

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1: Feedback Notes

### ODS Discussion (What is your desired goal and how to potentially achieve that goal)

- *Setbacks and Height / Site coverage*
  - Speaker 1 –
    - Requested information on objective criteria for site selection.
      - Staff asserted that the site selection has been an ongoing discussion topic at Council for approx. 2 years and the focus of the workshop is to identify standards, not reconsider sites.
  - Speaker 2 (97 Frederick Ave) –
    - Setbacks at 60 feet is a priority. Privacy and quality of land use are important.
    - Neighborhoods will be impacted with 10 du/ac density. Such a “Capricious” selection of properties will ruin neighborhoods.
  - Speaker 3 (Tom Jorgey, 425 East Oakwood Blvd, RWC) –
    - Provided rendering of multifamily development at 20’ from their property line to show what is not wanted.
    - Preserve existing standards of Atherton. This is “dropping bombs in our neighborhood.”
  - Speaker 4 (Jeff Morris, 55 Elena) –
    - 60+ year residents care about the character of Atherton. R-1A setbacks should be the same.
    - Question: How does state density bonus laws work? What’s the max that can be built in Atherton?
    - Nothing should exceed 2 stories.
    - Objective privacy standards should be developed.
    - There should be max unit size.
  - Speaker 5 (Greta, 74 Laburnum) –
    - Consider tree canopy, size and glory of trees. Preserve Atherton’s uniqueness.
  - Speaker 6 (Carol) –
    - Preserve the character and aesthetics of single-family homes.
    - 10 du/ac would require basement development.
      - Staff asked if concerned about setbacks for basements.
    - Multifamily homes should look like single-family homes with 7,000 sf above ground and 3000 sf underground.
    - Height restrictions should be the same.
    - Dormers should be limited but could be used.
    - Explains that FAR won’t allow for MFH.
  - Speaker 7 (319 Bay Rd, MP) –
    - Concerned about neighborhood and quality of life. Happy with existing development in the neighborhood but concerned about traffic.
  - Speaker 8 (Elizabeth Jensen, 30 Frederick Ave) –
    - Concerned about 4 units at a 5-way stop (Ringwood and Bay Road) sites.

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1: Feedback Notes

- Concerned about design for 10 du/ac. What happens if we come back and do 20 du/ac?
  - Staff explained that Council has directed 10 du/ac at private sites, but could be an iterative process pending HCD review. Changes to density would result in additional outreach and involvement.
- Speaker 9 (Dave Reeney, 224 Oak Grove) –
  - Is there a practical constraint that would require changing the front and rear setbacks? Keep setbacks in line with R-1A setbacks.
- Speaker 10 (Frederick Ave) –
  - What are people willing to sacrifice for setbacks? Questions for the public. Attendees respond that they want the exact same setbacks as R-1A.
- *Building Massing / Site design / Screening and Walls*
  - Speaker 1 (Tom Jorgey, 425 East Oakwood Blvd, RWC) –
    - Who Maintains these features? Thinks developer should maintain for the next 30-40 years.
    - Masonry fencing for durability.
    - Easement could be beneficial to help maintain fence.
    - Screening should screen for complete privacy of single-family lots. Developers should maintain screening. This should be ODS that is not an option to get out of.
    - 23 Oakwood Specific – How can we have ODS that give deference to the character of neighboring properties?
      - Staff suggested massing could respond to neighboring context (i.e. smaller building formers when properties abut neighbors in other jurisdictions that have a smaller building character).
  - Speaker 2 () –
    - Concerned about privacy. Wants soundwall. Concrete soundwall at 10-12 feet high.
    - High concrete wall maintained by developer.
    - Multifamily will disrupt community tranquility.
    - Traffic on Bay Rd and Ringwood is impossible and there's not enough parking. Where are 10+ cars going to park and how are they going to come and go?
    - Individual trash cans per units creates about 80ft is length for trash cans. Concerned about this as an eye-sore and odor.
  - Speaker 3 (Elizabeth Jensen) –
    - Concerned that a developer could buy multiple lots and build apartment like buildings. Requested staff to consider this possibility when developing ODS.
  - Speaker 4 () –
    - Have you seen a town or city being able to avoid housing element regulations?

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1: Feedback Notes

- Staff indicated no, and mentioned recent settlement between the City of Coronado and the State, with Coronado required to comply.
- Speaker 5 (Jeff Morris) –
  - Building mass – Max unit size and buildings should be 2-story max with no exceptions.
  - FAR should be a little higher, but not much more, than SFH.
  - Reiterated Density Bonus concern and suggested reducing density to 6 du/ac. 10 du/ac is too high.
- Speaker 5 (Rick DeGolia, 84 Play Dr) –
  - Concerned about adverse impact on privacy.
  - Massing – Is there a way to structure ODS, where lots are re-zoned to MFH...could we say that a couple of the lots could be developed for MFH?
    - Staff explained this is a legal question and not likely possible.
  - Concern about buying multiple lots and concern about façade running across all.
    - Staff explained that ODS could prevent that.
- Speaker 6 (Carol) –
  - Courtyard design should have protection/screening at the entrance to look like a single-family home.
  - Limit the number of entrances seen from the front.
  - Wants privacy from neighbors – No balconies. Doesn't want to see trash or storage on places like balconies.
  - Factor in a turning radius for garage access.
  - There should be no pools or sport courts. Doesn't want 40 ppl in the back during a holiday weekend making a lot of noise.
  - No Playground equipment
  - Need property management – Who's going to manage it? Who's making sure rules and privacy are respected.
  - Need solid gate (at front).
  - Wants design review for multifamily, but not single family.
  - Need underground parking. 10 units has potential for 20+ cars and pseudo-commercial trucks.
  - Underground storage for multifamily homes.
- *Façade Articulation and Parking*
  - Speaker 1 (Elizabeth, 111 Frederick Ave) –
    - Unrealistic to have one parking spot per unit. At least 2 spots per unit and self-contained within those units.
    - Traffic down Ringwood needs to be thought about. It's a disaster and is only going to get worse.
    - Town needs to work with Menlo Park on the traffic issue.
  - Speaker 2 (City Manager, George Rodericks) –

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1: Feedback Notes

- Prefer to see residential garage and entry style, with gate at entrance to garage rather than an open entry.
- Speaker 3 (Carol) –
  - Underground parking is typically on the side of the property.
  - If there is a gate at the property entrance, another gate at underground parking is not necessary.
  - Decibel limits and sound restrictions on underground parking
- Speaker 4 () –
  - Site criteria should be fair and consider properties that haven't been re-developed. Some places make sense – El Camino Real.
  - Focus on MFH on ECR to match other jurisdictions.
  - Lives on Bay Rd and doesn't feel safe walking. Neighbors have asked to walk through his property because of safety concerns.
- Speaker 5 (Lin H., 29 Frederik Ave) –
  - 5<sup>th</sup> home on Bay Rd backs up onto her property.
  - People feel uncomfortable walking down Bay Rd around Lindenwood. Neighbors created safer access through a shared gate.
  - Concerned about traffic on Frederick Street in Lindenwood.
  - Multifamily housing is going to make traffic worse, and people won't enjoy living in Atherton anymore and will move.
- *Other Issues*
  - Speaker 1 (Tom) –
    - Parking Standards
    - Traffic signals should be added at Selby. Should be on developer to provide.
    - Drainage concerns at 437 E Oakwood and other areas in Oakwood Blvd.
    - Could developers be forced to contribute financially?
      - Staff mentioned traffic mitigation impact fee. Attendees vocalized support.
  - Speaker 2 () –
    - Communicate why lots were chosen.
  - Speaker 3 (Planning Commissioner, Chair Lane) –
    - Describes and asks staff questions about threat of Builders Remedy
    - Urges the we need for a plan, given Builders Remedy, and that a plan creates outline for procedure and control of development standards for multifamily, which otherwise would not apply in a Builders Remedy scenario.