

From: [Buckheit, Lani](#)
To: [_DRB - Design Review Board](#)
Cc: [Murray, Susie](#)
Subject: DRB - Late Correspondence Item 8.1
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:41:11 AM
Attachments: [Safe Attachments Scan In Progress.msg](#)

INFORMATION ONLY PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO ALL –

Dear Chair Jones-Carter and Members of the Design Review Board,

Please see late correspondence for item 8.1 – Brookwood Medical, including an added applicant presentation and public correspondence.

This will also be added to the agenda.

Thank you!

Lani Buckheit | Administrative Secretary

Planning & Economic Development Department | 100 Santa Rosa Ave. Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-3226 | lbuckheit@srcity.org



GEARY F. REA

October 11, 2023

To: CITY OF SANTA ROSA DESIGN REVIEW BOARD c/o Susie Murray

With apologies, I only became aware of the City's reduction/elimination of the approved parking requirements with this application for reduction in parking. The Brookwood Medical proposal... is catty corner to my building. I own 1011 2nd Street.

Approving a further reduction in parking would mean overall **100 cars**, under 'normal' 250 sq ft standards for this project, would be unaccounted for.

For my background, as a restoration and reconstruction contractor, I was very active in the preservation of Railroad Square from 1978 through the 1980's. I owned, or was in partnership, in four properties. More importantly, I was President of the Railroad Square Association and worked at great length with the City (Roy Anderson, Chuck Regalia planners, Ken Blackman, and Stan Lindsey in Finance) to both get Railroad Square approved on the National Register as an Historic District... and to form a Benefit Assessment District to create parking.

Critical to Railroad Square, the Assessment District raised the funds to lease and improve parking, including under the freeway from the then Warsen/Pearson project. Railroad Square was initially designed for horse and buggy, parking was essential for vibrancy which has prevailed.

Consistent with similar historic fabric, the neighborhood of this project currently faces parking deficiencies but has endured. Several buildings, including mine, have no parking. Our building was a 1940 warehouse relic from Rosenberg's Department Store (Barnes and Noble now). The neighborhood was neglected and marginal with sketchy potential. In taking a risk but using our experience... we did our best to make our building attractive and useful... consistent with the City's 9820 seismic code and design review.

When the State Building was built on B Street, it was built without parking. No parking was approved: employees ostensibly would buy permits to park in the parking structure across the street. However, practically overnight, the parking on 2nd Street was filled up by 8am. Four cars would pull up and park. Four people would ride in the one car to split the cost 4 ways. I went to Bill Gallaher, the then head of parking. I asked him if we could label it 4-hour parking. His response was 'we don't have 4-hour parking in the city'... but thankfully Bill saw that it could result in being far less impactful to the neighborhood occupants than 2-hour... and would, and has largely, deter out of district parkers.

Having built several medical and dental buildings, (including next door 1017 2nd for Dr. Gary Barth and the Eye Care Institute in 1990), I am highly aware of the parking ratios. Not surprisingly, even in the newest of facilities can be onerous due to hunting for spaces at say... Kaiser, or Sutter on Mark West, (as you must have experienced yourselves). Not only have medical businesses had to increase staffing due to insurance and modern protocol... but they are also on a contemporary clock to push patient turnover. Parking at 250/per is tight and shy... both for those that are getting care... and the next customers are also there with their vehicles.

Consider the impact on those of us who inhabit the neighborhood... I don't mean to be pedantic because I know you do and need to... but when our neighborhood is decidedly deficient in parking... and a facility is approved **short 100 parking spaces (!)** by current regulations... it's not a minor detail. Encouraging public transit is worthy but not at the cost of livelihood and quality planning. To not deny this reduction is to sacrifice those of us that have worked decades to improve and foster community.

The gift this project has received, as approved, was already being built with a serious deficit number of almost **50 spaces**. That's a gift that should be recognized and honored instead of using imagined data... and clearly getting substantial cost saving perks.

Thank you for your considerations.

Geary