

Mayor Barbara Pierce
Vice Mayor Rosanne Foust

Council Members
Alicia Aguirre
Ian Bain
Jim Hartnett
Diane Howard
Jeff Ira



City Hall
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063
Voice (650) 780-7220
Fax (650) 261-9102
mail@redwoodcity.org
www.redwoodcity.org

**MINUTES – JOINT STUDY SESSION
PLANNING COMMISSION AND
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
July 11, 2006
7:00 p.m.**

Council Chambers *
City Hall
1017 Middlefield Rd
Redwood City, CA
Ph: 650-780-7233
Accessible to Disabled

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Borgens, Vice-Chair Cronin, Commissioner Holt, Commissioner Radcliffe, Chair Seybert

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Coddling, Commissioner Gee

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: S. Drotos, Dr. Steven Howard, Vice-Chair Andrew Raymundo, Chair John Spotorno

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: T. Gilman

Public Comments Excerpted from Minutes – Complete Minutes Available on-line at

<http://www.redwoodcity.org/government/bcc/plan/meetings.aspx>

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Powers, Glenborough Pauls, stated that he is committed to hear from both supporters and non-supporters from 2004 and listen to the public comment.

Victor Torreanno, Redwood City Resident, is glad to see this project back and would like to see some kind of access to the Bay front. He believes the hotel will be a revenue enhancement.

Fernando Vega, Redwood City resident, talked about how projects were torn down and new projects were put up and their success. Examples are Sequoia Station, Kaiser Hospital and Costco. This project will be a great benefit for the future and for housing opportunities to the younger generation.

Tine Davis, Redwood City resident, fully supports the project and feels Redwood City needs development.

Fred Grosser, Redwood City resident, is anxious to see the whole area developed. He believes this new development really serves the City and the residents. The plan now gives public access, enhances the water features and has a community park. He believes it does not need any office space.

Marc Moulton, Chair of Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County, stated that this is an opportunity to start off a new process that he hopes will take the City toward the completion of some housing that the mid-peninsula and Redwood City very much need.

James Jonas, Redwood City resident, stated that this is the beginning and continued participation is important. He received this notice by e-mail and recommends a forum on-line.

Daniella Gasparini, Redwood City resident, believes that you can't attract workers without housing development. If there is no housing there is no strong business climate. She further elaborated that consideration of this project must include an economic discussion and that there are signs that a significant amount of previously vacant office space may becoming filled and thus the provision of housing is all the more crucial. In conclusion, she stated that there was excellent turn-out for the meeting and that for future meetings the City should track attendance so that the City can document the fact that people participated in the review process.

Judy Serebrin, Redwood City resident, appreciates the community being invited to the first meeting. She is glad that the project is smaller and the public access is improved. She is concerned about the development on the Bay land and that structures and hotel heights are too big. She would like to see creative use of land that is existing and does not want to see any of the bay land filled in. She would also like affordable housing put into consideration.

Chuck Humpal, Redwood City resident, commented on the commutes workers in Redwood City make because they cannot afford housing. He believes that we need to build up instead of out.

Ralph Nobles, Friends of Redwood City, has some concerns regarding the EIR for the former project on this site. This is a different project and its impacts are going to be different, there needs to be either a focused EIR or an Amended EIR. Another concern is the loss of two acres of open water space and that this area was originally a wetland marsh.

JoAnne Kemist, Redwood City resident, is concerned about housing and if she were to ever downsize to a smaller home this would be a good place. The younger generation has difficulty competing in the world and even if salaries are good (higher) that cannot compete with the cost of living. She also added that the commutes add to traffic congestion and pollution. She also complimented Mr. Powers and is impressed that he has addressed so many of the concerns.

Joel Jensen, Redwood City resident, stated that this will be the future generation of kids and looks like a good fit.

Eric Biland, Redwood City resident, thanked Mr. Powers and stated that it takes two incomes to afford a house in the bay area. He also supports this development.

Lynne Trulio, Friends of Redwood City, supports the project and believes it is a very sensible plan to reach the housing needs. This project is good for families and the public process is great.

Jim Kirkland, Redwood City resident, supports the housing project and believes projects like these will help schools.

Pat Becker, Redwood City resident believes it is important to bring this community together and applauds this process. She fully supports any project that will bring in more housing.

Gail Raabe, Redwood City resident, believes that the issue of water supply needs to be explored further. If we proceed with development on the Bayfront, the community, Planning Commission and City Council needs to understand that there has to be a tradeoff. Based on the City's water plan there is not enough water to do both the Downtown Precise Plan and projects projected along the transit corridor. She would like the City staff to specifically provide information on this water supply issue, relative to this project and what percentage of the Downtown Precise Plan would then have to be cut.

Matt Leddy, Redwood City resident, is concerned about the San Carlos airport and airport traffic and whether or not the development will have an avigation easement. He believes affordable housing is important, but doesn't like the height. He likes the small boat ramp because it would give interaction with the Bay.

Lorraine Rumley, Sequoia Union High School District, is concerned about the impact of school age children. All four Redwood City High School campuses are impacted and full. Transportation for the children is expensive.

Cherlene Wright, Housing and Human Concerns Committee member believes that there is a great need for housing in this community. The project is an attractive place to live and opens up the Bayfront.

Shawn White, Redwood City resident, stated that this proposal is currently within the three acres per thousand standards as the Parks and Recreation Commission proposes and hopes that it will go through the process of being adopted. He would like to see some specifics in park acreage with regards to the Blomquist extension, to include for bicycle and pedestrian connecting to the Bayfront trail.

Ed LaVigne, Sequoia Union High School Union, thanked staff and the Planning Commission for the open process. He would like to know what impact this project will have on schools.

Nita Spangler, Redwood City resident, believes that this is a really complicated project and would like to see the City Council, Planning Commission, Architectural Review Committee, City staff and County staff to come together and have a series of meetings in which there would be some free wheeling suggestions.

Helen Horn, Redwood City resident, is concerned about the Fire department having access to the homes and dealing with 105 foot buildings and the high density.

Edward Stancil, Redwood City resident, believes what is needed is affordable workforce housing.

Pat Dickson, Redwood Shores resident, does not like the height of the project and would like to see the hotel eliminated and the housing be dropped to five stories equivalent to the surrounding buildings and the land for the hotel be used for additional housing. She would also

like to see “green” housing practices for this construction. She would also like to see the marina left as a marina.

COMMISSIONER AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Commissioner Cronin stated that forums will be the plan for public outreach and discussions.

Committee member Spotorno stated that there could be a lot of potential for a lot of other developments to happen out in that area in the future. It would be important to see what the overall context could be in the future. The ARC will be directly involved as this project moves forward. He would like to see pedestrian and bicycle access make some sort of connection to each side along the lower edge of the project and would like to see multiple connections to downtown.

Committee member Raymundo is curious about the traffic and parking and what will it do to the access in and out. He wanted to know if there was some link to public transportation and that the pedestrian paths should be linked. He would like to know if it is possible to have some of the residential building be walk up buildings as opposed to interior corridor buildings.

Committee Member Dr. Howard stated that he was a huge supporter of the old project. This project needs to maintain a variety, not the same size buildings all along. He would like to see work/live situations and see some level of the hotel used as office space. He believes that the retail next to the community park would be a more sensible location. He also thinks that it would be best to go up in height and try to protect the ground space to create interest rather than just covering the whole thing with four story concrete.

July 11, 2006 Joint Study Session: Planning Commission and Architectural Review Committee Peninsula Park

Public Comment Summary

Comments Transcribed from Butcher Paper Entries

“Concerns”

Sheet 1:

- Development of houses should be discussed in the context of other proposals, e.g. Pete’s Harbor, downtown, etc.
- Loss of wetland area!!
- The water supply is a problem for such a large development
- 101 crossings will cause much congestion
- The high rise buildings are eyesores at the edge of the Bair Island Reserve
- The increase of school age children must be accommodated with a school on the east side of 101
- Hotel in this area inappropriate in view of traffic congestion and family-oriented community
- Must consider connection to public transport
- What do you mean by low cost housing? We need to hear some numbers!

- Higher percent of “affordable” housing – more than 10% - 50% would be better. Less density. More wetlands.
- Workforce housing “along Redwood Creek”
- Mirror Docketown with affordable housing on both sides of creek
- 120 is too high for bay filled land in earthquake area
- A real environmental study not some old used one. But specific study on site!!
- \$ Raise minimum wage – when was your last raise?
- Water – traffic – congestion – isolation. Ditto!!
- No designated site for a new school. RCSD is quite crowded.
- Water flow, dredging, responsible maintenance of RC waterways to regain usage, and contribution or damage to any remaining wildlife.
- Where are the 10 story buildings?
- Taking development away from the downtown area. The downtown core should be where the density is.
- Keep it 5 stories consistent with general plan for Bay Area communities.
- Global warming → rising bay level → increasing costs of levees/pumps/etc. and instability when earthquake occurs
- There should be mixed use (commercial and retail) with higher density development
- Don’t ignore families – don’t assume kids won’t live there or need schools – RCSD is full!

Sheet 2:

- Concern for public safety since the area is sensitive to (earthquake? Couldn’t read word)
- Where’s the live-work space? Support the designers, architects, artists, and young entrepreneurs who make Redwood City fun!
- 10k retail won’t give residents a grocery store = how many car trips in ← → out daily?
- How will fire protection be realistically provided?
- How will the ongoing cost of dredging the bay (creek) be distributed? Citywide?
- Low-cost housing – any planned here?
- We need a large quantity of very-low-income housing (or homes)
- Co-housing opportunities are here! RWC could be a new model for housing options.
- Also consider live-aboard slips, not just pleasure craft. Live-aboard is a creative and responsible use of resources.
- Protect our wetland! Clean up Alviso instead.
- 6 years of pile driving projected. Noise, bad hours.
- No swimming – danger
- Raise minimum wages to afford cost of living
- No water access to Redwood City creek for boats
- Low tide – mud – totally stinky two times a day
- Preserve wetlands – brown pelicans seen along creek. 100s and 100s of egret – mating area.
- Flooding and El Nino – El Nina high tides
- No access
- Does more housing really mean affordable housing?

Sheet 3:

- No esplanade to access other “overlook park”
- Where is the public parking

- We need water for downtown development (housing)
- Airport traffic from San Carlos Airport – planes being redirected over other neighborhoods due to complaints from Peninsula Park residents, or closing down the airport for good
- Traffic – especially after Uccelli’s and Century 12 housing are built
- School capacity impacts and provide space for public schools (high school/elementary)
- Marina portion – make certain the layout/design is functional
- Developer honesty – the MSV materials were misleading with information and details – please speak true to the facts
- How tall are the existing MFUDs??
- We have an environmental consultant. Should we have a housing consultant? I’d like to hear a discussion of SPRAWL vs. DENSITY, i.e. building UP vs. building OUT.
- Is there a need in RWC for hotel?
- 10 stories too tall?
- Will there be live-aboard at the slips?
- Where is public parking for the community park? Hotel?
- How will Redwood Creek be dredged? By whom? How will sediment be disposed of?
- Impact on Bair Island preserve – human encroachment too close. Why fill in wetlands?
- Where will the water come from for the housing units?
- How do commuters (S to N) on 101 get through the extra traffic merging onto 101?
- 796 units = ~1,400 cars – where will they park?

“Likes:”

Sheet 1:

- Hotel – revenue enhancement for City, proximity to commercial in region
- Water element for housing
- Public access to bay front
- Bike/pedestrian path across 101 at the creek. Way overdue.
- Parks, walkways, destination to enjoy for those who aren’t boat owners. This area would be of interest to families to enjoy. Now we have no reason to go to enjoy.
- Pedestrian connection under 101
- A closer connection between RWS and RCW
- Walkway, bike path, city access under 101
- Public park, esplanades, housing – both med and high density, opportunity for high quality architecture
- Scaled down version is much better – all residents in the city can enjoy the walkways and marina
- RWC needs more housing for those employed in this City – will help with transportation on freeways
- Water/walking areas great for exercise
- Development of housing by “infill” and incr. density is desirable, but need more attention to traffic flow
- Great for long term jobs!
- I like that the height is lower this time, not to 75 but better how about 100? ☺

Sheet 2:

- Great new plan – construction jobs and homeowner tax base to fix RWC
- I think the latest plan is very “livable”
- I hope for affordable housing so that the workers mentioned can actually buy these homes. Also, would like to see some priced for our Police and Fire personnel.
- The esplanade – we love the river – it’s about time we could see it!
- Would like to see expert involvement such as army corps of engineers in the harbor and waterway development because ultimately the maintenance will pass to others such as the City as well as the cost
- High density housing as recommended by the Sierra Club
- I like the height. Maybe higher.

Sheet 3:

- Chocolate!
- Housing!!
- Esplanade
- Canals
- Bridges
- Housing
- Esplanades/public access
- Reduced size of project
- Housing! Will it be subsidized financing (silent seconds)? Teachers! Police! Nurses!
- Public access to water – canals and marina
- Community park
- New housing
- Long overdue for housing in this area. Beautiful!
- Reduce jobs/housing imbalance
- Reduce regional traffic congestion
- More time with families ← → less time in traffic
- People who work here should live here and spend money locally!

“Dislikes:”

Sheet 1:

- Impact on Redwood Creek and residents of Docktown
- Primary: permanent loss of marina capacity (once converted, waterfront is LOST to water uses). Also: height and blocked views for RWC residents
- No provision for Redwood City’s need for expanded recreational water access and use (for example, what one would get with a boathouse and a small boat parking area and ramps) for crew, outrigger, dragon boats, etc.
- Height/density/dredging??
- Marina area (water and berths) reduced in size
- This marina was used to mitigate another project years ago; how will we mitigate the bay fill this time around...
- High rise buildings, NO!!
- Need small boat launch
- Blomquist extension bridge
- Loss of wildlife and birds

- Preserve our wetlands – egret mating (100s) bird area
- Unaffordable housing!
- No raises for most workers – even cost of living raises – when was your last raise?

Sheet 2:

- Too high! 75 feet should be maximum – EIR should provide addendum visuals for heights
- Agree ↑ nothing higher than 75' please
- Pulls our city resources out of downtown. Water, etc.
- The esplanade should be U shaped to allow full access (drawing inserted). This would then be a “community” project. Also, parking on this side for folks would be nice.
- Filling in the bay
- Electric power pole and effect on people (EMF) right under them – energy field side effects
- Flooding – and El Nino and El Nina many times each year/roads and access
- Protect our wetlands – go to Alviso instead
- Heavy duty – truck and equipment back-up alarms and work related equipment noise
- Building in the bay destroys the environment
- Not smart growth, no transit access
- What is the open space percent – how does it compare with Redwood Shores 6.0 acres/1,000 residents
- What is the timeline for pile driving – 10 years – 20 years?
- What is parking podium going to look like? Blank walls? (drawing inserted)
- How much bay fill? Any is too much.
- Change pattern of air traffic over RWC neighborhoods
- Egret breeding grounds, brown pelican habitat

Sheet 3:

- Brussels sprouts
- No parking for community park
- Woodside Road will turn into a freeway linking to 280 – and Whipple – and all the side streets we live on! It will be the end of RWC. I saw it happen in Tustin, CA in 1975 - 80 (near Newport Beach).
- Buildings are too tall – should be at 75' maximum height as currently zoned
- Dislike wetland fill. This area was historically wetland.
- I agree/stop filling the Bay – housing does not belong on the east side of 101!
- Schools – Public access is ridiculous!
- “Apartments for firefighters”? PAY THEM MORE MONEY and they can live where they like!
- No emergency exit in case of fire
- Jammed Bair Island Road during commutes
- Address need for water to housing and biz units
- Blomquist extension? Bad idea.
- Marina should be retained – not built up (infill)