

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** JUDITH IAM <brightlightbeing@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 1:16 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Subject:** Woodmark

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Montes,

Yesterday, because of traffic, it took me nearly 15 minutes to drive from where I live (Luther Burbank Heights) to the Sebastopol Grange. That's 1.5 miles.

With proposed Woodmark development and 164 or so additional cars across the way, this time is likely to double.

Affordable housing is needed but this is the wrong place.  
The current community must be considered and consulted.  
Please keep us informed of meetings, etc.

Thank you, Judith lam

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** Katie Sanderson <kcvwbuggie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 2:30 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Cc:** Tiffany Lucas  
**Subject:** Re: Courtesy Notice Regarding Preliminary Review at 7716/7760 Bodega Ave (Woodmark Apartments)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To: Design Review Board, City of Sebastopol  
From: Katie Sanderson, 7720 Bodega Ave.#12, Sebastopol  
Subject: Woodmark Site Design

Significant Concern: TRAFFIC

- Bodega Avenue already has daily traffic back ups, with cars that are traveling east into town backed up as far as Robinson Avenue. This congestion forces motorists to use auxiliary neighborhood streets endangering residents especially children and seniors (Burbank Heights).

- Woodmark's plan of 84 units for low income families would add at least 162 cars needing to enter & exit going to work, child care, shopping, etc. multiple times a day. The impact of auto emissions to the surrounding environment, and City as a whole, will be increased health and ecological hazards.

- Traffic Study for proposal: During the public comments, for the last Woodmark meeting on December 18,2019, I questioned who would be responsible for an in depth traffic study. The response was that the developers would do the study followed by a City review. The reason, for this backward sequence, was given as the City does not currently employ a traffic expert. (With Sebastopol's increasing periods of gridlock traffic, a major concern to residents, this seems negligent to me and needs to be addressed.) For the massive traffic impact of the Woodmark proposal, over 162 cars, it is imperative that the City do the INITIAL study for a truly in depth review . I believe that Woodmark should pay the cost of the City hiring the very best firm to do this work. Woodmark should not do the initial study.

From the beginning the City has noted that these parcels of land are zoned for development. In addition, the City is under mandate to increase Affordable Housing.

The population that Woodmark's proposal targets is low income. This is in order, as they explained in previous meetings, to access State and Federal funding for their development. This of course would supplement their outlay and increase their profits.

I submit that the City reject the Woodmark application and look to future applicants who are knowledgeable and sensitive to the environment and needs of our City.

Sincerely,  
Katie Sanderson  
[Kcvwbuggie@gmail.com](mailto:Kcvwbuggie@gmail.com)

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 15, 2020, at 5:12 PM, Alan Montes <[Amontes@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:Amontes@cityofsebastopol.org)> wrote:

Hi,

I am contacting you on behalf of the City of Sebastopol's Planning Department, as you have previously expressed interest regarding the preliminary project at 7716/7760 Bodega Ave (Woodmark Apartments).

This email is to inform you that this item is returning to the Design Review Board on October 21, 2020 for a second Preliminary Review. Preliminary Review is meant to provide an informal critique and evaluation of a project's design approach. The Board will identify relevant issues and significant concerns and provide comments on the appropriateness of the preliminary design and its compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and the Design Review Guidelines. No actions are taken with a Preliminary Review

This meeting will be held over ZOOM which can be accessed through the internet or phone call. If you would like to attend the meeting please see the information below:

Meeting Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 at 4:00PM  
Internet Login: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83368934313>  
Phone Login: [+1 669 900 6833](tel:+16699006833)  
Meeting ID: [833 6893 4313](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83368934313)

The plans are available on the City Website for review at the following link:  
<https://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/Meeting-Event/Design-Review-Board/2020/Design-Review-Board-Meeting-of-October-21,-2020>

Should you have any questions about the project please don't hesitate to ask me. Additionally, if you have any comments that you want to provide to the Design Review Board please email them to me and I will make sure they are forwarded to the Design Review Board.

Lastly, I hope everyone is staying safe any healthy during these times.

Sincerely,

Alan Montes  
Associate Planner  
City of Sebastopol | Planning Department  
7120 Bodega Avenue | Sebastopol, CA 95472

(707) 823-6167 phone

[www.cityofsebastopol.org](http://www.cityofsebastopol.org)

<image001.jpg>

City offices are currently closed to the public due to the active shelter in place orders.

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** Danielle Shapona <danielleshapona@att.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 5:39 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Subject:** Bodega Project\Planning Meeting

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Alan,

I live at 7720 Bodega Ave. and I am concerned about the Woodmark Building Plan. Given how very congested Bodega Ave is in the present time regarding the amount of traffic, I am concerned about how very congested it will be by putting 84 Units which could add possibly 168 cars to compete getting out of the complex even with a traffic light. When we had to Evacuate last year due to possible Fire danger it looked like a parking lot of cars on Bodega Avenue. To me this is a Moral issue regarding the Quality of Human Life. Fires are not going away anytime soon, and I have a concern that putting 84 Units in a very small space would be Jeopardizing our Lives. A sensible plan would be possibly 25 Units not 84. You could be trading one problem for another, my question is... is it worth it?

Thank you for all your hard work in the decision making process, and I hope that I can appeal to your sense of Logic.

Kindly,  
Danielle

Sent from my iPad

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** patty hiller <pattyhiller@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 6:47 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Subject:** Bodega Ave project

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Alan,

I live at Burbank Heights and well remember all the trouble I had getting out during the evacuation a couple years ago. Do we really want to add that many more cars to our neighborhood traffic which is pretty unbearable much of the time?

Just saying.....

All best,  
Patty Hiller

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** Janis Dolnick <jdolnick@sonic.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 17, 2020 2:36 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Subject:** My Comments on the Bodega Ave. Woodmark Development Project

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Montes and the Sebastopol Design Review Board:

I am writing prior to the Zoom meeting of October 21 with the following issues regarding the Woodmark Apartments Development proposed for Bodega Avenue, immediately next to and west of the HOA in which I live.

I spoke with and have written to Mr. Montes about my strong objections regarding *this* development in *this* location. I have gone back and reviewed the December 18, 2019 minutes which contain the articulate, incisive questions and comments by both the Board and the public, as well as the entirely substandard responses by the architect and developer.

After using a magnifying glass to look at pages A1.1-A1.6, I am even more resolute in my opposition to this project. Here are some of my main points of opposition, most of which will be echoed, I am sure, by others who will be impacted:

1. There is only one entrance to this 84-unit complex. It is immediately adjacent to and east of the only entrance to my 27-unit HOA complex. Given the past 3 years of fires and one evacuation in 2019, **this arrangement is inadequate and dangerous.** Given the certainty of future fires and possible evacuations, it would put all those living within both of the complexes **at risk** due to the density of the proposed development and the number of cars for which they are making space.
2. Bodega Avenue is already congested under normal circumstances and will get worse even without the proposed development. I stay off of it when going east. It will be nearly impossible to get into or out of our HOA with this monstrosity next door. The highly inaccurate and distorted statistics provided at the 2019 meeting(s) significantly under-anticipate the impact of the added *minimum* of 152 cars. Although there are 84 units, Page A1.1 indicates that there will be "152 total spaces" provided. I will assume that each unit will have more than 1 car. Where will those extra cars park? But let's just go with 152. **This is completely untenable.** My 27-unit complex has 27 garages and 27 outside parking spaces, one per unit.

If there is any traffic study to be done it must NOT be done by anyone the developer chooses. But it must be paid for by them. Do I sound cynical? Maybe, but I am open-eyed to what the bias and distortion will be. An **independent entity** must be chosen **by the City** to monitor traffic going in *both* directions at peak times a) during the weekends *in the summer* (especially between 10 and 1, and again between 3 and 6) and b) during peak weekday hours (which, due to Covid, will distort the pre-Covid patterns we all know) of people going to and returning from work - NOT in the middle of a weekday, at dawn, or at 8 pm.

My experience, and that of my neighbors, is that when one stream of traffic in one direction abates, the stream of traffic coming from the other direction is already coming to Robinson Road and our property's exit directly opposite on the north, preventing departure/exiting for often several minutes waiting for a break in both directions of traffic.

Those extra 150 cars will congest the rest of Sebastopol, not just Bodega Ave.

3. I have looked at the amount of pavement and concrete being laid down, which, according to Page A1.1 is 46% of the development. Add to that the rain-runoff from rooftops - another 23%, as per the building footprints. In other words, where there had been permeable land absorbing the rainwater, **69% will be covered with asphalt, concrete and building/roofing runoff.**
4. I know that at those long-ago meetings, someone referenced the acreage of this project in relationship to its density (a *minimum* of 216 people as per the “unit mix summaries” of Phases I and II, if only 1, 2 or 3 people occupy 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom apartments respectively). Please revisit and compare the density and acreage of the proposed outsized monstrosity with a) the density and acreage of the Bears Meadow Hand b) the acreage and density of Burbank Heights. This development would be better suited elsewhere.
5. The renderings that look like photos on Page A1.6 are what people might now call “Deep Fakes.” They are highly deceptive and idealized images of what this development *might* look like 15-30 years from now with mature landscaping. A1.7 manages to keep out of the image our HOA immediately to the right/east of the Woodmark apartments.

What will actually occur will be more years than I want to imagine of major development going on next door, decimating the orchard and, as I recall, trying to flatten a hillside.

6. About the trees: the grading to make flat and pave a sloped hillside would - as the city arborist noted and if my memory is accurate – harm the roots of neighboring oak trees, killing them. This flies in the face of what we know about needing our trees, not just for their aesthetics but for their absorption of carbon, more important than ever. Unless a tree is sick, it should not be removed.
7. I believe there was some question about the funding of this project, and the developers receiving funding dedicated to farmworker housing. Again, as memory serves, it seemed like this was a somewhat deceptive and sketchy way to get funding for their project by dipping into a fund for farmworker housing and plopping it directly into a town where farmworkers, if they actually were able to afford to live in this project, would be commuting extensively to get to the areas where they would work. See item #2 and also dive deep into what may be deceptive shenanigans. There are so many low-income people who need affordable housing. The financing is driving the “farmworker-only” project. What is the math for “affordable” housing in this project? What does an average farmworker make? What will be the rent on these apartments?

In addition, we have learned of the vulnerability of our Latinx neighbors to Covid, in part because low wage employment requires densely packed apartments and houses to afford shelter. Again, what is the math regarding tenants to units?

8. And last but certainly not least: has there been any assessment on the impact to the buildings in my HOA directly on the east side of the boundary to this projected development? I live at the east end of a 5-unit building whose west end is just feet from the fenceline of what is now orchard. How will my building be impacted? How will the building that run parallel along the fenceline (9 units) be impacted?

I have a neighbor whose words a year ago still resonate, and I paraphrase: **this project is all about profit, not human concern.**

I have no doubt that the property next to our HOA will be developed, much as I would like it to stay undeveloped. Given that, if a development will be built on this property, **consider a much smaller footprint**, similar to Bears Meadow. Perhaps 25-30 units, taking into account the slope of the site, preserving neighboring trees and as many on-site trees as possible, and with much more open space and less asphalt. This project deserves more land on which to build. Not this parcel. Not here.



I appreciate the sober attention that was and will be given by the Board. I remember being so impressed by the Board's values being articulated vis-à-vis ecosystem preservation, the size and demographics of Sebastopol, and traffic infrastructure impacts if this project were to be approved.

**\*Do not approve it\***

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Dolnick  
7720-14 Bodega Ave.  
jdolnick@sonic.net

## Alan Montes

---

**From:** Tamaki Kimbro <tamakiann03@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 18, 2020 6:16 PM  
**To:** Alan Montes  
**Subject:** Re: Courtesy Notice Regarding Preliminary Review at 7716/7760 Bodega Ave (Woodmark Apartments)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr Montes,

Thank you for your notification. I plan to attend the city planning meeting on October 21st and I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns via email. I live at 7606 Washington Ave and my property abuts the back northeast section of the parcel for the proposed Woodmark Apartments. I have reviewed the revised plans submitted by Pacific West and still have many significant objections.

My primary concern is that these large scale apartments will really decrease the appeal of our quaint neighborhood. They will definitely impact the beauty of the natural environment my neighbors and my family currently enjoy in our backyards. Our views of tall trees and open sky will be replaced by 3 story buildings. We will be impacted by the noise pollution from construction as well as the increase in traffic flow that will likely spill over on to Nelson and Washington Ave.

I have two large heritage oak trees very close to the property line that are not correctly represented on the plans. No one from Pacific West has actually come on to my property to properly measure them and they are listed as having only 20 inch diameters when they are actually 26 and 24 inches at 52 inches off the ground. I still fear that the extensive excavation and retaining walls will likely damage these trees. (I have included a photo of my daughter and her friend with the oaks.)

In spite of the revisions made by the developers, I still do not feel that the proposed apartments are appropriate for this location.

Thank you  
Tamaki Myers