

August 3, 2017

Moshe Dinar
PO Box 70601
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Mr. Dinar:

SUBJECT: Summary of County Comments and Comments/Questions Received at a Major Development Pre-Application Public Workshop on June 21, 2017

County File Number: PRE 2017-00012

Thank you for your participation in the public workshop held on June 21, 2017 at the San Mateo County Government Center at 455 County Center, Room 101 in Redwood City, regarding the merger of two parcels (APNs 069-311-340, 069-311-250) located at 1301 and 1311 Woodside Road in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract of San Mateo County. The subject parcels, currently zoned R-1/S-74 (One-Family Residential; S-74 Combining District), are proposed to be re-zoned to R-3/S-3 (Multiple-Family Residential; 5,000 square foot minimum parcel size) to allow for higher density housing. You provided conceptual plans for an 18,550 square foot, three-story, 10-unit apartment/condominium complex to illustrate potential development under the proposed R-3/S-3 Zoning. The two (2) existing single-family residences are proposed to be demolished. The information and comments exchanged are invaluable in fostering an understanding of the surrounding community's concerns and comments about the project. The purpose of this letter is to summarize the comments received at the workshop and include additional comments received from the County and other reviewing departments and interested parties.

Besides those representing the project, there were about 30 members of the public in attendance at the meeting (20 of which signed the meeting "Sign-In" sheet). Prior to the meeting, staff received an abundance of email and phone correspondence expressing concerns about the project, mainly in the areas of parking, traffic, and density impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

SUMMARY OF CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROJECT

Generally, interested members of the public in attendance at the meeting expressed concerns regarding the proposed re-zoning. There was a strong consensus that the project will negatively impact the community and neighborhood as supported by the comments listed below:



1. **Location and Existing Multi-Family Housing:** Comments suggested that the proposed project is not needed because there is already existing multi-family housing in the vicinity and in the greater Redwood City area. Comments suggested that there is an excessive amount of multi-family housing development in Redwood City and questioned whether the more recent buildings are fully occupied. A member of the public suggested subdividing the parcels to create lots for multiple single-family homes in lieu of a single apartment complex.

Staff Input: Accounting for the combined square footage of both parcels at 13,068 square feet, the existing zoning, R-1/S-74, would not allow for more than two lots which would be the same as the existing condition. Each lot in the R-1/S-74 Zoning District must be a minimum of 5,000 square feet. A re-zoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) would be necessary to create lots which are less than 5,000 square feet in size.

2. **Zoning and Property Rights:** Comments suggested that the rezoning proposal is an act of spot zoning and potentially creates precedence for any parcel in the Sequoia Tract area to be rezoned for multi-family residential development. Comments suggested that the approval of the rezone would result in impacts that violate of the property rights of nearby property owners.

Staff Input: Comments suggested that the proposed rezoning of the two subject parcels would be consistent with the general multi-family and commercial zoning concentrated on Woodside Road. These parcels are among the few remaining along Woodside Road in the vicinity of the project site that are zoned for a single-family residential use. While the County's General Plan (Policies 8.1, 8.3, 8.15, and 8.31) and Housing Element (Policies HE 17 and HE 44) generally encourages the exploration of opportunities for commercial and multi-family residential development in urban neighborhoods and along major corridors such as Woodside Road, rezonings are a discretionary act subject to public comment, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, Planning Commission recommendation, and Board of Supervisors approval.

3. **Visual Impact:** The proposed design of the project does not fit in with surrounding development or the neighborhood. Comments focused primarily on the scale, bulk, and aesthetics of the proposed apartment/condominium complex. The comments predominantly noted that the overall dimension and massing of the three-story complex would not complement the adjacent area of smaller single family homes. There were also concerns about the shadows that the building would cast upon adjacent properties. In addition, many of the comments focused on the modern architectural style, deeming it out of character with the more traditional architecture of the neighborhood.

Staff Input: The proposed size of the building would be allowed if the zoning were to be changed to R-3/S-3. In terms of the concerns regarding architectural style, the project would not require a design review permit, and, therefore, findings regarding architectural compatibility with the neighborhood are not required.

4. **Parking:** Comments suggested that the proposed project will exacerbate parking problems that the neighborhood is already experiencing. The applicant stated that parking needs have diminished over time due to public transportation and that the 15 spaces required per County Zoning Regulations is sufficient for the project. Comments indicated overall disbelief in this statement with most people stating that each apartment would have at least 2 cars associated with it, that the project would result in extra parked cars on Rutherford Avenue, and that the project would severely reduce already limited parking for existing residents. Comments also cited the inconvenience of times and routes of the buses that stop in front of the project site.

Staff Input: The proposed on-site parking spaces comply with the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development pursuant to Section 6119 of the County Zoning Regulations. Additionally, as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, Planning Staff will require a traffic report which will consider traffic and parking impacts of the project and require mitigation measures for significant impacts.

5. **Traffic and Hazards:** Comments suggested that the proposed project will generate additional traffic from the tenants of the proposed apartment complex and create new traffic hazards. Such comments included that, due to the proposed entrance/exit on Rutherford Avenue and "right turn only" from Rutherford Avenue due to the existing street median, the additional cars from the project will create further congestion on Rutherford Avenue, which is already used as a thoroughfare/detour to get to San Carlos Avenue and Atherton Avenue. In addition, many neighbors noted that many cars passing through Rutherford Avenue greatly exceed the posted speed limit of 25 mph and that the additional traffic generated from the proposed apartment complex will exacerbate this issue. Many members of the public requested the installation of speed bumps. It was also noted that accidents have occurred at the intersection of Rutherford Avenue and Montgomery Avenue.

The applicant stated he would work with his traffic engineer to explore the feasibility of orienting the vehicular entry/exit onto Woodside Road.

Staff Input: When the application for the proposed project is submitted, the applicant will be required to submit a traffic report to determine if there will be any significant environmental impacts that may be caused by this project including potential traffic impacts, including the creation of new traffic hazards and the identification of mitigation measures.

6. **Tree Removal:** Comments suggested that the proposed project's removal of several significant trees will eliminate a much needed noise barrier between the single-family residences and the traffic on Woodside Road. The applicant noted that the proposed building itself, as a three-story structure, would provide a substantial sound barrier. A member of the public stated that, despite the proposed size of the structure, it would not abate sound as effectively as the existing trees.

Staff Input: At the time of a formal application, noise impacts will be analyzed through the environmental review process.

7. **Water Supply:** Comment suggested that adequate water service capacity may not be available to serve the proposed project. Such comments included that the existing water main would not have the ability to serve the needs of a multi-family development.

Staff Input: The California Water Service (Bear Gulch) has no comments regarding water service capacity issues at this time. At the time the applicant submits a formal application, the plans will be routed to the California Water Service for review.

8. **Affordable Housing:** Comments suggested that the proposed project will consist of luxury apartments or condominiums that will not be affordable to most of the general public. The applicant stated that the proposed project would have affordable units as required by the County. Additional concerns were raised regarding the possibility of the developer paying in-lieu fees instead of directly providing affordable housing units.

Staff Input: Per State Law, Section 7911 of the County Ordinance Code pertaining to affordable housing cannot be applied to rental properties. An Affordable Housing Impact Fee will be charged. If the applicant opts to create condominiums, 20% of the units (2 units) must be affordable.

9. **Property Values:** Members of the public are concerned that the proposed project will decrease the properties values of the single-family homes in the surrounding area. The applicant stated that property values may increase with the new development due to the quality of the design of the building and landscape.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROJECT

1. **Housing Stock Shortage in the San Francisco Bay Area:** Comments suggest that the density of the proposed project works to address the overall shortage of housing in the San Francisco Bay Area. A member of the public commented that the one of the only ways to combat increasing prices in the housing market is to build more housing. In addition, the proposed apartment complex would make for ideal senior living.
2. **Current Building:** Comments suggested that the single family homes on the two subject parcels are a visual blight to the neighborhood. The properties are not well maintained and the homes should be demolished.

COMMENTS RECEIVED BEFORE THE MEETING

In summary, prior to and after the meeting, Planning Staff received a total of seventy two (72) comments from the public in opposition and three (3) in support of the proposed project. The comments were generally similar to those received during the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER REVIEWING AGENCIES

To date, Planning Staff has received tentative comments from the following agencies:

County Current Planning Section**Compliance of Project Plans with the Proposed R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) District/S-3 Combining District Regulations:**

1. The proposed zoning would allow the proposed project as multi-family residential is a permitted use in the R-3 Zoning District.
2. Upon a preliminary review against the S-3 Combining District Regulations, the project appears to comply with the setbacks required (20 feet front/rear and 5 feet sides).
3. Upon a preliminary review against the S-3 Combining District Regulations, the project appears to comply with the maximum height permitted (33 feet high measured from average finished grade to average roofline of the 36 feet maximum allowed).
4. Upon a preliminary review against the S-3 Combining District Regulations, the project appears to comply with the lot coverage requirement (49.6% of the parcel area covered by structures 18 inches or more above ground where 50% of the parcel size is the maximum allowed). The project proposes 6,560 sq. ft. of lot coverage.
5. Upon a preliminary review against the County Parking Regulations, the project appears to be in compliance with the parking requirements for apartments (1.5 covered parking spaces for each dwelling unit with 2 bedrooms and 1 additional uncovered guest parking space for each 5 units) with fifteen covered parking spaces and two uncovered guest parking spaces.
6. The additional application requirements listed below, as well as the project's compliance with all applicable County Zoning Regulations and General Plan policies will contribute toward Planning Staff's subsequent recommendation to the Planning Commission.
7. Should the applicant move forward with an application for the project as proposed, the required application would include a Merger, General Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and a Tree Removal Permit.
8. The application shall include a traffic study, as prepared by a licensed transportation engineer or consultant. The report shall meet the minimum traffic study criteria as dictated by the County Department of Public Works (DPW), who shall review the study for its adequacy and conclusions. The traffic study must also include an assessment of the traffic impacts from other recently completed or pending projects as well. The findings from this study will be used as a factor to assess the level of CEQA review required.

9. The applicant will need to submit the square footage of proposed irrigated landscaping. The landscaping plan submitted with the application will be reviewed for compliance with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo).
10. The applicant shall include an erosion and sediment control plan with the application. This plan shall identify the type and location of erosion control devices to be installed upon the commencement of construction in order to maintain the stability of the site and prevent erosion and sedimentation off-site. A separate tree protection plan may also be required as part of the building permit. Species and size of trees shall be indicated on the plan (size shall be measured by diameter at breast height (DBH)).
11. Should the applicant move forward with an application for the project as proposed, the application and all supporting documents and materials would be subject to review and approval by several agencies, including but not limited to: County Building Inspection Section, County Department of Public Works, County Geotechnical Consultant, California Water Service, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and Caltrans. Agencies may request additional information if needed.
12. Should the applicant move forward with an application for the project as proposed, the project would be required to pay the Affordable Housing Impact Fee which was adopted by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors (effective August 8, 2016) to offset the impact of new development on the need for affordable housing in the County. The project constitutes new construction. The square footage of the existing single-family homes would be deducted from the overall square footage of new residential construction. The Affordable Housing Impact Fee would apply and the amount would be determined prior to the issuance of the associated building permit.

County Building Inspection Section

13. The proposed project requires a building permit from the County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department.
14. At least one "Guest" parking space shall meet all accessible requirements.

County Geotechnical Consultant

15. The proposed project will require a soil/foundation study for grading (if needed) and building permits.

County Department of Public Works

16. If the project results in parking areas greater than 5,000 square feet and/or impervious surface of 10,000 square feet or more, the project is considered a Provision C3 Regulated Project. Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the applicant shall have prepared, by a registered civil engineer, a drainage analysis of the proposed project and submit it to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. The drainage

analysis shall consist of a written narrative and a plan. The flow of the stormwater onto, over, and off of the property shall be detailed on the plan and shall include adjacent lands as appropriate to clearly depict the pattern of flow. The analysis shall detail the measures necessary to certify adequate drainage. Post-development flows and velocities shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state. Stormwater treatment systems shall comply with SMCWPPP's C.3 Technical Guidance. Recommended measures shall be designed and included in the improvement plans and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

17. Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the applicant shall submit a driveway "Plan and Profile," to the Department of Public Works, showing the driveway access to the parcel (garage slab) complying with County Standards for driveway slopes (not to exceed 20%) and to County Standards for driveways (at the property line) being the same elevation as the center of the access roadway. When appropriate, as determined by the Department of Public Works, this plan and profile shall be prepared from elevations and alignment shown on the roadway improvement plans. The driveway plan shall also include and show specific provisions and details for both the existing and the proposed drainage patterns and drainage facilities.
18. No proposed construction work within the County/Caltrans right-of-way shall begin until County/Caltrans requirements for the issuance of an encroachment permit, including review of the plans, have been met and an encroachment permit issued. Applicant shall contact a Department of Public Works Inspector/Caltrans inspector 48 hours prior to commencing work in their respective right-of-ways
19. Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the applicant will be required to provide payment of "roadway mitigation fees" based on the square footage (assessable space) of the proposed building per Ordinance #3277.

California Water Service

20. Fire service information is needed for building and domestic water needs.

Menlo Park Fire Protection District

21. Fire Apparatus Access is to be provided through 2 points of access: Woodside Road and Rutherford Avenue. Aerial Ladder Access is to be established along Woodside Road where overhead electrical wiring is not located. The aerial ladder placement shall meet the prescriptive distance requirements outlined in CFC Appendix D105.
22. Fire apparatus roadways, including public and private streets and in some cases driveways used for vehicle access, shall be capable of supporting the imposed weight of a 75,000 pound (34,050 kg) fire apparatus and shall be provided with an all-weather driving surface. Only paved or concrete surfaces are considered to be all-weather driving surfaces. CFC 2016, Appendix D.

23. NOTE ON FIELD PLAN: All curbing located within the complex that has not been assigned as onsite parking shall be designated as "No Parking Fire Lane". All fire lanes are to comply with MPFD Standard for "Designation and Marking of Fire Lane" since there is only 1 point of access to the complex. Provide a complete no parking-fire lane stripping plan with no parking signage in accordance to MPFD Standard on subsequent submittal: required no parking signage shall be installed at an approved location at entrances.
24. NOTE ON FIELD PLAN: Fire apparatus roadways, including public or private streets or roads used for vehicle access shall be installed and in service prior to construction. Fire protection water serving all hydrants shall be provided as soon as combustible material arrives on the site: PRIOR TO COMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL ARRIVING ON THE SITE, CONTACT THE MENLO PARK FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TO SCHEDULE AN INSPECTION OF ROADWAYS AND FIRE HYDRANTS. CFC 2016.
25. For buildings 30 feet (9144 mm) and over in height above natural grade, the required fire apparatus access roadway shall be a minimum of 26 feet (7925 mm) in width, and shall be positioned parallel to at least one entire side of the building, and the fire lane shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet (4572 mm) and a maximum of 30 feet (9144 mm) from the building. CFC 2016, Appendix D105: Fire District staging areas to be determined for Aerial Ladder Truck Minimum and Maximum climbing angles, if a climbing angle is less than 50 degrees the roadway shall be adjusted to comply to the charging condition listed above. Note Aerial Ladder requires minimum 4 feet setback on any side to allow for outriggers.
26. If applicable, Traffic Opticom Signal Preemption System is required for all traffic intersections controlled with a traffic signal. An encroachment permit shall accompany these installations.
27. Applicant to provide fire flow information through a separate engineered plan showing how this is to be achieved. This document shall be submitted to Menlo Park Fire Protection District for review and approval prior to issuance of grading and building permits. CFC 2016, Sec. 507.5.1 Appendix B Section 105.2 & Table 105.1
28. A public hydrant is required at Woodside Road. All hydrants to comply to the following: All fire hydrants shall be wet barrel standard steamer type with 1-4 ½-inch (114.3 mm) and 2-2 ½-inch (63.5 mm) outlets. MPFPD CFC Sec. 507.5.1 Appendix C
29. Fire hydrants and fire appliances (fire department connections and post indicator valves) shall be clearly accessible and free from obstruction.
30. Means of egress components to include exit pathway throughout use, exit stairwells, exit enclosure providing access to exit doors, door hardware, exit signs, exit illumination and emergency lighting shall comply to CFC/CBC Chapter Ten.

31. Man door providing direct access to the Sprinkler Riser Assembly (for each building) shall require signage on the door accessing riser stating- "Riser Room" or agreed upon language.
32. Approved plans and approval letter must be on site at the time of inspection.
33. Final acceptance of this project is subject to field inspection.
34. Upon completion of work and prior to closing ceiling, contact Deputy Fire Marshal Bob Blach of the Menlo Park Fire Protection District at 650-688-8430 to schedule a final inspection. 48 HOURS NOTICE IS REQUIRED FOR ALL INSPECTIONS.

Before submittal of the formal application, including all plans and materials cited earlier in this letter, please consider the comments discussed above. If you have any questions regarding this summary or need assistance with application requirements, please feel free to contact me at 650/363-4582 or by email at: rpanglao@smcgov.org.

Sincerely,



Ruemel Panglao
Project Planner

CML:RSP:aow – RSPBB0450_WAN.DOCX

cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission
Steve Monowitz, Community Development Director
Lisa Aozasa, Deputy Director
Planning Director, City of Redwood City
Menlo Park Fire Protection District
California Water Service – Bear Gulch
County Department of Public Works
County Building Inspection Section
County Geotechnical Consultant
CalTrans
Property Owners within a 500-foot Radius of the Proposed Project

Interested Members of the Public ("*" denotes members of the public who signed the "Sign-In Sheet" at the meeting):

Jesse Imbach
Patti Cooley
Betsy Webster
Connie Weisman
Micaela Musante
Suzanne Paridy
Craig Paridy
Linda Capello
Lydia Guevara
Supriya Pradhan
Ann Seecombe
Stephanie Herbst
Edward Morosa
Lori Morosa
Anya Drabkin
Steven Enns
Matvey Farber
Karen Roberts
Joyce Jordan
Ann Jona
Janna Sverdrup
Craig Ulrich
Christopher Elkins
Linda Gallo
Rebecca Smith
Pat Hatfield
Colleen Stein
Tracy Clarke
Alan Clarke
Lia Schnipper
Jason Greco
Amy Forrest
Travis Lutz
Anand Chabra
Beverlee Hastings
Anna West
Tim Benton
Jean Gray
Shaun Bloomquist
Scott Spencer
Anup Pradhan
Denise Bullwinkel
Clay Bullwinkel

John Tarantino
Jane Creighton
Terri Mullen
Pamela Schwartz
Maciej Siekierski
Anna Siekierski
Don Russell
Jeremy Schwartz
Mara Sallai
Gerald Janny
Eileen Lepera
Joan Ferguson
Nancy Hubbart
Max Petschauer
Karli Zarcone
Emily Smith
Barbara Reynolds
Kim Freitas
Jeff Frishof
Liz Rhodes
Larry Rhodes
John McGirr*
Douglas McLean*
Leota McLean*
Michelle Chabra*
Peggy Gibbons*
Steve Gibbons*
Marjory Luxenberg*
Emma Fernandez*
Lynn Montoya*
Ulrich Wiedmann*
James Lalikos*
Tai Woltmann*
Robie Bushnell*
Elizabeth Strumpell*
Cuyler Kidney*
Lisa Romano*
Dan Curran*