**Zoning Phase 2a Workgroup Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, July 6, 2016

Siena Youth Center

**Public Comment:**

* Question to clarify Community Plan
* Concerns about not receiving public notice (about community plan)
	+ Significant impact to community
* No setbacks in other areas of Redwood City
* Question about requirements for green space
* Comment about development on 5th and Waverly
* Question on the process of the development on 5th and Waverly
* Concern about public input process and County’s responsiveness
* Comment that the 5th/Waverly project got a lot of attention from the County and Mental Health Association
* Comment that the project is inappropriate for the community and neighborhood
* Could you give examples of the new zoning? How will it impact housing?
* Is there a visual timeline and plan of the whole process to the Board of Supervisors?
* How tall is one story?
* What does the current zoning say about height limits?
* What is the main goal of the zoning?
* What is the timing of phase1/phase2?
* What will be assessed in the new zoning? For example, changes to school district boundaries
* Clarification that there is a maximum of 4 stories in CMU2 area, and a maximum of 5 stories in CMU 1 zoning on the east side of map
* What is the current height limit?
* Taller buildings already being built, increased traffic, more commercial houses
* Concerns about safety for children
* Concerns that there aren’t plans for parking standards
* Concerns that “flexibility” means making room for larger buildings, concern about uncertainty of what the zoning proposals will actually be
* Has the County already received proposals for these areas?
* If the building goes up 4 stories, is the setback for the whole property?
* Would you be open to stepping back at each story?
* What is the existing set back?
	+ Are there any areas where the existing set back is less or more than 5ft?
* Question to clarify boundaries of where the changes are happening

**Comments from Workgroup:**

* Are there set backs on 5th Ave?
* Comment that the workgroup had many previous discussions about usage, i.e. types of businesses and residencies
* Clarification that zoning changes do not kick out any existing businesses, only new developments
* Proposal to require townhouses facing Blenheim. Concern about usage of alley to access parking
* Suggestion for more stringent proposal for development on alley way
	+ More low scale buildings on the Blenheim side
* Pointed out disproportional image on slide

**Public Comment:**

* Waverly already has issues with commercial parking and trash from visitors
* This neighborhood can’t handle any more than is already here
	+ The zoning proposal are very aggressive
	+ How do these zoning changes benefit us?
* People are already leaving because they are going to lose space on their property (for businesses)
* Does the community plan have approved environmental reviews? If so, then parking standards should be set
	+ Feels that the County is not actually asking for public input
* Concerns that the illustrations shown are distorted; inaccurately shows the scale of impact.
	+ Scaling will be corrected
* Concern about use of alleyway with new structures
* The intent of zoning is to make the neighborhood better, but the area is already great in many ways.
	+ Already seems very intense
	+ Can we bring more value and improvements to the area with lower density?
* How does this plan benefit kids? There won’t be any more kids in the area because there’s no space
	+ Is it more important to build and make profits? We think out families are more important
* Environmental Review shows increased problems
* The Community Plan was written before Facebook and before Downtown Redwood City
* Expressed dislike of changes in Redwood City
	+ Why do we need to go so fast? Suggestion to scale down the changes
* Is the alley behind Bentley’s going to stay? If it was combined with the parcel, it would increase the building size.
* Most people speeding through the neighborhood do not live here.
* Request to improve communication from the County