
4. LAND USE

This EIR chapter describes the potential land use implications of the project, including:

- (1) project relationships to and impacts on the local land use pattern; (2) project compatibility with nearby residential, commercial, industrial, maritime, open space, and airport land uses; and
- (3) project relationships to pertinent local and regional land use plans and policies.

4.1 SETTING

4.1.1 Existing On-Site Land Uses

The project site is located within Redwood City's Bair Island Road area, an important component of the Redwood City bayfront on the San Francisco Bay (north) side of Highway 101 (U.S. 101). The Bair Island Road area has developed over time with a diverse mix of marina, residential, auto retail, office, industrial, heavy commercial, and open space land uses. The area is currently served by one vehicular access route, Bair Island Road, which is linked to the Whipple Road and Woodside Expressway interchanges with U.S. 101 by East Bayshore Road. An approved secondary access to the area, known as the Blomquist Extension, will pass over Redwood Creek to connect East Bayshore Road with Blomquist Street, providing access between the project site and the Maple Street/U.S. 101 on-ramp. The Blomquist Extension has received the necessary jurisdictional approvals and is partially funded.

The approximately 46.45-acre project site is located adjacent to Redwood Creek and Smith Slough, which flow northward into San Francisco Bay. The site is generally bounded by Redwood Creek on the north and east; Smith Slough and the Bair Island National Wildlife Refuge on the northwest and west; townhouses, auto retail, and offices on the west; and Redwood Creek (with a marina of live-aboard vessels and an aquatic club) and U.S. 101 on the south.

The project site is comprised of approximately 29.45 acres of filled land and 17.0 acres of open water. The existing shoreline is a sloped embankment ranging in elevation from 105 to 109 feet above sea level.

The project site is comprised of two noncontiguous parcels of land, known as the Peninsula Marina property (on the south) and the Pete's Harbor property (on the north), separated by an existing multifamily residential and marina development--the "Villas at Bair Island" and Bair Island Marina--which would remain intact and is not part of the project.

The peninsula which contains the Peninsula Marina and Pete's Harbor properties was filled in stages over a two-decade period from the early 1960s through the mid-1980s.

Existing land uses on the project site are described below and diagrammed on Figure 4.1. Existing adjacent and nearby land uses are described in subsections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 of this chapter, respectively.

(a) Peninsula Marina Property. The open water portion of the Peninsula Marina property until recently contained 427 slips; in November 2001 all of these slips were vacated and removed. The most prevalent land use on the filled portion of the Peninsula Marina property is a five-building office complex owned by the project applicant, Glenborough-Pauls, LLC. The complex includes one two-story and four three-story buildings totaling approximately 90,000 square feet of commercial floor area, including a 1,600-square-foot waterfront restaurant. The property also includes 754 striped parking spaces, as well as three acres of previously graded, undeveloped land in the southwest corner, immediately north of U.S. 101 and Redwood Creek. This undeveloped area includes public easements for: (1) the existing bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Redwood Creek, (2) a planned extension of the San Francisco Bay Trail, (3) the planned Blomquist Extension, and (4) underground municipal utility lines.

There are currently no residential or maritime uses remaining on the Peninsula Marina property. The recently vacated and removed 427 boat slips included 155 official and 50 unofficial live-aboards.

(b) Pete's Harbor Property. The open water portion of the Pete's Harbor property includes an inner marina with 116 slips and an outer marina with 147 slips, for a total of 263 slips. The filled portion of the Pete's Harbor property is occupied by the following land uses:

(1) *Residential Uses.* The Pete's Harbor property contains one mobile home and approximately one dozen residentially occupied recreational vehicles. Within the Inner and Outer Pete's Harbor marinas, a total of approximately 90 boats are currently in use as live-aboard units. The project-related loss of these live-aboards is described under the impact analysis subsection of this chapter (subsection 4.3.2) and in subsection 6.3.5 in the Population, Housing, and Employment chapter.

(2) *Retail and Industrial Uses.* The Pete's Harbor property also includes the approximately 7,000-square-foot Pete's Harbor restaurant. Another structure housing John's RV repair and storage is located in the eastern portion of the property.

(3) *Maritime Uses.* The Pete's Harbor harbor master's office complex is located adjacent to the Pete's Harbor restaurant. The complex also includes restrooms, locked storage compartments, a boat repair facility, and dry storage for approximately 120 boats.

Figure 4.1. Existing Land Use Context 11 x 17 fanfold. page one

Figure 4.1. Existing Land Use Context 11 x 17 fanfold. page two

(4) *Storage Uses.* Portions of the Pete's Harbor property are also used for miscellaneous storage, including approximately 100 numbered metal storage containers and several dozen wooden storage sheds. New cars from off-site auto dealerships are temporarily stored in the northeast corner of the site.

(5) *Parking Uses.* The Pete's Harbor property also contains significant areas of striped and unstriped surface parking.

4.1.2 Existing Adjacent Land Uses

Existing land uses adjacent to the project site are described below and diagramed on Figure 4.1.

(a) Villas at Bair Island. An approximately 12.0-acre residential and marina development, the "Villas at Bair Island" and Bair Island Marina, separates the Peninsula Marina property from the Pete's Harbor property. Completed in 1998, the development includes a four-story, 155-unit apartment complex (three stories of residential atop a one-story parking structure), and a 100-slip marina (approximately five acres of land and seven acres of water). The Bair Island Marina is for use by "Villas at Bair Island" residents only, and is separated from the adjacent roadways, parking areas, and public open space by fencing.

(b) Electrical Transmission Lines. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) holds an 80-foot-wide transmission line easement running east-west directly north of the Peninsula Marina property. The PG&E easement contains two existing parallel electrical transmission lines, a 230-kilovolt (kV) line and a 115-kV line, suspended from steel truss towers approximately 204 feet in height. The PG&E easement segment contiguous to the project site totals approximately two acres in area and encompasses an open space parcel owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). This easement area is identified by the applicant on the project plans as a proposed public park; however, the easement is not owned by the applicant and is therefore not considered in this EIR as part of the Marina Shores Village project description. The existing transmission tower lines within the easement connect to a PG&E substation adjacent to Seaport Boulevard east of the project site, and extend to towers in the Bair Island Wildlife Refuge west of the site.

(c) North of the Site. The confluence of Redwood Creek and Smith Slough is located immediately north of the site. Outer Pete's Harbor is located on the project (south) side of the confluence; undeveloped Bair Island open space previously operated as salt evaporation ponds is located on the opposite (north) side of the confluence.

(d) East of the Site. The western bank of Redwood Creek forms the eastern border of the project site. Seaport Center, a commercial development that includes office, institutional, and retail (restaurant) uses, and marshland are located on the opposite, northeast and eastern banks of Redwood Creek.

(e) South of the Site. The project site is bordered on the south by Redwood Creek and U.S. 101, a ten-lane interstate freeway. Docktown, a live-aboard boat community with approximately 100 slips and associated parking, boat storage, and community center, is located on the southeast bank of Redwood Creek, between the project site and the freeway. Additional boat slips and a pay-per-use boat launch are also located along this segment of Redwood Creek, adjacent to Docktown.¹

(f) West of the Site. The Pete's Harbor portion of the site is bordered on the west by Uccelli Boulevard and Smith Slough. West and north of Smith Slough is the Bair Island National Wildlife Refuge, which consists of a publicly owned open space preserve (formerly salt evaporation ponds) with a pedestrian trail around its perimeter. The Wildlife Refuge, which is administered by the USFWS, is separated from the western edge of the project site by Smith Slough and is surrounded by water on all sides, with pedestrian access provided via a land bridge and trailhead off East Bayshore Road, approximately one-half mile west of the project site. Immediately south and west of the "Villas at Bair Island" development, the peripheral public trail parallels the southern edge of Smith Slough and leads via the land bridge into the Wildlife Refuge.

The Wildlife Refuge peripheral trail is used primarily at the end of the workday and on weekends and holidays. During peak-use periods on weekdays between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM, as many as 50 cars are parked at the refuge trailhead off East Bayshore Road.²

The Peninsula Marina portion of the site is bordered on the west by Bair Island Road. West of Bair Island Road, between East Bayshore Road and Smith Slough, are a variety of uses including the three-story Marina Pointe townhouses; the Baypoint Marina development comprised of a four-story office building and three one-story buildings housing a variety of heavy commercial and light industrial uses, the Bair Island Mini-Storage development, several car dealerships, the 12-screen Century Park Cinema complex, and the Alan Steel and Supply Company operation.

4.1.3 Other Existing Land Uses in the Project Vicinity

¹In a written response to the Marina Shores Village NOP, one Docktown resident (James Jonas, March 2002) stated that, as part of the Blomquist Extension project, the number of live-aboard slips in Docktown would be reduced by ten percent. However, review of environmental documentation for the Blomquist Extension found no reference to an anticipated reduction in slips in Docktown.

²Wagstaff and Associates site reconnaissance, February 2002.

In addition to the land uses adjacent to the project site a variety of other existing land uses are located in the project vicinity, and new land uses are also being planned for several locations in the vicinity, including the remainder of the Bayfront Area north of U.S. 101, east of the Bair Island National Wildlife Refuge, and west of the salt evaporation ponds (the *Bayfront Study* area).

(a) East of the Site. As diagrammed on Figure 4.1, a PG&E substation and the Central Concrete operation are located farther east of the project site, beyond the intervening, undeveloped marshland. Active Cargill Salt evaporation ponds are located east of Seaport Boulevard.

(b) Northeast of the Site. A vacant approximately 17-acre parcel at the northeast corner of Seaport Center has been proposed for development by Abbott Labs for approximately 541,000 square feet of research and development space. Northeast of the Abbott Labs site is the Port of Redwood City complex, which contains a variety of maritime and industrial uses including Romic Environmental Technologies (a hazardous waste transfer operation), Kaiser Cement Corporation (concrete manufacturers and distributors), RMC Lonestar (a cement materials transfer operation), Bell Marine (a concrete and asphalt recycling operation), BCBM (concrete and cement distributors), and Sims-LMC (a metal recycling operation). Pacific Shores, a 1,650,000-square-foot office development (approximately 75 percent vacant as of January 2003) is located east of Seaport Boulevard.

Inoperative salt evaporation ponds are located at the northern terminus of Seaport Boulevard and are the site of the recently approved West Point Marina mixed use development (408 slips plus 30,000 square feet of retail/commercial space).

(c) Southeast of the Site. The Redwood City Police Department headquarters complex and auto and truck storage lots are located immediately east of Docketown. A variety of heavy industrial uses are located south and east of Redwood Creek, east of Docketown, and north of U.S. 101, anchored by the Granite Rock operation, and including Frey Trucking and Supply, General Hardware and Supply, Continental Tool, Pavex, Peninsula Building Materials, T&H Lumber, a PG&E substation, and Lynsco Construction Materials. The Malibu Grand Prix and miniature golf complex is also located in this area on land owned by Granite Rock.

(d) South of U.S. 101. The area south of U.S. 101 is dominated by large-scale retail establishments, including numerous auto dealerships, Mervyn's Plaza, Veteran's Square, and K-Mart. Other uses in this area include office development, light and heavy industrial, heavy commercial, and public storage.

4.1.4 Cumulative Development Trends in the Project Vicinity

Table 4.1 lists other pending and anticipated development in Redwood City. As shown in the table, a total of approximately 64 single-family housing units, 5,275 to 6,375 multifamily housing units, 119,000 square feet of retail/commercial floor space, 3,163,000 square feet of office/research and development (R&D) floor space, and 710,000 square feet of other

commercial and R&D uses, are currently pending or have recently been approved in Redwood City.

Table 4.1

ANTICIPATED CUMULATIVE FUTURE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN REDWOOD CITY

<u>Development/Location</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>SFR (units)</u>	<u>MFR (units)</u>	<u>Retail/ Comm. (sq. ft.)</u>	<u>Office/ R&D (sq. ft.)</u>
Pacific Shores/Seaport Blvd.	Partially Occupied				1,280,000 ^a
Excite @ Home/415 Broadway	Partially Occupied				649,000 ^b
500 Arguello	Partially Occupied				38,300 ^c
1425 Kentfield Ave.	Under Construction		6		
Downtown Theater/2107 Broadway	Approved			80,000 + 4,200 theater seats	
885 Woodside Rd.	Approved		4		29,225
Stanford Boathouse/300 Cardinal Way	Approved			16,200-sq.-ft. boathouse	
Olympian Oil/699 El Camino Real	Approved			2,000-sq.-ft. gas station--8 pumps	
439 Fuller St.	Approved ^d				10,500
Carlsen Porsche/3636 Haven Rd.	Approved			18,000	
Bair Island Aquatic Center/1450 Maple St.	Approved			6.8-acre public boat launch	
Oracle Day Care/275 Oracle Parkway	Approved			21,800-sq.-ft. child care center (for 300 children)	
101 Twin Dolphin	Approved			17,000-sq.-ft. child care center	
820 Woodside Rd.	Approved			4,000	
885 Woodside Rd.	Approved		4		29,225
Starbucks/995 Marsh Rd.	Approved			3,224	
Pacific Materials Batch Plant/Seaport Blvd.	Approved	(Addition of batch plant to existing uses; no new employees required.)			
El Camino Real @ Maple	Pending		206		4,800
El Camino Real @ Jefferson	Pending ^e		300		
El Camino Real @ Vera	Pending		33		
150 El Camino Real	Pending		7		13,466
234-242 Orchard Ave.	Pending	4			

<u>Development/Location</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>SFR (units)</u>	<u>MFR (units)</u>	<u>Retail/ Comm. (sq. ft.)</u>	<u>Office/ R&D (sq. ft.)</u>
Brady Project/852-860 Walnut St.	Pending		15		
Abbott Laboratories/Chesapeake Dr.	Pending				541,077
Opfer Building/2233 Middlefield Rd.	Pending				7,500
West Point Marina	Pending	60 ^f		30,000 + 408 slips	
Kaiser Master Plan/1150 Veterans Blvd.	Pending			652,700-sq.-ft. medical ^g	
Downtown Area Plan	Draft Plan Under Review		2,600 to 3,400 ^h		
El Camino Real Mixed Use (Near Woodside Rd.)	No Project Submittal		750 to 900 ^h		
Woodside Rd. Mixed Use (Between Bay and Middlefield)	No Project Submittal		750 to 900 ^h		
Jefferson @ Middlefield	No Project Submittal ⁱ			200 hotel rooms + 110,000	
Syufy Theater Site/East Bayshore Rd. ^j	No Project Submittal		600		
TOTALS:		64	5,275 to 6,375	118,980	3,163,216
		+ 709,700 sq. ft. other identified uses (e.g., boathouse, medical) + particular uses not assigned sq. ft. (e.g., theater seats, hotel rooms)			

SOURCE: City of Redwood City Planning Department and Fehr & Peers Associates, January 2003.

Notes:

- ^a Sq. ft. = unoccupied space as of July 2001, when most recent traffic counts were conducted on Seaport Blvd. (including partially occupied Pacific Shores development).
- ^b Sq. ft. = unoccupied space as of January 2002, when most recent traffic counts were conducted for the site.
- ^c According to the project sponsor, the building was 60 percent occupied as of January 2002. Unoccupied floor area equaled approximately 38,300 sq. ft. The total building floor area is approximately 96,000 sq. ft.
- ^d The development was approved; however, the building has not been constructed, and the site remains vacant and for sale. The development remains on the list as an approved development that eventually could be constructed.
- ^e No developer as of the preparation of this EIR.
- ^f Live-aboard boats.
- ^g This number includes demolition of approximately 312,800 square feet of existing medical buildings and construction of approximately 965,500 square feet of medical space, for a net increase of approximately 652,700 square feet of medical space, including hospital, medical and administrative office, and ancillary uses.

^h The range of potential net increases in dwelling units under these projects is based on the City's *Draft Downtown Area Plan*, which proposes a Downtown High Density (D-HD) residential designation allowing up to 50-60 units/acre and a State Transit Corridors High Density (C-HD) residential zoning district allowing 36-50 units/acre. For purposes of "worst-case" environmental impact assessment, this EIR uses the maximum allowable densities for quantitative analyses, for a total of up to approximately 3,400 net additional multifamily units under the *Downtown Area Plan* and up to approximately 1,800 net additional multifamily units under the El Camino Real and Woodside Road mixed use projects.

ⁱ Development potential is based on worst-case (i.e., for potential environmental impacts) buildout of the site under the General Plan.

^j The owners of the Syufy theater site would operate the Downtown Theater complex (4,200 seats) at 2107 Broadway (listed as "approved" development). Although no specific project has been proposed for the existing Syufy theater site, future redevelopment of the site is anticipated. Discussions between City staff and the property owners have focused on a potential development of approximately 600 multifamily dwelling units, with some discussion of auto retail or commercial uses. Peak-hour traffic and other environmental impacts would generally be greatest with the 600-unit residential development, so this scenario has been assumed in the cumulative analyses in this EIR.

Legend: sq. ft. = square feet; SFR = single-family residential; MFR = multifamily residential; Comm. = commercial; R&D = research and development.

Additional development is also expected to occur over time in neighboring communities (e.g., Woodside, San Carlos, Atherton, East Menlo Park, and other incorporated and unincorporated San Mateo County areas). The potential cumulative environmental impacts of such regional development, in combination with anticipated future development in Redwood City (see Table 4.1), are evaluated in this EIR. The following chapters of this EIR include discussion of such potential cumulative, regional impacts: Population, Housing, and Employment (chapter 6); Transportation and Circulation (chapter 7); Biological Resources (chapter 8); Hydrology and Water Quality (chapter 9); Noise (chapter 13); and Air Quality (chapter 15).

4.2 PERTINENT PLANS AND POLICIES

4.2.1 Redwood City Strategic General Plan

The current Redwood City Strategic General Plan Land Use Element (adopted in 1990) contains the following land use-related policies relevant to consideration of the land use impacts of the proposed project:

- *Provide sufficient land for a variety of employment opportunities with optimum commute access.* (Objective 3, page 6-5)
- *Residential development should be located only where services and facilities can be provided.* (Policy L-1, page 6-5)
- *Residential neighborhoods should be protected from the encroachment of incompatible activities or land uses which may have a negative impact on the residential living environment.* (Policy L-2, page 6-5)
- *Higher residential densities should be promoted at locations near or within commercial and financial centers, employment centers, and transportation terminals.* (Policy L-3, page 6-5)
- *Commercial land should be distributed in a manner that maximizes community accessibility to a variety of retail commercial outlets and services and minimizes the need for automobile travel.* (Policy L-4, page 6-5)
- *Industrial and employment areas should encourage accessory uses and services such as restaurants, health clubs, child care, office supply sales, and delicatessens.* (Policy L-7, page 6-5)
- *Existing polluting industries, including noise and visual pollution, within or near residential, commercial, or employment areas should be phased out or moved to buffered locations with adequate environmental protection and control. Redwood City should adopt the hazardous waste plan being proposed by San Mateo County.* (Policy L-9, page 6-5)

The *Conservation Element* (adopted in 1990) contains the following policy relevant to consideration of the land use impacts of the proposed project:

- *The visual qualities of the community should be preserved and improved.* (Policy C-7, page 10-4)

4.2.2 On-Site City-Adopted Land Use Designations

Figure 4.2 (General Plan Designations) and Figure 4.3 (Zoning Designations) illustrate the current City-adopted land use designations for the project site and vicinity. On-site designations are described below; designations in the surrounding vicinity are described in the following subsection 4.2.3 (Surrounding City-Adopted Land Use Designations).

(a) Peninsula Marina Property. The Peninsula Marina property is designated *Commercial/Office* by the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and is zoned *CG-General Commercial* by the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, designations which allow retail, office, and a variety of commercial uses.

(b) Pete's Harbor Property. The Pete's Harbor property is designated *Mixed Use (Commercial and Residential)* by the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and zoned *CG-R--General Commercial-Residential Combining* by the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, designations which allow retail, office, and a variety of commercial uses, as well as residential uses up to a density of 40 units per acre.

4.2.3 Surrounding City-Adopted Land Use Designations

(a) General Plan. Redwood City Strategic General Plan land use designations surrounding the project site (see Figure 4.2) include *Future Development Expanding Limits of Urbanization* (e.g., Inner and Middle Bair Island), *Research and Development Uses* (e.g., Penobscot Drive/Seaport Center and south of Blomquist Street), *Unimproved Resource Areas* (e.g., north of Steinberger Creek), *Manufacturing Processing and Shipping* (e.g., south of Steinberger Creek), *Government* (e.g., the Redwood City police station), *Office Park Oriented Uses* (e.g., south and west of the project site), *Multi-Story Office and Retail Uses* (e.g., south of U.S. 101), *Moderate and High-Rise Residential* (e.g., in Downtown Redwood City), and *Mixed Use (Commercial and Residential)* (e.g., the "Villas at Bair Island" apartments separating Peninsula Marina from Pete's Harbor, and townhouses west of project site).

(b) Zoning. Redwood City Zoning Ordinance land use designations surrounding the project site (see Figure 4.3) include *TP-Tidal Plain* (e.g., all of Bair Island, Redwood Creek, Smith Slough, and adjacent tidal areas), *GI-General Industrial* (e.g., along Redwood Creek north of Saginaw Drive/Seaport Center and south of Steinberger Creek), *IP-Industrial Park* (e.g., Penobscot Drive/Seaport Center and north of Veterans Avenue), *IR-Industrial-Restricted* (e.g., south of Blomquist Street and along Maple Street), *CG-General Commercial* (e.g., south of

Figure 4.2. General Plan Designations.

Figure 4.3. Zoning Designations.

U.S. 101 and west of project site), *R-5--Multifamily-High Density* (e.g., in Downtown Redwood City), and *CG-R--General Commercial-Residential Combining* (e.g., “Villas at Bair Island” apartments separating Peninsula Marina from Pete’s Harbor, and townhouses west of project site). A portion of the *IP--Industrial Park* area north of Veterans Avenue includes a *V--Vehicular Combining District*, which permits auto and truck sales and service subject to an approved use permit (Zoning Ordinance, section 25.5).

4.2.4 Current Planning Studies for the Bayfront Area

The City commenced the development review and CEQA compliance process for the subject Marina Shores Village project and the Abbott Laboratories development (Chesapeake Drive) in 2002, and anticipates a similar process for the Syufy Enterprises site development (East Bayshore Road) when a formal development application is received. To integrate and supplement these three substantial project-specific development and environmental review efforts, and study the key urban design, transportation, infrastructure, and fiscal issues associated with such development in the Bayfront Area, the City is currently undertaking the *Bayfront Study*. The proposed approximately 136-acre *Bayfront Study* area includes the Marina Shores Village, Abbott Laboratories, and Syufy Enterprises sites, as well as additional lands surrounding the project site. The study is being completed with the assistance of a consulting urban design firm (Bottomley Planning and Design), and will identify specific land use, urban design, and transportation concepts for achieving appropriate, harmonious development of the Bayfront Area consistent with the Redwood City Strategic General Plan. As part of the *Bayfront Study*, a *Bayfront Transportation Options Study* is also being completed with the assistance of a consulting transportation planner (Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.) and a planning and design firm (Fukuji Planning and Design) in order to identify specific and innovative transportation options for the area, with emphasis on possible multi-modal (vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and water) connections within the Bayfront Area, and between the area, the downtown, and major interregional transit corridors. The current *Bayfront Study* is available for review at the City of Redwood City Community Development Services Department, City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road.

4.2.5 San Carlos Airport Land Use Plan

The San Carlos Airport is a general aviation facility located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the project site near the confluence of Steinberger Slough and Smith Slough. The San Carlos Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) includes airport-related land use controls which apply to those incorporated and unincorporated areas in the vicinity of San Carlos Airport which are potentially impacted by aircraft approach and departure movements. The plan includes airport related noise/land use compatibility criteria, restrictions on the heights of structures and/or objects near the airport, and other airport/aircraft safety criteria. The plan sets forth policies, standards, and criteria to address each of these issues to assist affected local agencies in achieving local land use compatibility with existing and future airport development and operations.³ The San Carlos

³City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) as Airport Land Use

ALUP was prepared by the San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) acting as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for San Mateo County.

The ALUC-adopted ALUP, under "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace for the San Carlos Airport," incorporates guidelines set forth in Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 for determining if an object is an obstruction to air navigation. The FAR Part 77 regulations contain three key elements: (1) standards for determining obstructions in navigable airspace; (2) requirements for construction notification if it may affect airspace; and (3) provisions for preparation of aeronautical studies by FAA staff.

Any proposed new construction or expansion of existing structures that would penetrate any of the ALUP-designated, FAR Part 77-based, imaginary horizontal and sloping surfaces for the San Carlos Airport would be deemed incompatible uses unless determined otherwise by the FAA.⁴ Because the project site is located within the ALUP-designated restricted height area for the San Carlos Airport, and because the proposed project would include structures over 200 feet in height (the FAA-identified potential airspace obstruction threshold),⁵ the project's relationship to the FAR Part 77-based imaginary surfaces constraints for the San Carlos Airport would warrant FAA review.

As identified in Table IV-5 of the ALUP (Criteria for Basing a Request for the Grant of an Avigation Easement to the County of San Mateo),⁶ the proposed project would also warrant ALUC review because: (1) the project site is within the planning area of the ALUP, and (2) the project includes a proposed amendment to currently adopted local land use policies (e.g., a general plan amendment and a zoning ordinance amendment) involving residential dwelling units.

Chapter 12 (Public Health and Safety) of this EIR addresses the project's potential impacts pertinent to ALUP policies in detail.

Commission for San Mateo County, California. San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan, San Carlos Airport Land Use Plan, December 1996, p. IV.1-2.

⁴Ibid., p. IV-34.

⁵David F. Carbone, ALUC staff, personal communications, January 9 and 10, 2003.

⁶Carbone and C/CAG, Table IV-5 (p. IV-54).

4.2.6 Regional Plans

(a) ABAG's Regional Land Use Policy Framework. The most recent regional land use policy document by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is entitled A Proposed Land Use Policy Framework for the San Francisco Bay Area, adopted by the ABAG Executive Board in July 1990. The document is described as a regional policy framework for future land use decisions in the Bay Area that respects the need for strong local control, but that also recognizes the importance of regional comprehensive planning for issues of regional significance. The document contains policies that (1) direct growth where regional infrastructure (e.g., freeways, transit, water, solid waste disposal, sewage treatment) is available and natural resources will not be overburdened; (2) encourage development that discourages long-distance commuting; (3) call for the establishment of firm growth boundaries; and (4) encourage provision of housing at all levels.

(b) ABAG's San Francisco Bay Trail Plan. The proposed alignment of an Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) planned extension of the San Francisco Bay Trail traverses the southern edge of the project site, as illustrated on Figure 4.4. The proposed extension alignment at this location starts north of the project site, at the terminus of the existing Bay Trail segment in the City of San Carlos near Mariner Park, passes around San Carlos Airport along the levee adjacent to U.S. 101, skirting the edge of the Bair Island National Wildlife Refuge, runs along the southwestern edge of the project site, and continues along East Bayshore Road to connect with the existing Bay Trail segment in the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge in Menlo Park.

(c) BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has state-authorized "Bay jurisdiction" over San Francisco Bay and all territory located between the shoreline and a line 100 feet inland of and parallel with the shoreline. Within its area of jurisdiction, BCDC is authorized to control both (1) Bay filling and dredging, and (2) Bay-related shoreline development.

The BCDC area of jurisdiction in the project vicinity includes the upper limit of all tidal areas along Smith Slough (the upper limit is the line of mean tidal level, plus another five vertical feet in areas with wetland vegetation) to its confluence with Redwood Creek (see Figure 8.1). BCDC also has jurisdiction within a 100-foot shoreline band along the local Bay shore. In addition, BCDC has state-authorized "certain waterways jurisdiction" in Redwood Creek from its confluence with Smith Slough downstream (bayward). "Certain waterways jurisdiction" is similar to "Bay jurisdiction," except that there is no additional shoreline band jurisdiction associated with it. "Certain waterways jurisdiction," if it exists on the project site, would be limited to a small area at the northern tip of the project site coincident with the Smith Slough/Redwood Creek confluence. The reach of Redwood Creek upstream of the confluence is not within BCDC jurisdiction.

Figure 4.4. Planned S.F. Bay Trail Alignment.

BCDC is authorized to issue or deny permits for any filling of the Bay within its Bay jurisdiction. Any project-proposed work within BCDC's "Bay jurisdiction," including the 100-foot shoreline band from the Smith Slough shoreline, or "certain waterways" jurisdiction will require such a BCDC permit. Other portions of the project (e.g., the proposed marina reconfiguration) would not require BCDC approval. Section 66605 of the McAteer-Petris Act allows the Commission to authorize Bay fill only for water-oriented uses, and minor fill to improve shoreline appearance or public access. Furthermore, the McAteer-Petris Act requires that fill should only be authorized if there is no feasible upland location, the fill is the minimum amount necessary, the fill minimizes harmful effects to the Bay, and the public benefits of the fill clearly exceed its detriments.

BCDC permit eligibility and conditions of permit issuance are largely governed by the San Francisco Bay Plan, completed and adopted by BCDC in 1968 and amended regularly since then. The plan was most recently amended in July 2001. The Bay Plan contains findings and policies related to fish and wildlife, water quality, fill, recreation, public access, and the appearance and design of shorelines, as well as procedures for BCDC control of filling and dredging and shoreline development.

The policies of the Bay Plan that pertain to portions of the proposed project within BCDC jurisdiction include policies concerning: (1) the protection of fish and wildlife habitat, including sensitive species; (2) water quality, including erosion and sedimentation control, and the use of best management practices to control polluted surface runoff; (3) protection and preservation of marshes and mudflats; and (4) the provision of public access to the waterfront. In determining whether to issue a permit for the proposed project elements within its jurisdiction, BCDC can be expected to focus on (a) whether the fill proposed is the minimum necessary, (b) whether public access would be promoted, (c) whether sensitive wildlife species would be adversely affected, and (d) whether an alternative upland location exists for the portions of the project within BCDC jurisdiction.

4.2.7 "Smart Growth" Concepts and Criteria

(a) The "Smart Growth" Concept. In recent years, concerns over increasing urban sprawl and the associated environmental and social impacts of sprawl have led regional planning agencies, municipalities, and interest groups to adopt policies and guidelines related to "smart growth." In its recently published policy guide for "smart growth," the American Planning Association defines "smart growth" as:

"[U]sing comprehensive planning to guide, design, develop, revitalize and build communities for all that have a unique sense of community and place; preserve and enhance valuable natural and cultural resources; equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development; expand the range of transportation, employment and housing choices in a fiscally responsible manner; value long-range, regional considerations of sustainability over short-term incremental geographically isolated actions; and promote public health and healthy communities. Compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use

*development patterns and land reuse epitomize the application of the principles of smart growth."*⁷

The project applicant has described the proposed Marina Shores Village project as a "smart growth" development.

CEQA Guidelines section 15125(d) states, "*The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans.*" Redwood City and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) have adopted policies and guidelines promoting "smart growth" concepts. These City and regional "smart growth" policies and guidelines are listed in sections (b) and (c) below. Project consistency with these listed policies and guidelines is discussed in section 4.3 herein (under *Impact 4-3*).

(b) Redwood City "Smart Growth" Policies. Although not specifically labeled as "smart growth" policies, the current Redwood City Strategic General Plan Land Use Element (1990) contains the following policies which promote compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use development patterns--i.e., "smart growth":

- *Residential development should be located only where services and facilities can be provided.* (Policy L-1, page 6-5)
- *Higher residential densities should be promoted at locations near or within commercial and financial centers, employment centers, and transportation terminals.* (Policy L-3, page 6-5)
- *Commercial land should be distributed in a manner that maximizes community accessibility to a variety of retail commercial outlets and services and minimizes the need for automobile travel.* (Policy L-4, page 6-5)
- *Promote the construction of lower-income housing developments located in areas that are convenient to public transportation, shopping, recreation, schools, hospitals, employment, and other community facilities.* (Housing Policy 1, page 8-28)

(c) ABAG's "Smart Growth" Criteria. ABAG, as part of its Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project, includes "smart growth" criteria on its website.⁸ While recognizing that "there is no single definition of smart growth," ABAG has proposed criteria that are common to the various definitions of "smart growth," including development that:

⁷American Planning Association. *Policy Guide on Smart Growth*, April 15, 2002.

⁸Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). *What is Smart Growth?*, www.abag.ca.gov, accessed June 24, 2002.

- revitalizes central cities and older suburbs;
- supports and enhances public transit;
- promotes walking and bicycling;
- preserves open spaces and agricultural lands; and
- ensures a good match between income levels and housing prices.

(d) Other, Unofficial "Smart Growth" Policies and Criteria. In the interest of promoting "smart growth" on a regional basis, two regional public interest groups, the Greenbelt Alliance and Urban Ecology, have adopted their own unofficial "smart growth" criteria, which are listed below. The adopted criteria of these two interest groups do not represent "applicable regional plans." Nevertheless, they do provide an additional guide for considering project consistency with "smart growth" concepts. Once either of these two organizations receives project information voluntarily submitted by a project proponent, it reviews the project according to the organization's endorsement criteria and makes a recommendation regarding agency endorsement of the project.

(1) *Greenbelt Alliance.* The stated mission of the Greenbelt Alliance public interest group is "to make the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area a better place to live by protecting the region's Greenbelt and improving the livability of its cities and towns." Since 1958, the Alliance has worked in partnership with diverse coalitions on public policy development, advocacy, and education.⁹ The Greenbelt Alliance has published a set of endorsement criteria consistent with its recent publication, *Smart Infill*. The general goals of the Greenbelt Alliance's Endorsement Program are to discourage urban sprawl, promote public transit and more transportation choices, provide for mixed uses within a neighborhood, promote affordability, promote innovative community design, and minimize the cost of City services. Alliance endorsement guidelines and criteria for residential and mixed use projects include the following:¹⁰

- Project is within an existing urban area;
- Project is within 1/2 mile or ten-minute walk from major transit service, defined as a rail or bus stop served by six or more buses per hour during peak periods;
- Project has overall density of at least 20 units per acre;

⁹<http://www.greenbelt.org/about/index.html>

¹⁰http://www.greenbelt.org/whatwedo/prog_edt_developers.html

- Project provides affordable housing;
- Project design is pedestrian-friendly;
- Project consists of 20 or more units; and
- Project includes community input through public outreach.

(2) *Urban Ecology*. Urban Ecology is a Bay Area public interest group whose stated objective is to work to build cities that are "ecologically thriving and socially just." The organization supports development projects that further this vision, particularly "infill" development which is built in existing developed areas rather than in open space and greenfield areas.¹¹ Urban Ecology offers letters of support to projects that meet its endorsement standards. The endorsement criteria listed below are required for full agency endorsement of a project. However, Urban Ecology will consider projects that do not meet these standards on a case-by-case basis. Urban Ecology's endorsement criteria include the following:

- Project is located in a built or urban setting or within an urban growth boundary approved by voters;
- Project has a net density of at least 25 dwelling units per acre;
- At least 20 percent of the residential units are affordable to persons at or below 80 percent of area median income;
- Project design encourages walking and bicycling;
- Project is located within 1/4 mile of a downtown or 1/2 mile of a transit stop with current or planned service levels of at least six vehicles per hour during the peak period;
- Project offers alternatives to car ownership and minimizes parking spaces;
- Project has no significant, unmitigable ecological impacts or environmental hazards; and
- Project sponsor has made a good faith effort to do community outreach and address local concerns.

4.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Comment: new tab grid for indented text underneath boxes--(just the old one with 1.167 added)

¹¹<http://www.urbanecology.org>

4.3.1 Significance Criteria

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the project would be considered in this EIR to have a significant land use impact if it would:¹²

- (1) Physically divide the community;
- (2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the City of Redwood City (including, but not limited to, the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and Zoning Ordinance), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), or the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- (3) Be inconsistent with an applicable regional plan.

4.3.2 Project-Proposed Land Use Changes

(a) Project-Proposed Development Plan. Figure 3.3 in chapter 3 (Project Description) of this EIR illustrates the proposed project site plan, and Tables 3.1 through 3.4 in chapter 3 outline the proposed project land use data. In summary, the proposed project, as presented by the applicant for environmental review in this EIR, includes the following four components:

- approximately 1,930 for-sale residential units in an array of 21-, 20-, 19-, 18-, 6-, and 4-story structures, all atop 2- and 3-story, above-grading parking podiums (i.e., 6 to 23 total stories), plus 2-story, at-grade townhouses;
- an approximately 300,000-square-foot office component in 4- and 6-story structures atop 3-story, above-grade parking podiums (i.e., 7 to 9 total stories);
- an approximately 12,000-square-foot restaurant-retail component in 2-story structures situated around a public plaza; and
- a network of common amenities (e.g., public pedestrian and bike paths); the reintroduction of slips in Peninsula Marina, from the former 427 slips to a proposed 50 to 60 slips, and the addition of a Peninsula Marina flushing canal; and a reduction in the number of slips in Inner Pete's Harbor from 116 slips to 30 to 40 slips, including the removal of approximately 90 live-aboards from Inner and Outer Pete's Harbor. Under the proposed project, no live-aboards would be allowed in either Peninsula Marina or Pete's Harbor.

(b) Project-Proposed General Plan Amendment and Precise Plan. The Peninsula Marina property is designated *Commercial/Office* by the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and is

¹²CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, item IX(a-c); and sections 15064(b and d) and 15125(d).

zoned *CG--General Commercial* by the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, designations which allow retail, office, and a variety of other commercial uses. The Pete's Harbor property is designated *Mixed Use (Commercial and Residential)* by the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and zoned *CG-R--General Commercial-Residential Combining* by the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, designations which allow retail, office, and a variety of other commercial uses, as well as residential uses up to a density of 40 units per acre. The project proposes a mixed use development that would introduce approximately 4,020 new residents to the site (see discussion of population impacts in chapter 6 of this EIR). The project's average residential density (62.52 units per acre) would be higher than what is currently allowed under the existing General Plan and zoning designations for the site (20 to 40 units per acre).

To permit the proposed land uses on the project site, the project would therefore require approval of a General Plan Amendment (GPA) by the City of Redwood City in order to permit residential uses on the Peninsula Marina portion of the project site and create a new high-density residential designation that would allow development of the residential portion of the project at an average density of up to 65 dwelling units per acre.

In addition, the proposed project would require approval of a Precise Plan. On December 2, 2002, the Redwood City City Council adopted Ordinance No. 1130-315, which amended the Zoning Ordinance to add the *Planned Community District* (P District), which "*is designed to provide for those uses, or combination of uses, appropriately requiring flexibility under controlled conditions not otherwise attainable under other districts.*" A Precise Plan must be adopted simultaneously with a P District, but a project-specific Precise Plan cannot be adopted until the required CEQA documentation for the project (in this case, an EIR) is certified by the City Council. Therefore, the adoption of a Precise Plan for the proposed project can be decided upon by the City Council only after this EIR is certified.

(c) Project-Proposed Provisions for San Francisco Bay Trail. The project applicant intends to accommodate ABAG's planned San Francisco Bay Trail extension (see previous subsection 4.2.6[b]). Two alternative locations have been suggested by the applicant for the Bay Trail extension through the project site: "scenario 1" along the existing 80-foot-wide PG&E transmission line easement, adjacent to the Bair Island Wildlife Refuge and north of the Marina Pointe townhouses, or "scenario 2" along East Bayshore Road. As shown on Figure 4.4, the ABAG-planned trail extension would continue beyond the project site, south across Redwood Creek via the existing pedestrian-bicycle bridge, and along East Bayshore Road where it would join with the proposed Blomquist Extension. Under applicant-suggested "scenario 1," Bay Trail users would utilize either Bair Island Road or cross Bair Island Road and utilize a sidewalk on the project site, which would then extend approximately 1,500 feet south to East Bayshore Road and the Blomquist Extension. This sidewalk segment of the Bay Trail would include two curb cuts on Bair Island Road, both of which would be marked for pedestrians and provide vehicular access to the proposed project. Under "scenario 2," Bay Trail users would cross Bair Island Road and continue along East Bayshore Road and then along the Blomquist Extension.

In addition, the proposed project pedestrian and bicycle access system is intended by the applicant to provide opportunities for Bay Trail users to exit the trail and access the grounds of the proposed project, including the project waterfront access points, as indicated on Figure 3.10 in chapter 3 (Project Description); however, the project grounds are not anticipated to be part of the Bay Trail.

4.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project-related land use impacts, including those that have been found to be *less-than-significant* and those found to be *significant* or *potentially significant*, are identified below. All impacts found to be *significant* or *potentially significant* are identified with a "boxed" statement and associated impact code (*Impact 4-1*, *Impact 4-2*, etc.) and are accompanied by a recommended mitigation measure or set of mitigation measures.

Loss of Local Marina Slips. The project would result in the displacement of 263 existing boat slip/tenants, including 90 slips/tenants currently paying rent as live-aboard residences and 173 slips currently available to the public as recreational boat slips. The project would replace the displaced tenants and slips with 227 to 247 slips available only to project residents. The project-related loss of 173 publicly available recreational boat slips would be offset by the recently approved West Point Marina project at the end of Seaport Boulevard, which would include approximately 420 publicly available recreational boat slips. The project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts related to these project-related changes in local boat slip and live-aboard provisions would be ***less-than-significant***.

As shown in Table 4.2 (Proposed Marina Changes), implementation of the proposed project would result in a net loss of up to 36 existing boat slips in Inner Pete's Harbor.

The proposed new project boat slips, totaling 80 to 100 in Peninsula Marina and Inner Pete's Harbor, as well as the 147 slips remaining in Outer Pete's Harbor, would be available to project residents only. As a result, the project would result in the loss of up to 263 boat slip tenants, including approximately 90 live-aboards and 173 publicly available recreational slips, and their replacement with 227 to 247 slips available to project residents only.

The housing impact associated with the loss of residential live-aboard boat slips is discussed in subsection 6.3.5 (Population, Housing, and Employment Impacts) of this EIR.

Table 4.2
 PROPOSED MARINA CHANGES

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Change</u>
<i>Peninsula Marina:</i>			
Number of Slips	0	50-60	plus 50-60
Water Area (acres)	14.10	3.80	minus 10.30
Inner Shoreline (lin. ft.)	3,500	3,900	plus 400
<i>Inner Pete's Harbor:</i>			
Number of Slips	116	30-40	minus 76-86
Water Area (acres)	2.90	1.66	minus 1.24
Inner Shoreline (lin. ft.)	1,600	1,800	plus 200
<i>Totals:</i>			
Number of Slips	116	80-100	minus 16-36
Water Area (acres)	17.0	5.46	minus 11.54
Inner Shoreline (lin. ft.)	5,100	5,700	plus 600

SOURCE: Glenborough-Pauls, LLC, November 2001.

Note: The existing 147 slips in Outer Pete's Harbor would remain intact; however, no live-aboard tenants would be permitted, and the slips would be available only to project residents. Therefore, the total number of boat slips at Marina Shores Village would total 227 to 247.

BCDC's San Francisco Bay Plan states, "[A]s the population of the Bay Region increases, more people will use their leisure time in water-oriented recreational activities. Water-oriented recreation facilities such as marinas, launch ramps, beaches, and fishing piers should be provided to meet those needs."¹³ The project-related loss of up to 173 publicly available recreational boat slips would have an impact on the availability of recreational marina facilities in the Bay Area, especially along the Peninsula and in Redwood City. All 227 to 247 boat slips included in the proposed project would be for use only by Marina Shores Village residents and would not be available to the general public. However, when this project is considered together with construction of the recently approved West Point Marina project at the terminus of Seaport Boulevard northeast of the Marina Shores Village site, which will include 480 boat slips, 420 of which will be for public recreational use, the cumulative environmental impact related to the loss of publicly available recreational boat slips at Peninsula Marina and Pete's Harbor would be considered less-than-significant.

Mitigation. No significant impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

Impact 4-1: Project Relationships to Existing Overhead Electrical Transmission Lines. Policy L-2 of the Redwood City Strategic General Plan Land Use Element states: "*Residential neighborhoods should be protected from the encroachment of incompatible activities or land uses which may have a negative impact on the residential living environment.*" The project residential components closest to the northern edge of the Peninsula Marina property portion of the project site would be in close proximity (as close as 150 feet) to the existing PG&E parallel 230- and 115-kV electrical transmission tower lines. These introduced residential/transmission line relationships could result in adverse impacts related to the perceived visual, public health and safety, and noise effects. The significance of these impacts is described in chapters 5 (Visual Factors), 12 (Public Health and Safety), and 13 (Noise) of this EIR--see subsections 5.3.3 (*Impact 5-7: Internal Visual Relationship of Project Development to Electrical Transmission Lines*), 12.3.2 (under "Potential Electromagnetic Field Health Hazards"), and 13.3.2 (*Impact 13-1: Project Compatibility with the Existing Noise Environment*). These nuisance and health factors may have a negative impact on the quality and safety of the residential living environment along the north edge of the Peninsula Marina property, and could lead to numerous future nuisance complaints; they are therefore considered to represent a **potentially significant land use compatibility impact** (see criterion 2 under subsection 4.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above)

¹³Andrea Gaut, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), Coastal Program Analyst, written response to NOP, March 28, 2002.

Project-proposed residential and commercial development in the northern portion of the Peninsula Marina property would be located in close proximity (as close as 150 feet) to the existing parallel PG&E 230- and 115-kV electrical transmission lines that extend east-west immediately north of the Peninsula Marina property (see Figure 3.4 in chapter 3 herein). These residential/transmission line relationships would have land use compatibility implications related to noise, visual, and safety factors.

PG&E easement provisions require that the area within the easements be kept free of structures and other permanent physical obstructions to maintenance access. Landscaping, fencing, and recreational facilities would be acceptable. Beyond these internal easement requirements, PG&E has not adopted guidelines or criteria with respect to residential or other land use setbacks from transmission lines.

No project residential structures or yards would be located within the PG&E easement (see Figure 3.4 in chapter 3). The project applicant has identified a public park within the transmission line easement on the project plans. The project-proposed use of this adjacent easement as a portion of a linear park would be consistent with PG&E easement limitations; however, this easement land is owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), is not currently available to the applicant, and is not included as part of the proposed project as evaluated in this EIR.

Potential health hazards associated with electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are described in chapter 12 (Public Health and Safety) of this EIR.

Mitigation 4-1. The following measures shall be implemented to address the potential for nuisance impacts related to project relationships to the existing PG&E electrical transmission lines:

(1) Provide notification in writing to all prospective residents of all residential units within 200 feet of the edge of the 230-kV/115-kV transmission lines easement that there are existing transmission lines of these specific power ratings, with associated visual and noise characteristics, within that distance; this notification shall be achieved by including such disclosure in the sale and rental agreement materials to be signed by project residents; and

(2) Implement *Mitigations 5-7* (Internal Visual Relationship of Project Development to Electrical Transmission Lines) and *13-1* (Project Compatibility with the Existing Noise Environment) identified in chapters 5 (Visual Factors) and 13 (Noise) of this EIR in order to reduce the potential visual and noise impacts of the existing electrical transmission lines to less-than-significant levels.

Implementation of these measures would reduce this potential land use compatibility impact to a ***less-than-significant level***.

Impact 4-2: Project Compatibility with Adjacent Residential Land Uses.

Project-proposed residential densities averaging approximately 62.52 units per acre and associated project building heights--up to eight 23-story towers on the Peninsula Marina property (maximum building height of 260 feet) and up to five 21-story towers on the Pete's Harbor property (maximum building height of 240 feet)--would be substantially higher than those in the adjacent "Villas at Bair Island" and Marina Pointe multifamily residential developments along Bair Island Road (maximum average densities of approximately 30 units/acre and maximum building heights of four stories and two stories, respectively), representing a **potentially significant land use compatibility impact** related to building mass, scale, and height relationships, general visual compatibility, light and glare, and shadow (see criteria 1 and 2 under subsection 4.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above; in particular, these land use compatibility relationships could be inconsistent with City General Plan policies L-2 and C-7--see subsection 4.2.1).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, item IX(b) ("conflict with any applicable land use plan," included herein as significance criterion 2), the *land use compatibility* of the proposed project with its existing surrounding environment is an issue under the purview of the Redwood City staff, Planning Commission, and City Council. Previous subsection 4.3.2 (Project-Proposed Land Use Changes) describes the General Plan Amendment and Precise Plan requirement aspect of the proposed project, as well as the land use compatibility factors (e.g., "appropriate use," "functional... relationships," "harmony with the character of the surrounding neighborhood") that the City will consider with respect to the proposed project.

The Marina Shores Village project would continue the recent land use pattern of multifamily residential development along Bair Island Road (including the "Villas at Bair Island" apartment complex and the Marina Pointe townhouses). However, the project proposes residential densities which would be substantially higher than those currently permitted in the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and Redwood City Zoning Ordinance (i.e., a maximum of 40 units per net residential acre). The project proposes a residential density of approximately 67.13 units per acre on the Peninsula Marina property and approximately 54.81 units per acre on the Pete's Harbor property, for an overall average residential density of approximately 62.52 units per acre. In comparison, the "Villas at Bair Island" apartment complex, which separates the Peninsula Marina property from the Pete's Harbor property, is developed at approximately 30 units per acre.

The residential densities on the project site would be accompanied by building heights (up to 260 feet on Peninsula Marina property and 240 feet on the Pete's Harbor property) that would make the Marina Shores Village residential towers the tallest buildings in Redwood City and surrounding communities. Therefore, although the proposed residential uses would be

consistent with the adjacent land use pattern, the density and height of the development would result in land use compatibility impacts associated with such visual factors as building mass, scale and height, and building shadow. These visual factors are addressed in Chapter 5 of this EIR (Visual Factors) under *Impacts 5-2* (Visual Impacts on Views and Vistas and on the Character of the Surrounding Area), *5-3* (General Visual Compatibility Impact), *5-4* (Potential Light and Glare Impacts), *5-5* (Shadow Impacts), and *5-6* (Inconsistency with City Urban Design Objectives).

The proposed office development at Marina Shores Village adjacent to U.S. 101 would be consistent with the existing commercial land use pattern along that portion of the highway.

The proposed project's 12,000-square-foot retail development on the Peninsula Marina property would be integrated within the overall site plan (see Figure 3.4 in chapter 3, Project Description) and would be considered to have a beneficial effect on adjacent land uses by providing convenience retail within walking distance of nearby residences (e.g., "Villas at Bair Island" and Marina Pointe).

Mitigation 4-2. The applicant shall implement *Mitigation 5-2* (Visual Impacts on Views and Vistas and on the Character of the Surrounding Area), *5-3* (General Visual Compatibility Impacts), *5-4* (Potential Light and Glare Impacts), and *5-5* (Shadow Impacts), which would reduce this land use compatibility impact to a ***less-than-significant level***, or, if one or more of these mitigations is not adopted, the City shall adopt a statement of overriding considerations acknowledging that the project would have a ***significant unavoidable land use compatibility impact***.

Project-Introduced Nuisance Conflicts with Nearby Industrial Uses. The proposed project involves introduction of a new high-density, large-scale residential development in proximity to existing industrial land uses east of Redwood Creek. However, due to distances of separation, intervening uses, project access characteristics, local wind patterns, and other factors, incompatibilities and related nuisance complaints associated with this land use relationship are anticipated to be ***less-than-significant*** (see *Land Use Element* Policy L-2 in subsection 4.2.1 herein).

The project-generated population of approximately 4,020 residents on the site raises concerns regarding possible conflicts with nearby industrial uses, particularly between high-rise residential development on the project site and 24-hour industrial operations on the east side of Redwood Creek.

During environmental review for the nearby Pacific Shores office development project in 1995 (see location #12 on Figure 4.1), several industrial firms operating in the area (the *HI: Heavy Industrial* designations on Figure 4.1) expressed concerns that the proposed Pacific Shores

project would be incompatible with their operations. The firms identified areas of potential conflict between their operations and the office project, including traffic, noise, dust, odors, hazardous materials handling and storage, hours of operation, financial impacts, and lighting. The firms also expressed concerns that these types of existing heavy industries that generate truck traffic, noise, dust, and other nuisances would find it difficult or impossible to find alternative locations to relocate in the Redwood City area. The industrial tenants were concerned that future tenant firms of Pacific Shores and their employees might not be tolerant and might exert pressure either to limit operations or to phase out the established heavy industrial enterprises.¹⁴ These potential land use conflicts were mitigated in part by transferring ten acres of the Pacific Shores site to the Port of Redwood City as a buffer zone, as well as requiring berms, landscaping, walls, and soundproofing to address noise, odor, and other nuisance conflicts.

The largest nearby industrial operation in terms of land area, Cargill Salt (location #21 on Figure 4.1), has stated, "The solar salt harvesting operation may produce natural marine odors from time to time. There is no way to mitigate this natural phenomena."¹⁵ In addition, in a comment letter received on the Pacific Shores Draft EIR, Cargill Salt stated, "Noise, dust and odors, as well as glare, may emanate from the solar salt harvesting operations on the abutting properties. During certain periods of the year, there have been, and may be in the future, nighttime operations."¹⁶ However, the Marina Shores Village project site is located several hundred yards from the Cargill site, and therefore, potential nighttime noise, dust, odor, or light intrusion is not expected to be substantial.

Unlike the Pacific Shores development, which is contiguous to or opposite the two largest industrial designations in the area (see Figure 4.1) and is served exclusively by Seaport Boulevard, the proposed Marina Shores project is separated from existing *HI: Heavy Industrial* designated properties by intervening properties and Redwood Creek, and would not be served by Seaport Boulevard (the principal industrial access route in the area). Due to its separation from these existing industrial properties and from Seaport Boulevard, the project would not result in significant land use compatibility impacts with nearby industrial uses (e.g., visual, public health and safety, noise, air quality, odor, etc.). The findings in the Public Health and Safety, Noise, and Air Quality chapters of this EIR (chapters 12, 13, and 15, respectively) indicate that, due to the degree of existing buffering (intervening uses and distances of separation) and local wind patterns, the project site would not be subject to significant hazardous materials, noise

¹⁴Recon Environmental. Final EIR for the Pacific Shores Center Project, March 1995, p. 3.1-6.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 3-106.

¹⁶Ibid.

(including night noise), vibration, dust, air contaminant, or odor impacts associated with existing nearby 24-hour industrial activities.

Table 4.3 identifies existing industries in the project vicinity and potential land use compatibility issues with the proposed Marina Shores Village project (an analysis similar to Table 4.3 was completed at the request of nearby industrial tenants for the Pacific Shores EIR).

Table 4.3
 EXISTING INDUSTRIES IN PROJECT VICINITY WITH POTENTIAL NUISANCE CONFLICTS
 WITH PROPOSED PROJECT

Industry	Potential Areas of Conflict with Proposed Project					
	Traffic	Hazardous Waste	Noise/Vibration	Dust	Odors	Night Lighting
Granite Rock ^a	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Central Concrete ^b	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Lyngso Construction Materials ^c	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Cargill Salt ^d	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Harbor Ready Mix ^b	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS

SOURCE: Bottomley Design and Planning, 2002; Wagstaff and Associates, 2002.

Legend:

LS = less-than-significant impact
 PS = potentially significant impact
 S = significant impact

- ^a Operations include transport of rock products and sand for asphalt and concrete.
- ^b Operations include the manufacture and distribution of construction materials.
- ^c Operations include production of garden soil and soil ingredient storage, including compost and manure. Business is seasonal with peak months in spring and fall.
- ^d Operations include solar salt harvesting.

Chapter 7 (Transportation and Circulation) addresses potential traffic impacts of the proposed project in combination with future background and cumulative traffic conditions (i.e., including nearby industrial operations).

Mitigation. No significant nuisance conflict with existing industrial uses is anticipated; no mitigation is required.

Impact 4-3: Project Inconsistency with "Smart Growth" Policies and Criteria.

"Smart growth" concepts, policies, and criteria set forth in adopted local (Redwood City) and regional (ABAG) land use policy documents are particularly applicable to intensive, large-scale residential and commercial development like the proposed project. The proposed project embodies a number of fundamental "smart growth" characteristics; it is a compact, high-density residential project that is pedestrian-oriented and located within an existing urban area (rather than geographically isolated). However, unless the project can demonstrate to City satisfaction: (1) adequate water and parks facilities, (2) a convenient and effective transit link to a local and regional express transit corridor or hub (e.g., the El Camino Real transit corridor and Redwood City/CalTrain intermodal station) and to the Redwood City downtown, (3) retail commercial provisions sufficient to serve the convenience needs of project residents and businesses, and (4) a specific and substantial below market rate housing component, the project would be inconsistent with various key City and ABAG "smart growth" policies. This possible project inconsistency with applicable local and regional land use policies represents a **potentially significant environmental impact** (see criteria 2 and 3 in subsection 4.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

As explained in section 4.2.7 herein, concerns in recent years over increasing urban sprawl and associated environmental impacts have led regional planning agencies, municipalities, and public interest groups to adopt "smart growth" policies, guidelines, and criteria. "Smart growth" policies and criteria adopted by the City, ABAG, and regional planning interest groups applicable to the proposed Marina Shores Village project are described in subsections 4.2.7(b) and (c) herein.

Under the "significance criteria" listed in section 4.3.1 herein, a project aspect which is inconsistent with an applicable City- or ABAG-adopted "smart growth" policy would be considered a *potentially significant adverse impact*. The proposed Marina Shores Village project embodies a number of fundamental "smart growth" characteristics: it is a high-density residential project with an overall residential density well in excess of 25 units per acre, it is compact and pedestrian-oriented, and it is an infill rather than a geographically isolated development (i.e., it is proposed for location within an existing urban area). However, the project does not incorporate or definitively reflect other key City- and/or ABAG-identified "smart growth" characteristics. Unless the following additional characteristics are

incorporated into the project to City satisfaction, the project would not be consistent with related City and/or ABAG "smart growth" policies and criteria: adequate water supply and adequate park provisions; an effective and convenient transit connection between the project and the City's downtown, key transit corridors, and the CalTrain intermodal transit station; adequate on-site convenience retail provisions; and a substantial affordable housing commitment.

Specific potential project inconsistencies with City- and ABAG-adopted "smart growth" policies are listed below:

- Redwood City General Plan Policy L-1 states that residential development "*should be located only where services and facilities can be provided.*" The capacity of certain necessary services and facilities to adequately serve the project's 1,930 residential units and approximately 4,020 residents (i.e., 3,910 net new residents) (see section 6.3.2 herein) has not been established (see chapter 10, Infrastructure and Public Services). Specifically, a confirmed, adequate supply of water to serve projected project demands has not been identified (see section 10.1 herein) and project compliance with City parks and recreation requirements has not yet been demonstrated (see section 10.6 herein).
- Redwood City General Plan Policy L-3 calls for promotion of higher residential densities "*at locations near or within commercial and financial centers, employment centers, and transportation terminals.*" The proposed project is not within a commercial, financial, or employment center, and is separated from the area's existing commercial, financial, and employment centers (the downtown and other centers) by the freeway and/or a walking distance greater than 1/2 mile or a 10-minute walk. Also, unless a strong and effective transit link is established between the project and local express transit routes, including the El Camino Real transit corridor and with CalTrain, the project would not be convenient to "transportation terminals"; the project applicant has proposed a shuttle bus system, as described in subsection 3.4.3(b) (Proposed Circulation--Shuttle Bus System), which would require a cooperative agreement with SamTrans.
- Redwood City General Plan Policy L-4 calls for distribution of commercial land "*in a manner that maximizes community accessibility to a variety of retail commercial outlets and services and minimizes the need for automobile travel.*" The proposed project and immediate area do not include enough retail space to conveniently and adequately serve the variety of convenience needs of the estimated 4,020 project residents (i.e., 3,910 net new residents).
- Unless a strong and effective transit link is established between the project and local express transit routes, including the El Camino Real transit corridor, and with CalTrain, the project would not be consistent with ABAG Regional Land Use Policy Framework policies encouraging such growth where transit is available and in a location that discourages long-distance commuting.

- Redwood City General Plan Housing Policy 1 calls for promotion of lower-income housing construction in areas convenient to public transportation, shopping, recreation, schools, hospitals, employment, and other community facilities. Similarly, ABAG "smart growth" criteria encourages development that "*ensures a good match between income levels and housing prices.*" Unless the project: (1) includes a substantial lower-income housing component--e.g., a 10- to 20-percent component affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, and (2) establishes a strong and effective transit link with local express transit routes, including the El Camino Real transit corridor and the Redwood City CalTrain/intermodal station, and with the downtown, the project would not further these City policies and ABAG criteria.

The Greenbelt Alliance and Urban Ecology "smart growth" criteria identified previously in this chapter are not adopted City or regional policy and, therefore, cannot be applied as significance criteria under CEQA. However, the project sponsor plans to submit an application to the Greenbelt Alliance for its endorsement of the proposed project after release of this Draft EIR. At this preliminary stage, a member of the Greenbelt Alliance has stated the project's partial consistency with the Alliance's "smart growth" criteria as follows:¹⁷

- The project site is considered urbanized because it is within the overall urban footprint of Redwood City;
- The project has a density greater than 20 units per acre;
- The project design includes provisions for pedestrian use and incorporates alternative parking design; and
- The project sponsor has made a good faith effort to do community outreach.

Mitigation 4-3. Incorporate the following "smart growth" characteristics into the proposed project, to City satisfaction:

- implementation of *Mitigations 10-1* and *10-8* from chapter 10 (Infrastructure and Public Services) of this EIR pertaining to water service and park provisions;
- a convenient and effect *transit link* between the project and local and regional express transit corridors and/or hubs, including the El Camino Real transit corridor and Redwood City CalTrain intermodal station, and between the project, downtown Redwood City, and other local employment, financial, and retail concentrations;

¹⁷Janet Stone, Greenbelt Alliance, personal communication, April 2002.

- *on-site retail commercial provisions* sufficient to serve the convenience retail needs of project residences and businesses;
- a substantial *affordable (below-market-rate [BMR]) housing component*; and
- implementation of all mitigations identified in chapters 8 (Biological Resources) and 12 (Public Health and Safety) of this EIR as necessary to reduce project-related ecological impacts and environmental hazards to less-than-significant levels.

Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential project policy inconsistency to a ***less-than-significant level***.

Cumulative Land Use Impacts. The proposed project, together with other development in the immediate vicinity and elsewhere in Redwood City (see Table 4.1 herein), would contribute to cumulative land use impacts as new development replaces existing development, resulting in potential cumulative land use incompatibilities and associated impacts on the visual environment, population/housing/employment, transportation and circulation, infrastructure and public services, biological resources, and other impact categories. These specific cumulative impacts associated with these particular impact categories are addressed in corresponding chapters of this EIR. Because the City has adopted and routinely implements land use and development review policies and requirements, the cumulative land use impacts of the proposed project together with the development identified in Table 4.1 are considered ***less-than-significant***.

The City has adopted and routinely implements the following procedures for evaluating the land use impacts of proposed development:

- Projects consistent with the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and Redwood City Zoning Ordinance are evaluated by the City based on criteria adopted by the City in those documents and in other adopted policies, regulations, and ordinances before project approval can be granted.
- Projects not consistent with the Redwood City Strategic General Plan and Redwood City Zoning Ordinance must apply for additional discretionary approvals (e.g., General Plan Amendment, Zoning Text and Zoning Map Amendments, Planned Development Permit, Precise Plan, Development Agreement, Design Review [Architectural] Permit) that require additional, detailed submittals (e.g., plans, drawings, specifications) sufficient for the City to determine compliance with applicable regulations under these discretionary actions before project approval can be granted.

Mitigation. No significant cumulative land use impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

