

City of Redwood City
Community Workshop on Laurel Way Project
Tuesday, March 29, 2011
Community Activities Building
1400 Roosevelt Ave, Conference Room 2
7:30 – 9:00 PM
NOTES

Meeting Purpose: *A Community Dialogue including background information and updates on the Laurel Way project as proposed, and an outline of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process as an opportunity for participants to discuss and provide feedback on the project.*

Present: Charles Jany and Sailesh Mehra from the City of Redwood City Planning Department, Pamela Thompson from the Attorney's Office, Rick Jarvis, special Counsel for the City, Oded Haner, representing the Laurel Way Project property owners, other property owners, area residents and interested parties. The meeting was facilitated by the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC.)

Mr. Jany welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced City staff before introducing PCRC as the neutral facilitators of the meeting. He reminded everyone to use the sign-in sheet which would be used by staff as a contact list.

Mr. Mehra provided a Power Point presentation on the Laurel Way Project outlining:

- History of the subdivision
- Laurel Way project area
- City Council policy regarding any proposed development
- CEQA process
- Environmental Review (EIR) topics
- Meetings on Project to date
- Public Comments & Environmental concerns
- Next Steps in Process
 - next steps for applicant
 - stakeholder timeline
 - City timeline

There was a question and answer session followed by small group discussion guided by the following questions:

1. *What do you like about the proposal?*
2. *What concerns you?*
3. *How could your concerns be addressed?*
4. *What additional information do you need about this proposal?*

Participants divided into three small groups facilitated by PCRC. Each group included area residents, Laurel Way Project property owners and interested parties. Staff and Mr. Haner circulated among tables as resources.

GROUP 1

1. *What do you like about the proposal?*
 - Positive that all neighbors get to know each other
 - I have not gone to every meeting. If houses are 1500 square feet that would bring in more young families to the neighborhood. Like the idea of young families

2. *What concerns you?*
 - Not sure what the proposal is
 - Don't like the Project
 - City does not maintain Highland Ave. This Project will make it worse
 - Problem is there is no proposal
 - Confirms that City Council does not listen
 - Number 1 concern is stability of the land. Concerned about landslides
 - Concerned about houses on North side of cul de sac.
 - The EIR is difficult to understand. Is the EIR trustworthy?
 - Issue of evaluation the credibility of the EIR
 - The wildlife has not been addressed. Only one day to say you didn't find the endangered species
 - Road problem. Project will lead to more pot holes, more cars, more parking problems
 - Disruption during construction - 8 more years
 - Slump landside mentioned in the past
 - Concern that land serves as a watershed. The runoff from 18 new homes adds more.
 - If there is pressure on City to approve this because they receive revenue – that is not a natural process. It is not right

3. *How could your concerns be addressed?*
 - Follow example - have two moderate size homes on three lots. Have homes that are appropriate size for the conditions
 - Long term assurance for protection of their investment – their home.
 - As property owner, these are good questions
 - If people have questions, make sure they can get right information
 - Does not want message to provide “simple explanations”
 - Impact on each homeowner different – but care about others as well

4. *What additional information do you need about this proposal?*
 - Is there a control for speculation? If for young families may be more amenable
 - How come the home owners are not joining in the group on the application?
 - If project is approved and later they have cracks in the house, who is responsible?
 - If Japanese scale of earthquake – 9.0 – what will happen to the homes?

GROUP 2

1. *What do you like about the proposal?*
2. *What concerns you?*
 - Existing infrastructure in bad shape on surrounding streets. How can we then add to already fragile infrastructure?
 - Too high density
 - Fragile area
 - Steep
 - Water draining down
 - Development too large for lots
 - Concern EIR is not worst case scenario but the developer's dream scenario
 - Doubt integrity of EIR. Why could developer input maximum buildable house size? Why wasn't it done relative to maximum size of house in the neighborhood?
 - Traffic impact with a minimum of 36 additional cars
 - Repairing road
 - Soil erosion
 - One house previously slid down the hill
 - If City widens the road, some homes will lose a portion of the front of their properties
3. *How could your concerns be addressed?*
 - Open space lot size is included in averaging the size of all lots. This makes ratio % of lots to house sizes inaccurate. EIR should be changed to reflect this discrepancy
 - Address concerns by conforming to current building codes on hillsides
4. *What additional information do you need about this proposal?*
 - If the City isn't responsible for utilities and infrastructure, who is responsible for safety services, including fire? ANSWER: Proposed roadway has to allow for public safety access
 - Is there a limit on # of construction starts/year?

GROUP 3

1. *What do you like about the proposal?*
2. *What concerns you?*
 - Danger to homes below the news homes because of slope
 - EIR did not include adjacent areas. It should
 - Outcropping tree #193 not addressed
 - Have ton of questions we need City and developers to answer rather than talk to ourselves for the rest of the night.
 - Current regulations prohibit slopes over 30%. Only 2 lots are buildable under current regulations
 - Sets precedent. Could translate to building on other substandard lots

- In absence of Planned Development (PD) the developer would like a hypothetical PD for 30% slope lot. Five acres that includes following criteria
 - Elevations, roads, driveways, profiles. Is their proposal even feasible?
 - Bio-retention basins supposed to gather water and dissipate gradually. Lot of deep water. Goring to pave 5 acres. Will make drainage worse. Don't think Plan will work.
 - EIR did not adequately address seismic impacts
 - We will lose year round creek to retention. Prefer natural flow year round
 - Mitigation measures insufficient. Totally subjective
3. *How could your concerns be addressed?*
- 46.7a and 46.7b – plan should follow City's criteria for number of units
 - Want City to look out for safety of citizens. Apply zoning laws
 - City provide FAR (Floor/Area/Ratio)
 -
4. *What additional information do you need about this proposal?*
- Who's liable in case of slides? Who will pay?
 - Does EIR reflect slides in past?
 - Utility trench through outcropping makes no sense. How does trench affect outcropping?
 - Will someone post a \$25,000,000 bond to protect homes below?
 - What is the development procedure? Cut? Trench? Step by step exactly what they're going to do.
 - Like to understand how creek downstream will be affected in normal and in storm conditions.
 - How much will the bio-retention basins hold?
 - How mitigate 10 years of construction traffic?

Next Steps:

Mr. Jany outlined the next steps in the process:

- The information gathered at this meeting will be typed up by the PCRC staff and submitted to the Redwood City Planning Department.
- Notes will be emailed to everyone who supplied email addresses on the sign- sheet.
- Notes will be placed within the project information file already on the web.
- A public hearing date for the City Council meeting on the appeal of the project EIR will be set by the City Clerk, City Attorney and Mayor.
- Interested parties (everyone who signed in at the 3.29.11 community meeting, and everyone on the City's mailing list in the project file i.e. 300-foot radius, plus those who have requested notification) will be notified of the hearing date by Redwood City Planning Services.

