

**PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES**

TOWN OF ATHERTON

June 23rd, 2022

1:00 pm

This meeting was held virtually and in-person.

1. ROLL CALL

**PRESENT: Eric Lane
Nancy Lerner
Perry Narancic
Gabia Konce
Randy Lamb**

Town Planner Lisa Costa Sanders, Principal Planner Stephanie Bertollo-Davis, and Associate Planner Jake Garcia were present.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

3. PUBLIC HEARING

a. Review Draft Housing Element Update – Review the Draft Housing Element update and provide comments to staff. No action at this time.

Chair Lane provided an overview of the Housing Element cycle and obligations Town faces to fit the State framework, be accepted by the State and maintain the character of the Town. Also overviewed timeline for completing the Housing Element.

Town Planner Lisa Costa Sanders presented the staff report.

Chair Lane requested and confirmed that staff will post slides on the Town of Atherton's site per a request.

Chair Konce wants to understand the projection numbers for housing supply, and the character changes in terms of supplying more multi-family housing.

Chair Lane shared that he believes temporary incentives that encourage the development of ADU's would be beneficial to reaching housing supply goals.

Open Public Hearing.

Diane Howard, Council Member of Redwood City, multifamily zoning overlay-23 Oakwood Boulevard; is concerned there is too much density proposed in this area when considering the current density in Redwood City abutting the proposal area.

Kerrigan wants to know if the Gilmore House, the Future of Playschool, the Corporate Yard, and areas around the new Civic Center, could be potential areas to increase density and meet low to moderate housing supply goals.

Scott Wylie, resident at 22 Oakwood, concerned about density proposed at 23 Oakwood because of the potential for traffic concerns at this location—believes 10 units per acre is a reasonable number.

Jennifer Chung, 366 E Oakwood Redwood City, believes the density at 23 Oakwood is too high because the traffic is high and there are many bicyclists, pedestrians, and children walking to school. Requests that Atherton be respectful of height limits not only in Atherton, but in Redwood City as well.

Anuj Gaggar, 343 West Oakwood Redwood City, concerned that the density at the 23 Oakwood would impact safety. Recommends 6 unit per acre density.

Francine Miltenberger, 351 Oakwood, 23 Oakwood; has felt that increased density over the years has contributed greater traffic issues. Concerned about fire and safety with there being one ingress and egress.

*Aaron Callahan shared that during COVID 23 Oakwood was designated as a safe street and closed to through traffic.

*George Parsons, 344 W Oakwood, agreed that density, safety, and sewer issues are a concern at 23 Oakwood. Added that there is a lot of development in surrounding cities.

Norm, 125 Alta Vista Drive, would prefer that density would be designated along the periphery of the town.

Fran, 354 W Oakwood, is concerned about the traffic at 23 Oakwood because of the density.

Lawrence, 182 Atherton Avenue, 170 Atherton; concerned about traffic, and the lack of certain infrastructure: bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. Concerned about affordable housing density, and the potential for greater densities.

Bryan Lamkin, 157 Atherton Avenue, 170 Atherton; believes the sculpture park that currently exists at 170 Atherton is a public good. Concerned about the density, and construction impacts on the neighborhood. Would like new alternatives to be proposed.

Jamie Greene, 1 Berry Lane, interested why the Town Center is not being considered.

Adam Landsdorf agrees that density should be focused more on the Town Center.

Mrs. Landsdorf, believes that SB 9 will not persist, and that development should reflect that.

Zach Whitman believes that density should be dispersed evenly and not just on the periphery.

>Ellen Jameson, support overlay zones to increase density and expand the location of the overlay.

>Giacomo Mourini, Ellen Jameson, and Serena Harini, supports measures to increase density and increase housing supply.

>Jerry Fish, 302 Fletcher Drive, is unsupportive of density.

> Delvin Yolk, resident of 194 Atherton Avenue, 170 Atherton, does not feel the site is compatible with the density, and will cause safety issues.

> Stephanie Tenover, 435 E Oakwood Redwood City, supports density, but feels that the density at 23 Oakwood is too high and will create a safety issue due to traffic. There are currently no sidewalks, and it could create hazards. Concerned about parking.

> J.D. *last name unintelligible, 327 Oakwood Boulevard, 23 Oakwood is too high in density and believes that density should be concentrated along the periphery.

>Francie Mitenberg, 351 W Oakwood, 23 Oakwood; concerned about density and traffic.

> Andrew Faulkner, 416 Oakwood, 23 Oakwood; feels the planned zoning would be out of character with the surrounding area. Concerned about sidewalks, parking, safety, and inequity.

> Julia Mossman, 18 Rossi Lane Redwood City, concerned about density and safety.

>Paul & Marina Torino, 28 Ross Lane Redwood City, concerned about density and safety.

>Paul, 340 W Oakwood, concerned about density and safety.

>Ivan De Garza, 572 West Cyprus, concerned about density and safety.

> Paul & Jasmine Libri, 21 Rossi Lane Redwood City,

> Albert Chung MD & Jennifer Potluck Chung, 366 E Oakwood Redwood City

>Carol Surgutsum & Family, concerned about density and safety.

> Tynan Smith, concerned about infrastructure keeping up with traffic flows.

>Kevin & Maria, concerned about density and safety.

>Stephanie Chevonert, concerned about density and safety.

>Joan & Scott Wiley, 23 Oakwood Boulevard, supported previous approval, but the current approval of 16 units per acre.

> Andrew Faulkner, 416 *address unintelligible, does not support density.

>Dan Alberti & Gail, 377 Fletcher Drive, concerned about 290 Polhemus, and the level of engagement with the community. Concerned that the site cannot be considered legally available.

>Perry, concerned about density and safety.

*Adam Langstor had a question about SB 9 and how it overlaps with the housing element; would like to have density increased where it already exists.

*Larry Kabul, the goal is to preserve the character of the town and locate higher density in alike areas.

*JD Anagnostou, inquiring about aspects of the proposed zoned townhomes. Are they for moderate income levels, and are they for rent or purchase?

Closed Public Hearing.

Town Planner Costa Sanders commented on town owned properties. Ultimately there is not enough land to place enough units on these properties. Also, they did not want to take away from green space and park lands. El Camino Real, 10 units an acre, the properties are about ½ an acre, you would need higher density to meet requirements. It is something that can be considered if it met certain requirements. Developers will determine whether a property is developed for sale or for rent. Staffs' projections are assuming around 20% affordability for future development.

Chair Konce concerned about the developer's perspective on the proposed zoning, and who could potentially build this housing.

Town Planner Costa Sanders said Staff spoke to property owners/developers at 23 Oakwood (property owners; Mr. Arata), and 170 Atherton Avenue (developers; PPG Peninsula Pacific Group [PPG]). 23 Oakwood currently has a concept plan for a traditional townhome style. 170 Atherton Avenue are interested in developing garden homes---they would be market rate, and 20% would be affordable (moderate income category, and not low-income category because of the high cost to develop).

Commissioner Narancic pointed out that we should redact commenters' contact information.

Chair Lane and Costa Sanders confirmed that they are redacted.

Town Planner Costa Sanders confirmed income ranges for affordable housing brackets.

Chair Lane provided additional comments over viewing process. Believes the overall process provided by the State does not constitute good planning. Stated he is in favor of ADU production but opposed to the proposed overlay zones.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Staff has updated the draft housing element to include the multifamily overlay zone, per the request of HCD. The draft housing element was posted for the public comment period on June 10, 2022. The public comment period will be open for a 30-day period until July 11, 2022. Comments can be received by email and will be brought to the City Council on July 20, 2022 for any necessary revisions that will then be presented on July 27, 2022. Then brought to HCD and they will have 90 days to review it. Any necessary revisions will be added, and then taken forward for adoption hearings.

5. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

6. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned 3:17 PM

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/Stephanie Bertollo-Davis
Stephanie Bertollo-Davis, Principal Planner