

**From:** [Steve Boom](#)  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Cc:** [Rick DeGolia](#); [Bill Widmer](#); [Elizabeth Lewis](#); [Diana Hawkins-Manuelian](#); [Robert Polito](#); [Lisa Boom](#)  
**Subject:** Housing Element -- Bear Gulch Reservoir  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 11:57:24 PM

---

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Hello,

We are writing to provide our feedback regarding the staff's proposal to consider adding high-density housing on parts of the Bear Gulch Reservoir land. Unfortunately, we are unable to attend the council meeting on Thursday.

We are residents at [REDACTED], all the way at the end of the Walsh Road corridor and a few hundred feet from California Water.

To be honest, we were shocked to read the staff's proposal to consider two housing sites on the Reservoir property, each of which could be as large as 40-60 units and stand 4 stories tall. Not only would such a proposal completely alter the very nature of the entire neighborhood (and thus the property values), but the addition of so many new residents to this area would create significant traffic and pedestrian safety issues as well as create high-density housing in a fire-prone area. We strongly oppose this proposal.

We purchased our property in 2016 because of the unique character of the Walsh Road corridor. For us, the Walsh Road corridor felt like — and continues to feel like — “Portola Valley but in Atherton.” In other words, the Walsh Road corridor has a uniquely rural feel to it, unlike any other area in Atherton. This sets it apart from Atherton Ave and its surroundings, which feel more like “Beverly Hills but in Atherton”, or the area of Atherton closer to El Camino Real which is more like surrounding suburban towns such as Menlo Park. Adding multi-story buildings to the Reservoir would, in one swift action, destroy the unique character of the Walsh Road corridor and, with it, the property values for homeowners such as ourselves who invested in the area. From a property value perspective, the unique, rural character of our neighborhood offsets its biggest downside which is proximity to I-280 and the attendant highway noise. If you remove the rural character of the neighborhood, it will be unrecognizable and drive property values down.

In addition, the proposal under consideration would add material population density to the neighborhood, which will cause significant traffic and pedestrian safety issues. Inevitably, the ingress and egress to these new multi-story buildings will cause significant congestion — and there is no reasonable way to mitigate it. And there is no public transportation anywhere nearby. The Reservoir is tucked away at the end of 1-way in, 1-way out narrow residential streets. There's no reasonable way to widen the roads, add lanes, or add new ingress or egress points. That means substantially higher traffic in residential areas that were not designed for it. And it will also add traffic to Alameda de las Pulgas, which is already congested at Las Lomitas during school hours and also around the Alameda/Atherton Ave intersection which already sees traffic backed up both northbound and southbound at multiple times during the day.

The residents of the neighborhood — as well as adjacent neighborhoods — enjoy walking the streets of the Walsh Road corridor at all hours of the day. To be honest, the situation is already somewhat unsafe because there are some blind curves on Walsh Road, the area is very dark once the sun starts to go down, and there seems to be constant truck traffic due to the Reservoir and also construction. Adding a significant number of new residents will only increase both the foot traffic and the car traffic, which will only make walking more unsafe. And given the fact that Walsh Road is a 1-way in, 1-way out street, there is no real alternative route for people to walk in the neighborhood away from the primary vehicular route. Pedestrians can't take a side street because there aren't any — all of the side streets are dead ends. People's options will be to walk down a more heavily trafficked road or to get in their cars to drive to another neighborhood in order to go for a walk. To call this counterproductive is a massive understatement.

Finally, the Walsh Road corridor is the area of Atherton most at risk for wildfires. A couple of years ago when there were significant fires in the Santa Cruz mountains, the residents of our neighborhood were prepared to evacuate because of our proximity to the mountains as well as all of the vegetation that surrounds us (which creates the rural character). And now there is a proposal to add multi-story buildings and materially increase population density? How can this be viewed as anything but an unnecessary increase in public safety risk, not only to the new residents but also to existing residents? Evacuation routes along our 1-way in/1-way out roads will be that much more congested, which has the potential to cause significant harm.

In short, we strongly oppose any proposal to build high-density housing on the Bear Gulch Reservoir. In reviewing the overall proposal, there are clearly other sites which are more suitable for high-density housing and are in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Steve and Lisa Boom

## Anthony Suber

---

**From:** albert cheung [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 7:10 PM  
**To:** Anthony Suber; Council  
**Subject:** Re: 23 Oakwood Blvd Development Proposal

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Please accept my apologies. The previous email should be dated December 14, 2022. The corrected version is below.  
Thank you,  
Jennifer Cheung

December 14, 2022

Dear Mr. Suber and Atherton Council:

Nearly six months later, we write again in response to the recent notice from the Town of Atherton regarding the proposed rezoning of several properties in Atherton to increase housing density. In particular, we are writing in regard to 23 Oakwood Blvd, which is close to our home on East Oakwood Blvd.

First, we do wish to express our disappointment that Atherton has chosen to not be better neighbors with us. If it were not for another Redwood City neighbor, we would not have known you were considering this property for high density development again. We hope that in the future you will make the effort to respect and care for all your neighbors, regardless of a municipal boundary line.

As we mentioned in June, we do support the statewide mandate to increase housing density to allow for more affordable housing for local populations, and yet we have several concerns with the current proposal for the Town of Atherton's proposal for 23 Oakwood Blvd. Listed below are our concerns, which we respectfully request you to consider.

1. 23 Oakwood Blvd continues to have a much higher density plan than other parcels in the Atherton proposal. Council members indicated that since it was on the edge of Atherton, it was easier to place it there. That may win a popularity vote but may not actually be the best choice for public safety. Please address why 23 Oakwood Blvd is suitable for the higher density, even though the access road is limited and joins into a complex intersection with no traffic controls.
2. The current Atherton zoning proposal would allow a developer to construct up to 20 homes per acre on this ~1.5-acre site. This is a small decrease from this summer; while we thank you for recognizing the original proposal was too high, we do ask that you evaluate how the cars from 30 homes will access the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood. In addition, please address how the increased traffic will affect the intersection of Selby and Oakwood as well as the overall traffic on Selby.
3. Selby and Oakwood are used as part of the Peninsula bicycle route and for pedestrians (including children walking to school), but the roads do not have sidewalks. This fall Jennifer was almost hit by a car coming from Atherton as it veered onto the Oakwood Circle. This is, unfortunately, becoming a more frequent occurrence as traffic returns to pre-pandemic levels. We respectfully request Atherton to address this safety hazard that would be created by a large development on Oakwood Blvd.

4. In addition, during morning rush hour, Oakwood Blvd already backs up significantly due to the high density of traffic on Selby Lane. How will the developer and Atherton address the increased number of cars needing to access Selby Lane during rush hour.
5. The 23 Oakwood Blvd lot is long and narrow. We all need to be vigilant that firefighters can access areas quickly and safely. Please address how you will ensure emergency vehicles will be able to access the roads with the complex circle entrance and traffic backup at Selby and Oakwood.
6. In the past ten years, the west side of Oakwood Blvd has already added two small lanes with an additional six homes. The circle was not designed to become a major thoroughfare but is already becoming so. We request that you require any developer near Oakwood Blvd address traffic flow and management with remedies such as but not limited to a traffic light at Selby Lane and El Camino Real, funding for sidewalks on the Oakwood Blvd circle, and a stop sign (with appropriate traffic studies) at the the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood.
7. The impact of an increased population on our schools and community recreation centers. Currently, these children would need to cross El Camino to access their local school, unless they attend Selby Lane School. Where will the children play? Will there be recreational opportunities on the property? Knowing that the children will be on the border of two communities but in the same school, can the developer open the recreational areas to the larger community?
8. Atherton in general and the 23 Oakwood Blvd area has a significant amount of flooding during the rainy season. Lately there have been flood warning signs on Selby and neighboring streets. With the increasing housing and impervious surfaces, how will Atherton address stormwater management? What remedies will be taken to ensure that flooding issues will be diminished, rather than exacerbated?
9. 23 Oakwood Blvd has beautiful trees on the property. How will Atherton ensure that any heritage trees and other plants that provide shade, thus reducing warming, will be protected during construction?
10. We reiterate the request we made this summer that you expand your communication circle to include all of Oakwood Blvd and not just the 500 feet beyond 23 Oakwood Blvd. As stated in the Bible, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself." We hope that Atherton can be as caring of its Redwood City neighbors as it can of its Atherton residents.

Sincerely,

Albert T Cheung, MD and Jennifer Pollock Cheung

  
Redwood City, CA 9406

On Wed, Dec 14, 2022 at 7:07 PM albert cheung <[alandjennifercheung@gmail.com](mailto:alandjennifercheung@gmail.com)> wrote:

June 22, 2022

Dear Mr. Suber and Atherton Council:

Nearly six months later, we write again in response to the recent notice from the Town of Atherton regarding the proposed rezoning of several properties in Atherton to increase housing density. In particular, we are writing in regard to 23 Oakwood Blvd, which is close to our home on East Oakwood Blvd.

First, we do wish to express our disappointment that Atherton has chosen to not be better neighbors with us. If it were not for another Redwood City neighbor, we would not have known you were considering this property for high density development again. We hope that in the future you will make the effort to respect and care for all your neighbors, regardless of a municipal boundary line.

As we mentioned in June, we do support the statewide mandate to increase housing density to allow for more affordable housing for local populations, and yet we have several concerns with the current proposal for the Town of Atherton's proposal for 23 Oakwood Blvd. Listed below are our concerns, which we respectfully request you to consider.

1. 23 Oakwood Blvd continues to have a much higher density plan than other parcels in the Atherton proposal. Council members indicated that since it was on the edge of Atherton, it was easier to place it there. That may win a popularity vote but may not actually be the best choice for public safety. Please address why 23 Oakwood Blvd is suitable for the higher density, even though the access road is limited and joins into a complex intersection with no traffic controls.
2. The current Atherton zoning proposal would allow a developer to construct up to 20 homes per acre on this ~1.5-acre site. This is a small decrease from this summer; while we thank you for recognizing the original proposal was too high, we do ask that you evaluate how the cars from 30 homes will access the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood. In addition, please address how the increased traffic will affect the intersection of Selby and Oakwood as well as the overall traffic on Selby.
3. Selby and Oakwood are used as part of the Peninsula bicycle route and for pedestrians (including children walking to school), but the roads do not have sidewalks. This fall Jennifer was almost hit by a car coming from Atherton as it veered onto the Oakwood Circle. This is, unfortunately, becoming a more frequent occurrence as traffic returns to pre-pandemic levels. We respectfully request Atherton to address this safety hazard that would be created by a large development on Oakwood Blvd.
4. In addition, during morning rush hour, Oakwood Blvd already backs up significantly due to the high density of traffic on Selby Lane. How will the developer and Atherton address the increased number of cars needing to access Selby Lane during rush hour.
5. The 23 Oakwood Blvd lot is long and narrow. We all need to be vigilant that firefighters can access areas quickly and safely. Please address how you will ensure emergency vehicles will be able to access the roads with the complex circle entrance and traffic backup at Selby and Oakwood.
6. In the past ten years, the west side of Oakwood Blvd has already added two small lanes with an additional six homes. The circle was not designed to become a major thoroughfare but is already becoming so. We request that you require any developer near Oakwood Blvd address traffic flow and management with remedies such as but not limited to a traffic light at Selby Lane and El Camino Real, funding for sidewalks on the Oakwood Blvd circle, and a stop sign (with appropriate traffic studies) at the the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood.
7. The impact of an increased population on our schools and community recreation centers. Currently, these children would need to cross El Camino to access their local school, unless they attend Selby Lane School. Where will the children play? Will there be recreational opportunities on the property? Knowing that the children will be on the border of two communities but in the same school, can the developer open the recreational areas to the larger community?
8. Atherton in general and the 23 Oakwood Blvd area has a significant amount of flooding during the rainy season. Lately there have been flood warning signs on Selby and neighboring streets. With the increasing housing and impervious surfaces, how will Atherton address stormwater management? What remedies will be taken to ensure that flooding issues will be diminished, rather than exacerbated?
9. 23 Oakwood Blvd has beautiful trees on the property. How will Atherton ensure that any heritage trees and other plants that provide shade, thus reducing warming, will be protected during construction?
10. We reiterate the request we made this summer that you expand your communication circle to include all of Oakwood Blvd and not just the 500 feet beyond 23 Oakwood Blvd. As stated in the Bible, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself." We hope that Atherton can be as caring of its Redwood City neighbors as it can of its Atherton residents.

Sincerely,

Albert T Cheung, MD and Jennifer Pollock Cheung

[REDACTED]

Redwood City, CA 9406

**From:** [Stephanie Corey](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Suber](#)  
**Subject:** High Density Housing Plan  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 6:40:00 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Dear Atherton City Council,

I recently found out about your proposed high density housing plan at 23 Oakwood Drive. As a Redwood Oaks neighbor, I would like to formally oppose the proposal. Redwood City has added a massive amount of high density housing in the last decade, and the residents have had to absorb the congestion that comes with this development. The very last thing our neighborhood wants is more high density housing quite literally yards away from our already overcrowded streets. A simple search on Google maps will show just how overcrowded Redwood City is in comparison to the properties in Atherton. Please find another way to deal with the state mandates without putting this undue burden on us.

Regards,  
Stephanie Corey, [REDACTED] Redwood City

## Anthony Suber

---

**From:** Susan Honda Eady <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 11:52 PM  
**To:** Anthony Suber  
**Subject:** Atherton's proposed 23 Oakwood Blvd development

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

December 14, 2022

Dear Mr. Suber and Atherton Council,

We write again in response to recent notice of the meeting to discuss Atherton's proposed 23 Oakwood Blvd development down just down the street from us. And again, we only hear about this via other neighbors – nothing from the town of Atherton. I realize that we do not live in Atherton but our family has lived here for over 50 years - and hope to continue to do so - safely.

We do support the statewide mandate to increase housing density to allow for more affordable housing for local populations, and yet we have several concerns with the current proposal for the Town of Atherton's proposal for 23 Oakwood Blvd.

1. 23 Oakwood Blvd continues to have a much higher density plan than other parcels in the Atherton proposal. Council members indicated that since it was on the edge of Atherton, it was easier to place it there. That may win a popularity vote but may not actually be the best choice for public safety. Please address why 23 Oakwood Blvd is suitable for the higher density, even though the access road is limited and joins into a complex intersection with no traffic controls.
2. The current Atherton zoning proposal would allow a developer to construct up to 20 homes per acre on this ~1.5-acre site. This is a small decrease from this summer; while we thank you for recognizing the original proposal was too high, we do ask that you evaluate how the cars from 30 homes will access the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood. In addition, please address how the increased traffic will affect the intersection of Selby and Oakwood as well as the overall traffic on Selby.
3. Selby and Oakwood are used as part of the Peninsula bicycle route and for pedestrians (including children walking to school), but the roads do not have sidewalks. It is more and more dangerous to walk as traffic returns to pre-pandemic levels. We respectfully request Atherton to address this safety hazard that would be created by a large development on Oakwood Blvd.
4. In addition, during morning rush hour, Oakwood Blvd already backs up significantly due to the high density of traffic on Selby Lane. How will the developer and Atherton address the increased number of cars needing to access Selby Lane during rush hour?
5. The 23 Oakwood Blvd lot is long and narrow. We all need to be vigilant that firefighters can access areas quickly and safely. Please address how you will ensure emergency vehicles will be able to access the roads with the complex circle entrance and traffic backup at Selby and Oakwood.
6. In the past ten years, the west side of Oakwood Blvd has already added two small lanes with an additional six homes. The circle was not designed to become a major thoroughfare but is already becoming so. We request that you require any developer near Oakwood Blvd address traffic flow and management with remedies such as but not limited



to a traffic light at Selby Lane and El Camino Real, funding for sidewalks on the Oakwood Blvd circle, and a stop sign (with appropriate traffic studies) at the the intersection of East Oakwood, West Oakwood and Oakwood Blvd, coming from Atherton – right in front of the proposed development.

7. The impact of an increased population on our schools and community recreation centers. Currently, these children would need to cross El Camino to access their local school, unless they attend Selby Lane School. Where will the children play? Will there be recreational opportunities on the property? Knowing that the children will be on the border of two communities but in the same school, can the developer open the recreational areas to the larger community?

8. Atherton in general and the 23 Oakwood Blvd area has a significant amount of flooding during the rainy season. Lately there have been flood warning signs on Selby and neighboring streets. With the increasing housing and impervious surfaces, how will Atherton address stormwater management? What remedies will be taken to ensure that flooding issues will be diminished, rather than exacerbated?

9. 23 Oakwood Blvd has beautiful trees on the property. How will Atherton ensure that any heritage trees and other plants that provide shade, thus reducing warming, will be protected during construction?

10. We reiterate the request we made this summer that you expand your communication circle to include all of Oakwood Blvd and not just the 500 feet beyond 23 Oakwood Blvd. We hope that Atherton can be as caring of its Redwood City neighbors as it can of its Atherton residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Susan Honda Eady

Jerry Eady

Tamiko Honda

[REDACTED]

Redwood City, CA 94061

**From:** [Stephanie Sargent](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Suber](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed Plan at 23 Oakwood Drive  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 10:18:42 AM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Hi Anthony,  
Public comment for December 15th meeting from Erin Callaghan.


**From:** Erin <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** December 13, 2022 at 10:05:20 AM PST  
**To:** council@ci.atherton.ca.us  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Council-Diane Howard  
<DHoward@redwoodcity.org>  
**Subject:** Proposed Plan at 23 Oakwood Drive

Dear Atherton City Council,

I live in the Redwood Oaks neighborhood of Redwood City, immediately adjacent to Atherton's border. Our streets are narrow with no sidewalks, similar to the rural design in Atherton. We have pedestrians, bikers, joggers and especially children riding their bikes to school on Selby Lane going through our neighborhood. We also have a large amount of cut-through traffic moving between El Camino and Woodside Road and 101 and 280 freeways. Due to the nature of our smaller properties, many people must park on these overburdened streets, sending pedestrians and bicyclists into the street where they must share the narrow road with cars, impacting an already very dangerous situation.

I recently found out about your proposed high density housing plan at 23 Oakwood Drive. I urge you to reject this proposal in light of the burden it would place on already overused streets that were not designed to carry the amount of traffic seen in this area, which also includes streets in Atherton.

Several months ago I participated in another Zoom meeting about a similar (but smaller) proposal for this same lot and there were many people from both Atherton and Redwood City requesting that Atherton rethink a proposal of that size. Considering this is even denser and nothing has changed in the design of our streets, I hope that Atherton will want to be good neighbors. Please find a better way to comply with state mandates rather than create a more dangerous situation on the Atherton/Redwood City border.

Sincerely,  
Erin Callaghan  
  
Redwood City

## Anthony Suber

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 9:21 AM  
**To:** Anthony Suber  
**Cc:** Goly Barar  
**Subject:** 23 Oakwood Housing Element

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Re-submitting this email to register our objections & support to all points below.

December 15, 2022

Dear Mr. Suber and Atherton Council:

Nearly six months later, we write again in response to the recent notice from the Town of Atherton regarding the proposed rezoning of several properties in Atherton to increase housing density. In particular, we are writing in regard to 23 Oakwood Blvd, which is close to our home on East Oakwood Blvd.

First, we do wish to express our disappointment that Atherton has chosen to not be better neighbors with us. If it were not for another Redwood City neighbor, we would not have known you were considering this property for high density development again. We hope that in the future you will make the effort to respect and care for all your neighbors, regardless of a municipal boundary line.

As we mentioned in June, we do support the statewide mandate to increase housing density to allow for more affordable housing for local populations, and yet we have several concerns with the current proposal for the Town of Atherton's proposal for 23 Oakwood Blvd. Listed below are our concerns, which we respectfully request you to consider.

1. 23 Oakwood Blvd continues to have a much higher density plan than other parcels in the Atherton proposal. Council members indicated that since it was on the edge of Atherton, it was easier to place it there. That may win a popularity vote but may not actually be the best choice for public safety. Please address why 23 Oakwood Blvd is suitable for the higher density, even though the access road is limited and joins into a complex intersection with no traffic controls.
2. The current Atherton zoning proposal would allow a developer to construct up to 20 homes per acre on this ~1.5-acre site. This is a small decrease from this summer; while we thank you for recognizing the original proposal was too high, we do ask that you evaluate how the cars from 30 homes will access the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood. In addition, please address how the increased traffic will affect the intersection of Selby and Oakwood as well as the overall traffic on Selby.
3. Selby and Oakwood are used as part of the Peninsula bicycle route and for pedestrians (including children walking to school), but the roads do not have sidewalks. This fall Jennifer was almost hit by a car coming from Atherton as it veered onto the Oakwood Circle. This is, unfortunately, becoming a more frequent occurrence as traffic returns to pre-pandemic levels. We respectfully request Atherton to address this safety hazard that would be created by a large development on Oakwood Blvd.

4. In addition, during morning rush hour, Oakwood Blvd already backs up significantly due to the high density of traffic on Selby Lane. How will the developer and Atherton address the increased number of cars needing to access Selby Lane during rush hour.

5. The 23 Oakwood Blvd lot is long and narrow. We all need to be vigilant that firefighters can access areas quickly and safely. Please address how you will ensure emergency vehicles will be able to access the roads with the complex circle entrance and traffic backup at Selby and Oakwood.

6. In the past ten years, the west side of Oakwood Blvd has already added two small lanes with an additional six homes. The circle was not designed to become a major thoroughfare but is already becoming so. We request that you require any developer near Oakwood Blvd address traffic flow and management with remedies such as but not limited to a traffic light at Selby Lane and El Camino Real, funding for sidewalks on the Oakwood Blvd circle, and a stop sign (with appropriate traffic studies) at the intersection of Oakwood and Oakwood.

7. The impact of an increased population on our schools and community recreation centers. Currently, these children would need to cross El Camino to access their local school, unless they attend Selby Lane School. Where will the children play? Will there be recreational opportunities on the property? Knowing that the children will be on the border of two communities but in the same school, can the developer open the recreational areas to the larger community?

8. Atherton in general and the 23 Oakwood Blvd area has a significant amount of flooding during the rainy season. Lately there have been flood warning signs on Selby and neighboring streets. With the increasing housing and impervious surfaces, how will Atherton address stormwater management? What remedies will be taken to ensure that flooding issues will be diminished, rather than exacerbated?

9. 23 Oakwood Blvd has beautiful trees on the property. How will Atherton ensure that any heritage trees and other plants that provide shade, thus reducing warming, will be protected during construction?

10. We reiterate the request we made this summer that you expand your communication circle to include all of Oakwood Blvd and not just the 500 feet beyond 23 Oakwood Blvd. As stated in the Bible, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself." We hope that Atherton can be as caring of its Redwood City neighbors as it can of its Atherton residents.

Sincerely,

Andrew Faulkner & Goly Barar

██████████, Redwood City

[REDACTED]  
Atherton, CA 94027  
December 13, 2022

Atherton City Council  
80 Fair Oaks Lane  
Atherton, CA 94027

Dear Council Members:

I was intrigued to read the package for the special housing meeting on Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>. Let me first remark that the Council and town staff have done an extraordinary job of trying to find land areas that could accommodate multifamily housing without significantly altering the character of the existing town. Well done!

It appears that the focus of this meeting is to further study potential land development spaces. The sites that are contained in the analysis would appear to be optimal with minimal impact to existing homes. I do have a few comments as to the recommendations:

1. Soils reports will be extremely important as regards the water table for the Bear Gulch area. My husband and I have built two homes on that side of the Alameda. At one property, we hit water at 5 feet and at 9 feet. I have no idea if there are water issues at Bear Gulch, but the question needs to be asked if a four-story building is contemplated. As you know, PPG has built extensively through the Walsh Road area and may have insight.
2. I see no mention of potential housing at Holbrook Palmer Park. I have been told that the terms of the land gift were that it must remain as a park or be deeded to Stanford University. I wonder though if the restriction applies to the location of the existing house that, I'm told, the police chief resides in? If that house were demolished or remodeled and a two or three-story multifamily building erected, would that violate the terms of the parkland gift? The town would merely be trading housing-for-housing. It would have no impact on the beauty or use of the park itself, since the existing house is at the perimeter and out-of-sight.
3. I see no mention of the Sacred Heart campus. This implies that the school is not willing to entertain housing. My children went to St. Joseph's, so I am somewhat familiar with the campus. It used to have a number of small units where retired nuns resided. I assume the units are still there? Perhaps this space could be redeveloped into multi-story housing for staff and faculty? Maybe the town, or a private investment group (of residents), could incentivize the school by offering low interest construction loans that would convert to a long-term mortgage? Interest could even be deferred until the new units were leased, costing the school nothing.
4. Is there any possibility of closing the Adelante Selby Spanish Immersion School and using the land for multifamily housing instead? Few Atherton residents have children there, although I realize that the elementary school is of benefit to the neighboring communities.
5. While the brownstone concept for Bay Rd. and Ringwood is interesting, I fear that it has the potential to devalue the surrounding homes. The proposal is for 3+ story buildings to be added to a largely one-story neighborhood. Granted, Bay Road is not that attractive, but that doesn't mean that its existing homeowners should bear the burden of 92 high density housing units within a relatively close distance. 999 Ringwood, for example, is valued at \$4.9M on Zillow. Putting 18 housing units on that property would most certainly devalue the adjacent homes,

especially if the new structure were a three-story configuration. If the town decides to pursue this, then underground parking should be mandatory. Architectural design will be very important. It is also possible that two-story multifamily housing units could be made to look like single family homes rather than three-story townhouses. You would not get as much density as with the higher configuration, but it would better maintain the existing character of the neighborhood. Joe Comartin did this 10+ years ago at the corner of Fremont in Menlo Park (i.e., built two-story multifamily units that actually resemble single-family units). Those “brownstones” are quite attractive and do not diminish the neighborhood. They blend in quite nicely. It might also be possible to design a third story pitched-roof “attic” unit with large dormer windows. This would give the benefit of three stories of housing with a two-story appearance.

6. If you allow three-story buildings, you should consider raising the fence height limits and mandate extensive landscape shielding.
7. I believe that parking for all multifamily housing should be underground unless it is at Bear Gulch or on the school campuses where parking lots would not detract. You are talking about a significant number of cars on each parcel. For example, the 18 proposed housing units at Ringwood could have as many as 27-36 vehicles (assuming a predominance of two working adults per unit). You’ll also have a fair number of trucks with lower-income inhabitants. They are hard-working people, many of whom may be in the trades.
8. Trash enclosures have to be carefully considered, too. With this many units on one parcel, you are likely talking about contained dumpsters, either in the underground garage or within fenced enclosures. I have owned several fourplexes. I can tell you that trash containment was one of my biggest headaches. I also don’t think you want to see 18 mailboxes out front, so this needs appropriate restriction. While I realize that your primary focus is on achieving the state-mandated 348 housing units, there are other considerations besides the structures.

The housing mandate is a horrendous set of issues for Atherton, and the Council and staff have worked arduously to find resolution. There are no easy answers. Thank you for the monumental amount of time and energy that you have already devoted. I look forward to meetings in the new year as you contemplate additional options and seek community input. You have done an excellent job of outreach already.

Respectfully,  
Carol Flaherty

**From:** [Peter Hutton](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Suber](#)  
**Subject:** 23 Oakwood Drive  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:09:39 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Dear Atherton City Council, I would like to formally oppose the proposal for high density housing at 23 Oakwood Drive.

The recent traffic alterations in Redwood City already drive through traffic onto East Oakwood Boulevard and in front of the proposed address. This is already a hazard in a residential area which is not designed to cope with a significant influx of new occupants.

The residents in both Atherton and Redwood City in the nearby areas will be significantly effected by a development of this size whilst the environmental impact is hugely depressing in an already overcrowded area.

Peter Hutton

--





**From:** [Clay Judd](#)  
**To:** [George Rodericks](#); [Rick DeGolia](#); [Elizabeth Lewis](#); [Bill Widmer](#); [Diana Hawkins-Manuelian](#); [Robert Polito](#)  
**Subject:** Special Meeting December 15th, 80-120 Housing Units on Reservoir Road and 80-120 Housing Units on Moore Road on Cal Water property.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 7:23:19 AM

---

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Dear Mayor DeGolia and Council Members,

I have just recently become aware of your recent Staff Report suggesting 80-120 housing units be built on the Cal Water property at the end of Reservoir Road along with an additional 80-120 housing units be built on the Cal Water property on Moore road.

It is hard to believe what I'm actually reading, and shocking that this is on the Staff Report. How could this have possibly been suggested when there are so many reasons this site is not suitable for development of this nature?

The original Cal Water proposal of 4 units for employees, was what the public was told prior to the December 15, 2022 meeting. How does the Staff Report suddenly add potentially 240 units to a Cal Water site, which is designed and built to provide water to the community?

If the City wants to build housing of this magnitude it should be built in a location closer to basic services and supporting roads. Neither Walsh road or Moore road could handle this kind of traffic.

I personally think the State mandate for added housing for every city and town is the wrong approach as Community Development requires advance planning and design for infrastructure to accommodate growth. The State should eliminate the housing requirement.

There are many neighbors in the Wash Road and Moore Road area that will be totally against your new housing proposal. Please rethink this new proposal and delete the Cal Water property from City Housing Update.

Sincerely,

Clay Judd



**From:** [kathy klebe](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Suber](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to development at 23 Oakwood dr.  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 7:18:22 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Atherton City Council,

As a Redwood Oaks neighbor, I would like to formally oppose the multi unit housing proposal for 23 Oakwood Dr. This high density housing on this street will add more cars to very busy walking/biking route. Dozens of school children walk the East and West Oakwood Bl. streets daily on their way to Adelante Selby Lane school. You need to find another way to fulfill the state mandates without putting this undue burden and safety hazard in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Klebe

--

Kathy

**From:** [Deborah Kranz](#)  
**To:** [Council](#); [Rick DeGolia](#); [Bill Widmer](#); [Elizabeth Lewis](#); [Diana Hawkins-Manuelian](#); [Robert Polito](#)  
**Cc:** [Deborah Kranz](#)  
**Subject:** Walsh Road - Housing Element  
**Date:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 2:15:33 AM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Atherton Council Members and Mayor:

I recently learned about the recommendation to consider designating two portions of the California Water Service Reservoir property at the end of Reservoir Road in the Walsh Road area to accommodate 40-60 units on both Potential Site 1 and 2 for a total of 80 to 120 new units in the heart of the Walsh Road neighborhood and permitting to build 4 stories or 48 feet within 30 feet of the property line. Setting aside the safety elements of having a dense development in the wildfire zone of Atherton and in the flood inundation zone of a failed dam, it is completely inappropriate to designate Atherton's most rural area for its most dense development.

You should take into consideration that there have already been traffic issues identified by the city to get onto Alameda that backs up traffic both mornings and evenings which will only worsen. This impacts the Los Lomas School as well and endangers our children. It is also unsafe to have this many residents traveling on a "not through" street. It would be far better to:

,

1. Not do anything until you work with the residents to build a case as to why they should consider ADU's. I do not believe that a case has been made to justify why ADU's should be counted. Many of us have rented our ADU's for years to students, teachers, Stanford Professors and visiting fellows, as well as young families that want our school district but cannot afford the homes. ADU's can also be offered to local public school teachers, local police, firemen and government workers.
2. Have the residents pay more tax and pay the fines assessed for not complying
3. Build the additional housing on a main thoroughfare such as El Camino, use Holbrook Palmer park or St Joes Seminary (there are less studying to be priests) where there is street access from both sides. You could assess the residents for the purchase of any property

I encourage you to come up with a more creative solution that to endanger lives of residents. I personally believe that by building this many homes in our small community that you will find that Atherton will not longer be ranked as highly as it has been in the past. You have many intelligent and creative residents in the community that you should approach to form a committee to look at the many options that are available vs making a haste decision that will permanently adversely affect our community.

Best,

Deborah & Michael Kranz



Atherton CA 94027

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Stephanie Sargent [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2022 11:12 PM  
**To:** Anthony Suber; George Rodericks; Council; City Attorney Mona Ebrahimi  
**Subject:** Re: Error on agenda

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Anthony, George, Mona and council:

The "remote public comments" email address has been incorrect on all agendas since at least September 02, 2022 up until the December 15th special meeting agenda. This means any public comments sent in remotely since September, possibly before, were never received. How many people have not been heard? People should be informed of the mistake Atherton has made and that their remote comments may have not been received or read during any and all meetings since September.

This is a public comment for the December 15th special meeting.

Best,  
Stephanie Sargent

> On Dec 12, 2022, at 10:22 PM, Stephanie Sargent <norcalgal357@icloud.com> wrote:

>

> Hi Anthony,

> There is a mistake with your email address on the December 15th special meeting agenda. The link for people to send public comment is wrong. Please fix it asap and resend out the agenda so people are able to email you and not get bounce back messages. You are missing and "a" in ".ca" in asuber@ci.atherton.ca.us Please let me know when you fix this and include me in the email. Thank you.

> Best,

> Stephanie Sargent

**From:** [Laurie Shepard](#)  
**To:** [Council](#); [Rick DeGolia](#); [Bill Widmer](#); [Elizabeth Lewis](#); [Diana Hawkins-Manuelian](#); [Robert Polito](#)  
**Subject:** Housing Element/Bear Gulch  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 9:08:59 AM

---

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Dear Members of the Town Council,

I just learned of the Town staff's most recent recommendation to consider designating two portions of the California Water Service Reservoir property at the end of Reservoir Road in the Walsh Road area. Bear Gulch Reservoir would be designated to accommodate 40-60 units on both Potential Site 1 and 2 for a total of 80 to 120 new units in the heart of the Walsh Road neighborhood. They would also be permitted to build 4 stories or 48 feet within 30 feet of the property line.

This staff recommendation was made without any conversation with any of the affected neighbors, or the Walsh Road community at large, and was obviously not well thought out before being proposed. This suggestion lacks common sense or basic planning precepts, and ignores the many obvious reasons this site is not appropriate, or safe, for high density development:

- The site sits in the middle of the wildfire zone of Atherton
- The site is in the flood inundation zone of a failed dam
- Large scale development creates threats of contamination to our drinking water supply
- The site lacks the necessary infrastructure to support high density development (water, sewer, power, accessibility, etc.).
- The site is only accessible via a single, winding, dead end road, not designed to accommodate high traffic volumes. High density development requires adjacency and accessibility to transportation corridors and public transportation (i.e. train/bus routes)

I would ask that this recommendation be immediately removed from the Town's submittal, as it would be completely inappropriate to designate Atherton's most rural area for its most dense development.

Thank you,

Laurie Shepard



## Anthony Suber

---

**From:** Jeffrey Staley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 5:55 PM  
**To:** Council; Rick DeGolia; Bill Widmer; Elizabeth Lewis; Diana Hawkins-Manuelian; Robert Polito  
**Subject:** Opposition to multi-family units at the Bear Gulch Reservoir Site

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Dear Mayor DeGolia and Members of the Atherton Town Council,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed project at the Bear Gulch Reservoir Site, which would include the development of up to 120 dense multi-family housing units. Please remove the Bear Gulch Reservoir Site from the list of possible properties listed in the Draft Housing Element Update date December 15th, 2022.

Below I have listed numerous significant safety, traffic and quality of life objections that would make this project entirely unacceptable.

1) Safety & traffic

- a. The proposed development of 80-120 densely packed units in a wildfire zone & inundation zone next to a dam is a meaningful safety & traffic hazard
- b. Housing Site No. 2 (at the end of Reservoir Rd)
  - i. Reservoir Rd is a cul-de-sac and Walsh Rd provides the only entry / exit to the entire neighborhood.
  - ii. These roads are not designed for the dramatic increase in traffic resulting from 40-60 units on the Bear Gulch Reservoir Site. This would create an unacceptable safety and evacuation risk in the event of a natural disaster. There is already a traffic and safety concern related to the volume of Cal Water trucks that regularly come and go from the Cal Water Corporation Yard via Walsh / Reservoir Rd.
  - iii. Additionally, Walsh Rd feeds all traffic onto Alameda de las Pulgas directly at the Las Lomitas elementary school, which creates a safety issue for Las Lomitas students and families many of whom travel on foot and bike from various surrounding neighborhoods.
  - iv. The Walsh Rd & Alameda de Las Pulgas intersection is already a significant traffic problem in the mornings and afternoons. 40-60 additional units would create unacceptable gridlock and safety concerns.
  - v. Many residents are also extremely concerned about safety for children, pedestrians, and bicyclists on Reservoir & Walsh Rd. Dozens of children bike to and from their schools on Reservoir & Walsh Road (Las Lomitas, La Entrada, Phillips Brooks, Sacred Heart, Menlo School). 100% of the traffic from the high-density units in Housing Site No. 2 would be funneled onto Reservoir / Walsh Rd as they are the only route to enter & exit the neighborhood.
- c. In addition to the above, there are many other noise and infrastructure questions that concern that residents have related to both Housing Site No. 1 & 2.

2) Rural nature of the neighborhood

- a. It's entirely inappropriate to designate Atherton's most rural area for its most dense development.
- b. Residents want to maintain the character of this rural Walsh Rd neighborhood and quality of life. Residents invested in the neighborhood with that expectation.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Jeff Staley  
Walsh Road Neighborhood Resident

---

Jeff Staley



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Marion Suarez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 1:24 PM  
**To:** Council; Rick DeGolia; Bill Widmer; Elizabeth Lewis; Diana Hawkins-Manuelian; Robert Polito  
**Cc:** José ICE Suarez; Rod Shepard  
**Subject:** Objection to proposed housing plans at Bear Gulch Reservoir

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

Dear Atherton City council members,

I write today to voice my extreme concern and objection to the proposed addition/building of 80-100 new housing units in the Bear Gulch Reservoir area of the Walsh Road neighborhood of Atherton.

I live on Meadow Lane and my family and I have lived in this neighborhood since 2013. One of its most striking and delightful attributes is its proximity to wildlife and its unspoiled natural aspect. Furthermore, the particular area of the Bear Gulch reservoir on Reservoir Road which is being flagged, has been safeguarded even from local residents who might like to walk there, by the Calwater personnel who work there, I thought because they wanted to limit the number of people who could potentially harm the environment there and pollute drinking water in the reservoir (that was the reason given to me when I tried to walk my dog there back in 2013 and was asked to leave by a member of the Calwater team). In all the time I've lived in the neighborhood I have not been through the barricade since. The area is blocked off currently to anyone who doesn't work for the water authority. The area is part of Atherton's wildfire zone and is also in close proximity to the flood inundation zone of a failed dam, as I understand it. Why then, would it be a good idea to put in multi-storey housing units for 10s to 100s of people there - Atherton's most dense housing in its most rural area?

The disruption to the small roads and access routes of our neighborhood while such a project is being built, would be utterly unthinkable for the entire community currently residing there. Even when one or two new single-family residences are being built in our Walsh Road neighborhood, the amount of traffic and congestion increases almost unbearably. The amount of construction vehicles and large trucks, temporary traffic signals or workmen with stop signs, roads being torn up for new drainage, noise, etc., are already pretty unbearable when one builds a single family home. With a project of this scale, being built at the end of a small, limited-access road, I cannot imagine the level of disruption. Furthermore, the immense congestion that would forevermore ensue, with that many people, cars, etc. after completion of such housing, are simply mind-boggling to me as a current resident. It would entirely disrupt and change the very nature of our neighborhood which is peaceful, green and remote. It is one of the few neighborhoods in our area to remain this way to this day. The potential detracting of value to the current homes in the neighborhood is also of course a genuine concern.

Furthermore, the hazards and dangers of adding this kind and this volume of housing to a neighborhood which has only one narrow access road out to the Alameda de las Pulgas, is frightening. I'm unsure if council members are aware that Walsh Road has no through-access to the Woodside end of the neighborhood, and it stops in a dead end? Resulting congestion and traffic could be extremely dangerous in the case of an emergency, with so many more residents and cars trying to escape out onto one single access route. I would like to know if Atherton emergency services have been consulted in relation to this proposal?

Furthermore, there is no access to any amenities, shops or transit services in our neighborhood. This proposed scheme assumes that all new residents would have private vehicles (and would thus need to incorporate sufficient parking designs, which would entail even more space being allocated to the project as well as further construction, disruption and ultimate destruction of the natural surroundings, etc.) and would be able to drive to work/public transit services. Why not put this type of housing in a part of the town which is closer to the train

station or El Camino Real with its access to shopping and transit amenities? That seems like a much more obvious and sensible part of Atherton for a multi-storey housing complex. Or nearer to Marsh Road/Middlefield where there is access to 101 as well as shopping centers, etc.

It concerns and upsets me that our own Town Council should propose this frankly strange suggestion for housing without any consultation to our neighborhood or regard to our community. Our family's home was a huge personal investment for us, and we chose it with great care and consideration for all the factors that would change as a result of this proposal. I know that many, likely all of my neighbors feel the same way. It is frankly an outrage that you would try to pass this proposal through without consultation, or even much consideration of so many critical and important factors.

I beseech you to reconsider your proposal and to listen to the concerns of your current city residents who rely on you for representation and support.

Yours,

Marion Suarez  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** SUSAN VALERIOTE <s[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:50 AM  
**To:** Council; Rick DeGolia; Bill Widmer; Elizabeth Lewis; Diana Hawkins-Manuelian; Robert Polito  
**Cc:** Ken goldman  
**Subject:** Bear Gulch/Walsh Rd Proposed rezoning for Housing

[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]

To the Atherton City Council,,

Im not sure why anyone who knows about the reservoir would think that changing the zoning rules to allow dense housing would be ok? Drivin on Walsh Road then to Reservoir Road leading into the suggested Site No 2 area is a narrow, dark, undivided by street markings, country road that when absorbing traffic from a dense development would surly have increased accidents . The only outlet now from Walsh Rd is to go back over a mile east to the El Camino to exit or if trapped there is a walk-thru tunnel only for fires at the end of Valley under 280. This would be dangerous for all folks living there now as well as the proposed multitude of families if you added to the numbers trying to get out of Walsh Rd in a fire.

Lastly, I was told that this reservoir among others had been deemed a security risk since 9/11, thus the gates. When my brother was visiting once and the gates were open on his walk up the road, the police were called and he was escorted off. So changing the zoning rules on land that is Secured for obvious reasons as well as designated Park and Open Space seems counter productive and a bad idea for the dam.

Im not sure where Site No.1 is emptying into Moore Rd? That road, although coming up on Mapquest all the time as a travel route into Walsh Rd, is defiantly not. Moore Rd is also a narrow country road and the security risks given the proximity of a dense population of folks proposed is again a security risk.

I think it is irresponsible to build in Open Space, next to a reservoir and with this kind of density. Please register that I am opposed to this suggestion after living near the end of Walsh Road for 27 years.

Susan Valeriotte

[REDACTED]  
Atherton, Ca

**From:** [Xiaochen Liu](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Suber](#)  
**Subject:** Strongly Opposing the Building Plan at 23 Oakwood  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 10:39:26 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

Hi Atherton Council,

I am the owner of [REDACTED] Oakwood Blvd and I am the direct neighbor of 23 Oakwood. I (with my wife) strongly oppose the plan of 23 Oakwood that turns the land for a 32-unit complex. Its move will cause significant safety issues to the neighborhood.

Oakwood blvd is a very narrow road that cannot hold two SUVs in parallels. It currently serves as the main entrance at the north side of atherton, and there are already more than enough traffic on it. Since the road directly attaches to each household's property, there is no more space for the road to be expanded. Right now all the pedestrians already have to share the road with cars, trucks, bikers, dogs. The 23 Oakwood's plan to build multiple units here will further increase the traffic by an order of magnitude, and will cause immediate safety hazard to neighbor Athernton/Redwood City residents.

All our neighborhoods in Athernton and Redwood City are opposing this plan, which means it is apparently a bad move and will badly harm this area.

Xiaochen

**From:** [Tracey Avery](#)  
**To:** [Council](#); [Rick DeGolia](#); [Bill Widmer](#); [Elizabeth Lewis](#); [Diana Hawkins-Manuelian](#); [Robert Polito](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Bear Gulch Reservoir as a Potential Multi-Family Housing Site  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 8:39:05 PM

---

**[The e-mail below is from an external source. Please do not open attachments or click links from an unknown or suspicious origin.]**

As a 36 year resident of the Walsh Road neighborhood, I strongly object to the consideration of the Bear Gulch Reservoir area for potential development of two sites that would be designated to accommodate a total of 80-120 new housing units.

Here are the reasons for my objections:

- **RESIDENT TRAFFIC SAFETY IN AN EMERGENCY-** Simply put, Walsh Road and its tributaries cannot handle more traffic. There is only one entrance/exit to Walsh Road- where Walsh meets the Alameda de Las Pulgas. Since we moved to this rural neighborhood in 1985, we have watched traffic increase each year. In 1985 we typically waited behind 1-2 cars before turning onto the Alameda from Walsh. Currently, the wait can be 10-12 cars on a typical day. Increased construction has also led to daily incidents of being stopped by construction workers, which further clogs the traffic on Walsh Road. In an emergency, residents could be trapped in traffic on Walsh Road and unable to exit. If 80-120 housing units are added, with multiple car owners per unit, traffic could increase by 160-240 cars per day. Walsh does not have the infrastructure to support this potential increase in traffic, and the neighborhood would become a death trap during a wildfire or breach of the dam. It is not feasible to add an additional entrance or exit to Moore Road/Woodside Road because it would simply add more traffic to the neighborhood as soon as Waze reveals this "cut-through" for drivers and Woodside High students hoping to avoid Woodside Road and the Alameda. This would be a safety and traffic hazard.
- **RESERVOIR SECURITY AND SAFETY-** the reservoir area is currently closed to the public for safety/security reasons related to the reservoir and dam. Without the current security the reservoir, dam, tanks, etc., Bear Gulch Reservoir could become a target of mischief, crime, or even terrorism.
- **ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS-** Bear Gulch Reservoir is currently zoned as Open Space, which is a priority in California. And, run-off from multi-family housing in this sensitive area could contaminate the local water supply. California should not be destroying protected open space to accommodate increased housing when there are many sites in less rural areas that would better meet the transportation and infrastructure needs of multi-family housing residents.

Thank you for your consideration of my objections to multi-family housing in the Bear Gulch Reservoir area. I would be happy to discuss this further with any of you.

Best, Tracey Avery (Meadow Lane)