

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
February 10, 2009
7:00 p.m.

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

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Borgens, Commissioner Cronin, Commissioner Gee, Commissioner Holt, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Seybert and Chair Radcliffe

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Ekas, Principal Planner Passanisi, Assistant City Attorney Aranda, Planning Secretary Mateo

GUESTS Colette Meunier, Contract Planner; Audrey Darnell, Impact Sciences

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED: For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, an audio and video tape recording of the entire meeting is available for listening or purchase at the Planning office, located in City Hall, Redwood City.

AGENDA POSTED: Copies of the Agenda for this meeting are posted at City Hall on the Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

1. **ROLL CALL**
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None**
3. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** Barbara Patterson, Redwood City resident, gave the Commission information regarding Cordilleras Creek & Watershed.
4. **CONSENT CALENDAR: No Items**
5. **FINGER AVENUE SUBDIVISION – 50, 80, AND 88 FINGER AVENUE**

Mr. Passanisi stated that this is an application for a 9 lot Subdivision on Finger Avenue.

Colette Meunier, Contract Planner for Finger Avenue Subdivision, gave a powerpoint on the following:

Finger Avenue Planned Development

Existing Project site

3 existing primary dwellings

3 cottages

Immediately adjacent to the creek

Proposed project development

2 entrances

4 houses that back up to Cordilleras Creek

Colette Meunier gave a powerpoint on the following:

Major Project Issues

- Two new intersections along Finger Avenue – a substantial change to the streetscape
- Encroachments into the 25-ft. creek setback. What impacts will this have on the creek and the safety of the homes? What precedent will be set?
- A narrower private street with no sidewalk. Would this access be adequate for bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular traffic? What precedent does this set?
- Are there too many homes proposed for the site?
- Are the individual houses too large?
- Can more trees be retained?
- Will the trees survive the construction of the project?
- Is the storm drain outfall appropriately designed?

Recommended Changes in the Project?

- Minimum setback of fifteen ft. from the top of bank
- No more than 1,000 sf within the 25-ft. creek setback
- Comply with City's Street Design Criteria
- Provide seven guest parking spaces
- Project not gated
- Lots 7 and 8 – comply with front and side setbacks, and 40% lot coverage
- Lot 6 – comply with the 40% lot coverage
- Lots 1 and 9 – setback second stories a minimum of 15 feet with 90 Finger Avenue
- Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 – comply with 40% lot coverage excluding area within the 25 ft. creek setback
- Retain tree #27, tall palm tree with changes in the Lot 7 garage and the Lot 6 house
- Retain Tree #21 with changes to Lot 7 porch
- Replace gabion wall with softscape design
- Revise the project to accomplish the following:
 - Lessen the changes in the neighborhood and impacts to 40 and 54 Finger Avenue resulting from two new intersections
 - Minimize the loss of on-street parking spaces along Finger Avenue
 - Reduce impacts on 54 Finger Avenue
 - Retain more trees
 - Maintain and enhance the existing vegetative screening for 54 Finger Avenue
 - Reduce development impacts to ensure tree retention
- The Project as revised to comply with these changes would come back before the Planning Commission for a determination that the revised project implements all these changes

Planning Commission Actions:

- If findings can be made, adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Approve the Planned Development Permit with project changes. Includes adoption of MMRP, action on the 25-ft. creek setback, and exceptions to the City's street design criteria
- Deny the Vesting Tentative Map – it does not comply with the approved PDP

Next?

- Commission member's questions about presentation
- Applicant presentation
- Public testimony
- Commission discussion and actions

Kirk McGowan, Project Owner, is proud of the design of the project has been working on the project for over 4 years and submitted an application 2 ½ years ago. Everything that they have designed is within the laws, rules and practices of Redwood City.

J.R. Rodine, Applicant, believes that this project is an ideal candidate for infill housing; this land is an underutilized land resource in a community where we need to produce more housing. The site has six existing units which will be removed and replaced with nine custom homes. There is no proposal for a General Plan or re-zoning. One of the major issues with the analysis was the application of slope regulations on relatively flat land. He also referred to the letter prepared by RKH (traffic Consultant) on July 14th that was in the packet regarding the roadway.

The purpose of their Planned Development objectives are to allow for minor deviations of the standards for front, side and rear yard setbacks in order to retain the many valuable trees. If the Planned Development application goes forward they are happy to move the houses forward on lots 1-4 to create a minimum setback of 15 feet. The current application does not show those setbacks, but the Commission can condition that to go forward. The applicant will provide stability for the structures to be built or to prevent the applicant from harming the creek, they believe that through three studies, the Bay Area Geotechnical group and its staff, there will be no impact on the creek. Currently the sites drainage runs out Finger Avenue untreated and flows into Cordilleras Creek without any treatment.

The applicant does not agree with the 15 foot second story setback on lot 1 and 9 (adjacent to Finger Farmhouse). The applicant believes that the Planning Commission's vote in supporting this project will provide much needed refill housing that the City Council has an objective to provide.

Dan McCloud, Project Site Engineer and Project Surveyor, talked about the issue of the slope Ordinance, supplementary lot area requirements for sloping sites. There is a difference of elevation from the front of the property compared to the back of the property. The roadway is 22 feet and staff would like it to be 25 feet with a 5 foot sidewalk, the 22 foot roadway allows for two 11 foot travel lanes, and those widths are actually greater than what is on Finger right now. Another reason they would like to keep the roadway narrow is the run-off potential from the pervious surfaces.

Doug MacBeth, Architect for Mark & Gross Associates (MGA), stated that their goal is to match and exceed the architectural look and style. They are treating each home uniquely and want to provide maximum privacy between new homes and existing homes using window placement. Mr. MacBeth showed a powerpoint of the plans of lots 1-9.

Allen Odriscal, Vice President BAGG Engineers, stated that BAGG Engineers has been studying The Finger Avenue site since June 2006. They believe the project is feasible and have reviewed the project site plan and believes it meets or exceeds the geotechnical recommendations contained in their report. They performed a slope stability analysis of the creek bank; their analysis was based on saturated soil conditions and a maximum credible earthquake occurring at the same time. Based on the analysis

they proposed and engineered setback of 25 feet from the top of the creek bank for stability plus an additional 5 feet for a total of setback 30 feet to conservatively account for any localized erosion of the creek channel that may occur. It is their recommendation that the home sites located beyond the 30 foot setback be supported on shallow conventional type building foundations and those homes sites located within the setbacks should be supported on deeper drilled foundations. In regards to homes sites for lots 1-4 that may be located near or outside recommended Engineering setback, as a precaution the client is considering the use of drilled pier foundations at all four home locations adjacent to the creek. In July 2008, they revisited the site to study stream channel, "the creek bank remains well vegetated with no signs of recent erosion and that the creek banks seem to be in the same conditions as when they first performed the geotechnical investigation." The recommendations contained in the original report were still valid. In Jan. 2009 a third study of Finger Avenue site to address comments made by a reviewer hired by a local neighbor. A third evaluation was done by their engineering geologist/and senior geotechnical engineer to address specific comments of Cordilleras Creek made by Geo Insight, Inc. dated Dec. 2008. They answered comments and the third report was reviewed by the City of Redwood City's Engineering Dept. Most of the comments contained in the geo insight review related to the potential for erosion on the creek and a slow mass behind lots 3 & 4 which creates a bend on Cordilleras Creek. If any erosion were to occur behind the proposed homes there would be ample time to consider and take action if any were needed at all. He referred to the letter by BAGG dated January 2009 regarding the original soils report.

Bob Lanzone, Attorney for the project applicant, stated that the project density is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning and there are no changes requested to either of those. In regards to the Mitigated Negative Declaration they support the work that has been done by Impact Sciences. The issues were the top of creek bank and that has been resolved, there is nothing going into the creek except the storm drain. The historic resources were studied by Dr. Laura Jones, reviewed by an outside consultant for the City and the HRAC, the conclusion is that an EIR is not required and it is not affecting a historic resource. The project stayed at 9 lots because economics of an in-fill project. In regards to the private driveway the 22 feet is more than adequate, it is not a through way, and will work as long as it is accessible to emergency vehicles. The 15 foot setback was accepted by the applicant in accordance with Engineering staff,

COMMISSIONER CLARIFYING QUESTIONS

Commissioner Holt referred to the calculating of lot coverage and if the 40% is only the living spaces or does it include the garage.

Ms. Meunier replied that the lot coverage includes the garage, porches and the 2nd story overhangs.

Commissioner Cronin referred to the creek and in the report it stated that there was no riparian vegetation at the creek. The Geotechnical described the creek as a well vegetated creek. The Commission is getting a mixed definition and it is inconsistent.

Allen Ordisol, stated that they are no experts on the species of plants; their observation is that the vegetation is not disturbed in regards to erosion.

Ms. Meunier replied that Riparian vegetation is a very specific group of plants that grow characteristically along creeks. The creek is well vegetated but does not include riparian vegetation and that is included in the biological report both prepared by the applicant and under the city's direction

Commissioner Borgens would like a clarification regarding if it is a drive way, private road or roadway.

Mr. Passanisi replied that he refers to it as a private driveway.

Mrs. Ekas later clarified that the improvement should be referred to us a private roadway or private street.

Commissioner Borgens asked if there are different regulations requiring driveways versus roadways versus private roads.

Mrs. Ekas referred to the applicant's comments regarding another application that the city is reviewing, and staff was referring to a driveway, driveway apron not the private road inside the project. That project plans include a 25 foot wide road way with a 20 foot driveway and the plans are still under review and will not be discussed tonight.

Peter Vorametsanti, City Engineer, stated that a driveway curb cut is leading up to a garage and is 8-16 feet. A private road has no garage lead up. There are different standards for each of these.

Commissioner Borgens asked why this would not be considered an intersection instead of an entrance into a driveway.

Commissioner Seybert asked what length requirement is needed before something becomes a private road and is no longer a driveway.

Mr. Vorametsanti replied that he is not aware of that because a driveway leads to a garage. There are single wide and double wide driveways 8 feet to 16 feet wide and that a minimum design standard for a private street uses 25 feet width of pavement.

Commissioner Gee asked what the lines mean on the aerial, Property lines and the City limit lines and the different lines on the creek and who is responsible.

Ms. Meunier replied that the parcel along the creek does not exist, the lines are from the GIS system and they use the County Assessors parcel lines.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Hogue, Redwood City resident, stated that he is directly and adversely impacted by this project. He believes that the current plan will destroy the existing quality of life. He has concerns with the diagrams that were presented by the developer at past meetings and workshops that show green grass in places where in reality there were driveways, houses and a creek. He believes there is a necessity for a back yard fence to keep the creek dwellers out of the property yards.

Dan Ponti, 54 Finger Avenue, gave a powerpoint presentation on the following:

Visual Character

- Based on the context of the existing conditions of the project site and its surroundings
- Current context:
 - Unique eclectic neighborhood with long history that is manifested in the quality of its physical characteristics:

- Juxtaposition of two distinctive 19th and early 20th Century subdivisions
 - Homes built between 1869-2008; most in 1920's; styles reflect diversity of ages; two homes listed in City's Historical Inventory
 - Wide range of home sizes (~1000 - >4500 sq ft; avg. ~1700 sq ft)
 - Varied street frontages, nearly 1200' of continuous streetscape on Finger Park Tract side of street; up to 600' on Wellesley Park Tract
 - One of the largest and densest urban forests in RWC not in parkland
- Significance of impact based on:
 - Stark contrast in design, open space, massing, and placement of homes as compared to existing. While design elements of the new homes vary, the home sizes and lot coverage's are uniform and unlike the existing neighborhood
 - Break-up of continuous streetscape with two intersections on Finger spaces < 150' apart impacts the continuity and rural character
 - No pedestrian access in new development and very small internal street frontages creates appearances of a vehicle-centric, isolated community apart from the rest of the neighborhood
 - Loss of large percentage of urban forest with no replacement of lost species
 - >1/2 of the Finger Park tract between El Camino and Hyde Street will be redeveloped; overall scale of the impact is significant
- RTC: Acknowledges that there are some issues with the project but that there is no significant degradation because:
 - Continuation of the same type of land uses that currently exists
 - Homes are similar size to others in neighborhood
 - Development continues streetscape
 - Tree removal/pruning is change but not degradation. Scale is governed by City Tree Removal policies

Homes/Streetscape

- Only 1 house >2800 sq ft near project and on street
- Next closest homes >2800 sq ft in size and on street are ~900' away
- New homes on Finger: 2845 – 2945 sq ft; 15' setback, 39-43% lot coverage
- Adjacent existing homes on street are 1200 – 1930 sq ft
 - Set back ~20' and greater; ~15-32% lot coverage
- Homes across street are 1140 – 2080 sq ft
 - Set back ~20'; ~30% lot coverage
 - 4 one-story and 3 two-story

Trees

- 12 of 41 trees to be removed for development
- Most trees to be removed are adjacent to or visible from the street
- 11 additional trees at risk from construction impacts or poor condition
- Significant canopy removal
- Replacement trees not of like kind – most small (<30') ornamentals

Recommended Modifications Address Visual Character

- Require standard private roadway with sidewalk

- Require Lots 7 and 8 to comply with R-1 front and side setbacks “to ensure that the siting and scale of these houses are similar to other homes in the neighborhood”
 - Reduction on Lots 1-4 lot coverage’s “so that they are similar in scale to other homes on Finger Avenue and to keep the houses proportionate to the usable area of the lots”
 - Retain additional trees and modify home and foundation designs to ensure tree retention
 - “explore alternatives and further revise project to...lessen the changes in the neighborhood and impacts to 40 and 54 Finger Avenue resulting from two new intersection”
- Why are these not in the MND?

Cultural Resources

- RTC mischaracterized point of our comments
- The historical report was not externally peer reviewed. CIRCA was only retained to provide a “completeness” review
- November 2007 HRAC meeting
 - Historical report by Laura Jones
 - Addendum by Julie Cain
 - A land use report of the Finger Farm lands through 1906 subdivision, and display of 1919 Sanborn insurance map, showing few structures on site
 - Context predates all of the buildings on the project site and most all bldgs. in area except Finger farmhouse
 - Criticized by CIRCA who stated that a neighborhood context that discussed how neighborhood developed was important to address impact of the new project
- April 2008 HRAC Meeting –
 - Final historical report by Laura Jones
 - Contains a section called “Historical Context”
 - This section is the Julie Cain land use report from Nov. 2008, verbatim and with no additions or modification
 - April 2 CIRCA completeness review only discusses the additions to the historical report that were included AFTER Nov. There is no mention of context in this review letter
 - RTC: “Mr. Ponti attached to his letter of comment two other peer review letters from Sheila McElroy dated October 7, 2007 and November 5, 2007 but he fails to advise that these were peer review comments on an earlier draft, not the one considered by the HRAC at their April meeting.”
 - Yes, but final draft had the exact same context information as the Nov. Addendum. CIRCA did not comment further on context because It was never modified following the Nov. meeting
 - HRAC approved the report in April 2008 with a context statement that covered only the period of time prior to when structures on the subject property and the surrounding neighborhood were built. The adopted report contains no historic context after 1919
- The neighborhood context should be developed to ensure a complete evaluation
 - An historic resource expert charged to do a “completeness review” called for it
 - Identification in the current General Plan for potential for a district suggests such an action is warranted to ensure that no potential resource is destroyed or compromised
- Geology and Soils
 - MND:

- Some potential for creek bank instability and erosion. BAGG defined a 30' (from toe of bank) setback in the unlikely occurrence that a major earthquake during high-groundwater causes failure
 - Mitigate with piers if construction in the setback zone
 - Homes on lots 1-4 are in the setback zone and will be constructed on piers
 - Comment:
 - BAGG report peer reviewed internally; not by a CEG or GE
 - Parameters for stability analysis not exposed in report
 - BAGG did not recognize existing evidence for creek bank instability, including a large slump that extends up from present toe of the bank 35', so these effects may be underrepresented in the BAGG analysis
 - Foundation distress and presence of small scarp indicative of ongoing small movements of the slump suggesting instability of the mass
 - Grading, filling, and outfall construction in the creek may enhance instability of the slump
 - Mitigation is inappropriate because it does not address slope instability creek-side of the piers
 - RTC:
 - Incorporated BAGG response letter of 1/29/09:
 - Concluded that slump is fill deposited decades ago to accommodate construction of a basement structure on site. Evidence for fill is widespread as indicated by recent straightening of channel alignment and existing retaining walls
 - Minor movement evidence in foundation and land surface is fill settlement and cannot explain mass of material in creek
 - Foundation and old, straight trees indicate no recent movement
 - Retaining walls show no evidence of erosion; erosion not observed in 2 ½ years of study
 - Stream channel is aggrading and soil blocking basement door indicates the stream is not eroding the bank along this area
 - Therefore there are errors in the GEOINSITE report and it does not provide evidence of an impact
 - BAGG's response is argument. They offer another opinion as to origin but provide no documentation to support channel straightening or historical evidence of filling the creek at the site
 - BAGG does not refute the anomalous topography, foundation distress, or settlement of the land surface associated with the feature that we interpret as a slump
 - Observations of undisturbed retaining walls and trees, soil buildup near the basement door, and lack of obvious changes in the creek bank over only 2 ½ years do not unequivocally preclude a bank erosion hazard. Especially if much erosion is episodic
 - Major movement of the slide mass is probably old <1930
 - Foundation distress and ground settlements suggests small adjustments in slide mass and points to its inherent instability
 - Speculation, but likely seismically induced
 - 1838 Peninsula, 1868 Hayward, and 1906 San Francisco earthquakes all would likely have produced ground motions sufficient for failure
 - No strong earthquakes since 1906, which would explain why we don't observe young features

- If true, high probability of future large EQ (>28%) by 2032 that could produce new slides or reactivate old ones
- Bank Erosion
 - Cottage/shed at 50 Finger Avenue
- Soil falls above retaining walls
- Undercutting of banks
- Failure of retaining wall

- Hydrology
 - Flood hazard
 - Floodway at top of bank

- Transportation and Traffic
 - Safety
 - Three intersection, with spacing 145' and 120' violates City standard for intersection spacing (200' minimum; 300' preferred)
 - RTC does not refute this
 - Combination of narrow roadway, lack of pedestrian access, narrow street frontages, create visibility, maneuverability issues
 - Initial RKH Traffic study and peer reviews do not consider internal roadway at all
 - Woonerfs
 - RKH claims project road is consistent with the woonerf concept – cites The Islands as an example
 - Recommendations to deny roadway exemption based in part on safety concerns
 - “A narrower street width would require a sharper turning radius for larger vehicles, which may result in the landscaping immediately adjacent to the driveway being run over, or require more than one back-up maneuver to exit the driveway.”
 - “A sidewalk provides a space for a passenger to exit from a car when being dropped off, instead of stepping into the street or onto landscaping on the lot adjacent to the street.”
 - “A sidewalk provides an area for pedestrian access that is separated from vehicle movement and protected by the curb.”

- Conclusion
 - Clear fair argument for significant impacts relevant to aesthetics, geology and soils, hydrology and traffic.
 - Clear evidence to suggest there is a deficiency in the description in the environmental setting relevant to whether the neighborhood has historic values

- Findings at Issue
 - “the proposed development will provide an environment of physical and functional desirability, in harmony with the character of the surrounding neighborhood or district”
 - “Flexibility with development standards facilitates the retention of the existing trees”
 - Setback modifications actually kill trees on lots 1, 5, and 7
 - Compliance with neighborhood character
 - “...would comply with the required front and side setbacks and maximum lot coverage requirements so that they would be consistent in scale and siting to other homes along Finger Avenue”

- This is compliance with R-1 development standards, not compliance with neighborhood character. No existing home comes close to 40% lot coverage; ALL New homes are near or at the maximum allowed.
 - “The houses would be individually designed, continuing the neighborhood’s eclectic character”
 - Variety is in detailing only – houses are relatively uniform in gross size and siting on lots. Eclecticism also involves variety in home size, frontages in addition to style
- Purpose of a PD Permit
 - Promote the most appropriate use of the land
 - Encourage innovative projects incorporating high-quality architectural solutions, building material, landscaping, etc.
 - Promote most functional and aesthetic relationships between building structures, signs, open space, and parking
 - Encourage the development of quality open space
 - Incorporate stormwater treatment provisions in site planning
 - Housing
 - Proposed development – 9 SF primary dwelling units
 - Allowable w/o PD – 4 primary SF dwelling units; 4 accessory DU’s
 - 1 dwelling unit additional (5 primary)
 - No moderate income
 - Required exceptions:
 - 29 zoning district development standard modifications (24 w/ staff modifications)
 - Creek encroachment
 - Roadway exception (not recommended, but unclear what impacts might be on other mods)
 - Encourage innovative projects incorporating high-quality architectural solutions, building material, landscaping, etc
 - Promote most functional and aesthetic relationships between building structures, signs, open space, and parking
 - Innovative design utilizes and enhances the natural setting
 - Encourage the development of quality open space
 - Comparison with Oakdale PD
 - Incorporate stormwater treatment provisions in site planning
 - Yes, but developments this size all require stormwater provisions now
- Creek Setback
 - 15’ setback with creek revegetation
 - Political compromise to an environmental issue
 - Where there are no encumbrances, reduced setbacks should be granted on basis of science, not expediency
 - Just because 15’ setback is consistent with past practice is no basis for compromise
 - Revegetation requirement a good idea, but should be required min exchange for other project modifications, not reduced back
 - Slippery slope – remember this precedent
 - Other creek side properties will be redeveloped
- Conclusion

- PD proposal, even modified, does not provide an environment in harmony with the character of the surrounding neighborhood
- PD proposal, even modified, does not promote the goals of Planned Development provisions, certainly not commensurate with the number of exceptions that are requested

John Darmanin, Redwood City resident, stated that the 25 foot setback has served well and we should not be ignoring that. He stated that an EIR is necessary for this project.

Bob Moss, Palo Alto resident, stated that the applicant should not be allowed to build in the 25 foot setback of the creek.

Nita Spangler, Redwood City resident, does not want an exception of the 25 foot setback rule. She has concerns with the “U” shaped driveway and with the history of the Finger Property and Wellesley Park.

Richard Izmirian, San Carlos resident and representing the Friends of Cordilleras Creek, stated that the Redwood City setback Ordinance is sound and cannot accept this project’s encroachment into the 25 foot creek setback because other projects may ask for the same in the future. He believes that the 15 foot setback lets the applicant decide the top of bank. The storm water outfall should not happen, it may destabilize the creek.

Jim Gernand, Redwood City resident, believes that today’s hearing is about the communities standards and rules it’s not an economic study that they are doing. The difficulty with this project is the developer’s design to test the limits of practicality by the number of exceptions that are required for the approval of this Planned development Permit application. He referred to the staff report pages 32 & 33 the number of changes to the project if it were to be approved, particularly the discussion related to determination of lot coverage. There have been comments about equitable treatment for the project and he supports that.

Dean Collins, Finger Farmhouse resident, stated that the 100 year storm comes sooner than every 100 years. The last 100 year storm the water came up to his fence at the top of bank. If you allow any development near the creek it will be bad.

Barbara Patterson, Redwood City resident, has worked with creek advocates for about 10 years. In 2009 there are creek encroachment issues that are still being dealt with. Their group teaches respect of the 25 foot setback and restoration of the creek and trees. The Friends of Cordilleras Creek received grant money to encourage neighbors to love, protect and restore the local urban creeks. She would ask for a no vote on the project as is and hopes for 7 or 8 homes on that property and require a full EIR under CEQA.

M/S (Seybert/Cronin) to close Public Hearing
Motion Passed

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Seybert would like these items to be continued, so that they can study all the information received tonight.

Commissioner Gee referred to the creek issue and if there are easements from either Redwood City or San Carlos and who is responsible for maintaining the creek or the

permitting of the retaining walls. He referred to hydrology and how the upstream impacts the downstream, and the speed and volume of the water caused by properties upstream. He would like to know how many private streets are in Redwood City and if this private street on this project is normal.

Commissioner Seybert stated that it is difficult to consider alterations or alternatives to a project when he does not have visual representation of what that means, he would like staff to come back with some drawings.

Commissioner Cronin referred to the EIR versus the Mitigated Negative Declaration and still has some questions about that whole decision making process and why staff went that way.

Commissioner Smith referred to the 15 feet top of bank and asked how that number was arrived at. He stated that if they ever considered piers in the foundation he believes we need to understand how far down they will have to go. He would also like to know the soils report and where they will start encountering some ground water.

Commissioner Gee would like the graphics to be consistent with the presentations and the tables. He would also like to see the tables of the existing neighborhood compared to the application, compare similar information – we have house sizes, but not lot coverage ratios. He disagrees with the use of slope guidelines on this parcel as well as the property line does go into center creek that needs to be counted as a property line.

Commissioner Holt referred to the Mitigated Negative Declaration versus the Environmental Impact Report and how can they evaluate this MND if there are so many changes that are being suggested and why aren't they doing an EIR. She would like to see new alternatives to the project.

Commissioner Gee stated that whatever decision is made he would like it done in a timely manner and would like a resolution for everyone involved so they have clarity of where this is going.

Commissioner Borgens would like to get more clarification on the sign-off from the Fire Department.

M/S (Seybert/Gee) to continue the meeting to March 31st.

Motion Passed

6. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST

7. ADJOURNMENT

M/S: (Cronin/Borgens) to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Passed

The meeting adjourned at 11:02.m. to reconvene at the next Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 2009 at 7:00PM in the City Hall Council Chamber, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, California.