

February 22, 2000 Fax: 3 Pages

To: Ms. Lisa Aozasa
San Mateo County Planning and Building Division
Mail Drop PLN122, 455 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063
650.363.4852 - FAX: 650.363.4849

re: MidCoast Community Council initial comments and questions regarding
Moss Beach Heights Affordable Housing Project - PLN1999-00452

Lisa:

These are collected comments and questions that have come from our last regular council meeting and the subsequent Planning & Zoning Committee meeting. I've tried to group them in an attempt to focus the concerns and areas that residents feel need to be addressed.

I hope some might be dealt with at Thursday's Planning Commission meeting - others may be better addressed at the subsequent meetings with the hydrologist and the EIR consultant. Some of the answers may well be in the FEIR and we just haven't found them yet, so guidance would be welcome.

Thanks for your time and help with this project . I will follow up by phone Tuesday (2/22) to discuss further arrangements for the upcoming meetings.

Chuck Kozak
MidCoast Community Council Planning & Zoning Committee Chair
PO Box 370702
Montara, CA 94037
650.728.8239 (Home/VM/FAX) - 650.678.0469 (Cell phone, Days)

1. Drainage:

- a. Need clarification of fiscal arrangement, responsibility/liability, and inspection/enforcement of sedimentation/retention pond facility. Are there similar projects that Kaufmann & Broad have undertaken?
- b. Concern that drainage design for Etheldore street will not be adequate for levels of runoff expected from heavy storms and periods of current flooding. What are improvements for the apartment building areas that will alleviate flooding conditions? Will the County address the flooding problem on Etheldore beyond the scope of this project?

2. Project Compatibility and Integration into neighborhood:

- a. Issue of community integration - no consideration in EIR of extended project streets at top into existing neighborhoods to create less of an "enclave".
- b. Described PUD specifications have smaller lots, reduced setbacks, and smaller street than surrounding residential zoning. Parking and utility easements are on private lots, resulting in further reduction of usable lot size and setbacks. This, along with repetitive design of houses

presents an incompatible project with existing surrounding neighborhoods in Moss Beach. Specific information on range of lot sizes is requested rather than an average.

- c. Clarification of the shuttle service, including financial responsibility and information on similar project by K&B, and guarantees of its continuation during the life of the affordability component
- d. Why not a Fire Department/Emergency Vehicle turnaround on Vista? Why was this street deemed different than others? Why not connect to hospital parking lot at top of ridge?
- e. What level of improvements to Etheldore are planned: paving and sidewalks?
- f. Will tot lot be available for community use?
- g. Does the project meet park requirements of San Mateo County Subdivision Ordinance, and if not, why is it not required to do so?
- h. Request for examination of historic use and agreement for trail uses across property were not addressed fully in FEIR, and description of prescriptive rights is contested. Project should maintain levels of access and trails that currently exist. A community integration issue as passage across the property on existing trails is a common way of getting from one part of Moss Beach to another.
- i. New photo-simulations of views show that some of the proposed houses will break the ridgeline as seen from the highway or from the airport, in apparent conflict with LCP policies on new development location and protection of visual resources.

3. Affordability:

- a. What is the County-wide plan for affordable housing and how does this project fit in? Will there be specified consideration for Coastside residents as specified in the LCP, or will affordable housing be open to all in the county?
- b. Can availability and restrictions be placed on the Market Rate housing to increase the affordable percentage component of the project? Such as low-cost loans for qualified residents?, and low rate financing tied to deed restrictions that would keep house prices at an affordable level?
- c. Clarify the target population and projected price range of the Market Rate housing.
- d. If there is set financing/profit margin target for Kaufmann & Broad, can the number of Market Rate units decrease (and lot size increase) as prices for the Market rate units rise? Estimates in DEIR of \$340-390,000 range are now outdated and very low in today's housing market.

Environment:

- a. More details on amount of drainage to San Vicente Creek - an 8" pipe does not seem adequate for the amount of water that is typically seem coming off this site during heavy rains.
- b. Environmental impacts of increased flow into San Vicente Creek are not adequately addressed - what is extra flow on existing creek habitat and wildlife, as well as impact downstream at Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and Monterey Bay Sanctuary waters?

c. Where are response from Fish & Game and Fish & Wildlife, Fitzgerald Marine Reserve (San Mateo County and State of California) and Monterey Bay Sanctuary (NOAA)? Are they not required for a Final EIR?

d. Impacts of projected house on slope down to ravine on south side of project not fully addressed, especially to drainage tributary along road at bottom of slope.

Process:

a. As this is to be the EIR for the water supply pipeline also, the final configuration should be determined before certification (currently, it could be anything from two 12" pipes to one 10" and one 4" pipe), the current status of availability of supply from CCWD should be examined, and the EIR contain a comprehensive examination of alternatives such as supply from other sources and the use of storage tanks for either fire-fighting or redundant supply capacities.

b. Is it necessary for the Planning Commission to vote on the entire project at once, or is it best to begin with just certification of the EIR and hear the other issues (Re-zoning, LCP amendments, grading, etc.) separately?

c. It was felt that some responses did not address issues in the same level of detail as request as required by CEQA. Specific list will be forthcoming.

d. For outstanding issues that need to be monitored over the life of the project (pond maintenance, keeping the shuttle running, other required mitigation), it was suggested the applicant post a performance bond or maintain an escrow account to guarantee performance in the areas.

e. Award construction jobs to local San Mateo County firms and workers.