el Elemento de Vivienda de Santa Rosa
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 5:07:47 PM

From: Patricia de Guzman [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 11:58 AM
To: SR Forward <srforward@srcity.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: FYI Santa Rosa Housing Element News / Noticias sobre el Elemento de Vivienda de Santa Rosa

Dear Amy / City of Santa Rosa,

I am providing comments regarding the recently circulated Housing Element draft as the trustee/owner of a Santa Rosa property in Montgomery Village. This is the first time that I'm providing comments for something like this and have no precedent nor context for what is required in terms of form or substance. So I hope all is in order for you to accept the following comments/suggestions:

1. First of all, I just wanted to say that it would've been helpful to have been given more time to review the circulated documents. The City's email was sent on Feb. 7 which provided only one already otherwise busy weekend for property owners who are busy with work and personal obligations during the week.

Given the short timeframe allowed for comments and without the opportunity to have a meaningful review of the documents, I can only provide generalized comments.

2. Given the housing shortage in the city and in general, it would be helpful for homeowners to have the ability to readily comply with requirements to, for example, have a JADU esp. since these additional units would not need additional investment on land to build them on, as they would generally already be on occupied land. Some suggestions include the following:

a. It would be helpful to have less prohibitive permit fee amounts for JADUs/ADUs compared to a demolition permit fee. I'm not sure what additional labor or manpower is necessary for issuing a building vs. a demolition permit that would require a cost that is ~20 times more. Currently, a demolition permit costs a lot less than a JADU permit which would naturally favor demolition rather than the progressive approach of building and seems contrary to a realistic attempt to solve the housing shortage problem.

b. If building permits need to truly cost more, it would be helpful for the city to offer grants to offset permit costs and perhaps even building or compliance costs, since homeowners would essentially be "partnering" with the city in helping alleviate the housing shortage.

c. It would also be helpful to have less burdensome requirements to have a JADU/ADU, so homeowners can readily comply. To have a meaningful impact in alleviating the housing shortage, compliance should be favored over non-compliance. Compliance that requires costly architectural and building work would naturally deter homeowners from creating additional housing units on their existing lots that would otherwise count towards the City's housing supply stock.

d. For the newer "green" or eco-friendly requirements, it would be helpful to give homeowners (esp. of properties that are a little older and who may otherwise already have a compliant JADU, etc.) more time to comply with these newer requirements (e.g., within a span of a year or so from fulfilling other compliance requirements or completing an otherwise compliant structure). Again, homeowner grants would also be helpful here.

e. It would also be useful for homeowners to have resources (perhaps including even dedicated staff) from the city to help guide them in layman's terms through the process of building/converting existing space into a JADU, ADU, etc.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration of the above.

Respectfully,
Patricia de Guzman

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

From: The City of Santa Rosa <srcity.org@service.govdelivery.com>
Date: February 7, 2023 at 5:05:48 PM PST
Subject: Santa Rosa Housing Element News / Noticias sobre el Elemento de Vivienda de Santa Rosa
Reply-To: srcity.org@service.govdelivery.com

[Redacted]

[\[Español abajo\]](#)

Dear community and organizations,

We'd like to provide an update related to the SR Forward project and the Housing Element. On Tuesday evening, Feb 14th the City Council will hold a public hearing to consider adoption of the Housing Element. Once adopted the Housing Element will be submitted to the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for potential certification. Agenda information will be posted at least 72 hours in advance here: <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. Please visit our [dedicated page](#) for the following information, and more.

- The current [draft Housing Element](#).
- An [annotated version of the revised HCD Housing Element draft](#). All revisions are shown in tracked changes and revisions addressing HCD's formal comments are highlighted in yellow with references to the revisions of HCD's November 1st 2022 letter.
- A [matrix](#) of HCD's November 2022 comments with the page numbers where the comments were addressed.
- [Housing Element Summary](#).

This will be a public hearing and we welcome you to provide comments either at the meeting or in writing beforehand. If you'd like to provide written comments please email them to Amy Lyle at srforward@srcity.org. Please send them by noon on Monday the 13th if you'd like them distributed to the Council prior to the meeting.

To join the meeting on February 14th, you can do it in person or virtually:

- In person. You can attend the City Council meeting at City Council Chambers. (Address: 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95404)
- Online. There are different options, based on your preference:
 1. **Zoom:** Access through this link: <HTTPS://SRCITY-ORG.ZOOM.US/J/86876779687> or by dialing 877-853-5257 on your phone entering the webinar ID: 868 7677 9687 (This would be the only way to participate with live comments during the meeting and to get real time translation into Spanish)
 2. **YouTube** (Click the link)
 3. **Facebook** (Click the link)
 4. **TV.** On Channel 28 for Comcast and Channel 99 for AT&T
 5. **City's legislative meeting portal.** (Click the link)

If you need additional guidance to provide comments during the meeting, follow the steps on this

link: <https://www.srcity.org/3360/How-to-Provide-Public-Comment>

We appreciate the comments that we have received and staff will do their best effort to incorporate them on our Housing Element before submitting to HCD.

Thank you for collaborating with us,

Santa Rosa Forward team

Estimada comunidad y organizaciones,

Nos gustaría proporcionar una actualización relacionada con el proyecto SR Forward y el elemento de vivienda. El martes 14 de febrero por la noche, el Concejo Municipal llevará a cabo una audiencia pública para considerar la adopción del Elemento de Vivienda. Una vez adoptado, el elemento de vivienda se enviará al Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario (HCD) del Estado para su posible certificación. La información de la agenda se publicará con al menos 72 horas de anticipación aquí: <https://santa-rosa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. Visite nuestra [página dedicada](#) para obtener la siguiente información y más.

- El actual [proyecto de Elemento Vivienda](#).
- [Una versión comentada del borrador revisado del elemento de vivienda HCD](#). Todas las revisiones se muestran en cambios registrados y las revisiones que abordan los comentarios formales de HCD se resaltan en amarillo con referencias a las revisiones de la carta de HCD del 1 de noviembre de 2022.
- Una [matriz](#) de los comentarios de HCD de noviembre de 2022 con los números de página donde se abordaron los comentarios.
- [Resumen del elemento de vivienda](#).

Esta será una audiencia pública y le invitamos a que proporcione comentarios ya sea en la reunión o por escrito con anticipación. Si desea proporcionar comentarios por escrito, envíelos por correo electrónico a Amy Lyle a srforward@srcity.org. Envíelos antes del mediodía del lunes 13 si desea que se distribuyan al Consejo antes de la reunión.

Para unirse a la reunión del 14 de febrero, puede hacerlo de manera presencial o virtual:

- En persona Puede asistir a la reunión del Concejo Municipal en las Cámaras del Concejo Municipal. (Dirección: 100 Avenida Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa, CA 95404)
- En línea. Hay diferentes opciones, según su preferencia:
 1. **Zoom**: Acceda a través de este enlace: <HTTPS://SRCITY-ORG.ZOOM.US/J/86876779687> o marcando en su teléfono al 877-853-5257 e ingresando el ID: 868 7677 9687 (Es la única forma de participar con comentarios en vivo durante la reunión y para obtener traducción en tiempo real a español)
 2. **YouTube** (haga clic en el enlace)
 3. **Facebook** (haga clic en el enlace)
 4. **TV**. En el Canal 28 para Comcast y el Canal 99 para AT&T
 5. **Portal de reuniones legislativas de la ciudad**. (Haga clic en el enlace)

Si necesita orientación adicional para proporcionar comentarios durante la reunión, siga los pasos en este enlace: <https://www.srcity.org/3360/How-to-Provide-Public-Comment>

Agradecemos los comentarios que hemos recibido y el personal hará todo lo posible para incorporarlos en nuestro Elemento de Vivienda antes de enviarlos a HCD.

Gracias por colaborar con nosotros,

Equipo Santa Rosa Avanza

stop subscriptions at any time on your [Subscriber Preferences Page](#). You will need to use your e-mail address to log in. If you have questions or problems with the subscription service, please contact [subscriberhelp.govdelivery.com](#).

This email was sent to sequoia@webtv.net using GovDelivery Communications Cloud on behalf of: The City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave Santa Rosa, CA 95404 707-543-3000

|

└───┘

From: [Michael Lipelt](#)
To: [City Council Public Comments](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Housing Element linked to bike/ped infrastructure investment/ Item 16.1
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:11:32 PM

Honorable Santa Rosa Council Members and Staff

I am Michael Lipelt, 4th district in Santa Rosa.

I wish to comment on the Housing Element Update 2023-2033. Item: 16.1.

Affordable Housing needs to be looked at from a holistic/systems model. In order to have affordable housing we need to build out more housing units.

Eliminating minimum parking requirements city-wide allows for more available land for housing and thus drives down the cost of development while reducing more vehicles in the city core.

With affordable housing we need affordable, safe, reliable transport around the city. Investing in safe, protected bike/ped networks to get folks to work and around town is essential to reduce car dependency and to meet our climate and safety goals.

Likewise each urban dense housing element needs to have a community park within a 10-15 minute walk.

Planting native trees to provide shade and beauty to our housing developments and along our bike/ped networks will also capture carbon and release clean air to breathe.

We need to use more permeable ground covering materials in our housing elements to allow water to sink down into the aquifers and not run off into storm drains.

Thank you for your visionary work to create a Santa Rosa designed more for people than for cars.

With gratitude,
Michael Lipelt