

**Summary of Comments**  
**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #3**  
**June 14, 2006**

---

The following is a summary of the verbal comments received from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their third meeting for the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan. Prior to this meeting, TAC members received copies of the Draft Preferred Alternative package for their review. This package contained a description of the proposed development types and intensity for the identified opportunity sites, an explanation of the land use framework developed to guide future projects and an introduction to potential streetscape improvements for designated corridors and streets within the Plan Area.

At the meeting Design, Community & Environment (DC&E) gave a presentation summarizing and reviewing the material provided in the Draft Preferred Alternative package for the TAC members. After the presentation, each member was asked to provide a summary of their initial comments on the project and process. Some members also provided additional written comments, which are included.

**I. COMMENTS FROM TAC MEMBERS**

**Janet Spilman – Sonoma County Transportation Authority**

- ◆ What is the TORPA area?

**Fabian Favila – Transit Planner**

- ◆ Add the existing Urban Design Standards to the new ones being created
- ◆ Consider needs for lane widths for buses and bikes

**Bill Mastick – Design Review Board**

- ◆ Suggests overlaying the street circulation standards with the land use concept plan for the community workshop
- ◆ Design Standards should be tailored to relate to the character of each Sub-Area in the Land Use Framework.

**Patti Cisco – Planning Commission**

- ◆ How will the land use diagram be developed?
- ◆ Has a grander vision for the Sebastopol Road site, is this too restrictive?
- ◆ Should more areas be designated as mixed-use?
- ◆ Envisions retail along Sebastopol Road and Dutton with residential to the north.
- ◆ There could be issues with toxic contamination and there will be higher clean-up standards for residential development.
- ◆ Are we being boxed into something that won't happen because it is potentially too expensive?

### **Carol Dean – West End Neighborhood Association**

- ◆ On the Land Use map, St. Rose Church, New College and Kids Street Learning Center should be designated as Public/ Institutional
- ◆ Would like to see an overlay of Circulation over Land Use Framework for clarity
- ◆ The West End is suffering currently from the traffic from the widening of Highway 101.
- ◆ TAC should continue to provide valuable input from those living in the area.

### **Denise Hill – St. Rose Neighborhood Association**

- ◆ The impact of the Courthouse Square reunification to pedestrians and traffic could be significant
- ◆ There is a potential conflict between cars and pedestrians in the area
- ◆ What enhancements will make things better for pedestrians?
- ◆ There is nothing listed for 9<sup>th</sup> Street and it needs improvements between Morgan and Wilson to increase pedestrian friendliness

### **Jake Ours– Redevelopment Agency**

- ◆ There should be an opportunity site in Juilliard Park area and on the City Hall site
- ◆ Maps need to correspond to each other.
- ◆ The Circulation and Streetscapes map should include Exchange and Hinton as Enhanced Multi-Use Corridor
- ◆ The Economics analysis does not reflect what is happening – rental units do work financially
- ◆ Does not think subsidy of retail is appropriate – don't use the word subsidy

### **Dick Carlile – Santa Rosa Main Street Association**

- ◆ Need to avoid the suburban model of thinking and need to think in a more urban way
- ◆ It is not possible to have fire access mid-block downtown
- ◆ Connect Roberts Avenue under the freeway to help connect Roseland to the station and help reinstate the grid. This connection may also take pressure off of Dutton and Railroad St.
- ◆ Likes the Courthouse Square reunification assumption
- ◆ Imwalle shouldn't be called out as agriculture when it will be residential
- ◆ Pedestrians, bicyclists and cars should be equal per the General Plan
- ◆ Design Guidelines are important and new ones should build off of the existing ones
- ◆ There needs to be another meeting of the TAC

### **Andy Allen – Utilities Department**

- ◆ Map coordination to look at numbers to model for utility services
- ◆ Doesn't want St. Rose designated as Public/ Institutional – keep mixed use
- ◆ Fire needs access and easement for water at the proposed project on Donahue St. at the railway
- ◆ May need utility easements along rail corridor because it may be easier than per project

### **Jason Nutt – Public Works Department**

- ◆ It makes sense to distinguish between good pedestrian streets and those that are not.

**Lynda Angell – Historic Railroad Square Association**

- ◆ Retail should face Railroad Square
- ◆ Concerned about residential density and the impact on traffic and circulation
- ◆ Stories should be linked to height

**Clare Hartman – Community Development Department**

- ◆ The preferred alternative is too restrictive
- ◆ Likes the current density flexibility in the downtown and worries that increased prescriptiveness could stifle potential development.
- ◆ Where is the grocery store located in the Conceptual Illustrative?
- ◆ Wants to be specific about the size of the grocery store in the downtown in the Specific Plan
- ◆ The Railroad Square Sub-Area is confusing and not consistent with the zoning
- ◆ What is an activity-generating use?
- ◆ Does not favor mid-point and required mid-point does not get you diversity
- ◆ The circulation diagram should describe a north-south primary connector east of 101 and Dutton should be designated as such on the west side.
- ◆ In the land use diagram it would be nice to see the existing land uses under the proposed ones

**Nancy Adams – Public Works Department**

- ◆ Need to address pedestrians and the connectivity to the transit corridors
- ◆ Suggests looking at the MTC report on transit connectivity

**John Nemeth - SMART**

- ◆ Imagines only residential uses in the Railroad Square Sub-Area.
- ◆ Do townhomes qualify as activity-generating uses?
- ◆ Prefers measuring height in stories, rather than in feet
- ◆ A simplification of policies can be positive

**Paul Eelkema – Cultural Heritage Board**

- ◆ Appreciates the details and believes the package helps answer developers' questions about what can be done in the Plan Area.
- ◆ Olive Park is a historic district and is another way to get to Roseland
- ◆ Although the circulation system looks good on paper, it isn't clear how people will actually relate to it.
- ◆ There needs to be a clarity of purpose in the circulation system

**Chris Carrieri – Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee**

- ◆ Dutton and B Street should be designated as Primary Connector Streets
- ◆ The Railroad/ Olive Street corridor is critical and it is not currently designated as Class II or III bike paths.
- ◆ Santa Rosa Avenue is also a pivotal corridor because it crosses 1<sup>st</sup> Street
- ◆ The arts scene on A Street is worth noting
- ◆ The connection between Prince Memorial Greenway and the Joe Rodota trail should be shown

## **II. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Allen Thomas

- ◆ How are we going to achieve this vision?
- ◆ What are the priorities, key intersections or developments?
- ◆ Where do we focus our energy?

Willard Richards

- ◆ Will the package be posted on the internet?

Guy

- ◆ The Mendocino Avenue / Santa Rosa Avenue is not mentioned in the text and should be discussed as a corridor for enhancement.
- ◆ Dutton and Sebastopol is mentioned, Dutton has an LOS F during PM Peak.
- ◆ Also need to take into consideration traffic coming off of the freeway.

Duane DeWitt

- ◆ There needs to be transit connectivity for walkers, wheelers, drivers and transit users.
- ◆ The Greyhound station on Santa Rosa Avenue needs to be closer to transit.
- ◆ There are other tourist attractions to market and not just Railroad Square.

### **Summary of Comments - Ken MacNab – City of Santa Rosa**

- ◆ There haven't been issues raised regarding the proposed density, so it seems like the level is ok
- ◆ The Plan should not too prescriptive, nor should it be too vague
- ◆ Overlay the Streetscape and Corridors map on the Sub-Areas map to respond to pedestrian needs
- ◆ There needs to be consistency between maps and diagrams
- ◆ Use of the word subsidy is negative
- ◆ There is support for a Roberts Ave connection
- ◆ Dutton could be designated as a Primary Connection Street
- ◆ Imwalle land use reflects community input
- ◆ What is the best way to express height, in feet or in stories?

## **III. COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL FROM ATTENDEES AFTER MEETING**

Email #1

1) I received a call from Autumn Buss (redevelopment program specialist with City & TAC member) who had the following comments to share regarding the preferred alternative package:

a) The northwest corner of the "TORPA" opportunity site boundary needs to be adjusted to exclude the existing house located on the southeast corner of 6th Street and Pierson.

b) The comments she shared regarding the EPS memo included in the report and particular to Tax Increment did not appear to be included. Please do so.

Ken MacNab  
City of Santa Rosa

---

Email #2

**Subject:** Specific Plan Streets

Figure 2 of the recently released Preferred Alternative Package for the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan shows the Circulation and Streetscape. It could be improved. I decided to work on this diagram when I noted that West Sixth St. in the West End Neighborhood (where they do not want traffic) is designated a "Primary Collector Street" all the way to its dead end. The result of my analysis is attached. For a base map, I used Figure 3 reduced by 75%.

The orange lines mark streets that automobile drivers now use to get around town. A surprising number of them have two travel lanes in each direction, or for one way streets, two travel lanes in the direction of flow. The orange is intended to indicate efficient automobile travel routes. I think these routes need to be acknowledged in the Specific Plan because they are now important for moving traffic and are likely to continue to have that importance for some time to come. The dashed orange streets could become orange routes when Courthouse Square is reunified. (The dashed orange lines were added from memory – I could download the report from the City website but not the diagram showing the traffic flow.)

I did not in this diagram address the streetscapes for the orange routes. That important work is yet to be done.

Arrows at the edge of the diagram indicate streets and highways that move traffic well beyond the area of the diagram.

Automobile traffic efficiency is secondary on the blue streets, but they are an important part of the circulation grid. If drivers are in a hurry, perhaps they should select another route. I am not sure whether A Street and its connection to Ninth Street should be blue or orange. There will be through traffic on Wilson, but the blue color in this diagram suggests that the streetscape and ambience is more important than traffic efficiency there. The dashed blue indicates potential access to the Transit Oriented Redevelopment Project Area (TORPA).

If you approve, I would appreciate it if you could forward this to the contractors, DC&E as well as W-Trans.

Comments are solicited.

Willard Richards