

APPENDIX A

Inventory of Residential Sites

AppendixA: Inventory of Vacant and Underutilized Sites, Pending Projects, and Approved Projects

Map Label	AFPH	APN	Address	Zoning	General Plan	Minimum Density	Maximum Density	Acres	Public Ownership	Previous Cycle	Site Type	Potential Units			Units by Affordability Level			Project Details	Existing Use	Existing Units	Built-Square Feet	SF (Built) to Land Ratio	Land Value	Improvement Value	Other Value	Improve-ment to Land/Value Ratio	Planning Area	
												Realistic Capacity	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate												
1	Very Low/Low	127-441-006	19357 HWY 12	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	6.084			Underutilized	53	32	21	0	0					2	880	0.00	\$ 181,013	\$ 20,099	\$ -	0.11	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor
2	Above Moderate	127-441-005	19380 HWY 12	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.089			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 2,805	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
3	Mixed Income	127-760-001	19366 SONOMA HWY	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.138			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 139,244	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
3	Mixed Income	127-760-002	19370 SONOMA HWY	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.157			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 162,452	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
4	Mixed Income	018-442-005	19410 SONOMA HWY	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.679			Underutilized	8	0	0	4	4					2	1239	0.04	\$ 1,010,360	\$ 328,367	\$ -	0.33	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor
5	Mixed Income	018-442-016	860 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.197			Vacant	3	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 82,182	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
6	Above Moderate	127-774-015	BECCERA WAY	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.173			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 105,117	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
7	Above Moderate	127-204-007	742 W SPAIN ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.248			Underutilized	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 177,776	\$ 17,062	\$ -	0.10	Northwest Area	
7	Above Moderate	127-204-008	738 W SPAIN ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.248			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 151,497	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
8	Above Moderate	127-204-010	730 W SPAIN ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.249			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 151,497	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
9	Above Moderate	127-204-020	19325 5TH STREET W	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.245			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 14,024	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
10	Mixed Income	127-221-016	600 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.211			Vacant	3	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 18,161	\$ 54,583	\$ -	0.46	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
11	Mixed Income	127-221-033	590 West Napa Street	R-C	Housing Opportunity	15	25.0	0.527		4th, 5th	Underutilized	10	0	0	1	5					1	0	0.00	\$ 83,535	\$ 33,493	\$ -	0.40	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor
12	Above Moderate	018-111-076	443 CASABONNE LN	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.121			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 412,226	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
13	Above Moderate	018-111-059	430 W SPAIN ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	1.185			Underutilized	5	0	0	0	5					0	3240	0.06	\$ 2,798,697	\$ 80,828	\$ -	0.03	Northwest Area
14	Above Moderate	018-201-037	0 W SPAIN ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	1.081			Vacant	1	0	0	0	1					0	0.00	\$ 334,191	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
15	Mixed Income	018-201-033	222 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.197			Vacant	2	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 25,020	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
16	Mixed Income	018-202-088	432 1ST ST W	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.130			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 214,844	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
17	Mixed Income	018-162-023	330 1ST ST W	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.504			Vacant	5	0	0	3	3					0	0.00	\$ 65,019	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
18	Mixed Income	018-221-021	596 E NAPA ST	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.273			Vacant	3	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 65,768	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
19	Above Moderate	018-222-026	250 E NAPA ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.221			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 54,098	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
20	Above Moderate	018-222-027	248 E NAPA ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.221			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 57,279	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
21	Above Moderate	018-102-033	1400 1ST W	R-R	Rural Residential	0	3.0	0.528			Vacant	3	0	0	0	3					0	0.00	\$ 1,931,643	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
22	Above Moderate	018-102-035	0 BRAZIL ST	R-R	Rural Residential	0	2.0	0.527			Vacant	1	0	0	0	1					0	0.00	\$ 10,266	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
22	Above Moderate	018-102-037	0 BRAZIL ST	R-R	Rural Residential	0	2.0	0.519			Vacant	1	0	0	0	1					0	0.00	\$ 10,376	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area	
23	Above Moderate	018-231-060	0 E NAPA ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.290			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
24	Mixed Income	018-860-006	441 SAN LORENZO CT	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.449			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 12,951	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
25	Above Moderate	127-231-031	PLUM TREE CT	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.315			Vacant	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 21,754	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area	
26	Mixed Income	018-540-100	623 IRIS WAY	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.126			Underutilized	1	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 39,824	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-West Area	
27	Mixed Income	018-540-007	583 CURTIN LN	R-M	Medium Density Res.	7	11.0	0.232			Underutilized	2	0	0	1	1					0	0	0.00	\$ 249,820	\$ 27,755	\$ -	0.11	Central-West Area
28	Very Low/Low	018-241-054	477 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	2.998			Vacant	27	16	11	0	0					0	0	0.00	\$ 1,665,483	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor
29	Mixed Income	018-241-015	325 W NAPA ST	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.138		4th, 5th	Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 164,955	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
29	Mixed Income	018-241-016	315 W NAPA ST	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.138			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 164,955	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	
30	Mixed Income	018-239-009	673/675 SECOND ST W	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.242			Pending/Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 415,000	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
30	Mixed Income	018-239-010	710 Berkens Street	MX	Mixed Use	0	20.0	0.233			Pending/Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 420,000	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
31	Mixed Income	018-251-014	171 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.138			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 406,344	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
32	Mixed Income	018-251-061	159 W NAPA ST	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.138			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 20,895	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Downtown District	
33	Mixed Income	018-314-006	599 1ST STREET W	MX	Shared Use	0	20.0	0.249			Vacant	2	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 245,560	\$ 7,007	\$ -	0.37	Downtown District	
33	Mixed Income	018-314-003	599 1ST STREET W	MX	Shared Use	0	20.0	0.249			Underutilized	2	0	0	1	2					0	0.00	\$ 245,560	\$ 7,007	\$ -	0.37	Downtown District	
35	Mixed Income	018-301-002	0 BRIGADWAY	C	Commercial	0	20.0	0.160			Vacant	2	0	0	1	1					0	0.00	\$ 247,546	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Bradyway Corridor	
36	Above Moderate	018-312-017	0 FRANCE ST	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.286			Underutilized	1	0	0	0	1					0	0	0.00	\$ 167,547	\$ 28,389	\$ -	0.17	Bradyway Corridor
37	Above Moderate	018-262-014	532 2ND ST E	R-L	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	3.128			Underutilized	12	0	0	0	12					1	5264	0.164	\$ 3,480,949	\$ 1,209,725	\$ -	0.35	Central-East Area

Appendix A: Inventory of Vacant and Underutilized Sites, Pending Projects, and Approved Projects

Map Label	AFPH	AFN	Address	Zoning	General Plan	Minimum Density	Maximum Density	Acres	Public Ownership	Previous Cycle	Site Type	Units by Affordability Level			Potential Units	Existing Site Conditions								
												Very Low	Low	Moderate		Above Moderate	Project Details	Existing Use	Existing Units	Built Square Feet	SF (Built) to Land Ratio	Land Value	Improvement Value	Other Value
E	Mixed Income	127-471-038	515 LASUVEN ST	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.412			Approved	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0.00	\$ 229,664	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Northwest Area
F	Above Moderate Mixed Income	127-204-021 018-165-012	315 5TH ST W 341 First Street West	R-LL	Low Density Res. Medium Density Res.	2	5.0	0.646			Pending-Under Approved	1	0	0	1	1	2660	0.09	\$ 643,320	\$ 1,210,916	\$ -	\$ -	1.88	Northwest Area 0.00 Downtown District
H	Mixed Income	018-131-012	216 First Street East	MX	Housing Opportunity	15	25.0	0.285		4th, 5th	Pending-Under	0	0	0	0	1	1699	0.14	\$ 666,192	\$ 299,783	\$ -	\$ -	0.45	Northwest Area
H	Mixed Income	018-131-013	126 First Street East	MX	Housing Opportunity	15	25.0	0.289		4th, 5th	Pending-Under	0	0	0	0	1	1699	0.13	\$ 666,192	\$ 299,783	\$ -	\$ -	0.45	Northwest Area
H	Mixed Income	018-131-018	254 First Street East	MX	Housing Opportunity	15	25.0	2.028		4th, 5th	Pending-Under	50	0	5	40	0	9000	0.06	\$ 1,554,451	\$ 699,544	\$ -	\$ -	0.41	Northwest Area
I	Moderate	018-222-008	214 E NAPA ST	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.256			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	3173	0.28	\$ 434,505	\$ 662,093	\$ -	\$ -	1.52	Central-East Area
J	Above Moderate	018-273-013	420 PATTON ST	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.235			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	1080	0.11	\$ 545,928	\$ 376,687	\$ -	\$ -	0.69	Central-East Area
K	Moderate	018-393-004	302 ARAGUAY	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.310			Approved	1	0	0	1	0	940	0.16	\$ 385,994	\$ 384,133	\$ -	\$ -	0.21	Central-West Area
L	Moderate	018-411-012	899 BROADWAY	MX	Mixed Use			0.550			Pending-Under	2	0	0	2	0	960	0.04	\$ 1,125,811	\$ 160,830	\$ 510	\$ -	0.14	Broadway Corridor
M	Moderate	018-382-034	481 York Court	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.278			Approved	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area
M	Moderate	018-382-035	482 York Court	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.224			Approved	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	Central-East Area
N	Mixed Income	128-061-001	19910 Fifth Street West	W-R-O	Housing Opportunity	15	25.0	1.504		5th	Pending-Under	15	0	1	2	12	960	0.01	\$ 29,883	\$ 11,072	\$ -	\$ -	0.37	Central-West Area
O	Above Moderate	128-162-042	470 HARRINGTON DR	R-LL	Low Density Res.	2	5.0	0.277			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	2868	0.24	\$ 546,612	\$ 419,299	\$ -	\$ -	0.77	Southwest Area
P	Above Moderate	128-071-014	234 MALET ST	R-R	Rural Residential			1.338			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	1312	0.02	\$ 900,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	0.56	Southwest Area
Q	Above Moderate	128-071-023	114 MALET ST	R-R	Rural Residential			0.498			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	1210	0.06	\$ 368,943	\$ 553,414	\$ -	\$ -	1.50	Southwest Area
R	Above Moderate	128-131-016	20929 1ST STREET W	R-R	Rural Residential			0.570			Pending-Under	1	0	0	1	0	2916	0.12	\$ 618,340	\$ 412,226	\$ -	\$ -	0.67	Southwest Area
S	Mixed Income	128-181-004	1211 Broadway	MX	Mixed Use			0.340			Pending-Under	5	0	0	2	3	696	0.04	\$ 488,798	\$ 210,235	\$ -	\$ -	0.43	Broadway Corridor
	Mixed Income	128-781-013	20955 Fifth Street East	MX	Mixed Use			0.00			Pending-Under	59	0	0	12	47	2434	0.02	\$ 44,834	\$ 58,430	\$ -	\$ -	1.30	Southwest Area

APPENDIX B

Balancing Act Submissions

Appendix D - Balancing Act Submissions

Submission ID	Submitted At	Are you happy with the availability of housing in the City of Sonoma?	Are you a resident?	Age Range	Gender	Total RHNA Allocation	50% Buffer - Amount	1 - Downtown District - Amount	2 - West Napa/Sonoma Corridor - Amount	3 - Northwest Area - Amount	4 - Broadway Corridor - Amount	4 - Broadway Corridor - Comment	5 - Vallejo District - Amount	6 - Central-West Area - Amount	7 - Southwest Area - Amount	7 - Southwest Area - Comment	8 - Gateway District - Amount	9 - Southeast Area - Amount	10 - Central East Area - Amount	11 - Northeast Area - Amount	Submitter Postal Code
42764	11/5/2021 21:37	Sonoma	Yes	19 - 39	Male	311	0	75	0	80	0		0	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	95476
51187	2/26/2022 16:18	No	Yes	19 - 39	Male	311	311	40	80	0	40		80	80	0	0	80	80	0	0	95476
51214	2/27/2022 2:28	No	No	60 - 69	Male	311	20	5	25	20	45		10	20	10		20	20	80	80	95476
51223	2/27/2022 5:54	Yes	Yes	80 - 89	Male	311	0	0	0	0	0		0	50	80		80	80	50	0	95476
51418	3/1/2022 4:42	No	Yes	40 - 59	Male	311	0	50	50	55	80		0	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	95476
51422	3/1/2022 5:50	No	Yes	60 - 69	Other	311	0	25	50	45	20	Density in th	40	20	80	0	80	80	35	50	95476
51434	3/1/2022 15:30	No	Yes	60 - 69	Other	311	0	40	0	0	80		20	80	80		80	80	80	80	95476
51550	3/2/2022 21:48	Yes	Yes	60 - 69	Male	311	0	0	30	30	30		0	45	40		30	40	30	40	95476
51733	3/3/2022 22:57	No	Yes	70 - 79	Male	311	0	50	30	30	30		50	50	20	20	0	20	20	15	95476
52039	3/5/2022 22:22	No	Yes	40 - 59	Female	311	0	10	10	10	45		10	0	65	0	25	35	60	50	95476
54361	3/15/2022 5:05	No	Yes	40 - 59	Male	311	0	15	50	15	25		10	50	20		20	50	30	30	95476
54675	3/16/2022 22:02	No	Yes	40 - 59	Male	311	0	20	20	20	30		5	30	30		60	60	30	20	95476
55022	3/21/2022 11:16	No	No	60 - 69	Male	311	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		80	80	80	80	95476
55027	3/21/2022 14:40	No	No	19 - 39	Male	311	0	0	80	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	80	80	95404

APPENDIX C

Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

Q1 Do you live in Sonoma?

Answered: 381 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	90.03%	343
No	9.97%	38
TOTAL		381

Q2 How long have you lived in the City?

Answered: 363 Skipped: 18

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
0-2 years	7.99%	29
2-5 years	21.76%	79
5-10 years	19.56%	71
10+ years	36.09%	131
Other (please specify)	14.60%	53
TOTAL		363

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	17	4/15/2022 7:49 PM
2	22	4/15/2022 7:47 PM
3	20 years, 2-3 blocks outside city limit....interested party per your description.	4/15/2022 7:21 PM
4	20 años	4/15/2022 7:17 PM
5	I work here but can't afford to live here.	4/15/2022 2:43 PM
6	22 years	4/15/2022 8:41 AM
7	In Valley	4/15/2022 6:03 AM
8	I live in El Verano, 95476	4/14/2022 8:26 PM
9	i leave in agua caliente	4/14/2022 7:27 PM
10	Do not live in Sonoma	4/14/2022 5:57 PM
11	I live in the valley - so, county land	4/14/2022 5:39 PM
12	35 years	4/14/2022 2:44 PM
13	41 years	4/14/2022 10:04 AM
14	After 50+ years in Sonoma I now live in BHS	4/14/2022 9:04 AM
15	35 years	4/14/2022 8:46 AM
16	I live 4 blocks from the city boundary for 10 years	4/14/2022 8:25 AM
17	32 years	4/13/2022 9:59 PM
18	37 years	4/13/2022 9:27 PM
19	20 years	4/13/2022 8:57 PM
20	46 yrs.	4/13/2022 6:09 PM
21	51 years	4/13/2022 5:40 PM
22	73+ years	4/13/2022 5:38 PM
23	45 years	4/13/2022 5:21 PM
24	All my life	4/13/2022 5:12 PM
25	Santa Rosa 9 years after Sonoma 1 year	4/13/2022 5:00 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

26	41 years	4/13/2022 4:06 PM
27	43 years	4/13/2022 4:02 PM
28	40 years	4/13/2022 3:37 PM
29	42 years	4/13/2022 3:23 PM
30	40	4/13/2022 3:18 PM
31	70+ years	4/13/2022 3:17 PM
32	Since birth. 1970	4/13/2022 3:16 PM
33	22 years	4/13/2022 3:07 PM
34	27 years	4/13/2022 3:03 PM
35	47 years	4/13/2022 2:46 PM
36	Havelived in Sonoma Valley for 60~ years	4/12/2022 7:51 PM
37	I don't live in the City	4/12/2022 1:28 PM
38	9 years resident in City limits, +_ 12 years 100 yards in Napa Co	4/12/2022 12:05 PM
39	32	4/9/2022 6:28 AM
40	30+	4/9/2022 4:09 AM
41	41 years	4/8/2022 5:59 PM
42	30+	4/8/2022 10:55 AM
43	46 years	4/8/2022 10:36 AM
44	I live in the unincorporated east side, 16 years	4/7/2022 7:10 PM
45	31 years	4/6/2022 4:56 PM
46	Lifelong	4/6/2022 3:21 PM
47	30 years	4/2/2022 6:18 PM
48	Lived in the City for many years, now live in unincorporated for the past 11	3/31/2022 10:51 AM
49	29 years	3/28/2022 3:47 PM
50	I'm living now in BHS	3/26/2022 9:58 AM
51	21 years	3/26/2022 7:38 AM
52	18 years	3/25/2022 5:05 AM
53	Not a resident	2/25/2022 4:24 PM

Q3 What made you decide to live here? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 363 Skipped: 18

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Proximity to family and/or friends	35.81%	130
Other (please specify)	34.99%	127
Proximity to job/work	34.71%	126
Safety of neighborhood	33.61%	122
Quality of housing stock	19.28%	70
Proximity to shopping and services	14.33%	52
Affordability	13.77%	50
Quality of local school system	9.64%	35
City services and programs	9.64%	35
Total Respondents: 363		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	able to work from home now and wanted to live in wine country	5/8/2022 8:46 AM
2	Beauty. Of tree lined streets, care of neighborhood	4/23/2022 6:12 PM
3	My family moved here in 1977.	4/21/2022 4:55 PM
4	Found an available house for rent	4/21/2022 12:03 PM
5	Amenities including biking, hiking, urban growth boundary, natural beauty, wildlife, restaurants, and culture. Historic buildings.	4/18/2022 4:05 PM
6	Wanted a small town close to SFO.	4/18/2022 12:09 PM
7	Beauty of City, walkability, variety of outdoor activities and parks. Also the ebb and flow of visitors, which keeps it interesting.	4/18/2022 11:22 AM
8	Accessible to San Francisco, but still removed.	4/16/2022 8:49 AM
9	Lovely area, history, wine country vibe, proximity to major airports, affordable (at that time)	4/15/2022 8:56 PM
10	Marriage	4/15/2022 7:33 PM
11	The area WAS very nice and NOT OVERCROWDED.	4/15/2022 7:21 PM
12	NA	4/15/2022 2:43 PM
13	Lifestyle choice	4/15/2022 9:04 AM
14	22 years ago the rental cost was somewhat reasonable - not now	4/15/2022 8:41 AM
15	Family owned home	4/15/2022 6:03 AM
16	Sense of Community	4/14/2022 8:26 PM
17	The beauty of the area.	4/14/2022 5:48 PM
18	the natural beauty of the biome	4/14/2022 5:39 PM
19	Spectacular small town with great people!!	4/14/2022 5:34 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

20	Retirement	4/14/2022 5:14 PM
21	Wine country	4/14/2022 3:46 PM
22	Weather, proximity to SF	4/14/2022 3:16 PM
23	Attending college at Sonoma State University	4/14/2022 1:12 PM
24	big city to small town	4/14/2022 11:09 AM
25	Born and Raised	4/14/2022 10:04 AM
26	Beauty of the city	4/14/2022 9:39 AM
27	moved here with my parents after my father retired	4/14/2022 8:46 AM
28	Quality of life	4/14/2022 7:57 AM
29	Beauty, quiet comfortable friendly community	4/14/2022 6:44 AM
30	Loved visiting the town and wanted to leave SF	4/14/2022 6:38 AM
31	It's in the wine country and living close to the plaza	4/13/2022 10:46 PM
32	Just a nice size pleasant neighborhood	4/13/2022 10:41 PM
33	A more rural feeling vs. SF	4/13/2022 9:59 PM
34	Small town, country feel, the Plaza	4/13/2022 9:27 PM
35	Got married to a man with medical practice here 32 years ago	4/13/2022 9:15 PM
36	Beautiful country similar to Tuscany Italy	4/13/2022 8:57 PM
37	Born here. 4th generation in the Sonoma Valley.	4/13/2022 8:23 PM
38	Es un pueblo pequeño y a ese tiempo yo estaba sola en este país	4/13/2022 8:14 PM
39	Home town feeling	4/13/2022 7:50 PM
40	have grown up here, husband born here	4/13/2022 7:21 PM
41	We like a Sonoma life style.. small town.. decent restaurants.. wine country.. good friends and neighbors.. weather b4 many fires	4/13/2022 7:17 PM
42	Kindness and community connection	4/13/2022 7:12 PM
43	It is where I found housing.	4/13/2022 6:57 PM
44	beauty	4/13/2022 6:27 PM
45	open space	4/13/2022 6:09 PM
46	Availability of pretty girls.	4/13/2022 6:04 PM
47	Retirement	4/13/2022 5:40 PM
48	I was accepted at Sonoma State University and had friends in Sonoma.	4/13/2022 5:40 PM
49	proximity to nature, hiking trails, climate (moved before the drought and fires!), low population levels	4/13/2022 5:38 PM
50	born and raised 3rd generation	4/13/2022 5:38 PM
51	loved the beauty of the area	4/13/2022 5:21 PM
52	I was born here and never moved away. My family, children, grand children live here as well	4/13/2022 5:12 PM
53	Couldn't afford to buy in Sonoma, so bought in Santa Rosa	4/13/2022 5:00 PM
54	Beautiful rural feeling	4/13/2022 4:53 PM
55	Proximity to hiking trails and bike path	4/13/2022 4:48 PM
56	Inherited a home	4/13/2022 4:46 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

57	Affordable mobilehomes available so I could retire in my favorite small town!	4/13/2022 4:38 PM
58	menos congestion, menos gente	4/13/2022 4:35 PM
59	Walkability and beauty of Sonoma	4/13/2022 4:23 PM
60	singe stor	4/13/2022 4:23 PM
61	Affordable housing subsidybecame available.	4/13/2022 4:19 PM
62	Small town setting	4/13/2022 4:06 PM
63	future spouse lived here.	4/13/2022 4:06 PM
64	Nice place to live	4/13/2022 4:04 PM
65	When I relocated to Sonoma I was living in Marin County. A separation and the cost of rent was beyond my means.	4/13/2022 4:02 PM
66	historic charm	4/13/2022 3:51 PM
67	Sonoma is my hometown and i love it here because of the people, the farmer's markets, festivals, parades, and nostalgic reasons. If it weren't for those facts there is no way I'd live here. It doesn't feel safe like it once was, our school system is a joke, it is outrageously expensive and an absurdly competitive job market. There aren't many viable shopping opportunities for locals and most of my services (dry cleaning, hair salon, gym) I get from out of our town. Sonoma is beautiful, sonoma is nostalgic, but sonoma is none of those reasons that you have listed in this question.	4/13/2022 3:44 PM
68	community size and friendliness	4/13/2022 3:41 PM
69	Small Ag town with quality living; climate, cooler than Napa (both ways:); access to city.	4/13/2022 3:32 PM
70	Retiring from City - quality new home in nice neighborhood	4/13/2022 3:31 PM
71	Moved from SF for better weather and at that time, a good place to raise kids	4/13/2022 3:23 PM
72	Entertainment	4/13/2022 3:22 PM
73	I moved here 43 years ago....it was wonderful back then!	4/13/2022 3:20 PM
74	Quality of life and community	4/13/2022 3:19 PM
75	Retired	4/13/2022 3:18 PM
76	The beauty, the feeling of community, being rural with all the ag, the Slonoma vibe	4/13/2022 3:18 PM
77	The semi-rural wine country lifestyle	4/13/2022 3:17 PM
78	Family moved here	4/13/2022 3:17 PM
79	Roots	4/13/2022 3:16 PM
80	Nice city	4/13/2022 3:15 PM
81	Natural beauty and slow pace	4/13/2022 3:07 PM
82	because it's beautiful. semi rural area. small town living	4/13/2022 3:04 PM
83	wanted to get out of SF	4/13/2022 3:02 PM
84	It is my summer and winter home away from Philadelphia snow, ice, humidity.	4/13/2022 2:57 PM
85	Previous visit as tourist	4/13/2022 2:54 PM
86	Grew up here	4/13/2022 2:54 PM
87	1 hr from SF	4/13/2022 2:53 PM
88	All of the factors	4/13/2022 2:50 PM
89	The Beauty, the Wineries, the Social Climate	4/13/2022 2:46 PM
90	Born in Sonoma	4/13/2022 2:40 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

91	Climate, proximity to SF, friendliness of people, usable family parks	4/13/2022 2:40 PM
92	Grew up here.	4/13/2022 2:39 PM
93	Live in Petaluma	4/13/2022 12:25 PM
94	I was born and raised here	4/13/2022 11:27 AM
95	Came as child in young family, following work opportunity for WWII veteran father	4/12/2022 7:51 PM
96	I don't live here.	4/12/2022 1:28 PM
97	Location, size & quality	4/12/2022 12:05 PM
98	proximity to wineries, small-town feel, outdoor space	4/9/2022 9:00 PM
99	Quality of life and space	4/9/2022 8:38 PM
100	Native of Sonoma	4/9/2022 9:45 AM
101	Born and raised	4/9/2022 4:09 AM
102	Weather and safety	4/8/2022 9:41 PM
103	Small town atmosphere	4/8/2022 8:16 PM
104	The city is not overcrowded and a lot of activities that can do in the cities.	4/8/2022 8:07 PM
105	Raised here	4/8/2022 5:59 PM
106	got a good deal	4/8/2022 5:07 PM
107	Retired here after visiting here my whole life.	4/8/2022 3:21 PM
108	Family	4/8/2022 1:40 PM
109	It's Sonoma... enough said!	4/8/2022 11:39 AM
110	grew up here	4/8/2022 10:55 AM
111	Wanting to leave the big city to raise children in a small community.	4/8/2022 10:36 AM
112	I liked the NorCal climate and geography, we rented a place at a good price and never left	4/7/2022 7:10 PM
113	nature, proximity to SF, mountains, beaches	4/7/2022 11:31 AM
114	I am a 3rd generation Sonoman.	4/6/2022 1:02 PM
115	Quality of life: weather, natural beauty, interesting people, proximity to urban centers, arts	4/3/2022 9:00 AM
116	Small town feel. Not overbuilt like some areas	4/1/2022 10:29 AM
117	family	3/31/2022 10:51 AM
118	Keep in mind I moved here back in 1970, things were a lot different then	3/29/2022 12:46 PM
119	LOVE community feeling and being able to walk to the Square for all events and patronage	3/28/2022 3:47 PM
120	A good place to retire	3/26/2022 8:52 PM
121	Safe small town mentality, friendliness	3/25/2022 4:24 PM
122	Quaint, quality small wine country town close to big city resources & entertainment.	3/25/2022 5:05 AM
123	Husband and I have grown up here, returned after college.	3/24/2022 11:39 PM
124	I liked trhe Bay Area geography anbd climate, we found a decently priced apartment and stayed.	3/24/2022 7:15 PM
125	Slower pace community, but proximity to San Francisco	3/24/2022 4:55 PM
126	Living in wine country and the Plaza in general	3/24/2022 2:40 PM
127	Quality of life	3/23/2022 5:22 PM

Q4 Do you currently own or rent your home?

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I own my home	61.03%	213
I rent my home	31.23%	109
I rent a room in a home	3.72%	13
I live with extended family or with another household	2.87%	10
I am currently without permanent shelter	1.15%	4
TOTAL	349	

Q5 Select the type of housing that best describes your current home.

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Single-family home (detached)	59.31%	207
Multi-family home (apartment/condominium)	18.05%	63
Duplex/attached home	11.46%	40
Mobile home	5.73%	20
Accessory Dwelling Unit, granny flat, guest house	3.44%	12
Other (please specify)	1.15%	4
Currently without permanent shelter	0.86%	3
TOTAL		349

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Studio	4/15/2022 7:36 PM
2	Pueblo Serena MHC	4/13/2022 9:31 PM
3	Home plus ADU	4/8/2022 10:37 AM
4	Single family home with guesthouse	3/25/2022 5:09 AM

Q6 How would you rate the physical condition of the residence you live in?

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Sound: Very good to excellent condition and needs minimal repairs	57.02%	199
Minor : Shows signs of minor deferred maintenance (e.g., peeling paint, chipped stucco, missing shingles, etc.)	22.64%	79
Moderate: Needs one modest rehabilitation improvements (e.g., new roof, new wood siding, replacement of stucco, etc.)	11.17%	39
Substantial: Needs two or more major upgrades (e.g., new foundation, roof replacement, new plumbing, new electrical, etc.)	8.31%	29
Dilapidated: Building appears structurally unsound, unfit for human habitation in its current condition, and demolition or major rehabilitation is required	0.86%	3
TOTAL	349	

Q7 How satisfied are you with your current housing situation?

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I am very satisfied	51.58%	180
I am somewhat satisfied	27.51%	96
I am somewhat dissatisfied	11.75%	41
I am dissatisfied	4.87%	17
If you answered dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied please provide a reason below.	4.30%	15
TOTAL		349

#	IF YOU ANSWERED DISSATISFIED OR SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED PLEASE PROVIDE A REASON BELOW.	DATE
1	I want to have a home of my own	4/15/2022 7:36 PM
2	interior needs full updated remodeling - appliances, flooring, windows, bathroom vanities - nothing has been upgraded since it was built in 1980's	4/15/2022 8:44 AM
3	It's in need of a ton of work but I can afford it how it is, so not inclined to question it. Also, wish I could buy it but my property manager also wants to buy it and turn it into an airbnb. Not sure if I'll save enough \$ to purchase it before her.	4/14/2022 5:43 PM
4	I never know when I will be evicted.	4/14/2022 8:27 AM
5	Our HOA board violates Davis Stirling law on many issues and retaliates against a senior for citing their violations.	4/13/2022 5:51 PM
6	I would like to own my own place	4/13/2022 5:22 PM
7	The management company is AWFUL!!! And they pay no attention to upkeep or problems.	4/13/2022 4:34 PM
8	We bought our home in 2011 and thought it would be our "starter home," however, once we went to purchase a larger home for our growing family, we couldn't find any affordable houses in the city of Sonoma. We instead had to do an addition which is an expensive endeavor in itself. We have not been pleased with the City building department. We understand why so many families are choosing to leave Sonoma. It's unfortunate	4/13/2022 4:23 PM
9	Housing management maintenance poor	4/13/2022 4:21 PM
10	Our house is smaller than we need as a family of 3 (husband, wife, 10 y/o child) but we cannot afford bigger even though bring in \$6,000/mo after taxes. The house has lots of little things wrong with it but we live in fear of notifying our landlord as we can't afford a rent hike or for him to decide we're too much to deal with.	4/13/2022 3:47 PM
11	I am not supported by the on site mgt	4/13/2022 3:23 PM
12	Crime fastly rising, slumlord, dangerous speeds on st, quality bare minimum for rental	4/12/2022 11:50 PM
13	Unsure how to best modify/expand to accomodate extended family needing home base (in lieu of camping/couch surfing)	4/12/2022 7:55 PM
14	Many neighbors did not follow the noise ordinance.	4/8/2022 8:12 PM
15	We are being made to move because their 94 year old mother is moving in.	4/8/2022 2:48 PM

Q8 Which of the following housing upgrades or expansions have you considered making on your home?

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Roofing, painting, and general home repairs	35.53%	124
Landscaping	27.22%	95
Does not apply	27.22%	95
HVAC, solar, and electrical	25.50%	89
Room addition	18.05%	63
Accessory dwelling unit	14.90%	52
Other (please specify)	10.03%	35
Total Respondents: 349		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Have done all of the above	4/17/2022 6:14 PM
2	Laundry room	4/15/2022 7:36 PM
3	I rent - the owner needs to do the upgrades	4/15/2022 8:44 AM
4	Garage	4/15/2022 6:04 AM
5	energy efficiency/insulating better, and adding a bathtub as we have a young child	4/14/2022 5:43 PM
6	we added a bedroom in 2017-2018 for our son, we remodeled our back yard in 2020 due to rotting decks and fences, remodeled our kitchen in 2021 due to failing appliances and limited space, replaced outdoor siding on 3 of 4 exterior walls and repainted the entire house in 2021-2022, other repairs still pending	4/14/2022 9:24 AM
7	I've already made all the listed improvements over the past 6 years	4/14/2022 6:40 AM
8	None	4/13/2022 7:51 PM
9	Perhaps add a battery	4/13/2022 7:19 PM
10	Everything	4/13/2022 7:13 PM
11	heat pump to replace gas furnace and AC	4/13/2022 5:40 PM
12	Drywall the garage	4/13/2022 5:01 PM
13	We are working to update our home which was built in the 1970's	4/13/2022 4:55 PM
14	After moving to Sonoma and residing here...I cannot own a house or mobile home. My rent has reached it's ceiling for affordability.	4/13/2022 4:05 PM
15	Bath and kitchen updated	4/13/2022 3:53 PM
16	Water Filtering System	4/13/2022 3:46 PM
17	internal cosmetic improvements	4/13/2022 3:43 PM
18	Cannot expand; upgrades as we can	4/13/2022 3:34 PM
19	We already remodeled and don't plan any more changes	4/13/2022 3:25 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

20	flooring	4/13/2022 3:23 PM
21	We rent	4/13/2022 3:17 PM
22	new windows	4/13/2022 3:16 PM
23	Garage	4/13/2022 3:03 PM
24	Installed solar last year	4/13/2022 2:55 PM
25	New patio cover	4/13/2022 2:55 PM
26	Adding a half bath	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
27	remodel, landscaping	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
28	Chimney repair, new sliding glass doors (more energy efficient)	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
29	Have done siding, painting and electrical updates	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
30	we have 375 sf, if we had one more room that would be great	4/7/2022 7:12 PM
31	None.	4/6/2022 5:30 PM
32	About 10 years ago remodeled the inside, new roof, painting, complete new landscape. Thankfully nothing more is needed now	3/29/2022 12:47 PM
33	Kitchen upgrade	3/26/2022 8:53 PM
34	Get a Cat from Pets Lifeline	3/26/2022 10:00 AM
35	Remodel guesthouse	3/25/2022 5:09 AM

Q9 Which of the following best describes your household type?

Answered: 349 Skipped: 32

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Couple	31.52% 110
Single person household	20.34% 71
Couple with children under 18	16.33% 57
Couple living with roommates	6.30% 22
Multi-generational or extended family household (parents, grandparents, aunts/uncles, children, grandchildren, etc. all under the same roof)	6.02% 21
Single person living with roommates	5.44% 19
Single parent with children under 18	4.01% 14
Single person living with family	3.72% 13
Other (please specify)	3.72% 13
Adult head of household (non-parent) with children under 18	2.58% 9
TOTAL	349

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Couple with adult kids at home temporarily	4/14/2022 8:28 PM
2	Couple living with adult child	4/14/2022 8:28 AM
3	owner + roommate	4/13/2022 8:06 PM
4	Senior couple, kids long gone	4/13/2022 7:19 PM
5	senior housing	4/13/2022 4:21 PM
6	My daughter has been living here for two years as the result of covid..will be moving in the next few months.	4/13/2022 3:23 PM
7	Couple with children between 17-21	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
8	Single, with area for guests and associates	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
9	Single adult with related adult "camping" in back yard	4/12/2022 7:55 PM
10	Couple, her adult child	4/8/2022 10:28 AM
11	Was a single parent, now single household. However, if my landlord raises the rent, I will need to leave Sonoma.	3/28/2022 4:30 PM
12	with Dogs	3/25/2022 5:09 AM
13	Couple with 1 child under 18, 1 child over 18	3/24/2022 11:40 PM

Q10 If you wish to own a home in Sonoma but do not currently own one, what issues are preventing you from owning a home at this time? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 319 Skipped: 62

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I cannot find a home within my target price range in Sonoma	31.66%	101
I do not currently have the financial resources for an appropriate down payment	23.82%	76
I do not currently have the financial resources for an adequate monthly mortgage payment	15.99%	51
I cannot find a home that suits my living needs in Sonoma (housing size, disability accommodations)	3.45%	11
I cannot currently find a home that suits my quality standards in Sonoma	5.96%	19
I do not currently wish to own a home in Sonoma	6.27%	20
I already own a home in Sonoma	51.10%	163
Total Respondents: 319		

Q11 If you wish to rent a home in Sonoma but do not currently rent one, what issues are preventing you from renting a home at this time? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 292 Skipped: 89

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I do not currently wish to rent a home in Sonoma	42.12%	123
I already rent a home in Sonoma	38.36%	112
I cannot find a home within my target rental cost in Sonoma	13.70%	40
I cannot find a home that suits my living needs in Sonoma (housing size, disability accommodations)	11.64%	34
I cannot currently find a home that suits my quality standards in Sonoma	5.48%	16
Total Respondents: 292		

Q12 Do you think that the range of housing options currently available in the City of Sonoma meets your needs?

Answered: 324 Skipped: 57

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	56.79%	184
No	43.21%	140
TOTAL		324

Q13 Do you think that the range of housing options currently available in the City meet the needs of the community?

Answered: 323 Skipped: 58

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	35.29%	114
No	64.71%	209
TOTAL		323

Q14 What types of housing are most needed in the City of Sonoma? (Select all that apply)

Answered: 322 Skipped: 59

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Single family, small (less than 1,600 square foot home)	47.83% 154
Single family, medium to large (1,600 square foot home or larger)	30.43% 98
Duplex, Triplex, and Fourplex	42.24% 136
Townhomes or Condominiums (multi-family ownership homes)	37.89% 122
Apartments (multi-family rental homes)	36.96% 119
Co-housing (individual homes that are part of larger development with shared common space, such as kitchen, living, recreation, and garden areas)	31.06% 100
Accessory Dwelling Unit	19.25% 62
Other (please specify)	14.91% 48
Total Respondents: 322	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	ADU's can create great problems : noise, density,parking.	4/23/2022 6:23 PM
2	we desperately need affordable housing - not market price - affordable for those making 80% and under of the going market rate	4/19/2022 3:55 PM
3	No new housing or population needed as any population increase will harm our community, environment, and quality of life	4/18/2022 4:12 PM
4	I would only be speculating. I suggest we let the free market decide what housing is needed.	4/18/2022 12:17 PM
5	With the crazy real estate market, possibly it's more lack of affordability rather than lack of availability?	4/18/2022 11:51 AM
6	Tiny house communities for young adults, elderly and low-income folks (similar to cohousing but smaller units with shared gardens, green spaces and common spaces available)	4/15/2022 1:23 PM
7	community developments with small homes surrounding a shared common space for gardening	4/15/2022 8:57 AM
8	low income homes	4/14/2022 11:16 AM
9	Need to update the infrastructure and have clear fire exits before adding housing stock	4/14/2022 7:47 AM
10	Precios más razonables	4/13/2022 9:38 PM
11	Affordable housing	4/13/2022 9:05 PM
12	lower income housing that for instance, teachers could afford	4/13/2022 8:58 PM
13	Low-low income housing (perhaps subsidized) for the under-housed and homeless.	4/13/2022 8:01 PM
14	Not a question for us, it is a City Planning issue. Hopefully plans are to remain relatively small and not Napa-ize Sonoma. If it doesn't come later, would like to note minimize water hook ups until a better water solution is achieved and moratorium on swimming pools.	4/13/2022 7:26 PM
15	Everything for people who are NOT wealthy	4/13/2022 7:21 PM
16	Necesitamos más tipos de vivienda que la gente obrera pueda poder pagar.	4/13/2022 7:06 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

17	look at East Side of Sonoma to build new cohouses..ENOUGH BUILDING TILL WE BURST ON WEST SIDE ..THE RICH SETTLERS CANT KERP BUYING LAND ON EAST SIDE TO HOLD SO NOT OPEN FOR NEW LOWER INCOME BUILSS.WEST SIDE HAS TAKEN ALL THE NEW AFFPRDABLE SPACE WITH NO STUDY OF INPACT TO ONLY WEST SIDE ..ENOUGH	4/13/2022 6:36 PM
18	low income housing	4/13/2022 5:56 PM
19	Affordable	4/13/2022 5:35 PM
20	More mobile-home parks	4/13/2022 5:08 PM
21	Can we go higher with some condo or apartment complexes to create more housing vertically?	4/13/2022 4:52 PM
22	Supportive housing for individuals with special physical and mental needs	4/13/2022 4:49 PM
23	Affordable single family homes	4/13/2022 4:32 PM
24	affordable Housing desperately needed as well as very low income housing	4/13/2022 4:26 PM
25	Less vacation rentals.	4/13/2022 4:10 PM
26	I'm satisfied with my house	4/13/2022 4:10 PM
27	Affordable homes, like those at mobile/manufactured homes except owning the property under them, too; communal compounds with like-minded people for environmentally sustainable living	4/13/2022 3:49 PM
28	Maybe a definition of accessory dwelling unit could help here	4/13/2022 3:21 PM
29	Anything that's more affordable then what is currently available	4/13/2022 3:20 PM
30	None, It's fine the way it is	4/13/2022 3:12 PM
31	Affordable homes of Quality	4/13/2022 3:02 PM
32	All of the above. As a longtime local Realtor, I can say that there are not enough options for existing members of our community.	4/13/2022 3:00 PM
33	low income housing less then 40K/yr.	4/13/2022 2:54 PM
34	The missing middle. Mixture of business/commercial and residential like many areas in Europe.	4/13/2022 2:51 PM
35	affordable housing	4/13/2022 12:29 PM
36	for homeless and worker housing	4/12/2022 12:13 PM
37	I believe less construction is needed. The city is too crowded as it is.	4/11/2022 8:38 AM
38	Decent homes for those making 100k and under	4/8/2022 6:06 PM
39	modular homes	4/8/2022 5:18 PM
40	Until more water is available we shouldn't be building more.	4/8/2022 3:33 PM
41	None	4/8/2022 11:42 AM
42	50+ unit deed-restricted projects	4/7/2022 7:18 PM
43	I have a house	4/7/2022 8:00 AM
44	tricky question, the number of second homes and inflation of pricing	3/31/2022 10:59 AM
45	Infill, taller than 2 stories, Affordable and missing middle. Build density on empty lots include on the East Side, replace empty single family homes with denser housing.	3/29/2022 2:25 PM
46	It is incredible sad, that renters are expected to live below standards, shoved in small multi unit family dwelling. Repulsive	3/28/2022 4:30 PM
47	People who live in Sonoma don't need homes; they already live here. Additional housing will only swell the population of people from elsewhere who don't live here now. More people means less water for those who live here now. More people only taxes public services and	3/25/2022 5:26 AM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

drives mire climate change. Thise who want to live here simply need to buy or rent an existing dwelling from someone who is moving away. "Constant growth" will destroy the Valley as we know it, and the planet as well.

48 Just want to clarify that I think we could use more medium (approx. 1600-2000 sf) homes but don't think we need to add more inventory of large (2500+ sf) homes.

3/24/2022 2:50 PM

Q15 How important are the following housing priorities to you and your family?

Answered: 324 Skipped: 57

	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
Housing affordable to working families	66.04% 212	26.79% 86	6.23% 20	0.93% 3	321
Provide housing to meet Sonoma's social and economic needs, including both existing and future residents, as well as employers	63.44% 203	28.13% 90	7.81% 25	0.63% 2	320
Ensure all persons and households have fair and equitable access to housing and housing opportunities	54.35% 175	30.75% 99	11.80% 38	3.11% 10	322
Promote sustainable, efficient, and fire-safe housing to address safety, energy, and climate change impacts	53.87% 174	38.39% 124	7.12% 23	0.62% 2	323
Ensure that children who grow up in Sonoma can afford to live here	52.96% 170	32.40% 104	12.15% 39	2.49% 8	321
Sustainable, walkable development (housing within walking distance to services, schools, and/or the downtown)	51.40% 165	38.63% 124	9.35% 30	0.62% 2	321
Rehabilitate existing housing	44.27% 139	41.72% 131	9.55% 30	4.46% 14	314
Integrate affordable housing throughout the community to create mixed-income neighborhoods	42.32% 135	35.42% 113	18.81% 60	3.45% 11	319
Establish programs to help at-risk homeowners keep their homes, including mortgage loan programs	41.46% 131	40.19% 127	14.56% 46	3.80% 12	316
Support fair/equitable housing opportunities and programs to help maintain and secure neighborhoods that have suffered foreclosures	39.31% 125	39.31% 125	17.92% 57	3.46% 11	318
Lease-to-own housing (condominiums, apartments)	35.44% 112	41.14% 130	18.67% 59	4.75% 15	316
Provide ADA-accessible housing	30.91% 98	47.95% 152	14.51% 46	6.62% 21	317
Create more mixed-use (commercial/office and residential) projects to bring different land uses closer together	28.66% 92	40.81% 131	27.73% 89	2.80% 9	321

Q16 Are there any populations or persons that need additional housing types or dedicated policies and programs to ensure they can access housing in Sonoma?

Answered: 317 Skipped: 64

	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Farmworkers	45.78% 141	36.36% 112	11.04% 34	6.82% 21	308	1.79
Homeless persons or at risk of homelessness	42.04% 132	32.80% 103	15.29% 48	9.87% 31	314	1.93
Seniors	42.48% 130	36.93% 113	11.44% 35	9.15% 28	306	1.87
Persons with a disability, including developmental	42.62% 130	35.74% 109	11.15% 34	10.49% 32	305	1.90
Single Parent Head of Households	41.94% 130	39.03% 121	11.29% 35	7.74% 24	310	1.85
Large families (5 or more persons)	29.84% 91	43.61% 133	15.74% 48	10.82% 33	305	2.08

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	low income wage earners	4/19/2022 3:55 PM
2	Make it easier for homeowners to share their guest rooms and home on Airbnb and other platforms that help all homeowners avoid foreclosure.	4/18/2022 4:12 PM
3	I don't think the government should dictate housing, let the free market dictate the needs.	4/18/2022 12:17 PM
4	I'm not familiar enough with services already provided to those populations to know if they need additional.	4/18/2022 11:51 AM
5	All essential workers: safety, education, retail, hospitality, agricultural	4/15/2022 6:11 AM
6	Teachers, medical personnel first responders	4/14/2022 5:54 PM
7	Qualify Seniors - on limited income - including those that would like to retire and can't afford to	4/13/2022 9:24 PM
8	Young adults. 20 - 40 years of age.	4/13/2022 8:28 PM
9	This and last question seem like "loaded" questions. They are not black and white answers	4/13/2022 7:26 PM
10	No more rich people owning several vacant homes	4/13/2022 7:21 PM
11	All working-class families and individuals, especially Latinx.	4/13/2022 5:08 PM
12	Teachers, City workers including Law Enforcement and Fire Dept.	4/13/2022 4:49 PM
13	I don't think farmworkers actually need to live in the town proper.	4/13/2022 4:31 PM
14	Single elderly retired educators are in need along with veterans! I am a retired educator and Vietnam veteran...where do I belong?	4/13/2022 4:20 PM
15	Be inclusive of all types of people and ensure we have the health/mental health services to care for all before building more.	4/13/2022 3:49 PM
16	Lower middle to Middle class workers in the services industries (restaurants, bars, wineries, retail). Generally younger (20s-40s)	4/13/2022 2:57 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

17	Workforce	4/13/2022 12:29 PM
18	The gap between current low income eligibility and the market rates. If you make 100,000 you are arguably in a worse position as you aren't eligible for assistance but are still so far from being able to afford a home.	4/8/2022 8:23 PM
19	More people means more water use. Getting infrastructure in place should be priority one!	4/8/2022 3:33 PM
20	Latinos, OPOC abnd seniors in fixed incomes	4/7/2022 7:18 PM
21	Families of public servants, teachers, police, firefighters, etc	3/31/2022 10:59 AM
22	Focus on those historically excluded from Sonoma--Black and Indigenous people. Need to reverse history of exclusion. Think about policies that help bring diversity into Sonoma, not just about maintaining existing mostly, white and aging residences.	3/29/2022 2:25 PM
23	Seniors - are priced out and shoved out away from services	3/28/2022 4:30 PM
24	Agricultural sponsored on site housing	3/25/2022 5:11 PM
25	Working families	3/25/2022 6:45 AM
26	LatinX, 60% AMI and below	3/24/2022 7:22 PM

Q17 What is your race/ethnicity?

Answered: 322 Skipped: 59

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
African American	6.52%	21
Asian	3.73%	12
Hispanic	8.07%	26
Native American	1.55%	5
White/Non-Hispanic	73.29%	236
Other (please specify)	6.83%	22
TOTAL		322

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Mixed race/Asian	4/21/2022 12:15 PM
2	N/A	4/16/2022 8:59 AM
3	Mixed	4/15/2022 7:14 PM
4	White with hispanic origin	4/15/2022 1:23 PM
5	Hebrew	4/14/2022 9:12 AM
6	Mixed	4/14/2022 8:06 AM
7	Jewish	4/13/2022 9:23 PM
8	doesn't matter	4/13/2022 6:36 PM
9	Middle Eastern	4/13/2022 5:29 PM
10	I will not be defined by my race or ethnicity!	4/13/2022 4:20 PM
11	Should not matter	4/13/2022 3:49 PM
12	na	4/13/2022 3:44 PM
13	bi-racial	4/13/2022 3:26 PM
14	Not a relevant question	4/13/2022 3:12 PM
15	Multiple race	4/13/2022 2:57 PM
16	Ukranian	4/13/2022 2:54 PM
17	don't wish to answer/doesn't play a roll	4/8/2022 2:11 PM
18	Human	4/8/2022 11:15 AM
19	Hispanic/native	4/8/2022 10:35 AM
20	white	4/7/2022 8:00 AM
21	Hebrew	3/26/2022 10:06 AM
22	American	3/25/2022 5:26 AM

**Q18 Do any of the following apply to you or someone in your household
(check all that apply):**

Answered: 292 Skipped: 89

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Ages 65 or over	43.15%	126
Ages 55 to 64	28.08%	82
Children under 18	25.68%	75
Large family (5 or more people)	16.10%	47
Have a disability (non-developmental)	7.19%	21
A single female head of household with children	5.82%	17
A single male head of household with children	4.11%	12
Farmworker	2.40%	7
Have a developmental disability	2.40%	7
Total Respondents: 292		

Q19 What housing challenges have you experienced?

Answered: 312 Skipped: 69

	YES	NO	TOTAL
I am concerned about my rent going up to an amount I can't afford.	43.18% 133	56.82% 175	308
I struggle to pay my rent or mortgage payment.	28.90% 89	71.10% 219	308
I am concerned that if I ask my property manager or landlord to repair my home that my rent will go up or I will be evicted.	29.28% 89	70.72% 215	304
My home is in poor condition and needs repair.	26.32% 80	73.68% 224	304
My home is not big enough for my family or household.	25.58% 77	74.42% 224	301
I need assistance with understanding my rights related to fair housing.	21.78% 66	78.22% 237	303
I need assistance finding rental housing.	18.21% 55	81.79% 247	302
I am concerned that I may be evicted.	15.84% 48	84.16% 255	303
I cannot find a place to rent due to bad credit, previous evictions, or foreclosure.	12.58% 38	87.42% 264	302
I have been discriminated against when trying to rent housing.	11.30% 34	88.70% 267	301
There is a lot of crime in my neighborhood.	10.96% 33	89.04% 268	301
I have been discriminated against when trying to purchase housing.	9.90% 30	90.10% 273	303

Q20 Do you or someone in your family have any of the following specific housing needs? Please check all that apply.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 209

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Senior independent living (senior single family community or senior apartments)	49.42%	85
Assisted living for senior (55 and over) that provides assistance with daily tasks and has increasing levels of care (from assisted living to skilled nursing)	31.98%	55
Supportive services to find and obtain housing.	27.91%	48
Daily living assistance and services to be able to live independently.	22.09%	38
Independent living for someone with a disability	13.95%	24
Supportive or transitional housing that provides services and support to avoid homelessness	13.37%	23
Emergency shelter	8.72%	15
Assisted living for disabled persons that provides assistance with daily tasks and has increasing levels of care (from assisted living to skilled nursing)	8.14%	14
Total Respondents: 172		

Q21 Have encountered discrimination or other issues that have affected your ability to live in safe, decent housing of your choice? If so, please explain any discrimination or fair housing issues you have encountered.

Answered: 314 Skipped: 67

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
No	94.90%	298
Yes (please specify)	5.10%	16
TOTAL		314

#	YES (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Have encountered racism as regards housing in another city (not Sonoma)	4/23/2022 6:23 PM
2	Pushed out by all cash buyers and corporations.	4/22/2022 7:56 PM
3	I have experienced housing discrimination multiple times when inquiring about housing for a family with young children. I know the occupancy standards and have had multiple different landlords/homeowners renting their house tell me the number of people was "too much for the aging septic" or the structure of the house "wasn't appropriate/was dangerous for children."	4/15/2022 1:23 PM
4	purchasing mobile home in senior park with one adult being over 55 and other 34 and disabled	4/14/2022 9:49 AM
5	low income	4/13/2022 4:26 PM
6	Neighbor thief & vandalism of my real property ignored by system (law enforcement, court)	4/13/2022 3:07 PM
7	my neighbors do not like my friends, simply because they are poor.	4/13/2022 2:54 PM
8	na	4/13/2022 2:01 PM
9	Age discrimination, emotional support animal discrimination & emotional support animal breed discrimination	4/8/2022 10:37 PM
10	Landlord sold home to new investor looking to flip	4/8/2022 8:23 PM
11	Victim of crime because we don't have the infrastructure (enough police funding) to handle increased populations!!!	4/8/2022 3:33 PM
12	everything is easier when you're white, sonoma is pretty racist	4/8/2022 11:15 AM
13	Agent refused to accept a bid/offer from me but accepted from white woman with similar circumstances (single parent)	4/8/2022 10:35 AM
14	Lack of money	4/7/2022 8:49 PM
15	No policy subsidy	4/7/2022 8:48 AM
16	When I rent and buy a house, I encounter discrimination. The owner deliberately raises the price to embarrass me.	4/7/2022 7:21 AM

Q22 Multifamily. Looking at the map above, please identify your preference for new multifamily housing development in each area.

Answered: 276 Skipped: 105

	STRONGLY PREFER	PREFER	NEUTRAL	DO NOT PREFER	STRONGLY DO NOT PREFER	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Maxwell District	28.46% 74	26.54% 69	28.46% 74	9.62% 25	6.92% 18	260	1.20
Broadway Corridor	23.74% 61	30.35% 78	30.35% 78	8.56% 22	7.00% 18	257	1.11
Southeast Area	23.37% 61	21.84% 57	35.63% 93	11.88% 31	7.28% 19	261	0.84
Gateway District	23.35% 60	27.24% 70	36.58% 94	7.00% 18	5.84% 15	257	1.11
Southwest Area	23.05% 59	26.95% 69	37.89% 97	8.98% 23	3.13% 8	256	1.16
West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	21.37% 56	31.68% 83	31.68% 83	8.40% 22	6.87% 18	262	1.05
Northeast Area	21.01% 54	22.57% 58	35.80% 92	14.01% 36	6.61% 17	257	0.75
Central-East Area	19.69% 50	23.62% 60	35.04% 89	13.78% 35	7.87% 20	254	0.67
Downtown District	19.14% 49	21.48% 55	32.03% 82	15.23% 39	12.11% 31	256	0.41
Central-West Area	19.44% 49	20.24% 51	42.86% 108	10.71% 27	6.75% 17	252	0.70
Vallejo District	17.76% 46	22.01% 57	37.84% 98	11.97% 31	10.42% 27	259	0.49
Cemetery District	15.33% 40	16.86% 44	37.16% 97	16.48% 43	14.18% 37	261	0.05
Northwest Area	12.99% 33	24.41% 62	44.88% 114	11.02% 28	6.69% 17	254	0.52

Q23 Mixed Use. Looking at the map above, please identify your preference for new mixed use development in each area.

Answered: 263 Skipped: 118

	STRONGLY PREFER	PREFER	NEUTRAL	DO NOT PREFER	STRONGLY DO NOT PREFER	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Broadway Corridor	25.91% 64	25.10% 62	34.82% 86	5.26% 13	8.91% 22	247	1.08
Maxwell District	22.09% 55	27.31% 68	34.14% 85	7.63% 19	8.84% 22	249	0.92
Downtown District	22.45% 55	27.35% 67	31.02% 76	9.39% 23	9.80% 24	245	0.87
Gateway District	22.54% 55	27.46% 67	38.52% 94	4.51% 11	6.97% 17	244	1.08
Southeast Area	20.25% 49	21.07% 51	41.74% 101	8.68% 21	8.26% 20	242	0.73
West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	17.93% 45	31.87% 80	36.25% 91	7.57% 19	6.37% 16	251	0.95
Southwest Area	17.07% 42	20.33% 50	45.93% 113	10.57% 26	6.10% 15	246	0.63
Central-East Area	16.39% 40	19.26% 47	43.85% 107	10.25% 25	10.25% 25	244	0.43
Vallejo District	14.69% 36	20.00% 49	39.18% 96	14.29% 35	11.84% 29	245	0.23
Northeast Area	15.06% 36	24.69% 59	36.40% 87	12.55% 30	11.30% 27	239	0.39
Central-West Area	13.81% 33	23.85% 57	44.77% 107	10.04% 24	7.53% 18	239	0.53
Northwest Area	11.98% 29	23.55% 57	45.04% 109	10.74% 26	8.68% 21	242	0.39
Cemetery District	10.25% 25	18.03% 44	37.70% 92	15.98% 39	18.03% 44	244	-0.27

Q24 Single Family. Looking at the map above, please identify your preference for new single family housing in each area.

Answered: 260 Skipped: 121

	STRONGLY PREFER	PREFER	NEUTRAL	DO NOT PREFER	STRONGLY DO NOT PREFER	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Maxwell District	22.22% 54	26.75% 65	34.57% 84	8.64% 21	7.82% 19	243	0.94
Southeast Area	21.90% 53	31.40% 76	32.64% 79	6.61% 16	7.44% 18	242	1.07
Central-East Area	20.90% 51	25.82% 63	36.89% 90	8.20% 20	8.20% 20	244	0.86
West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	18.03% 44	27.46% 67	35.25% 86	10.25% 25	9.02% 22	244	0.70
Northwest Area	17.50% 42	27.08% 65	37.50% 90	10.83% 26	7.08% 17	240	0.74
Downtown District	17.95% 42	18.38% 43	32.48% 76	16.67% 39	14.53% 34	234	0.17
Northeast Area	16.94% 41	29.34% 71	36.78% 89	9.92% 24	7.02% 17	242	0.79
Broadway Corridor	17.45% 41	21.70% 51	36.17% 85	14.04% 33	10.64% 25	235	0.43
Gateway District	17.15% 41	25.52% 61	38.49% 92	9.21% 22	9.62% 23	239	0.63
Cemetery District	16.60% 40	22.41% 54	33.20% 80	13.69% 33	14.11% 34	241	0.27
Central-West Area	16.25% 39	28.75% 69	37.08% 89	10.83% 26	7.08% 17	240	0.72
Southwest Area	16.05% 39	34.98% 85	34.16% 83	8.64% 21	6.17% 15	243	0.92
Vallejo District	14.88% 36	24.79% 60	38.02% 92	12.40% 30	9.92% 24	242	0.45

Q25 Are there other housing types needed in specific areas of the City? Please describe.

Answered: 132 Skipped: 249

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Do not feel am familiar enough to make such decisions	4/23/2022 6:28 PM
2	Sonoma already has enough housing, but we need to do everything we can to preserve neighborhood character and encourage increasing property values. We need fewer renters and multi-family and more prosperous and high quality single-family homes.	4/18/2022 4:19 PM
3	Let the free market determine where what type of housing is needed.	4/18/2022 12:21 PM
4	Viviendas para jóvenes.	4/16/2022 11:45 AM
5	Temporary housing WITH SERVICES for those not housed now	4/15/2022 9:07 PM
6	No	4/15/2022 8:09 PM
7	N/A	4/15/2022 8:05 PM
8	Agua Caliente	4/15/2022 7:32 PM
9	No	4/15/2022 7:19 PM
10	Attractive tiny & very small home single family home communities structured as Community Land Trusts, with stand-alone units sized between 400-1200 sf and with green spaces, community gardens & shared common amenities between them (like larger meeting hall, outdoor play equipment, etc.) We need to get away from the idea of multi-family = apartments & condos, this is why these developments are so resisted as they urbanize the city. Tiny home and small home villages do not, they add charm and everyone loves the look of them and they are affordable and desirable to first time homebuyers, renters, single folks, elderly, etc.	4/15/2022 1:33 PM
11	Emergency and transitional housing in the west napa/sonoma corridor.	4/14/2022 6:05 PM
12	Teacher, Medically Personnel and First Responder housing or programs for low down payments and low interest rates.	4/14/2022 3:07 PM
13	Focus on equality through out the City- The east side should not be favored more then the west	4/14/2022 10:22 AM
14	No	4/14/2022 8:56 AM
15	No	4/14/2022 8:36 AM
16	I am not an expert on land use, nor am I am an engineer. If growth is thoughtful, structure is supported, pot holes filled, water available, fire exits accessible and public schools prioritized, then, YES to smart, thoughtful mixed use development throughout town.	4/14/2022 7:56 AM
17	Not at this time	4/13/2022 10:56 PM
18	N/a	4/13/2022 10:15 PM
19	Senior housing that's affordable for people that don't qualify as low income	4/13/2022 9:32 PM
20	My main priorities are water and access out of the city in the case of fires.	4/13/2022 9:30 PM
21	None come to mind.	4/13/2022 9:25 PM
22	No	4/13/2022 8:19 PM
23	We need low-income housing --it doesn't matter where--we just need it.	4/13/2022 8:05 PM
24	AFFORDABLE..... this town is ONLY viable for wealth	4/13/2022 7:25 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

25	Appropriate Homeless housing	4/13/2022 7:12 PM
26	small community area with common services .day care,stores,a center	4/13/2022 6:46 PM
27	Accommodations for the homeless, so they don't set up encampments on public or private land.	4/13/2022 6:02 PM
28	Don't know	4/13/2022 6:00 PM
29	I just dont know all these areas that well	4/13/2022 5:52 PM
30	Affordable senior housing within walking distance of grocery shopping as well as senior programs and services.	4/13/2022 5:02 PM
31	More duplex type homes	4/13/2022 4:40 PM
32	Studio type apts. for singles.	4/13/2022 4:39 PM
33	Loft spaces for retried artist/creatives...musicians, writers!	4/13/2022 4:27 PM
34	55+ communities	4/13/2022 4:17 PM
35	Landlords that keep their rents low should be given tax incentives.	4/13/2022 4:16 PM
36	No	4/13/2022 3:46 PM
37	?	4/13/2022 3:45 PM
38	Where can a number of houses that would actually make a difference go?...Mobile home are a good way to provide housing	4/13/2022 3:35 PM
39	Affordable housing for working families	4/13/2022 3:29 PM
40	None that I am aware of	4/13/2022 3:27 PM
41	Affordable without the strict constrains on income	4/13/2022 3:25 PM
42	Affordable for all who work in our City in the Hospitality Industry, our Hospital Workers. Our Teachers, and all services workers for the City.	4/13/2022 3:18 PM
43	No	4/13/2022 3:09 PM
44	very low income housing. section 8 housing.	4/13/2022 2:58 PM
45	No	4/13/2022 2:55 PM
46	don't know just know if two working people that make a good income can't afford a home then something is wrong	4/13/2022 2:45 PM
47	for Homeless - URGENT!	4/12/2022 12:19 PM
48	Affordable apartment	4/9/2022 7:42 AM
49	Even renovating old houses	4/9/2022 6:37 AM
50	To ensure the housing needs of special groups	4/9/2022 5:03 AM
51	Increase the housing demand of specific groups	4/9/2022 2:19 AM
52	Unsure	4/8/2022 9:48 PM
53	Encourage higher income housing on the west side to even out the school district disparities	4/8/2022 8:27 PM
54	Add some specific housing needs	4/8/2022 8:10 PM
55	Housing needs to be built in specific areas	4/8/2022 6:30 PM
56	Small homes with decent yard for families. Teachers and other professionals who grew up here can't afford to buy here.	4/8/2022 6:11 PM
57	Infrastructure should be step number one. We can't handle the population now.	4/8/2022 3:35 PM
58	Yes, but Just start somewhere!	4/8/2022 1:50 PM
59	Our downtown areas need more small mixed use housing (room rentals, kitchen, bath, yard	4/8/2022 1:44 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

privileges.etc) & studios atop or behind our businesses, while maintaining a aesthetic, historical feel to the buildings.

60	Some special housing needs need to be added	4/8/2022 7:21 AM
61	Apartment lei	4/8/2022 5:46 AM
62	When the government arranges relatively perfect	4/8/2022 5:28 AM
63	Urban housing construction is relatively perfect	4/8/2022 2:28 AM
64	No	4/8/2022 2:06 AM
65	I don't know	4/7/2022 10:44 PM
66	unwanted	4/7/2022 10:44 PM
67	I don't know much about other types of housing	4/7/2022 10:29 PM
68	no	4/7/2022 8:00 PM
69	50+ unit deed-restricted projects on the east side in Opportunity Areas	4/7/2022 7:22 PM
70	I don't feel like it	4/7/2022 6:24 PM
71	There may be a need for small multistory homes	4/7/2022 5:53 PM
72	Don't need	4/7/2022 5:27 PM
73	apartment	4/7/2022 12:40 PM
74	apartment	4/7/2022 12:09 PM
75	apartment	4/7/2022 11:02 AM
76	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 10:26 AM
77	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 9:57 AM
78	There is no	4/7/2022 9:53 AM
79	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 9:37 AM
80	There is no	4/7/2022 9:31 AM
81	It's pretty good.	4/7/2022 9:22 AM
82	no	4/7/2022 9:14 AM
83	Cemetery District mind building a single-family villa.	4/7/2022 8:51 AM
84	High-grade residential area	4/7/2022 8:49 AM
85	There is no	4/7/2022 8:46 AM
86	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 8:44 AM
87	No, it's very thoughtful	4/7/2022 8:41 AM
88	It takes a lot of houses	4/7/2022 8:31 AM
89	no	4/7/2022 8:31 AM
90	no	4/7/2022 8:31 AM
91	There is no	4/7/2022 8:31 AM
92	N/A	4/7/2022 8:30 AM
93	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 8:23 AM
94	villa	4/7/2022 8:16 AM
95	NO	4/7/2022 8:12 AM
96	We don't have any other rooms we need	4/7/2022 8:09 AM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

97	We don't have any other rooms we need	4/7/2022 8:09 AM
98	We don't have any other rooms we need	4/7/2022 8:09 AM
99	Don't need	4/7/2022 8:03 AM
100	That's enough to meet the demand.	4/7/2022 8:01 AM
101	no	4/7/2022 7:47 AM
102	More houses are needed	4/7/2022 7:45 AM
103	Villa community	4/7/2022 7:31 AM
104	no	4/7/2022 7:31 AM
105	without	4/7/2022 7:31 AM
106	No	4/7/2022 7:25 AM
107	No	4/7/2022 7:03 AM
108	I have no opinion	4/7/2022 6:56 AM
109	Don't like to build any other housing areas, because the city is not suitable for people to live in	4/7/2022 6:49 AM
110	no	4/7/2022 6:45 AM
111	no	4/7/2022 6:42 AM
112	More apartment.	4/7/2022 6:42 AM
113	no	4/7/2022 6:42 AM
114	no	4/7/2022 6:34 AM
115	Enough is good	4/7/2022 6:30 AM
116	We could have lived cheaper or nicer if we were further away from everything, but we chose to be in a denser area, more walkable.	4/7/2022 6:27 AM
117	I think we can add some two-story villas appropriately	4/7/2022 6:26 AM
118	I don't think so	4/7/2022 6:21 AM
119	no	4/7/2022 6:18 AM
120	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 6:11 AM
121	No special houses are available	4/6/2022 6:00 PM
122	Transitional housing for at risk people is needed in Maxwell District or Downtown district (close to services)	4/2/2022 12:36 PM
123	Luxury condos for those downsizing, but keeping character and scale of Sonoma. Nothing higher than 2 stories.	4/1/2022 10:37 AM
124	no	4/1/2022 6:10 AM
125	All developed areas need to densify and Broadway is a great place to grow taller with mixed use. Eastside especially has mostly single family homes and free market will keep providing them at a price unattainable to people who work in Sonoma. Build dense housing that is more affordable there. Sonoma NEEDS housing for it's workforce and business owners are clear their #1 need housing for their workers. It is not true that densifying will ruin our tourist economy, quite the opposite is true.	3/29/2022 2:33 PM
126	I don't get the point of these questions. As soon as you decide on an area, the people living there will start to complain that they don't want more traffic AND what about water. Do we have enough to support more housing in Sonoma?	3/29/2022 12:54 PM
127	single family homes to rent- so renters dont need to be squished together	3/28/2022 4:32 PM
128	Affordable rental units	3/26/2022 10:09 AM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

129	Follow current zoning/planning uses. Plan for safe police patrols and walks throughout the whole area. We need deterrent to crime.	3/25/2022 5:24 PM
130	If any new housing is added anywhere it should be Workforce housing for employees of local employers, and temporary housing for local residents who are rendered homeless by circumstances. Sonoma otherwise does NOT need to increase population by building housing for people who don't live or work here now. That only enriches developers and destroys Sonoma quality of life for existing residents, all of whom can afford to live here or they wouldn't be living here, and who have paid dearly for their housing and want to preserve its resale value.	3/25/2022 5:49 AM
131	Na	3/24/2022 11:48 PM
132	50-unit projects in central, north and south east sides, esp. Opportunity Areas or adjacent to Opportunity Areas	3/24/2022 7:27 PM

Q26 Housing Rehabilitation. Looking at the map above, please identify areas in need of housing rehabilitation.

Answered: 221 Skipped: 160

	SIGNIFICANT REHABILITATION: SOME OR ALL HOUSING IN THIS AREA IS IN DISREPAIR OR UNSAFE.	MODERATE REHABILITATION: SOME HOUSING IN THIS AREA IS IN DISREPAIR.	MINOR REHABILITATION: MINOR REPAIRS, BUT HOUSING IS GENERALLY IN GOOD CONDITION.	NO REHABILITATION: HOUSING IS IN GOOD CONDITION.	(NO LABEL)	TOTAL	WEIGH AVERA
Maxwell District	15.31% 32	30.14% 63	26.79% 56	11.96% 25	15.79% 33	209	
West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	8.70% 18	28.99% 60	32.85% 68	14.01% 29	15.46% 32	207	
Northwest Area	11.65% 24	26.21% 54	33.01% 68	17.48% 36	11.65% 24	206	
Vallejo District	6.57% 13	21.72% 43	31.31% 62	23.74% 47	16.67% 33	198	
Cemetery District	6.06% 12	16.67% 33	28.28% 56	32.32% 64	16.67% 33	198	
Northeast Area	7.50% 15	21.00% 42	27.50% 55	31.00% 62	13.00% 26	200	
Downtown District	4.93% 10	17.24% 35	36.45% 74	28.08% 57	13.30% 27	203	
Central-West Area	5.85% 12	27.32% 56	33.17% 68	21.95% 45	11.71% 24	205	
Broadway Corridor	10.29% 21	23.53% 48	33.33% 68	21.08% 43	11.76% 24	204	
Central-East Area	8.29% 17	18.54% 38	30.24% 62	31.22% 64	11.71% 24	205	
Southwest Area	9.76% 20	26.34% 54	33.17% 68	16.59% 34	14.15% 29	205	
Southeast Area	5.45% 11	22.28% 45	35.15% 71	24.26% 49	12.87% 26	202	
Gateway District	9.18% 19	23.19% 48	33.82% 70	19.32% 40	14.49% 30	207	

Q27 Community Investment. Looking at the map above, please identify areas in need of improved access to jobs, services, education, or recreation.

Answered: 182 Skipped: 199

	JOBS: IMPROVE TRANSIT	JOBS: ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE-GENERATING DEVELOPMENT (COMMERCIAL, OFFICES, RESEARCH/TECHNOLOGY, ETC.)	SERVICES: INCREASE ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE	SERVICES: INCREASE ACCESS TO DAILY LIVING SERVICES (GROCERY, BANKING, ETC.)	EDUCATION: INCREASE ACCESS TO SCHOOLS	RECREATION: INCREASE ACCESS TO PARKS, RECREATION FACILITIES, AND OPEN SPACE	TOTAL
Maxwell District	34.50% 59	19.30% 33	18.71% 32	7.60% 13	7.02% 12	12.87% 22	
West Napa/Sonoma Corridor	28.66% 47	25.00% 41	16.46% 27	12.20% 20	6.10% 10	11.59% 19	
Northwest Area	22.37% 34	25.00% 38	19.74% 30	13.82% 21	5.92% 9	13.16% 20	
Vallejo District	22.15% 33	14.77% 22	18.79% 28	16.78% 25	9.40% 14	18.12% 27	
Cemetery District	26.71% 39	14.38% 21	16.44% 24	18.49% 27	4.11% 6	19.86% 29	
Northeast Area	22.07% 32	17.93% 26	17.24% 25	22.07% 32	8.28% 12	12.41% 18	
Downtown District	23.03% 35	30.26% 46	14.47% 22	12.50% 19	7.24% 11	12.50% 19	
Central-West Area	22.30% 33	17.57% 26	18.24% 27	17.57% 26	9.46% 14	14.86% 22	
Broadway Corridor	26.97% 41	19.74% 30	17.11% 26	13.16% 20	7.89% 12	15.13% 23	
Central-East Area	27.03% 40	19.59% 29	18.24% 27	18.24% 27	5.41% 8	11.49% 17	
Southwest Area	27.63% 42	19.08% 29	12.50% 19	21.05% 32	9.21% 14	10.53% 16	
Southeast Area	22.67% 34	16.67% 25	24.00% 36	20.67% 31	6.67% 10	9.33% 14	
Gateway District	25.32% 40	25.32% 40	12.66% 20	17.72% 28	3.80% 6	15.19% 24	

Q28 What age range most accurately describes you?

Answered: 268 Skipped: 113

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
0-17 years old	0.37%	1
18-23 years old	2.61%	7
24-39 years old	35.45%	95
40-55 years old	21.64%	58
56-74 years old	29.48%	79
75+ years old	10.45%	28
TOTAL	268	

Q29 Please describe any additional housing comments or concerns you would like to share with the City.

Answered: 150 Skipped: 231

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Rent is out of control There are way to many vacation rentals in residential neighborhoods	4/30/2022 7:46 PM
2	We need significantly more affordable housing options in all areas of Sonoma.	4/21/2022 1:51 PM
3	We must ONLY allow housing that does not increase traffic, air pollution, and obesity. We cannot allow car-focused housing or housing that increase driving in any way. No low-income or low quality housing should be allowed and no population increase.	4/18/2022 4:23 PM
4	We appreciate the City of Sonoma taking the time to look into these housing issues.	4/18/2022 2:40 PM
5	City is fairly small so access is good to most services except over on the East side where not much grocery r banking. Vallejo and Cemetery districts are already good access for recreation, hiking, etc, so keep those for that. Take advantage of areas already set up for mixed use and multifamily services and transportation to add more there. I hear that local governments won't necessarily have a say when it comes to additional water, sewer, parking needed, so should save time and costs by adding into areas already set up for them first.	4/18/2022 12:31 PM
6	Government should not try to fix the housing in our area. Look at the unintended consequences rent control has done in almost every market. It leads to less housing. Let the free market adjust.	4/18/2022 12:27 PM
7	Seguridad en general	4/16/2022 11:49 AM
8	Cada vez es más caro vivir en el valle y las rentas siguen aumentando deberían tener un control de renta establecido	4/15/2022 8:15 PM
9	Que no suban mucho la renta	4/15/2022 7:38 PM
10	None	4/15/2022 7:23 PM
11	It would be nice to see more reasonably priced rentals. Also fewer single family homes - we need to also build up.	4/15/2022 6:14 PM
12	Housing discrimination is rampant but underreported by a landslide. I attempted to learn of my rights when facing housing discrimination multiple times and the resources available are severely underfunded and challenging to make use of in a way that was actually effectual. For example, when I was experiencing clear discrimination, I was faced with the untenable decision to either file a laborious and NON-anonymous "report" on my neighbors, or on the friends of friends whom I know in the community, or I could keep my mouth shut and not jettison those relationships I might need to keep intact for my or my family's survival someday. I did the latter, I kept my mouth shut, painfully, each time. Only privileged, wealthy and already well-housed folks can afford to jettison those type of relationships that could lead to possible word-of-mouth (meaning below market rate, as market rate nobody can afford) housing. Also it's clear that if a landlord has the option to AirBnB their modest cottage home for 2 weekends/month and make as much money as they'd make if my family rented it each month for a year, clearly I and other renters like me will continue to be discriminated against for this very reason. It doesn't make economic sense to incentivize vacation rentals for tourists over working class families and citizens, and that's how its set up right now.	4/15/2022 1:45 PM
13	Mandating that business expansion has a residential component on property is ridiculous and unattainable. Allowing more ADUs on property must have an affordable housing clause attached to have any benefit	4/15/2022 9:18 AM
14	east side needs more housing on lots. Plant more trees along bike path and streets to provide shape and beauty	4/15/2022 9:04 AM
15	Do not exacerbate Parking and traffic around plaza	4/15/2022 6:42 AM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

16	Las rentas están muy altas y cada día es más difícil de encontrar propiedad que acepten mascotas	4/14/2022 6:36 PM
17	N/A	4/14/2022 3:15 PM
18	Stop putting all of the higher density housing on the west side only. We need locals and diversity to populate the east side also so it isn't a dead zone of vacation homes and rich people. The west side is teeming with family life and people who actually live, work and send their kids to schools in Sonoma. We need to balance out the housing types in town. It's going to be much too dense with traffic on the west side and up Hwy 12!! Balance needed!	4/14/2022 11:53 AM
19	There is a clear division in the City of Sonoma - East compared to the West. Affordable housing should go on the east side to true up the equality between East and West sides.	4/14/2022 10:55 AM
20	I owned a duplex with affordable housing. Did not find that the rents were significantly lower than average rent.	4/14/2022 9:59 AM
21	Traffic issues; speeders in neighborhoods; beggars; people scoping homes to steal deliveries, etc	4/14/2022 9:09 AM
22	Need more availability for housing for disabled and or low income residents without having to wait years to be eligible.	4/14/2022 9:02 AM
23	Large Residential/Mixed use projects should be developed only on main corridors. Adequate parking is essential for any development. Residential neighborhoods should not be impacted.	4/14/2022 8:37 AM
24	Affordable, really, not just government definition	4/13/2022 10:56 PM
25	We moved from near Hwy 12 (lived in a cul de sac) @ downsized. Found Pueblo Serena fit our needs the best.....own the home but pay rent for the space. We could not afford Temelec or other single family homes in the valley. We sold our home..lived there 30 years & were able to buy home (no mortgage) and put balance in investments. Not putting up a large hotel complex downtown would allow for additional housing assuming the cost is not prohibitive allowing younger people to purchase a small home. Living off of 5th St west I love to walk for my errands.....post office 3 grocery stores, 2 drugstores, clothing store, library and bank!	4/13/2022 10:41 PM
26	N/a	4/13/2022 10:23 PM
27	The cost of rentals is crazy- I am retirement age but can't afford to retire here. So many of our services workers can't afford it here. It's going to become a town with no services if something isn't done.	4/13/2022 9:38 PM
28	Water and access out of the city in the case of fires.	4/13/2022 9:31 PM
29	The residential rents here are ridiculous bordering on criminal.	4/13/2022 9:27 PM
30	The City keeps putting off affordable housing on developments, instead taking \$\$ for the "one-day" project. STOP THAT. REQUIRE any development to INCLUDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING *NOW*! Create more opportunities for our family members to stay in the area or else this will become a ghost town, berift of young people who will get their start working customer service, vocational skills, and service jobs.	4/13/2022 8:42 PM
31	Ninguno	4/13/2022 8:22 PM
32	Being on fixed income,it's very expensive for a single senior to live in this city.	4/13/2022 8:13 PM
33	the city will GROW no matter who or why they don't want it to and denying space to build or house in certain areas and OVERLOADING other areas is not a sustainable GROWTH PLAN..EVERYONE MUST BE PART OF THE NEW SONOMA ..PEACE	4/13/2022 6:53 PM
34	Please do not let homeless encampments take over the city as they have done in other communities.	4/13/2022 6:07 PM
35	I consider myself quite ignorant of the needs in certain areas in Sonoma, so basically I'm just interested in rezoning away from single family housing in favor of multi-family dwelling.	4/13/2022 5:49 PM
36	We need affordable housing for seniors and working class people!!	4/13/2022 5:39 PM
37	Good survey. But later questions (renovation, access) are skewed because metro area's problems are in the more highly populated El Verano and the Springs. Need a one-stop government covering all.	4/13/2022 5:19 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

38	I am grateful for our City's Mobilehome Rent Stabilization Ordinance as it makes it possible for me to afford living in my home. However escalating sewer rates may change that!	4/13/2022 5:14 PM
39	I very much disagree with putting Apartments, condos, large developments in fully established single home neighborhoods.	4/13/2022 4:43 PM
40	My apartment units are owned by the city. I wish they would come by one day and look at how Burbank is "taking care" of its property. Disgraceful!!!!	4/13/2022 4:41 PM
41	I am a retired senior. I have resided in the Sonoma Valley for 43 years. At the rate of rental increases I will be forced to relocate!	4/13/2022 4:33 PM
42	New housing requires water - we need to save water in the drought	4/13/2022 3:52 PM
43	we don't have water, road space, parking, or room to stay the town we love and paid a lot to live in if we keep increasing the amount of multi family homes! And our children need fresh air and room to excursive not smog and pavement	4/13/2022 3:50 PM
44	None	4/13/2022 3:50 PM
45	The school situation with all of our public schools is a complete disaster. The city should be ashamed of itself. Administrative turnover happened annually and that is not ok.	4/13/2022 3:46 PM
46	The recent addition to low cost housing is helpful but some of the residents still can't afford the rent. Those with jobs in agriculture or the service industry do not have stable job income to seasonal layoffs or reduction of hours in the off season. As a tourist town, it would be helpful to Sonoma to articulate the tradeoffs - high priced housing and service sector jobs leave employees without the ability to live in the area. However, that is true of Marin County - good paying jobs in education but the teachers can't afford the housing prices. Such ethical cross-hairs.	4/13/2022 3:34 PM
47	With all due respect, it seems the City of Sonoma can't get out of its own way and makes it very difficult for projects to get approved. Perhaps I don't have all the information, but this is the sense I get when watching the planning commission and city council meetings, reading the local newspaper, and hearing from folks who have attempted to get projects approved. The Truck & Auto site at the corner of MacArthur and Broadway is a good example - housing should've been built there long ago, but instead it's now a blighted eyesore. I am hopeful things will turn around and we'll soon see progress being made. To offer some perspective, I am a 6th generation resident and the last generation of my family that will be able to live here. My adult children have no plans of returning due to lack of decent jobs and reasonably-priced housing.	4/13/2022 3:33 PM
48	Make use of some of the unused lots that are currently a blight	4/13/2022 3:31 PM
49	Please do not view this as some grand social engineering scheme. It rarely makes for good decisions.	4/13/2022 3:25 PM
50	Need to minimize VRBOs and second and third homes. -This also increases hotel occupancy and associated taxes. So many homes are temporary. Maybe a massive tax when taking on a second mortgage.	4/13/2022 3:24 PM
51	Keep the City out of financial redistribution efforts	4/13/2022 3:21 PM
52	THis entire questionnaire is totally unbalanced. It is only geared to generate more more more housing. What about quality of life issues, water, sustainability etc? Why aren't those issues addressed?	4/13/2022 3:17 PM
53	We need to have empty house taxes in this community. Limit vacation rentals and no Picasso.	4/13/2022 3:02 PM
54	The system is broken. unless you inherit money or property even doctors struggle to buy a home they want to live in. ridiculous. needs to be more supply to lower these prices or laws yes laws in place to prevent highest bidder. even if u get lucky and can find a home u can barely afford someone will come in and out bid u.	4/13/2022 2:48 PM
55	N/A	4/13/2022 4:37 AM
56	CRIME IS INCREASING FAST IN SONOMA AND IT WOULD BE WISE TO DO BETTER SCREENING OF WHO IS MOVING INTO OR VIOLATING CURRENT RENTAL CONTRACTS ETC BECAUSE IT IS GETTING PRETTY SKETCHY AROUND HERE	4/13/2022 12:06 AM
57	Unsheltered folks	4/12/2022 12:22 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

58	Overcome community resistance to new housing for lower incomes	4/11/2022 9:41 PM
59	Concerned that every lot and parcel of land in the city limits will be filled with too much housing. Not enough water. The city is too crowded as it is, it cannot sustain more.	4/11/2022 8:46 AM
60	As a couple we have good paying jobs and work for large organizations within Sonoma for years yet can't live our dream of being a first time home buyer in the town we love and support. Instead we have to hunt for a 2500 dollars a month run down 1960s rental that's not energy efficient. It will eventually push us out of Sonoma. Sonoma will at some point not have any new or young families to support and grow the town.	4/9/2022 7:19 AM
61	I have lived in this beautiful city for my entire life (32 years). I work at our local Boys & Girls Club and my Fiancé works at Sonoma Raceway. We both make over 65,000 a year and yet we still find it difficult to find a rental that meets our price range (2,400 a month). The rental options in our price range are either small studio apartments or old dilapidated apartments. I would love to continue to live in my hometown of Sonoma, but if this housing trend continues I don't see us being residents here for much longer.	4/9/2022 7:00 AM
62	Fiscal policies to increase the supply of public housing, fiscal policies to support the consumption of public housing,	4/9/2022 6:42 AM
63	We will ensure the housing needs of special groups and strengthen infrastructure	4/9/2022 5:05 AM
64	We will improve residents' housing needs, make good planning, and protect their rights and interests	4/9/2022 2:22 AM
65	Need for more options which are affordable.	4/8/2022 9:51 PM
66	When you build new housings, please provide a safe cross walk for the pedestrians.	4/8/2022 8:47 PM
67	We are rapidly becoming a retirement community and are putting too many barriers in the way of young families who want to build a long term life here. Down payment assistance grants could help ensure that the only young families that are moving here aren't the Uber rich tech families and prevent us from being a community of seniors that are aging out and second home millionaires. While the needs of low income residents are clearly a huge priority, consider how supporting the middle class families would combat some of the boujie second home crowd takeover.	4/8/2022 8:31 PM
68	Increase some specific housing needs to ensure the health of residents	4/8/2022 8:15 PM
69	Specific areas need to build corresponding housing needs, improve and rehabilitate old neighborhoods, to ensure the safety of citizens	4/8/2022 6:34 PM
70	Again- single family homes that local professionals like a teacher can afford.	4/8/2022 6:13 PM
71	We need to address our infrastructure first. Especially water.	4/8/2022 3:37 PM
72	Water!!!! You want to build more housing but what about adding water capacity? Nothing has been added in years and we are expected to save more and more water and the city wants/needs to add more housing, something needs to give.	4/8/2022 2:19 PM
73	Better well paying jobs, as well as entry level, are much needed in SV. Bring back an Adult Learning school. Maintain our historical buildings, & create an 'honest' history museum about the area's past.	4/8/2022 1:56 PM
74	We need to take back housing from the slumlords in this town. no one should have multiple rental properties (commercial or home). Mattsons are looking awful tasty these days...#EATTHE RICH	4/8/2022 11:25 AM
75	More affordable housing and especially more affordable rents.	4/8/2022 10:45 AM
76	Some special housing needs need to be added to ensure the housing needs of citizens	4/8/2022 7:28 AM
77	Increase the apartment	4/8/2022 5:49 AM
78	Ensure the safety of housing construction, increase infrastructure, and make people's lives happier	4/8/2022 5:39 AM
79	We will build more suitable housing for the middle class and reduce housing pressure	4/8/2022 2:37 AM
80	Provide temporary shelter for the homeless	4/7/2022 10:47 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

81	So that more people who can't afford it can live in a good house	4/7/2022 10:47 PM
82	Establish more suitable low rent housing or preferential conditions for low-income people.	4/7/2022 10:32 PM
83	Build more houses so that more people who don't have houses can have their own.	4/7/2022 8:53 PM
84	ok	4/7/2022 8:01 PM
85	The city can take way more housing than the 6th cycle RHNA, double easily; all new housing needs too be deed-restricted to make up for past displacement of the working class here	4/7/2022 7:31 PM
86	I think part of the house needs waterproof material	4/7/2022 5:55 PM
87	It's too expensive. Some can't afford it	4/7/2022 5:28 PM
88	There is no	4/7/2022 12:41 PM
89	No opinion	4/7/2022 12:10 PM
90	No opinion	4/7/2022 11:04 AM
91	If only the housing allowance were higher	4/7/2022 10:27 AM
92	If only the housing allowance were higher	4/7/2022 9:57 AM
93	No opinion	4/7/2022 9:54 AM
94	If only the housing allowance were higher	4/7/2022 9:39 AM
95	No opinion	4/7/2022 9:32 AM
96	The government has done a very good job.	4/7/2022 9:25 AM
97	no	4/7/2022 9:15 AM
98	I think building schools and shopping malls around the new houses will create jobs and attract people to the area.	4/7/2022 8:57 AM
99	Hope to build more parking lots	4/7/2022 8:51 AM
100	No opinion	4/7/2022 8:48 AM
101	I don't have a problem with the current house	4/7/2022 8:47 AM
102	The above survey is very detailed. There are no necessary questions	4/7/2022 8:47 AM
103	Yeah, like the elevator for the old people's area	4/7/2022 8:45 AM
104	no	4/7/2022 8:36 AM
105	no	4/7/2022 8:36 AM
106	no	4/7/2022 8:36 AM
107	I hope the quality is better	4/7/2022 8:33 AM
108	N/A	4/7/2022 8:33 AM
109	If only the housing allowance were higher	4/7/2022 8:24 AM
110	no	4/7/2022 8:17 AM
111	NO	4/7/2022 8:13 AM
112	There is no	4/7/2022 8:11 AM
113	There is no	4/7/2022 8:11 AM
114	There is no	4/7/2022 8:11 AM
115	Hopefully the infrastructure will be updated	4/7/2022 8:05 AM
116	The government does a very good job.	4/7/2022 8:04 AM
117	I think the city is very well organized	4/7/2022 7:48 AM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

118	More houses are needed	4/7/2022 7:47 AM
119	no	4/7/2022 7:36 AM
120	I hope we can speed up the housing plan, sort out the dilapidated houses first, and then build new ones.	4/7/2022 7:35 AM
121	It may be possible to replace the water heater in our house	4/7/2022 7:34 AM
122	Hope to strengthen security	4/7/2022 7:33 AM
123	no	4/7/2022 7:31 AM
124	No	4/7/2022 7:27 AM
125	I have no opinion	4/7/2022 6:57 AM
126	I don't have any other problems and I'm fine with it	4/7/2022 6:52 AM
127	Can appropriately reduce the school district housing prices	4/7/2022 6:48 AM
128	no	4/7/2022 6:46 AM
129	Housing environment is more important.	4/7/2022 6:45 AM
130	I wish more houses could be built	4/7/2022 6:44 AM
131	no	4/7/2022 6:35 AM
132	I have no opinion	4/7/2022 6:33 AM
133	Maybe we need more affordable housing	4/7/2022 6:29 AM
134	I think some of the exterior of the house might need some waterproof paint	4/7/2022 6:29 AM
135	I wish the policy could be relaxed	4/7/2022 6:23 AM
136	no	4/7/2022 6:20 AM
137	If only the housing allowance were higher	4/7/2022 6:13 AM
138	希望政府根据这项调查以及政府给出得规划图更好的施展	4/7/2022 2:16 AM
139	No special houses are available	4/6/2022 6:04 PM
140	Water!! How do we build with shortage of water?? Need to keep some open spaces / green belts between housing clusters. And parks for neighborhood children to play in. And MORE parking allowed for housing and commercial businesses. Over flow parking from employees into neighborhoods is not acceptable!	4/6/2022 5:18 PM
141	Very concerned that both NIMBY happens most on the East side of Sonoma and that the West side gets slammed with congestion. Concerned that we'll simply lose our traditional neighborhoods with the agenda of Gov Newsome and City elects serving that agenda.	4/6/2022 4:11 PM
142	Don't overbuild. There is limited water, we are in a fire zone and there is already lots of traffic.	4/1/2022 10:38 AM
143	Rent control	4/1/2022 6:13 AM
144	it was only through the grace of our friends who rented my mother-in-law a home here in Sonoma for 15 years at a reasonable price so she could live in Sonoma close to us. Once she moved into a residential facility they were able to double the amount of rent for the home she was renting.	3/29/2022 12:59 PM
145	Renters live in fear of their rent being raised and no available affordable properties	3/28/2022 4:36 PM
146	Safety first as that is beginning to factor into land usage	3/25/2022 5:41 PM
147	Additional housing is only needed to the extent it is needed to secure housing for employees of local businesses and entities that service city residents, e.g., the school district, hospital & city govt. More housing is NOT needed simply to add population & enrich developers.	3/25/2022 5:59 AM
148	Appreciate affordable housing programs between companies like denova and the City.	3/24/2022 11:52 PM
149	I'm hoping for some bold, Progressive action that won't cave to rich NIMBYs	3/24/2022 7:35 PM

Sonoma Housing Needs and Priorities Survey

150

We need more of everything except large houses with huge lots.

3/24/2022 3:03 PM

Q30 Submit your name and contact information for your chance to win a \$50 Visa gift card! If you would like to be added to the City's contact list for the Housing Element Update, please enter your contact information below.

Note: This information will be kept separate from the remainder of the survey responses in order to ensure responses are published anonymously.

Answered: 200 Skipped: 181

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Name	99.50%	199
Company	0.00%	0
Address	0.00%	0
Address 2	0.00%	0
City/Town	0.00%	0
State/Province	0.00%	0
ZIP/Postal Code	0.00%	0
Country	0.00%	0
Email Address	100.00%	200
Phone Number	0.00%	0



Personal information removed (pages 48-59) to maintain the privacy of respondents.

APPENDIX D

Stakeholders Survey

Q1 Contact Information. Please provide your name, organization you are affiliated with, and contact information.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Name	100.00%	3
Organization	100.00%	3
Address	100.00%	3
Address 2	0.00%	0
City	100.00%	3
State	100.00%	3
ZIP Code	100.00%	3
Country	0.00%	0
Email Address	100.00%	3
Phone Number	100.00%	3

#	NAME	DATE
1	Laurie Hobbs	4/15/2022 1:47 PM

2	Margaret DeMatteo	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
---	-------------------	-------------------

3	Jennifer M Montgomery	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
---	-----------------------	-------------------

#	ORGANIZATION	DATE
---	--------------	------

1	Morton's Warm Springs	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
---	-----------------------	-------------------

2	Legal Aid of Sonoma County	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
---	----------------------------	-------------------

3	Sonoma Valley Unified	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
---	-----------------------	-------------------

#	ADDRESS	DATE
---	---------	------

1	1651 Warm Springs Road	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
---	------------------------	-------------------

2	144 South E Street Suite 100	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
---	------------------------------	-------------------

3	419 Moll Ct	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
---	-------------	-------------------

#	ADDRESS 2	DATE
---	-----------	------

There are no responses.

#	CITY	DATE
---	------	------

1	Glen Ellen	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
---	------------	-------------------

2	Santa Rosa	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
---	------------	-------------------

3	Sonoma	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
---	--------	-------------------

#	STATE	DATE
---	-------	------

1	CA	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
---	----	-------------------

City of Sonoma Housing Element Community Service Providers, Community-based Organizations,
and Development Professionals Stakeholders Survey

2	CA	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
3	California	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
#	ZIP CODE	DATE
1	95442	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
2	95404	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
3	95476	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
#	COUNTRY	DATE
There are no responses.		
#	EMAIL ADDRESS	DATE
1	laurie@mortonswarmsprings.com	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
2	mdematteo@legalaidsc.com	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
3	jmontgomery@sonomaschools.org	3/29/2022 8:01 AM
#	PHONE NUMBER	DATE
1	5103665067	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
2	14156906499	4/1/2022 12:32 PM
3	2096170614	3/29/2022 8:01 AM

Q2 Service Population. Which community population(s) does your organization serve? Please note that the populations identified below are based on populations identified as having special housing needs in State Housing Element Law.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Seniors	66.67% 2
Disabled	66.67% 2
Developmentally disabled	66.67% 2
Large families (5 or more persons)	100.00% 3
Families with female head of household	100.00% 3
Farmworkers	66.67% 2
Persons in need of emergency shelter	33.33% 1
Homeless	66.67% 2
Persons requesting assistance with fair housing/discrimination issues	33.33% 1
General population	100.00% 3
Other (please specify)	66.67% 2
Total Respondents: 3	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Mostly everyone	4/15/2022 1:47 PM
2	low-income persons	4/1/2022 12:32 PM

Q3 Housing Types. What are the primary housing types needed by the population your organization services? Please check all that apply.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

City of Sonoma Housing Element Community Service Providers, Community-based Organizations,
and Development Professionals Stakeholders Survey

	GENERAL POPULATION	SENIORS/ELDERLY	DISABLED	DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED	FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD WITH FAMILY	FARMWORKER
Single family detached housing	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	100.00%
Single family attached housing (individually-owned townhomes or condominiums)	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00%
Single family housing affordable to low, very low, or extremely low income households	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	100.00%
Duplex, triplex, or fourplex	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	50.00%
Multifamily - market rate	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00%
Multifamily housing - affordable to extremely low, very low, and low income households	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00%
Lease-to-own housing (condominiums, townhomes, or single family)	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	100.00%
Senior housing that includes services providing assistance with daily living	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00%
Accessory dwelling unit	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00%
Co-housing (individual homes that are part of larger development with shared common space, such as kitchen, living, recreation, and garden areas)	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00%

City of Sonoma Housing Element Community Service Providers, Community-based Organizations,
and Development Professionals Stakeholders Survey

Emergency shelter	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00%
Transitional or supportive housing	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00%
Housing with features for a disabled person (ramp, grab bars, low counters and cabinets, assistive devices for hearing- or visually-impaired persons)	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00%
Housing close to services (grocery stores, financial, personal, and social services, etc.)	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	50.00%
Housing with on-site child daycare	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	50.00%
Permanent farmworker housing	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	100.00%
Seasonal or temporary farmworker housing	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00%

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Safe, affordable, alternative housing (tiny homes, RV's, etc...)	4/1/2022 12:44 PM

Q4 Housing Needs and Services. What are the primary housing needs of the population(s) that your organization serves? Please check all that apply.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

City of Sonoma Housing Element Community Service Providers, Community-based Organizations,
and Development Professionals Stakeholders Survey

	GENERAL POPULATION	SENIORS/ELDERLY	DISABLED	DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED	FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD WITH FAMILY	FARMWORKERS
General assistance with renting a home	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
General assistance with purchasing a home	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Assistance finding housing affordable to extremely low income (<30% of median income) households	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1
Assistance finding housing affordable to lower income (<80% of median income) households	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1
Assistance with being housed in an emergency shelter	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Assistance with being housed in transitional or supportive housing	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Grants or loans to make modifications to make a home accessible to a disabled resident	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Occasional financial assistance to pay rent, mortgage, and/or utilities	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2
Housing close	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	50.00%	100.00%	100.00%

City of Sonoma Housing Element Community Service Providers, Community-based Organizations,
and Development Professionals Stakeholders Survey

to public transportation	2	2	2	1	2	2
Housing close to services (grocery stores, financial, personal, and social services, etc.)	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2
Housing close to daycare	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	50.00% 1
Assistance with addressing discrimination, legal rent or mortgage practices, tenant/landlord mediation, or other fair housing issues	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2
Translation assistance for non-english speaking persons	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	100.00% 2	50.00% 1	100.00% 2	100.00% 2

Q5 What are the primary barriers your organization and/or service population encounter related to finding or staying in housing?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Affordability, gentrification, short term vacation rentals taking the lion's share of the housing stock that would otherwise be available as smaller and affordable units, also the lack of zoning/code to streamline building more affordable cohousing, ADUs, etc. that have a higher quality of life with access to nature and open spaces than condos or apartment complexes	4/15/2022 1:59 PM
2	Affordability. Even once housed, landlords seek to raise the rent each year to the point that tenants cannot afford it. Lack of tenant protections, as many tenants are not covered by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019.	4/1/2022 12:44 PM

Q6 What services or actions are needed to provide or improve housing or human services in Sonoma?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Better support for housing discrimination, legalizing composting toilets, allowing units on wheels as ADUs, as well as units on foundations under 400 square feet, or whatever that minimum is. More integration of wealthy and low-income areas, services, populations, etc. More mixed use in pocket neighborhoods to improve walkability and move away from car-centric culture	4/15/2022 1:59 PM
2	A local just cause ordinance and local rent control that are more protective than the Tenant Protection Act of 2019. More lower income to extremely low income housing as identified by the regional housing needs assessment.	4/1/2022 12:44 PM

Q7 What services or actions are needed to improve access to regional services?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Walkability, Bike paths and walking paths off streets, mixed use pocket neighborhoods are key.	4/15/2022 1:59 PM
2	More access to services for non English speaking communities, coordinated outreach in rural areas.	4/1/2022 12:44 PM

Q8 Are there any other housing priorities, issues, or concerns that you would like to identify to assist the City of Sonoma in identifying housing needs and developing appropriate programs to address housing needs?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Integration culturally with the Springs district	4/15/2022 1:59 PM
2	A local just cause ordinance and local rent control that are more protective than the Tenant Protection Act of 2019 to preserve existing housing stock for tenants. More lower income to extremely low income housing as identified by the regional housing needs assessment. Allowing for alternative housing structures like tiny homes and RV's (with composting toilets). Mobile home tenant protections.	4/1/2022 12:44 PM

Q9 Does your organization develop housing?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes - we develop housing and have built in Sonoma or are working on/toward a project in Sonoma	0.00%	0
Yes - we develop housing in the region, but do not have direct experience with Sonoma	0.00%	0
No - we provide supportive services, advocacy, or other human services but do not develop housing	100.00%	2
TOTAL		2

Q10 In your experience, what are typical costs, including land acquisition, site improvements, building construction, and other costs, of single family development in Sonoma or the greater Sonoma County region?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q11 In your experience, what are typical costs, including land acquisition, site improvements, building construction, and other costs, of multifamily development in Sonoma or the greater Sonoma County region?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q12 In your experience, what are typical costs of mixed use development, including land acquisition, site improvements, building construction, and other costs, in Sonoma or the greater region?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q13 What is the preferred parcel size (minimum and maximum) for an affordable (lower income) multifamily development project?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q14 What is the minimum desirable density (units per acre) for an affordable (lower income) housing development project?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q15 Have you encountered any specific impediments to developing housing in Sonoma? If yes, please describe.

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q16 Are there specific changes to the City's planning and development process that have a significant effect on the ability to accommodate or develop housing? If yes, please describe.

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q17 What does it take to produce lower and moderate income housing in Sonoma or the region? Are there additional factors that the City should consider to accommodate and encourage lower and moderate income housing in Sonoma?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

APPENDIX E

Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

COMMENTS	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
1.1	Description of SBC SVC policy platform	SVC's policy platform is noted.
1.2	Revise objectives to be specific, measurable and occur faster	Objectives have been revised for more specificity. Housing Plan timelines reflect the City's resources and time anticipated to implement various programs.
1.3	Clarify precedence of city specific commitments in Admiratively Further Fair Housing	The AFFH program matrix as well as complementary programs throughout the Housing Plan have been revised for consistency.
1.4	Policies lack program implementation measures	Policies do not have individual program implementation measures. Policies establish a standard the City will follow and each policy does not require a program. Programs are designed to achieve overall goals and to address specific constraints and issues where identified in the Background Report. However, where policies would benefit from an implementing action, programs have been added or revised accordingly.
1.5	Sonoma acknowledge racial history and commit policies to achieve fair housing future	The Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) analysis has been revised to include additional data and information regarding segregation and the City's racial history, including identification of areas with limited diversity and acknowledgement of past racially exclusive practices in Sonoma. Programs have been revised accordingly to promote diversity, both economic and racial, by increasing access to areas with less diversity.
1.6	Add a commitment to pursue a Pro-housing Designation from HCD	Program 7 (formerly 6) has been revised to pursue a Pro-housing Designation.
1.7	Program 1 - add language to inclusionary requirement	Program 1 is revised to ensure that inclusionary units are affordable in perpetuity; the commentor's recommended language regarding location and quality of units is already reflection in Section 19.44.070 of the Municipal Code.
1.8	Programs 2 and 6 - Add new objectives to affordable housing funding sources	Programs 2 and 6 have been revised to identify specific objectives
1.9	Program 3 - Add new objectives to produce feasible redevelopment places	Program 3 has been revised to identify potential sites for adaptive reuse by 2026.
1.10	Program 4 - Objective should include numbers of alternative units	Program 4 is revised to include a quantified objective

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

1.11	Program 5 - Address comments from Napa-Sonoma ADU Center	Program 5 Napa-Sonoma ADU Center did not submit a comment on Sonoma's Draft Housing Element
1.12	Add a program to reduce the number of second or empty homes	Program 6 is added to address second homes, including approaches to reduce second homes and develop funding mechanisms to address the effect second units have on diminishing the housing supply available for year-round occupancy.
1.13	Program 7 – support objective and fast timeline	The City did expedite preparation of its objective design standards for multifamily projects and adopted the standards on June 15, 2022. Programs 14 and 15 ensure the City expands its objective standards to also address mixed use and multi-unit projects and to provide a streamlined ministerial approval process for eligible projects by December 2023.
1.14	Add a program to provide tenant protections	Former Programs 10 and 11 are combined into a revised Program 11 to address tenant and resident protections
1.15	Program 12 - Add data addressing the level of risk of conversion for non-multi-family units	Program 12 is revised to address inclusionary and other affordable units at-risk of conversion to market rate
1.16	Program 13 - Include a rental registry	Program 13 is revised to develop a rental, ADU, and SB 9 registry.
1.17	Program 14 - Revise timeline for design guidelines and design review	Program 14 is revised to reflect the City's adoption of objective design standards for multi-family development on June 15, 2022
1.18	Program 15 – Clarify paragraph A, reduce or eliminate parking requirements, address inclusionary standards	Program 15 – Paragraph A is applicable. The recommendation regarding removal or unbundling of parking requirements is noted. Parking has not been a constraint for development projects in the City, demonstrated by the City exceeding its 5 th Cycle RHNA. An amendment is not necessary to address ensuring that inclusionary units are provided in perpetuity as that will be addressed through implementation of Program 1.
1.19	Program 18 – reducing, unbundling, or eliminating parking for new or redeveloped residential projects.	Program 18 - No changes are made related to parking, as previously described.
1.20	Program 19 - Clarify density bonus requirements	Program 19 – clarified to state that density bonuses will be granted to eligible projects consistent with State law
1.21	Program 21 – make smaller multi-unit buildings (duplexes up to 5-plexes) allowable in all residential zones, distribute subsidized units for low and very low-income households fairly across all neighborhoods and residential zones	Program 21 – State ADU law allows 3 units on any property with a single-family residence and allows 2-4 units on lots zoned for single family uses that meet the requirements of SB 9. In combination, these laws provide for 2 to 3 units, which can function as a duplex or triplex or stand-alone units, throughout zones that allow single family residential uses providing for increased density and increased opportunities, similar to the commentor's recommendation. The City will also implement methods to increase density in residential

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

			neighborhoods as described in Program 4, which has been integrated into Program 22, Table 1.
	1.22	Program 22 - Require visitability standards in residential construction	Program 22 is revised to address visitability requirements for new residential construction and multifamily remodels
	1.23	Program 25 - Add objective to integrate closure and conversion protections from AB 2782 into the City's existing ordinance	Program 25 focuses on mobile homes as a source of housing for seniors. Program 11 (formerly 10 and 11) addresses mobile home protections and other renter protections at a broader level and is updated to reflect the statutory requirements of AB 2782.
	1.24	Program 26 – SVC members and other community organizations should be named here; materials and events should be designed from the start in both English and Spanish	Program 26 is revised to identify organizations that provide significant housing resources to Sonoma by name
	1.25	Program 28 - Strengthen draft provisions for displacement protection of lower-cost housing, including below moderate-income units	Program 28 implements the requirements of State law related to replacement units. The suggestion to extent protections to below moderate-income households is noted.
	1.26	Program 29 – Water supply limitations are compatible with new infill affordable housing, across Sonoma County, water consumption per person has dropped while the population has grown	Program 29 – comments regarding benefits of infill affordable housing in terms of water supply are noted.
	1.27	Program 31 – Mistakenly labeled as Program 29	Program 31 – renumbered.
Omar Paz Jr.	2.01	Support for Sonoma Valley Collaborative comment, noting the time has come to provide serious investment in affordability, retention of local community, and leadership for a housing blueprint that promotes equity for workers and families that are the backbone of the community	The commenter identifies their support for the Sonoma Valley Collaborative Comment – please see Response to Comment #1.
Linda Bruce	3.01	Support for Sonoma Valley Collaborative comment	The commenter identifies their support for the Sonoma Valley Collaborative Comment – please see Response to Comment #1.
Bryce Jones	4.01	Support for higher density, mixed-use, missing middle and affordable housing	The commenter's support for higher density, mixed use, missing middle, and affordable housing is noted.
	4.02	Plans falls short of the needs of the community and direction the State is encouraging cities and counties to develop Plan for needs of young and old; families and singles; workers and students More inclusive, more effort on creating types, sizes, and price ranges	While the commenter indicates the Housing Element falls short of the needs of the community, the commenter does not recommend any specific programs. A number of revisions have been made to the Housing Element to provide more detail regarding fair housing, including historical practices in the community that resulted in segregation, and includes modifications to programs in the Housing Plan to improve tenant protections, provide for earlier implementation of programs related to promoting affordable housing, and to increase

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

			the emphasis on the range of housing types, which would also result in more variety in housing sizes and prices
Anna Colichidas, Sonoma Valley GSMOL	5.01	Support of mobile home communities	The support for mobile home communities and discussion of the costs and concerns related to homeowners is noted.
	5.02	Support rent stabilization, just cause eviction, and establishing a rental registry	Program 10 has been revised to include additional methods to protect tenants, including addressing excessive rent increases and unjust evictions. Program 13 addresses establishing a rental registry.
	5.03	Consider cost-of-living-adjustment in-leu of rental housing cost increases	Program 11 has been updated to reflect AB 2782.
	5.04	Requests objective to integrate closure and conversion protections from AB 2782 into the City's existing ordinance	The commenter's concerns are noted. The City did expedite preparation of its objective design standards for multifamily projects and adopted the standards on June 15, 2022. Programs 14 and 15 ensure the City expands its objective standards to also address mixed use and multi-unit projects and to provide a streamlined ministerial approval process for eligible projects by December 2023.
Keith Diggs	6.01	Expresses that the Draft Housing Element fails to remove constraints to the development of housing, indicating that the City must streamline its review process and design standards now not in 2026	The City accommodated 100% of its RHNA at all income levels in the 5th Cycle.
	6.02	Concern over actual production of homes will meet the City's need without bold reforms	The commenter's concerns regarding parking and the City's design review process are noted. However, the City exceeded its 5th Cycle RHNA and has multiple projects underway with a low income component. The City processes projects expeditiously and the City's requirements do not impede development at the upper end of allowed densities.
	6.03	Concern over City's denial that its land-use restrictions pose a serious constraint to housing, including parking and design review	There are additional development opportunities with the City's underutilized properties. The inventory of residential sites focuses on higher density and mixed use sites that the City can demonstrate meet HCD's requirements for lower income housing and on sites that are anticipated to be developed during the 6th Cycle. Program 3 has been amended to identify at least 4 sites for adaptive reuse, which could include sites in the area identified by the commenter, by 2026.
Vic Conforti	7.01	Include under-utilized commercial properties for mixed-use and affordable housing	The City continues to promote use of commercial land to accommodate residential uses as described by the commenter, with Program 3 promoting adaptive reuse of commercial and other underutilized sites.
	7.02	Commercial Zoned land is a good location for high density housing	

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	7.03	Economics of residential land versus commercial land, noting land in a commercial zone does not have the same demand as residential zoned land.	The comment regarding economics of residential versus commercial zoned land is noted. Many of the small sites included in the Housing Element in existing residential areas are anticipated to accommodate moderate and/or above moderate <u>moderate</u> -income housing.
Kaitlyn Garfield, Housing land Trust of Sonoma County	8.01	Renters are disproportionately more cost burdened; owners able to build equity Support City's goal of ensuring those who work in Sonoma are able to live here Support for City's inclusionary policy	The comments regarding disproportionate burdens to renters versus homeowners, the commentor's support of the City's goal of ensuring those who work in Sonoma are able to live in the city, and the commentor's support for the City's inclusionary housing policy and commitment to preserving affordability of existing housing stock and conversion of market rate units to long-term affordability are noted.
	8.02	Support for preserving the affordability of existing housing stock All inclusionary ownership units should be required to be affordable in perpetuity Inclusionary units comparable to size, finish, construction quality to market rate units	Program 1 is revised to ensure that inclusionary units are affordable in perpetuity; the commentor's recommended language regarding location and quality of units is already reflection in Section 19.44.070 of the Municipal Code.
Collin Thomas, Systems Change Advocate with Disability Services and Legal Center (DSLCL)	8.03	Units converted to affordable units should be affordable in perpetuity	Program 15 is revised to ensure that affordable units are provided in perpetuity.
	9.01	Prioritize removing barriers so it is easier, quicker, and chapter to build affordable housing	Programs 14 and 15 addresses removal of constraints to various types of housing and are both prioritized for completion in the first year of the planning period (by December 2023).
	9.02	Preserving affordable homes from becoming market rate should be a top priority	Preservation of assisted housing is addressed under Program 12 and will be implemented on an on-going basis, with outreach to property owners at least 18 months prior to units potentially converting, throughout the 6th Cycle.
	9.03	Support increased awareness of Section 8 vouchers and City should encourage landlords to accept these vouchers	Program 9 includes annual outreach to property owners to encourage owners to register with the Sonoma County Housing Authority to increase the housing stock that accepts vouchers
	9.04	Transitional and temporary housing is another significant need	Program 15 removes barriers to transitional, supportive, and temporary housing

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	9.05	Review homeless services, including wrap-around services, so people can get and stay housed	Program 24 has been updated to strengthen the approach to ensure adequate services for unhoused persons
	9.06	Barrier to housing is lack of accessible housing for those with mobility, vision, and sight disabilities. Visitability increases accessible housing supply and be aware that certain housing types that require a lift or elevator may be difficult to make accessible	Program 23 provides an administrative (ministerial) process for reasonable accommodation requests. Program 22 is revised to address visitability requirements in the Municipal Code
	9.07	Design neighborhoods that are accessible for all mobility levels with examples provided of sidewalk and transportation features that improve accessibility	An accessible transportation network is recognized as necessary to accommodate persons with a disability. Program 22 is revised to ensure that the City's Circulation Element is updated to ensure that the City's circulation system provides accessibility for all persons, including persons with a disability
David Brigode	10.01	Inventory of sites is exhaustive as to what may potentially become available	The comment regarding the extensiveness of the inventory of sites is noted.
	10.02	Some listed sites are suitable for a single unit and likely won't be affordable	The inventory of sites addresses the need for a range of income levels and is not limited to sites for affordable housing. The inventory of sites identifies the affordability assumptions for each site in Appendix A.
	10.03	The commenter identifies 4 affordable housing opportunity sites and describes characteristics of the sites.	Comments regarding each of the 4 sites are addressed below.
	10.04	19357 Sonoma Highway is up for sale and has a peculiar shape, has floodplain issues, would require curb and sidewalk setbacks, requires hillside construction, a portion is not suitable for housing production, and 2 affordable units would be lost.	19357 Sonoma Highway (57 units) is included as it is available for development. This site is 6.08 acres with a maximum allowed density of 20 units per acre, which would accommodate 120 units. The Housing Element assumes that 50% of the site would develop with residential units, which is backed up by the City's development code which allows the 50% residential requirement to be reduced or waived only in certain instances. This assumption that 50% of the site would develop with residential uses would accommodate a non-residential component as well as site constraints. Program 28 of the Housing Plan addresses replacement of affordable units.
	10.05	477 W Napa is landlocked, it has been argued that a seasonal stream underlies the site, and access may be an issue.	477 W. Napa is not landlocked – this site has access 5th Street W. For example, a reciprocal access agreement with the adjacent Village Green Senior Apartments (owned by Burbank Housing) could provide more convenient pedestrian access to Safeway for the seniors and disabled persons at Village Green while providing the 477 W. Napa site with a second access route.
	10.06	45 Napa Road (18 units) is too small.	State law requires that sites identified for the very low and low income RHNA be at least 0.5 acres and not larger than 10 acres, unless smaller

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	69 Napa Road (51 units) has been complicated by a large number of heirs. If this site is sold to a market rate developer, the City's affordable housing pool vanishes.	<p>or larger sizes are demonstrated to be feasible. This site is 0.87 acres and exceeds the State's 0.5-acre minimum size threshold.</p> <p>The Housing Element cannot guarantee which sites will be sold to whom as the City does not control the affordable housing sites. The identification of sites is based on the density of sites, whether the site is vacant or if existing uses would make development less feasible during the 6th Cycle, and whether the site's density is appropriate for affordable housing.</p>
10.07	Address prior RHNA allocation shortfalls	<p>The City accommodated 100% of its RHNA at all income levels in the 5th Cycle and does not have a carryover of unaccommodated units to address. The commentator's suggestion that the City offset any overproduction of above-moderate units is noted. This is not a requirement of housing elements.</p>
10.08	Address restrictions imposed on annexation of suitable land outside Urban Growth Boundary for affordable housing	<p>The Housing Element does not rely on or include any annexations. Information regarding one site that has requested annexation is provided for informational purposes but is not needed for the City's inventory of sites.</p>
10.09	The four sites listed as suitable for affordable housing are not likely to be so under present market conditions. The assertion that there will be sufficient land is misleading to the public and masks the effects of the existing UGB boundary.	<p>As described in Chapter 4 of the Background Report, the sites meet the criteria for affordable housing sites. There is always the potential that sites will be purchased by a market rate developer and not developed with affordable housing. To reduce this potential, Program 19 is revised to consider an Affordable Housing Overlay to incentivize the development of the sites with affordable housing. It is also noted that there are 4 additional sites included in the inventory of sites that will provide very low and/or low income units.</p>
10.10	Stating that there is no segregation in Sonoma is untrue.	<p>Chapter 5 has been updated to include additional information regarding race, ethnicity, and segregation and the findings have been updated accordingly to acknowledge segregation and racially exclusive practices affecting the community.</p>
10.11	The Urban Growth Boundary does the opposite of Policy H-4.2- "Incentivize the production of affordable housing through growth management prioritization"	<p>The Urban Growth Boundary provides a tool for the City to manage the pace and location of development. The City's growth management program, which is the focus of Policy H-4.2 has been placed on hold as discussed under Program 17.</p>
10.12	Regarding Program 1, why must we sacrifice inclusionary affordable housing to incentivize the takeover of any remaining vacant land for unneeded market rate development?	<p>The inclusionary housing requirement is not implementable if it unduly constrains the development of market rate housing or if it requires a higher rate of inclusionary housing than is justified.</p>
10.13	Regarding Program 2, the commentator indicates that there is no discussion of the status and capacity of the City's Housing fund,	<p>The City's Housing Trust Fund was added to Program 2 and to Table 41 of the Background Report. The City does not have remaining set-aside</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	or an analysis of where the money went from the proceeds of the former Redevelopment agency set-aside for AH.	funds from the redevelopment agency; all encumbered assets of the City's former redevelopment agency were transferred to the Community Development Commission by operation of law.
10.14	Program 13 does not mention monitoring, and taking steps to remedy, the loss of any site described as an AH opportunity zone.	Program 27 addresses monitoring and replacement of housing inventory sites to ensure no net loss in accordance with State law.
10.15	The commenter indicates that the ability of the City Council to exempt projects from the Growth Management Ordinance on a case-by-case basis introduces arbitrary, non-objective judgement by the City Council on affordable housing development in violation of State law.	The GMO is currently on hold, as previously described. However, the ability of the City Council to exempt projects from the GMO is not a constraint on affordable or other housing as it allows the City Council the opportunity to further incentivize affordable housing projects. However, Program 17 ensures that, should the GMO be reactivated, that it be monitored in conjunction with Program 13 and modified to ensure adequate incentives are provided for affordable housing and fulfillment of regional housing needs.
10.16	The commenter indicates that the statement that “the city intends to complete the necessary actions to meet the State AFFH requirements.” is irrelevant word salad, proposes absolutely nothing, and does not acknowledge the data in Table 1 or offer any remedies to the obvious state of racial and ethnic imbalance currently extant in Sonoma and furthered by the City's housing policies, including the UGB.	This comment is noted. The AFFH analysis has been updated, along with references to Program 22 and other relevant programs to address AFFH issues.
10.17	The commenter asks once vacant land is used up, what is left to re-zone for affordable housing?	Jurisdictions that do not have adequate vacant land must identify underutilized (nonvacant) sites for reuse or intensification or identify lands for annexation.
10.18	Adopt moratorium on market rate housing	A moratorium on market rate housing is not necessary and would have a negative effect on the Statewide housing shortage. The City requires market rate housing to provide affordable units through the inclusionary requirement and has identified adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA, including very low, low, and moderate income units.
10.19	Adopt 50% inclusionary housing requirement for 80% of less AMI populations.	A 50% inclusionary requirement would constrain market rate housing and would not be supportable by a nexus or other study to justify such a high percentage.
10.20	Institute affordable housing overlay	Program 19 is revised to consider an Affordable Housing Overlay to incentivize the development of the sites with affordable housing.
10.21	Require residency requirement for new residential construction	Requiring a residency requirement for all new residential construction would severely limit residential development as the City's RHNA is intended to accommodate the City's fair-share of regional housing

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

			growth and not solely benefit City residents. This would also perpetuate existing fair housing patterns referenced by the commentor.
	10.22	Require annual tax on unoccupied primary residences	Program 6 is added to address second homes, including approaches to reduce second homes and develop funding mechanisms to address the effect second units have on diminishing the housing supply available for year-round occupancy.
	10.23	Urban Growth Boundary is an impediment to affordable housing creation	The commentor’s concern regarding the Urban Growth Boundary is noted. The City has adequate capacity to accommodate its RHNA without annexation.
	10.24	Utilize eminent domain to acquire suitable sites	Eminent domain is a lengthy, costly process that would likely delay the provision of housing. The City has a track record of working successfully with developers and non-profits for the development of affordable housing and will continue to follow its successful approach.
Fred Allebach	11.01	Reference source not found throughout Housing Element No substantiation of the statements by reference source	This comment was provided during the public review period. The missing references were to 5 of the tables in the document. The references were fixed and an updated version of the Draft Housing Element, with an explanation of the corrections on the cover, was provided to the public on August 29, 2022.
David Eichar	12.01	Consider rezoning vacant lots to higher density would allow for apartment buildings and/or condominiums to be built on the major thoroughfare	This comment is noted. Program 4 promotes development of alternatives to single family units, including duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and cottage/courtyard housing. Program 19 was revised to review opportunities to apply an Affordable Housing Overlay to provide for increased densities and a greater variety of housing types on lots with potential for multifamily housing. Program 16 is revised to address two recent bills, Assembly Bill 2011 and Senate Bill 6 that provide for streamlined review and approval of eligible projects.
David Brigode	13.01	Questioned whether certain sites listed as suitable for affordable housing are under legal control by a non-profit developer and the criteria for listing these as affordable housing sites	The referenced sites are not controlled by a non-profit developer dedicated to 100% affordable housing. The sites meet the size and density criteria for affordable housing as described in under Section 3, Realistic Capacity and Affordability, in Chapter 4 of the Background Report.
Fred Allebach (8/18/22 – Armstrong Estates)	14.01	Armstrong Estates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Armstrong Estates includes 19 vacant lots which are allocated in the 6th Cycle to 37 above-moderate income housing and 0 at moderate-income or below-income. Two 	<u>The inventory of sites allocates affordability of very low and low income units based on sites that meet criteria for size and density discussed in Chapter 4. The Armstrong Estates lots do not meet these criteria. Very low and low income units may be developed on lots identified for above moderate units – however, none of these lots are currently proposed for very low or low income units and the City cannot</u>

Appendix E
City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

<p>Comments within this letter are sorted by topic.</p>	<p>lots (590 E. Armstrong and 505 Armstrong) are larger than 0.50 acres. Remaining lots are under 0.50 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC&Rs or Conditions of approval stipulate that lots must be minimum of 20,000 s.f. or 0.459 acres, which leads to underutilized space and questions how optional rules can lock in wasted and inequitable space like this? • Vacant lots fronting Napa Street East are close in size to the 1.9-acre AltaMadrone/Altamira lot on Broadway, where 48.60% of the average median income and lower-income units were allocated. • Suggest that the two big lots on East Napa are divided into parcels smaller than 0.50 acres each except for one (505 Armstrong). If these open spaces were joined, there would be more 0.50 acre lots. 	<p><u>take credit in its inventory for programs in the Housing Element that will increase lower income opportunities in single family areas. To encourage additional lower income and more diverse housing options in the City's neighborhoods that are zoned single family, the Housing Element includes Program 4 – Alternative Housing Models, which supports co-housing, shared housing, and assisted living for seniors, among others. Program 5 – Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) also allow 3 units on any property with a single-family residence and allows 2-4 units on lots zoned for single family uses that meet the requirements of SB 9.</u></p> <p><u>Minimum lot size is based on the City's zoning. The City does not prepare or adopt the CC&Rs for a project.</u></p> <p><u>The comment regarding vacant lots fronting Napa Street East is noted.</u></p>
<p>14.02</p>	<p>R-L Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No density bonus, very-low or low-income housing can be applied for and thus the zone is effectively closed off to integration by (arbitrary) city policy to maintain the character of neighborhoods. • The city then identifies land elsewhere, all along Hwy 12, in the worst, densest spots near a state highway. This plan effectively recaps redlining segregation, and Urban Renewal's relocation of the poor to the worst spots, this in modern terms through tacit, neutral-term city zoning, Development Code, and the HE. • Sonoma residential areas includes more than 50% of R-L low density, and single-family zoning, and thus more than 50% of possible residential development excludes very-low and low-income housing units, which results in segregation with protected classes. • Concentrating above-moderate income housing away from very-low and low-income housing units in different zones suggests segregation. • Low density NIMBYism is a known issue, one not admitted by Sonoma. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/18/opinion/california-housing-unions.html 	<p><u>Program 19 – Affordable Housing/Access to Opportunities Density Bonus and Incentives:</u> Applicants of residential projects of five or more units in any residential or mixed-zone may apply for a density bonus and additional incentives if the project meets specific requirement. Density bonuses do not exclude very low-, or low-income housing units. Density bonuses can be requested in the R-L zone. A density bonus may be requested for any project that meets State density bonus eligibility criteria.</p> <p><u>Sites identified for lower income housing meet size criteria identified by the State. As previously discussed, the Housing Element includes Program 4 – Alternative Housing Models, which supports co-housing, shared housing, and assisted living for seniors, among others. Program 5 – Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) also allow 3 units on any property with a single-family residence and allows 2-4 units on lots zoned for single family uses that meet the requirements of SB 9.</u></p> <p><u>Program 1 - Inclusionary Housing:</u> The City's inclusionary housing ordinance ensures that a component of affordable housing is provided with new development, ensuring that future single family subdivisions and other residential projects provide affordable units. This has been successful in the City, with affordable units provided in completed</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This all acts to concentrate wealth in the R-L, single family zoned areas, especially the east side, and concentrate poverty on Hwy 12 where the worst air, light and noise pollution is. 	<p>subdivisions residential projects and proposed in pending projects. Rental projects require a minimum of 25% of units to be affordable to extremely-, very-, and low-income categories, and ownership projects require at minimum 25% of the total units to be affordable to households in the low-, moderate-, and middle-income categories. An in-lieu fee may also be paid instead of providing affordable units in a residential project of four or fewer units. This program is the City's primary tool to provide affordable housing throughout the community and ensures access to areas of opportunity, amenities, and housing available to a range of income levels. The City will also re-evaluate its current ordinance to ensure that the provisions remain appropriate and do not impede the development of housing and are effective in providing an affordable component to new development.</p> <p>Program 3 – Adaptive Reuse converts existing buildings, including market-rate housing to provide opportunities for new residential uses and new affordable and special needs housing. The City identifies at least 4 sites for adaptive reuse, which could include sites in the area identified by the commenter, by 2026. As part of considering alternative housing types under Program 4, the City may identify opportunities for lot consolidation in predominantly single family areas to increase potential for very low-, and low-income housing sites.</p> <p>The City does not select sites that are “the worst” for affordable housing development. Further, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the City to consider and mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts to development projects, including but not limited to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), flood, light and glare, air quality and noise.</p> <p>Any discretionary project, either affordable or market rate, will be subject to CEQA.</p> <p>Very low- and low-income housing units do not necessarily correspond to “poverty”, as persons living above the poverty threshold are also eligible for lower income housing.</p> <p>Comments regarding Armstrong Estates and inclusionary housing are addressed above.</p>
<p>Fred Allebach (8/18/22 –</p>	<p>15.01</p>	<p>Armstrong Estates, additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If “realistic development potential” depends on land price and price is lower at city edges, it follows that urban growth

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

<p>General Comments)</p> <p><i>Comments within this letter are sorted by topic.</i></p>	<p>limit annexations and/or extra-urban growth limit annexations would garner cheaper land and be better for “realistic development potential.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vacant lots meet a current city threshold for very-low and low-income affordable housing units. If other properties in the city can be identified to take excess capacity for very-low and low-income RHNA units, and the east side needs integration, why are Armstrong lots not identified for very-low and low-income potential? Could it be that the Armstrong CC&Rs prohibit development that would result in integration of lower average-median income homes? That would be modern redlining which should be illegal. If land price is prohibitive on the east side, that is evidence that shows a pattern of segregation. 	<p><u>Annexations:</u> While “realistic development potential” could involve properties outside the City’s current boundaries, the Housing Element does not rely on or include any annexations.</p> <p><u>Urban Growth Boundary:</u> The Urban Growth Boundary provides a tool for the City to manage the pace and location of development. The City’s growth management program, which is the focus of Policy H-4.2 has been placed on hold as discussed under Program 17. Further, the ability of the City Council to exempt projects from the growth management ordinance is not a constraint on affordable or other housing as it allows the City Council the opportunity to further incentivize affordable housing projects. Program 17 ensures that, should the GMO be reactivated, that it be monitored in conjunction with Program 13 and modified to ensure adequate incentives are provided for affordable housing and fulfillment of regional housing needs.</p>
<p>15.02</p>	<p><u>Safeway-adjacent lot:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Safeway-adjacent lot counts Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) very-low and low RHNA from an unproven commercial conversion (the city has no track record of experience to convert commercial property to affordable housing), which jeopardizes the potential development of such affordable housing. 	<p><u>Comments regarding Affordable Development Housing Opportunities are discussed above.</u></p> <p>The City will work with the Safeway-adjacent lot project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA.</p>
<p>15.03</p>	<p>Orchard lot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The orchard lot by SPARC puts the lowest-income residents in the 100-year flood danger near Sonoma Creek, and also near a highway, which increases light, noise, and air pollution. 	<p>The realistic capacity calculation for this site includes setbacks from the riparian corridor and development on the site would be located outside of the 100-year floodplain. Units in proximity to Highway 12 would be reviewed for compliance with the City’s noise standards, which address interior noise. Trip levels along Hwy 12 in that area do not trigger a health risk assessment and development in that location would not be subject to significant impacts associated with toxic air contaminants. Further, any discretionary project, either affordable or market rate, will be subject to CEQA. Additional comments regarding environmental impacts are discussed above.</p>
<p>15.04</p>	<p>DeNova Montaldo Apartments and First Street East Townhomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12% (14) of very-low and low-income inclusionary units are from the pending 19320 Hwy 12 DeNova Montaldo Apartments and First Street East Townhomes with 10 low-, 	<p>The City implemented its housing programs to accommodate affordable housing and fully met its 5th Cycle RHNA. Sites included in the inventory to accommodate the City’s RHNA meet the State requirements to demonstrate that the City can accommodate its very low and low income sites. Program 13 – Housing Element</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>10 moderate-, and 80 above-moderate income housing units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DeNova Montaldo Apartments and First Street East Townhomes are both examples of City housing opportunity sites that RHNA designated for low-income but then were sold at market rate. This sets a precedent for two thirds of the 88% of the current housing element's AFFH on two housing opportunity sites to go market rate as well, which would leave an inadequate very-low and low-income site inventory buffer. 	<p><u>Monitoring/Annual Reporting</u> in the <u>Housing Plan</u> requires the <u>City</u> to review its inventory throughout the cycle and adjust if sites become unavailable or if the City's remaining inventory cannot be accommodated.</p>
<p>15.05</p>	<p>St. Francis Preserve (across from Bragg Street):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The city owns the St. Francis Preserve lot near the Alta Madrone SAHA project (formerly Altimira Apartments). Why isn't the city not using this publicly-owned land in the site inventory? There is no news on what the issues are, or what contacts have been made to address those issues. The city owns this lot and should deal with the issues and put them on the table in this housing element, and then give the land to an affordable housing developer. Missing information: The site is not listed in the Housing Element; it has no lot number or ID on City zoning map. Failure to identify this big, city-owned lot in the site inventory, and to discuss and analyze options in the Housing Element, is an oversight. 	<p>This site was not included as a potential housing site because it is a wetland preserve and open space area and is not available for development.</p>	
<p>15.06</p>	<p>Sites 1-70:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 363 total sites are vacant and underutilized; 101 very-low income, 66 low-income, 47 moderate-, 149 above-moderate. 205 lettered lots A-S are all pending/approved vacant and underutilized; 11 very-low, 16 low, 22 moderate, 155 above-moderate. 	<p>This comment is noted.</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p>
<p>15.07</p>	<p>Map label # 1 on Excel chart: 19357 Hwy 12 (53 very-low income, low-income and mixed-use housing units; 32 very low-income units, 21 low-income units)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19357 W. Hwy 12 is an empty lot with an orchard on it behind the SPARC pot store and near Sonoma Creek. Rather than integrate wealthy segregated east side, city is 	<p>This comment is noted.</p> <p>There is no current development application on file for the property at 19357 Highway 12. This site is identified as a site that can accommodate a portion of the City's RHNA during the 6th Cycle. As outlined in the Housing Plan, the City will actively support</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p> <p>There is no current development application on file for the property at 19357 Highway 12. This site is identified as a site that can accommodate a portion of the City's RHNA during the 6th Cycle. As outlined in the Housing Plan, the City will actively support</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>sacrificing precious green open space that everyone is always trying to protect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the project? • How will this reasonably go very low- to low-income? • How will “the free market” do this without aid? • What efforts to have an AH developer buy it? • What is the land value? • What appraisals and by who? • Are there metrics to show how the City arrived at “realistic development potential?” 	<p><u>development of the identified lower income sites in the inventory in order to meet the RHNA, as well as engaging in efforts to increase affordable opportunities and diversity throughout the community. Program 2 will encourage the City to work with affordable funding developers.</u></p> <p><u>Assessed values for each site are determined by the County Assessor are shown in Appendix A.</u></p> <p><u>The City will work with the project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA.</u></p> <p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p>
<p>15.08</p>	<p>Map label # 2 on Excel chart: 19380 Hwy 12. 1 above moderate-income housing or mixed-use housing unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the Starling bar lot on Spain and Hwy 12. • If this is mixed use and above-moderate housing, why is the orchard lot very close by appropriate for mixed use but not very-low and low-income housing? • Can the City just assume mixed use will be whatever average-median income unit it wants for RHNA? • This shows that top-down zoning assumptions are possible. • Zoning has to change through some process and one of those ways is planner tweaking in Housing Elements. • Ultimately, zoning is a shell game that can be played to garner the results desired, to separate discreet land uses or to mix and unite them, to separate people or mix and unite them. • If, in a limited two square mile space, the City has more than half of residential areas at R-L (low-density zoning, single family zoning, exclusionary zoning), and a top City goal is to protect the character (white and wealthy) of that R-L, that leaves fewer and fewer options for space to take very-low and low-income units, i.e. poor people, and thus, R-L protective zoning becomes a tool of segregation. • Segregation is not somehow accidental or non-existent; it’s real and it’s contingent on zoning choices. • R-L protectors like to explain this all (admitting no segregation exists) as simply market forces at work, beyond 	<p><u>Affordability assumptions are based on project-specific details for sites with proposed projects and site criteria described in Chapter 4 of the Background Report. See response to previous comments regarding programs to increase affordable housing in single family zones and high resource areas.</u></p> <p><u>Property zoning (such as R-L) is designated by the zoning map and zoning amendments are approved by the City Council. Single-family zoning does not necessarily exclude very low- and low-income housing categories and therefore does not directly lead to housing segregation.</u></p> <p><u>The City will work with the project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>City control, denying a pattern of and responsibility for segregation, blaming 1% Wall Street for cashing out the 10% R-L residents, who see themselves as victims of capitalism on par with VL and L residents as victims of the system. The game of Monopoly laid it out quite well. Park Place is the 1%, Ventnor Ave. is the 10%. Baltic Ave is the BIPOC working class. And as Richard Rothstein proved in his book The Color of Law, the US gov't itself enabled the 1% and the 10% to externalize the BIPOCs. Big fish eat little fish. R-L fish dominate dense VL and L fish.</p>	
15.09	<p>Map label #3 on Excel chart: 19366 and 19370 Hwy 12, mixed use, mixed income</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an empty lot on Lyon on the way to SAHA Sonoma Oaks affordable housing development. 	<p>The comment is noted.</p>
15.10	<p>Map label # 11 on Excel chart: (590 West Napa, 5th cycle, 5 moderate-income housing and 5 above moderate-income housing) No comment</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
15.11	<p>Map label # 28 on Excel chart: 477 West Napa (, VL, L, Safeway lot, vacant part of lot, commercial. 45 units, 27 VL/ 18L</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This property has a top, center-city valuation yet is used for very-low and low-income housing? Who will pay Safeway top dollar for the land for the very-low and low-income housing? If the land goes for sale, what is stopping DeNova from doing more of the same lion at the water hole behavior? The city needs to show more serious, concerted plans and tactics to see that the very-low and low-income housing goals actually happens here. The problem is wishful thinking with no track record of converting commercial property to affordable housing. Safeway is a vampire squid giant corporation that can't be realistically expected to conform to any benevolent local intentions, and has shown no interest in affordable housing. The City denied Safeway a gas station in Sonoma, now the City wants a favor? 	<p>These comments are noted. This site meets the size and density criteria for affordable housing. The Housing Plan presents the City's approach to encouraging affordable housing, including advertisement and outreach related to lower income sites. Program 2 will ensure that the City coordinates with local affordable housing developers to explore every opportunity for the development of affordable housing.</p> <p>The City will work with the project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to encourage affordable units and to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and State requirements.</p> <p>VMTs are calculated through function of traffic impact studies, which are required for large development projects.</p> <p>The comments regarding future use of the site and speculation regarding future possibilities is noted.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeway costs 4x as much as Grocery Outlet for the exact same items, how does this being closer to amenities qualify as possibly boosting access to higher opportunities? • Any lower income person with a car will never shop in Sonoma, too many savings elsewhere, this is why the idea of walk and bike to goods and services amenities is false, you need to be able to afford to buy anything, and in Sonoma, prices are laughably high. • VMT is going to be wrong in Sonoma Valley if a box is checked as simply being close to a grocery store, and that will somehow lower VMTs. Not if that grocery costs 4x as much as at a Napa Grocery Outlet. Everything in Sonoma Valley costs more; the way to lower costs is to free up infrastructure and development constraints so enough population can justify more discount stores. • Here we bump up against the essential trouble of Sonoma Valley, a Sleepy Hollow Stasis protectionism has disallowed big enough transportation arteries so the area can't grow bigger, and this locks in a fundamental segregation and inequity. How to integrate a place where consciously restricted space results in skyrocketing land values? This is Aspen-ization. Do Sonoma essential, workers need to live in barracks 20 miles away? • What we really need here is to make a City of Sonoma Valley out of the whole urbanized area and USA from Glen Ellen, SDC, to the Springs, Temelec, Sonoma, 8th East industrial area, east side and Sonoma Mountain TCAC High areas, and down to Vineburg on an axis with the sewage treatment plant. Then there would be space enough to plan to include/enfranchise everyone. • As long as Sonoma clings to a defensive Balkanization of its own predominant narrow R-L interests, this will be the poison pill that stops rational, equitable planning for the rest of the contiguous Sonoma Valley area noted above. See the most recent LAFCO MSR where it is recommended, in polite terms, that the City expand its urban growth boundary and annex the Springs. 	
--	---	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

15.12	<p>Map labels #35 and #36 on Excel chart: These are lop-sided above-moderate sites in low density zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicates lack of effort to integrate wealthy east side and city moderate- to high-income TCAC opportunity areas. 	<p><u>As indicated above, projected income levels are based on site and project characteristics for the purposes of accommodating the RHNA and do not limit future development of a site to specific income levels. The Housing Plan includes programs to evaluate progress on the RHNA and to ensure that adequate sites are available to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period. Distribution of sites based on fair housing issues is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Background Report. As previously discussed, the Housing Plan includes programs to increase housing opportunities in single-family and high resource areas.</u></p>
15.13	<p>Map label #37 on Excel chart: 532 2nd St East 12 units Above Mod, underutilized; empty space on a lot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why not look for empty space on the east side and up-zone to higher density and aim at very low- and low-income housing inclusion? If land prices are all uniformly high because of a restricted space, pressure-cooker lid effect, then a self-fulfilling prophesy is created. The will to rezone and integrate is negatively impacted by the very zoning and land uses (and resulting high prices) that have been chosen in the first place. 	<p><u>See response to previous comment.</u></p>
15.14	<p>Map label #67 on Excel chart: 0 Fryer Creek Drive, city-owned, .24 acres - 2 moderate-income and above moderate-income housing units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Fryer Creek Dr. is not an address on Google maps. 	<p><u>This comment is noted. Sites with a “0” address have not yet been assigned a street number.</u></p>
15.15	<p>Map label # 69 on Excel chart: 250 Napa Road, just east of Friedman’s, 21 vacant residential units, 10 moderate-income housing units, 11 above moderate-income housing units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Across the street from Friedman’s to the south calls for very-low income and low-income housing, same area, why the difference in zoning and RHNA average median income? If smaller private parcels will sell for higher prices, and City areas for AFFH and AH are increasingly marginal, something has to give in City land use and zoning so as to meet state AFFH objectives. 	<p><u>This comment is noted. As indicated above, projected income levels are based on site and project characteristics for the purposes of accommodating the RHNA and do not limit future development of a site to specific income levels. The Housing Plan includes programs to evaluate progress on the RHNA and to ensure that adequate sites are available to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period. Distribution of sites based on fair housing issues is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Background Report. As previously discussed, the Housing Plan includes programs to increase housing opportunities in single-family and high resource areas.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

			<p><u>Via Program 13, the Housing Element will be regularly monitored and annual reporting will occur to assess affordable housing programs and progress towards RHNA.</u></p>
<p>15.16</p>	<p>Map label # 70 on Excel chart: 250 Napa Road, just east of Friedman's, 21 vacant residential units, 10 moderate-income housing units, 11 above moderate-income housing units AND 45 Napa Road (same lot as 69 Napa Road, different part of lot including vacant residential, housing opportunity site; 11 very low-income housing units and 7 low-income housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sites will need to be streamlined for development. - This is where there are rumors of a Darius Anderson hotel/affordable housing tradeoff for satisfying the housing requirement for the extreme CEQA-stalled Plaza hotel. • These lots are not listed as pending, but something seems to be pending in this area; maybe a sphere annexation of the Zepponi lot? • 250 Napa Road - This is the back end of the Four Corners auto service station lot. • 250 Napa Road - Where is the Darius Anderson housing trade-off site everyone keeps talking about and why is this site not mentioned in the Housing Element? • 45 Napa Road - Zepponi sphere site is immediately adjacent to the south, that would require annexation. • 45 Napa Road - Growth management ordinance at 122 units from accumulated growth manage ordinance allocation; maybe this is the Darius site? 	<p><u>Comments regarding location and uses of sites is located. As indicated above, projected income levels are based on site and project characteristics for the purposes of accommodating the RHNA and do not limit future development of a site to specific income levels. The Housing Plan includes programs to evaluate progress on the RHNA and to ensure that adequate sites are available to accommodate the RHNA throughout the planning period. Distribution of sites based on fair housing issues is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Background Report. As previously discussed, the Housing Plan includes programs to increase housing opportunities in single-family and high resource areas.</u></p>	
<p>15.17</p>	<p>RHNA Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If total RHNA allocation is 311, there is a discrepancy with the city is listing of 568 units on the Excel site inventory chart. It is not clear what the reserve is for. • Of 311 total RHNA units, half (155 units) has to be low-income and very-low income. • East side land valuations are much higher than the west side. The city needs to show a track record that development of certain sites will be possible. On the east side there is a much higher likelihood of above-moderate 	<p><u>The City is listing sites that are anticipated to be available to accommodate the RHNA during the 6th Cycle. As shown throughout the Housing Plan, the City has identified many programs to support and further affordable housing, including programs that provide for integration of affordability into high resource areas. As discussed in Chapter 4, there is excess capacity. Program 2 - Partnerships with Affordable Housing Developers: Vacant parcels are not necessarily controlled by non-profit developers who dedicate 100% of their units to affordable housing. Program 2 encourages creative approaches to finance, build, and rehabilitate affordable and special needs housing.</u></p>	

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>housing being developed than anything below-moderate, that is the track record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If segregation is not to simply be a default outcome of city land use policy, the city needs to show active plans to integrate the east side despite higher land values. • East side plans missing from Housing Element; east side integration is totally eluded in the Housing Element, and zoning is not identified as a constraint. • RHNA 2000-2020 identifies 236 moderate- and below-income housing units and 293 above-moderate income housing units, which indicates that affordable housing production is what's needed most in Sonoma and the Housing Element should bend over backwards with assertive, bold programs and policies to realize that goal. • 88% of all affirmatively furthering fair housing, very-low, and low RHNA units are located on three sites along Highway 12 with no guarantee that affordable housing developers will purchase these sites. Sites are individually owned and will be developed as the market dictates. • City staff indicates that opportunity sites are not owned by a non-profit developer dedicated to 100% affordability. • Sites are individually owned and will be developed as the market dictates. • The criteria used to determine opportunity sites was based on lot size, realistic development potential, and location. Each site has its own realistic capacity column and the potential number of affordable units and affordability level. Only a percentage of the sites on the opportunity sites list have the potential to be developed with affordable housing." • This puts the AFFH buffer at risk with no backup because the city has few two-acre minimum sites for realistic affordable housing development capacity left. • What about collaboration plans with the County to address super high County RHNA in Rezoning sites at Merlo by Broadway Market? 	<p><u>The City has partnered with several different non-profit developers in the provision of affordable ownership and rental housing. Additionally, the City will work with the project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA.</u></p> <p><u>The City will work with the project proponent upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA.</u></p> <p><u>Affordability of sites is based on the characteristics of proposed and approved projects, deed restriction, past performance of similar projects or units, and site criteria assumptions for affordability, as discussed in the Inventory of Residential Sites in the Background Report.</u></p>
--	--	---

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why list Doyle as all Above Mod and Mod when it could be top-down zoned as an Opportunity Site for very-low and low-income housing just like 69 Napa Road? If annexed sites would count toward RHNA, why no plans for the 182 accumulated GMO units at Merlo and Zepponi? 	<p>Chapter 4 of the Background Report provides metrics for realistic capacity. See response to previous comments regarding increasing affordable housing opportunities in high resource and single family zones.</p> <p>Program 14 – Design Guidelines and Design Review: Development Standards: The City uses design review to ensure development embodies excellence in architectural design and complements the scale, character, and rich history of the community. Such standards are applied City-wide, not just R-L zoned properties.</p>
15.18		<p>R-L Zoning, additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City modus operandi now is to use zoning to protect R-L “character”, to play as many “historic” cards as possible so as to limit density in single family home areas; no one ever mentions the increased property values that come with such protection. 	<p>Program 14 – Design Guidelines and Design Review: Development Standards: The City uses design review to ensure development embodies excellence in architectural design and complements the scale, character, and rich history of the community. Such standards are applied City-wide, not just R-L zoned properties.</p>
15.19		<p>Segregation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The city needs to provide metrics for “realistic capacity.” “Potential” is also constrained by voluntary city zoning and code choices that force affordable housing projects out of R-L and R-M zones, thereby creating and maintaining pattern of segregation. In a way, control of City zoning and the City Municipal, Code can be seen as a racket by the predominantly single-family home owners (and their enablers) who dominate and who have dominated City government, that protects their vested stake in increasing property values and in a status quo that denies any culpability for segregation. This Housing Element seems like an extension of the priorities of that racket, or regime of power and control. The city cannot satisfy AFFH and integrate the predominantly white, wealthy east side with just ADUs that will likely all rent above average median income. 	<p>Chapter 4 of the Background Report provides metrics for realistic capacity. See response to previous comments regarding increasing affordable housing opportunities in high resource and single family zones.</p> <p>See discussion of fair housing issues in Chapter 5 of the Background Report. Program 21 – Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH): The AFFH includes data and information regarding segregation and the City’s racial history, including identification of areas with limited diversity and acknowledgement of past racially exclusive practices in Sonoma. Programs have been revised accordingly to promote diversity, both economic and racial, by increasing access to areas with less diversity.</p> <p>Program 15 – Development Code Amendments – Housing Constraints: This program minimizes governmental constraints under the City’s control to facilitate the provision of housing and encourages innovation in design, ownership, and living arrangements.</p> <p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p>
15.20		<p>Market rate housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DeNova Homes has been buying available land in the City for market rate projects, with as high a price point as possible (as evidenced by the Mockingbird Lane R-O site project where prices ended up being up to \$500,000 more than DeNova said, because the market went up). DeNova is like lions waiting at the watering hole, they are killing the 	<p>Program 15 – Development Code Amendments – Housing Constraints: This program minimizes governmental constraints under the City’s control to facilitate the provision of housing and encourages innovation in design, ownership, and living arrangements.</p> <p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p> <p><u>Any developer, including DeNova Homes, has the right to purchase available land to develop homes for sale at market rate. The City’s inclusionary housing requirement and Program 1 require such developers to set aside a percentage of both rental and ownership units for affordable housing.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>City on a glut of market rate housing. If the City's plan is basically to be a deer in the headlights for the market, and surrender to market forces, then the Housing Element will basically just continue the pattern of overproduction of above-moderate income housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No annexation plans appear except for possibly the 20455 5th East, the Doyle lot (DeNova Homes). The site inventory says this will be 59 units total, 47 above-moderate income housing and 12 moderate-income housing. The Housing Element says, "if annexed, development would count towards RHNA." Is the same true for other possible sphere annexations on the Merlo, Zepponi, and Serafini lots? This counts towards RHNA at what average median income? More market rate glut? DeNova advertised this in an initial presentation as "attainable housing" but refused to give a price point. This refusal to be specific is kind of like the current City HE, say whatever you need to say to get what you want. The city should actively and aggressively counteract the market by considering the suggestions of David Brigode and David Eichar, whose housing element public comments needs to be considered, as opposed to excuses and denial. 	<p>Comments regarding development partnerships with affordable housing developers, annexation, and feedback from David Brigode and David Eichar are discussed above.</p>
<p>15.21</p>	<p>ADUs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADUs are all classed as moderate-income for the site inventory, and 64 ADU units are expected through the whole 6th cycle. People rent ADUs, not buy them. ADUs are in the same size as SB-9 units, 700-800 sf. If rental ADUs and rental SB-9 units are essentially the same size, why can one be forced to be deed-restricted as low-income housing (top end 80% AMI) and the other counted as moderate-income housing (top end 120% AMI)? Landlords routinely maximize the allowable rent, so top end is a reasonable expectation. ADU policy will need clear, enforceable parameters to measure if any are actually rented at moderate, very-low, or low-income. A potential ADU tenant needs to know if the 	<p>ADUs are classed as moderate income based on the City's 5th Cycle reporting of ADU units. This is not a limitation that restricts ADUs to only being affordable to moderate income households. Program 5 provides for affordability of ADUs to be tracked and it is anticipated that a number of ADUs will be affordable to very low and low income units based on Bay Area data collected for ADUs.</p> <p>Deed-restriction requirements for ADUs are based on State law.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>unit is ear-marked as affordable at some level, and what rights they have.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can only locate five ADUs on the site inventory Excel chart. 	<p><u>See response to previous comments. As previously discussed, the AFFH includes data and information regarding segregation and the City's racial history, including identification of areas with limited diversity and acknowledgement of past racially exclusive practices in Sonoma. Programs have been revised accordingly to promote diversity, both economic and racial, by increasing access to areas with less diversity.</u></p>
<p>15.22</p>	<p>Additional constraints to affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This AFFH site location potentially concentrates poverty, not integrating any into east side tax credit allocation committee (TCAC) moderate- and high-opportunity areas. This also puts actual construction up to a wing and prayer. Where are the lower-average median price developers who will build? Where are the plans and affordable housing developer relationships to be ensuring that these sites do not go market rate? What evidence is there that Safeway will do anything? The city has no track record of a conversion of a commercial property like Safeway to affordable housing; this should be questioned by HCD. The zoning at 20455 5th East is classed as "sphere." What will that City zone be? Can the County help out and rezone/up-zone ahead of time? What productive, cooperative relations with the County have set the table to meet the needs of both City and County RHNA? An R-O site? R-H High density? This Doyle lot has City high density on one side and City medium on the other and no neighbors want high density no matter what the AMI range; this possible project will be NIMBY WW3. [How to answer this?] For the vacant and underutilized and 6th cycle AFFH, we see the city under pressure to show better lower AMI #s, but without specific plans to recruit non-profit developers, which there have been none in public nor in any public meetings, it appears the city is just saving stuff here to pass the HE. See David Brigode's site inventory public comments. 	<p><u>Affordable housing developers may build in any residential or mixed-use zone and include affordable housing provisions via Program 1.</u></p> <p><u>The City will work with the project proponent of the Safeway lot upon submittal of any discretionary development application to address consistency with the General Plan, Zoning Code, Housing Element, and CEQA. Program 2 will ensure that the City coordinates with local affordable housing developers to explore every opportunity for the development of affordable housing.</u></p> <p><u>Comments regarding AFFH, development partnerships with affordable housing developers, annexation, and feedback from David Brigode are discussed above.</u></p>
<p>15.23</p>	<p>Missing information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to find or access site inventory in two online Housing Element documents given by the city; the digital copy is very cumbersome. 	<p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p> <p><u>The site inventory is located in Appendix A and is discussed in Chapter 4 of the Background Report. Land values and existing development information is based on County Assessor data.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to find a text explanation of the Excel chart because the massive Adobe .pdf document is too complicated, not user friendly; page numbers do not work or are not numbered in logical fashion. • This Housing Element is particularly inscrutable. This site inventory chart needs a short explanation of what it is and how it's laid out. • Unable to see that any specifically reserve sites are laid out; will the city outline the 311 RHNA allocation and have a dedicated reserve buffer, or mix them all together? • If mixed, will they all be counted as 6th cycle units? • The Excel site inventory chart does not total to 311 anywhere, have to manually add up all the numbers. • The land value and improvement value categories fail to explain the metrics, is it by square foot, by the acre, what? What is the rationale here? Improvement to land value ratio is unexplained, there is no basis given to believe this or not. • If there are lower land values on the edge and just outside the City, and the City is very small, two square miles, this gives a rationale to expand the UGB to gain access to appropriately sized and priced lots for AH. • If the City wants to find every reason why not to have new land for AH, but then not have realistic AFFH/ AH land capacity in the City, then HCD will start to see a glimmer of Sonoma's Green Checkmate, NIMBY land management pattern. • Possible SB-9 units are not identified as part of inventory. If only 5.4% of all units are expected to go SB-9, that would be at 16 of all of Sonoma's 311 6th Cycle RHNA. • This is important because the city SB-9 ordinance says all SB-9 units for renters have to be deed-restricted to Low AMI (Mod for ownership), so the public has to be able to see which units the city expects to go SB-9 and then to count them to the proper RHNA AMI category. Why are possible SB-9 units not identified in the site inventory? • If any rental SB-9 units count as moderate or above-moderate income housing, this won't be consistent with city SB-9 ordinance, or if any are classed as very low-income 	
<p><u>Program 17</u> speaks to the growth management ordinance, which manages increases in service and infrastructure demand from development consistent with available water supplies and sewer treatment capacities. This ordinance limits the City to a development average of 65 units per year. If implemented, this number is sufficient to accommodate Sonoma's regional housing needs, defined as 311 units for the 6th cycle.</p> <p>The approach to SB 9 sites is discussed in Chapter 4 of the Background Report.</p>		

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>housing, that would be inconsistent as well. The City has boxed itself in with ADU, SB-9 and affordable by design inconsistencies. The City SB-9 ordinance assumes affordable by design is impossible in Sonoma in single family zoned/ R-L areas, therefore if the city counts any market rate Mod rental units in SFZ areas to 6th cycle RHNA, this goes against its SB-9 ordinance rationale to deed restrict all SB-9 units. To be consistent, all rental moderate-income and below housing units in the city's 6th cycle RHNA need to be deed-restricted, or the SB-9 deed-restriction needs to be lifted.</p>	
<p>15.24</p>	<p>A few Ta-Nahisi Coates quotes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "... 'gentrification' is but a more pleasing name for white supremacy, is the interest on enslavement, the interest on Jim Crow, the interest on redlining, compounding across the years, and these new urbanites living off of that interest are, all of them, exulting in a crime. To speak the word gentrification is to immediately lie... white people are, in some profound way, trapped; it took generations to make them white, and it will take more to unmake them." • "To ignore the fact that one of the oldest republics in the world was erected on a foundation of white supremacy, to pretend the problems of dual society are the same as the problems of unregulated capitalism, is to cover the sin of national plunder with the sin of national lying." • "White America" is a syndicate arrayed to protect its exclusive power to dominate and control (Black) bodies. Sometimes this power is direct (lynching), and sometimes it is insidious (redlining)." 	<p>Noted. See AFFH analysis in the Background Report.</p>	
<p>Fred Allebach (8/22/22 – Site Inventory) Comments within this letter are sorted by page number.</p>	<p>16.01</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 61 shows that 6th cycle pending and approved above moderate-income housing units (113) is outstripping moderate- and below (39) by far. This is the same pattern as 2000- 2020 RHNA performance, where the city had an above moderate-income housing unit overproduction of 293, and a 236 underproduction of moderate-income housing and below. Throughout the Housing Element the city emphasizes having met 5th cycle RHNA targets but ignores aggregate performance from 2000-2020. 	<p>Aggregate 2000-2009 reporting is outside the scope of this Housing Element. Comments regarding housing segregation and underutilized properties are addressed above.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 91 above moderate-income housing units in vacant areas not allowed for very low- and low-income housing and 22 above moderate-income housing for underutilized areas not allowed for very low- and low-income housing. Therefore, 111 sites in the city, for above moderate-income housing are closed off from very low- and low-income housing, mostly low and medium density areas; is this a pattern of segregation? 	
	16.02	<p>Page 96</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There 64 ADUs for the 6th cycle, all at the moderate average median income (AMI) level. There is no requirement for this, it's a guess and a hope. Moderate-income housing is 80-120% AMI. Rents almost always go to maximum level possible. With no deed restriction, ADUs can be expected to rent for whatever the market will bear and in Sonoma, that is a LOT, most likely higher than 120% AMI. ADUs will thus only reasonably be affordable to the above moderate-income AMI class. It is extremely likely that no low -or very low-income renters will be able to afford 6th cycle ADU rents and moderate-income housing may be priced out too, even as the city counts all ADUs as moderate-income for RHNA. The city assumes some ADUs will be affordable to low-income and very low-income AMI. HCD should require that the city show proof that ADUs are renting at the moderate-income level, and require the city to undertake enforceable actions and trackable programs to ensure that ADUs rent at that level. <i>Note, the City SB-9 process and ordinance, where "affordable by design" housing is assumed to be impossible in Sonoma at any square foot level and therefore the City size and deed-restricted SB-9 units to 800 sf and Low AMI for rentals and Mod AMI for ownership.</i> This deed restriction is an impediment, deterrent, and constraint to housing construction because owners will be less able to recoup construction costs from low- and moderate-income housing rents. As Planning Commissioner Steve Barbose said, "If you require on a single-family lot in town that people build an affordable housing unit, with 	<p><u>These comments have been shared above, and are noted again here.</u></p> <p>Comments relating to ADUs and affordable housing development opportunities are addressed above. In summary, ADUs are governed by State law; where they are permitted and developed are driven by <u>residential property owners.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>building costs what they are, effectively what you're going to do is keep that house from being built... Because the person who's thinking about building is not going to be able to afford it."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical info for the reader on why VL and L sites are all on Hwy 12: 20 units per acre is state "default density" for VL and L This is cited in the HE • City sites for VL and L are zoned C (commercial), MX (mixed use) and R-O (housing opportunity site) from .5 - 10 acres. Why a default density of 20? bc VL and L can't be produced at a one-off level, larger scale and numbers are needed to make affordable unit production pencil. AH developers need two acres and at least 50 units to make a lower AMI affordability project pencil. • However, in Sonoma R-O sites are routinely bought by market rate developers (DeNova) and made into market rate projects. • Sites anticipated to accommodate VL and L: There are WAY too many typos and errors here, very hard to navigate, took me 40 minutes to decipher, very poor proof reading, so many typos and errors wastes the public's time. • The pending 1st St East townhomes (Listed as site J in HE, is actually site H; listed as 50 units, 0 VL, 10 L, 10 Mod and 80 Above Mod • Site 38 typo, 38 is Above Mod, maybe site 28 477 W. Napa St/ Safeway? • Site 80, there is none on site inventory, only goes up to #70 is this 19357 Hwy 12? The behind SPARC orchard site? • Site C is a typo, this is site B, only one VL and L each anyway • Site A is correct, 10 VL, 4 L, 41 Above Mod • The huge bulk, 88%, of the VL (101) and L (66) units for 6th cycle RHNA are in three locations along Hwy 12: Napa Rd/ Hwy 12 and Broadway, the Safeway vacant lot on Hwy 12/ Napa St. and an old orchard site behind SPARC on Hwy 12. Addresses for the above: 19357 Hwy 12, 45 & 69 W. Napa Rd., 477 W. Napa St. • Aside from the above, the 12% other VL and L in the HE are 10 VL and 13 L. Of these, 10 VL and 4 L are at DeNova's 	
--	--	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>Montaldo Apts. on Hwy 12, and then 9 L at First St. East townhomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hwy 12: 167 VL and L units, 88%, Montaldo and First St East Townhomes: 23 VL and L units, 12% <p>Page 97</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R-M zoning (moderate) can go 10 per acre density in R-M, moderate density can also go on R-H (high density), C and MX zoning This is telling: “The City has used these default density thresholds as a guide in allocating its sites inventory by income category, as presented in Table 61 and detailed by site in Appendix A.” What this says is that the City makes zoning rules to protect R-L and R-M from VL and L integration and then turns around and says “we are only obeying and being consistent with the rules.” This is the Plato’s Cave shadow of exclusionary zoning. East side lots of smaller size had to be subdivided at some point. Lots of size in Armstrong could be reaggregated to make sizes sufficient for AH projects. Land cost would be similar to the Safeway vacant lot the City is calling for all VL and L. My thought process here is how to get east land for AFFH? One way would be to get the size and the AFFH/ TCAC location would be to annex east side sphere parcels 885 and 905. “ ... development trends in the City indicate strong support for redeveloping sites with more intense residential uses.” Why not redevelop and rezone the east side? Why all on Hwy 12? 	<p>These comments related to inclusionary housing, Armstrong Estates, and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
16.03	16.04	<p>Page 98</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development trends in Sonoma have been demonstrably, predominantly market rate, and Above Mod. ABAG RHNA performance website: 2000 -2020, Sonoma underproduced Mod and below by 236 units and overproduced Above Mod by 293; this is the actual lay of the land, yet City keeps saying “we met 5th cycle RHNA, everything is great.” This is like having had cancer but then never mentioning it to the doctor bc you didn’t have it in the last eight years. 	<p>These comments related to housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here. See response to previous comments.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market conditions: no mention of 2000- 2020 RHNA performance, a performance that led to and maintains current R-L and R-M segregation. 	
<p>16.05</p>	<p>Page 99</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects with entitlements; Pending projects: all Above Mod. BAU in Sonoma is Above Mod. Above Mod is what drives all prices up and what is predominantly on the east side. Important to note that <i>there are no</i> 100% AH/ 60% AMI and below projects pending. SAHA (AltaMadrone Apts) on Broadway was the last 100% AH project for many years before and after. The City has all manner of excuses why not. This while the Springs (contiguous unincorporated area right next to Sonoma) has 170 60% AMI and below units pending in two big projects. Sonoma has no big projects pending and there is no guarantee that the three Hwy 12 locations ID'd for VL and L units will not go market rate. This shows Sonoma is just not creating the conditions, "setting the table", to have AH here and it is really only the HE process that is forcing the City to even talk about it. • City 6th cycle RHNA for VL is 83 and for L is 48, 131 total for VL and L. On the three Hwy 12 sites noted above that are planned to take 88% of 6th cycle VL and L, there is a 36-unit excess VL and L capacity. Since these sites are in no way guaranteed to not go market rate, and no plans or projects are lined up, one would have to conclude that the City has put almost all, except for 12%, its VL and L eggs in one unsure basket, and therefore there is not a reasonable, planned-for excess capacity for VL and L in the site inventory. If any of these three Hwy 12 sites do not pan out, that leaves only the 23 at Montaldo and First St East townhomes as back-up, to make up the 6th cycle 131 for VL and L. My impression is that current site inventory is not a very sure or assertive way to go about meeting the VL and L RHNA requirements. Maybe rezoning R-L exclusionary zoning at the two .5+ acre lots at Armstrong estates should be added as options? • I suggest VL and L site option #1 should be to annex the east side sphere parcels; that would be way more like meeting the intentions of AFFH. 	<p><u>Noted. The SAHA project was completed during the 5th Cycle. The City has had multiple projects with affordable components in recent years (5th Cycle) as discussed in Chapter 6 of the Background Report.</u></p> <p><u>Commenters concerns regarding potential market rate development of sites identifies as having capacity to accommodate lower income housing are noted and have been addressed previously.</u></p>

	<p>16.06</p> <p>Page 100 - ADUs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 64 ADUs over the whole 6th cycle. "...it is anticipated that a portion of ADUs will be affordable to VL and L income households." What is "a portion?" How many? How? Under what magical spell? ● All ADUs in the HE however, will be classed as Mod. This is troubling bc in the City's SB-9 ordinance it is assumed that nothing below market rate can be affordable by design in Sonoma, that's why the City deed-restricted all SB-9 rental (800 sf max) to Low and ownership to Mod. ● If ADUs at 700-1200 sf can be assumed to go Mod, why not SB-9 units too? Seems like the city is speaking with a forked tongue here; on one hand 700 sf ADUs are affordable by design to "a portion" of VL and L residents but an 800 sf SB-9 unit cannot be affordable by design and needs to be deed restricted to L for renters? ● Upshot: SB-9 units should be consistent with ADU assumptions on attainability and have the City SB-9 deed restriction changed to 80-120% AMI for renters, otherwise there are two diff objective standards at play for the same square foot units. If nothing in Sonoma can be affordable by design, then all site inventory at Mod and below should be required to be deed-restricted. ● Table 62 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For .5 and more acres, vacant sites: there are 23 vacant R-L sites and one R-M site in the City; these are all closed to VL and L by default density assumptions that R-L and R-M will not be rezoned in the 6th cycle HE, bc as the City lays out, there are adequate sites elsewhere. To this, I counter that there is an existing pattern of east side segregation that needs to be addressed, and that all HE VL and L site eggs are in one basket leaving an uncertain buffer. ○ For 1 to 2.5 acres vacant, for R-L and R-M there are five more sites. These should be, with R-L first, ID'd for multi-family units of four or more each. 	<p>These comments related to ADUs have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

16.07	<p>Page 101</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For <i>underutilized</i> there is one R-L site at five acres. Upshot, there are plenty of .5 – 10 acre sites in R-L and R-M zoned areas, it is only an arbitrary zoning classification that keeps poor, BIPOC people, VL, L, out; this can be seen as modern redlining, exclusionary zoning without the overt racial terminology. The five acre R-L siter should be ID'd for VL and L in the site inventory. See my SB-9 objective language analysis essay where the true intentions behind City Dev. Code objective language are revealed by Planning Commissioners and later voted for by the City Council. That nearly All VL and L are going on or right near Hwy 12, recaps redlining and Urban Renewal's poor relocation record of putting poor people in the worst locations; this is framed by the City as an improvement to "revitalize" these Lower Resource TCAC areas. This "revitalization" seems like a pure fantasy, pulling the wool over the public's eyes with a nebulous term that practically has low chances of succeeding without more assertive, honest and meaningful guardrails than Program 21 set by the city to make sure the ideas come to fruition and that actual patterns of segregation are addressed. The HE site inventory as a whole could just as easily be seen as furthering intentional segregation by protecting the "character" of low density, single family-zoned areas, under the guise that higher density is more appropriate elsewhere, for a variety of optional, not necessary assumptions about land use and use-compatibility. The Figure 2 aerial map of inventory, is very hard to read. This should be worked on to make it easier to see, lighten the background, make ID colors and markings clear and distinct, double the size and make a foldout. 	<p>These comments related to housing segregation and underutilization of sites have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
16.08	<p>Page 105</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFFH: "taking meaningful actions, in addition to combatting discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics." 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>(Race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful actions, discrimination, access to opportunity, patterns of segregation, barriers that restrict access to opportunity... What would not undertaking any HE rezoning and keeping VL and L out of R-L and R-M zoning be then if not discrimination, denying access to opportunity, patterns of segregation, and barriers that restrict access to opportunity? • I have to conclude that the city is avoiding naming and being responsible for segregation and not taking meaningful actions bc a segregation problem is refused to be admitted to. Sonoma and the consultant have adopted a willfully ignorant, partial view that seeks to spin the facts of Sonoma to be different than clear patterns of segregation, that can be seen and demonstrated with the data in this HE, esp. from the AFFH data viewer. • AFFH analysis avoids key zoning and segregation Census Block Group data, denies visible, demonstrable trends and patterns of segregation, allows segregated near-RCAAs to stand, doesn't address already-externalized regional minorities and protected classes, does not utilize the three east side Block Groups to give higher VL and L AMI protected classes access to opportunity; keeps disparities going by restricting VL and L income access to R-L and R-M zoning areas and the HE fails to have a reference section that shows what research the City did to arrive at its conclusion that there is no pattern of segregation, or to show what materials were <i>not</i> cited. • Outreach - Is the full HE translated to Spanish? 	
16.09	<p>Page 106</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops and Public Hearings - Some Planning Commission members are hostile and unresponsive to housing advocate's points, esp. in the recent SB-9 process. City Council is unresponsive. It is routine for the public to get no response to communications or public comments. What good is public involvement if it's not accounted for in any policy or action? 	<p>Comment noted. The City is required to accommodate the RHNA as allocated by ABAG.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Balancing Act online engagement tool - This was a good idea but I found the software difficult to use and to do a thoughtful site distribution. The options did not let me slice and dice like I wanted. There was a paltry response (14 responses) from the public, making results inconclusive. Outreach was maybe not that strong, and/or is representative of a disengaged citizenry. Putting announcements on the City website is not enough outreach. ● The citizenry that did show up for the City’s 2019 Housing Our Community (HOC) series made a public recommendation of 725 new units for the 6th cycle, half deed-restricted, yet the City acted to reduce its initial RHNA from 480 to 311. The HOC materials are very difficult to find on the City website, took me 10-15 mins and there is no summary of findings. 	
16.10	16.10	<p>Page 107</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing Survey 381 responses, 343 from city Responses were mostly how great it is in Sonoma, which for people for whom money is no object would say. And, all of Coastal Cal is a very nice place to live climatically and geographically, regardless of jurisdiction. ● The survey showed signs of trouble too: 43% concerned about unaffordable rent, 29% struggle to pay rent or mortgage, 30% are intimidated to ask for repairs by property manager or landlord. ● Stakeholder Input - Sonoma Valley Housing Group, SVHG, a left of center group of which I am a member, a group well known and among the few who show up to comment on housing issues, was not asked to participate in stakeholder input. This was disrespectful for a group that shows up way more than others, but the ultra-Right Farm Bureau was asked to comment, and they never show up to anything here. 	<p>Noted. The City will add SVHG to the stakeholder list for future projects.</p>
16.11	16.11	<p>Page 108</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessment of Fair Housing Issues - Key data and background info is from a 2012 county study. 10 years old. This study is said to be: “the most recent comprehensive regional analysis of fair housing issues.” This is 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

- preposterous! 2012?!Q%#@# With so many newer studies it is inexplicable why a 2012 study would be relied on.
- What about UC Berkeley Otherling and Belonging regional segregation studies? What about numerous local studies I shared with the City and the consultant? Since there is no references section or citations for many items, it's impossible to see what the consultant did or do not consider for data. No reference section or textual citations makes it easy to see why the HE comes off as rosy colored sunglasses spin; the City wants to pass the HE and not make waves by drawing attention to local segregation and inequity, the more problems ID'd, the more work and responsibility would be entailed.
- This HE draft almost seems like a calculated test to see how little can stick with HCD. I hope that when the City gets its first rejection letter from HCD, that the next draft will have a redline version so the public will not have to wade through all of this again to see that all details, comments, suggestions, and questions have been addressed.
- Indeed, an off the record staff comment, about why the City would not take any of the county's huge RHNA to further "smart" city-centered growth, or to offset the proposed 1000 units at SDC, staff said in effect, the higher the City RHNA obligation, the more chance to fail... why would the City take on more risk?
- The City is more concerned to check easy boxes and pass the HE then to honestly address patterns if segregation and Valley housing issues in a bold way, would rather play it safe and pass than to address patterns of segregation and fail.
- "The unexamined life is not worth living." Socrates
- I sent the following links to the City and to HE consultant Beth Thompson and never had a response and was told by City staff I should not contact the consultant without city staff present. My sense is that the HE is spun away from grappling with real Valley/ regional disparity issues and is narrowly focused on Sonoma as a fantasy island of privilege, where housing equity problems are framed as only applying within city boundaries. Since the poor and BIPOC have largely been externalized from Sonoma, there's no

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>problems! A larger view would dig deeper into why the City TCAC Education score was so low. Why? Bc the Valley socioeconomically disadvantaged who have been displaced from Sonoma are counted in City school/ TCAC education scores. This is just the tip of an inter-related Valley housing iceberg not even hinted at in the City HE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o District R maps 2020 Census-based, from Sonoma county Redistricting process; you can get really granular with these in any county areas o DWR DAC mapping tool o Hidden in Plain Sight study 2017, Sonoma Valley Fund o County EDB studies, EDB Hispanic Demographic Trends 10/22/20 o Hanna Fortulezas/ Latinos in Sonoma Valley study, 2020 o Los Cien’s Latino Scorecard and United Way Real Cost presentations, 10/22/20 o Sonoma Valley Collaborative’s Homes for a Sustainable Sonoma Valley, 2020 o The State of Working Sonoma, Fall 2018, Jesus Guzman (I can produce the report for you) o Generation Housing State of Sonoma County Housing 2022 o Measure of American Portraits, Sonoma County/ Springs, 2010, 2020 HDI scores o Urban Displacement Project shows Sonoma and Springs areas as “becoming exclusive” and “early ongoing gentrification” 	
<p>16.12</p>	<p>Page 109</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach Capacity - Pretty weak, landlords and property manager agents have all the cards, tenants have a seriously over-burdened Legal Aid and few rights, and very low ability to undertake any legal proceedings with City Code enforcement already stretched too thin to enforce Sonoma’s many rules and regulations, it’s doubtful that fair housing enforcement will be apt in any meaningful way. 	<p><u>These comments related to fair housing have been shared above, and are noted again here.</u></p> <p><u>Also:</u></p> <p><u>Program 20 – Fair Housing Services: Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California</u> is the designated provider of fair housing and tenant-landlord information throughout the County. <u>This agency</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>provides fair housing investigation and coordinates referral services to assist individuals who may have been victims of discrimination. These comments related to housing segregation, fair housing, and fair housing services have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
<p>16.13</p>	<p>Page 110</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with Fair Housing Laws - Density bonus law: If VL and L are not allowed in R-L and R-R zoned areas, to keep the density low and protect the “character”, then a density bonus does nothing to integrate these areas. • Housing Accountability Act: the City has done an end-run on the HAA having a VL, L and Mod- restrictive zoning code, and by loading up City Development Code objective language to reflect low density protectionist values. Dense infill with VL, L, and Mod units, in R-L and R-R areas are already, <i>a priori</i> disapproved. • An excessive historic preservation pattern in Sonoma further restricts development. • Least Cost Zoning Law: here the City shows circular justifications for maintaining segregation of near-RCAA areas; all income categories need to be covered in the HE, compliance is achieved through implementing the GP and HE, “consistent with” a zoning code that perpetuates segregation and denies VL, L, and Mod access to higher opportunity east side Block Group areas. • Excessive Subdivision Standards: “Refrain from imposing criteria for design or improvements for the purpose of rendering infeasible the development of housing for any and all economic segments of the community.” This is exactly what the City did with its SB-9 and UGB ordinances, inserted poison pill language “for the purpose of rendering infeasible the development of housing.” • This may also apply to Armstrong Estates, no study has been done on Sonoma CC&Rs to show how subdivision standards plus zoning may chill neighborhood inclusion of VL, L and Mod housing. • The state has already called out Sonoma on its SB-9 poison pills, the City UGB has the same exact poison pill pattern: rendering infeasible any extra-UGB annexation with excessive deed-restriction, lot size limits, and a clause that there can be no extra-sphere annexation if there is vacant

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>or underutilized land in the city without defining what the economic feasibility of such vacant and underutilized land is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pattern here is that the City uses the letter of the law, that it creates in secret-to-99% Development Code language, to minimize integration potentials, rather than take a more assertive, proactive course for AFFH; this is Miles’ Law, the people in power at the City are protecting their low density, single family home-zoned character, this is the primary value when it comes to housing. The dominant view since Mayor Harvey left, is of low-density protectionism. 	
	16.14	<p>Page 111</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Element Law - Ditto above comments on a GP and HE system primarily designed to protect and preserve low density, single family zoning which has the effect of modern redlining of three east side Block Group areas. The HE here cites the 2012 study (when many more recent studies are available) and seeks to proscribe the discussion of AFFH to avoid addressing segregation, specifically impediment #2: ethnic segregation and lack of AH. If the City has externalized BIPOC protected classes through conscious, triple bottom line unsustainable economic and tourism policy, then outreach to these classes is not necessary, even as such BIPOC people live right next to the City in unincorporated, racially concentrated areas of poverty, specifically Census Tract 1503.05. If the City has already externalized BIPOC and concentrated wealthy whites in \$800,000 to \$2 million east side homes, can the City then claim there is no segregation in town? This is disingenuous. If the whole HE is avoiding Sonoma accountability for actual patterns of segregation, and regional segregation in Sonoma Valley is not even mentioned, a picture is given of a place that is just OK, as if it can live in a self-satisfied bubble and not account for its relation to the rest of Sonoma Valley or account for past behavior and lack of action and policy that caused such displacement. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presumption seems to be that such displacement and segregation is accidental and therefore no one's responsibility. • The whole HE can be seen as an effort to underplay the true scope of Sonoma AFFH issues; serious partial spin is in play with the Sonoma HE. References to UC Berkeley Othering and Belonging 2019 and 2021 regional segregation studies are conspicuously lacking, one reason possibly being that the city power is more ideologically aligned with the NIMBY think tank Embarcadero Institute, as said in-effect, by the HE consultant in the 8/18 Planning Commission HE presentation. Yes, state housing laws are onerous, is the assumption. • Lack of City info on AFFH and of prioritizing AH as the crisis that it is shows that the City is eliding that it is the 18th most segregated city Bay Area; do you get to be the 18th most segregated city in the Bay Area by accident? No one knew? This is merely a matter of people's choices? Better read <i>The Color of Law</i> by Richard Rothstein and think again. • Upshot: the City needs to take AFFH outreach and enforcement way more seriously, but this can only realistically happen if the City first admits there are segregation problems that need more urgency to address 	
16.15	<p>Pages 115-116 - Analysis of available Fed, State, and local data and knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration and segregation patterns and trends - Segregation is RCAA and RE/CAPs, concentrated areas of affluence or poverty. The City says there are none. What if it is close and there are substantial similarities? Just bc the threshold is not crossed patterns can be ignored? • Lack of references indicates that spin is at play and data contradicting the rosy colored picture view has been left out. You are not going to find what you are not looking for; Sonoma has not had a strong AH policy presence and this weak direction from electeds that tends by default to favor single family home, low density residents, signals to staff and consultant that a weak tea, just check the boxes approach to AFFH is OK. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Diversity Index: According to 2021 UC Berkeley https://belonging.berkeley.edu/roots-structural-racism, Sonoma is in a larger area of low to moderate segregation. The same source fingers Sonoma as the 18th most segregated city in the Bay Area, right in there with Marin County. ● One thing that happens with selective data slicing and dicing is that Census Tract areas get averaged across jurisdictional boundaries, and pockets of more concentrated segregation get minimized. This is the case for the three east side Block Groups that have a clear RCAA-type segregation pattern, and also for Tract 1503.05 in the unincorporated Springs with a clear poverty pattern. ● In Table 1 Demographic Trends, Sonoma as a whole is listed but not the highly RCAA-type segregated east side Block Groups. In some sense, there has to be the will to want to look for something and prove it. Who is the consultant working for? Every stakeholder group? Just some? Just the City as directed by a few people? ● Table 1 mentions that the west side is more diverse, but no analysis of the east side like I have done. Why not? One thing that has happened in Sonoma is that a racially, and wealth-segregated community has come to believe this is normal, by accident, attributable to “the market”, and not connected to past antecedents, and therefore no inequity problems or responsibilities are admitted; this is a highly bubbled, covert segregationist view characteristic of the modern, post redlining approach to maintaining segregation. ● Ta-Nahisi Coates: “To ignore the fact that one of the oldest republics in the world was erected on a foundation of white supremacy, to pretend the problems of dual society are the same as the problems of unregulated capitalism, is to cover the sin of national plunder with the sin of national lying. The lie ignores the fact that closing the “achievement gap” will do nothing to close the “injury gap” in which black college graduates still suffer higher unemployment rates than white college graduates, and black job applicants without criminal 	
--	--	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	16.16	<p>records enjoy roughly the same chance of getting hired as white applicants with criminal records.”</p> <p>Pages 116-117 - Mapped patterns of integration and segregation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does not mention race and ethnicity but does mention wealth/ income group. In 3rd paragraph, says “looking beyond Sonoma’s boundaries...” but only refers to disabilities/ seniors, married couples, female-headed households. Why not “look beyond Sonoma’s boundaries” for the bigger picture of a local Plantation economy? Look how Sonoma’s equity issues have been externalized to the unincorporated Springs, specifically Tract 1503.05. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
	16.17	<p>Page 117</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Patterns of moderately segregated wealth, as indicated by median income, do exist in Sonoma.” refers to east and west sides here, but, east side is \$55-87,000 and east side is \$87-125,000, not the same, there is more white- segregated wealth on the east side. The latter assertion belies the clear wealth and race RCAA-type segregation pattern in three east side Block Groups. Lower AMI communities in Sonoma County “are somewhat more likely to be located in the more racially and ethnically diverse portions of the county”; this is BS, not “somewhat”, Tract 1503.05, the Latino Springs, directory adjacent to Sonoma, shows significant disparities with Sonoma along a clear range of documented indicators; what I see here is an intentional underplaying of local disparity in the HE. Roseland and Moorland along Hwy 101 are even worse concentrations of poverty. Hardly “somewhat.” “As described throughout this HE, the City is committed to supporting the development of housing affordable to lower income households in locations throughout the city...”; this statement stands contrary to how the east side has no VL and L units in the HE. “throughout the City” seems to really mean on Hwy 12 only. Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “There are some patterns of isolation and segregation apparent when considering certain 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

- characteristics (apparently not wealth, race, and ethnicity in Sonoma Valley and in the City) ...the City will continue to...reduce patterns of isolation and segregation and increase access to housing-related and other resources in these areas in order to effect change from current conditions.”
- Words here say segregation will be addressed. The site inventory tells another story, with overwhelming majority of VL and L all being put in existing areas of VL and L, and all on unproven sites on Hwy 12. Above Mod in Sonoma is left segregated as default areas of R-L affluence.
 - I have to conclude that the City is intentionally not taking the City and Valley segregation bull by the horns, has a HE of minimizing issues, just checking the boxes and doing the least or nothing, as in the case of east side -near RCAA/white segregation. It seems from the Whittier CA HCD HE rejection letter, that most of points I am making here are validated by HCD’s critique of Whittier’s weak HE showing. Hopefully the City will not just ratchet up to the next weak level and see what flies.
 - **Figure 8 race ethnic neighborhood concentration**
 - This map shows Sonoma as “LatinX-white”, omitting 80-85% east side white/wealthy and omitting Tract 1503.05 as majority Latino, lack of a studied, granular view presents a false view of what is really on the ground here. The fact Tract 1503.05 is 50+% Latino does not show on this map.
 - Tract 1503.05 shows up time and again as an area of great disparity with Sonoma, yet the HE gives no indication of this, this has to be an intentional omission bc the data clearly shows the disparity with Sonoma, esp with the three east side Block Groups. 1503.05 is the source

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>of low City TCAC Education scores, the data and stats and indicators from 1503.05, combined with the disparity with Sonoma east side Block Groups, tell the real story of Valley patterns of segregation, why does the City HE just confine this analysis to City TCAC Ed scores?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As HCD can see, I sent plenty of Valley-level segregation resources up front to the consultant. ● Figure 9 diversity index by Block Group 2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ East side clearly has lower diversity. 1503.05 shows up as highest diversity, and the Valley as more diverse than 2010 ○ Maybe the Trump undocumented exodus, plus fire effects on rent prices and displacement had not registered by 2018, bc many undocumented Latinos have left the Valley bc of 2017 fires and Trump ICE oppression... ○ A better attempt at more current Valley and City demographic info is warranted, but with no text citations and a reference section, can't tell at a glance what info is from what date. ● Fig 15 proportion of senior by Census tract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seniors are clearly concentrated in assisted living facilities on south and west sides. Need data on rental costs here, do seniors need to be wealthy to be housed in Sonoma? How much do local senior housing and assisted living facilities charge? ● Fig 16 median household income by Block Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ East side is clearly the wealthy area, my Block Group analysis shows this, and this correlates with racial segregation. 	
16.18	<p>Page 127</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAP) - Must have a non-white pop. of 50% or more, i.e. Tract 1503.05 in the Springs does. My EnviroScreen 4.0 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

	<p>analysis of this Tract shows that the population metrics have not been calculated by the CA EPA and/or by the State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at DWRs DAC tool for a breakdown of Valley Block Groups and annual incomes. There are “no R/ECAPs in Sonoma County...” Are HUD metrics being used here to elide local poverty? That Measure of America’s Portrait data show on very low HDI scores for Roseland, Moorland and the Springs? This has been a game played by the powers that be, to not address Springs poverty issues, to say there is less of a problem there than there really is; The Springs 1503.05 is a mini-Roseland; these are not fundamentally R/ECAP patterns? • “Comparing Figure 9 (Diversity Index) to Fig 16 (median household income), the HE says <i>it appears that areas of high diversity do not generally correlate with lower incomes and that areas of low diversity reflect a range of income levels.</i> • This totally misses 1503.05 as an area with high diversity and lower income, similar to Roseland and Moorland. And, the HE says that far east side, 1502.04 Block Group 1 as high diversity and lower income, this seems total wrong from my analysis of the latter Block Group. I live in this area. The 1502.04 Block Group 1 analysis suffers from averaging the city portion with non-city portion of the Block. I have to conclude that a deep analysis of east side wealth was not done; what took so long to get the HE out if not to research these topics more thoroughly? • Racially/ concentrated areas of affluence (RCAA) - The HE admits that white race can correlate with affluence. An RCAA is: 80% or more white, median household income \$125,000 or greater. No RCAAs in Sonoma, <i>but it is close</i>, % white is there, home value is there, near east side TCAC high area median income is \$101,000-\$105,000. The TCAC Education score brings in non-City, non-east side residents and this then lowers the east side score, making east side Block Groups appear to be something they are not. • For a matter of \$20,000 a year income and an inaccurate TCAC Ed score, the near east side would be an RCAA area, therefore there is no white affluence concentration issue? 	
--	---	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>16.19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 2 does not examine east side Block Group stats. Page 128 • Disparities in access to opportunities - Which areas offer low-income better chances? Clearly from TCAC scores and Census Block Group data, the east side. The HE uses CalEnviroScreen 3.0 4.0 is out now. The HE can use 4.0, not 3.0. As noted, in my analysis, Springs population data is missing in EnviroScreen 4.0, and TCAC website that conclusions can be affected by lack of data. • No census block groups have the Highest TCAC score, but one east Block has High and one has Medium. • "...the proposed sites to accommodate the 6th cycle RHNA are located throughout the City in varying levels of opportunity to the extent feasible, given the City's exiting built-out development pattern." "Throughout" apparently doesn't mean VL or L sites in the City TCAC High and Medium areas. • What does "to the extent feasible given the City's exiting built-out development pattern" mean? Does it mean the R-L and R-R are immune from integration? No rezoning to combat east side segregation? "Built out" would mean all areas get to high density or R-O density, that's why they have rezoning, things change. Exclusionary zoning is not right nor adaptive, it's an old segregated suburban residence pattern than needs to change. "Built out" here seems to mean nothing can change in segregated R-L areas. • The R-L development pattern itself is against AFFH, it lets stand white, wealthy plunder while other areas are integrated. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
	<p>16.20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 67 TCAC Opportunity resource levels by Tract - By promoting Low TCAC areas, the City intends to improve these areas with more goods and services, access to transit, jobs. The HE says "the City must look to Low/ Moderate resource areas to accommodate new development"; why <i>must</i>? While ignoring segregation and not rezoning the east side? 	<p>These comments related to fair housing, ADUs and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HE says “the city has distributed these units <i>throughout</i> the resource levels to promote more equal and equitable patterns of opportunity? The is BS, not true, east side is decidedly not taking any VL and L, this is not <i>throughout</i> resource level areas, it’s 88% on Hwy 12 in Low Resource areas. The HE claims that ADUs in all areas represents a commitment to equity, to “all income levels in diff geographic areas of the city”; more BS, all ADUs are Mod (120% AMI) for RHNA and SB-9 ordinance sets precedent that affordable by design is not possible in the city; to say that ADUs will cover all income levels is not even consistent with what is said earlier in the HE about ADUs. And, ADUs, without some controls, will all go market rate anyway. Economic Opportunity - The HE Says econ scores are “inconstant in the city.” Areas east of 12 have a lower job proximity index; what about the type of low paying tourism hospitality jobs? People with million+ dollar houses are going to work in tourism, hotels, and hospitality? Where is any analysis of the actual, specific jobs available here and that the people who have them can’t afford to live in Sonoma? This section needs to be beefed up to show types of jobs, the pay etc. 	
	16.21	<p>Pages 129-130</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational Opportunity - SVUSD is 63.1% Hispanic, 56.2% of students come from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds. The HE has no analysis of how this data here represents Valley-level segregation, only how it effects the City’s TCAC Ed score, this is a paltry and blindered view. The HE might look at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SVUSD Student Population Forecast By Residence School Year 2021-2022 Report Forecast 2022-23 to 2028-29 Davis Demographics 2/16/22 Sonoma’s scores are lower than other county Tracts and then in Napa County, this points to serious trouble here in Sonoma Valley with Census Tract 1503.05, which is a mini- 	<p>These comments are noted.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>Roseland next to affluent Sonoma. These education data points are the tip of the iceberg of a HE, un-analyzed Valley segregation and major disparity with the east side and 1503.05</p>	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p> <p>Programs 29, 30, and 31 address environmental sustainability and ensures that Sonoma grows in a responsible manner.</p> <p>The comments regarding transportation, economic and education scores, and sensitive communities are noted.</p>
<p>16.22</p>	<p>Page 130</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Env Opportunity - CA EnviroScreen socio-econ scores are lacking for Tract 1503.05. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The east side has better environmental scores but whole city is good for green scores. ● Transportation - No mention of bus headway times. Sonoma is more isolated in the county, it is well known that public transit headway times are bad. ● The fact is the Valley has fought urbanization since the 1960s and made sure there are no big roads in and out, so as to protect rural character; this is the Sleepy Hollow Stasis and the Green Checkmate, a corollary effect of which is wealthy, white segregation and a high housing cost burden for anyone (poor whites included) who is not a wealthy white ● Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The fact that Education scores are impacted by out-of-city factors which reduce City TCAC scores shows the inter-relatedness of Sonoma to the surrounding unincorporated areas. Econ scores are admitted to vary (only “somewhat”, which is disputable), east side Block Group analysis shows affluent racial segregation. Then HE says that sites to accommodate lower AMI units are “distributed between (TCAC) Low and Mod resource areas” but this is false bc none are in the near east side Mod area, 88% of VL and L eggs are in the Hwy 12 Low basket ○ City says new MX development will provide jobs and commercial opportunities to provide goods and services, without any breakdown of the type of jobs or the cost of goods; what if there is a good chance the jobs are low paying and the goods overpriced? City HE needs some analysis of what kind of jobs people might have 	

	<p>given the local economy, with citations, from county EDB for example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The spin here is that Low areas will be brought up rather than High and Medium areas rezoned and integrated, this allows affluent areas to remain segregated and lock in an unsustainable status quo. ○ City then trumpets boilerplate about improving ratio of jobs to housing with a 311 RHNA that is not even half what the public asked for in the 2019 City Housing Our Community series. The city is not leading the Valley in smart growth infill to protect SDC, even as city council members protest density at SDC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fig 17 TCAC Econ score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shows Block Group 2 of 1504.02, the near west side, is City’s poor area, while lumping known low/ fixed-income Mobile Home Park areas into a “more positive” econ area. Far east side Block Group is lumped with 8th East, dilutes, makes a lower rating of a fundamentally Med-High area, The high concentration of Above Mod housing inventory by income on the far east side shows that this is not a low opportunity area. ● Fig 18 TCAC Ed score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shows how City is inter-related with and affected by Latino Springs. SVUSD and Santa Rosa school districts have lowest scores, SR annexed Roseland and will annex Moorland; Sonoma keeps Springs as unincorporated and denies/ ignores issues; this Ed score shows how Springs is economically disadvantaged and segregated as well ○ Why did SR step up to address unincorporated inequity issues but Sonoma is not? Do wealthy white cities get to play segregated fantasy island and then make all the rules the preserve that? Sonoma sets rules to maintain 	
--	---	--

	<p>segregation and then claims to be too small to do anything about it, a Catch-22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig 19 TCAC Env score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Text on p. 130 says the whole city is good, is OK, and east side has better Env scores. ○ This map shows the bulk of the City as “less positive” with the whole 1502.02 Tract with slightly better scores. It’s likely that heavy traffic on Hwy 12 and 8th East causes air pollution as well and lots of leaf blowing negatively affects air quality. ○ The huge bulk of VL and L City RHNA is set for the areas with the worst Env score, along Hwy 12. General impression, HE analysis is shallow and designed to try and pass HCD, rather than to dig into real issues and unmask and address them, the consultant is working for the City, not for equity and justice; the City wants to pass the HE more than it wants to address real inequity and segregation issues. • Fig 20 TCAC Opportunity Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The near and north east side High and Moderate areas correlate exactly with the City’s high concentration of Above Mod housing inventory by income. Census data also shows how the far east side has the same high concentration of Above Mod housing inventory by income, even as this map has the far east side as TCAC Low. ○ The legend shows a category for high segregation, but apparently UC Berkeley segregation studies have not been included, that have Sonoma as the 18th most segregated city in the Bay Area. • Fig 21 Job proximity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City is two square miles, everything is close to everything. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fig 22 Sensitive communities (this is “sensitive” for <i>disproportionate housing</i> needs but the map only says “sensitive”) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Something is counter-intuitive here as the near and far east side are listed as the same level of <i>sensitive</i> as the Latino Springs and as the City’s near west side Block Group 2 of Tract 1502.02 ○ What is happening here is that in Tract 1502.02 as a whole, which the map shows as all sensitive, the west side of 1502.02 is being conflated with the east side; in reality, it is the west side that is sensitive, as shown clearly by the TCAC Econ score map. In no way is the east side equivalent in AFFH sensitivity to the LatinX Springs. That the level of analysis here is so shallow and goes against all the other data about the east side, shows that the whole HE maybe has or could have the same level of diffuse, shallow analysis, it took them years to make the HE, and in two weeks I see problems? ○ It could be that this “sensitive” for <i>disproportionate housing</i> needs means the east side is too cloistered, but if so, that would support my whole analysis of east side segregation. 	
16.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Page 137 ● Discussion of disproportionate housing needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overcrowded households are not significant in the city, but <i>are</i> significant in the Springs Tract 1503.05. Why account for disadvantaged unincorporated in the TCAC Ed. score but not make any analysis of the other local unincorporated indicators? The Latino Springs has a high concentration of over-crowding and of multi-family units, all this and more can all be seen by using layers of the county’s DistrictR mapping tool. ● Figs 23-24 	<p>These comments related to partnerships with affordable housing developers, fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

- Renter cost burdened households: the whole City south of Napa Street is 60-80% cost burdened *bc of the proximity to the wealthy east side*, this is an inflation infection stemming from an inordinate east side wealth concentration. Landlords are charging as high rent as they can get and people who want to stay in their community have to pay or be displaced or find a studio-efficiency unit for the same price they were paying for two bedrooms.
- Owner cost burden has the same conflation of west and east sides as the sensitive communities, showing the east side as equivalent to the west when in fact, the west side is more cost burdened and likely the same as the rest of the City at a 40-60% cost burden range. A more detailed reading of Census Block Group and the AFFH data viewer map layers is called for in the HE, by someone who is not scared to see issues that may cause meaningful action problems for the City.
- The text says: “Overpayment increases the risk of displacing residents who are no longer able to afford their housing costs.” Where is any data on displacement rate? How many people have been displaced in Sonoma since 2008 Great Recession, the fires, Covid-19, and current increased inflation? How many second home owners and wealthy Silicon Valley amenity migrants have come in?
- For displacement, more and better data needed: The Urban Displacement Project shows parts of Sonoma as “becoming exclusive.” Look at net migration by county maps. Lack of data and analysis here, for trends City officials speak about, underplays the seriousness of this displacement and cost burden issue.

- Then, the HE gives a paltry mitigation of “incentives to encourage affordable development ... and a targeted program to connect lower income residents ... with affordable opportunities.” With a city that constantly says there is not enough staff, and with a track record of doing basically nothing for new AH development since SAHA’s AltaMadrone Apts. on Broadway (that took 10-15 years to come to fruition in early 2021) I can only conclude that what the City is proposing is largely words and in not “meaningful actions” to address the scope of the housing crisis here.
- If segregation problems are denied, then no meaningful actions are needed to solve them, this seems to me to be a core fault of the HE, not seeing and eliding the actual for AFFH.
- The HE says commercial in lieu fees will cover new AH unit costs, but the city council recently diluted an aggressive Planning Commission effort to make such fees actually cover the costs.
- Also note that City Sustainable Tourism web page has NOTHING about living wages or labor equity and makes equity policy all a matter of voluntary business choices, in fact, the page has nothing about labor at all; tenant and labor issues come up short in Sonoma.
- **Future Growth Needs**
 - “The City’s future growth need is based on the (311) RHNA.” For the 6th cycle HE; in a city that has become progressively more east side class and race segregated, what about based on reality? As lower income residents are displaced, and the City sorts to higher wealth, “growth”, for VL and L cohorts, is more at displacement mitigation, clawing back the displaced working class that has been lost through unsustainable tourism policy that only

- serves the visitors and hoteliers and hospitality sector, and does not account for the social aspects of the sustainability triple bottom line.
- "... proposed affordable units are dispersed throughout the community, to the extent feasible based on the city's existing built-out land uses, and do not present a geographic barrier to obtaining affordable housing." This phrase is LOADED with assumptions; AH units are only dispersed throughout insofar as they don't impinge on exclusionary zoned R-L and R-R areas. Feasible means that R-L and R-R cannot be rezoned bc they are supposedly built out at low density. This basically says that for half the City residential area, low density is enshrined as an immutable characteristic, which is false bc all zoning is subject to change based on societal needs and change. R-L and R-R are barriers to AH bc they close off more than half the City's residential area to AH and VL and L units. This might as well be a mountain lion habitat-type of equity avoidance program, coupled with historic barriers. City low density protectionism as embodied in City zoning Code, is *clearly an administrative, elective barrier* to integration and AH based on enshrining the economic and social advantages of R-L/ R-R property owners.
 - The City is "accommodating" its 6th cycle RHNA by failing to address and by preserving east side class and racial segregation, and by putting the huge bulk AH and VL and L units in the worst environmental locations in an exact recap of the worst relocation failings of 1970s Urban Renewal relocation and of redlining.
- **Existing Needs**
 - The City does have a history of working with AH developers, but since the whole SAHA/ AltaMadrone process, there has been nada,

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

nothing, no public evidence of work to recruit a project and in fact, the City has developed a line of denial that it is not the City's responsibility to facilitate anything, it is only a matter of money, and loss of Redevelopment money, and the City's recent AH fund is not big enough. Equity as a housing concern is mocked by City low density protectors.

- Since loss of Redevelopment money the City has been like a deer in the headlights, paralyzed AH advocates are supposed to trust single family home, low density property owners who dominate City government, to have their best interests in mind, kind of like trusting foxes who are guarding the henhouse
- Out of 5778 total City housing units, 439 are AH, 7.5% of City housing is AH. Is that OK? Seems pretty small... Renters make up near half the population, many of whom are cost burdened. Seem like the City needs to aim at 50% AH to really serve the populace's housing needs. David Brigode's bold housing policy ideas should be tried on for size.
- "The City actively works with affordable housing developers..." When? Who? Where is there any public record of this or of council direction? This almost seems like a lie. In the last 20 years, the neighboring Springs has hosted four large AH projects, two finished and two entitled for near 400 units. In the same time frame the City has done one 48 unit AH project. The county is killing the City in local AH production in Sonoma Valley. I can only conclude that inflated City land prices and City zoning protectionism are the causes for the lack of City AH progress. If the City wanted more action, it could get it. The City could also address land availability by rezoning and relaxing its sphere and UGB hard lines, take the

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>pressure cooker lid off the space so prices can go down</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost Burden <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Location is one of the biggest factors for price: <i>east side is a high dollar location</i>. 56.7% of renters overpay, the majority in lower income groups. HE says the majority are on south side, but Fig 23 shows everything south of Napa St east as “the south side, which conflates the east and west sides as the “south side”; local sense has the south side starting at MacArthur, not Napa St. East, who proof-read this? 	
	16.24	<p>Page 138</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost Burden, cont’d <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 30.5% of homeowners overpay, most in southern Sonoma, which Fig 28 has as a more accurate representation. In fact the cost burden here is so great that displaced people routinely are unable to find a place to live, and with City SB-9 ordinance, deed-restriction was required bc the City felt affordable by design was simply not possible, even for an 800 sf duplex on a small lot; this is not just in various City locations but in all zones where R-L is allowed, well more than half the residential areas. ● Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Based on input from the community and the County AI (what is county AI? HE needs an acronym list), the most disproportionate housing needs includes rehab of existing housing stock and increased variety of housing types at affordable prices, including housing for lower income households.” ○ But, the standard housing section above this said that <i>cost burden was likely the greatest problem, not rehab problems</i>. It is surprising that the consultant would fall back on a weasel word phrase like a general, 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and Armstrong Estates have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>undefined “affordable prices.” In Sonoma we can assume that anything below market rate would have to be “for lower income households” and be deed-restricted or be very small like a JADU to be “affordable”; the HE needs to define the need by AMI range, and since only 7.5% of Sonoma housing stock is AH, i.e. deed-restricted but the cost burden is 56.7% for renters and 30.5% for owners, it follows that for “increased variety of housing types at affordable prices”, the percent of AH needs to be increased to a level of 56.7% for renters and 30.5% for owners, not merely 7.5% and not merely rehabbing an undefined number of multi-family homes, 50.1% which would be for L and Mod.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to know how many units this MFH program would project? It sounds good, what are the number of units for RHNA? ○ City needs to be bolder and call for multiple 100s of AH units at 60% AMI and below, and that these units go not just on Hwy 12 but also on the two TCAC Moderate and High Areas on the east side, specifically the two .5+ acres lots at Armstrong Estates. If Armstrong has CC&Rs that prohibit high density or MFHs, this needs to be called out in HE subdivision constraints as modern redlining. Also, annex the far east side sphere areas as #1 AFFH AH area, a perfect place to line up a 100% AH project. 	
	16.25	<p>Pages 138-139</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Displacement Risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vacant sites represent the majority of site for new housing (and AH.) Two Armstrong lots at .5+ acres each on far east side, in an obvious High/ Moderate TCAC area, not “Low”, if these lots are vacant, there is no good reason I can think of to not ID these for VL and L, if not for Ledson CC&Rs? 	<p>These comments related to fair housing, displacement, and Armstrong Estates have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The .5+ acre Sebastiani parking lot, lot #324 MX zoning is in a TCAC High area. Of lot #324 total: the big lot is 14000 sq ft and the small one is 8300 so the total is about 1/2 acre (0.51); 0.3 acres and 0.2 acres respectively, as per a local surveyor. ○ The ag zoning next to this lot # 324 could be rezoned and voila, a nice big parcel for VL and L RHNA in a TCAC High area. If AFFH and integration are priorities, this kind of rezoning should be looked at, there are no crops next to lot #324, just grass and picnic tables; this is not even Sebastiani, it's some faceless corporation with no production facilities any longer on site bc labor cost too much. 	
	16.26	<p>Page 139</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “To date, the City has no evidence that new development (affordable or market rate) has resulted in economic displacement.” This seems on par with the no segregation assertion. We need serious research to show unequivocally where displacement is at, in the City and the Valley, and the Bay Area. ● However, the HE says, <i>if displacement might occur, see Action Program 21</i>; this see Action Program 21 needs to be cross-referenced with page # so the reader does not have to fumble through the whole HE to find it. It seems like the City has <i>no evidence</i> about displacement period, there being no reference here, its’ hard to check what the city’s evidence is? ● What about the Urban Displacement Project that shows Sonoma and Springs areas as “becoming exclusive” and “early ongoing gentrification.” ● What about RHNA performance from 2000- 2020 that shows a City 293 over-production of market rate and 236 underproduction of Mod and below; does not citing data make it go away? ● The above coupled with high east side concentration of Above Mod home prices shows that the east side is the driver of high inflation. East side R-L home price inflation is 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and displacement have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>driving City cost burden and displacement, while east side property values are protected and grow to benefit homeowners who dominate city government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I might be getting carried away, but it seems like a protection racket, what Ta-Nahisi Coates says is a white syndicate. What about Mockingbird Lane and Oliva Apts and other DeNova projects where the price points ended up being substantially higher than advertised? Affects displacement? If prices were 4 to \$500,000 more than promised, “bc of market conditions”, doesn’t that displace locals who can’t afford that? We are in a regime now where home offers have been 100s of 1000’s over asking prices, in cash, new development is not part of that? What qualifies as evidence here? With no index, the reader can’t find <i>displacement</i> in the HE and check all the assumptions and refs given, the HE seems intentionally obscure, hard to navigate and lacks evidence to prove points made 	
16.27		<p>Page HP 18, Program 21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have to conclude Program 21 is NOT meaningful action and is in fact very weak tea, the words belie a do-as-little-as-possible approach that fundamentally, a priori, denies serious housing issues in the City, and then proposes to do very little about it; this is NOT an activist document that shows the City determined to address the housing crisis for lower AMI residents, but rather a slick, boilerplate effort at minimization, denial, and minimal commitment to address a housing crisis. Program 21 is not convincing as a serious effort. Program 21 immediately refers to an impediments analysis in another section, it should re-state the core impediments here in the text, don’t give the runaround. Segregation and displacement are already not defined as impediments. In order to show meaningful action to address AFFH, Program 21 proposes: to put something on the City website and do two events a year in lieu of outreach, offer FHANC services, acronym not spelled out, Legal Aid is not referred to; rely on ADUs “at all income levels” even though ADUs will likely be market rate; and ADU’s RHNA AMI price points 	<p><u>These comments related to fair housing, displacement, and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</u></p> <p><u>Comments related to Program 21 are noted.</u></p> <p><u>Program 13 monitors the Housing Element on an annual basis to ensure that the City continues to assess its affordable housing programs.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>are inconsistent with City SB-9 assumptions that affordable by design at any size is not possible in Sonoma.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program 21 will rely on Section 8 vouchers which are about impossible to get and to realize. • Program 21 will re-evaluate 25% inclusionary ordinance to see it is not an impediment, even as the 25% is used to show the city being a good actor with AFFH. • Program 21 will provide housing opportunities in TCAC High and Mod areas “for all members of the community” by having ONE annual meeting with AH developers to ID opportunities; NO mention here that city zoning does not allow VL and L in the R-L TCAC High and Mod areas anyway and that to develop AH here there would need to be scale of at least 50 units per project, which R-L would not allow; why not do this upfront with rezoning the east side in the HE rather than put all the poor people on Hwy 12? • Program 21 will improve City TCAC scores by doing at least two projects (no scale mentioned, could be a duplex) that improve any one of the three (Econ, Ed. Env) TCAC scores: the Ed. score can only be improved by the City engaging with the county on Springs disparities, an action and policy the City has avoided, see my Grand Jury comments about the City having a myopic focus on itself to the exclusion of regional Valley issues; this item does not even get close to how to introduce any numbers and scale of AH units into TCAC High and Mod areas, this is simply not a serious effort. • Program 21 makes housing rehab an item when the HE later states that cost burden (low wages/ high prices for everything here, local inflation airport effect) is the most serious housing issue, not rehab. • Program 21 will reduce discrimination by landlords by having ONE annual meeting, this won’t do shit without any legal rights for tenants, of which I see about ZERO in the HE, need to contact Margaret DeMatteo of Legal Aid and get tenant protections into the HE. • Program 21 will conduct an annual displacement analysis: the fact that no existing displacement analysis can be cited to continue upon shows that there is no current 	
--	--	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>displacement research and thus the later HE assertion that there is no evidence for econ displacement (coupled with lack of systemic document references) can be suspected as an unsupported statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tract 1502.04 is cited as an area of displacement susceptibility, yet without specifying the Block Group at stake this conflates the west side with the east side Block Groups, resulting in an inaccurate statement. • What is really happening here is that east side super home price inflation (based on protective, segregatory R-L zoning that is not even acknowledged in the HE) is making the west side Block Group 2 “sensitive” to displacement; this is “vulnerable to displacement” even without the effect of new housing causing it. • A look at the AFFH Viewer maps clearly shows a west side Block Group 2 difference and a consistent affinity of east side Block Groups 1 and 3 with higher wealth, higher home values and higher internal Block Group Education ranks, and higher white % demographics, the HE does not dig into this and in fact, elides it by continuing to conflate the east side with west side. • Conclusion on displacement and Program 21: the City is not looking to dig any deeper and is content to stay on the surface and make a weak tea HE based on superficial analysis that intentionally does not recognize patterns of segregation and displacement and then makes weak meaningful actions like Program 21 to not address AFFH problems that are not seen. 	
16.28	<p>Page 139</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical point <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City is justifying putting all VL and L on Low Resource areas along Hwy 12 as “most appropriate” on the basis of access to transit, lower real estate values, curing supposed blight, and MX zoning. This then makes these rationales, in aggregate, a higher value than AFFH and integrating lower AMI residents into City segregated TCAC High and Mod areas. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing, displacement, and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In a two square mile City, everyone as good access to transit, in all areas. ○ Access of AH developers to lower real estate values are a reason to make extra-UGB annexations, but these have been put off limits by UGB poison pill language. ○ One person’s “blight” is another’s “character”, what blight are we talking about? Where? Broadway Market? 4 Corners auto shop? That is the kind of rural character place people supposedly value. ○ MX zoning on Hwy 12 as “most appropriate” for VL and L RHNA is a choice that will not necessarily yield the most social goods bc for many, proximity to jobs means proximity to wealthy east side home owners who need: yard work, home health care, house cleaning, construction/ maintenance etc. Many City jobs are for worker bees at the wealthy, Above Mod homes. This is a good rationale for an east side sphere annexation, closer to work, could walk or bike to work. ○ No <i>proximity to goods</i> will serve VL and L income residents anyway, bc if they have a car, they will never shop in Sonoma anyway bc so much better prices are to be had in Napa and the 101 Corridor ○ The City should layer its own Ellis Act reform, just cause and rent stabilization onto whatever state “just cause” laws are cited in the HE. 	
	16.29	Page 139 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “Research has shown...” what research? Citation? 	This is based on the impetus to address fair housing, including exposure to environmental issues and access to high-performing environmental area. Access to environmental opportunity is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Background Report.
	16.30	Pages 139-140 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Findings 	These comments related to displacement and Program 21 have been shared above, and are noted again here.

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The City is committed to making diligent efforts to engage underrepresented and disadvantaged communities in studying displacement.” Why doesn’t it seem that way? Program 2.1 is cited again, how “diligent” is that, to have weak tea annual meetings and rely on ADUs no lower-AMI residents can afford anyway? This seems like words only, no sense of real purpose and desire to address deep issues. 	
	16.31	<p>Page 140</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For Mobile Home park conversions, the City HE should adopt a law that gives MHP residents the right of first purchase should the property come up for sale. ● C. Sites Inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site inventory “considers whether the identified sites serve the purpose of replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity.” ○ How does putting basically all the RHNA VL and L units on Hwy 12 in three locations and none on the Central-East Planning Area demonstrate that the City is “carefully considering how the development of new affordable housing options can promote patterns of equality and inclusiveness”? ○ A look at AFFH Data viewer maps, DAC tool maps, Measure of America maps, DistrictR map tools, and local studies cited in hyperlink above shows that one, the Sonoma Valley USA is highly segregated, and two that Sonoma’s east side is segregated from not only the rest of the Valley USA but also from the rest of Sonoma. ○ All these sources were shared with Beth Thompson of DeNovo. 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and housing segregation have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

- It sure looks like the City is fueling and supporting a thesis to put all “inclusiveness” in already Low TCAC opportunity areas and none in TCAC Mod and High areas. This does not seem in any way like *promoting patterns of equality and* inclusiveness and rather seems like a convoluted set of rationales to protect east side R-L zoning from increased density and inclusion; part of the rationale is to not have any HE rezoning and assume that R-L and R-R residential patterns are “built out”, permanent, and not subject to upzoning for integration. See my SB-9 Objective language review for a show of underlying City R-L protectionism values.
- **C.1. Segregation/ Integration**
 - Here is the zinger of the whole HE: “The City finds there are no known historic patterns of segregation by race and ethnicity, persons with disabilities, familial status, age, or income.” “Nevertheless, as described throughout this HE, the City is committed to supporting the development of housing to promote a balanced and integrated community.”
 - A balanced and integrated community seems to be seen by the HE as at the level of the whole City and not at the level of challenging the status existing R-L segregated neighborhoods (half the City residential area) that are also High and Medium TCAC areas, and also not at the level of comparing the City to the Latino Springs.
 - Why is the City claiming not, when strong evidence says there are patterns of segregation, esp. the east side? Sonoma is the 18th most segregated city in the Bay Area. <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/most-segregated-and-integrated-cities-sf-bay-area>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

- The top tax credit Resource Opportunity Areas in the City: Census Tract 1502.04 Block Group 1, and Census Tract 1502.02 Block Group 3, the Central-East Planning Area, are 80% - 85% white respectively, with home values reaching to \$2 million with 80+% white ownership. Technically, the Block Groups noted above are not RCAs but they are close enough to see a clear RCAA pattern. The low TCAC Ed. score was explained above as not representing the actual educational attainment of these latter east side Block Groups. Census data does give ed. attainment by Block Group.
- Census Tract 1502.04, Block Group 3 is in the middle of Mod and High TCAC areas but the wealthy white signal is diluted by being lumped in geographically with the 8th East industrial area. This Block Group has two .5+ acre, appropriate for VL and L AH, lots at Ledson's Armstrong Estates.
- These above Block Groups are also heavily if not 100% single family zoned, low density areas which are known indicators of high segregation.
- I would have to say the HE consultant and the City are trying to pull the wool over the public's eyes by one, denying obvious segregation, and two, failing to recognize and admit that zoning is not a government constraint on fair, affordable housing. R-L exclusionary zoning is the new redlining, and three, denying that displacement is an issue.
- The HE site inventory has almost all VL and L RHNA units in three vacant lot locations (Napa Rd. and Broadway, Safeway, and on an orchard behind SPARC, *all* on Hwy 12, none integrated into the Block Groups noted above. **All eggs are in this basket, with little buffer back up should any of these sites go market rate.** This

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>allows a clear east side, affluent, white, segregated pattern to stand, which is consistent with Sonoma’s, on the record stated values of preserving and protecting the historic character of low density, single family zoned areas as its top housing priority.</p>	
<p>16.32</p>	<p>Page 140</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HE goes on to say that the VL and L sites “...are located throughout the community and are not concentrated in areas of lower diversity...” This seems like a stretch bordering on a false statement. “Throughout the community” is actually all on Hwy 12, and avoiding “areas of lower diversity”, i.e. the east side, means no VL and L at all on the east side where more diversity is called for by AFFH by not concentrating whites and wealth. Note that Sonoma is already substantially less diverse than the Springs, where overall Valley segregation between the City and Springs can be seen. If the City was being honest, a substantially-similar-to-RCAA-pattern on the east side should be acknowledged and mitigated, and rezoning should be done to address de facto east side zoning redlining, and annexing the far east side sphere lots should be the #1 AFFH option. 	<p>These comments are noted.</p> <p>These comments related to fair housing and diversity have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>	
<p>16.33</p>	<p>Page 141</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “proposed sites, including VL and L RHNA sites are distributed throughout the community with a number (how many? see below) of sites located in areas with high and highest median household incomes.” This is a big, non-specific stretch, the bulk of VL and L are not on the east side, the area with the highest incomes, the huge, overwhelming bulk, 88% of VL and L are on Hwy 12 in Low TCAC areas. If the City keeps saying this in the HE, I have to repeat myself as well. There are only 10 L and no VL on the 1st Street East townhome project, 5 Mod and 41 Above Mod; is this what we get for “including VL and L RHNA sites are “distributed throughout the community”, on a Housing Opportunity Site? This account for VL and L units: “distributed throughout the community” besides on Hwy 12? 	<p>These comments related to fair housing and diversity have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>	

- I'd have to say that the HE is vastly overstating any efforts at real integration of lower AMI residents with higher TCAC areas, to the point of being mostly false.
- The City's rationale for not integrating the east side is to improve opportunities and incomes in Low TCAC areas, bc these projects "may be transformative." This would be more believable if the City was actually showing interest in socioeconomic transformation, but the fact that the city has no equity platform at all shows there is little track record of interest in equity. The City has an economic department it pays for with the Chamber, and a Climate Action Commission and an Environmental Sustainability Coordinator, but no equity pillar to be seen.
- **R/CAPS, RCAAs**
 - Recognizable Valley and City concentrations and patterns of wealth and poverty are being spun by the HE to avoid coming to grips with Sonoma's larger segregation from the Springs and to downplay clear patterns of wealth disparity within Sonoma between the east and west sides.
 - Sonoma is internally segregated by class and racial diversity has been externalized to the Springs.
 - If a HE consultant was instructed by the City to play up patterned segregation and wealth concentrations, to make an activist HE, it could easily be done, but none of that shows
 - Conclusion: status quo low density, R-L protectionism is the highest City housing ideal but that is kept covert in the HE. Problems like segregation and displacement are minimized and elided and hence Goals, Programs and Policies appear as weak tea. It's a minimal, non-assertive, hands-off program.
 - The R/CAPS, RCAAs section says: "areas of low diversity reflect a wide range of income levels ", but an analysis of east side Block Groups show this to not be true in these locations. The

- City appears to be trying, when convenient, to collapse the east side into the rest of the City, to hide a wealth concentration issue, so that VL and L RHNA will not have to go there and mess up the “character of the neighborhood.”
- **3. Access to Opportunity**
 - The HE says Sonoma doesn't not have any High Resource areas, wrong, it does, with a .5+ acres MX-zoned parking lot and an empty “ag” area that is not used for ag purposes. This ag lot could be another prime AFFH 100% AH project spot, along with the east side sphere lots.
 - The City does admit it has a TCAC moderate/medium resource area (near east side) but this area has not been ID'd to accommodate *any* of the lower AMI RHNA. Therefore, the statement that the RHNA is “distributed throughout these areas” is wrong.
 - A rationale follows for putting all VL and L on Hwy 12: “help to create more lower AMI housing in those areas, that new residents will create more neighborhood stability” there, and “expand opportunities for people to both live and work in Sonoma.” The exact same general rationales can easily apply to the near east side.
 - The paragraph goes on, in planning-speak, with more of the same rationale: “help diversify the land use pattern”, “improve conditions by providing greater housing choice and a broader range of goods and services”, bring new residential development closer to transit and jobs”, and “otherwise support community revitalization.”
 - As long as Sonoma Valley as a whole has a Plantation economy arrangement with the Springs, and east side wealth infects the rest of the city with overall unsupportable high prices,

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

- Sonoma goods are services will tip to the highest possible price points, and a low-wage, unsustainable jobs profile is more likely given existing conditions.
- A commitment by the city to foster a more just, equitable economy would be more important here than nebulous planning claims, that somehow a non-idealistic, bland social engineering “revitalization” based on weak tea HE analysis and Program 21 plans will bring transformational social goods. If the City was actually interested in revitalization and transformational planning, this HE would look A LOT different; revitalize what? How?
 - The City’s basic plan seems to be a deer in the headlights and to let the market take care of things, with the minimum HE necessary to pass HCD. The City could direct its “Sustainable Tourism” policy to direct more benefits to workers, “so they can work and live here.” There could be an equity pillar of City planning policy. Staff could be hired and the council say: we want activist, progressive housing policy now. Instead of treading water and playing it safe.
 - In Access to Opportunity, zoning is not ID’d as a constraint to AFFH and integration.
 - “RHNA sites are mostly distributed in tracts with moderate to more positive outcomes”, wait a minute! Moderate what? Cumulative TCAC score? This is an intentionally vague statement that is not true, bc the near east side TCAC Block Group is the only Medium resource area, and there are no VL or L RHNA sites there.
 - “Greater housing choice in Sonoma” is imagined to effect and fix current low TCAC Ed. scores in the future, housing choice of a presumably VL and L variety; what kind of

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>proof of cause and effect is at play here? An invisible hand?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If people are locked into needing to keep low annual earnings in order to keep low rent units, then they will be trapped by a self-reinforcing low-income, low standards of life conditions loop, and this will not somehow magically “revitalize” and make “more positive economic outcomes.” ○ All the City’s plans will do here is allow low-wage workers to tread water with locked-in low AMI rent without fear of displacement, as long as they keep annual earnings low to qualify for low rents. That can work to keep essential workers stuck in low wage jobs in the community, but it’s not transformational. ○ Somehow, a nebulous “opportunity”, of putting all VL and L units in Hwy 12, will help to raise TCAC educational scores; this is such a weak tea assertion it is unbelievable. What is the source here? There is no attempt in this HE to engage the structural, systemic Valley issues that make for the socioeconomic disadvantage that is cited for low Ed scores; in fact low Ed scores are only the tip of the iceberg of what is being elided by the City here, which is whole-Valley segregation in which Sonoma’s east side is one fundamental polarity. ○ Since affordable by design is assumed by the City to not be possible, the best any essential worker or missing middle can hope for in terms of econ/ housing advancement would be to get one of the few ADUs that would rent for below 120% AMI. ○ ADUs can be expected to rent at the top level of Mod income, or 120% AMI and into Above Mod levels; landlords as a whole have shown they will max prices as much as possible, there may be a few altruistic situations, but very few 	
--	---	--

- since the common experience of people losing a rental is that they can't find anything affordable and they are then displaced, and displacement is not tracked. New professionals in town cannot find place to live.
- In order to track displacement, the NBOP tenant's union should be engaged in the HE and a renter/ tenant registry established.
 - **4. Disproportionate housing needs**
 - The intent of the City putting almost all VL and L RHNA on Hwy 12 is to "add housing to desirable areas and provide a range of housing choices at diff prices to current and future residents. With a broader range of options, housing will become more affordable across the community, which should lessen the housing cost burden, particularly for renters."
 - Hwy 12 at 4 Corners with 24 hour traffic is a "desirable area"? The HE seems to be in a *Through the Looking Glass* space of narrative creation.
 - City makes an assumption that more supply, and a "broader range of housing choices", specifically 311 choices at the RHNA AMI spread over 8 years, will lower prices and ease renter housing cost burden. This is a rosy, market-based assumption, when in fact, all the market has done is rip people off, and the city has tried and limit supply as much as possible by UGB, SB-9 poison pills and by restrictive zoning that locks in low density for more than half the possible residential areas, in two square mile area.
 - Why did the City resist the initial 480 RHNA allocation, have it reduced to 311, not cooperate with the county on a RHNA subregion to address systemic housing disparity issues in the Valley, and not pursue the 725 units/ half deed restricted,

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>recommended by the 2019 Housing Our Community series?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LAFCO has recommended the City look to expand its UGB and sphere to encompass the Springs area; the Grand Jury housing report took county cities and Sonoma to task for being too passive and inward-looking on housing (see my Grand Jury and LAFCO MSR wrote ups.) ○ This in spite of a severely constraining UGB that primarily seeks to protect Green values and open space, the authors of which assume, in circular reasoning, that no amount of new supply will lower prices bc demand for Sonoma’s elite environment is so strong, but demand is strong bc of limited supply... ○ If new supply at the level of only 311 units will make a diff in cost burden, imagine what extra-UGB annexations and expanding the sphere, and opening up land on Napa Rd (recall the 285 Napa Rd Habitat project that the City UGB made sure would fail) would do for supply and lowering prices? ○ In fact, the City is defined by a protect small town character ideology which is fundamentally at odds with being inclusive in meaningful ways and at odds with housing equity, and the HE is a transparent effort to paper over the City Code rules and regs that act counter to many of these above HE assertions about revitalization and transformation etc. The real bull, of low density land use protectionism, is not being taken by the horns by the HE. ○ Like other Coastal Cal protectors, the City says, “we’re for AH, just an appropriate scale so it doesn’t mess up our character”, i.e. at a scale where no meaningful AH can be produced, i.e The Green Checkmate. 	
--	---	--

- **Site analysis findings**

- There are two vacant lots (Armstrong Estates) on the far east side that will allow development at densities that can foster AH, why are these not considered for HE equity social engineering? By failing to ID these two sites, the HE allows concentrated wealth and white segregation to continue unabated.
- There is a Sebastiani ag lot and east side sphere parcels both big enough for 50-unit, east side projects. These should be top VL and L unit priority in a re-worked site inventory.
- The City avoids addressing clear east side patterns of wealth and white concentrations and says these are not issues. RHNA sites avoid addressing east side econ and racial segregation and give the east side a get out of jail free card on AFFH.
- The City says RHNA site inventory does not burden existing sites of racial and econ homogeneity and that is right, east side gets a pass on integration, and this seems about as far from AFFH as you can get.
- Invisible hand investment on Hwy 12 will somehow magically create opportunities and social goods will be created out of selfishness, bc there is no plan or guarantee that the VL and L sites will be taken up by AH developers, and Program 21 is a weak tea, minimal commitment to see that any AFFH will actually be done.
- The HE thesis denies AFFH issues, denies segregation, denies displacement, underplays and mis-represents east side affluence and white racial concentration. A blindered view is presented that seeks to minimally address HE requirements and not engage the regional and state housing crisis at the level that HCD is hoping for. The Sonoma HE is sophisticated

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	16.34	<p>version of the mountain lion habitat SB-9 defense scheme, basically finding all the reasons why not to address housing constraints of R-L, low density zoning in service of more integration and more AFFH.</p> <p>Page 146</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● D. Analysis of contributing factors and fair housing priorities and goals - In Table 68, displacement risk is ID'd as a fair housing issue; contributing factors are: land use and zoning laws and economic pressure (i.e. UGB, SB-9, R-L and R-R zoning, gentrification and elite tourism economy price inflation. The latter should be ID'd as impediments and constraints to housing. ● City priority for displacement risk? Medium/ Low, cites Progs 10,11, 21 and 25; none of these address low density zoning as exclusionary, nor UGB, SB-9 undue constraints to City housing supply. If zoning and land use are not seen as constraints and high priority problems, then they don't have to be fixed, this is maybe willful denial? ● Program 10 is a mitigation, mobile home park rent stabilization and conversion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City doing well here, make sure all MHPs are covered and zoned in the city ○ formally add a MHP resident's right of first purchase if park comes up for sale, not just for cionid conversions ● Program 11 condo conversion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ looks like City is doing OK here ● Program 21 already critiqued that as fundamentally weak tea ● Program 25 MHP senior only occupancy, go for it ● Top Three Issues to be addressed in Housing Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ONE, basically outlines Program 21, relies in info and education and enforcement, which the City is not strong on and proposes only annual meeting work, hardly seems like "meaningful actions" 	<p>These comments related to fair housing, displacement, and diversity have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
--	-------	---	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	16.35	<p>Page 147</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TWO, “Housing mobility enhancement to increase access to opportunities and improve access to AH throughout the community.” This is a diffuse, meaning-devoid statement. ○ THREE, “New housing choices and AH in the City’s higher opportunity areas and improving opportunity scores.” ○ Well, if this is a top issue, why such a paucity of VL and L in R-L and R-R areas? ○ Improving TCAC scores will require engaging with the Springs and addressing the City’s externalized and disadvantaged workforce and their educational and other equity issues, which the HE gives no indication of any effort towards. 	<p>These comments related to Program 21, fair housing and diversity have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
	16.36	<p>Page 148</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The HE continues to say, against actual plans, the City will combat patterns of segregation, will be inclusive, reduce barriers to opportunity for protected characteristics, and do this through a weak effort of passive outreach, low enforcement capability, and infrequent meetings. ● City SB-9 ordinance represents a transparent effort to subvert state housing laws to make it more difficult to do lot splits and slightly upzone R-L areas. Given the City’s behavior here and stated intents, HCD should suspect and be alert for other City housing law subversion. ● AFFH HE Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program 1: VL, L and Mod opportunities “throughout the city”; not born out by RHNA site inventory ○ Programs 2, 6: facilitate AH construction; no public display of this since SAHA/ AltaMadrone which itself took more than 10 years to come to fruition, yearly meetings with AH developers not near enough, VL and L sites could just as well go market rate, no active plans known ○ Program 5: encourage ADUs; ADUs are all at Mod for site inventory and will likely all be 	<p>These comments related to Housing Programs, fair housing, density bonuses, and ADUs have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>

	<p>market rate AMI bc landlords have a pattern to max the rent, SB-9 says attainable housing is not possible in Sonoma but wishful ADU policy says it is?; this is not AFFH, it's a high-rent wolf in sheep's clothing. HCD should call out the City for an over-reliance on ADUs to mitigate high price points when no evidence shows they will.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program 7: ensure commercial development pays a fair share of in lieu fees; city council dialed back assertive Planning Commission effort to make commercial development pay full cost of a unit ○ Programs 15, 24: support homeless shelters and transitional housing; city efforts have centered on getting the one shelter as far away from the center of town as possible and even out of town into the Springs; City says the shelter has 10 beds but they are not in use bc of a use permit complaint by a citizen who doesn't want homeless near his kids; if homelessness is a Valley issue that the City can farm out, need to make other equally critical socioeconomic disparity issues Valley-wide efforts too ○ Program 27: replace AH units; remains to be seen if the City can do this, an accountability and tracking process for AH units has recently (under heat from HE process) been set in motion, but chronic staff shortage and lack of enforcement capability; the City needs to make AH a top priority ○ Program 28: make sure adequate sites available through 6th cycle; the City apparently has a plenty of sites, only problem, none of the VL and L are in R-L/ R-R areas, site inventory puts huge bulk of VL and L on Hwy 12 and leaves econ and race segregated east side with no changes, all VL and L eggs are in 	
--	--	--

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

<p>Fred Allebach (8/29/22 – Zoning)</p> <p><i>Comments within this letter are sorted by topic.</i></p>	<p>17.01</p>	<p>one basket, of one or two of these sites fail to produce VL and L there's no VL and L buffer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program 19: promote density bonus; this is fine, but don't use exclusionary zoning R-L and R-R as de facto redlining, putting all density on Hwy 12 recaps the worst aspects of redlining and 1970s Urban Renewal relocation, if lower income BIPOC are to be included, dense AH unit projects need to be put into R-L and R-R zones, an equity formula can be devised: one 50-unit project for every 500 people-area ○ Programs 4-15: accommodate specialized housing types; again, R-L and R-R areas need to be opened up, in a two-square mile city, accommodation for farm workers etc. can't be off limits in more than half of residential areas; in a stunning lack of creativity and urgency, <i>any</i> effort at farmworker or employee housing has not even been seen, why all these plans all of a sudden if not forced by the state? Will the City view HE and AFFH laws as they do SB-9 etc, as Sacto overreach to be subverted? ○ Program 20: educate the underserved; if this will amount to only a largely unseen posting on the City website, what diff will it make? In fact, the underserved have largely been externalized already, necessitating a displacement mitigation program to claw back the displaced and their place in the community, and not call it "growth"; make a tenant registry to track displacement 	<p>These comments related to Armstrong Estates have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
	<p>Armstrong Estates, additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The future development of the parcels east of Armstrong Estates will lead to the extension of Charles Van Damme Way and William Cunningham Avenue, and perhaps to the connection of Appleton Way with East Napa Street. This area, portions of which are currently outside of city limits, has an R-S designation, which calls for somewhat higher densities and a greater variety in lot sizes than what is found 		

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>in the development to the west (Armstrong Estates), which features lots having a minimum area of 20,000 square feet. (Ord. 2003-02 § 3, 2003).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Here we see code relating to Armstrong Estates, there has to be a minimum lot size of 20,000 sf. • What other code might there be about Armstrong Estates that keeps it as the top ostentatious wealth area in town? • The Armstrong area is in a Tax Credit, Low Resource Area directly adjacent to TCAC High and Medium Opportunity Areas, this in the R-L low density east side of Sonoma that has zero very-low and low-income integration in the 6th cycle site inventory. Something is wrong with this picture if the base zoning allows for about 100% segregation, and zoning is not identified as a governmental constraint. • Here at Armstrong, there are lots of open land that could integrate the east side but city zoning and possibly also Armstrong CC&Rs are stopping it. • Also stopping integration: Is the city denying there is any pattern of segregation and, that the east side is already essentially an RCAA? More analysis will likely bump east side TCAC scores up, can the city pretend the substance of an RCAA is not there? 	
	17.02	<p>Central East Planning Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A look at Sonoma’s Central-East Planning Area as described in the Sonoma Municipal Code. How such Code prevents the area from addressing patterns of segregation: • None of the City’s 6th cycle Housing Element’s very-low income and low-income housing site inventory is slated to go in this area, despite the higher TCAC scores that make such areas more desirable for integration of socioeconomically disadvantaged and protected classes. • This area consists of most of Census Tract 1502.04 Block Group 1 (near east side), a TCAC Medium Opportunity Area and Census Tract 1502.04 Block Group 3 (far east side), a TCAC Low Opportunity Area, and a small piece of Census Tract 1502.02 Block Group 3 (east side north/ Sebastiani area) a TCAC High Opportunity Area. Tract 1502.04 Block Group 2 is the near west side with much lower scores and 	<p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	<p>indicators. If Tract 1502.04 is considered as a whole, Block Group 2 will drag the scores down.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City's Central-East Planning Area is essentially the same as the area of the above hyperlinked Block Groups. From Census Block Group data, this area is 80-95% white, with home values from \$800,000 to \$2 million, with high levels of educational attainment, equally good TCAC Environmental scores and marginally different economically. The far east side is mixed with out-of-city data that goes out to 8th St. East, this mixing lowers its economic score. TCAC Education scores are lower in the three hyperlinked Block Groups bc out-of-City socio-economically disadvantaged students for the local school system are mixed into the City's east side. Closer analysis would maybe show that higher east side TCAC score is likely, even to the point of all east side Block Groups being an RCAA and TCAC High Resource Area. This might depend on whether one was trying to prove it or not. From the Municipal Code: Central-East Planning Area "Existing land uses include: 1. Low density single-family homes; 2. Four neighborhood parks; 3. The Sonoma Community Center; 4. Undeveloped, Sonoma residential property in the sphere of influence; and 5. A cemetery." 	
17.03	<p>R-L Zoning, additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Default R-L zoning does not allow density above R-L, single-family zoning. Why does Chapter 19.44 SMC indicate that "densities do not include density bonuses?" No density higher than single-family zoning is allowed, and thus, no affordable housing projects can be allowed because by definition, 50-some units and more than 0.50 acres but less than 10 acres are necessary for an affordable housing project to be allowed in Sonoma, and to pencil. However, no density bonus can maybe be waived, and large affordable housing projects be allowed in Armstrong Estates: "19.44.050 Types of bonuses and incentives allowed. A qualifying residential development project shall be entitled to the following density bonus and other incentives. If a 	<p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p> <p><u>Comments related to density bonuses, housing segregation and preservation of housing character have been shared above, and are noted again here..</u></p>

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
 Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

		<p>density bonus and/or other incentives cannot be accommodated on a parcel due to strict compliance with the provisions of this development code, the planning commission is authorized to waive or modify development standards as necessary to accommodate all bonus units and other incentives to which the development is entitled.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of low-density R-L character is ultimately a subjective choice by the City and this is only in force because three City Council votes agree to it. Very few even think to address Sonoma segregation by looking at the Municipal Code and then wonder why the Housing Element has no very low- and low-income units on the east side referred to above? • There really is no good reason other than to preserve and maintain the white, wealthy status quo that has been advantaged through segregation. There are plenty of working class whites in Sonoma, not many on the east side. • The only difference now between this and overt redlining, is that this Central-East Planning Area has covertly staked out segregatory boundaries through visual, spatial/ design prohibitions and through zoning. 	
17.04	<p>Segregation, additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s clear why the SB-9 lot-split/ duplex bill was so strenuously undermined by the City: • By-right lot splits that ended up with two duplexes and two ADUs “could affect efforts to maintain the character of the area” through significant subdivision of lots. • “Maintaining the character of the area” is a top Sonoma priority, even to the point of denying obvious patterns of segregation. • The desired future has nothing about integration and is all about visual compatibility and maintaining low density suburbia. This sounds like subjective language: “preserve the existing quality and fabric of residential neighborhoods.” • If multi-family units, “Multifamily developments shall require screening and buffering of parking and driveway areas, and noise and light sources.” 	<p><u>These comments are noted.</u></p> <p><u>Comments related to ADUs have been shared above, and are noted again here.</u></p>	

Appendix E
 City of Sonoma 6th Cycle Housing Element Update
Public Review Draft Comments and Responses

	17.05	<p>Additional constraints to affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general objective for this area, as expressed in SMC 19.20.020, Project planning and design, is to preserve the existing quality and fabric of residential neighborhoods in the Central-East planning area. • Two key issues that could affect efforts to maintain the character of the area include a significant number of parcels that could be subdivided as infill lots, and the site planning and building design techniques employed in their development. Development of the potential infill parcels will mainly need to focus on visual compatibility with the adjacent patterns of site design, building scale, and architectural context. 	<p>These comments are noted.</p> <p>Comments related to affordable housing have been shared above, and are noted again here.</p>
--	-------	---	--