Dear Planning Commission,

I wanted to point out that the zoning changes increase the maximum height to 4 from 3, up to 6 with a bonus. I think this is a positive change of the plan - I support increased density, particularly of housing, which will allow more people to move closer to the improvements the plan makes to ECR.

Thank you,
Tim
Dear Planning Commission,

1. When it was discovered that second hand smoke had deleterious impacts on the health of others the solution was not to discourage NON-smokers from going to work, restaurants and public places. Smoking was limited. So, if cars are damaging the health of others, (by both emissions and hitting them) shouldn't we limit cars, not pedestrians, cyclists and residents?
2. We are in one of the most expensive markets in the world. More housing is a good thing. Doubling the heights of housing would be awesome. And, as Tania correctly points out, if the cars present a risk to the residents, shouldn't we limit cars, not living in a home?

Bella
From: Kris Johnson  
Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2017 11:21 AM  
To: GRP-Planning Commissioners  
Subject: Fwd: Live/work zoning

Planning Commission,

Thank you very much for the engaging and healthy discussion involving the El Camino Corridor last night. In my haste, I neglected to mention that my speech (included below) includes additional detail that I was unable to cover in the three+ minutes I was given.

Based on what I heard last night from the Commission, members of the CAG and staff, I want to reiterate my concerns about any effort to up-zone the live/work zoning area of the corridor. I appreciate Vice-Chair Bondanno’s comments about ensuring that this will be a separate process. It’s still not clear why this proposed short-term rezoning strategy (included in the Draft) was glossed over with the CAG and I look forward to future opportunities for clarification.

Regards,  
Kris Johnson

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kris Johnson  
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2017 8:31 PM  
To: GRP-Planning Commissioners  
Subject: Live/work zoning

Dear Planning Commission,

Here’s the text of my speech this evening. Thank you for my consideration.

Regards,  
Kris Johnson
My name is Kris Johnson and I am a 17-year resident of RWC. I live a few blocks from Downtown and walk and bike often on El Camino.

I have read the Draft El Camino Corridor Plan and it's an impressive undertaking. The importance of this Plan was illustrated to me the other day when I saw drove down El Camino and marveled at the new Caltrain multi-modal Transit Center in San Carlos. They spent 10’s millions of dollars on that state of the art Center and strangely they couldn’t find a way of including bike lanes on El Camino. Not only did they not paint bike lanes but there isn’t even room for them if they decided to add them down the road. I asked the Mayor of San Carlos why there were no bike lanes and he said it was up to Caltrans. Unfortunately, if you leave things up to Caltrans to decide what’s best for your community, then you know what the results will be.

So thank you City Staff and Redwood City Council for having the foresight and taking the initiative on this Plan. It is imperative that we decide as a community what the corridor looks like — what it becomes. I would like to the thank the members of the community who dedicated time over the course of the last year to this effort. Your commitment and contributions are greatly appreciated.

For those of you from the Advisory Group who are present this evening, you might remember me speaking early on in the process about my concerns about any effort to use this an opportunity to up-zone in the corridor. I was specifically told by a staff member and member of the Advisory Group that evening that up-zoning was not part of your purview.

In fact, the City website for the Plan says "The Corridor Plan will provide a detailed review of the existing conditions and build off of the existing development standards to create a comprehensive plan for the entire corridor. The plan will not increase height limits or intensification beyond existing zoning standards."

You can imagine my concern when I read on page 43 of the Draft report lists one of the suggested strategies. “Rezone the current MULW zoning districts as MUN or MUC with a Live/Work Overlay.” Changing the live/work zoning to MIxed-use
Corridor (MUC) would systematically double the building heights that are currently allowed in this area of the City.

As many of you are already aware, Redwood City already allows taller buildings in its Downtown and Mixed-use corridor than any other City on the peninsula from SF to SJ. And for those of you who we may not be unaware, Sequoia Station is zoned for 10 stories at El Camino and 12 stories along the tracks (all courtesy of our DTPP). So I hope you can understand why members of the community might be concerned about any effort to up-zone areas of the corridor. Look around…Redwood City does not have a problem with attracting developers.

In fact, three developers have made recent purchases in the mixed use live/work zone area: 1) Premia Capital is in the process of finalizing a deal for the long abandoned lot directly across from Main & Elm restaurant and has already drawn up plans for an impressive office project with significant community benefits, 2) WL Butler has purchased multiple properties in the live/work zone since the zoning was adopted in 2013 and, 3) Greystar is in the process of acquiring multiple properties in this area of the City for an obscene project that has more office space than currently allowed in the DTPP. All three have all made recent investments in the live/work areas based on current zoning, not on what zoning might be some day.

While I agree there are challenges with live/work zoning, I strongly disagree with any suggestions that the l/w area needs complete rezoning in order to facilitate investment. This proposed rezoning was glossed over and not discussed in depth with the Advisory Group but somehow made it to the report and also made it to the “short term” implementing action (page 68 of the Draft Plan). It’s only been 4 years since the zoning was changed live/work. Is that really enough time to judge the effectiveness of l/w zoning especially given recent purchases by developers? Please consider discussing tweaks to the existing zoning if necessary but pause any talk about converting this area to mixed-use corridor (thus doubling the heights of buildings allowed) and please don’t allow office space as a permitted use but continue to treat it as a conditional use in the live/work area of the City. I recognize we are not here this evening to craft zoning policy but the inclusion of verbiage that suggests we should re-zone the live-work zoning in this Draft report concerns me and many members of the community greatly.

Thank you.

Kris Johnson
November 7, 2017

Redwood City Planning Commission
c/o City Clerk
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Honorable Planning Commissioners,

The Redwood City Parks and Arts Foundation Board of Directors has reviewed the proposed El Camino Real Corridor Plan and discussed the sections, goals, and strategies that are relevant to the mission of the Foundation. We are writing to ask for your support and prioritization of the following elements that we find most crucial to the future of parks and public art throughout the corridor.

Section 4.3:
“4J Work with Sequoia High School to improve public access to open space on the school campus, particularly at the corners of Broadway and James”

“4M Establish new standards and guidelines with respect to the provision of parks and plazas for development within Activity Centers”

We look forward to working with you on these ventures on behalf of our community.

Sincerely,

Mac Hart
Board Member
Redwood City Parks & Arts Foundation

1400 Roosevelt Ave, Redwood City, California 94061

www.rwcpaf.org
facebook.com/rwcpaf
twitter@rwcpaf
Dear Planning Commission members,

Thank you for your support of the Redwood City El Camino Real Corridor Plan at the meeting last night and in particular your dedication to protected bike lanes and the safety and movement of everyone. I think it is a bold and visionary plan and am looking forward to its adoption and implementation.

I wanted to also make a few clarifications from statements at last night’s meeting.

1. There was a suggestion to explore parking-protected bike lanes. We support that as an option, however, due to space limitations, it would require the removal of a travel vehicle lane. This is why the tradeoffs debated at the CAG and Commission are so important. It would be great to fit the current travel lanes, parking, and a protected bike lane, but that is not possible within the right of way available.

2. A question came up regarding Menlo Park’s El Camino Real process and the concerns of the fire department. In fact, having a protected bike lane on El Camino Real could provide more room for emergency vehicles needing to pull over or avoid stopped car traffic. This is because the protected bike lanes would be replacing a parking lane that could be full of inanimate vehicles. Redwood City can explore options for flexible or mountable barrier treatments that are spaced to allow emergency vehicle access when needed.

3. I agree that it is crucial to coordinate with neighboring cities on their bike network. As mentioned, Menlo Park and Atherton have looked at buffered and protected bike lanes on their portions of El Camino Real. I feel that if Redwood City embarks on this project, then those cities would be more likely to follow. Mountain View included bike lanes in their El Camino Real Plan in 2015. To the north, San Carlos hasn’t focused on El Camino Real, but Old County Road is a good parallel route that can be accessed from Arguello from downtown Redwood City or from Whipple if coming from the west of El Camino Real. Belmont and San Mateo have also looked at bike facilities on El Camino Real but have not made any plans. Redwood City could be the start of it all.

4. At the same time it is important to make these connections to the surrounding bike network, this would still be an essential improvement to Redwood City’s bike network allowing access for people biking to a key commercial district with an abundance of housing.
Thanks again for your thoughtful consideration of this plan. In closing, I’m attaching a factsheet on protected bike lanes that we put together this year. I look forward to continuing to be involved in this process. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Emma

--
Emma Shlaes
Policy Manager
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
96 N. Third Street, Suite 375
PO Box 1927
San Jose, CA 95109
Office: 408-287-7259 Ext. 228
Cell: 650-703-1191
http://bikesiliconvalley.org

SAVE THE DATE: 12.1.2017: Join us at Freewheelin’: SVBC's Annual Member Party December 1 to celebrate the importance of members like you in making our work successful. Join/renew your membership today!
Factsheet: Protected Bike Lanes

A protected bike lane uses barriers such as planters, curbs, parked cars, or posts to physically separate cars and people biking. Protected bike lanes add the most protection and comfort for a wide range of users. People driving and biking prefer protected bike lanes because they added the sense of predictability of people biking and an increased sense of safety. Protected bike lanes are also referred to as a ‘Cycle Track,’ ‘Separated Bikeway,’ or ‘Class IV Bikeway.’

Protected Bikeway Act of 2014: The State of California recently created an official category of protected bike lanes and flexible guidance on how to implement them in the community. Previously, the lack of official guidelines from the state created obstacles for cities that wanted to add protected bike lanes and did not have consistent standards or other design resources. For detailed information, please see Caltrans "Class IV Bikeway Guidance" (www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/design/SeparatedBikeway_FinalDraft_DIB89_112315.pdf).

Various Types of Barriers Used for Protected Bike Lanes: The design guidelines recommend a variety of effective barrier types used for protected bike lanes, allowing for flexibility in design, depending on existing road conditions. (Photos sourced from FHWA Protected Bike Lane Design Guide.)

Flexible or ridged bollards

Raised median or concrete barrier

Planters

Parked cars

Protected bike lanes in the US have increased rapidly:

- Since 2010, San Francisco has installed about 13 miles of protected bike lanes and plan on having 15 more miles completed by the end of 2017. (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, 2016. “A New Generation of Bikeways.”)
- New York City has installed over 30 miles of protected bike lanes between 2007 and 2014. (New York City Department of Transportation, 2014. “Protected Bike Lanes in NYC.”)

Source: People for Bikes, 2017. “The Green Lane Project is Complete.”

Contact: Emma Shlaes, Policy Manager, emma@bikesiliconvalley.org

May 2017
Factsheet: Protected Bike Lanes

Research from other cities shows that adding protected bike lanes leads to decreased collisions, increased safety, increased people biking, increased health and environmental benefits, and increased business/investment.

Safety:

- Within a year, Telegraph Avenue in Oakland saw a 40% decrease in all collisions after installing parking protected bike lanes. (Oakland Department of Transportation, 2017. “Telegraph Avenue Progress Report.”)
- New York City had a total decrease in collisions by 20% from 12 protected bike lane projects. (New York City Department of Transportation, 2014. “Protected Bike Lanes in NYC.”)

More People Biking:

- Valencia Street in San Francisco saw a 140% increase in people biking after adding bicycle facilities. (National Complete Streets Coalition, 2012. “Complete Streets in California.”)
- Telegraph Avenue saw a 78% increase in people biking. (Oakland Department of Transportation, 2017. “Telegraph Avenue Progress Report.”)
- Columbus Avenue in NYC saw the number of people biking increase by 51%. (New York City Department of Transportation, 2014. “Protected Bike Lanes in NYC”)
- These projects saw the number of people biking increase while collisions and travel times decreased or remained consistent.

Good for Business:

- Many stores report seeing a rise in business due in part to the increased number of people biking and walking.
- Valencia Street reported a 60% increase in sales after installing bike lanes. (National Complete Streets Coalition, 2012. “Complete Streets in California.”)
- Telegraph Avenue saw a 9% increase in sales after reconfiguring the street with parking protected bike lanes. (Oakland Department of Transportation, 2017. “Telegraph Avenue Progress Report.”)

| Valencia St. | Telegraph Ave. | Columbus Ave. |
| Collisions | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| People Biking | ↑ | ↑ | ↑ |
| Travel Time | ≈ | ≈ | ↓ |
| Economic Benefits | ↑ | ↑ | N/A |

Contact: Emma Shlaes, Policy Manager, emma@bikesiliconvalley.org
Subject: FW: El Camino Corridor plan

From: Jihan Bayyari
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 5:40 PM
To: GRP-Planning Commissioners
Subject: El Camino Corridor plan

Dear planning Commission,

As a resident, business owner, parent and cyclist. I would love to see the protected bike lanes along El Camino.

We all know that painted lines would do nothing to encourage people to use El Camino. The parking along El Camino is hazardous as worst and inconvenient at best.

This would be amazing to enhance our city as the progressive city we see it changing into.

Thanks for your time, 

Jihan Bayyari
Owner Cyclismo Cafe
Mom
Bike Rider
Subject: FW: In support of protected bike lanes on El Camino Real corridor in Redwood City

From: Ever Rodriguez
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 3:38 PM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-Planning Commissioners
Cc:
Subject: In support of protected bike lanes on El Camino Real corridor in Redwood City

Dear Council members,

This note is in support of protected bicycle lanes along the corridor being planned on El Camino Real in Redwood City.

This corridor is crucial to our community of North Fair Oaks, particularly on the side of the Selby Lane neighborhood. Many families would benefit from having a safe bike route to shops and many other services along El Camino Real and in downtown Redwood City, and this could alleviate vehicular traffic tremendously by reducing the number of local cars transiting this segment. In addition, many of our students attending Sequoia High School would be able to travel the short distance safely through a protected bike lane. Protected bike lanes provide safety to all cyclists while providing peace of mind to automobile drivers.

Finally I would like to emphasize the environmental benefits that such bike lanes could yield, and to mention the positive influence that your decision could bring to adjacent cities also considering the same issues along El Camino Real.

Promoting a cycling culture begins with a sound and safe infrastructure. Please plan and support protected bike lanes along El Camino Real corridor in Redwood City.

Thank you very much.

With best wishes,

Everardo

******************************************************************************

Everardo Rodriguez

Chair,
North Fair Oaks Community Council
San Mateo County, California
erodriguez@NFOCouncil.org
******************************************************************************
October 4, 2017

Chair Radcliffe and Members of Redwood City Planning Commission
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063
Attn.: Lindy Chan, Planner <lchan@redwoodcity.org>

RE: El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Dear Chair Radcliffe and Members of the Planning Commission,

The Sierra Club Sustainable Land Use Committee has reviewed the El Camino Real Corridor Plan proposal. We are enthusiastic in our appreciation of the detail and thoughtfulness of the recommendations.

We would like to call special attention to a few items in particular

1. Bike Lanes on El Camino:

Redwood City has proved itself a leader among peninsula cities in the development of a Transit Oriented Downtown with a much better mix of housing and jobs than many peninsula cities.

Our City can provide leadership for the Grand Boulevard Vision for other cities to follow. Visualizing El Camino as a truly Complete Street is supported by the Citizens’ Advisory Group (CAG) proposal.

The Sierra Club supports protected bike lanes on El Camino and designing for pedestrians. If bicycling is to be successful on El Camino Real, ensuring safety is of paramount importance. Public input to date has provided strong support for separated bikeways with a physical barrier (known as Class IV). Physical barriers improve safety for people riding bicycles as well as for the people driving cars next to them.
2. Pedestrian Priority and Vision Zero

Zero collisions:

Wider level sidewalks and reduced traffic speed with compact roadways are the two goals we should work towards.

Reduced speed is the most effective means of avoiding accidents and fatalities. Evidence shows that drivers are more likely to accept reduced speed measures when the road design makes it intuitively clear. It is important to post reduced speed limits, use narrowed roads and add other measures to discourage speeding, such as smaller radius at turns, bulb-outs, etc.

3. Parking:

The survey showed that existing parking is underutilized along El Camino

Use Public Art Program for better utilization of Parking:

We propose Redwood City's lively Public Art program includes a special program to direct drivers to underutilized public parking in the rear or underneath buildings. Make this part of the graphics branding along El Camino

Parking demand management: All parking should be paid parking – for housing as well as employee parking.

Parking should also be shared so that valuable parking spaces are most efficiently used with Smart Parking Apps that track available parking.

A Transportation Management Association that covers the entire Downtown and El Camino Corridor would be able to coordinate these efforts.

1: New technology designed to prevent accidents, such as automatic braking to maintain vehicle spacing and automatic steering to prevent lane wandering, may have a greater positive effect on both safety and capacity when the roadway is more compact. The closer vehicle spacing required or encouraged by compact road designs is just what these technologies are intended to cope with

2: http://www.accessmagazine.org/fall-2012/slower-roads-provide-faster-travel/
4. Importance of the Urban Forest - Street trees and street edge plantings as part of improved pedestrian experience and also improved air quality, improved ecosystem (therefore improved health), and they mitigate impacts of tall buildings, by screening them from view\(^3\).

5. RPPP: Extend the residential parking permit program to protect neighborhoods from overspill parking from the Corridor, as needed.

6. Neighborhood should see benefits: Earmark some portion of funds collected from new development projects to improvements that benefit the neighborhood adjacent to the project. Community benefits may also be conferred in the form of direct improvements to the neighborhood, rather than through payment of fees- a publicly accessible open space, treatment at neighborhood entries to calm traffic, including trees, gates, signage, speed humps, paving treatments, sharper corners, etc

We look forward to continued participation in this important element of Redwood City’s transformation.

Respectfully

Gita Dev, Co-Chair

Sustainable Land Use Committee

Cc  City Council, Redwood City
    Aaron Aknin, City Manager, Redwood City
    Mike Ferreira, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club Loma Prieta (SCLP)
    James Eggers, Exec. Dir., SCLP

\(^3\) See image of street with trees
Planning Commissioners,

I will be speaking during public comment this evening and wanted to give a heads-up that it will entail pages 43 & 68 of the Redwood City - El Camino Corridor Plan (Draft). I have attached the pages for your convenience. I am concerned about any discussion to modify or change the mixed use live/work zoning (MULW and MULW-S) that is part of the Plan. I know that the Planning Commission doesn’t take rezoning lightly, thus I'm certain you will give this section of the Plan the attention it deserves.

Regards,
Kris Johnson
GOALS

- Foster a mix of uses along the Corridor, balancing commercial development with new housing opportunities.
- Remove barriers to developing live/work units, while still maintaining the zoning districts’ original intent.

STRATEGIES

3C Rezone the current MULW and MULW-S zoning districts as MUN or MUC with a Live/Work Overlay. Emergency shelters would remain as permitted uses in the same locations that exist under the current zoning ordinance.

3D Identify Live/Work as a public benefit that would permit projects to qualify for the allowable bonus height provisions, especially those projects that adapt or repurpose existing buildings that provide neighborhood character.
## Short-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Corresponding Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td><strong>Live/Work Overlay.</strong> Consider rezoning the MULW and MULW-S districts to MUN or MUC with a LiveWork overlay, which allows LiveWork as a permitted use. Allow LiveWork projects to qualify for bonus height provisions, with a greater bonus permitted (no more than the maximum allowed) for projects that adapt or repurpose an existing building that contributes to neighborhood character.**</td>
<td>3.2, 3.3</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td><strong>Child Care Facilities.</strong> Consider amending provisions in the zoning ordinance for applicable districts to allow child care facilities by right, exempt on-site child care facilities from counting toward the overall FAR, and allow child care facility playgrounds to count towards residential open space requirements, as long as the playground facility is made accessible to all tenants.**</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td><strong>Visibility and Solar Access.</strong> Prohibit or discourage arcades and other architectural features that block natural light and visibility of businesses from the street.**</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td><strong>Right of Way Allocation Alternatives.</strong> Prepare 30% Design Drawings as part of the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant for up to two preferred right of way allocation alternatives for El Camino Real, between Maple and Charter streets.**</td>
<td>1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5</td>
<td>Community Development, Engineering; consultation with SamTrans and Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrics and Monitoring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation Metrics.</strong> Establish metrics (as appropriate) and a monitoring program to enable tracking of implementation of the Corridor Plan.**</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 6, 2017

Ms. Nancy Radcliffe, Chair
Redwood City Planning Commission
C/o Redwood City Planning & Housing Division
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

RE: CAG DRAFT El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Dear Ms. Radcliffe,

First 5 San Mateo County is pleased to see that the Draft El Camino Real Corridor Plan includes supporting and prioritizing the development of child care facilities close to where people work and live along the Corridor.

In 2016, First 5 launched the Build Up for San Mateo County Kids Initiative, a county-wide, collective impact approach to address the need for childcare throughout the County. The Center for Early Learning at the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, along with First 5 and other partners, convened a cross-sector task force to explore this crisis and identify solutions. The Task Force identified the following possible solutions:

1. Work across sectors to reuse/re-designate existing space to increase the number of early learning spaces
2. Work with cities and the county on policies and incentives to prioritize child care in future development, such as Developer Impact Fees
3. Engage large employers to create child care facilities for their employees
4. Generate revenue sources for facility development, and assist providers in drawing down existing funds.
5. Work with cities and the state to ease the permitting process and reduce fees and/or provide tax credits for child care

In a recent needs assessment, Brion Economics, commissioned by First 5 and the San Mateo County Human Service Agency, found that Redwood City needs to create nearly 1,800 new child care and preschool spaces for children ages birth to twelve by 2025 to keep up with demand. To be accessible to middle and low-income families, the majority of those spaces need to be subsidized. Though many child care providers are interested in expanding, the lack of suitable, available facility space is one of the largest barriers to opening new programs.

The issue of child care intersects with community development and the needs of Redwood City’s residents in several ways. High quality child care and preschool, conducted in appropriate facilities, is a critical support to working families. High quality early childhood education has been shown to improve the school readiness of children once they enter Kindergarten, allowing them to do better in school and potentially close achievement gaps. Lastly, the career field of early care and education is a steady source of employment for workers in the county.

As you continue to discuss the skyrocketing cost of housing or excruciating traffic, we urge you to advocate for quality child care in the same way you would support improved roads, expanded public transit and more affordable housing. Prioritization of the development of child care and preschool facilities as a public benefit within the El Camino Corridor Plan would be a critical support to address these child care needs identified by Brion Economics and the Child Care Partnership Council. Quality child care must be a part of our civic dialogue to ensure that our families are supported and our communities thrive.

If you would like further information on First 5 and the Build Up for San Mateo County Kids Initiative, please contact us!

Sincerely,

Kitty Lopez,
Executive Director

www.first5sanmateo.org
November 6, 2017

Redwood City Planning Commission
c/o Redwood City Planning & Housing Division
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

RE: CAG DRAFT El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Dear Ms. Radcliffe and Members of the Planning Commission,

As the executive director of 4Cs of San Mateo County and the co-chair of policy committee of the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council (CCPC), I am pleased to see that the Draft El Camino Real Corridor Plan includes a goal related to supporting and prioritizing the development of child care facilities close to where people work and live along the Corridor.

The issue of child care intersects with community development and the needs of Redwood City’s residents in several ways. High quality child care and preschool, conducted in appropriate facilities, is a critical support to working families. Furthermore, high quality early childhood education has been shown to improve the school readiness of children, allowing them to do better in school and potentially close achievement gaps. Lastly, child care and early learning are a steady source of employment for workers in our community and early learning programs contribute to the economic vitality of the area.

In a recent needs assessment, Brion Economics found that Redwood City needs to create almost 1,800 new child care and preschool spaces for children ages birth to twelve by 2025 to keep up with demand. To be accessible to middle and low-income families, the majority of those spaces need to be subsidized. Though many child care providers are interested in expanding, the lack of suitable, available facility space is one of the largest barriers to opening new programs.

I hope you will prioritize the development of child care and preschool facilities as a public benefit within the El Camino Corridor Plan. It would be a critical support to children and families, a healthy and sustainable community, as well to address the community needs identified by Brion Economics and the CCPC.

Sincerely,

David Fleishman
Executive Director
Hello RWC Planning Commission,

I just reviewed the latest Corridor Plan slides. As a resident of Redwood City/Emerald Hills since 1993 and the transformation of downtown and it has been an amazingly positive experience.

As for the latest Corridor Plan I love the plan to provide separate and protected bike lanes. We have ridden our bikes downtown to avoid the traffic and today it can be quite intimidating.

At this point, I have only two concerns with the latest plan.

1) Easily Accessible Green Spaces
The plan and slides seem to suggest that it will fit green space here and there. This will be woefully inadequate, particularly when the plan is to increase housing density.

Per, “A Pattern Language” by Christopher Alexandra, People need green open places to go; when they are close they use them. But if the greens are more than three minutes <walk> away, the distance overwhelms the need. In 1971, the Berkeley Planning Department conducted a study which showed that the great majority of people living in apartments want two kinds of outdoor spaces above all others: (a) a pleasant, usable private balcony and (b) a quiet public park within walking distance.

The recommendation is that green spaces be uniformly scattered throughout a city. Make the greens at least 150 ft across and at least 60K square feet in area.

I realize the above is a significant challenge to provide retroactively, but I ask that this be a strong consideration in future plans. Question - is there any building code that requires a builder to provide a percent of green space similar to providing parking spaces?

2) Building Height Restriction
The spate and more important, the height, of new RWC apartment buildings the past few years has been alarming. Understood that there is a housing shortage on the peninsula, but this is changing the overall “feel” of RWC which in my book is not good. I suspect you have heard from others RWC residents on this topic, but going forward, hope you will consider limiting the number and height of new apartment buildings.

Another excerpt from “A Pattern Language”.

High buildings have no genuine advantages, except in speculative gains for banks and land owners. They are not cheaper, they do not help create open space, they destroy townscapes, they destroy social life, they promote crime, they make life difficult for children, they are expensive to maintain, they wreck the open spaces near them, and the damage light and air and view. But quite apart from all of this, which shows that
they aren’t very sensible, empirical evidence shows that they can actually damage people’s minds and feelings.

…In any urban area, no matter how dense, keep the majority of buildings four stories high or less. It is possible that certain buildings should exceed this limit, but they should never be buildings for human habitation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Amy Martin

415 Upland Road
Redwood City
November 2, 2017

Ms. Nancy Radcliffe
Chair
Redwood City Planning Commission
c/o Redwood City Planning & Housing Division
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

RE: CAG DRAFT El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Dear Ms. Radcliffe,

As the co-chairs of the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council (CCPC), we are pleased to see that the Draft El Camino Real Corridor Plan includes a goal related to supporting and prioritizing the development of child care facilities close to where people work and live along the Corridor.

The CCPC is a community-based advisory council to the Board of Supervisors and the San Mateo County Office of Education, and in our most recent community needs assessment, we identified a need to increase both the supply and the quality of child care and preschool facilities in San Mateo County in general, and Redwood City specifically.

The issue of child care intersects with community development and the needs of Redwood City’s residents in several ways. High quality child care and preschool, conducted in appropriate facilities, is a critical support to working families. Furthermore, high quality early childhood education has been shown to improve the school readiness of children, allowing them to do better in school and potentially close achievement gaps. Lastly, child care and early learning are a steady source of employment for workers in our community and early learning programs contribute to the economic vitality of the area.

In a recent needs assessment, Brion Economics found that Redwood City needs to create almost 1,800 new child care and preschool spaces for children ages birth to twelve by 2025 to keep up with demand. To be accessible to middle and low-income families, the
majority of those spaces need to be subsidized. Though many child care providers are interested in expanding, the lack of suitable, available facility space is one of the largest barriers to opening new programs.

Prioritization of the development of child care and preschool facilities as a public benefit within the El Camino Corridor Plan would be a critical support to address the community needs identified by Brion Economics and the CCPC.

If you would like further information on the CCPC and the need for child care and preschool facilities in San Mateo County, please contact us at CCPC@smcoe.org.

Sincerely,

Dave Pine
San Mateo County Supervisor
District 1
Co-chair

Anne Campbell
San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools
Co-chair