

From: [Susan \[REDACTED\]](#)
To: [McDonnell, Kevin](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#); [Cader-Thompson, Janice](#); [Healy, Mike](#); [Karen Nau](#); [Shribbs, John](#); -- [City Clerk](#); [Ellis, Evelyn](#)
Subject: Survey results about the Scott Ranch
Date: Sunday, February 26, 2023 3:40:39 PM
Attachments: [Survey Results Febr 26 2023.pdf](#)

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Dear Mayor McDonnell and City Council members,

Petalumans for Responsible Planning conducted a survey with Petaluma residents about the Scott Ranch. The survey questions were as follows:

My Opinion on the Davidon / KCPP Development at Windsor & D

To the Petaluma City Council

Support the project as proposed

Parkland for the entire parcel

Support the park but not the houses

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly

The survey ended at 5 p.m. on Saturday, February 24, with 205 respondents.

The results were the following:

1.2% = Support the project as proposed

61.1% = Parkland for the entire parcel

25.4% = Support the park but not the houses

12.3% = Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly

The citizens who responded to the survey wrote comments to you, the City Council. We hope that you will take the opportunity to read these heartfelt comments from people who probably will not speak at the City Council meeting or write emails. This survey was a way for people to have their voices heard.

Susan Jaderstrom
On behalf of Petalumans for Responsible Planning
PetRP@comcast.net

**My Opinion on the Davidson / KCPP Development at Windsor & D
To the Petaluma City Council**

Support the project as proposed

Parkland for the entire parcel

Support the park but not the houses

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly

The results of 205 respondents were the following:

1.2% = Support the project as proposed

61.1% = Parkland for the entire parcel

25.4% = Support the park but not the houses

12.3% = Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly

Comments to the City Council:

Parkland for the entire parcel	Luxury homes encroaching on that sensitive area is just the worst idea. Additionally, developing that space makes the entrance to Petaluma from the west just more unpleasant and unattractive - like Livermore or some heavily developed, formerly rural town. ENOUGH. The homes across D St from the red barn we enough of an encroachment on the edge of town. Let the beauty of the red barn property welcome travelers.	Patty Norman
Parkland for the entire parcel	We must do everything possible to respect and protect this green space. There are many existing distressed and/ or abandoned lots that should be improved and developed for low income housing. This is where the developers could make a difference	Madelyn Crafts
Parkland for the entire parcel	Please DO NOT destroy this beautiful area with single family houses. So many animals already call this their home.	Harriet Coyne
Parkland for the entire parcel		Genie Praetzel

Parkland for the entire parcel, Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	So many deficiencies in the EIR, DEIR, FEIR that are well documented by credentialed and respected experts in their field. The process by which an agreement was struck between KCPP and Davidon was NOT transparent, no inclusive. How many rules will City Council overlook in order to line the pickets of this developer? No thanks.	Sue Davy
Parkland for the entire parcel	I am 100% opposed to building houses on this parcel. I also do not support ramped up park amenities, such as a path along the creek which is home to sensitive species, nor the addition of large paved parking areas. We need to protect the other species on earth by giving them some land. We already have a beautiful park with trails and should leave this zone largely undisturbed for the wildlife. In addition, creating a traffic cluster on D Street at the beautiful rural entrance to our town would be a complete and utter nightmare. This project would likely, in my opinion, invite future growth into our iconic oak hillsides. Please have the wisdom to stop this project in its tracks. Thank you.	Hillary Smith
Parkland for the entire parcel	This land is too important to the environment to construct houses in the endangered frog territory. The 28 homes will add 56 (28 x 2 cars) more cars to the already clogged D Street. The plans for the extension to Helen Putnam Park are too elaborate and too destructive. Make this is simple park entrance with a trail away from the creek.	Mark Jaderstrom
Support the park but not the houses		Sherri Fabre-Marcia
Support the park but not the houses	We have enough housing for the rich.	Paula Moors
Support the park but not the houses	D Street traffic is out of control now. The last thing it needs is more houses outside of walking distance to schools, jobs, and stores. Our infrastructure is already overtaxed. The only housing we are short on is affordable housing.	Caroline Gelsman
Support the park but not the houses	This is a sensitive area, susceptible to harm with any disturbance to the landscape. Such disturbance is inevitable with the proposed housing for this hillside. Construction is inherently associated with large equipment which will undoubtedly have unintended consequences. This area has the potential to be a wonderful addition to Helen Putnam Regional Park, offering additional trails for visitors. This is the option I support.	Cynthia Rathkey
Support the park but not the houses		Greg Beddow

Parkland for the entire parcel	Undeveloped open space is fast disappearing in and around Petaluma. This project is not needed and not wanted.	Jeffrey Creque
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	As few houses as possible with as much parkland as possible.	Catherine V Fok
Parkland for the entire parcel	Could we have a scaled down version of the park?	Chris Cort
Parkland for the entire parcel		MC Luebbermann
Parkland for the entire parcel	It's too beautiful a parcel to destroy with houses. Positively would pay money yearly to keep it as OPEN SPACE!!!!!!	Kerrin Shettle
Parkland for the entire parcel	We do not need to expand housing in to the hills that give Petaluma a great deal of its charm and country feel. Build more densely in transportation corridors.	Kathryn Azevedo
Parkland for the entire parcel		Leslie Taylor
Parkland for the entire parcel		Dusty Resneck
Parkland for the entire parcel	The land should be left alone as it is, no homes and limited human access.	Alan Utbrittan
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses		Susan Johnson
Parkland for the entire parcel		Kathleen Lawrence
Parkland for the entire parcel		Douglas Lund
Support the park but not the houses	Please extend Helen Putnam Park do not extend housing	Mary Fassbinder
Support the park but not the houses	I am not sure what you mean above about the difference between Parkland for the entire parcel and support the park but not the houses. We have a Gem of open space. I would love to support the park and I have, and keep the entire space as a Parkland parcel.	Joan Butler
Parkland for the entire parcel	Given the Climate Emergency, and the negative impacts of the housing in this location, this project should not go forward. The cumulative effects of giving in here and there has led us to sprawl and poor development in Petaluma. Please stand up for what is right.	Eric Storm
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	The environmental sensitivity of this area is being ignored. The public is not clearly been given the truth about all the important areas that were studied in the environmental report. This is a known wildlife corridor, as anyone who drives on Windsor knows as we stop to let the wildlife	Nancy Moran

	cross at a specific place they always cross. Open space is so important but this is not the area to expand the park and pave the grasslands. Too many sensitive creatures trying to make it in the area. Please reconsider and buy out Davidon KCPP so no building occurs. Let the public know the truth	
Support the park but not the houses	This is such a n unique environmental sensitive area, that it should be preserved as best as it can with minimal destruction of landscape and wild live. Too much digging and destruction of hills asphalt and cables will destroy this precious piece of land. It is beautiful as it is and I cannot emphasize enough how important it is to preserve open space for human well-being and quality of live, air quality and nature connection. So much is destroyed already and we need to preserve for our future generations. Smaller houses can be build in areas where no nature need to be destroyed.	Rentia humphries
Support the park but not the houses	The proposed houses violate everything about Petaluma's effort to be carbon neutral soon. Plus the houses would be built in an area with high risk of wild fires.	Paul Johnson
Support the park but not the houses	Concerned about the wildlife corridor obstruction.	Robert Bertram
Parkland for the entire parcel	Keep open space and protect the environment!	Jennifer Wheeler
Parkland for the entire parcel	This sensitive area should not be developed for more expensive houses that Petalumans don't need. It would be a great park or addition to Putnam Regional Park with minimal hardscaping for parking lot and trails and trails well away from the creek.	Henry White
Parkland for the entire parcel	The Davidon parcel has been a haven for all types of wildlife. I don't want to see it destroyed by houses and fences. With the recent rains, I've noticed a deepening of the crevices and water runoff on the south side of Kelly Creek (the proposed park area).	Susan Murphy
Support the project as proposed		Alan
Parkland for the entire parcel		Allen Noren
Parkland for the entire parcel	I would qualify this: protect the open space, expand park, but ensure sensitive areas are protected from visitors.	Jason Davies
Parkland for the entire parcel	No houses, No more cars, No more traffic, Nothing to maintain, no more noise and save our frog, his environment and the pathways of all his friends!	Jerry Beene

	<p>This project has been one long, slow sales pitch that violates our general plan.</p> <p>The argument that Planning Commission and city council must approve this project simply because it's been in the pipeline many years & put in front of PC & CC multiple times does not mean it is a good or acceptable project.</p> <p>Why are we changing our general plan? What good is a general plan if we violate it repeatedly?</p> <p>We are not forced to accept this project.</p> <p>How many times are we going to violate our general plan, and put things where they don't belong? Why are we making decisions that put a near-extinct species, the Sonoma red legged frog in further peril?</p> <p>At what point will Petaluma care about a species that's nearly extinct?</p> <p>How can we look ourselves in the mirror when we're not responsible citizens of this planet and are choosing to exterminate an entire species? None of our children would be proud of us. Anyone who votes for an Amphitheater and a playground, and paths in this area can rest assured knowing absolutely 100% certain that the impact of their decisions will last forever. Is that really the legacy we want ... do we truly have no heart or soul?</p>	
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	It reflects so poorly on Petaluma to turn its back on the environment in this way for yet more luxury homes where are General plants don't put them. That is the bottom line.	Taryn Obaid
Support the park but not the houses	Not an appropriate location for new development. Existing infrastructure such as roads, sewer and water are in poor shape and do not adequately serve the community as it is. This proposed development will make things worse by increasing pressure on the afore mentioned services with no measures to mitigate. I also have concerns that first responders will not be able to move in a timely fashion along D Street. The traffic situation is already terrible. Single family home model is obsolete .	James Coyne
Parkland for the entire parcel	I oppose the Davidon project and the proposed hardscape additions to Helen Putnam Regional Park.	Anne Wurr

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	<p>Mark Twain's The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County, is standard reading in California schools.</p> <p>Please don't approve this greenwashed proposal and set up Petaluma as responsible for frog's extinction.</p> <p>Please recall frogs are considered the canary in the coal mine for biodiversity per most-sensitive riparian habitat.</p>	Ahmed Obaid
Support the park but not the houses	I AM HIGHLY AGAINST ANY DEVELOPMENT NEAR OR NEXT TO HELEN PUTNAM PARK. DAVIDON PROPOSED HOUSING ISN'T APPROPRIATE FOR THIS AREA. PETALUMA NEEDS AFFORDABLE HOUSING.	JUDY T.
Parkland for the entire parcel		M Sullivan
Support the park but not the houses	Petaluma, it seems to me, is overbuilding residential housing beyond what the infrastructure and water supply can support, not the least of which are the deplorable condition of the city streets. And the additional traffic that the Davidon houses will generate on D Street (which cannot be mitigated by Davidon's own admission, will be a nightmare!!!) Davidon is not interested in what the loss of this beautiful landscape will mean to existing Petaluma residents, both human and wildlife, as well as future generations. They can pack up and return to the bay area, and check off another development!!	Kathleen Meagher
Parkland for the entire parcel		Rick Luttmann
Parkland for the entire parcel		Susie Albrecht
Support the project as proposed		Barbara Bloom
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses		Michael Kraus
Parkland for the entire parcel	This property is not suitable for development. The City Council declared a climate emergency in 2019; my question is four years on, when will it start acting like there is one. Committees, plans and policies are all well and good, but the real need in an emergency is for action. Building bloated luxury homes on the edge of town in a fire prone area that is a complex and sensitive natural environment is exactly the opposite of what is needed now. Why are our elected leaders putting a developer's monetary gain over our community's long term viability? Because he	Beth Meredith

	might sue the City if he can't make money? In the past the City had the courage to stand for urban growth boundaries, essentially limiting the reach of developers. Isn't it time the City stood once again for the needs of the community over the profit of a few?	
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	I also want to be sure that traffic on D does not get any worse than it already is!	Cherry Baumann
Support the park but not the houses	I am very much against the Davidon project. The traffic issues have not been truthfully addressed. Water is an issue. And their claims have been fake.	Patti Schofler
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses	There is so little green space left in Petaluma. Please do not build on Scott's ranch. Please keep the entire parcel as it is and incorporate it into Helen Putnam park, allowing animals to live, trees to clean our air, and humans to enjoy. Thank you	Laura Johnston
Support the park but not the houses		Pat Riley
Support the park but not the houses		Norma Walsh
Support the park but not the houses	We simply don't need more building, traffic, congestion, infrastructure costs especially at the cost of this beautiful space. Enough.	Terry Murphy
Parkland for the entire parcel		Bonnie Glass
Parkland for the entire parcel	No more runaway development!	Patricia Williams
Parkland for the entire parcel	Davidon and KCPP are sham artists- not bringing open and transparency to the idea of a project. Why did KCPP pay hard earned money and "gifting" for land that could/should have been "deeded" like in Napa. So I guess "to hell" with the community wants and needs and input- M Group and City Planning/Council just do what they always do- destroy the community and not grow in an appropriate direction to meet community standards.	Gill Ginger
Parkland for the entire parcel		Karin Beddow
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses		Mike Nelson
Parkland for the entire parcel		Lark Schumacher
Support the park but not the houses		Patricia Wilson

Parkland for the entire parcel	This parkland should give priority to needs of wildlife. Sensitive areas should be protected from human activity. Trails should be designed so that people and their bicycles, dogs and horses are not tempted to enter the creek.	Sandra Garber
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Dale Axelrod
Support the park but not the houses		Alex Fabian-Davies
Support the park but not the houses	Not a fan of more McMansions, no matter how "few" they promise to build - we do not need houses sprawling into our beautiful open space. We need OPEN SPACE to get away from the sprawl. It just makes no sense environmentally.	Tracy Perlich
Support the park but not the houses		bob bertram
Support the park but not the houses	Not only will the housing development increase traffic but also noise/regular pollution	Lea
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	Open space in Petaluma continues to be supplanted by homes, apartments, townhouses, condos, and it sickens me. Optimally, I would like this proposal to go into the circular file, but if that's not an option, I would like to see as few homes as possible and as large a park as possible.	Carol Treacy
Parkland for the entire parcel		Lori Wohl
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	I am strongly against building of homes or park on the Land at Windsor and D Streets. Land is not by definition solely for human amusement and profit, neither of which shall ever be satiated by more. More trails, more profit, more amusement, while the natural world crumbles like so much melting ice in our careless hands until it is no more. Leave the wild animals and places be please.	Paula Lecht
Parkland for the entire parcel	Mr Scott, a lifelong bachelor, bequeathed his land to UOP so that it would be used as an outdoor education venue. He never envisioned that UOP would do anything else with the land, especially not have UOP sell it off for a housing development. With this aside, to do anything other than have the land become a parkland will have serious, and in some cases horrible, consequences for Petalumans. With houses on the property, not only will traffic be significantly increased on D St, Windsor Dr and Western, but those whose homes along Kelly creek will continue to have more and more erosion on their land. Petaluma already has very expensive housing. There is no need to have additional	Reva Novey

	over a million dollar plus homes. There are plenty already. In addition, the secret meetings and agreements made between the Davidon people and KCPP is deplorable. almost enough in itself for the Davidon project should be rejected. I sincerely hope the council will not only not approve this project, but to also stop allowing Davidon to ever proceed with a housing project in Petaluma.	
Support the park but not the houses		Lesley
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	The developers HAVE not understood "D" Street and the impact. They are incredibly GREEDY people from Los Angeles. They are tricky and horrible	Ginger Irwin, 1309 1/2 "D" St. Petaluma
Parkland for the entire parcel	If only the city council thought of all the extraneous "stuff" that residents have to deal with when a new subdivision goes in: excess traffic and degraded roads (b/c the developers never deal with what the trucks do), to name a few. Our city council has never met a developer they didn't love. And please get them to stop building "boutique" hotels (I thought that meant around 5-8 rooms, not 5 stories and a rooftop restaurant). In essence, the city council is ruining this town. I will vote against all of them again. Thank you.	Athena Sargent
Parkland for the entire parcel	I would love it all to be park, but I understand the land was donated to a school and then that school sold the land to a developer (Davidon) to raise \$. Now the developer has been working on their plans, so it seems the only way to get the land from the developers and turn it into parkland would be if they were compensated for it in some way. We can't just make the developer donate the land to become park. So while I feel passionate about this particular land remaining open space and portions of it being given access to the public for recreation etc. I acknowledge this outcome would be a miracle. We need a viable path to make this vision possible. thanks for your great work!	Brian L
Parkland for the entire parcel		Merri Lee
Parkland for the entire parcel	I have lived next to HP Park for 22 years, and am now, and have ALWAYS BEEN, totally opposed to this project. The impact on the hillsides, on the wildlife is undeniable. The traffic will be greatly impacted. There is NO reason to decimate our precious outdoor space for a few tax dollars. I am FIRMLY against this development.	Katherine Applegarth

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	Come on Petaluma City Council! This is a sham and has been from the very beginning with KCPP/Davidon. The latest revelation regarding Davidon and Napa City Council is a huge eye-opener. I implore you to figure out how to save the city from a lawsuit and put an end to this absolute corporate circus. It's a travesty. As a resident of Petaluma and living on Cambridge Lane for 22 years, my family and I vehemently opposed the houses and park plans.	Maggie Athoe
Parkland for the entire parcel		Dana Hooper
Parkland for the entire parcel		M. Atkinson
Parkland for the entire parcel	Dear Pro Development Land Robbers- I am against this travesty and crime against NATURE and all that Petaluma REPRESENTS by the proposed grotesque homes and the degradation of our wonderful Scott Property. How about Open Space coming together to protect all the land by buying out Davidon and only limited human interaction of the land!!!!	Andrew Mercieca
Support the park but not the houses		donna norquist
Parkland for the entire parcel		Pete Gang
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	The park cannot look like an afterthought to the development. It should be installed first and maintain a subtle appearance. If we can plant and establish trees before the new homes are built perhaps it will lessen the negative impact they will have on this beautiful area.	Lauren lautner
Parkland for the entire parcel		Melissa Atkinson
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses	In my opinion, to continue only Parkland with trails to Helen Putnam park. Simple is better. Small parking lot for cars, but to also make trail from Windsor drive, and along the D street ext. towards the sidewalks of town.	Lydia Schindler
Parkland for the entire parcel	Davidon has not been honest in its mitigation plans. This is an environmental disaster on so many levels including traffic and water.	Patti Schofler
Support the park but not the houses	Do not want to see ANY houses!	Pamela Appell
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Pepper Fernandez
Parkland for the entire parcel		Marshall Reese

Parkland for the entire parcel	For decades we have appreciated the beauty tranquility and visual entrée to that side of Petaluma; it should not be touched in anyway.	Paul Praetzel
Support the park but not the houses	We don't need more traffic on D Street or Windsor drive	Zohreh Ansari
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Barry Bussewitz
Support the park but not the houses		MaryHeckman
Support the park but not the houses	The traffic on D Street is well over the top. The last thing we need is more houses that require cars as transportation to school, work, and a entities.	Caroline Gelsman
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	This plan needs much work to make it acceptable.	Nan Winters
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	With so much new housing and thus traffic being added to Petaluma, keeping open spaces/natural habitat for wildlife, seems essential.	Mary Beene
Parkland for the entire parcel	As it stands there are so many people abusing our neighborhood. There will be many more if this is developed into the plan as it stands. Not to mention the environmental improvements will not be followed through with. Look at West Haven. Not to mention people don't use that parking lot and park all over Victoria. Oh and shall we talk about the dog poo left everywhere? We even provide bags and a place to put it. If people want the park extended it should be done on the other side. We all know this is about the houses and the ensuing profit.	Wendy Arnold
Support the park but not the houses		Terry Murphy
Parkland for the entire parcel		Raquel Barrios
Parkland for the entire parcel	I've been working on sustainable urban development for 25 years and this project is so far out of alignment with best practices it should have been shut down years ago. A net negative for the community that ruins a beautiful piece of open space, adds to the city infrastructure burden, and does nothing for our housing affordability crisis.	Maureen Smith
Support the park but not the houses		Dustin Clark
Parkland for the entire parcel	No houses!	Kelly Garzelli

Parkland for the entire parcel	My first preference is to have the parcel be entirely parkland, and second would be have both and modified to be environmentally friendly.	Joan Butler
Parkland for the entire parcel	My main concern is the traffic and roads. The current condition of the D St. extension Road is completely unacceptable. The moment you drive in from Marin County and hit the city of Petaluma sign the roads are practically undrivable. Also after 3 PM Monday through Friday the traffic on the street is bumper-to-bumper coming in from Marin County. This has affected the road condition as well. The city does nothing to repair this and has been in this condition for the entire 25 years. I've lived here. Not do we not have the infrastructure to support this project but the increased traffic. It will cause is unacceptable. Windsor Drive already is affected by the traffic coming in off D street and people speed through the development like it's a race track. The city needs to implement speed bumps along Windsor Drive. People fly thru the stop signs as well making this a very dangerous situation for pedestrians and cyclists. I understand the need for development as people need a place to live, but this is not the right location.	Trudee Herman
Support the project as proposed		Bob Billings
Support the park but not the houses		Louise Leff
Parkland for the entire parcel	Petaluma will be over developed if we don't start saving our open spaces. More development means , more traffic, with limited roads and revenue to make repairs, creates stress for residents, possibly more crime. Strain on existing services which are set up for a small town. Etc. Let's keep Petaluma beautiful!	Debra Wallin
Parkland for the entire parcel	Build in town, and keep open space for wildlife.	Elaine Daly
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		pam zimmerman
Parkland for the entire parcel	We need parkland, not luxury housing	Kellie
		Gerald Gass
Parkland for the entire parcel		Russ Freudenburg
Parkland for the entire parcel		T A Barrett
Support the park but not the houses		KAYVAN NIKFAR

Support the park but not the houses	We don't need the increased traffic and large homes eating away the land.	Katie Sellmann
	<p>Your survey is limiting. There should be a category for Open Space Conservation for the entire parcel, not "Parkland for the entire parcel." I believe this reflects the lesser awareness in the Petaluma community about how to approach and plan for open space conservation with additional features, which are NOT "Parkland." This land and habitat deserve full conservation, with potential volunteer programs for enhancement and restoration and education programs to support learning about our environment as part of the access part of the property. The Red Barn area could have more of a focus for education and potentially plant-based agriculture, as this is an already impacted human area. I think your group is selling yourselves very short with this survey and I'm unclear who created it. Petalumans really do not understand what open space conservation means. This is a teachable moment about what is possible and best for this land. There never was a need for an "Extension" of Helen Putnam Regional Park. The Scott Ranch property should be a fully conserved open space land with additional elements of education, volunteering and a decision about use of the Red Barn area for the benefit of everyone.</p>	Susan Kirks
Parkland for the entire parcel	Free Parking lots would be good. Like to see the old barn redone and with additional free parking lots, less parking on Windsor and Oxford.	JERRY BEENE
Parkland for the entire parcel		Stevan Bosanac
Support the park but not the houses		Judi Allewelt
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses		Heather Kurland
Parkland for the entire parcel	this is an unnecessary development for petaluma which damages habitat, will impact traffic, and only put expensive homes into an already over-priced market. who wins? only the developers. not the people who live in the neighborhood or who use the street, not the animals that belong on the land. just say no.	rachel kaplan
Parkland for the entire parcel	This project is fundamentally flawed especially from an environmental aspect. Not to mention there is too much traffic along the D St. corridor now and any housing built there is only going to make things far worse. We must save our open land space and stop building on every square inch of land! Besides WHERE are you finding	Loretta Mateik

	the water for ANY number of homes built?? Seriously...where are you getting the water?	
Parkland for the entire parcel	NO WATER, NO HOUSES! Entire project is environmentally flawed.	Robert Mateik
Support the park but not the houses	We don't need more congested traffic, we need more open spaces, and we don't want to attract more homeless to be attracted to the public restrooms! Keep Petaluma beautiful, not another corporate city out for profit. Don't ruin our home and one of few sanctuary places.	Rana ansari
Support the park but not the houses		Barbara Stowe
Parkland for the entire parcel, Support the park but not the houses		Elizabeth PMcP
Support the park but not the houses		Pamela Appell
Parkland for the entire parcel		Karen Norton
Support the park but not the houses	The runoff for this project needs to have settling ponds for runoff mitigation. I do not give permission to the city of Petaluma to dump runoff into Kelly Creek (owned by the residences along Kelly creek) The city has bypassed the Weir on the corner of Sunnyslope Ave and Sunnyslope St. This is in violation of the purpose of the Weir. Construction should be not be allowed until this issue is addressed.	paul schmidt
Support the park but not the houses	We need more publicly accessible open space in Petaluma, with an eye towards keeping or creating more healthy habitat for wildlife, while providing low impact but inspirational outdoor areas for people.	Dennis Jongsomjit
Parkland for the entire parcel		Lishka Arata
Support the park but not the houses		Sil Machado
Parkland for the entire parcel		Julie Grace
Parkland for the entire parcel	We really need to preserve this spot as a corridor and habitat for the animals as well as having undeveloped space at that location to retain our rural heritage and celebrate its beauty and right to keep existing...once it's gone, it's gone forever.	Christopher Newhard
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Bob Butler
	No development there.	Jeanine Seaver

Support the park but not the houses		Chey Moore
Parkland for the entire parcel	What is the purpose of destroying this open space? For 28 homes that me and my friends can't afford? For adding a little trail to the park? For a parking lot on D? Plowing over the frog territory? I grew up in Petaluma. This development makes me sad.	Mark Miller
Parkland for the entire parcel	This land should never be developed. The land is too environmental sensitive. Leave this land as open space for future generations	Susan Jaderstrom
Parkland for the entire parcel	I drive to Helen Putnam Park frequently with my kids. I was at first happy that a new parking lot would be on D Street. Then I read about what would happen to the land if a lot of it was paved over for parking. I wouldn't take my kids to a playground next to D Street because there is too much traffic. Please don't destroy this land and build houses that our family could never afford.	Christina Gonzales
Parkland for the entire parcel	I am all about the environment, and this development is all about making money for some company that isn't even in Petaluma.	Tim Scott
Parkland for the entire parcel	Protect open space and stop sprawl in Petaluma!	Teri Shore
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		MC Luebbermann
Parkland for the entire parcel	Who thought this plan was a good idea? Why can a wealthy developer come to our town and build whatever they want? Keep Petaluma the town where I want to stay. Don't let millionaires take over our open space. Leave the land just the way it is.	Jim Andersen
Support the park but not the houses		Sharon Johnson
Parkland for the entire parcel	No more housing until we get more water.	John Van Straalen
Parkland for the entire parcel	What are you doing? We don't need these houses. We don't need the land destroyed. Leave it alone!	Karen Smith
Parkland for the entire parcel		Larry Johnsen
Parkland for the entire parcel		Gary Thompson
Parkland for the entire parcel		Maria Gomez
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Cherry Baumann

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	Kelly Creek is likely the ONLY free-flowing stream within the city limits. It needs to be restored from its currently degraded condition to support a riparian wildlife community. The market-rate houses are not needed nearly as much as a refuge for beleaguered riparian life forms. This is incredibly rare habitat that will only be degraded further by the proposed upslope homes AND a needless park entrance that has paved walkways on both sides of the stream, a playground, parking, bathrooms, and other development that supposedly benefits humans at the extreme expense of Nature. The fanciful, idealized depiction by Prunuske Chatham belies the damage to this rare natural resource that such a transformation would cause. Don't let this ill-conceived project occur and destroy what could be a remarkable haven for other life forms that continue to be displaced and destroyed by human greed and ignorance. Make living systems a priority by drawing the line against intrusive development and our misguided predilection for altering Nature to suit our whims. Make room for other life forms.	David Donnenfield
Parkland for the entire parcel		Sharon Risedorph
Support the park but not the houses	Petaluma is over crowded as it is. Our street are horrible and it take sometime 45 minutes to travel from one side to the other. STOP BUILDING take care of what is already here.	Joann Lowrie
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	Such sensitive land with wildlife corridors and protected species needs to keep trampling human feet entirely out of it.	Tonya Parnak
Parkland for the entire parcel	I will be submitting my comments in full through a letter.	Diane Gentile
Parkland for the entire parcel	It would be so wrong for Petaluma's City Council to approve the Davidon Development. It would be against the will of over 80% of Petalumans and visitors and wildlife and native grasses that love the undisturbed land. Please vote against this ill-conceived Davidon development. PROTECT OUR GREEN SPACE!!!! NO CONSTRUCTION ON THE HILLS AND VALLEYS OF SCOTT RANCH!!!! PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT FOR THE FUTURE OF THE PEOPLE WHO WILL ENJOY THE OPEN SPACE FOREVER!!! PROTECT OUR GREEN SPACE!! THANK YOU!	Sharon Risedorph
Parkland for the entire parcel	Why destroy our beautiful open space? Leave it alone!	Brenda Williams

Parkland for the entire parcel	I have lived here all of my life. I don't recognize our town anymore. All of this development and traffic is horrible. Don't approve Davidon.	Gail Miller
Parkland for the entire parcel		Margaret Taylor
Parkland for the entire parcel	Don't destroy this land for houses for millionaires. I would like a house for me and my family but will never be able to afford one in Petaluma.	Sharon Martin
Parkland for the entire parcel	I moved here from Mexico. I am now a citizen. I care more about saving beautiful land than I do about parking closer to the park. I will never be able to live in one of those houses for the rich.	Jess Sanchez
Support the park but not the houses	It would be easy to think that reducing the number of houses planned on this last remaining open space at the edge of town by the developer Davidon to 28 with optional ADUs must be acceptable because the number proposed is the least to date. Although the developer rather brags transferring land to Helen Putnam is a sign of what a good corporate citizen they are, the truth is, they would never been allowed to build on those steep hills, remove more trees, grade that land. Much better to get rid of the unusable land than convince a new HOA they should be happy with security, maintenance and fire protection. So, just because the number of dwellings proposed has been reduced, please don't think this current plan is as good as it can get. Encroachment on the flora and fauna by housing and the presented trail system is not the best we can do for Petaluma.	Pam Granger
Parkland for the entire parcel		Ally Baker
Parkland for the entire parcel	I have lived in Petaluma for 30 years, and it has changed so much. We are thinking of moving somewhere when the city appreciates open space--not cars, traffic, and building over wildlife habitat. This project is really out of touch with the community.	Wendy Brooks
Support the park but not the houses	My big concern is fire evacuation danger exacerbated by the addition of 56+ additional vehicles. I'm also confused as to how adding more homes and a 10 space parking lot will increase the access of Helen Putnam Park for East Petaluma residents? There are already two county lots available that are underutilized and they sure don't say "westside residents only" on them.	Jim Granger
Parkland for the entire parcel		Pavan Patel
Parkland for the entire parcel	No homes. No trampling over the sensitive habitat. No to Davidon.	Anja Larsson

Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	I don't understand why we need more houses in a RHNA bracket that has already satisfied the requirements.	Natasha
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	Please do not build a parking lot with an entrance on the very busy D Street - so dangerous! And a playground next to that busy road? Do the designers not have children? No one wants to play next to cars racing by.	Bev
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly	When you look at all of the 'rules' that this project violates (VMT, hillside ordinance, climate action plan), not to mention common sense, displacing wildlife, increasing fire danger, one must question the motivation. What is the benefit of bringing 28 wealthy families to Petaluma to live here, vs finding a creative solution to protecting and restoring this acreage? More development does not equal more benefits to the community.	Dylan
Parkland for the entire parcel	See my comment letter.	John Crowley
Want both the houses and park plans modified to be more environmentally friendly		Simone Haslam
Parkland for the entire parcel	Build houses somewhere that doesn't destroy the environment.	John Wilson
Parkland for the entire parcel	Stop destroying our town. Building houses for rich people. Letting people walk over sensitive land. This development doesn't make sense.	Karen Clark
Parkland for the entire parcel	Where has common sense gone in this town? Building homes that no one can afford (at least not my family) in a known high risk fire area. Putting a playground right next to D. Having a trail through frog territory. I just don't understand why this development is good for Petaluma.	Lisa Walker
Parkland for the entire parcel		Nancy Hill
Parkland for the entire parcel	I used to love Petaluma. Now I can't drive across town without leaving at least 30 or 45 minutes. Congestion, accidents. I don't understand adding more houses at the edge of town where you know everyone will have to drive to get their kids to school, sports, etc.	Mark Wood
Parkland for the entire parcel	Stop this nonsense! Just because a developer can afford to buy the land why does the City have to allow building on some of our last remaining open space at the edge of town?	Ken Bennett
Parkland for the entire parcel	For many, many reasons, this is truly a horrible project. You must not value open space if you allow this development to go forward in Petaluma. This project creates biology problems,	Melissa Myers

	fire problems, traffic problems, and houses no one can afford.	
Parkland for the entire parcel		Jacob Ross
Parkland for the entire parcel		Carol Barnes
Parkland for the entire parcel		Shirley Hayes
Parkland for the entire parcel		Eric Hill
Parkland for the entire parcel	If you allow all of the building on this land, I will never walk the trail along the creek. I don't want to kill any of those endangered frogs.	Vicki Diaz
Parkland for the entire parcel	I have been opposed to this project for years. I thought that a park might be nice but not the park with trails along the creek. When I read how much sensitive habit would be destroyed, I became upset. Now I feel that that the land should just be left alone.	Diana Gomez
Parkland for the entire parcel	No to this development!	Phil Rivera
Parkland for the entire parcel	There are legitimate rationales why the Davidon development has not succeeded in their plan, on this property, for twenty years! And I concur with all of the experienced and knowledgeable experts and their opinions, who have opposed it - without adding my two cents. LISTEN to those who truly care about THIS land and THIS environment, in PETALUMA. (Think of the next 20 years, and beyond!) Not to those who stand to gain - financially, politically, or to save face! And - the developer can retreat back south to Walnut Creek with no thought to the "spoils"!!!	Kathleen Meagher
Parkland for the entire parcel	We have walked extensively from the PHS neighborhood where we have lived at the same address for the past 33 years. Our regular walking loop takes us around La Cresta/D Street/Windsor Dr/Western and we have seen many changes. We watched the Victoria section being built from its inception. The number of slides alone as they were being built was interesting to watch. Now proposed is building in an even steeper terrain where damage to the ecologically sensitive area is unavoidable to even make it safe to build. So much for caring about the destruction. Then there are the issues of runoff that would run down B Street and ancillary streets to the detriment to those homes that have been there for decades and in some cases more than a century. D Street will be gridlocked with construction trucks for how many years? We have an issue with housing, but this project does nothing for creating housing for	Craig Riddle

	those who need it the most. Our quality of life will be impacted negatively if this was to be built. Wrong project/wrong place/wrong headed.	
Parkland for the entire parcel		Rick Smith
Support the park but not the houses		M. Brazis
Parkland for the entire parcel		M A Brazis
Parkland for the entire parcel		Megan Halinan
Parkland for the entire parcel		Paul Barber
Parkland for the entire parcel		Patty Scholerfer
Parkland for the entire parcel		Anne Diggs
Parkland for the entire parcel		Tony Negro
Parkland for the entire parcel		Dan Cader
Parkland for the entire parcel		Caroline Gellsman
Parkland for the entire parcel		Andy Morris
Parkland for the entire parcel		David Powers