

**Donovan Arteaga**

---

**From:** R Gerbs <riley.gerbrandt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:22 AM  
**To:** shane pavonetti; jessenickell3art@gmail.com; Luke Rizzuto; Donovan Arteaga; Trina Barton; kami@davidlyng.com; janerbarr@aol.com; Sandy Brown; yeseniajduan@gmail.com; renee@reneesgarden.com; jagomez173@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Jonathan DiSalvo; Matt Machado; Manu Koenig; Jamie Sehorn; Mike Reis; Oppose Capitola  
**Subject:** Please Pull Item 9 from the 10/22 Planning Commission meeting consent agenda

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hello Commissioners,

I request that you pull Item #9, 241371 - 841 Capitola Road, Santa Cruz - APN 026-491-40 - from the Consent Agenda Items.

In accordance with Item #6 on today's Commission Meeting, which says "Only a Commission Member may pull items from Consent to Regular agenda. Members of the public must request that a Commission Member pull an item from the Consent Agenda prior to the start of the Meeting." Per this direction, I request that you pull Item #9 from the Consent Agenda of today's meeting.

**I request this due to new information that our community members have recently receive regarding the timing of this application and the County's Housing Element, that is extremely important and that requires public discussion today prior to your vote on this item.**

Respectfully,  
Riley Gerbrandt

## Donovan Arteaga

---

**From:** R Gerbs <riley.gerbrandt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:10 PM  
**To:** Jamie Sehorn; County Counsel; Manu Koenig; shane pavonetti;  
jessenickell3art@gmail.com; Luke Rizzuto; Donovan Arteaga; Trina Barton;  
kami@davidlyng.com; janerbarr@aol.com; Sandy Brown; yeseniajduan@gmail.com;  
renee@reneesgarden.com; jagomez173@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Oppose Capitola; Mike Reis  
**Subject:** Brown Act and Government Code Violation at Public Hearing for 841 Capitola Road today at this morning's Planning Commission Meeting  
**Attachments:** 10-22-2025 Planning Commission Agenda on County website as of 10-22-25.pdf; Pages from Planning Commission Agenda, 841 capitola road item as of 10-20-2025.pdf; 10-22-2025 Planning Commission Meeting information on County website as of 10-22-25.pdf; Final\_Two\_Minute\_Speech\_Item9\_841CapitolaRoad\_RileyGerbrandt.docx

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

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Jamie, County Counsel, Supervisor Koenig, and Planning Commissioners

This morning, a Brown Act and Government Code Violation at Public Hearing for 841 Capitola Road today at this morning's Planning Commission Meeting.

I was denied the opportunity to speak today on Item #9 of the Planning Commission's public hearing.

I spoke on Item #6 consent agenda, because the agenda that I had on hand (which was posted on October 20, 2025 on the County's website <https://cdi.santacruzcountyca.gov/UPC/GetInvolved/PublicMeetingsHearings/PlanningCommission.aspx>, believing that this was the agenda for this morning's meeting. See attached agenda that I downloaded from the County's website showing this Item #9 on the Consent Agenda.

I was denied the opportunity to speak on Item #9 during public comment for that item, because I was deemed to "having already spoken on this item previously". Moreover, I was trying to raise a Brown Act violation about the agenda posting, because the County did not post a revised agenda showing the agenda changes, as the agenda posted on 10/22/2025 at the County's website and available in-person at the public hearing was different than the one available on the County's website as of 10/20/2025 ... and the County did NOT NOTICE the public of these agenda revisions.

Moreover, my wife called in per the requirements of the agenda " **To provide comments by telephone please dial (669) 254-5252, Webinar ID: 161 791 6904.**" and raised her hand during public comment period, but she was not called on to provide public comment.

Again, moreover,

1. Public comment Gov. Code § 54954.3 requires the public to have a chance to comment before the final decision. If the Commissioners ask substantive questions of staff that introduce new information, as this Commission is doing, and the public is not given a chance to comment on that new information, any decision today could be challenged as violating due process or failing to allow meaningful public participation. Practically, many agencies follow best practice and fairness principles by giving the public a second public comment period, so the public can respond to staff clarifications or new information raised by Commissioners' questions. Therefore, I ask the Chair either

- a. Provide a final brief comment period before deliberation and vote — as this ensures fairness given the depth of issues and new information not previously in the packet, or
- b. Explicitly confirm that **no new facts** will be raised by Commissioners or staff during staff Q&A **that the public hasn't already addressed.**

There was new information discussed by staff and the Commissioners after public comment, and the public **was not** provided opportunity to speak again on this item after Commissioner deliberation and questions to County staff.

Lastly,

On parking, the Workbench developers are **lying to you**, and **EVEN YOUR STAFF are not telling you the full story:**

- Under Gov. Code § 65915(p)(1), State law limits how much parking a county may require—it does not **require** a reduction.
- The County Code's 84-space requirement fully complies with this law.
- The applicant's request to reduce parking to zero, and staff's recommendation for 31 spaces, **have no statutory basis.**
- As confirmed by METRO and AMBAG in written comment provided to you, the project site is NOT within ½ mile of a "major transit stop" nor within ½ mile of a "high-quality transit corridor included in an adopted regional transportation plan" as defined in Government Code 65915 subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code.

**If the developer cannot meet parking standards, the remedy is to reduce the number of units, not waive requirements that protect neighborhood safety.**

Please see my attached comments, which I was going to read during this item, that were not included in public comment or the public record.

Respectfully,  
Riley Gerbrandt

--

-----  
Riley Gerbrandt, P.E., M.ASCE  
Professional Civil & Geotechnical Engineer

Email: [Riley.Gerbrandt@gmail.com](mailto:Riley.Gerbrandt@gmail.com)



## County of Santa Cruz Planning Commission Agenda

Community Development and Infrastructure, 701 Ocean Street, Suite 400, Santa Cruz, CA  
95060

**Meeting Date :** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:30 AM

**Location :** Community Room (Basement)  
County Government Center  
701 Ocean Street, Room 020 (Basement)  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

### **REMOTE OPTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AVAILABLE**

Members of the public who are unable to attend the in-person meeting have the option of joining the meeting virtually via the ZOOM meeting link: <https://santacruzcounty-us.zoomgov.com/j/1617916904> , or by calling in and providing testimony during the public comment period for each Scheduled Item. To provide comments by telephone please dial (669) 254-5252, Webinar ID: 161 791 6904.

For questions regarding hearing procedures, or to submit written public comment associated with any scheduled item, please contact Donovan Arteaga, Administrative Support, at (831) 454-2801 or [Donovan.Arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:Donovan.Arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov).

The meeting starts at 9:30 AM with the first item and proceeds through the items in consecutive order unless otherwise noted. Staff reports on permit applications are available for review or purchase one week before the hearing by calling 831-454-5317. You may also view staff reports here by clicking the underlined item number below. All items are subject to continuance. No notices of continued or rescheduled hearing dates are mailed. Please contact the project planner for further information on specific applications.

---

### **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

0. **Agenda en español**
  - Agenda en español [Click Here](#)
1. **Roll Call: Chair Barton, Commissioner Nickell, Commissioner Pavonetti, Commissioner Jimenez, Commissioner Shepherd**
2. **Additions and Corrections to Agenda**
3. **Declaration of Ex Parte Communications**
4. **Announcement by Commission members of items removed from Consent to Regular agenda.**
5. **Public Comment**

Any person may address the Planning Commission during its Public Comment period. Speakers must not exceed two (2) minutes in length or the time limit established by the Chair, and individuals may speak only once during Public Comment. All Public Comments must be directed to an item listed on today's Consent Agenda or a topic not on the agenda. Commission members will not take actions or respond immediately to any public communication presented regarding topics not on the Agenda but may choose to follow up later, either individually, or on a subsequent Planning Commission Agenda.

6. **Action on the Consent Agenda (Items 7)**

Consent Agenda Items: Consent items include routine business that does not call for discussion. One roll call vote is taken for all items. Only a Commission Member may pull items from Consent to Regular agenda. Members of the public must request that a Commission Member pull an item from the Consent Agenda prior to the start of the meeting.

---

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

7. **Approval of Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the September 24, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as submitted by the Community Development and Infrastructure Department.

**- DRAFT MINUTES 9/24/2025** [Click Here](#)

---

### **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

**8. 241335 1200 Granite Creek Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95065 APN: 101-041-09**

Public Hearing to consider an appeal of the Administrative Approval of Application 241335, a proposal to increase allowed height from 28 feet to 32 feet with increased setbacks, specifically the condition of approval requiring submittal of a copy of the letter of acceptance of the project Biotic Report.

The property is located at 1200 Granite Creek Road in Santa Cruz.

APPLICANT: Valerie Hart  
OWNER: Nicholas & Elissa Boyd  
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 1  
PROJECT PLANNER: John Hunter, (831) 454-3170  
EMAIL: John.Hunter@santacruzcountyca.gov

**- 241335 Letter & Exhibits** [Click Here](#)

Late Additions (after publishing of Staff Report)

**- 241335 Biotic Report** [Click Here](#)

**- 241335 Late Mail** [Click Here](#)

**9. 241371 841 Capitola Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95062 APN: 026-491-40**

Public Hearing to consider a proposal to demolish one existing residential dwelling unit and construct 57 units within a five-story multifamily building. The project includes a 42.5-percent Density Bonus in exchange for the provision of four affordable units (comprising of one Very-Low Income (VLI) unit and three Extremely Low Income (ELI) units). Requires approval of a Site Development Permit pursuant to Builder's Remedy pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65589.5 and Density Bonus pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65915.

Consider a determination that the project is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.66.

The project site is located on the north side of Capitola Road at 841 Capitola Road (Assessor's Parcel Number 026-491-40) approximately 80 feet east of its intersection with Grey Seal Road in Live Oak.

APPLICANT: Clay Toombs for Workbench  
OWNER: 841 Capitola LLC  
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 1  
PROJECT PLANNER: Jonathan DiSalvo, (831) 454-3157  
EMAIL: Jonathan.DiSalvo@santacruzcountyca.gov

**- 241371 Staff Report & Exhibits** [Click Here](#)

Late Additions (after publishing of Staff Report):

**- 241371 Applicant's Letter of Support** [Click Here](#)

**- 241371 Plans** [Click Here](#)

**- Public Comment for Application No. 241371 Received Prior to Publishing of PC Staff Report**  
[Click Here](#)

**- 241371 Staff Report Corrections Memo** [Click Here](#)

**- 241371 Staff Report Updated (Exhibits Amended 10/21/25)** [Click Here](#)

- 241371 Late Mail [Click Here](#)

- 241371 Late Mail 2 [Click Here](#)

10. **Secretary's Report on Upcoming Meetings and Agendas**

11. **Community Development and Infrastructure Department Director's Report**

12. **County Counsel's Report**

13. **Written Communications**

- **Written Communications** [Click Here](#)

Late Additions (after publishing of packet):

- **Written Communications 2** [Click Here](#)

---

### **APPEAL INFORMATION**

Denial or approval of any permit by the Planning Commission is appealable to the Board of Supervisors. The appeal must be filed with the required appeal fee within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission. To file an appeal you must write a letter to the Board of Supervisors and include the appeal fee. For more information on appeals, please see the "Planning Appeals" brochure located in the Planning Department lobby, or contact the project planner.

### **APPEALS OF COASTAL PROJECTS**

(\*) This project requires a Coastal Zone Permit which is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission. It may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors; the appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission.

(\*\*) This project requires a Coastal Development Permit. Denial or approval of the Coastal Development Permit is appealable to the Board of Supervisors; the appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission. After all local appeal periods have ended (grounds for appeal are listed in the County Code Section 13.20.110), approval of a Coastal Development permit is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. The appeal must be filed with the Coastal Commission within 10 business days of receipt by the Coastal Commission of notice of final local action.

**Note regarding Public hearing items:** If any person challenges an action taken on the foregoing matter(s) in court, they may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing described in this notice or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at or prior to the public hearing.

Agenda documents may be reviewed at the Planning Department, Room 420, County Government Center, 701 Ocean Street, Santa Cruz.

The County of Santa Cruz does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs or activities. The Board of Supervisors chamber is located in an accessible facility. If you require special assistance in order to participate, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 454-3137 (TTD/ TTY call 711) at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to make arrangements. As a courtesy to those persons affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent free. If you plan to attend the meeting and participate in public comment and need translation please contact Micaela Lopez at (831) 454-2336 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting in order to make arrangements. ***Si desea asistir la reunión y participar en los comentarios públicos y necesita traducción, comuníquese con Micaela López al (831) 454-2336 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión para hacer los arreglos.***



## County of Santa Cruz Planning Commission Agenda

Community Development and Infrastructure, 701 Ocean Street, Suite 400, Santa Cruz, CA  
95060

**Meeting Date :** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:30 AM

**Location :** Community Room (Basement)  
County Government Center  
701 Ocean Street, Room 020 (Basement)  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

### **REMOTE OPTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AVAILABLE**

Members of the public who are unable to attend the in-person meeting have the option of joining the meeting virtually via the ZOOM meeting link: <https://santacruzcounty-us.zoomgov.com/j/1617916904>, or by calling in and providing testimony during the public comment period for each Scheduled Item. To provide comments by telephone please dial (669) 254-5252, Webinar ID: 161 791 6904.

For questions regarding hearing procedures, or to submit written public comment associated with any scheduled item, please contact Donovan Arteaga, Administrative Support, at (831) 454-2801 or [Donovan.Arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:Donovan.Arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov).

The meeting starts at 9:30 AM with the first item and proceeds through the items in consecutive order unless otherwise noted. Staff reports on permit applications are available for review or purchase one week before the hearing by calling 831-454-5317. You may also view staff reports here by clicking the underlined item number below. All items are subject to continuance. No notices of continued or rescheduled hearing dates are mailed. Please contact the project planner for further information on specific applications.

---

### **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

0. **Agenda en español**
  - Agenda en español [Click Here](#)
1. **Roll Call: Chair Barton, Commissioner Nickell, Commissioner Pavonetti, Commissioner Jimenez, Commissioner Shepherd**
2. **Additions and Corrections to Agenda**
3. **Declaration of Ex Parte Communications**
4. **Announcement by Commission members of items removed from Consent to Regular agenda.**
5. **Public Comment**

Any person may address the Planning Commission during its Public Comment period. Speakers must not exceed two (2) minutes in length or the time limit established by the Chair, and individuals may speak only once during Public Comment. All Public Comments must be directed to an item listed on today's Consent Agenda or a topic not on the agenda. Commission members will not take actions or respond immediately to any public communication presented regarding topics not on the Agenda but may choose to follow up later, either individually, or on a subsequent Planning Commission Agenda.

6. **Action on the Consent Agenda (Items 7)**

Consent Agenda Items: Consent items include routine business that does not call for discussion. One roll call vote is taken for all items. Only a Commission Member may pull items from Consent to Regular agenda. Members of the public must request that a Commission Member pull an item from the Consent Agenda prior to the start of the meeting.

---

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

7. **Approval of Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the September 24, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as submitted by the Community Development and Infrastructure Department.

**- DRAFT MINUTES 9/24/2025** [Click Here](#)

8. **241335**            **1200 Granite Creek Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95065**            **APN: 101-041-09**

Public Hearing to consider an appeal of the Administrative Approval of Application 241335, a proposal to increase allowed height from 28 feet to 32 feet with increased setbacks, specifically the condition of approval requiring submittal of a copy of the letter of acceptance of the project Biotic Report.

The property is located at 1200 Granite Creek Road in Santa Cruz.

APPLICANT: Valerie Hart  
OWNER: Nicholas & Elissa Boyd  
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 1  
PROJECT PLANNER: John Hunter, (831) 454-3170  
EMAIL: John.Hunter@santacruzcountyca.gov

**- 241335 Letter & Exhibits** [Click Here](#)

9. **241371**            **841 Capitola Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95062**            **APN: 026-491-40**

Public Hearing to consider a proposal to demolish one existing residential dwelling unit and construct 57 units within a five-story multifamily building. The project includes a 42.5-percent Density Bonus in exchange for the provision of four affordable units (comprising of one Very-Low Income (VLI) unit and three Extremely Low Income (ELI) units). Requires approval of a Site Development Permit pursuant to Builder's Remedy pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65589.5 and Density Bonus pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65915.

Consider a determination that the project is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.66.

The project site is located on the north side of Capitola Road at 841 Capitola Road (Assessor's Parcel Number 026-491-40) approximately 80 feet east of its intersection with Grey Seal Road in Live Oak.

APPLICANT: Clay Toombs for Workbench  
OWNER: 841 Capitola LLC  
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 1  
PROJECT PLANNER: Jonathan DiSalvo, (831) 454-3157  
EMAIL: Jonathan.DiSalvo@santacruzcountyca.gov

**- 241371 Staff Report & Exhibits** [Click Here](#)

**- 241371 Plans** [Click Here](#)

**- 241371 Applicant's Letter of Support** [Click Here](#)

**- Public Comment for Application No. 241371 Received Prior to Publishing of PC Staff Report**  
[Click Here](#)

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

10. **Secretary's Report on Upcoming Meetings and Agendas**
11. **Community Development and Infrastructure Department Director's Report**
12. **County Counsel's Report**
13. **Written Communications**  
**- Written Communications** [Click Here](#)

## APPEAL INFORMATION

Denial or approval of any permit by the Planning Commission is appealable to the Board of Supervisors. The appeal must be filed with the required appeal fee within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission. To file an appeal you must write a letter to the Board of Supervisors and include the appeal fee. For more information on appeals, please see the "Planning Appeals" brochure located in the Planning Department lobby, or contact the project planner.

## APPEALS OF COASTAL PROJECTS

(\*) This project requires a Coastal Zone Permit which is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission. It may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors; the appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission.

(\*\*) This project requires a Coastal Development Permit. Denial or approval of the Coastal Development Permit is appealable to the Board of Supervisors; the appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of action by the Planning Commission. After all local appeal periods have ended (grounds for appeal are listed in the County Code Section 13.20.110), approval of a Coastal Development permit is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. The appeal must be filed with the Coastal Commission within 10 business days of receipt by the Coastal Commission of notice of final local action.

**Note regarding Public hearing items:** If any person challenges an action taken on the foregoing matter(s) in court, they may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing described in this notice or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at or prior to the public hearing.

Agenda documents may be reviewed at the Planning Department, Room 420, County Government Center, 701 Ocean Street, Santa Cruz.

The County of Santa Cruz does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs or activities. The Board of Supervisors chamber is located in an accessible facility. If you require special assistance in order to participate, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 454-3137 (TTD/ TTY call 711) at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to make arrangements. As a courtesy to those persons affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent free. If you plan to attend the meeting and participate in public comment and need translation please contact Micaela Lopez at (831) 454-2336 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting in order to make arrangements. ***Si desea asistir la reunión y participar en los comentarios públicos y necesita traducción, comuníquese con Micaela López al (831) 454-2336 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión para hacer los arreglos.***

Below is a collapsible outline containing dates of Planning Commission meetings. **Click the year, and then the month of the meeting** for which you are looking. **Click on the "Minutes" to the right of the date** to access the project descriptions of all items considered at that meeting; to access the entire initial study document, click the number to the left of project title.

[-] [Year 2025](#)

[-] [October](#)

[10/8/2025](#) [[Agenda](#)]

[10/22/2025](#) [[Agenda](#)]

[+] [September](#)

[+] [August](#)

[+] [July](#)

[+] [June](#)

[+] [May](#)

[+] [April](#)

[+] [March](#)

[+] [February](#)

[+] [Year 2024](#)

Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission

Historic Resources Commission

Housing Advisory Commission

Planning Commission

Zoning Administrator

**Search Agendas and Minutes**

## Two-Minute Public Comment – Item #9 (841 Capitola Road)

*Riley Gerbrandt*

Before I begin my two minutes of public comment, I want to state two things for the record and point of order regarding the process today that is potentially in conflict with the Brown Act and Government Code:

1. The noticing for this item and this morning's Planning Commission agenda does not meet Brown Act noticing requirements. The agenda posted on the County's website as of October 20, 2025 (**this week**) showed this item on the Consent Agenda. It now shows the item on the Regular Agenda, but without proper noticing that a revised agenda had been posted and what the changes were.
2. Public comment Gov. Code § 54954.3 requires the public to have a chance to comment before the final decision. If the Commissioners ask substantive questions of staff that introduce new information, as this Commission is doing, and the public is not given a chance to comment on that new information, any decision today could be challenged as violating due process or failing to allow meaningful public participation. Practically, many agencies follow best practice and fairness principles by giving the public a second public comment period, so the public can respond to staff clarifications or new information raised by Commissioners' questions. Therefore, I ask the Chair either
  - a. Provide a final brief comment period before deliberation and vote — as this ensures fairness given the depth of issues and new information not previously in the packet, or
  - b. Explicitly confirm that **no new facts** will be raised by Commissioners or staff during staff Q&A **that the public hasn't already addressed**.

My two minutes of public comment starts **now**:

Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Riley Gerbrandt, a neighboring property owner and Civil Engineer. I've submitted a letter and email explaining these comments in more detail—those are included in your packet as Late Mail.

I respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Deny the application under Gov. Code § 65589.5(d)(2) for non-compliance with objective standards and for failing to qualify for Builder's Remedy status; or
2. Continue the hearing and direct staff to:
  - a. Produce the complete public record, including all correspondence through October 2025;
  - b. Provide written clarification of any extension or procedural waivers granted to the applicant;
  - c. Require submission of a new SB 330 preliminary application reflecting the > 20 percent project increase, processed under the County's certified Housing Element and current zoning;
  - d. Complete a full CEQA review addressing traffic, stormwater, tree removal, and neighborhood privacy; and
  - e. Require a Traffic Impact Study consistent with County Design Criteria Part 1, Section D, prepared by a licensed traffic engineer, released at least 30 days before any future hearing, and reopen the completeness determination pending that study.
3. Deny the parking concession and require the 84 total parking spaces the County may lawfully require under Gov. Code § 65915(p)(1), affirming that this site is not within ½ mile of a major transit stop—as confirmed by AMBAG and METRO—so it does not qualify for transit-based reductions under § 65915(p)(2).

**Absent such actions, any approval would constitute an abuse of discretion and violate CEQA's mandate for transparent, evidence-based decision-making.**

On parking, the Workbench developers are **lying to you**, and **your staff are not telling you the full story**:

- Under Gov. Code § 65915(p)(1), State law limits how much parking a county may require—it does not **require** a reduction.
- The County Code's 84-space requirement fully complies with this law.
- The applicant's request to reduce parking to zero, and staff's recommendation for 31 spaces, **have no statutory basis**.
- As confirmed by METRO and AMBAG in written comment provided to you, the project site is NOT within ½ mile of a "major transit stop" nor within ½ mile of a "high-quality transit corridor included in an adopted regional transportation plan" as defined in Government Code 65915 subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code.

**If the developer cannot meet parking standards, the remedy is to reduce the number of units, not waive requirements that protect neighborhood safety.**

**Second**, the record before you is incomplete.

Over two years, our community has provided hundreds of pages of correspondence, yet only 33 pages appear in your packet.

You're being asked to act without the full record, which must be corrected.

**Third**, County Counsel has not issued a written opinion on the PLG-130 irregularities, timing, or conflict-of-interest issues.

**Acting today without legal advice exposes the County to risk.**

**Fourth**, staff accepted uploads on January 30, 2025, even though the PLG-130 form required waiting until the next business Monday to upload records, which would have been after the response deadline to the County's November Letter of Incompleteness.

No written extension exists—our Public Records Act request produced no evidence of one.

The January 30<sup>th</sup> application resubmittal was non-responsive and should be deemed to have expired and the application withdrawn.

**Fifth**, newly obtained County-HCD emails from March 20 and 25, 2024 show that County staff already deemed the Housing Element in compliance before the April SB 330 filing—so no Builder's Remedy rights could apply.

Staff are also incorrect that this project can qualify for "Builder's Remedy 2.0." The new provision under AB 1893 allows only SB 330 applications that were (a) deemed complete before January 1, 2025 and (b) not already Builder's Remedy projects to elect that status.

This project was already filed as a Builder's Remedy project, so it cannot lawfully "convert" under AB 1893.

Any expansion of this project beyond 20 percent therefore requires a new SB 330 filing subject to today's objective standards and certified Housing Element.

**Sixth**, unresolved conflict-of-interest concerns remain involving former Commissioner Tim Gordin, whose Form 700 disclosures appear incomplete while he held an ownership interest in this project.

Thank you for protecting the integrity of Santa Cruz County's planning process.

## Donovan Arteaga

---

**From:** R Gerbs <riley.gerbrandt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 12:12 PM  
**To:** henry garcia; Donovan Arteaga  
**Cc:** oppose841capitolroad@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Re: Oppose 841

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

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Please see list of planning commissioner emails that you can write to about this (see below) as well as writing [Jonathan.DiSalvo@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:Jonathan.DiSalvo@santacruzcountyca.gov), [Jamie.Sehorn@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:Jamie.Sehorn@santacruzcountyca.gov), [manu.koenig@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:manu.koenig@santacruzcountyca.gov), [donovan.arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:donovan.arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov)

To: shane pavonetti <s.pavonetti@gmail.com>, jessenickell3art@gmail.com, Luke Rizzuto <rizcon@earthlink.net>, donovan.arteaga@santacruzcountyca.gov, trina.barton@santacruzcountyca.gov, kami@davidlyng.com, janerbarr@aol.com, sandy.brown@santacruzcountyca.gov, yeseniajduan@gmail.com, renee@reneeegarden.com, "jagomez173@gmail.com" <jagomez173@gmail.com>  
Cc: Jonathan DiSalvo <Jonathan.DiSalvo@santacruzcountyca.gov>, Matt Machado <Matt.Machado@santacruzcountyca.gov>, Manu Koenig <Manu.Koenig@santacruzcountyca.gov>, Jamie Sehorn <Jamie.Sehorn@santacruzcountyca.gov>, Mike Reis <reismj88@gmail.com>, Oppose Capitola <oppose841capitolroad@gmail.com>

On Wed, Oct 22, 2025 at 9:56 AM henry garcia <[garciababy08@att.net](mailto:garciababy08@att.net)> wrote:

We oppose this! There's already no parking around here and destroying all those trees!!!

Garcia Family

308 hill street Unit 8

--

-----  
Riley Gerbrandt, P.E., M.ASCE  
Professional Civil & Geotechnical Engineer

Email: [Riley.Gerbrandt@gmail.com](mailto:Riley.Gerbrandt@gmail.com)  
-----

## Donovan Arteaga

---

**From:** Teresa Buika <tblpcs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 22, 2025 3:56 PM  
**To:** Donovan Arteaga  
**Cc:** First District  
**Subject:** 841 Capitola Road project comments

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

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

To the Planning Commission and Supervisor Manu Koenig,

These comments relate to the proposed WorkBench housing project at 841 Capitola Road. This project needs serious reconsideration and a great reduction in size. First off, this project was developed after a serious conflict of interest from Supervisor Koenig's past Planning Commissioner, Tim Gordin, while he was directly involved in the process of setting the Housing Plan and policies for the County. He waited for loopholes to benefit financially himself and to directly impact local neighbors in a negative way.

The project should be contained within its own site, not using Grey Seal Road as its accessway. This project should use Grey Seal Road as an emergency egress only if needed, but not as its main access way. That is a major impact on the neighbors.

The project will dwarf over the residential neighbors on both sides, casting shadows, reducing privacy and quiet. Why not build more single family homes and/or maybe smaller two story townhomes, if indeed the developer wants to have a design that "Respects the Neighborhood"? Because of greed.

The developer touts this as a sustainable transportation neighborhood yet the project is NOT on a "high quality transit line" as defined by the County with buses only coming once every 30-60 minutes on either routes 3A or 3B.

They say they will reserve one of the precious parking spaces for Zipcar for shared use -- has Zipcar agreed to this? As the person who brought Zipcar to the UCSC campus almost 20 year ago, I know that Zipcar has cars on campus still but the few that once were located in the City no longer exist. To think that Zipcar will add ONE car to this housing unit is ludicrous.

If they will provide free Metro bus passes to all residents, **it needs to stipulate that this should be for ALL residents for the life of the project.** Metro passes for all uses any time 365/24/7 **including the Highway 17 bus.** This project should also stipulate that any future rail passenger service should also be covered free for all residents if/when that is developed. While Supervisor Keonig is all for reduced parking spaces, he offers no support for new bus transit or rail transit in the area. Local residents should not have to be negatively impacted for his policy decisions.

The nearest BCycle station is at 7th and Brommer, over 1/2 mile away, not "steps away" as mentioned in the developer letter. This program is struggling locally with limited expansion coming to the County, and cannot be used as a program alternative for this project. The project touts that it will host its own resident bikeshare program. Please provide the details: How many bikes will this have? Are they electric? and where will these be stationed (or are these also going to use more parking spaces? - parking for these bikes nor the Zipcar space are shown on the plans.) Who will maintain this program for residents?

Regarding parking - this project says it includes the "maximum feasible parking" but perhaps the project should be scaled down. The plans show that the parking will be assigned... So which units do NOT get parking?

In general, the housing also needs to share which units are the low income housing units (are these studios only?) and it is laughable to think that FOUR of 57 units are designated for low income residents (7%) rather than working with the community to build more low income units. This will do very little to make an impact on LOCAL residents who need housing.

This project is riddled with conflict from this developer and the supervisor he respresnted for years, and does not respect the local community. Please reconsider this design so it actually does "respect the neighbors." (Note, I live in Live Oak but will not be directly impacted by this development.

Teresa Buika

## Donovan Arteaga

---

**From:** Katherine McAuley <mcauleykatherine@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 24, 2025 4:43 PM  
**To:** Donovan Arteaga  
**Cc:** Nathan MacBeth; Manu Koenig  
**Subject:** Santa Cruz Affordable Housing Approval

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

\*\*\*\*CAUTION:This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Santa Cruz County Planning Commissioners:

I'm writing to express my strong support for the Anton Solana affordable housing project at Thurber Lane and Soquel Drive. We desperately need more housing for working families, seniors and young professionals in our community. Please support efforts to house our workforce by approving this important project.

Thank you for voting yes on this project!

Katherine McAuley  
October 24, 2025  
Resident of Santa Cruz  
Live Oak & Santa Cruz Harbor since 1969  
310-684-8342

Sent from my iPhone

## Donovan Arteaga

---

**From:** Linda Heyes <hey2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 24, 2025 5:37 PM  
**To:** Donovan Arteaga  
**Subject:** Proposed Housing Development at 3500 Paul Sweet Road

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

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Linda and John Heyes  
3400 Paul Sweet Road, Apt D 219  
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

October 24, 2025

Santa Cruz County Supervisor Manu Koenig  
701 Ocean Street, Room 500  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Opposition to Proposed Housing Development at 3500 Paul Sweet Road

Dear Supervisor Koenig,

We have lived for almost two years at Dominican Oaks, a retirement community at 3400 Paul Sweet Road. This letter expresses our firm opposition to the proposed six-story, 105-unit development next to our campus. We believe this project threatens the safety, security, and quality of life for our residents, many of whom are older adults with mobility challenges.

If it is approved, we are concerned that traffic during the construction phase could limit road access to Dominican Oaks, and that the increased competition for parking could significantly delay or block the ability of residents and emergency vehicles to reach Dominican Hospital quickly in times of emergency. The Hospital is our neighbor and the only heart and primary stroke receiving center in Santa Cruz County. Safeguarding reliable access to medical care should remain a priority for planning decisions in our area.

Also, Paul Sweet Road is the only evacuation route for Dominican Oaks and for neighboring residences and businesses. Our community alone has more than 200 senior residents, many of whom will require more time and assistance to evacuate during a fire or other emergency. In addition, the area is surrounded by forest, which increases the danger of wildfire and makes safe evacuation even more critical.

We are concerned about the prospect of a six-story building looming over our community and seriously reducing the privacy of residents, especially those whose apartments directly face the proposed construction site. If the housing development comes to pass, increased traffic, congestion, noise, and delays will threaten the peaceful environment that we came here to enjoy.

We do understand the need for more housing in Santa Cruz County, and we support well-planned initiatives to achieve this goal. Furthermore, Dominican Oaks contributes by serving as the only affordable senior housing facility in the

County. Nonetheless, this particular project is not suitable for our location. It jeopardizes emergency access, evacuation safety, and the wellbeing of hundreds of vulnerable seniors.

We respectfully urge you to oppose this proposal and to protect the safety and quality of life for Dominican Oaks residents and the surrounding community. Thank you for caring about our neighborhood.

*Linda and John Heyes*