



Workshop 2 Summary

This meeting was conducted on October 8, 2016 (10 am – noon) at Montgomery High School in Santa Rosa, CA.

MEETING PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

On Saturday, October 8, 2016 approximately 150 community members attended the second community workshop for the Southeast Greenway General Plan Amendment process. The purpose of the meeting was to summarize the feedback from the workshop held in August, present the draft Guiding Principles for the Southeast Greenway, describe the circulation and land use alternatives for the Greenway, and get the community's feedback.

Lisa Kranz, Supervising Planner at the City of Santa Rosa welcomed everyone and introduced the partners involved in this planning effort. Bruce Brubaker, Principal at PlaceWorks, summarized the results from the previous workshop and then presented the draft Guiding Principles and circulation and land use alternatives. After his presentation, attendees divided into eight groups to give their feedback at four topic stations around the room:



- Guiding Principles
- Circulation and Land Use Alternatives for the West Segment of the Greenway
- Circulation and Land Use Alternatives for the Central Segment of the Greenway
- Circulation and Land Use Alternatives for the East Segment of the Greenway

The stations were facilitated by City staff and members of the consultant team, and included boards with information (see Appendix A: Station Boards). Each group discussed the proposed principles and alternatives; facilitators noted their comments and questions. Each participant then filled out a survey to express his/her individual preferences on each topic (see Appendix B: Survey). After all groups visited each topic station, the facilitators reported back to all participants about the common themes and feedback they heard at their stations. The station summaries are listed on the following pages. The individual surveys will be compiled at the end of the survey period on October 26, 2016 and reported to Planning Commission and City Council at a joint session on November 1, 2016.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK AT TOPIC STATIONS

When participants signed in at the workshop, they received a nametag with a group number (1-8). After the presentation, participants provided their feedback on the four topics. To keep the groups small, there were two stations per topic for a total of 8 stations. The commonalities of the feedback at the stations are summarized below. Individual's comments are included in the surveys which will be tabulated at the end of the survey period as noted above.

FEEDBACK ON DRAFT GUIDING PRINCIPLES (STATIONS 1 & 2)

- Prioritize the Greenway's inclusivity. It should provide access and connections for all: bikes, pedestrians, vehicular parking, adjacent neighborhoods, and wildlife.
- Preference to acknowledge the Greenway's role in City's response to climate change. Prioritize preservation of open space with native plantings to reduce maintenance and operating costs.
- Preference to break Guiding Principle #3 into separate principles.
- Some preference to reconsider commercial and housing development in the Greenway and the Greenway's economic and social role, as noted in Guiding Principle #3:
 - Consider the economic trade-offs.
 - Keep value low to keep purchase price low.
 - Clarify economic vitality and whether it can be achieved with minimal commercial development (e.g., bike rentals, cafes, etc.).
- Prioritize Greenway's holistic development and integration with neighborhoods.
- Prioritize quality of life and promote the health and vitality of the community.
- Prioritize aesthetics, including public art, landscaping, and historic and cultural aspects.
- Prioritize educational experience, including wildlife/nature, interactive, and interdisciplinary uses.



FEEDBACK ON WEST SEGMENT ALTERNATIVES (STATIONS 3 & 4)

LAND USE

- Significant preference for “less is more” with little or no development anywhere in the Greenway. Some countered that sentiment, favoring a limited amount of development for workforce housing.

- Significant preference to see “eyes on the Greenway” to create a more secure environment. Many people pointed out that the best way to accomplish that would be through allowing some housing development along the Greenway.
- Consensus that the triangular area bounded by Farmers Lane, Hoen Frontage Road, and the Highway 12 onramp was not considered part of the Greenway; many felt it could be intensely developed without impacting other Greenway values.
- Mixed opinion about lodging: some were averse to lodging; others saw it as a means of generating tax revenue, or serving as a base for ecotourism by providing access to natural systems, trails, and Spring Lake Regional Park.
- Significant preference for a community pool in the area adjacent to Montgomery High school.
- Significant preference that trailhead amenities should include water and restrooms at a minimum.



CIRCULATION

- Preference to keep Highway 12 onramp as is; concern that changing the alignment of the existing onramp would be expensive and tricky. Lack of consensus on roundabout; some are concerned about grade changes in this area and how the roundabout would function; others more familiar with roundabouts think it could work well here.
- Significant preference to locate multi-use path in the middle of the Greenway property, rather than along the northern or southern boundary adjacent to existing homes and fences.
- Preference to protect wildlife corridors and prioritize continuity and connectivity through the Greenway.
- Some preference for a bridge over Hoen Avenue.

FEEDBACK ON CENTRAL SEGMENT ALTERNATIVES (STATIONS 5 & 6)

LAND USE

- Significant preference for Alternative 1. Some want housing added that faces greenway like in Alternative 2; some oppose any housing. Some want retail included at the ground level of 2-3 story housing. Some want housing moved to the south side of the Greenway.
- Mixed opinions about uses near Yulupa Avenue:
 - Remove active recreation due to parking and traffic issues east of Yulupa Avenue.

- Include small café west of Yulupa Avenue and restore wetland east of Yulupa Avenue in Alternative 1.
- Make community garden areas bigger. Remove 2-3-story housing to expand community garden east of Yulupa Avenue.
- Add café (or kiosk) to Alternative 1 west of Yulupa Avenue.
- Preference for plazas to include amenities.
- Preference to include clusters of trees for nesting and wildlife habitat.
- Preference for public art throughout.



CIRCULATION

- Preference to keep Greenway unfenced to allow for wildlife connections; some doubt that this area is wide enough to be a wildlife corridor.
- Significant preference to locate multi-use path in the middle of the Greenway property, so it is less impactful on adjacent neighbors. Preference for separated paths for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Concern about crossing Yulupa Avenue. Need to slow vehicle traffic. Consider narrowing it, creating a refuge island, making street crossings noticeable, or building an underpass or bridge.

FEEDBACK ON EAST SEGMENT ALTERNATIVES (STATIONS 7 & 8)

LAND USE

- Significant preference for orchard restoration and preservation of natural features (including wetlands) and wildlife habitat.
- Preference for visitor/education center to be removed from alternative 2; many consider it be an inappropriate use here.
- Preference for a café or deli.
- Mixed opinion about housing: some think it will improve safety by increasing eyes on the Greenway and some do not think it is appropriate here.
- Preference for trailheads in this area to be small and unpaved and include mileage markers, wayfinding and educational signage, and public art.

CIRCULATION

- Concern about crossing Summerfield given the traffic; many would like a bridge.
- Strong preference for separating the bicycle and pedestrians on the pathways to address bike speeds and the steep slope in this area.



COMMON QUESTIONS/CONCERNS BEYOND THE PROJECT SCOPE

- How is this going to be funded and maintained?
- How will we ensure safety on the Greenway (e.g., cameras, lighting, land uses, panic button, police foot patrol)?
- Specific design requests for the multi-use path included width, separation for different users, surface materials, seating/no seating along it, and exact locations (e.g., it should meander, not have blind corners, and include a loop). Include wayfinding and signage.
- Parking issues were raised consistently, most notably where the Greenway's visitors will park and how neighborhoods would be protected from overflow parking.
- Concern about traffic impacts, such as congestion on Hoen Frontage Road and impacts of new development on existing cross streets.
- Desire for more clarity on housing. If housing is developed, whom should it serve (e.g., workforce housing or affordable housing)? How should housing relate to the Greenway?