RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Town Council review all comments received on the Draft Housing Element (Attachments A, D and E), take public testimony, direct any changes, and direct staff to submit the Draft Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). A draft HCD transmittal letter, with the required AB215 (public review compliance) acknowledgment, is Attachment H.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The draft Housing Element was finalized by the Town Council at its meeting of May 10, 2022. The full report is posted at:
https://www.woodsidetown.org/sites/default/files/fileattachments/town_council/meeting/33022/item_a_-_draft_cycle_6_2023-2031_housing_element_update.pdf

The May 10, 2022, report contains an explanation of the Housing Element Update process itself, including the determination of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation (the number of housing units each California jurisdiction must plan for in an 8-year cycle); as well as a detailed description of the Town’s approach to preparing the draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element, and the associated public meetings and outreach.

During the May 10, 2022, meeting the Town Council directed changes to the draft RHNA strategy. The draft Housing Element was then noticed in the newspaper and posted on the Town website on May 18, 2022:
https://www.woodsidetown.org/planning/draft-housing-element-public-comment

The comment period was closed on July 1, 2022, at 5pm, a 44-day comment period – which exceeds the statutory 30-day comment period.

COMMENTS RECEIVED
The Town received a total of 65 comments by the July 1, 2022, 5pm deadline. Tables 1 and 2 on Page 2 describe these 65 comments.

Two additional comments were received after the comment deadline and before the publication of this report (Attachment E).
A post-public comment period comment letter, dated July 5, 2022, was received from Vice Mayor Shaw and Council Member Dombkowski (Attachment A).

Any comments received after July 6, 2022, will be transmitted to the Town Council as desk items.

| Table 1. Summary of Commenters. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Resident/Organization:        | No. of Comments: | Adjusted for Repeat Commenters: |
| Resident (Woodside)           | 37              | 28               |
| Resident (Redwood City)       | 9               | 9                |
| Campaign for Fair Housing      | 1               | 1                |
| Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County | 1 | 1 |
| Next Door Woodside            | 4               | 4                |
| San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCCD) | 1 | 1 |
| Woodhill Estates HOA (Redwood City) | 2 | 1 |
| Woodside Fire Protection District | 1 | 1 |
| Yes In My Backyard (YIMBY)    | 9               | 3                |
| **Total:**                    | **65**          | **49**           |

| Table 2. Summary of Comment Subjects. |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Subject:                             | No. of Comments: | Adjusted for Repeat Commenters: |
| Site Opposition:                     |                 |                  |
| 773 Cañada                           | 11              | 7                |
| Cañada College                       | 12              | 10               |
| “Commercial Corridor”                | 4               | 4                |
| Farm Hill                            | 14              | 14               |
| Runnymede                            | 10              | 8                |
| Housing Element Concerns/Suggestions | 20              | 14               |
| Response to Comments                 | 2               | 2                |
| **Total:**                           | **73***         | **59**           |

*Some comments include more than one subject.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
A formal Response to Comments was prepared (Attachment C) for all comments received by the comment deadline.

RECOMMENDATION
Program Changes
Based on the comments received, staff recommends revisions to the Housing Element Programs as described in Table 3 and new Housing Element Programs as described in Table 4.
Table 3. Recommended Housing Program Revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program No.:</th>
<th>Program Revision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1.3.de</td>
<td>Develop Amnesty Program for ADUs and JADUs (<em>renumbering only</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Recommended New Housing Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program No.:</th>
<th>New Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1.2.c</td>
<td>Conduct ADU Workshops by the Five New Town Council Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1.3.d</td>
<td>Expedite Processing of Building Permits for ADUs/JADUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.1.b</td>
<td>Streamline Cañada College Housing Development Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.3.a</td>
<td>Consider Reducing Fees for Increased Density Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3.3.b</td>
<td>Expedite Processing of Building Permits for Increased Density Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Changes

Based on the comments received, staff recommends revisions to Appendix G, Site Inventory, as described in Table 5.

Table 5. Recommended Appendix G, Site Inventory, Revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision No.:</th>
<th>Revision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Add a Town website link* to the HCD-required format for the Site Inventory: <a href="https://bit.ly/3bQEjRv">https://bit.ly/3bQEjRv</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*This Excel table is too large to print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Add a narrative to describe the Site Inventory (Attachment F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Add the full Site Inventory Map (Attachment G).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RHNA Strategy Changes

Staff also recommends that the Town Council review and consider the revised RHNA strategy proposed by Vice Mayor Shaw and Council Member Dombkowski (Attachment A).

Revisions to the RHNA strategy suggested by Vice Mayor Shaw and Council Member Dombkowski include:

- A reduction in the projected number of ADUs per year (to comply with HCD instructions to align projections with historic trends, as may reasonably be supplemented by incentives/programs);
- Acknowledgement of final pipeline projects (i.e., Cycle 5 projects which have not received a Building Permit final by June 30, 2022, and which may therefore be carried over to Cycle 6);
- Further refinement of the Cañada College Faculty and Staff Housing affordability distribution (from 40 very low/40 low to 50 very low/30 low);
- Elimination of the “Commercial Corridor” rezoning (as it is unlikely to yield additional housing density in Cycle 6);
- Assignment of rezoning to pre-adoption (as post-adoption rezoning will be required to be 20 units/acre); and,
- Description of rezoning as “Small-Lot Single-Family”.

Town Council Meeting

July 12, 2022
Attachment A includes both the May 10, 2022, RHNA strategy posted with the Comment draft as well as the suggested Shaw/Dombkowski revised RHNA strategy. Please note that if this strategy is adopted, Housing Element Program H2.1.a, which currently refers to Overlay Zoning, will need to be updated to reflect this change.

Explanatory materials on “Small-Lot Single-Family”, images and sample development standards, are Attachment B.

NEXT STEPS/IMPORTANT DEADLINES
Given the compressed deadlines to obtain State certification of the Town’s Housing Element, the following deadlines must be met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Task:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/15/22-10/15/22</td>
<td>Submit Draft Housing Element to HCD for 90-day Review Period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 10/2022</td>
<td>Complete a Draft CEQA Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 10/2022</td>
<td>Make HCD Required Changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/22-1/15/22</td>
<td>Submit revised Housing Element to HCD for 60-Day review period/certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/23</td>
<td>Planning Commission Review of Final Housing Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/23</td>
<td>Town Council Review and Adoption of Final Housing Element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, rezoning and prioritized code changes to implement the Housing Element Programs shall be started and completed between July 2022, and December 2022.

ATTACHMENTS
A. Post-Public Comment Period Comment received from Vice Mayor Shaw and Council Member Dombkowski, dated July 4, 2022
B. Small-Lot Single-Family
   1. Images
   2. Sample Development Standards (Tacoma)
C. Response to Comments, dated July 12, 2022
D. Comments received on Draft Housing Element through July 1, 2022 (65 comments)
E. Comments received on Draft Housing Element after July 1, 2022 (2 comments)*:
   1. Thomsen, Stephan (Opposition to Runnymede site), dated July 3, 2022
   2. Padilla, Christine, San Mateo Child Care Partnership Council (Urging planning for child care facilities), dated July 5, 2022
F. Site Inventory Narrative
G. Site Inventory Map
H. Draft HCD Transmittal Letter

*Any additional comments received after July 5, 2022, will be transmitted to the Town Council as desk items.
To: Town Council

From: Councilmembers Shaw and Dombkowski

Re: Revised Proposal Post-Public Comment Period

Date: July 4th, 2022

The purpose of this memorandum is to propose revisions to the Town’s Cycle 6 RNHA plan as approved at the Council’s May 10th, 2022 meeting. These revisions are based on extended discussions we have had with town staff, numerous meetings with residents during the extended public comment period, a review of written public comments received as well as a deeper understanding of the governing parameters of the HCD process.

Based on the inputs received, we have made the following specific changes, as expressed in the attached redlined document, for the council’s consideration:

1) Based on our current run rate of ADU development, initiatives underway to increase awareness and improve the building process, we are targeting 19 ADU’s per year in this revised proposal. While we believe the Town will surpass this threshold, the governing process anchors our ability to meaningfully deviate from our historical precedent.

2) Following further analysis of the SMCCCD Facilities Master Plan, we have adjusted the Cañada College affordability distribution to 50 very low and 30 low-income units from the more simplistic earlier assumption of an even 40/40 split in those categories.

3) Upon further reflection, we have removed the so-called “Commercial Corridor” from the proposal given our focus on Town-owned property for the potential development of small lot single-family homes. Additionally, we acknowledge that its inclusion was an attempt at scaling back the “Missing Middle” proposal and development opportunities are limited at this time.

4) And finally, after exploring the pre- and post-zoning process - and learning that any post-zoning effort on these properties will be mandated at 20 units per acre - we are proposing these properties move “above the line”, which will give the town the ability to methodically consider their path forward for small lot single-family residences over the course of this cycle.

Please find the attached exhibits highlighting:

1) The Town-Council approved plan;
2) Our proposed redlines to said document; and
3) The clean version for your consideration.

The extended public comment period has offered us the opportunity to “measure twice (or in this case a half-dozen times) and cut once” on this critical issue. We believe this revised plan incorporates our collective best efforts as a community to meet the very high bar that has been set for the upcoming RHNA cycle.

We look forward to working with the council to incorporate any other reasonable modification to this plan in order to meet our scheduled deadlines.

ATTACHMENT A
# RHNA PLAN (Cycle 6, 2023-2031): Town Council Approved 5/10/22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 20% Buffer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation plus Buffer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2021 ZONING SUPPORTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADUs (25/year)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU - Pipeline not finalized by June 30, 2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs (6/year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs - Pipeline not finalized by June 30, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 9* (8/cycle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Land Divisions:

- **1101 Cañada (SFD)**: 7
- **1101 Cañada (ADU)**: 1
- **773 Cañada (SFD) * (APN 068-100-220)**: 5
- **773 Cañada (ADU/JADU) * (APN 068-100-220)**: 1
- **Godetia (SFD)**: 1
- **Godetia (ADU)**: 1
- **385 and 387 Moore (SFD)**: 2
- **385, 387, and 389 Moore (ADU)**: 1

## Condemned:

- **111 Hillside (SFD)**: 1
- **111 Hillside (ADU)**: 1

## Multi-Family Projects:

- **Cañada College**: 40

## TOTALS - CURRENT ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTALS THROUGH 2022 REZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Deficit/Surplus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POST-ADOPTION REZONINGS

### Multi-Family Sites:

- **Commercial Corridor (10 units/acre)**: 10
- **773 Cañada, Portion of Lot (10 units/acre)**: 10
- **Farm Hill Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre)**: 5
- **High Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre)**: 5
- **Runnymede, Town-owned (10 units/acre)**: 5

## TOTALS – POST-ADOPTION ZONING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL CUMULATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 plus buffer Deficit/Surplus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RHNA PLAN (Cycle 6, 2023-2031): Town Council Approved 5/10/22 Proposal 2.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 20% Buffer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation plus Buffer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2021 ZONING SUPPORTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADUs (25 19/year)</td>
<td>60 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU - Final Pipeline not finalized by June 30, 2022</td>
<td>6 6 6 2 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs (6/year)</td>
<td>48 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs - Final Pipeline not finalized by June 30, 2022</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 9* (8/cycle)</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Divisions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1101 Cañada (SFD)</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 Cañada (ADU)</td>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Cañada (SFD) * (APN 068-100-220)</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Cañada (ADU/JADU) * (APN 068-100-220)</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godetia (SFD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godetia (ADU)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 and 387 Moore (SFD)</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385, 387, and 389 Moore (ADU)</td>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Condemned:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 Hillside (SFD)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Hillside (ADU)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi-Family Projects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cañada College Faculty and Staff Housing</td>
<td>40 50 40 30 0 0 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - THROUGH 6/30/22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 106</td>
<td>109 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-70 56</td>
<td>-104 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393 345</td>
<td>66-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RHNA 6 Deficit/Surplus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 16</td>
<td>57-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 4</td>
<td>-30-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POST PRE-ADOPTION REZONINGS**

**Multi-Family Sites Small Lot Single Family:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor (10 units/acre)</td>
<td>10 0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Cañada, Portion of Lot (120 units/acre)</td>
<td>6 6 6 10-2 10 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Hill Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre)</td>
<td>5 4 5 4 2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre)</td>
<td>5 4 5 4 2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede, Town-owned (10 units/acre)</td>
<td>5 4 5 4 2 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS – POST PRE-ADOPTION ZONING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 18</td>
<td>15 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>20 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CUMULATIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125 124</td>
<td>124 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 68</td>
<td>124 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443 395</td>
<td>49 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RHNA 6 plus buffer Deficit/Surplus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>62 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>-38-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RHNA PLAN (Cycle 6, 2023-2031): Proposal 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 20% Buffer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation plus Buffer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2021 ZONING SUPPORTS:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADUs (19/year)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU - Final Pipeline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs (6/year)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs - Final Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 9* (8/cycle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Divisions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 Cañada (SFD)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 Cañada (ADU)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Cañada (SFD) * (APN 068-100-220)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Cañada (ADU/JADU) * (APN 068-100-220)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godetia (SFD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godetia (ADU)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 and 387 Moore (SFD)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385, 387, and 389 Moore (ADU)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemned:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Hillside (SFD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Hillside (ADU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañada College Faculty and Staff Housing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - THROUGH 6/30/22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>106</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>345</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RHNA 6 Deficit/Surplus**

|                        | 16 | 33 | 4  | -36 | 17  |

### PRE-ADOPTION REZONINGS

#### Small Lot Single Family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Farm Hill Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| High Road, Town-owned (10 units/acre)     | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| Runnymede, Town-owned (10 units/acre)      | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 |

**TOTAL – PRE-ADOPTION ZONING:**

|                        | 18 | 18 | 12 | 2  | 50  |

**TOTAL CUMULATIVE**

|                        | 124 | 103 | 68 | 100 | 395 |

**RHNA 6 plus buffer Deficit/Surplus**

|                        | 16 | 41 | 6  | -62 | 1   |
Second Floor Plan
894 sq. ft.

First Floor Plan
508 sq. ft.

1,402 sq. ft.
total living space
Mt. Burdell Place is a transit-oriented development in walking distance to downtown Novato. The plans were originally approved as a for-profit development. With community support and volunteers who will complete about 85 percent of the construction, these homes will be sold to working families with good credit making less than 80 percent of the area median income.
Residential Small-Lot Single-Family Zoning Regulations

This Tip Sheet may be used as a guide for zoning standards for small-lot development in Residential Districts and does not apply to pipestem lots or other zoning districts. The applicant is responsible for reviewing full code regulations listed in Sections 13.06.020 and 13.06.020.K and 13.06.100.F of the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC).

**SMALL-LOT SIZE STANDARDS**
Minimum Standard Lot requirements for lot width, lot area, and lot frontage are listed in TMC Section 13.06.020 (also Tip Sheet L-100). Parcels that do not meet these standards are considered Small Lots. Small Lots are categorized as Level 1 or Level 2. Design standards are summarized below fro the creation of new small lots and development of existing small lots.

**Allowances for Computing Lot Area**
Lot Size Averaging – Infill: To provide for consistency with pre-existing development patterns, the average size of lots along the street frontage and block (excluding the site) may be substituted for that district's Standard Lot size.

Lot Size Averaging – Subdivisions: Within proposed Short and Full Plats, lots in the R-1 District may be 4,500 sq ft and may be 3,000 sq ft in other districts, provided that the overall average lot size within the Plat meets the Standard Lot size of the zoning district. Critical areas and buffers may not be counted toward lot size averaging.

Alley lot area credit: In R-1, R-2, R2-SRD and HMR-SRD Districts, half of the width of abutting alleys which are utilized for vehicular access to the lot may count toward minimum lot area, up to an additional reduction equivalent to 10 percent of the Standard Lot size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Dimensions</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-2 SRD</th>
<th>HMR-SRD</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4L</th>
<th>R-4</th>
<th>R-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Lot Size</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Small Lot Design</td>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Average Lot Width (feet)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Average Lot Width (feet)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEIGHT**
Lots that have an average width of 40 feet – 50 feet have a height limitation of 30 feet, as measured per the IRC.

Lots that have an average width of less than 40 feet have a height limitation of 25 feet, as measured per the IRC.

Any main dwelling in the View-Sensitive District (VSD) has a height limitation of 25 feet, as measured by the Land Use Code definition of Building Height in the VSD.

**LEVEL 1 DESIGN STANDARDS**
Applies to new single-family dwellings on new or existing lots that are smaller than the Standard Lot size.

**Clear Building Entries**
A clearly defined building entrance must be incorporated that faces the street and has weather protection that is at least 4 feet deep along the width of the building entry (porches may be used to meet this standard).

**Floor Area Ratio**
Houses developed on Small Lots shall not exceed a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5. Floor Area Ratio is the ratio of the total floor area of the home compared to the lot area, not including spaces below grade and accessory structures.

**Garages**
Garages may be located in the rear of the lot with rear access to the lot. Where rear access is not available, or cannot be developed, garages or carports must be set back at least 5 feet behind the front façade of the house, or from the front of a covered porch if the porch is at least 48 square feet and contains no dimension less than 6 feet. In addition, garage doors and carports shall not occupy more than 50% of the width of the front façade.

---

Note: This Tip Sheet does not substitute for codes and regulations. The applicant is responsible for compliance with all codes and regulations, whether or not described in this document.

More information: City of Tacoma, Planning and Development Services | www.tacomapermits.org (253) 591-5030

To request this information in an alternative format or a reasonable accommodation, please call 253-591-5030 (voice), 253-591-5031 (voice TTY), or 711 (Washington Relay Service).
Residential Small-Lot Single-Family Zoning Regulations

Facade Transparency
Houses must be oriented with the front of the home facing the street. At least 15% of any façade facing a street shall be transparent. A façade includes all vertical surfaces of the façade of a dwelling, not including exposed foundations and unfinished attic space.

Rooflines
Primary rooflines shall be oriented towards the front of the lot, with the tallest ridgelines running perpendicular to the street frontage.

Driveway Approaches
Maximum driveway width is 20 feet (14 feet for lots less than 45 feet wide). The driveway may not occupy more than 50% of the lot width.

Minimum Useable Yard Space
Usable yard space cannot include structures, driveways or parking. It must be a contiguous area that is:
- located in the rear or side yard;
- equal to at least 10% of the parcel area; and
- dimensions not less than 15 feet (not less than 12 feet for parcels smaller than 3,500 sq ft).

Street Trees
One street tree is required per Small Lot per planting standards contained in TMC 13.06.020.K.

LEVEL 2 DESIGN STANDARDS
In addition to meeting all Level 1 Design Standards, lots that are smaller than the Level 1 dimensions must meet additional standards as follows:

Choose at least three Building Façade Details:
- Decorative porch or entry design
- Bay windows or balconies
- Decorative molding / framing details around all front façade windows and doors
- Decorative door design including transom and/or side lights or other distinctive feature
- Decorative roofline elements, such as brackets, multiple dormers, and chimneys
- Decorative building materials, including decorative masonry, shingle, brick, tile, and stone
- Landscaped trellises or other decorative elements that incorporate landscaping near the building entry

Choose at least one of the following:
- Meets Built Green or other equivalent environmental certification for new construction, or
- Includes a porch with a minimum area of 60 square feet and no dimension less than 6 feet

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
- Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 13.06.020 - Residential Districts, 13.06.020.K & 13.06.100.F - Small-Lot Single-Family Development District, 13.05.010.B - Variances 2.02 - Building Code

Minimum Useable Yard Space

Housing Style Variety
Repetitive front façade designs adjacent to neighboring houses with the same design are prohibited. A variety of façade styles is desired per TMC 13.06.100.F.2.g

Prohibited Materials
Plywood and other similar sheet siding materials, such as T1-11 siding, may not be used for front facades or for facades facing streets. Board and batten is allowed on up to 40% of a front façade.

Note: This Tip Sheet does not substitute for codes and regulations. The applicant is responsible for compliance with all codes and regulations, whether or not described in this document. More information: City of Tacoma, Planning and Development Services | www.tacomapermits.org (253) 591-5030

To request this information in an alternative format or a reasonable accommodation, please call 253-591-5030 (voice). Town Council Meeting | please dial 711 to connect to Washington Relay Services.

July 12, 2022
L-145, 4/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Resident/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfthin, Jenine</td>
<td>Raymundo Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Runnymede site - egress.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Mitchell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SMCCCD</td>
<td>5/23/2002</td>
<td>Cañada College response to Paulson, Anne re: Master Plan.</td>
<td>The SMCCCD is preparing a Facilities Master Plan, which includes proposed housing sites for all three colleges in the District, to address the waiting list of 240 faculty and staff members. The Woodside Housing Element includes one-third of this demand for Cañada College (80 units). See link for last community meeting on May 4, 2022: <a href="https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php">https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billimoria, Virsis (Vicky) &amp; Farrokh</td>
<td>Woodleaf Ave.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Recorded Open Space Covenant.</td>
<td>Recorded Open Space Covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard, Don</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>WFPD</td>
<td>6/24/2022</td>
<td>Supports multi-family development at 773 Cañada - good evacuation, landscape mitigation, improvements to infrastructure, fire safe construction.</td>
<td>Response to neighbor comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canellos, Chris &amp; Eva</td>
<td>Somerset Pl.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/20/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Cañada College site - habitat, views, open space, traffic, WES.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chohan, Harprett &amp; Gupta, Nina</td>
<td>Woodridge Ct.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>6/29/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - noise, traffic, utilities, habitat, Open Space Covenant.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review. Recorded Open Space Covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clary, Lloyd</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>6/21/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Cañada College and Farm Hill sites (noise, traffic, biotic).</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Resident/Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damerdji, Salim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign for Fair Housing Elements</td>
<td>5/20/2022</td>
<td>Inclusion of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>The SMCCCD is preparing a Facilities Master Plan, which includes proposed housing sites for all three colleges in the District, to address the waiting list of 240 faculty and staff members. The Woodside Housing Element includes one-third of this demand for Cañada College (80 units). See link for last community meeting on May 4, 2022: <a href="https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php">https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn, Danielle</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - reduced property value, Open Space Covenant, habitat, not consistent with SB9.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review. Recorded Open Space Covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site. SB9 is for a specific housing prototype, i.e., it allows a lot split and two units on each lot by right, it is not the basis for a Housing Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichbaum, Eldan &amp; Chaat, Geetinder</td>
<td>Ridgeway Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, habitat, sewer, lack of services.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Mary Beth</td>
<td>Woodside Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/17/2022</td>
<td>Opposes term &quot;Commercial Corridor&quot;.</td>
<td>Agreed. This area should not be referred to as a &quot;Commerical Corridor&quot;. This area is zoned residential, not commercial, and includes several institutional uses which are allowed in a residential zone district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timing of rezone/overlay.</strong></td>
<td>Rezoning will be required, and should occur prior to Housing Element adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garavaglia, Wayne</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/05/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - community character, engineering</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goeld, Paul</td>
<td>Cinnabar Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, habitat, sewer, lack of services.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review. Recorded Open Space Covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Kimberly</td>
<td>Raymundo Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Runnymede site - seismic, fire, habitat, sewer, egress, density.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Element recommendations:**

- Requires a ballot measure to remove height restriction from Measure J (late 1980s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Kimberly</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Consider the &quot;Village Hill&quot; site.</td>
<td>No multi-family housing sites were located in the Western Hills as this area is a VHFSZ and is accessed from narrow, winding roads.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Heidi</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/22/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - fire risk.</td>
<td>See comment letter from Bullard, Don, WFPD, above.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Heidi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/16/2022</td>
<td>Requests WFPD attend the HE hearing.</td>
<td>See comment letter from Bullard, Don, WFPD, above.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, Heidi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>Questions 773 Cañada development density - 10 or 20 units/acre.</td>
<td>Multi-family sites not rezoned before plan adoption will be required to be 20 units per acre.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess, John</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/20/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - reduced property value.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

- * Incent ADUs in new subdivisions;
  - Establish expedited permitting and set fee reductions for ADUs.

- * Require ADUs for certain projects;
  - ADUs cannot be required. The mechanism would be rezoning to a minimum density.

- * Reduce fees;
  - Set reduced fees for affordable housing units. Included as Program H1.3.c for ADUs and JADUs.

- * Add overlay zone for 2-4 plex;
  - PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.

- * Expedite permitting;
  - Expedite permitting for affordable housing units.

- * Integration of Housing and Safety Elements;
  - County of San Mateo Multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2021 was adopted by Woodside.

- * Distribution of housing sites and access to services;
  - Affordable housing sites have been distributed throughout Town.

- * General Plan consistency;
  - All projects are required to be consistent with the General Plan.

- * Fire hazard planning; and,
  - All projects are required to meet fire regulations.

- * Page 70 (MF housing to be located in minimal constraint areas).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Resident/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Edit (Page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hess, John</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>5/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - fire, sewer, seismic, slope, access to services, community character.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Gordon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woodhill Estates HOA (RWC)</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - open space, traffic, noise, habitat.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Gordon</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huhs, John &amp; Renee</td>
<td>Marva Oaks Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Runnymede site - seismic, sewer, egress, reduced property value.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Jean</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, habitat, sewer, lack of services.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khurana, Himanshu &amp; Arora, Aditi</td>
<td>Woodridge Ct.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, habitat, sewer, lack of services.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krajcar, Stephen (Steve) &amp; Ton</td>
<td>Somerset Place</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/24/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Cañada College site - habitat, traffic, impacts to trails, reduced property value.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine, Jeremy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County</td>
<td>6/17/2022</td>
<td>ADU Projection too high.</td>
<td>Lower ADU projection from Z5.</td>
<td>Table 3-5; Page G-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add ADU Programs.  
  ADU Workshops by the new (five) Town Council Districts calendared for five consecutive Thursdays (9/15/22, 9/22/22, 9/29/22, 10/6/22 and 10/13/22).

- Reduce ADU affordability assignment.    
  The ABAG ADU affordability distribution (30/30/30/10) for Cycle 6 is regional and will be applied in Woodside.

- Increase density to 20 units/acre.  
  Revisit RHNA Strategy at the July 12, 2022, TC Meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lubin, Stephen</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/24/2022</td>
<td>Locate MF housing near Town Center (services).</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.</td>
<td>Add Program H1.3.d and H3.3.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Commercial Corridor” unlikely to be developed.</td>
<td>Thus the reason for choosing predominantly Town-owned sites, i.e., the Town has control over development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce complexity of Cañada College entitlement process.</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies. Reduce complexity of Cañada College entitlement process.</td>
<td>Add Program H3.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town assistance to Cañada College.</td>
<td>See Program H1.3.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase staff capacity.</td>
<td>Town Council to approve Planning staff changes (via budget) on 7/12/22, which will increase staff availability for advanced planning, particularly the Housing Element and its programs.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Double counting single family dwellings.</td>
<td>The HCD form for Cycle 5 has two categories: new construction and demolition. Mid-cycle 5, Woodside was explicitly instructed by HCD to revise our Annual Report to NOT include new construction as ‘net’.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change program language from “consider” to “shall”.</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add deliverables and timelines to policies.</td>
<td>See Table 3-6, Pages 3-43 thru 3-54.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add financial incentives.</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone Community Commercial.</td>
<td>Town Center is currently development restricted by the late 1980s citizen initiative ballot Measures J. Require a new ballot measure to lift development restrictions.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rental registry.</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce parking requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedite permitting.</td>
<td>Expedite permitting for ADUs/JAUDS and increased density housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item A Page 21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacSwain, Jonathan</td>
<td>W. Maple Wy.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - reduced property value, quality of life, fire.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malloy, David &amp; Mary</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant.</td>
<td>Recorded Open Space Covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, socially isolated, car dependent. Recorded Open Space covenant would need to be retracted by the Town Council to develop the site. AFFH requires distribution throughout Town.
- Opposes Runnymede site - habitat, egress, community character, freeway noise, sewer, seismic, Highway 280 scenic impacts, socially isolated, car dependent. All future development projects would require environmental review. AFFH requires distribution throughout Town.
- Opposes 733 Cañada Road site - fire, sewer, freeway noise, Highway 280 scenic, habitat issues, socially isolated, car dependent. All future development projects would require environmental review. AFFH requires distribution throughout Town.
- Opposes High Road site - geologic issues, socially isolated, car dependent. All future development projects would require environmental review. AFFH requires distribution throughout Town.
- Fail on AFFH requirements (Pages 3-20 & 3-21). Sites for increased density have been chosen in part based on the probability of an actual project being constructed.
- Consider inclusionary zoning. PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.
- Encourage small-scale housing near Town Center.
- Zone area within walking distance to Town Center to 10 units/acre.
- Zone area within biking distance to Town Center to 5 units/acre.
- Produce units with a range of affordability, or require an inclusionary fee.
- Subsidize low income units with an inclusionary fee.
- Rent control units.
- Coordinate low income housing with a new bus route.
- ADUs do typically blend more successfully into the existing fabric of the Town. Specific Cycle 6 policies and assistance will promote the increased production of ADUs.
## TC Meeting of July 12, 2022
Cycle 6 Housing Element - Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martinson, Bill &amp; Pamela</td>
<td>Woodridge Ct.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill Site - Recorded Open Space Covenant, traffic, noise, views, habitat.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, Holly</td>
<td>Raymundo Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Housing Element fulfills SB9 mandate.</td>
<td>SB9 is for a specific housing prototype, i.e., it allows a lot split and two units on each lot by right, it is not the basis for a Housing Element.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Door Woodside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposes Runnymede site - egress, fire, traffic, seismic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Cardinale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Woodside staff</td>
<td>5/18/2022</td>
<td>Notice of 5/20/22 TC Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan A.</td>
<td>(not known)</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>Drawing attention to notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Hess</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>Urging comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan M. (MacSwain)</td>
<td>W. Maple Wy.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>Urging comments to State to oppose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochsner, Jim</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Open Space Covenant, traffic, noise.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offen, Karen</td>
<td>Raymundo Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/29/2022</td>
<td>Runnymede site - request for deed.</td>
<td>Transmitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offen, Karen</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/29/2022</td>
<td>Runnymede deeded by State to Town, after not needed for Highway 280 construction, for &quot;public purposes&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offen, Karen</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/29/2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/17/2022</td>
<td>Inclusion of SFD replacements.</td>
<td>HCD dictates how units are reported via their annual reporting form (which frequently changes from year to year). In Cycle 4, HCD required reporting of units as net and finalized - which we did. Mid-stream in Cycle 5, HCD required annual reporting as new and demo as separate categories, and permits issued. Woodside has submitted annual reports to HCD in January of each year, well ahead of the April 15th deadline; which they review and accept. The most recent HCD dashboard shows Woodside exceeding compliance, according to their own numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/18/2022</td>
<td>Inclusion of SFD replacements.</td>
<td>See comment above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of new project SFDs &amp; ADUs.</td>
<td>See comment above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline SFD replacements.</td>
<td>See comment above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of SB9 units.</td>
<td>Only a modest number of SB9 units have included (8 units total for the 8-year cycle), and at above-moderate income level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter:</td>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>Resident/Organization:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Edit (Page):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>Inclusion of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>HCD has indicated that Cycle 6 ADU projection will be based on the average of the last four years. Anything other than this should be supported by new evidence (ADU survey) and additional programs (e.g., amnesty, incentives, workshops). Additional workshops have been added.</td>
<td>Add Program H1.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/19/2022</td>
<td>ADU Projection.</td>
<td>Duplicate Comment: HCD has indicated that Cycle 6 ADU projection will be based on the average of the last four years. Anything other than this should be supported by new evidence (ADU survey) and additional programs (e.g., amnesty, incentives, workshops). Add promotional workshops by the five new TC Districts.</td>
<td>Add Program H1.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of SFD replacements.</td>
<td>Duplicate Comment: HCD dictates how units are reported via their annual reporting form (which frequently changes from year to year). In Cycle 4, HCD required reporting of units as net and finaled - which we did. Midstream in Cycle 5, HCD required annual reporting as new and demo as separate categories, and permits issued. Woodside has submitted annual reports to HCD in January of each year, well ahead of the April 15th deadline; which they review and accept. The most recent HCD dashboard show Woodside exceeding compliance, according to their own review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipeline SFD replacements.</td>
<td>See answer above.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter:</td>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>Resident/Organization:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td>Response:</td>
<td>Edit (Page):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of SB9 units.</td>
<td>Duplicate Comment: Only a modest number of SB9 units have included (8 units total for the 8-year cycle), and at above-moderate income level.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land division units.</td>
<td>Subdivisions are rare in Woodside; therefore subdivisions support new units development above and beyond the status quo projection. Also supporting this fact is that the super majority of new home development in Woodside is accompanied by at least one ADU.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condemned unit replacement.</td>
<td>Condemned properties in Woodside are rare; therefore redevelopment of this property supports new units development above and beyond the status quo projection. There is an application in for a new SFD and an ADU.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Cañada College units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>6/14/2022</td>
<td>Commit to yearly monitoring of RHNA progress.</td>
<td>The current Town practice is to monitor RHNA progress every January when the Annual Report is prepared to ensure progress and adjust as needed. This practice will continue.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Omit Cycle 5 pipeline projects.</td>
<td>The Town will count Cycle 5 pipeline projects (i.e., projects not finaled by June 30, 2022) as Cycle 6 projects. These projects will be backed out of the Cycle 5 RHNA overage.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase zoning from 10 to 20 units/acre to increase economic feasibility of development.</td>
<td>Rezoning before Housing Element adoption may be less than 20 units per acre. Town will deed restrict units.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with nonprofit housing developers.</td>
<td>The Town met with two nonprofit housing developers during the preparation of the Cycle 6 Housing Element.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne &amp; Diggs, Keith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/26/2022</td>
<td>Adequacy of Site Inventory.</td>
<td>Appendix G: Added a link to the full HCD format Site Inventory excel spreadsheet, which is too large to print, and a map and narrative.</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone Cañada College in favor of the existing overlay zone.</td>
<td>PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cycle 6 Housing Element - Response to Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne &amp; Diggs, Keith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/26/2022</td>
<td>ADU Projection.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Program H3.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Anne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/29/2022</td>
<td>Posting of Housing Element.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poletti, Paul</td>
<td>Runnymede Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Constitutional challenge. State housing legislation affects individual rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poletti, Susan</td>
<td>Runnymede Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Constitutional challenge. State is bullying local governments with threats of fines (violation of 8th Amendment). Use Town revenue for legal defense.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Ramzi</td>
<td>Somerset Pl.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/20/2022</td>
<td>Location of Cañada College units.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Ramzi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/26/2022</td>
<td>Location of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Ramzi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Location of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Ramzi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Location of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiling, Maria</td>
<td>Woodridge Ct.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/26/2022</td>
<td>Location of Cañada College units.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Pam</td>
<td>Dean Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>5/21/2022</td>
<td>Request for summary comparison of Cycle 5 and Cycle 6.</td>
<td>Prepared a Cycle 5/Cycle 6 comparison for Pam Roberts.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-family overlay zone approval process.
Development standards for the Cañada College overlay, developed during Cycle 5, are discretionary. Revise code to streamline development processing.

### ADU affordability assignment.
The ABAG ADU affordability distribution (30/30/30/10) for Cycle 6 is regional and will be applied in Woodside.

### Duplicate Comment: HCD has indicated that Cycle 6 ADU projection will be based on the average of the last four years. Anything other than this should be supported by evidence (ADU survey) and additional programs (e.g., amnesty, incentives, workshops). Additional workshops have been added.

### Add Program H1.2.c

Paulson, Anne & Diggs, Keith - YIMBY 5/26/2022 ADU Projection.

Duplicate Comment: HCD has indicated that Cycle 6 ADU projection will be based on the average of the last four years. Anything other than this should be supported by evidence (ADU survey) and additional programs (e.g., amnesty, incentives, workshops). Additional workshops have been added.

Poletti, Paul Runnymede Dr. Resident (Woodside) 7/01/2022 Constitutional challenge. State housing legislation affects individual rights.

Opposes Runnymede site - reduce property values.

Poletti, Susan Runnymede Dr. Resident (Woodside) 7/01/2022 Constitutional challenge. State is bullying local governments with threats of fines (violation of 8th Amendment). Use Town revenue for legal defense.

Ramsey, Ramzi Somerset Pl. Resident (Woodside) 6/20/2022 Location of Cañada College units.

The SMCCCD is preparing a Facilities Master Plan, which includes proposed housing sites for all three colleges in the District, to address the waiting list of 240 faculty and staff members. The Woodside Housing Element includes one-third of this demand for Cañada College (80 units). See link for last community meeting on May 4, 2022: https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php


Prepared a Cycle 5/Cycle 6 comparison for Pam Roberts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter:</th>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Resident/Organization:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>Edit (Page):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rothstein, Torrey &amp; Fiona</td>
<td>Woodside Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/14/2022</td>
<td>Opposes rezoning of &quot;Commercial Corridor&quot;.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Pauline</td>
<td>Cañada Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/10/2022</td>
<td>Opposes rezoning of &quot;Commercial Corridor&quot;.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shulman, Jacob &amp; Valerie</td>
<td>Woodridge Ct.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>6/27/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - Recorded Open Space Covenant, reduced property value, noise, habitat.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan, Victor</td>
<td>Woodhill Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Redwood City)</td>
<td>7/01/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Farm Hill site - reduced property value, Open Space Covenant.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trubridge, Mary Frances &amp; Browne, Joe</td>
<td>Palm Cir.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/23/2022</td>
<td>Opposes 773 Cañada site - fire, water.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaykumar Shreyas, Ripal</td>
<td>Woodside Rd.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/16/2022</td>
<td>Opposes &quot;Commercial Corridor&quot; rezoning - traffic.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Davis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YIMBY</td>
<td>5/31/2022</td>
<td>HCD Comments on City of Temple City SB9 Ordinance.</td>
<td>Woodside's SB9 Ordinance (adopted December 2021, and amended February 2022) limits units to 800 sf, limits height to 18 feet and prohibits basements. The HCD memo to Temple City requires that development standards not be more restrictive than the zoning allows for other projects. PC hearing on 9/21/22 and TC hearing on 9/27/22 calendared for housing strategies, including further modifications (i.e., further allowances) to the Town’s SB9 ordinance.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williford, John and Katherine</td>
<td>Raymundo Dr.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/21/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Runnymede site - rural character, traffic.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto, Akira</td>
<td>Somerset Pl.</td>
<td>Resident (Woodside)</td>
<td>6/25/2022</td>
<td>Opposes Cañada College housing on the south/southwest side of the campus.</td>
<td>All future development projects would require environmental review.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attn: Woodside Town Council

Re: Draft Housing Element

Thank you all for the time and effort that you have had to spend on this state-imposed conundrum.

We have lived at Drive since 1995. All 5 of our children attended Woodside School from Kindergarten to 8th grade. We consider ourselves fortunate to have been able to raise our children on Raymundo; it’s a corner of Woodside unlike any other.

About 20 years ago we had guests over, I was inside cooking and a guest came in and said to me with an amazed look “Wow, your horse is really tame….Nick just climbed right up the horse with no saddle!” My stomach dropped. We did not own a horse. Nick, who was 2 ½ years old at the time, he climbed over the fence, and went for a ride on the neighbors horse. He didn’t know where our property ended and our neighbors started or that we did not own a horse.

There is a constant flow of riders on horses streaming past our home all day, every day. Our concern is that if another 10 or more families were to also live on our street, and there is an emergency requiring an evacuation order; we would not have a safe exit out of out Runnymede. The road would be filled with horse trailers! Take into account the number of horses just at NCEFT alone. Add all of the horses that are boarding at the Fontana’s property on the corner/my next-door neighbor. It would be a huge hazard.

At the onset of last week’s fire, horse owner’s were parking their trailers on Runnymede, preparing for a quick exit. There are a lot of horses on Raymundo and they are my neighbor’s pets, they also live in this corner of Woodside. They deserve to be protected too!

This is not the only reason that this property is unsuitable for a multifamily housing project. I know of many more and have chosen to focus on the issue that makes me lose sleep.

I don’t know what the solution is; but, when I heard someone that lives near Hacienda say that they had to wait six minutes to make a left onto Woodside Road. I thought to myself ‘a traffic light can solve that problem. It could also solve the same problem on Cañada Road. And at least they won’t burn to death in their cars when the 1,000s of acres of open space located north of Raymundo catch fire … and we will be forced to all evacuate through one exit!”

Unfortunately, not all fires give notice and I wouldn’t bet my life on it and you should not either.

We believe that you are also concerned for our safety, you will make the right decision and find another solution that does not include Raymundo/Runnymede.
Thank you,

Jenine and Per Alftin
Ms. Paulson:

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you last Thursday morning. However, when we spoke, I had not realized your objective in the email below or subsequent social media posts, nor your intent to convey any sentiments on behalf of the Community College District or me. As I do not wish my comments to be taken out of context, let me clarify the matter as I now have had the opportunity to gain additional context that was not provided during our conversation.

As I explained during our call, the District is undertaking a Districtwide Facilities Master Planning process, whereby we are identifying future facilities needs, which could include housing (both for employees and students). As part of the Master Plan process, the District has identified potential locations at each of our campuses, including Cañada College, where at some future point, should the District have interest and funding, housing could be located.

Since our call, I have reviewed a memorandum to the Mayor and Town Council on May 10, 2022, in which the Town Manager and Principal Planner conveyed what I believe is a fair summary of the District’s planning process and the current capacity and limitations of our employee housing program. Based on that information, it was inferred that there could, at some point in the future (though no plans currently exist) be a new housing development at Cañada College which would serve a number of employees on our housing waitlist (and there was an extrapolation of the number).

Since we spoke last week, I have learned that my colleague, the District’s Executive Vice Chancellor, shared this same information with Town staff. Last Friday, I spoke with both the Town Manager and the District’s Executive Vice Chancellor, and the District does not have concerns with the summary representation offered by the Town Manager in his earlier referenced memorandum, as it makes mention of potential opportunities, not draft or concrete plans.

I hope this brings clarity to this matter. Should you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,
Mitch

---

Mitchell A. Bailey
Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff
Office of the Chancellor
San Mateo County Community College District
Dear Mr. Schaan,

The Woodside Draft Housing Element released today projects 80 units of housing at Cañada College, based, supposedly, on a conversation with Mitch Bailey, the Vice Chancellor at the community college district that includes Cañada College. Vice Chancellor Bailey is the person in charge of planning building projects in the community college district.

In a phone call today, Vice Chancellor Bailey denied the existence of a plan for 80 units of housing at Cañada College in the next eight years. He denies telling Woodside that the district has a plan for 80 units of housing at Cañada College in the next eight years. He denies that such a plan exists.

He explained that the district is doing its facilities master plan, which identifies locations for potential future housing but does not specify the number of units, the location, or the date by which they would be constructed. The district currently has a 250 person waiting list for their existing employee housing in the three colleges in the district, but the existence of a waiting list does not imply that the college is able to satisfy that demand in the short time frame of 8 years.

Unless Woodside can show something in writing from the Community College District, detailing a plan for 80 units of housing, these units must be removed from the Housing Element projections.

Sincerely,
Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
We reside in Woodhill Estates and have been homeowners since 1996 at Avenue. We received a copy of the Town of Woodside Courtesy Notice regarding proposed higher density and/or multi-family housing at two locations near us - Canada College and Farm Hill adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park.

We are opposed to both of these proposals as they ignore the agreement/contract reached when the residents of Woodhill Estates negotiated concessions for the construction of Barkley Fields.

1. Farm Hill Proposal

This new proposal appears to develop the open space buffer, remove the large Eucalyptus trees and build a road into and out of the parcel from Woodhill Drive, requiring removal of the sound deadening trees. This is not honoring the agreement reached when the residents of Woodhill Estates negotiated concessions for the construction of Barkley Fields.

We think there are better options which do not conflict with prior agreements and which are closer to city center to meet this housing need. When the Town of Woodside requested support for Barkley Fields from our neighborhood this support was given, with the understanding that the Town got what they needed and that some of the open space would be preserved and steps would be taken to mitigate the impact of the field. This proposal ignores those promises.

2. Canada College Proposal

The housing for Faculty and Staff at Canada College built in 2008 was to address the need for affordable housing. We are surprised to see yet another proposal at Canada College since this project was supposed to meet the immediate and projected need at that location. The recent construction of the faculty and staff housing at Canada College, and the Solar Panels and...
the Gymnasium and Pool at Canada College resulted in a long term and **ongoing increase in traffic**.

3. The state's mandate for housing is focused on providing more housing near city centers. **These two proposals are not near the Town of Woodside city center.** Proposing to go back to these two sites to solve the Town of Woodside's required increase in housing puts an undue burden on our neighborhood again, when we have already been impacted by these prior projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Virsis and Farrokh Billimoria
Kevin and Jackie,

Please see the attached Fire Safety Assessment for 773 Canada Road.

Don Bullard
Dear Kevin and Jackie,

As requested, I have completed a fire safety assessment of the land located at 773 Canada Road which has been identified as a potential location for the RHNA/HCD plan for up to 10 SFD plus an additional 10 ADU’s.

As I understood my assignment, I was to provide my assessment of what impact the development of the property would have on fire safety.

You may recall a letter I wrote to the Town Council in December of 2021 that was in opposition of building in the Very High Fire Severity Zones:

“To protect public safety in the Town of Woodside it is of my opinion that communities and neighborhoods located in the Very High and High Fire Severity Zones should be exempted from the mandates of Senate Bill 9, and specifically, as examples; Woodside Glens, Skywood Acres, Grandview/Espinoza, and neighborhoods served by Old La Honda Road. Recognize that these are established communities with long standing established infrastructure that I am speaking of.

I go on to say, the current conditions in the Very High and High Fire Severity zones as defined by Cal Fires 2007-2008 FRAP maps are not conducive for further development as proposed by Senate Bill 9. City streets less than 20 feet wide, extended evacuation times, topographical challenges, and climatic conditions that aid the spread of wildfires all contribute to the ever-present challenge in these high fire hazard zones.

California’s many recent wildfires amply demonstrate the extreme risk created by the intermix of dense vegetation and hundreds of structures and accessory buildings throughout Woodside. That risk is only heightened by the Town’s steep hillsides, narrow ravines, dense, creek-fed vegetation, increasingly dry, extended fire season, and substandard road widths.

Senate Bill 9 would encourage much more structure density and people to live in Very High and High Fire Severity areas, increase the risk of ember cast structure ignitions, structure to structure fire spread and increase the risk of clogged roads needed for emergency vehicle access and evacuation by residents.
I cannot stress enough how this could lead to the potential loss of life for residents and fire personnel. I also urge the Town to adopt an improved building code over that of the state’s Building Code which requires the use of ignition resistant materials and methods for new construction to further improve the wildfire resilience of structures within the Town.

The Very High Fire Severity areas front the Woodside coastal range mountains and “the narrow drainage and sub-drainage topographic features of the coastal Mountains have the capability to funnel winds, increase wind speeds, erratically alter wind direction, and facilitate fire spread and promote extreme fire behavior. This is especially true during Diablo wind events when strong northerly winds are aligned with the downslope direction of the canyons and watersheds of the Coastal Mountains. The topography of woodside is, therefore, capable of producing wind conditions that promote extreme wildfire behavior.” These unique topographic and weather conditions that promote fast moving and extreme wildfire conditions makes swift evacuation critical for residents within and adjacent to the Very High fire severity areas. Furthermore, many Very High and High Fire Severity areas are adjacent to and amongst unmitigated non-fire resilient open space lands containing extreme fuel loads which only make matters worse. Many residents have only a single route out of the area. A large portion of the roads in the Very High Fire Severity areas are narrow and winding having the potential to cause life threatening traffic congestion during an evacuation as residents try to leave the area and firefighters attempt to enter the area to fight the fire. Allowing additional density in these areas at the levels proposed through SB 9 would result in a threat to the health and safety of the residents in that area.”

This is what I stated to the Town Council in December of 2021 in opposition of SB 9 lot splits and increased density in established communities within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones of the District and Town.

It's important to recognize the difference between the lands I spoke of in my December letter to the Town Council, and the identified property for future development located at 773 Canada Road.

The land at 773 Canada Road is within the recognized Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone except for a small sliver of that property to the North being in the moderate zone. 773 Canada Road is not within an established community with long standing established infrastructure, nor does it front the Woodside coastal range mountains and “the narrow drainage and sub-drainage topographic features of the coastal Mountains which have the capability to funnel winds, increase wind speeds, erratically alter wind direction, and facilitate fire spread and promote extreme fire behavior. If developed, the infrastructure at 773 Canada road would be greatly improved, including water supply with increased fire hydrant spacing, wide, 20’ roadways, potential underground electrical utilities, and the potential for increased access and egress from Canada Road connecting to West Maple Way creating an additional evacuation route for residents of Western Emerald Hills.

It's important to think about evacuation. In a fast-moving wildfire, swift evacuation of people is critical, and to achieve swift evacuation we need good access/egress options. 773 Canada Road provides both, good access, and good egress. Canada is a wide road that can handle good traffic flow and has multiple options that lead directly to highway 280. Additionally, a connection to West Maple would be an improved evacuation benefit for both 773 Canada occupants as well as Western Emerald Hills residents. The potential for swift evacuation of this area is good.

The existing land at 773 Canada consists of rolling grassland hills with very sparse Oak and other species of trees that I suspect, for the most part, will be required to be removed if the land gets developed. Any new landscaping will have to be approved by the fire district as fire resistant landscaping before planting. These grasslands are what we call light flashy fuels and are easily mitigated through mowing. The land on this property is not an example of what I spoke of as being “risky” in my December letter to the Town Council. The land does not consist of dense, creek-fed vegetation, steep Easterly facing slopes and narrow ravines, and...
does not promote situations of extreme fire behavior. If developed, most of the existing rolling grasslands will be covered with pavement, ignition resistant and/or non-combustible construction (Built to current Codes and Standards), and improved infrastructure. I see this as having a positive effect on fire safety to the area. Additionally, the fire district would require and impose a Wildfire Hazard Assessment Plan (WHAP) on the development, requiring a 200–300-foot perimeter fuels management plan that would be inspected annually, by the fire district, prior to fire season.

Overall, it is the opinion of this Fire Marshal that a development project at the location of 773 Canada Road that was built to current Code and Standards would have a positive impact on, and increase fire safety to the area.

Don Bullard
Fire Marshal
Woodside Fire Protection District

www.woodsidefire.org
Ms. Young:

Thank you for your Courtesy Notice of the upcoming meeting regarding the Housing Element. As we live at [redacted] Place between the western edge of Canada College property and Canada Road, we do plan to attend and would like to share our concerns with regard to the proposed 80 units of housing at Canada College.

Several months ago, we came to a Town Council meeting and expressed concern about the possibility that the College would develop the area below the main level of the College on the Canada Road side. We were assured at that time that the College had no intention to develop it and that any development would occur on the other side of the campus, where the current housing has been built. In light of this new document, we again seek that assurance. Given the current circumstances and pressures to build out our beautiful town, we would further ask the Council to seek and/or create a permanent green belt out of the land below the college on the Canada Road side, to forever restrict housing development on that side of the campus and preserve a beautiful and vital habitat.

This area is precious open space between our home and the buildings and parking lots of the college and surrounding other homes in our neighborhood. This is good habitat for deer and other animals and also serves as a fire break. Only a small portion of this land appears to be buildable. We don’t believe it would be wise from a seismic or drainage standpoint to build homes into that steep hill. It leaves little acreage to build and many of those units would be unattractive as they would be very close to I-280 and its incessant traffic noise. Further, it would be far cheaper to build in the area where the current residences and their supporting utility infrastructure already exist.

Additional development on that side of campus would increase traffic on Canada Road, which is already seriously backing up during the commute hours, making it difficult on some mornings to drive our kids to school. It would also make the intersection of Canada Road and West Entry Drive very dangerous, especially if there were student housing placed there. Further, we would reject fully the idea of having student dorms so close to our residential areas. We would fear the havoc that could be caused by young students and their predictable foibles.

Another concern we would have with the plan altogether is the impact on our access to our elementary school. By increasing the housing units present, you increase the school population. We are privileged to currently live in an area of Woodside that has access to WES. We would like assurance that the access will remain in place. Given enrollment increases that would result from extra housing units being added, we are concerned that we may be cut out of the WES district, which would have serious impact on housing values here, not to mention, being denied the fine educational experience WES has to offer.
We came to Woodside for its peace and beauty and its schools. We strongly urge you to protect us and the other living beings that call this place home.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We are reachable at this email or by phone at 650-867-2019 if you wish clarification of these remarks.

Chris and Eva Canellos

PS

Recently, to our disappointment and without any notice to us, the college has used some of this area (south of West Entry Drive) as a dumping ground for their excess dirt from recent construction. This has greatly detracted from the beauty of the area and likely has had an adverse effect on the habitat. On windy days, the dirt is kicked up in the form of unpleasant dust. We would like to you to request that the College remediate that area and restore its natural beauty as soon as possible.

Christopher Canellos ’74, MBA ’76, Parent ‘22
Senior Adviser – Financial Management Services
University Hall

Redwood City, CA 94063

Phone:
Fax:
Email:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.
Jackie,

Please find attached our letter in response to courtesy notices sent by Town of Woodside relating to the plan for Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update near Barkley Fields and park and Canada College.

Regards,
Nina Gupta & Harpreet Chohan

Court,
Redwood City, CA 94061
Nina Gupta & Harpreet Chohan  
[Redacted] Court,  
Redwood City, CA 94061  

29 June 2022

Jackie Young,  
Town of Woodside Planning Director

We reside in Woodhill Estates and have been homeowners since 2016 at [Redacted] Court, Redwood City CA 94061. We recently received two courtesy notifications from the Town of Woodside (the “Town”) with less than fifteen days’ notice to provide comments regarding proposed higher density and/or multi-family housing at two locations near me: Canada College and Farm Hill adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park.

We are opposed to both of these proposals as both impact our quality of life and our community negatively and are inconsistent with previous agreements with the Town. We have already been subjected to multiple projects impacting our neighborhood with significant increases in traffic in recent years. The construction of Barkley Fields removed a lot of mature Eucalyptus trees, and the fields use for baseball, soccer and recreation add to noise in our neighborhood. The recent construction of the faculty and staff housing at Canada College, as well as the construction of Solar Panels and the Gymnasium and Pool at Canada College resulted in years of construction noise and an ongoing increase in traffic due to residents at the facility. Proposing to go back to these two sites to solve the Town’s required increase in housing puts an undue and unproportionate burden on our neighborhood again, when we have already been impacted by these prior projects.

Farm Hill Proposal

The Town had extensive negotiations with the Woodhill Estate Homeowners Association (“Woodhill HOA”) on the construction of Barkley Fields in 2005. During the negotiations, the Town agreed among other things to restrict the use of space currently being contemplated for development, and plant and maintain trees behind 75 Woodhill Drive to act as a sound barrier. This was done and is serving this purpose. In addition, the open space behind 5 and 7 Woodridge Court was to act as a sound buffer and the large Eucalyptus trees were to remain for sound deadening. This has also worked well.

This new proposal (Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update) appears to develop the open space buffer that the Town has previously designated as ecologically sensitive, remove the large Eucalyptus trees and build a road into and out of the parcel from Woodhill Drive, requiring removal of the sound deadening trees. This is not honoring the agreement reached with the Woodhill HOA when the residents of Woodhill Estates negotiated concessions for the construction of Barkley Fields. Further this parcel does not have sewer, water or electrical supply so these would have to be addressed adding further strain to resources. In addition, PG&E natural gas pipelines are adjacent to this parcel. As open space and with a stream bed, this parcel provides
needed habitat for frogs, California quail, doves, bluebirds, rare butterflies, raccoons, skunks, whitetail deer, mountain lion and a pair of great horned owls reside in the tops of the Eucalyptus trees. All these habitats would be destroyed by the new proposal in contravention of Senate Bill 9. We purchased our home at [redacted] Court on the basis that this land would be designated as open space in perpetuity in accordance with the Town’s Deed Restriction. The new residents would be directly behind our home at [redacted] Court and would be a direct interference with the quiet use and enjoyment of our property that was protected by the Town’s Deed Restriction. When the Town of Woodside requested support for Barkley Fields from the Woodhill HOA this support was given, with the understanding that the Town got what they needed and that some of the open space would be preserved and steps would be taken to mitigate the impact of the field. This proposal ignores those promises.

The housing for Faculty and Staff at Canada College built in 2008 was to address the need for affordable housing. This was a complex project requiring de-annexation to Redwood City in order to provide sanitary sewer and freshwater supply. We are surprised to see yet another proposal at Canada College since this project was supposed to meet the immediate and projected need at that location. Again, this is a case of us giving our support with the understanding that Canada College got the housing that they needed, yet now there is a proposal to add more.

**Overall Intent**

The state's mandate for housing is focused on providing additional housing near city centers where there is adequate bus and rail transportation, bike lanes, access to grocery, entertainment and jobs within walking distance. The proposals put forward by the Town are not within walking distance to grocery shopping, dining, and entertainment for these parcels of land. These two proposals are not near the Town of Woodside city center and therefore will add to local traffic and noise.

For these reasons, we think there are better options which do not conflict with prior agreements, deed covenants and which are closer to city center to meet this housing need. We humbly request that you remove Canada College and Farm Hill from any further consideration.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Nina Gupta & Harpreet Chohan
[Redacted]
Redwood City, CA 94061
Attached are my written comments on the proposal for Multi-Family Housing in Woodside. Thank you.
June 21, 2022

Housing Element Update 2023-2031

To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director

From: Lloyd Clary, [REDACTED] Drive, Redwood City, CA 94061

I reside in Woodhill Estates and have been a homeowner since 2007 at [REDACTED] Drive. I received a copy of the Town of Woodside Courtesy Notice from my neighbor regarding proposed higher density and / or multi-family housing at two locations near me: Canada College and Farm Hill adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park.

I am opposed to both of these proposals as both impact my quality of life and our community negatively. In addition, we have already been subjected to multiple projects impacting our neighborhood with long term increase in traffic and short term during construction in recent years. The construction of Barkley Fields removed a lot of mature Eucalyptus trees and the fields use for baseball, soccer and recreation add to noise in our neighborhood. The recent construction of the faculty and staff housing at Canada College, as well as the construction of Solar Panels and the Gymnasium and Pool at Canada College resulted in years of construction noise and an ongoing increase in traffic due to residents at the facility. Proposing to go back to these two sites to solve the Town of Woodside’s required increase in housing puts an undue burden on our neighborhood again, when we have already been impacted by these prior projects. In addition, there is a separate proposal to add a permanent batting cage at Barkley Fields which will add the noise of aluminum bats. Our neighborhood did not oppose this as we desire to be a good neighbor to the Town and we support youth athletics. Overall the Barkley Fields operation, with the concessions made, had been positive or at least neutral in the view of our neighborhood.

Farm Hill Proposal
During the negotiations on construction of Barkley Fields in 2005, the Town agreed to plant and maintain trees behind 75 Woodhill Drive to act as a sound barrier. This was done and is serving this purpose. In addition, the open space behind 5 and 7 Woodridge Court was to act as a sound buffer and the large Eucalyptus trees were to remain for sound deadening. This has also worked well. And the vehicle gate was not to be used for access to Barkley Fields except by Fire Department and Field Maintenance crews. Foot traffic was only to be allowed via the parking lot of the facility and no pedestrian access gates were added on the north or west sides of the field. This has also worked out well to prevent cars from parking along Woodhill Drive.

This proposal appears to develop the open space buffer, remove the large Eucalyptus trees and build a road into and out of the parcel from Woodhill Drive, requiring removal of the sound deadening trees. This is not honoring the agreement reached when the residents of Woodhill Estates negotiated concessions for the construction of Barkley Fields. This parcel does not have sewer, water or electrical supply so these would have to be addressed. In addition, PGE natural gas pipelines are adjacent to this parcel. As open space and with a stream bed, this parcel provides needed habitat for frogs, California quail, doves, bluebirds, raccoon, skunk, whitetail deer, mountain lion and a pair of great horned owls reside in the tops of the Eucalyptus trees. All of this would be destroyed by the proposal. The new residents would be directly behind 75 Woodhill, and 5 and 7 Woodridge Court.

There are no nearby facilities for medical care, grocery shopping, dining and entertainment for this parcel. This would require automobile travel to access services in Redwood City or Woodside. For these reasons, I think there are better options which do not conflict with prior agreements and which are closer to city center to meet this housing need. When the Town of Woodside requested support for Barkley Fields from our neighborhood this support was given, with the understanding that the Town got what they needed and that some of the open space would be preserved and steps would be taken to mitigate the impact of the field. This proposal ignores those promises.

Canada College Proposal
The housing for Faculty and Staff at Canada College built in 2008 was to address the need for affordable housing. This was a complex project requiring de-annexation to Redwood City in order to provide sanitary sewer and freshwater supply. I am surprised to see yet another proposal at Canada College since this project was supposed to meet the immediate and projected need at that location. Again, this is a case of our giving our support with the understanding that Canada College got the housing that they needed, yet now there is a proposal to add more.

**Overall Intent**

The state’s mandate for housing is focused on providing more housing near city centers where there is adequate bus and rail transportation, bike lanes, access to grocery and entertainment and jobs within walking distance. Redwood City has focused efforts along the Caltrain corridor for this reason. These two proposals are not near the Town of Woodside city center and therefore will add to local traffic and noise.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Lloyd Clary
To whom it may concern:

Woodside is claiming that Cañada College is planning to build 80 units of low income housing at Cañada College. The city has no basis for this projection. To accommodate its RHNA, the Woodside Draft Housing Element is counting 80 units of low income housing at Cañada College. Per the draft, “the Town identifies a site at Cañada College, where the College District anticipates constructing approximately 80 units for student and faculty housing that meet very low- and low-income level categories. The College informed the Town of a new facilities plan that includes construction of new fully independent living units for students, including student families, and College employees” (p 139/G-7). The memo memorializing the conversation between the town manager and Community College District Vice Chancellor Richard Storti does not support this assertion. Vice Chancellor Storti said that the district is developing a facilities master plan—which looks much further in the future than the eight years of the RHNA planning period—and is “considering” developing housing as part of that long-term plan. He did not say how many units of housing they would be considering developing, nor how that housing would be allocated among the district’s three campuses. He said the district doesn’t have any funding right now to build housing. None of these statements would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the district anticipates building 80 units of housing at Cañada in the next eight years. Woodside must make space for those 80 low income units of housing elsewhere.

Respectfully,
Salim Damerdji
Volunteer for the Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Hello Jackie,

Attached are our written comments in advance of the July 12, 2022 Town Council Meeting.

I’ve also attached:

1. Two scanned pages from the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, dated March 31, 2004
2. SB 9 Eligibility and Application Checklist
3. Covenant Town of Woodside—APN 068-322-390

Thanks a lot—and enjoy your holiday weekend!

Danielle Dearborn

Drive

Woodside CA 94061-1831
July 1, 2022

The Honorable Dick Brown, Mayor of the Town of Woodside
Members of the Town Council
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062

Re: Comments on Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update – July 12, 2022 Meeting

Dear Mayor Brown and Members of the Town Council,

As the property most significantly impacted by the inclusion of “Farm Hill, adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park,” in the Town’s Draft Housing Element, we are registering our strong objection to the proposal of the site for any type of development, now or in the future. Clearly, the peaceful enjoyment of our property and our privacy would be greatly compromised if the site were developed beyond its current use and our property value would be negatively impacted. In addition:

When we purchased our home in 2005 we had several meetings with Susan George and the Town’s representatives about the development of Barkley Fields and Park. At the time, the Town provided us with the “Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (dated March 31, 2004),” to assuage our concerns that the Barkley Field project would not grow beyond its initial planned scope, possibly carrying over into the 1.68-acre Town-owned parcel directly behind our home. Among—and in addition to—verbal assurances, we were directed to the Biological Resources Mitigation Measures mentioned throughout the Study (e.g., see scanned pages 50 and 51 attached). It was our understanding then, as it is now, that this Town-owned parcel is protected as Open Space in perpetuity for the reasons mentioned in the Study.

In addition, with regard to the State’s “SB 9 Eligibility Checklist,” (p. 2) it appears the requirements are not met per the guidelines, specifically “Parcel does not contain prime agricultural lands, wetlands, protected species habitat, or land subject to a conservation easement.”

Lastly, not long after the Park’s construction was complete, we were given a copy of the Covenant made by the Town which in clear, unequivocal language excludes the subject property from any development, now or in the future. We have included a copy of the Covenant in our email to Jackie Young.

Given this information, we urge you to vote to withdraw the “Farm Hill, adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park” parcel from the Draft Housing Element. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Dearborn, MD  Danielle Dearborn

attached pp. 50 and 51, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, dated March 31, 2004
SB 9 Eligibility and Application Checklist
Covenant Town of Woodside—APN 068-322-390
/dd
c) Create impacts for a project which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable;

d) Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly.

After considering the above, the Planning Department has therefore determined that the potential environmental impact of this project is insignificant, provided mitigation measures outlined below are implemented.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1.** To prevent a significant amount of dust from leaving the site during grading activities, which would degrade air quality for the nearby residential area, the Town shall implement the following actions during all phases of construction on the project site (these measures are consistent with measures identified by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to reduce construction impacts):

- Cover all trucks hauling debris from the site;
- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand or other materials that can be blown by the wind;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access road, parking areas and staging areas at construction site;
- Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;
- Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizer to inactive construction areas (if any);
- Install sandbags, hay bales or silt fencing along edge of drainage swale and public roadways to prevent silt runoff from entering these areas;
- Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.** In order to avoid impacts to the Bay checkerspot butterfly, presence/absence surveys shall be conducted on the project site and adjacent open space lands prior to project construction. Such surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the optimum time for detection of the species (e.g. March through May). If no butterflies are detected, then there will be no impacts to this species and no further mitigation is required.

If the Bay checkerspot butterfly is confirmed present on the site or on adjacent open space lands, the Town personnel shall consult with representatives of USFWS and implement measures deemed appropriate by USFWS to avoid take of the insect and/or secure a permit from USFWS to allow for take of the species. If a take permit is required (as per Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act), the Town shall prepare and implement a Habitat Conservation Plan prior to site grading and construction. The plan shall identify measures to minimize impacts to the species and provide compensatory mitigation (i.e., long-term management of the Town open space parcel for the species and its habitat and restoration of degraded habitat to benefit the species). Interpretive signs, describing the protected status of the species, trail use restrictions and restrictions on collection shall also be installed along the trails. To minimize impacts to sensitive habitat areas on adjacent open space lands from increases in human use of the park, the Town shall install and maintain fencing between the Barkley Fields, the Town-owned parcel and the Cal Trans open space. Designated access areas between the park and the open space lands shall be maintained, such that visitors to the open space lands are encouraged to use existing trails. Successful implementation of this measure will reduce impacts to the Bay checkerspot butterfly to a less-than-significant level.
Mitigation Measure BIO-2. To avoid impacts to special status plant species, presence/absence surveys shall be conducted on the project site and adjacent Town open space land prior to project construction. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the optimum time for detection of the species (e.g., March through May), following CDFG’s Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (revised May 2000). If special status species are found, Town personnel shall consult with representatives of USFWS and CDFG and implement measures deemed appropriate by such agencies to avoid take of the species or provide salvage and compensatory mitigation (i.e., management of the Town open space parcel for the species and its habitat). Trail maintenance shall be done to the minimum width needed for trail safety and adequate sight lines. Off-trail use in serpentine areas shall be discouraged by installing signs to encourage users to stay on the trail. If sensitive plants are found, the Town shall install permanent exclusion fences to separate the special status plant species from the park users, develop a species relocation plan for those species disturbed by the project (if direct impacts cannot be avoided); and implement any additional mitigation measures USFWS and/or CDFG require. Successful implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3. To compensate for the removal of serpentine grassland on the 1.68-acre Town–owned parcel will be limited to a pathway, waterline and landscaping, with the remainder of the parcel preserved as open space and managed for serpentine grassland resources. The Town shall install and maintain fencing between the open space parcel, the Barkley Fields and the Cal Trans open space. Designated access areas between the parcels shall be maintained, such that visitors to the open space lands are encouraged to use existing trails. The water line will be placed beneath the existing trail in the Town parcel; construction activities within this area shall minimize impacts to the adjacent serpentine grassland by using small trenching equipment that can limit the area of disturbance to the existing trail bed.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: To avoid indirect impacts to riparian and freshwater marsh habitat that occur in and along the banks of the drainage swale, the Town shall incorporate construction Best Management Practices (BMP’s) to preclude sediments from entering the drainage swale during and after construction of the sports field and pedestrian trail.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the project and will contain all the BMP’s. The Town shall implement the following BMP’s during all phases of construction on the project site:

- Conduct grading during the dry season (i.e., May to November);
- Divert concentrated runoff away from channel banks;
- Minimize vegetation removal on slopes;
- Identify with construction fencing all areas that require clearing, grading or are otherwise disturbed;
- Stabilize disturbed soils to minimize erosion and sediment input to the drainage swale;
- Implement erosion control measures to prevent sediment from entering the drainage swale, including the use of silt fencing or fiber rolls to trap sediments;
- Conduct erosion control seeding of all disturbed areas as soon as practicable after disturbance following construction;
- Monitor the effectiveness of the erosion control measures during the first year’s rainy season and implement remedial measures (e.g., reseeding, repair of silt fencing) if sedimentation or erosion is noted.
- Maintain fence and riparian barrier plantings between field and drainage swale.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5. The removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation and grading should be timed to avoid the December 15 through August 31 bird-nesting period to the extent possible. If no grading or vegetation removal is proposed during the nesting period, no surveys are required. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a qualified wildlife biologist...
SB 9 Eligibility and Application Submittal Checklist

California Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) became effective January 1, 2022. SB 9 has two components: (1) requires a proposed housing development containing no more than 2 residential units within a single-family residential zone to be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements; and (2) requires ministerial approval of urban lot splits that meet certain requirements.

SB 9 only applies to single-family residential zoned parcels within U.S. Census Bureau designated urbanized areas or urban clusters; excludes parcels designated as a historic landmark or located within a historic district; protects existing affordable housing and tenant occupied housing; requires any rental unit created to be rented for a term longer than 30 days; and requires an applicant for an urban lot split to occupy one of the housing units for 3 years, among other requirements.

SB 9 is the Coastal Zone is extremely limited. For properties located in the Coastal Zone, the County’s Local Coastal Program, Subdivision Ordinance, and Zoning Regulations are applicable as adopted in their entirety. Please contact the Planning Department at PlanningProjects@smcgov.org or at (650) 363-1825 for SB 9 projects in the Coastal Zone.

Full legislative text: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB9

SB 9 EARLY ASSISTANCE MEETING

Projects that elect to take advantage of SB 9 are encouraged to complete an Early Assistance Meeting with Planning Department staff prior to a building permit application for the housing development or application for subdivision (lot split).

Early Assistance Meetings can be scheduled through the online appointment system by visiting https://planning.smcgov.org or by requesting a meeting through email at PlanningProjects@smcgov.org or by phone at (650) 363-1825.

Early Assistance Meeting

1. At or before the meeting, the applicant should provide staff with a preliminary plan that conveys a general understanding of the proposal and a completed SB 9 Eligibility Checklist.

2. At the meeting, staff will review the proposal and SB 9 eligibility and inform the applicant of any proposal or eligibility discrepancies, processing next steps, and fees.

3. Within 10 business days of the early assistance meeting, staff will provide the applicant with a brief written summary of the main points discussed at the meeting.
**SB 9 ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST**

SB 9 projects are considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, provided certain requirements are met. Applications for Design Review are not required and environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act does not apply.

SB 9 housing development projects must meet all the following criteria. SB 9 subdivision (lot split) projects must meet additional criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 9 Eligibility Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel is legal and wholly located in a U.S. Census Bureau designated “urbanized areas or urban clusters.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel is located in a single-family residential zone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ One-Family Residential District (R-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ One-Family Residential/Country Club Park District (R-1/CCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Residential Estates District (R-E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Residential Hillside (RH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Project includes residential uses only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel does not contain prime agricultural lands, wetlands, protected species habitat, or land subject to a conservation easement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed development is not located within a historic district or property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory or within a site designated or listed as a County landmark or historic property or district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed development would not require demolition or alteration of affordable housing, rent or price controlled housing, housing occupied by a tenant in the last 3 years, or housing that was withdrawn from the rental market in the last 15 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed development does not demolish more than 25% of the exterior structural walls of an existing structure, unless at least one of the following is met:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ If local ordinance so allows; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The site has not been occupied by a tenant in the last 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed rental units may not be used for short-term rentals of less than 30 days.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parking. Off-street parking of up to one space per unit, except that no parking requirements shall be imposed in either of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor (PRC Section 21155) or a major transit stop (PRC Section 21064.3); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ There is a car share located within one block of the parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel is served by a wastewater provider; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel has a septic system (On-site Wastewater Treatment System) and a percolation test completed within the last 5 years, or, if the percolation test has been recertified, within the last 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel is not located in very high fire hazard severity zones (or is located in very high fire hazard severity zone and criteria of Gov. Code Section 65913.4(a)(6) is met), earthquake fault zone, floodplain, floodway, or contain hazardous materials may be allowed if certain criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Objective zoning, design, and subdivision requirements are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Deed restriction indicating prohibition on short-term rentals will be required as part of subdivision map recordation; or building permit final inspection for housing development where no subdivision is proposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 9 Subdivision (Lot Split) Additional Eligibility Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed urban lot split results in two parcels of approximately equal lot area (60/40 split at most), with each new parcel containing at least 1,200 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcel proposed for urban lot split was not established through a prior SB 9 lot split.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adjacent parcels were not previously subdivided through an SB 9 lot split by the lot owner or anyone acting “in concert with” the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parcels created by proposed urban lot split will only be used for residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed urban lot split and housing development does not include construction of Accessory Dwelling Units or Junior Accessory Dwelling Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Affidavit stating that applicant will occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of 3 years from the date of approval of the urban lot split (unless applicant is a community land trust or qualified non-profit corporation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 9 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVE ZONING AND DESIGN STANDARDS

Building permit applications for housing developments must include a completed SB 9 Eligibility Checklist at the time of application submittal. Eligibility review will occur during the plan check process once the building permit is accepted for processing (a complete application). A determination of eligibility will be made prior to building permit issuance. Eligible projects must meet the following objective zoning and design standards identified below.

SB 9 Objective Zoning Standards

- Residential Units must meet the following development standards of the respective zoning district:
  - Setbacks
    - Development of two 800 sq. ft. units:
      - Front: Zoning District Minimum
      - Sides and Rear: Zoning District Minimum (or 4 feet if required to accommodate two 800 sq. ft. units)
    - Development larger than two 800 sq. ft. units or one single-family residence:
      - Zoning District minimum setbacks apply
    - Development of new unit in same location with same dimensions as an existing structure:
      - No setbacks
  - Lot coverage
  - Floor Area Ratio
  - Height
  - Daylight Plane
  - Parking (one space per unit; no parking if project is within a 3/4 mile walking distance high quality transit corridor or major transit stop; or one block of car share location)
    - https://planning.smcgov.org/zoning-regulations

- Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units.
  - https://planning.smcgov.org/zoning-regulations

SB 9 Objective Design Standards – EMERALD LAKE HILLS

- Building Shapes and Bulk.
  - Control the bulk of buildings on hillsides by requiring them to be terraced up or down the hill at a uniform height.

- Materials and Colors.
  - Use colors such as warm grays, beiges, natural woods, and muted greens. Prohibit the use of cool gray, blues, pinks, yellows, and white.
  - Ensure that all roof materials have Class "C" or better fire resistive ratings.

- Utilities.
  - Install all new service lines underground.

---

2 A local agency may deny a proposed housing development project if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of [Government Code] Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environmental and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.

3 A local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards that would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of up to two units or that would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area.

4 Larger developments not meeting Zoning District minimum standards may apply for a variance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 9 Objective Design Standards – PALOMAR PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Building Shapes and Bulk. Control the bulk of buildings on hillsides by requiring them to be terraced up or down the hill at a uniform height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Materials and Colors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Use colors such as warm grays, beiges, natural woods, and muted greens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Ensure that all roof materials have Class “C” or better fire resistive ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Utilities. Install all new service lines underground.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SB 9 SUBDIVISION APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVE SUBDIVISION STANDARDS**

Applications for review and approval of tentative parcel maps must be filed with the Planning Department. Within 30 days of application submittal, the Planning Department will notify the applicant if the application is complete or if additional information is required. Complete applications will then be transmitted to other agencies for review and comment. Approval or denial of the subdivision is based on compliance with SB 9 requirements and findings listed below.

County’s adopted Subdivision Ordinance:
https://planning.smcgov.org/subdivision-regulations

All documents must be completed and submitted in Portable Document Format (PDF) via email to PlanningProjects@smcgov.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 9 Subdivision Application Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tentative Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digital (PDF file format) tentative parcel map prepared in accordance with Subdivision Ordinance Section 7011.2 (see next checklist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Application Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A completed application form with an attached statement by the applicant setting forth grounds in support of the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/planning-permit-application-form">https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/planning-permit-application-form</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/subdivision-application-companion-page">https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/subdivision-application-companion-page</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Environmental Disclosure Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A completed Environmental Information Disclosure Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <a href="https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/environmental-information-disclosure-form">https://planning.smcgov.org/documents/environmental-information-disclosure-form</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Title Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A preliminary title report, showing the legal owners at the time of application, and all easements, encumbrances, and other reservations of record affecting the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owner’s Concurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proof of the owner’s interest in the property and concurrence with the application for subdivision as required by the Community Development Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fees as adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The fees for tentative map or tentative parcel map review in accordance with the most recent Service Fee Schedule adopted by the Board of Supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tentative Parcel Map Form and Content**

Tentative parcel maps must be submitted to the County Planning and Building Department for review and approval. Maps shall meet the following minimum requirements for form and content.
### Form and Content Requirements for Tentative Parcel Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and Address of Preparer.</td>
<td>The map must be prepared by a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor, whose name, address, email, registration or license number, and signature must be shown on the map, along with the date of preparation. The name and license or registration number of any geologist or soils engineer who may have helped prepare the map should also be indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner and Subdivider’s Name and Address.</td>
<td>The names and addresses of both the legal owner, and the subdivider if not the same, must be shown on the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Name.</td>
<td>Tentative maps shall have the proposed subdivision name stated on the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale.</td>
<td>The scale of the map shall be large enough to show all details clearly and enough sheets shall be used to accomplish this end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orientation.</td>
<td>The north arrow shall point up the sheet, unless a different orientation is more appropriate in a particular case, and each sheet must have a north arrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Size.</td>
<td>The lettering must be a minimum of 1/8&quot; in size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity Map.</td>
<td>A vicinity map must be included, showing adjacent properties on all sides and indicating the current record owner of such property. The location, names and widths of adjacent rights-of-way shall be shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number.</td>
<td>The current assessor’s parcel number(s) of the parcel(s) to be subdivided shall be indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description of the Property.</td>
<td>A legal description that defines the boundaries of the proposed subdivision and establishes the legality of the parcel to be divided must be included. If the description is not printed on the map itself, then it must be in a separate, attached document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning and Land Use.</td>
<td>The map shall indicate the existing zoning district and existing and proposed land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Schedule</td>
<td>If the subdivider plans to develop the site in phases, the proposed sequence and timing of construction phases must be shown on the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Proposed Topography.</td>
<td>Existing and proposed topography must be shown by contours at two (2) foot intervals if the existing ground slope is less than ten percent (10%), and at not less than five (5) foot intervals for existing ground slopes equal to or greater than ten percent (10%). Contour lines must be labeled at least every one hundred fifty (150) linear feet along the contour line and should be continued, in general, at least fifty (50) feet beyond the boundaries of the site within urban areas. Also, note on plan the location of reference benchmark for vertical control. Existing contours must be represented by dashed or screened lines and proposed contours by solid lines. The source and date of contour information must be specified. The preliminary design of all grading shall be shown, including the approximate finished grade of each lot, the elevation of proposed building pads, and the top and toe of cut and fill slopes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Existing and proposed profiles, sight distance, and point of access shall be shown for all driveways, and compliance with all applicable County standards shall be demonstrated.
- A separate grading plan may be required to clearly show all details of the existing and proposed topography.

- Lot Dimensions and Area.
  The map must show existing and proposed parcel lines and their dimensions. Existing property lines must be shown with dotted lines, proposed property lines with solid lines. The area of each parcel must be indicated, in square feet if less than one acre, and in acres (to the nearest hundredth of an acre) if one acre or larger. Each parcel should be consecutively numbered, beginning with the number one (1).

- Trees.
  The map must indicate the type (species), circumference, diameter and drip line of existing significant or heritage trees, as defined by the County Significant Tree and Heritage Tree Ordinances. Any trees proposed for conservation or removal and the location of replacement trees to be planted shall be indicated.

- Existing Structures.
  The type, location and outline of existing structures must be shown and marked as to whether they will remain or be removed.

- Existing and Proposed Streets.
  The map must show the locations, names, widths, centerline radii, centerline slopes and angle of intersection of all existing and proposed streets within and abutting the subdivision. Existing and proposed street improvements such as pavement type, curbs, gutters or sidewalks should be indicated. Whether streets are publicly or privately maintained, or proposed to be publicly or privately maintained, should also be noted. The location of official plan lines or projected streets and highways as indicated in the State Transportation Improvement Plan, the County General Plan or any adopted area plan should be shown, if applicable.

- Easements.
  The map must show the location, width, and purpose of all existing and proposed easements, including avigation easements.

- Existing and Proposed Utilities.
  The map must show the location and size of all existing and proposed utilities service lines and facilities, including the following:
  - All provisions for water supply for domestic use and fire protection purposes including source (watermains, wells), quality and approximate quantity expressed as gallons per minute.
  - All provisions for sewage disposal, storm drainage and infiltration, flood control, and required National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) facilities including the approximate grade and elevation of existing and proposed sewers and storm drains, location of septic systems and their expansion areas, location of the soil percolation test sites, and preliminary calculations used to select, size, and locate all proposed facilities.
  - All provisions for utility services, such as gas, electricity, telephone, and cable television.

- Flood, Coastal Erosion, or Sea level Rise Hazard Areas.
  The map must show the location of all areas of special flood hazard which are subject to inundation, storm water or tide water overflow, as illustrated on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps on file with the Planning Department. The location, width, and direction of flow of each watercourse and the base flood level (as shown on the National Flood Insurance Program Maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency) and flooding from Sea Level Rise (using the latest available science-based projections) must also be indicated. Projections of landward erosion over the life of the development must also be shown.

- Recreation Area.
  Existing and proposed recreation areas, trails, bike paths or parks for private or public use, including proposed shoreline access points, must be shown.
Common Areas and Open Space.
Proposed common areas and areas to be dedicated to public open space must be shown.

Findings

If the project meets all criteria, the project shall be approved. In the case of denial, only one finding need be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding of Denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A local agency may deny a proposed housing development project if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of [Government Code] Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environmental and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 As used in this paragraph, a “specific, adverse impact” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete. The following shall not constitute a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety:
(A) Inconsistency with the zoning ordinance or general plan land use designation.
(B) The eligibility to claim a welfare exemption under subdivision (g) of Section 214 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.
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TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessors Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town’s General Plan ("Remainder Property").
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town’s General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee’s sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17th day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]

Peter Mason, Mayor
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RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park."

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit “A”, and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

*   *   *   *   *   *

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-151344
Date October 29, 2009

Town Clerk
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California

County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shyrtless, Notary

personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

[Signature of Notary Public]

(Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM
Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative acknowledgment verbiage as may be printed on such a document so long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form if required.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. he/she/they is/are) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clear and photographically reproducible. Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.
- Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
- Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
- Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
- Securely attach this document to the signed document.
Corporation Gift Deed

The undersigned grantor(s) declared

DOCUMENTARY TRANSFER TAX IS

as a condition of grant, the transfer of the property charged, or

a condition of grant, the transfer of the property herein and the execution of a grant deed, remaining at time of sale

CHARTERED AS

Woodside

AND

IN CONSIDERATION of the need for open space and access to the Native Plant Preserve and no other consideration,

DIVIDEND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California

GRANTS

TOWN OF WOODSIDE, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

the following described real property in the Town of Woodside

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

STATE OF CALIFORNIA


In Witness Whereof, said corporation has caused its corporate seal and seal to be affixed hereto and these instrument to be executed by its

President and

Secretary duly authorized

Division Development Corporation

By

RICHARD W. OLIVER, Vice President

By

RICHARD W. OLIVER, Secretary

In the presence of

RICHARD W. OLIVER

and

RICHARD W. OLIVER

who subscribed their names to this instrument on behalf of the corporation hereunder named, and who are in fact the persons who executed the instrument and who the corporation named in this instrument to the best of their knowledge and belief.
Dear Ms. Young,

Please see attached PDF and please include in Council Members packet.

Thank you.

Geetinder Chattha, MD
Eldan Eichbaum, MD

--
Sincerely,

Eldan Eichbaum, MD, FACS, FAANS

This e-mail message and any attachments, which may contain confidential and privileged information, are to be viewed solely by the intended recipient of Eldan Eichbaum, M.D. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete the mail and all attachments.
July 1, 2022

TO: Mayor Dick Brown and Town Council Members

FROM: Geetinder Chattha, MD and Eldan Eichbaum, MD, Woodside, CA

We strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element. This parcel is unsuitable for the proposed intensive residential use for many reasons - open space violations, environmental and wildlife impacts, capricious and discriminatory sewer permitting, lack of nearby public transportation, and lack of nearby business, employment and consumer services. You should know that our neighborhood is fully prepared to litigate each and every one of these violations should that become necessary.

It is our earnest hope that it will not be necessary.

First and foremost is the legally binding covenant that states that the Town of Woodside would not build on the Farm Hill parcel. This covenant was agreed upon by neighboring property owners as a compromise to the development of Barkley Fields in 2010.

In the spirit of providing more housing, we are planning to build a two bedroom, two bath fully independent ADU this year.

In this era when citizens are losing trust with their elected officials, it is imperative to abide by legal documents. If the Town of Woodside does not abide by this covenant, it will gravely undermine the social contract and trust that binds communities together.

I urge you to find alternative avenues to satisfy the development of new housing.

Sincerely,

Geetinder Chattha, MD

Eldan Eichbaum, MD

Woodside, CA
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
650.851.6790

Exempt from Fee Pursuant
To Government Code,
Section 6103.9

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Town of Woodside
Town Clerk
P.O. Box 620005
Woodside, CA 94062

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessor Parcel No. 088322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
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NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town's General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee’s sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17 day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]

Peter Mason, Mayor
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RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park”.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit “A”, and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-6771
of Town Clerk
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California

County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shortsleeve, Notary (here insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to
the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/their authorized
capacity, and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of
which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph
is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature of Notary Public

(Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be
properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative
acknowledgment verbiage may be printed on such a document so long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in
California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the
document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form if required.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document
signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which
must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her
commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of
notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural form by crossing off incorrect form (i.e.
he/she/they is/are) or circling the correct form. Failure to correctly indicate this
information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clear and photolithographically reproducible.
Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a
sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of
the county clerk.
- Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this
acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
- Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
- Indicate capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a
corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
- Securely attach this document to the signed document.
THE Undersigned Grantor(s), herein declared

To and for the use of

The following described real property in the

TOWN OF

The undersigned grantee(s), hereby declared

To and for the use of

The following described real property in the

TOWN OF

July 12, 2022
Hi Sage,

Thank you so much for your time the other day, I really appreciated your thoughts and comments.

Here is my public comment for the Draft Housing Element:

Having attended one very long planning committee meeting, I understand that the changes the state of California is asking of Woodside are forcing our town to make some very difficult compromises. Some of us will be impacted more directly than others.

In the new Draft Housing Element, our family home is one of six private properties in our neighborhood being referred to as a "Commercial Corridor" for a possible overlay zone with density up to ten units per acre. The term "Commercial Corridor" is new with this plan. The "Commercial Corridor" is six private family homes, there is no commercial zoning here, nor is the state asking for increased commercial development. The overlay as described in the document does not include a commercial addition, but my concern is that the term will stick and as the plan changes and grows, the commercial growth will be added to the density growth or the density growth won't be required but we will have opened the door to commercial rezoning. Because the state requirements have nothing to do with commercial development, and whatever decisions are made about zoning to meet the housing requirements, there is no additional commercial zoning being created, the term "Commercial Corridor" needs to be removed from the planning process.

My other concern is with the following line "If the town is not on track to meet its RHNA targets..." then we will rezone three town owned sites and apply the overlay zone to six private properties. How do we know when we are on track or not on track? When is this review and what is the midterm target? Who decides? I have observed through the process of developing this plan and along with the other high density projects in town that there are people who are really pushing for these projects to happen, not for the common good and solving California's housing issues, but because these high density housing projects are a great business opportunity. With this type of pressure, even if we are on target, will we say no to the overlay, once it has been put in place? I believe this vague language benefits no one. Why define this very specific plan which will affect very specific properties and then give it such a vague definition of whether it will happen? I would hope that the town realizes that once these properties are listed in this document, whether the overlay happens or not, the property is changed. I would suggest that we remove the 'backup plan' for the document and make the other numbers happen.

Mary Beth Erickson
Road
Sage Schaan

From: Wayne Garavaglia <>
Sent: Sunday, June 5, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Sage Schaan
Cc: 
Subject: Additional comments on May 18, 2022 Draft cycle 6 RHNA plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sage,

By this time, I believe you have received many comments regarding the proposed building of "multi family" units on the 773 Canada road property.

There is little that I can add to this discussion except to say that my mother and father moved to Palm Circle in 1951, and built their house by hand. I grew up in this house, my father passed away in this house, and my mother wishes to finish her life here.

My biggest concern is that in an attempt to create more housing, families in the surrounding area will have their lives forever disrupted.

I am not saying that any development will be bad, but please consider not only the engineering aspect of the development, but also how it will change the surrounding community.

Thankyou for your attention.
Wayne Garavaglia
RD.
Jackie Young –

Please see attached PDF and please include in Council Members packet.

Thank you.

Paul

Paul M. Goeld

[REDACTED] Road

Woodside, California  94062
June 30, 2022

TO: Mayor Dick Brown and Town Council Members

FROM: Paul Goeld
Road
Woodside, CA 94062

I strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element. This parcel is unsuitable for the proposed intensive residential use for many reasons - open space violations, environmental and wildlife impacts, capricious and discriminatory sewer permitting, lack of nearby public transportation, and lack of nearby business, employment and consumer services. You should know that our neighborhood is fully prepared to litigate each and every one of these violations should that become necessary.

It is our earnest hope that it will not be necessary.

At this time, I will limit my objection to this project based on a single legal argument that is undeniable, indefensible, and enforceable, namely, the legally-binding agreement that our neighbors reached with the Town of Woodside to facilitate the construction of the Barkley Field project in 2010. That Covenant, which was entered into “voluntarily and willingly” (that’s the Town’s words) was recorded at the San Mateo County Clerk-Recorder on November 17, 2009. It is a legally binding agreement and you cannot unilaterally nullify it.

That Covenant is two short pages and I hope Council Members will take 3 or 4 minutes and actually read the agreement that is legally binding on the Town. The text is very clear that the Town agreed to never build on this site.

I have excerpted a few paragraphs from the Covenant and copied them below. With respect to the Farm Hill parcel that you have included for development, that agreement specifically states:

B. Covenantor [“Town of Woodside”] has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent [Barkley] park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property [the “Farm Hill” parcel you are proposing for development] as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor [Town of Woodside] voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in “Exhibit A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town’s General Plan (“Remainder Property”).
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town’s General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. NO IMPROVEMENTS, STRUCTURES, OR APPURTENANCES SHALL BE PLACED, CONSTRUCTED OR DEVELOPED ON THE REMAINDER PROPERTY AT ANY TIME with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be constructed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining the existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. THESE COVENANTS ARE TO RUN WITH THE LAND AND SHALL BE BINDING ON COVENANTOR AND ITS HEIRS, SUCCESORS AND ASSIGNS.

Given the crystal-clear, unambiguous language of this Covenant and the fact that it is an ENFORCEABLE LEGAL INSTRUMENT, I will generously assume the Town Council was unaware of this contract when it included the Farm Hill parcel in its recent Draft Housing Element. However, if you were aware of this Covenant and yet still included it in your development plans, especially without disclosing this clear legal encumbrance, then your actions, in my opinion, were deceptive to the public, perhaps even fraudulent.

Our neighborhood executed that agreement at the specific request of the Town in order to facilitate the construction of Barkley Field. Our neighborhood made significant sacrifices and clearly upheld our end of the bargain that we struck. We expect – no, we DEMAND – that the Town honor its end of this bargain and immediately remove the “Farm Hill” parcel from the Draft Housing Element. This type of development is specifically PROHIBITED under the terms of our agreement. The Covenant is an enforceable legal instrument.

As the Town Council holds public hearings to pursue the Draft Housing Element, you will almost certainly be making lots of promises, representations and agreements to reassure impacted neighbors. How do you expect those property owners to believe and trust your representations if you are actively refusing to honor an EXISTING agreement such as ours? Your ignoring OUR agreement will justifiably be waived in your faces at every public hearing. Who will trust you? Who SHOULD trust you?

Nothing in California law permits you to unilaterally ignore an enforceable legal instrument. We demand that you remove the Farm Hill parcel from the Draft Housing Element immediately.
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
650.851.6790

Exempt from Fee Pursuant
To Government Code,
Section 6103.9

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Town of Woodside
Town Clerk
P.O. Box 620005
Woodside, CA 94062

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessor's Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
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NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town’s General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee’s sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17th day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]
Peter Mason, Mayor
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RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park".

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit "A", and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason

NOES, Councilmembers: None

ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines

ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

ATTEST:

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

Clark of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy of
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California

County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Short sleeve, Notary (here insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(s), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

[Signature of Notary Public]

(Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Covenant

[Title or description of attached document]

[Rev. Date 5.4.2012]

[Title or description of attached document continued]

Number of Pages

Document Date

11-17-09

(Additional information)

CAPACITY CLAIMED BY THE SIGNER

☑ Individual(s)
☐ Corporate Officer
☐ Partner(s)
☐ Attorney-in-Fact
☐ Trustee(s)
☐ Other [Mayor of Woodside]

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage usually as appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative acknowledgment verbiage may be printed on such a document so long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form (if required).

☐ State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.

☐ Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.

☐ The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).

☐ Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.

☐ Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. his/her/its, is/are) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.

☐ The notary seal impression must be clear and photographically reproducible. Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.

☐ Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.

☑ Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.

☐ Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.

☐ Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).

☑ Securely attach this document to the signed document.
The undersigned grantor, the Corporate Corporation, has transferred to the Corporation, Gift Deed, listed in the following:

Town of Woodside, a Municipal Corporation

The following described parcel in the

Town of Woodside, State of California

PARCEL LEtTERED C, AS DESIGNATED ON THE MAP ENTITLED, "PARCEL MAP", SHOWN A RESTRICTION OF THE LANDS OF DIVINION DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION


In Witness Whereof, the Corporation has caused the corporate seal and this instrument to be notarized and this instrument to be executed by the officers who are authorized and empowered to do so by the laws of the State of California.

[Signature]
Richard R. Oliver, Presiding Officer

DIVISION DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

[Signature]
Richard R. Oliver, Presiding Officer

Town of Woodside, State of California

CONSIDERING that the aforesaid lands are hereby conveyed to the Corporation, Gift Deed, and

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Corporal has caused the corporate seal and this instrument to be notarized and this instrument to be executed by the officers who are authorized and empowered to do so by the laws of the State of California.

[Signature]
Richard R. Oliver, Presiding Officer

Town of Woodside, State of California
From: Kimberly Hansen <>
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2022 2:49 PM
To: Jackie Young; Sage Schaan
Cc: Kimberly Hansen
Subject: Comments on Draft Housing Element
Attachments: Letter Woodside Town Council July 1.docx

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see attached and confirm receipt as it is a large document. Thanks, Kim

Kim
July 1, 2022
Dear Woodside Town Council, Members of Housing Element Task Force,

This correspondence has two topics: the first is a request and the reasons why the Runnymede/Raymundo Town owned property should be removed from the draft housing element list, and the second is a recommendation/request for longer term changes to Woodside Town to strategically plan for additional housing opportunities now and in the future.

Unique characteristics of this Runnymede property that make it unsuitable for inclusion in our housing plan:
- The site is in a seismic/fault zone. The parcel is approx. 300ft long and would be subject to Woodside municipal code building setbacks of either 125 or 50 ft. Cannot support high density.
Above, Illustration #1, Map source JCP Natural Hazard Map, April 2022.

-Per JCP map, Illustration #1, a portion of the site is in a Wildland area fire zone, Substantial forest fire risk.

-The Runnymede site is bordered by the 23,000 Acre, SFPUC owned Crystal Springs/Peninsula Watershed. This is a highly protected wildland that is home to endangered species and our water supply. And is characterized as Wildland area fire zone, Substantial forest fire risk.

-The maps in the draft housing element plan do not zoom in to show the fault area that is on this parcel. Below, Illustration #2, Woodside Town geologic map of soil types and Hermit fault

-No sewer. This property does not touch a property that is hooked to sewer or in a sewer district. This was once a requirement BTW.
- Located on a dead-end street that terminates at the 900+ Acre SM County Huddart Park (Wildland area fire zone, Substantial forest fire risk.)

- Large number of horses on Raymundo (est 20+) and Runnymede (additional 70-80). Horse trailer capacity on-site where horses live est 50%. In event of an evacuation, 25 two-horse trailers would need to come to pick up horses. With 25 two-horse trailers and 100+ residents trying to get out.

- Equestrians from Woodside and beyond park on Runnymede to access the trails. This is one of the only spots for trailers to park to access Huddart Park.

- No turnaround at end of the street for horse evacuation- Both Raymundo and Marva Oaks cul-de-sacs are too small for truck + trailer turn-around.

- Location of fire hydrant in front of this property requires blocking >1/2 the street for hook-up to fire engine. Will totally hamper evacuation efforts in an emergency.

- The parcel size of the Runnymede property is incorrectly stated in the draft housing element as 1.97A. The property that the Town currently owns is 1.77A, so at a density of 10 U/A, max # is 8. Not 10. The adjacent .3Ares owned by The City of San Francisco is not owned by Woodside.
(disingenuous to include) and is a critical portion of the San Mateo County Parks Regional Trail System and is a pedestrian and equestrian connector segment for the Crystal Springs Trail. It is not appropriate to list as being owned by the Town or available. https://www.smegov.org/parks/crystal-springs-segment

Section 2, Recommendations to amend regulations/municipal code

Add elements to the draft housing plan to demonstrate the Woodside is interested in long-medium term planning and participation in adding additional housing units:

- Remove 1988 single-level height restriction to add second story for mixed use or higher density. Start now on a plan to bring this to voters… We’ve had 2 story buildings in Town center since late 1800s, over 100 yrs. What could be more consistent with our rural character? Robert’s Market, Pioneer and Gilbert Center are examples.

- Incentivize or require any subdivision or new construction to include an ADU. (Start with 1101 Canada, in process now)
- Up-zone, Incentivize or require ADU or multiplex style construction for >50% remodel.
- Reduce permit costs and add overlay for 2-4plex
- Reduce time and permit fees towards ADU process. Even more than our recent improvements.
- Pre-approve/ fast-track ADU designs and/or vendors
- Analyze SB9- why has this not been attractive to our community?

Parting thoughts from the supporting documents for the housing element:
Recent legislation requires the integration of the Housing Element with the Safety Element.
-SB1241 ensures that additional housing is planned for areas that are most suitable for development, while considering local conditions. Wildfire risk and availability of infrastructure are some of the factors that need to be considered.
-SB 99 includes information identifying residential developments in hazard areas that do not have at least 2 emergency evacuation routes.
-AB 686 requires that sites either be located throughout the community, access to amenities, transit and proximity to available infrastructure and utilities.
-SB 1333 (the consistency doctrine) relates to the “constitutional” status of the general plan: all development-related local actions must be consistent with all the elements of the general plan.
-ABAG fire hazard planning document: Urban developments shall be planned and constructed to resist the encroachment of uncontrolled fire... mitigate potential losses due to wildfire.
-Page 70, Housing Element “encourages” land best suited to accommodate increased housing density in areas with minimal environmental constraints, outside of high fire zones that have limited emergency access, access to sewer, and adjacent to arterial roads identified in the Town’s General Plan Circulation Element.

Sincerely,

Kim Hansen
Hello, the other comment that I’d like you to consider would be to add the Town owned property on Woodside rd, at “Village Hill” to your list for consideration as a site for additional housing units. While I don’t know all the specifics on this property, it seems interesting based upon its size, location, access to sewer, services, transportation, low fire and seismic hazards. And it is vacant, under-utilized (arguably).
Thank you for considering this suggestion, Kim

Kim Hansen

On Jul 1, 2022, at 2:49 PM, Kimberly Hansen < > wrote:

Please see attached and confirm receipt as it is a large document. Thanks, Kim

Kim
Thank you for your response, Sage. I was looking at an older chart I found online. Many of us are confused about the numbers.

I understand how difficult this is. There's absolutely nothing you can do to make anyone happy, let alone everyone.

Many of us feel like we're in a fight for our homes. I hope you can understand that. The broader picture is upsetting but the individual one is high stress. Totally selfish but that's the way it is.

We know it's not easy for any of you and I appreciate the fact you're still willing to talk.

Regards,
Heidi

---

Dear Heidi,

Below is a link to the Draft Housing Element that includes the direction from the Town Council.

[https://www.woodsidetown.org/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning/page/33502/draft_housing_element_for_public_comment.pdf](https://www.woodsidetown.org/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning/page/33502/draft_housing_element_for_public_comment.pdf)

Page 89 of the PDF shows the table as directed by the Town Council. You will see that 773 Cañada Road shows 10 units at 10 units per acre.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kindest Regards,
From: Jennifer Li <JLi@woodsidetown.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 8:46 AM
To: Sage Schaan <SSchaan@woodsidetown.org>
Cc: Kevin Bryant <KBryant@woodsidetown.org>
Subject: FW: [Town Council Agenda] Draft Housing Element for Public Comment

From: Heidi Hess <>
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 7:43 AM
To: Town Hall email <townhall@woodsidetown.org>
Subject: Re: [Town Council Agenda] Draft Housing Element for Public Comment

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Members,

I attended the May 10 Town Meeting to discuss the implications of SB9 on our town.

My concern was specific to the property located at 773 Canada Road. During the meeting the council decided to allow 10 multi-family units on one acre instead of 20 units. If the town agreed to 10 units before the June cutoff date the state could not then come in and mandate 20 units per acre.

There is a recording of this and it seems clear. The chart that has been posted still shows 20 multi-family units per acre. Will the town stand by it’s suggestion of 10 units per acre as discussed at the meeting?

Thank you,

Heidi Hess

From: Town of Woodside California <townhall@woodsidetown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 4:35 PM
To: 
Subject: [Town Council Agenda] Draft Housing Element for Public Comment

Draft Housing Element for Public Comment

NOTICE OF 30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
FOR THE DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT (2023-2031)

Public Comment Period for the Draft Housing Element
All cities and counties are required to adopt a Housing Element pursuant to Government Code Section 65583. The Housing Element must now be revised every eight years and revisions must include a review of the Town’s progress toward meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for Cycle 5 (2015-2022). The Housing Element must
also include a framework of goals, policies and objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing for the next RHNA cycle, Cycle 6. Among its requirements, the Housing Element is required to include an inventory of adequate sites for the development of required housing, and programs to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) for all members of the community.

This notice advises members of the public that the Town’s draft 6th Cycle Housing Element (2023-2031) is available for review prior to its submission to the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for State-level review and comments.

The Town Council provided its direction on the Housing Element on May 10, 2022. These changes have been incorporated into the Public Comment Draft and are now ready for public review. The 30-day Public Review and Comment Period extends from May 19, 2022, through June 17, 2022. The Draft Housing Element is available for public review at the Woodside Planning and Building Counter, Woodside Town Hall. The Public Comment Draft Housing Element is also available on the Town website at: https://www.woodsidetown.org/planning/draft-housing-element-public-comment.

For more information, contact Sage Schaan, AICP CEP, Principal Planner, at (650) 851-6796 or Sschaan@woodsidetown.org.

Written comments may be submitted during the Public Comment Period at the address indicated below:

Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062

Or to Sage Schaan at: Sschaan@woodsidetown.org

Supporting Documents
Draft Housing Element for Public Comment (3 MB)
Draft Housing Element for Public Comment - Appendices (31 MB)

Web Links
Links:
Planning Commission Cycle 6 Overview (1-12-22)
Mayor appoints RHNA Subcommittee at Town Council meeting (1-25-22)
Planning Commission Housing Study Session #1 (2-2-22)
Planning Commission Housing Study Session #2 (2-16-22)
RHNA Subcommittee #1 (2-17-22)
RHNA Subcommittee #2 (2-24-22)
Planning Commission Review of Housing Element Chapters 1 and 2 (3-2-22)
Town Council Review of Housing Element Chapters 1 and 2 (3-8-22)
RHNA Subcommittee #3 (3-10-22)
Planning Commission Review of RHNA Subcommittee Recommendation (3-16-22)
Town Council Review of RHNA Subcommittee (3-22-22)
Planning Commission Review of Housing Element Chapter 3 (4-25-22)
Town Council Review of Housing Element Chapter 3 (5-10-22)

Unsubscribe
Hi Jackie,

John and I would like to request someone from the Woodside Fire Department attend the meeting on June 28 so we could ask questions about building high density in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

Thank you,

John and Heidi Hess

Road
Members,

We dodged a bullet yesterday. Luckily when the fire broke out, we had no wind, heroic firefighters with quick response and only grass and light scrub between the park and our houses. The fire came dangerously close to Palm Circle, where we live, and the power substation.

Fire in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is a reality. Just because SB9 allows building in such areas does not mean the town should allow it. If this fire isn't clear evidence of this, I don't know what is. This was our concern and nightmare come true. Imagine if there were high density housing built there. A fire could jump from house to house through the town. As it was, there was a buffer.

Those on Palm Circle are scared. Very scared. The next time this happens we may not be coming home to our houses. We may not be so lucky.

Please reconsider high density building on 773 Canada. It's simply too dangerous.

Heidi Hess
Jackie Young

From: John Hess
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 4:35 PM
To: Jackie Young
Subject: Value impact of 773 Canada Multi-family

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

woodside plan-Property value

Jackie. Attached is a different view than I have seen before. Thanks
Re: Effect of Multi-family on the value of homes near 733 Canada

In recent weeks I have talked to numerous neighbors and others about what they thought about putting multi-family homes in single-family neighborhoods. Surprise, surprise; no one thought it was a good idea.

Why not? Numerous reasons emerged but all related to lowering the value of the property. Without being money-grubbing, rich, poor or in-between, all want to maintain the value of their property and sell it for as much as possible when that time comes. That's called economics and common sense.

We can all estimate the value of our own property, and weigh the impact of factors affecting it, but we seldom think of the aggregate impact on a neighborhood, community or town.

This is my approximation of the impact of building ten multi family units near 15 existing homes close to 733 Canada Road. It valued each home and its impact individually. My assessment is based on 60 years experience as a real estate developer and consultant to many large and medium developers of single family and multi-family properties. I am familiar with all the affected homes.

**Economic impact of 10 Multi-family units Proposed in RNHA Draft Plan for 773 Canada Road**

Estimated Market Value of 15 Adjacent Properties $ 38,500,000

**Estimated lowered adjacent property value:**
- **If multi-family is built in south east portion of 773** $ 3,841,000
  - (ranging from 4% to 15% of individual home value)
  - Based on proximity, view, noise, traffic, privacy, fire danger, crowding, neighborhood character, hill damage, etc.

- **If multi-family is built in north-west portion of 733** Minimal loss
  - Loss is to Town character rather than neighborhood

- **If an additional single family + ADU replace multi-family** Minimal loss
  - hilly site may be crowded

I respectfully request that no multi-family housing be submitted in the final NRHA plan for 773 Canada Road. The draft plan shows a surplus of 49 units so why burden the neighborhood?

John M.Hess  Ph.D.  [Redacted] Road  Woodside CA 94062
Sage Schaan

From: John Hess
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2022 4:55 PM
To: Sage Schaan
Subject: Comments on May 18, 2022 Draft cycle 6 RHNA plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sage,

Regarding the property at 773 Canada Road  For the reasons cited below, I strongly request that 10 units of multi-family be removed from the Draft plan.

Process:
In the Post Adoption category, it is the only privately owned property to be used for multi family units
  * It is not in the "pipeline" The owner has not applied for rezoning so there has been no public input on rezoning, site planning, environmental impact or other concerns.
  * The printed/mailed announcement for the March 22 public hearing specified "...a few multi-family housing projects (...) outside of the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and with reasonable access to sewer." You can imagine our surprise when we later learned that 773 Canada is the only proposed multi-family site in the high fire zone.

Safety & Development.:
From its past correspondence, I know the Council members are familiar with most of the items mentioned in the abbreviated list below.

* The property is in a very high fire zone. As a grassland buffer, it can help protect the town from consistently prevalent winds from the northwest toward Emerald Hills and the rest of the Town and peninsula urban areas.

* Neighbors involved in setting up the north Canada sewer line understood that only a few sewer taps would be available.

* Earthquake issues are self evident even if the property is not in the maximum danger zone.

* Slope issues have been raised by others. I would hate to see the Town's reasonable standards abandoned just to gain a few units.

* Access to schools, libraries, and the town center is at least several miles away. Much of Canada has no or very poor sidewalks. The bike lanes are next to consistently fast traffic. Public transportation is non-existent.

Aesthetics & Woodside Character

Woodside is an unusual gem known throughout California and the United States. Its character has been built and nurtured over many decades by hard work and the dedication and investment of innumerable individuals -- let's keep it intact.

Thank you for your consideration.

John & Heidi Hess

[Address redacted] Road
To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director

Ms. Young, please see the attached comment letter and related attachment on behalf of Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association. Please feel free to contact me or Nohemi Leon, Woodhill Estates Account Manager at Manor Association, should you have any questions. Thank you for your attention.

cc: Members of the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association Board of Directors; Nohemi Leon, Manor Association
June 24, 2022

Housing Element Update 2023-2031

To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director
From: Gordon Ho, President, Board of Directors, Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association, Redwood City, CA

Any Mail Correspondence Replies may be routed to our property manager:
Attn: Gordon Ho, c/o Nohemi Leon, Woodhill Estates Account Manager
Manor Association
San Mateo, CA 94404

Comments on Courtesy Notice, Town of Woodside Housing Element Updates

Several members of our Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association on Woodridge Court received courtesy notices from the Town of Woodside on a proposed development of Parcel 068-322-390. As shown in the attached agreement between the Town of Woodside and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association, this proposal is prohibited per the conditions in the agreement.

Referring to “Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval” (attached) and modified on 1/20/2010 and filed with the deed for parcel 068-322-390 including “Exhibit A”, the relevant sections in “Exhibit A” are:

Section 9. This section highlights concerns over impact of park operations on noise and traffic on Woodhill Estates neighborhood. Obviously developing this parcel would greatly impact Woodhill Estates neighbors with traffic into the parcel and via access from Woodhill Drive and is counter to the concerns cited in this section.
Section 20. This section prohibits access from Woodhill Drive, both for vehicles and pedestrians. The only intended exception is for emergency access for Fire Department or access to gas lines by PG&E or tree maintenance by Town of Woodside crews. A permanent road for access to Parcel 068-322-390 would be prohibited.

Section 23. This section restricts the deed of parcel 068-322-390. It states the parcel is to be “maintained as open space in perpetuity”. This prohibits the development as proposed in the Courtesy Notice.

Section 26. The agreement states that the Town of Woodside would plant additional trees on parcel 068-322-390. This was to mitigate noise from the activities at Barkley Fields on the homes at 75 Woodhill Drive and Woodridge Court. The section refers to “planting trees near the drainage swale on the SE corner of Barkley Fields”. This was never completed. The reason given by the Town of Woodside at the time was that the large existing 3-4 Eucalyptus trees would remain, but more trees could not be planted as this parcel showed evidence of endangered butterflies. The decision was made by Town of Woodside to not disturb this parcel to avoid impact on butterfly habitat.

Obviously developing the site would require removal of the large Eucalyptus trees and destruction of the butterfly habitat.

Conclusion

Due to the restrictions to the deed stated in Sections 9, 20, 23 and 26 in the Conditional Use Permit, we do not believe the proposed development meets the legal requirements of the permit. For this reason, we believe the Town of Woodside should remove this proposal from consideration and so advise all interested parties.

Sincerely, Gordon Ho

Attachment: Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit and Exhibit A
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 - 002

BEING A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE FINDING THAT THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, CUP 2004-002, FOR THE OPERATION OF A PUBLIC PARK (BARKLEY FIELDS AND PARK) LOCATED AT 5001 FARM HILL BOULEVARD (APNs: 068-322-330 & 068-322-360) AND MODIFYING CONDITIONS TO ALLOW AMPLIFIED MUSIC AT ANNUAL ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS AT THE PARK.

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2004, the Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002, to establish a public park (Barkley Fields and Park) in the SR (Suburban Residential) Zoning District; and,

WHEREAS, Condition 9 of CUP 2004-002 requires that the Planning Commission review the Conditional Use Permit at a noticed public hearing two years after the park construction project has been accepted by the Town from the construction contractor, or after two fall seasons of play by authorized league teams; and,

WHEREAS, two fall seasons of play have been completed; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Condition 9 of CUP 2004-02, the Town had updates prepared to the traffic and noise studies which were originally prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration circulated on March 31, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside has requested modifications of Conditions 6, 16, and 19 to allow the use of amplified music at annual anniversary celebrations at the park; and,

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2010, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the compliance with Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings, as further discussed, detailed and supported by the Planning Commission staff report of January 20, 2010:

1. The Town is in compliance with Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002, for the operation of a public park (Barkley Fields and Park) at 5001 Farm Hill Boulevard.

2. Allowing the use of amplified music at annual anniversary celebrations will not have a significant negative impact on adjacent properties.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission hereby modifies Conditions 6, 16, and 19 of CUP 2004-002 as follows:

6. There shall be no sound amplification utilized on site.

16. No amplified sound shall be permitted in the park, except as allowed by Condition 19.

19. The Town may utilize the park facilities for one Town-sponsored “Park Opening” celebration,
after construction is completed and before it is put into public use, and on an annual anniversary basis thereafter. The Town shall ensure the management and control of this event in a manner that would have minimal, if any, impact upon the Homeowners. For example, to address parking and traffic concerns, participants shall be shuttled to the park from Town Center. To ensure compliance with this, no parking shall be allowed on the site except for delivery and other essential vehicles; Farm Hill Boulevard and the entrance to Woodhill Estates shall become “No Parking” zones for the day of the event, with ticketing and towing enforced, and the Town shall have an adequate number of Deputy Sheriffs specifically assigned to the event to enforce the parking restrictions. The use of amplified sound shall be limited to the official program, not Amplified sound may be used for an official program and amplified music may be used during any annual anniversary celebration. Formal notice of the event will be provided to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the property owner/resident at 75 Woodhill Drive at least thirty days prior to the event.

The modified Conditions of Approval for CUP 2004-002 are hereafter as listed in Exhibit A, “Barkley Fields and Park, 5001 Farm Hill Boulevard, Conditional Use Permit (CUP 2004-002), Conditions of Approval.”

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of January 2010, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners: Elder, Voelke, Yost and Chair Thompson

NOES: Commissioners: None

ABSENT: Commissioners: Brasher, Hobson and McDevitt

ABSTAIN: Commissioners: None

APPROVED: 

Sandra Thompson, Chair

ATTEST: 

Planning Secretary
EXHIBIT A

BARKLEY FIELDS AND PARK
5001 FARM HILL BOULEVARD
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 2004-002)
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

As modified January 20, 2010

1. That the emergency access gate along Woodhill Drive be redesigned to mirror the fencing style that is proposed along that roadway and so as to prevent pedestrian access from Woodhill Drive.
2. That the trees planted along Farm Hill Blvd. be Valley Oaks or another species of oak.
3. That non-deciduous tress be utilized at the entry to the parking lot.
4. That a bike rack be located on the site so as to provide a secure place for the storage of bicycles.
5. That a hitching post be located on the site to accommodate any equestrians visiting the site.
6. [Not used.]
7. Outdoor lighting shall be limited to bollards not to exceed a height of 4.5 feet, with the location limited to the parking area. Prior to erecting the lights, the applicant shall provide a photometric survey demonstrating an average foot candle in the parking area of 1 foot candle with a maximum of 3 foot candles.
8. Only one play structure, similar to the one that is in Woodside Elementary School’s kindergarten yard and only one swing set that includes two (2) bucket swings and two (2) regular swings shall be constructed at the park. No other play structures will be added to the park.
9. Pursuant to Woodside Municipal Code Section 153.252 (C), the Conditional Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a noticed public hearing two (2) years after the park construction project has been accepted by the Town from the construction contractor, or after two (2) fall seasons of play by authorized organized league teams. Prior to this review, the Town shall cause updates to the traffic and noise studies contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration to be prepared by licensed professionals. The review shall focus upon actual impact of park operations on the Woodhill Estate neighborhood, including, but not limited to, a review of noise and traffic generated by the park use. This will also include a review of the impact of field usage by specific individual organized league teams. During the public hearing, the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and others may present evidence regarding the impacts of the project. If no impacts or only insignificant impacts are identified, the Town may add picnic tables to the park, subject to any applicable permitting processes. If impacts are identified, the Town will take all reasonable and necessary steps to mitigate these impacts. If the impacts cannot be mitigated or the Town and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association fail to reach agreement about the potential impacts and their mitigation, the Town shall schedule a revocation hearing before the Planning Commission pursuant to Section 153.254 of the Woodside Municipal Code.
10. The Town shall manage the scheduling of usage of the playfield through a formal application process, including requirements for security deposits by field users and adherence to all Town policies, regulations, and laws. The Town shall include a provision in field usage regulations that the failure of authorized field users to comply with all Town policies, regulations, and laws will result in suspension of privilege of field use.
11. The Town shall only accept and approve field usage applications from official, organized youth leagues that serve the residents of the Town of Woodside. No other reservations shall be permitted.
Other teams, including adult teams, may use the field on a first come, first served basis during those times when the field has not been reserved.

12. The Town will provide the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association with quarterly reports detailing the specifics of field usage applications received and approved, including types of sport, age categories, and any specific usage conditions imposed as a basis for approval of the application and advance quarterly schedules of the planned usage of the fields.

13. Reservations for the use of the fields shall include a one-hour interval between scheduled events.

14. The park shall not be used for tournament play, except that single tournament games may be scheduled in which an official youth league team that serves the residents of the Town of Woodside is a participant and that meet all Town operating policies, regulations, and laws.

15. No barbeque grills shall be installed by the Town and portable grills and/or fires of any kind will be prohibited in the park.

16. No amplified sound shall be permitted in the park, except as allowed by Condition 19.

17. No alcohol shall be permitted in the park.

18. The Town shall not approve the use of any part of the park facility, other than youth sports, for private or commercial purposes, including, but not limited to, weddings, concerts, reunions, private sports lessons, and private club activities.

19. The Town may utilize the park facilities for one Town-sponsored “Park Opening” celebration, after construction is completed and before it is put into public use, and on an annual anniversary basis thereafter. The Town shall ensure the management and control of this event in a manner that would have minimal, if any, impact upon the Homeowners. For example, to address parking and traffic concerns, participants shall be shuttled to the park from Town Center. To ensure compliance with this, no parking shall be allowed on the site except for delivery and other essential vehicles; Farm Hill Boulevard and the entrance to Woodhill Estates shall become “No Parking” zones for the day of the event, with ticketing and towing enforced, and the Town shall have an adequate number of Deputy Sheriffs specifically assigned to the event to enforce the parking restrictions. Amplified sound may be used for an official program and amplified music may be used during any annual anniversary celebration. Formal notice of the event will be provided to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the property owner/resident at 75 Woodhill Drive at least thirty days prior to the event.

20. “No Park Parking” and “No Park Access” signs will be installed on Woodhill Drive. The curb on the west side of Woodhill Drive will be posted with “No Parking” signs and be painted red from the intersection with Farm Hill Boulevard to the Town limits.

21. The park shall be closed one-half hour after sunset and shall be patrolled during both open and closed hours by a private security company to be hired by the Town to ensure the security of the facility and to ensure compliance with park operating regulations, including those operating regulations that emanate from the park’s Conditional Use Permit.

22. There shall be no lighting in the park except for security lighting in the parking area.

23. A deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than the walking path and utility line associated with the initial construction of the park.

24. The fencing around the perimeter of the project facing Woodhill Drive shall be a like material to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association’s fencing.

25. The Town shall plant the initial landscaping outside the project’s proposed fence on Woodhill Drive in landscape materials that are of a type and design acceptable to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association. The installation of the landscape materials will not be undertaken until the landscape
phase of the project is underway. The Town shall thereafter grant the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association an encroachment permit to maintain the landscaping and irrigation along Woodhill Drive.

26. Subject to the agreement of the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the Town Manager, the Project plans shall be revised to incorporate the planting of additional and larger trees by the Town near the drainage swale on the southeast corner of the Fields.
To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director

Further to my message on June 27th, please see the attached supplemental comment letter. We would very much appreciate it if you can acknowledge receipt of this letter, as well as the prior correspondence and attachments. Thanks again for your attention.

cc: Members of the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association Board of Directors; Nohemi Leon, Manor Association
July 1, 2022

Housing Element Update 2023-2031

To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director
From: Gordon Ho, President, Board of Directors, Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association, Redwood City, CA

Any Mail Correspondence Replies may be routed to our property manager:
Attn: Gordon Ho, c/o Nohemi Leon, Woodhill Estates Account Manager
Manor Association
San Mateo, CA 94404

Follow up to Comments on Courtesy Notice, Town of Woodside Housing Element Updates

As follow up to my letter of June 24, 2022 “Comments on Courtesy Notice, Town of Woodside Housing Element Updates” where I provided the “Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval” and “Exhibit A”, we have since reviewed the deed for the parcel 068-322-390 at the San Mateo County Assessors office. We have confirmed that the Town of Woodside duly signed and filed the deed restriction for this parcel per the agreement with the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association. I provide a copy of the filing (attached) for your use.

As mentioned previously, Section 23 restricts this parcel stating that it is to be “maintained as open space in perpetuity”. This prohibits the development as proposed in the Courtesy Notice. For this reason, our HOA believes that the Town of Woodside should remove this proposal from consideration and so advise all interested parties.

Sincerely,

Gordon Ho, President
Woodhill Estates HOA

Attachment: Covenant Town of Woodside
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
650.851.6790

Exempt from Fee Pursuant
To Government Code,
Section 6103.9

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Town of Woodside
Town Clerk
P.O. Box 620005
Woodside, CA 94062

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A.  Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessors Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B.  Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C.  Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D.  To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town's General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee's sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17 day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]
Peter Mason, Mayor
RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park".

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit “A”, and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

*   *   *   *   *

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-16771
Date          October 29, 2009

By Clerk
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shortsleeve, Notary
personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to
the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their
name(s), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of
which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph
is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature of Notary Public

Lynn Shortsleeve
Notary Public
San Mateo County

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM
Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as
appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be
properly completed and attached to this document. The only exception is if a
document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative
acknowledgment verbiage as may be printed on such a document so long as the
verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in
California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the
document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form if required.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document
  signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which
  must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her
  commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of
  notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e.
  he/she/they is/are ) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this
  information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clear and photographically reproducible.
  Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a
  sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of
  the county clerk.
- Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this
  acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
- Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
- Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a
  corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
- Securely attach this document to the signed document.

CAPACITY CLAIMED BY THE SIGNER
✓ Individual(s)
☐ Corporate Officer
☐ Partner(s)
☐ Attorney-in-Fact
☐ Trustee(s)
☐ Other ____________________

Number of Pages __________

Document Date __________

(Additional information)
Town Council Meeting
July 12, 2022

Corporation Gift Deed

The undersigned grantor(s) declared

Documentary transfer tax of $ 

1. Computed on full value of property conveyed, or 
2. Computed on full value, less any liens and encumbrances remaining at time of sale 
3. 100% of the minimum area of Woodside

AND IN CONSIDERATION OF THE USE FOR OPEN SPACE AND ACCESS TO THE NATIVE PLANT PRESERVE AND NO OTHER CONSIDERATION, the corporation organized under the laws of the State of CALIFORNIA

TOWN OF WOODSIDE, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

the following described real property in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California


In Witness Whereof, said corporation has caused its corporate seal and this instrument to be executed by its President and Secretary duly authorized.

President: Richard B. Oliver

Secretary: Richard B. Oliver

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

before me, the undersigned

Richard B. Oliver

know me to be the President and Secretary of the corporation that executed the within instrument known to me to be the person who executed the within instrument on behalf of the corporation whose name, and official position, I have inserted above, and that such corporation executed the within instrument pursuant to its bylaws at a meeting of its board of directors.

Witness: [Signature]

Title Order No.

Form of Loan:

[Signature]
Dear Council Members:

John first lived in Woodside during the late 60’s when he was in graduate school at Stanford.

We bought our property on Marva Oaks Drive in 2006 and built our “dream home”, where we now live with our two children, aged 12 and 14.

The main reason we moved to Woodside was its rural character, for which we paid a premium price. Otherwise, we would have moved to a high-density place like Mountain View and paid much less for our home. We had hoped to age in place in our home.

The proposed Runnymede/Raymundo housing project is a few hundred yards downslope from us.

We are writing to oppose this proposed project for numerous reasons our neighbors already addressed. Having a high-density project at the foot of Raymundo would, in our opinion, ruin the reasons we bought here in the first place.

Accordingly, we urge you to remove the Town-owned parcel on the northeast corner of Runnymede Road and Raymundo Drive (“Proposed Location”) from the list of properties proposed for “Post Housing Element Certification Rezoning” and to spread the opportunities thereby created for medium-to-high density housing throughout the Town through SB9 Lot Splits and Appropriate Deed Restrictions.

Discussion:

1. Proposed Location is Not Appropriate for High-to-Medium-Density Housing

   (a) Draft Figure 3-5 illustrates that the Proposed Location is very near active fault zones. Indeed, we presently have two active landslide planes on our property and have had multiple large landslides (one taking out Marva Oaks Drive) during the last half century!

   (b) Draft Figure 3.7 illustrates that the Proposed Location is in an Environmentally Sensitive Area. This is just asking for lengthy and expensive environmental litigation in the course of the rezoning/permitting process for the Proposed Location.
(c) Draft Pages 3-20, 21 contain lists of 16 of HCD's and the County's best practices for selecting sites to accommodate lower income RHNA. The Proposed Location does not conform to any of these siting and amenity considerations.

(d) Draft Figure 3-8 illustrates that the Proposed Location is not convenient to the existing Town Sewer system. It would be very expensive to extend the Town sewer system to the Proposed Location; and the clay soils in this area make it difficult to site a septic leach field appropriate for a medium-to-high-density housing project.

2. **Proposed Location Would Add Additional People, Vehicles and Animals to already Inadequate Evacuation Routes**

We have already had one wildfire this season less than a mile from us! Our only evacuation route is down Raymundo Drive (a narrow, windy road) and along Runnymede to Canada. In the event of another wildfire, earthquake or other disaster, residents' lives and property would be put at greater risk by the addition of medium-to-high-density housing at the worst choke point in our evacuation route!

3. **Even Though the Draft States the Proposed Location Would be Rezoned Only if Necessary to Meet RHNA Targets, the Inclusion of the Proposed Location on the List Means it Will be Used, if not during this Cycle, in the Next One**

Once a property is included in a list such as this, it is highlighted for future development. As much as we try, the current “housing crisis” is not going away. It is unfair to put a target on the backs of properties in the Raymundo/Runnymede area, which certainly will adversely affect their value, merely because they are close to Town-owned land. The burden of AFFH should be more equally distributed among our fellow neighbors!

4. **The Ten-Unit Deficit Created by Removing the Proposed Location from the Draft Could be Filled Through SB9 Lot Splits and/or Selected High-Density Rezoning Upon Owner Application, both with Appropriate Deed Restrictions**

To achieve a more equitable distribution of the AFFH among Woodside residents, the Town should encourage SB9 Lot Splits and/or rezoning of existing privately-owned properties for medium-to-high-density development. We are only referencing 10 units, which should be easily achievable within the required eight-year period.

Thank you for your consideration,

Your neighbors,

Renee and John Huhs

Drive
Woodside, California 94062 USA

Thank you for your consideration,

Your neighbors,

Renee and John Huhs

Drive
Woodside, California 94062 USA
We oppose this...
Jean Katz
drive
Redwood City

Sent from my iPad
June 30, 2022

TO: Mayor Dick Brown and Town Council Members

FROM:

I strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element. This parcel is unsuitable for the proposed intensive residential use for many reasons - open space violations, environmental and wildlife impacts, capricious and discriminatory sewer permitting, lack of nearby public transportation, and lack of nearby business, employment and consumer services. You should know that our neighborhood is fully prepared to litigate each and every one of these violations should that become necessary.

It is our earnest hope that it will not be necessary.

At this time, I will limit my objection to this project based on a single legal argument that is undeniable, indefensible, and enforceable, namely, the legally-binding agreement that our neighbors reached with the Town of Woodside to facilitate the construction of the Barkley Field project in 2010. That Covenant, which was entered into “voluntarily and willingly” (that’s the Town’s words) was recorded at the San Mateo County Clerk-Recorder on November 17, 2009. It is a legally binding agreement and you cannot unilaterally nullify it.

That Covenant is two short pages and I hope Council Members will take 3 or 4 minutes and actually read the agreement that is legally binding on the Town. The text is very clear that the Town agreed to never build on this site.

I have excerpted a few paragraphs from the Covenant and copied them below. With respect to the Farm Hill parcel that you have included for development, that agreement specifically states:

B. Covenantor [“Town of Woodside”] has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent [Barkley] park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property [the “Farm Hill” parcel you are proposing for development] as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor [Town of Woodside] voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in “Exhibit A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town’s General Plan (“Remainder Property”).
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town’s General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. NO IMPROVEMENTS, STRUCTURES, OR APPURtenANCES SHALL BE PLACED, CONSTRUCTED OR DEVELOPED ON THE REMAINDER PROPERTY AT ANY TIME with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining the existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. THESE COVENANTS ARE TO RUN WITH THE LAND AND SHALL BE BINDING ON COVENANTOR AND ITS HEIRS, SUCCESORS AND ASSIGNS.

Given the crystal-clear, unambiguous language of this Covenant and the fact that it is an ENFORCEABLE LEGAL INSTRUMENT, I will generously assume the Town Council was unaware of this contract when it included the Farm Hill parcel in its recent Draft Housing Element. However, if you were aware of this Covenant and yet still included it in your development plans, especially without disclosing this clear legal encumbrance, then your actions, in my opinion, were deceptive to the public, perhaps even fraudulent.

Our neighborhood executed that agreement at the specific request of the Town in order to facilitate the construction of Barkley Field. Our neighborhood made significant sacrifices and clearly upheld our end of the bargain that we struck. We expect – no, we DEMAND – that the Town honor its end of this bargain and immediately remove the “Farm Hill” parcel from the Draft Housing Element. This type of development is specifically PROHIBITED under the terms of our agreement. The Covenant is an enforceable legal instrument.

As the Town Council holds public hearings to pursue the Draft Housing Element, you will almost certainly be making lots of promises, representations and agreements to reassure impacted neighbors. How do you expect those property owners to believe and trust your representations if you are actively refusing to honor an EXISTING agreement such as ours? Your ignoring OUR agreement will justifiably be waived in your faces at every public hearing. Who will trust you? Who SHOULD trust you?

Nothing in California law permits you to unilaterally ignore an enforceable legal instrument. We demand that you remove the Farm Hill parcel from the Draft Housing Element immediately.
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
650.851.6790
Exempt from Fee Pursuant
To Government Code,
Section 6103.9

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Town of Woodside
Town Clerk
P.O. Box 620005
Woodside, CA 94062

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessor Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
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NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town's General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee's sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17 day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]

Peter Mason, Mayor
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RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park”.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit “A”, and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-15344
Date: Oct 29, 2009

Town Clerk
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shortslieve, Notary

personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity, and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature of Notary Public

(Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Covenant

(Title or description of attached document)

Laws Code Sec. 6139

(Title or description of attached document continued)

Number of Pages 4

Document Date 11-17-09

(Additional information)

CAPACITY CLAIMED BY THE SIGNER

☑ Individual(s)
☐ Corporate Officer
☐ Partner(s)
☐ Attorney-in-Fact
☐ Trustee(s)
☐ Other Mayor of Westside

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative acknowledgment verbiage as may be printed on such a document so long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form if required.

☐ State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
☐ Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
☐ The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
☐ Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.
☐ Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. we/she/they is/are) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.
☐ The notary seal impression must be clear and photocopiable reproducible. Impression must cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
☐ Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.
☐ Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
☐ Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
☐ Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
☐ Securely attach this document to the signed document.
June 30, 2022

TO: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director
FROM: Himanshu Khurana and Aditi Arora

We reside in Woodhill Estates and have been homeowners since 2017 at Court, Redwood City CA 94061. We recently received two courtesy notifications from the Town of Woodside (the "Town") with less than fifteen days' notice to provide comments regarding proposed higher density and/or multi-family housing at two locations near our house: Canada College and Farm Hill adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park.

We are opposed to both of these proposals as both impact our quality of life and our community negatively.

Farm Hill Proposal

We strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element as its inclusion is inconsistent with previous agreements of Woodhill Estates HOA with the Town of Woodside. Additionally, this parcel is unsuitable for the proposed intensive residential use for many reasons - open space violations, environmental and wildlife impacts, capricious and discriminatory sewer permitting, lack of nearby public transportation, and lack of nearby business, employment and consumer services.

The Town had extensive negotiations with the Woodhill Estate Homeowners Association ("Woodhill HOA") on the construction of Barkley Fields in 2005. During the negotiations, the Town of Woodside agreed to restrict the use of space currently being contemplated for development, and in fact agreed to plant and maintain trees behind 75 Woodhill Drive to act as a sound barrier. This was done and is serving this purpose. In addition, the open space was to act as a sound buffer and the large Eucalyptus trees were to remain for sound deadening. This has also worked well.

This new proposal (Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update) appears to develop the open space buffer that the Town has previously designated as ecologically sensitive, remove the large Eucalyptus trees and build a road into and out of the parcel from Woodhill Drive, requiring removal of the sound deadening trees. This is not honoring the agreement reached with the Woodhill HOA. As open space and with a stream bed, this parcel provides needed habitat for frogs, California quail, doves, bluebirds, rare butterflies, raccoons, skunks, whitetail deer, mountain lion and a pair of great horned owls reside in the tops of the Eucalyptus trees. All these...
habitats would be destroyed by the new proposal in contravention of Senate Bill 9. We purchased our home at 1 Woodridge Court on the basis that this land would be designated open space in perpetuity in accordance with the Town’s Deed Restriction.

Canada College Proposal

The housing for Faculty and Staff at Canada College built in 2008 was to address the need for affordable housing. This was a complex project requiring de-annexation to Redwood City in order to provide sanitary sewer and freshwater supply. We are surprised to see yet another proposal at Canada College since this project was supposed to meet the immediate and projected need at that location. Again, this is a case of us giving our support with the understanding that Canada College got the housing that they needed, yet now there is a proposal to add more.

Overall Intent

The state’s mandate for housing is focused on providing additional housing near city centers where there is adequate bus and rail transportation, bike lanes, access to grocery, entertainment and jobs within walking distance. The proposals put forward by the Town are not within walking distance to grocery shopping, dining, and entertainment for these parcels of land. These two proposals are not near the Town of Woodside city center and therefore will add to local traffic and noise. For these reasons, we think there are better options which do not conflict with prior agreements, deed covenants and which are closer to the city center to meet this housing need.

When the Town of Woodside requested support for Barkley Fields from the Woodhill HOA this support was given, with the understanding that the Town got what they needed and that some of the open space would be preserved and steps would be taken to mitigate the impact of the field. This proposal ignores those promises.

We humbly request that you remove Canada College and Farm Hill from any further consideration. Thank you for your consideration.

Also please find attached signed letters(same content as this email) and the that Covenant(recorded at the San Mateo County Clerk-Recorder), in response to courtesy notices sent by the Town of Woodside relating to the plan for Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update near Barkley Fields and park and Canada College.

Sincerely,

Aditi Arora & Himanshu Khurana

[Address] Redwood City, CA 94061
June 30, 2022

TO: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director
FROM: Himanshu Khurana and Aditi Arora

We reside in Woodhill Estates and have been homeowners since 2017 at Redwood City CA 94061. We recently received two courtesy notifications from the Town of Woodside (the “Town”) with less than fifteen days’ notice to provide comments regarding proposed higher density and/ or multi-family housing at two locations near our house: Canada College and Farm Hill adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park.

We are opposed to both of these proposals as both impact our quality of life and our community negatively.

Farm Hill Proposal

We strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element as its inclusion is inconsistent with previous agreements of Woodhill Estates HOA with the Town of Woodside. Additionally, this parcel is unsuitable for the proposed intensive residential use for many reasons - open space violations, environmental and wildlife impacts, capricious and discriminatory sewer permitting, lack of nearby public transportation, and lack of nearby business, employment and consumer services.

The Town had extensive negotiations with the Woodhill Estate Homeowners Association ("Woodhill HOA") on the construction of Barkley Fields in 2005. During the negotiations, the Town of Woodside agreed to restrict the use of space currently being contemplated for development, and in fact agreed to plant and maintain trees behind 75 Woodhill Drive to act as a sound barrier. This was done and is serving this purpose. In addition, the open space was to act as a sound buffer and the large Eucalyptus trees were to remain for sound deadening. This has also worked well.

This new proposal (Draft Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update) appears to develop the open space buffer that the Town has previously designated as ecologically sensitive, remove the large Eucalyptus trees and build a road into and out of the parcel from Woodhill Drive, requiring removal of the sound deadening trees. This is not honoring the agreement reached with the Woodhill HOA. As open space and with a stream bed, this parcel provides needed habitat for frogs, California quail, doves, bluebirds, rare butterflies, raccoons, skunks, whitetail deer, mountain lion and a pair of great horned owls reside in the tops of the Eucalyptus trees. All these habitats would be destroyed by the new proposal in contravention of Senate Bill 9. We purchased our home at 1 Woodridge Court on the basis that this land would be designated open
space in perpetuity in accordance with the Town’s Deed Restriction.

Canada College Proposal

The housing for Faculty and Staff at Canada College built in 2008 was to address the need for affordable housing. This was a complex project requiring de-annexation to Redwood City in order to provide sanitary sewer and freshwater supply. We are surprised to see yet another proposal at Canada College since this project was supposed to meet the immediate and projected need at that location. Again, this is a case of us giving our support with the understanding that Canada College got the housing that they needed, yet now there is a proposal to add more.

Overall Intent

The state’s mandate for housing is focused on providing additional housing near city centers where there is adequate bus and rail transportation, bike lanes, access to grocery, entertainment and jobs within walking distance. The proposals put forward by the Town are not within walking distance to grocery shopping, dining, and entertainment for these parcels of land. These two proposals are not near the Town of Woodside city center and therefore will add to local traffic and noise. For these reasons, we think there are better options which do not conflict with prior agreements, deed covenants and which are closer to the city center to meet this housing need.

When the Town of Woodside requested support for Barkley Fields from the Woodhill HOA this support was given, with the understanding that the Town got what they needed and that some of the open space would be preserved and steps would be taken to mitigate the impact of the field. This proposal ignores those promises. I am attaching the agreement That Covenant, which was entered into and that was recorded at the San Mateo County Clerk-Recorder as well.

We humbly request that you remove Canada College and Farm Hill from any further consideration. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Aditi Arora & Himanshu Khurana

Redwood City, CA 94061
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
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TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessors Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town's General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee's sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17 day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]

Peter Mason, Mayor
RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park”.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit "A", and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

* * * * *

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burrow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

Mayor of the Town of Woodside

ATTEST:

CLerk of the Town of Woodside

I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-6771

Date: \(\text{October 29, 2009}\\)

Town Clerk
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CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California

County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shortsleeve, Notary
personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

[Signed Notary Public]

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as appears above in the notary section of a separate acknowledgment form must be properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternate acknowledgment verbiage as may be printed on such a document as long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the document carefully for proper wording and attach this form if required.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural form by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. he/she/they in line) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clear and photographically reproducible. Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.
- Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not missed or attached to a different document.
- Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
- Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
- Sealately attach this document to the signed document.

[Title of document]

[Date]

[Number of pages]

Corporation Gift Deed

The undersigned grantor, the corporate body known as [Corporation Name], hereby conveys to the grantee, [Grantee Name], the property described below

PARCEL 1: A tract of land known as [Property Description], located in the [City/Town], County of [County], State of [State], more particularly described as follows:

[Detailed property description]

The grantor hereby conveys to the grantee, [Grantee Name], the above-described parcel of land for the consideration of [Consideration Amount], to be paid by the grantee to the grantor.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the grantor has caused its corporate name and seal to be affixed hereto and thereunto to be signed by its [President/Secretary]

[Signatures]

[Corporate Seal]
Ms. Young:

Thank you for allowing comments to your courtesy notice regarding the Housing Element updates. Many questions and concerns come to mind regarding the location at Canada College.

We have been residents for over 29 years at the same location of 18 Somerset Place. We were drawn to the area because of the natural surroundings and wildlife that roam the land which is rich with suitable protection and shelter. The increased traffic flow and habitat removable would greatly ruin that precious environment. The Canada College campus has many parking lots that have replaced some of this wilderness land. This small corridor of land should be preserved for its pristine beauty.

High volume traffic and overuse of community resources in a concentrated area are troubling. There are few equestrian trails in San Mateo county and Woodside offers not only trails but zoning for housing horses. A trail borders Somerset Place, Godetia Road and Canada Road. This may be lost!

Additional traffic on the two lane Canada Road would be greatly increased thus causing congestion. Entrance to Canada College from the west would be compromised for both students and staff. There would also be an increased danger for joggers and cyclists on Canada Road. This area also seems inadequate to provide an 80 unit housing complex as well as the needed parking facility for those residents.

Another concern is the potential loss of home value over a period of time. Safety may be an additional major concern based on how the 80 housing units are utilized.

Solutions to these potential problems could be achieved if another location can be found.

Please feel free to contact us at any time if needed.

Toni and Steve Krajcar
RE: Housing Element Public Comment

To the honorable Woodside City Council,

The Housing Leadership Council (HLC) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the city of Woodside’s housing element. HLC works with communities and their leaders to create and preserve quality affordable homes. We were founded by service providers and affordable housing professionals over 20 years ago to change the policies at the root cause of our housing shortage.

This letter provides proposals for changes and additions that will enable housing for Woodside’s most vulnerable residents. The first part of this letter examines Woodside’s site inventory and proposes improvements. The second part has more specific policy recommendations Woodside can implement to demonstrate the city’s commitment to affordable housing.

**Site Inventory**

Woodside’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation requires the city to plan for 328 units at the affordability levels described in the “Woodside’s RHNA Allocation” table as listed below. The site inventory requires cities to demonstrate that they have adequate locations with the necessary policies in place to produce the RHNA allocations.

Recent changes to state law require cities to meet a higher burden of proof for affordable housing in their site inventories. In particular, sites projected for lower-income housing must meet higher standards than in prior cycles, particularly if more than 50% of sites are non-vacant—as is the case in Woodside.¹ HLC’s proposals in this section are intended to help the city comply with state law and create the best possible plan for new housing.

---

¹ HCD’s [Site Inventory Guidebook](#), p. 27
**Woodside’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodside’s RHNA Allocation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside’s site inventory according to draft HE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to demonstrate capacity for enough housing units, Woodside’s housing element relies primarily on projected ADU production. Woodside projects that 25 units will be developed per year, for a total of 200 units. The city assumes that 30% of those units will be available to very low income households, 30% available to low-income households, 30% available to moderate income households, and 10% available to above moderate-income households.

Woodside does not provide adequate evidence to support these assumptions. The rate of ADU production in Woodside from 2018-2021 was 14.75 ADUs per year.² The city claims it can assume a higher rate of development because 188 respondents to a city survey indicated interest in constructing at least 1 ADU. However, the city has no programs in place that make a firm commitment to implementing any new laws that support ADU development; those programs that might make a significant impact on ADU production use vague language like “consider,” rather than making actual commitments to change policy. (See the next section, “Goals, Policies, and Programs.”)

Absent additional evidence and firm commitments to new policy changes, the city must assume that its ADU count will match the per year rate from the four years before the planning period began.³ That means the city should project 114 ADUs, deducting 86 from its site inventory.

Furthermore, the town provides no evidence to justify its affordability projections for ADUs, which lead the city to assume ADUs will produce 60 very low- and 60 low-income units. In fact, in research cited in Woodside’s own housing element, fewer than 7% of new market-rate ADUs in San Mateo County are affordable to those at a very low income, far lower than Woodside’s assumption of 30%. In fact, the average ADUs built in Woodside during the last housing element cycle is more than 1,200 square feet—highly unlikely to be naturally affordable.⁴ The city presents no local evidence to the contrary, so HLC recommends the city assume 5% of new ADUs will be available to very low-income households, 20% will be affordable to low-income

---

² [Draft housing element appendices](#), Appendix I, p. 152
³ HCD’s [Site Inventory Guidebook](#), p. 31, “Use the trends in ADU construction since January 2018 to estimate new production.”
⁴ [Draft housing element appendices](#), Appendix I.1, p. 158
households, 50% will be available to moderate-income households, and 25% will be available to above market-rate households. This changes Woodside’s site inventory to count 6 very low-income ADUs, 23 low-income ADUs, 57 moderate-income ADUs, and 28 above moderate-income ADUs, meaning it has demonstrated capacity for units as follow:

### Woodside’s Site Inventory With Accurate ADU Count and Affordability Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors further challenge the assumptions made in Woodside’s site inventory. At several points, the city assumes low-income housing will be built on sites zoned for less than 20 units/acre, Woodside’s “Mullin” density.\(^5\) Absent compelling evidence that affordable housing will be built at a lower density over the next RHNA cycle, which Woodside has not provided, suburban jurisdictions may only project low-income housing on sites zoned for at least 20 dwelling units per acre.

In particular, the city assumes Cañada College will provide 40 low and 40 very low income housing units, when the site is not actually zoned to allow those units. Rather, the site has an overlay zone allowing for potential discretionary approval–theoretically. But Woodside’s overlay by no means guarantees the approval of housing at the Cañada site. The overlay still requires discretionary review, with several potential veto points throughout the approval process.

Even if zoning permitted, the city has provided limited evidence regarding its claims that Cañada College is likely to develop 80 units of housing over the next RHNA cycle. In a memo dated May 10, 2022, a Vice Chancellor of the San Mateo Community College District is paraphrased saying that the district has considered plans to build housing at all of its three campuses in its facilities master plan.\(^6\) However, he also specified that development and implementation of these plans is dependent on funding, which is currently unavailable. The city promises to “actively support” the district in attempts to get funds, but does not make any meaningful commitments to increase the likelihood of funding availability.

Even if the Cañada College district acquired funding, the facilities master plan does “not specify a number of proposed units at each campus” or present a timeline for housing development to occur, according to the May 10, 2022 memorandum. The district also does not describe the housing type, affordable, student, workforce, or otherwise, that it would want to build. Absent compelling evidence that Cañada College has firm plans to develop housing on its Woodside campus over the next eight years—or that Woodside has actually implemented new policies to make this development likely—the sites must be removed from the inventory entirely. With this

---

\(^5\) HCD’s [Amendment of State Housing Element Law – AB 2348](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billPdf.xhtml?billId=2348&year=2022), p. 6

\(^6\) [Town of Woodside Memorandum](https://www.townofwoodside.org/), May 10, 2022
adjustment, Woodside has inventory for 31 very low-income units and 47 low-income units, well below the city’s RHNA allocation for those categories.

Finally, Woodside commits to upzoning three town-owned sites to 10 dwelling units per acre, which it then assumes will be developed as low- and very low-income housing because “any partnership with an affordable housing developer would ensure the units are available to those in the very low- and low-income categories.” The density is too low for most tax credit affordable housing developments, and the city has no other proposed revenue or incentives that would be available for affordable homes.

Absent substantive new policy commitments to upzone these sites and pursue other proactive measures to facilitate development on them, Woodside must remove them from the inventory. Removing these sites from the inventory leads the city to have demonstrated capacity for a mere 16 very low-income homes and 32 units of low-income homes.

In order to demonstrate viability of the city-owned sites, Woodside will need to implement ambitious new policies and programs requiring significant staff capacity. These include a commitment to upzone the lots to 20 dwelling units per acre, to issue timely requests for proposals for the sites, and entitlement and permitting. Absent significant new policies and programs, the city’s site inventory must remove the city-owned sites entirely. Even with the generous assumption that 80 units of market-rate housing will be built at Cañada College over the next eight years, Woodside’s site inventory does not meet its RHNA allocation, particularly for low- and very low-income homes.

### Woodside’s Site Inventory Accurately Counting Low Income vs. Market Rate Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
<th>Above Moderate Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a very generous count to the city, because several other factors undermine Woodside’s site inventory even further. Woodside’s single-family home projections seem to rely partly on units double counted from the prior year. The city does not adequately consider governmental constraints to the use of SB 9 projects or make any substantial commitments to remove those constraints, both steps explicitly required by HCD in order to count SB 9 units toward its projections.\(^7\)

As demonstrated above, Woodside must identify new sites or strategies to create the necessary capacity for its site inventory. In order to make new sites available to meet the low- and very low-income housing needs, the city will need to commit to substantive policy changes to spur new housing development.

---

\(^7\) Draft housing element, p. 86
\(^8\) HCD’s SB 9 Factsheet, p. 7-8
Goals, Policies, and Programs

In the following section, HLC describes how Woodside can strengthen its Goals, Policies, and Programs to more effectively promote low- and very low-income housing as needed to create a viable site inventory. This is not just a technical exercise; this is an opportunity to demonstrate Woodside’s genuine commitment to promoting housing at all levels of affordability by implementing new policies.

Similarly to the site inventory, new state laws have added new requirements to the goals, policies, and programs section of a housing element. Passed in 2018, AB 1397 requires cities to directly connect policies and programs to the identified needs, governmental constraints, and site inventory, among other analyses. Another 2018 law, AB 686, implemented Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing mandates, specifically requiring cities to consider how their goals, policies, and programs can better advance fair housing goals, especially the production of low- and very low-income housing. The specific programs cities implement must include “concrete steps, timelines and measurable outcomes.”

Woodside’s programs do not meet the standards of AB 1397 or AB 686. Most programs are already in place or describe routine enforcement of state and local law. Several programs make firm commitments to upzone sites, but at densities too low to facilitate the intended low-income housing production (10 dwelling units/acre). Those few programs that might have an impact on housing production are weakened by noncommittal language: Woodside offers to “consider” at least five beneficial policies (programs H1.3a, H1.3b, H1.3c, H2.1b, and H4.2a), but does not make specific policy proposals to achieve the stated program goal. HLC recommends the city use firmer language in order to make measurable commitments.

In order to demonstrate capacity for new low-income housing, Woodside will need to implement new policies with firm commitments, measurable deliverables, and clear timelines. Producing deeply affordable housing requires certain densities, as much because of the nature of state and federal tax credit programs as the economies of scale. Affordable housing developers often require other incentives in order to make their projects viable, such as impact fee and parking reductions, waivers, and other benefits. Below, HLC proposes specific policies recommended by affordable housing developers and service providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Policy or Program Number</th>
<th>Proposed Measure(s)</th>
<th>Text and Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program H1.3e</td>
<td>Allow Pre-Approved ADU Designs with</td>
<td>Cities can incentivize ADU development by lowering costs. Pre-approved ADU designs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 See, e.g., Gov. Code, § 65583, subds. (b), (c); HCD, Building Blocks, at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/building-blocks/ index.shtml
10 HCD’s Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidebook, p. 55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program H1.3f</td>
<td>Waive Impact Fees for ADUs With Low- or Very Low-Income Deed Restrictions for at Least 99 Years</td>
<td>Lowering costs for deed-restricted affordable ADUs in particular will incentivize production of the lower-income ADUs that Woodside needs in order to meet the needs of all residents and create a compliant site inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H1.3g</td>
<td>Partner With Nonprofit Property Management to Incentivize Property Owners to Rent Their ADUs at Affordable Rates</td>
<td>Nonprofit property management organizations such as Hello Housing can provide low-cost property management services to help households rent ADUs out at affordable rates. The city can actively partner with these providers and promote their services to encourage ADU affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H2.1d</td>
<td>Fair Housing Throughout the Community</td>
<td>Commission an EIR to study the environmental impacts of upzoning to allow the mullin density (20 du/ac in Woodside) in all neighborhoods located within 0.5 miles of transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H2.2</td>
<td>Incentivizing Affordable Multi-Family Housing Production</td>
<td>Making affordable housing financially viable requires incentives that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2.2a</td>
<td>Fee Exemptions for 100% Affordable Housing Projects</td>
<td>According to the 21 Elements Fee Survey, jurisdictions charge fees ranging from $6,824-$167,210 per unit in multifamily housing. These additional fees can make many affordable housing projects, which rely on public subsidy, infeasible. Waiving or lowering fees for 100% affordable housing projects can promote the production of more affordable housing across a spectrum of income levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H2.3</td>
<td>Generate Revenue from Local Sources to Subsidize Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Goal H2, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, requires new policies and programs to comply with statutory requirements and adequately encourage affordable housing production in Woodside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H2.3a</td>
<td>Expand Sources of Funds for the City Affordable Housing Fund.</td>
<td>In order to raise reliable revenue, the city would benefit from internal revenue-raising proposals, such as:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Vacancy Tax** - Parcel taxes in the form of a vacant property tax have been used by cities (VPT, Oakland) to fund affordable housing and homeless services; as well as to entice owners of undeveloped sites to either sell or build homes on their parcels.

2) **Transfer Tax** - A one-time tax payment that is levied by a government on the transfer of ownership to property (i.e. sale of a home) from one individual or entity.

HLC recommends that the city commit to dedicating staff time and arranging a range of public meetings to discuss opportunities to raise revenue from local sources to subsidize affordable housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment to Program H3.1a</th>
<th>Promote Low- and Very Low-Income Housing at Cañada College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Though HLC does not believe Cañada College can be included as an opportunity site in this RHNA cycle absent compelling evidence that the College has plans to build new housing in the next eight years, we support efforts by Woodside to facilitate housing at this site in the long term. The City of Woodside can increase the long term likelihood of housing at Cañada College by upzoning the campus to 20 dwelling units per acre and allowing by-right approval as well as a mix of other incentives, such as waivers, fee reductions, and potential city subsidies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment to Program 3.2a</th>
<th>Rezone Town-Owned Sites for Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezone town-owned sites to the city’s Mullin density, 20 dwelling units per acre, and offer a timely Request for Proposals for all site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program H3.2b</th>
<th>Rezone Community Commercial Properties to Allow Medium Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow development up to 20 du/ac in Woodside’s community commercial zone, and upzone for 10 du/ac within 0.25 miles of this area. Woodside will minimize the impact of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Providing incentives for mixed use development on these sites; implement a 10% inclusionary zoning requirement on these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program H4.2c | Rental Registry  
Create a rental registry listing all properties available for rent in the city, especially affordable rentals and those accessible to people with disabilities. |
| Program H4.2e | Eliminate Parking Minimums for Special Needs Populations  
Eliminate parking minimums for housing geared toward the elderly or developmentally disabled populations throughout the town. Allow parking reductions or waivers for all very low- and extremely low-income housing within 1 mile of a regional transit stop or transit corridor.  
These communities do not drive, so requiring parking for their dwellings increases cost with no additional benefit to the residents. |
| Program H4.2d | Facilities and Services for Special Needs  
Provide expedited permit review or by-right approvals for housing projects that include facilities that address special needs populations, including but not limited to the physically and mentally disabled, large families, and extremely low-income households. |

HLC wants to be a partner to the city, sharing our collective knowledge of state law and best practices to facilitate fair housing. Please contact me or other HLC staff if you would like to talk further about how Woodside can identify and implement policies that will best meet the community’s needs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeremy Levine  
*Policy Manager, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County*
Dear Council Members,

Please consider the attached comments on the Draft Housing Element and forward them to HCD for consideration in their review. I hope you reconsider your approach to this issue.

Sincerely,

Steve

--
Stephen Lubin
Thalia & Stephen Lubin, Architects
Woodside, CA 94061
Since incorporation Woodside has experienced continuously decreasing economic diversity of its residents. It is now far less likely that those who are employed in town live here.

Traffic has increased substantially while the population has barely budged. This increase is directly related to increased sprawl and auto dependance. More traffic, not more people, has decreased our quality of life.

The State has and probably will continue to impose housing requirements on the Town such as relaxed ADU rules, SB9 and RHNA quotas. Some aspects of these requirements conflict with many of our traditional planning concepts and promote sprawl and traffic. This does not mean we can ignore the need for housing. We must proactively plan for housing which is consistent with our local values. If we are not proactive on this issue, we will have no defense against more onerous mandates from the State.

It is time to update our founding goal of preserving open space to include a more comprehensive environmental benefit. We need to plan for a compact, pedestrian friendly town center with affordable housing within walking distance.

The Draft Housing Element does not do this. Its action plan is not likely to provide significant housing or preserve the character of the Town.

The provision of housing which serves people with a wide range of income levels is a desirable goal for the Town of Woodside. This diversity of housing would decrease traffic and congestion by providing housing close to work for people employed in Woodside.

The “significant increase of jobs” in town since 2010 noted in the Element highlights the need for convenient housing.

Woodside’s founding principle of preserving open space and rural (rustic setting with ample open space) environments is central to the planning goals of Woodside.

Providing additional housing in Woodside will transform the character of the Town. This change can either promote sprawl, fire risk, traffic and destruction of open space or it can cluster increased density close to services so we can create a pedestrian oriented town center, reducing traffic and the need for parking.
The Draft Housing Element furthers suburbanization by placing relatively large (for Woodside) developments around the edges of Town, increasing traffic and destroying open space.

We do not have control over all the causes of increased traffic, but we can control the distribution of housing and the making of a pedestrian friendly town center.

The current cycle of RHNA requirements is not the end of the need for more housing, nor is it likely to be the end of State housing requirements. If we fail to look at the long-term impacts, we will stumble into a chaotic future. Multiple cycles of dense housing on the edges of town will result in an amorphous, inside-out jumble of traffic inducing, nature destroying development.

The Town seems to hope the State requirements will disappear. It has presented a Draft Housing Element that is not likely to succeed in actually providing housing. If the State requirements do not go away, we will be stuck with implementing a poorly conceived plan.

The proposed Housing Element is not likely to succeed in meeting the State’s housing requirements because the chosen sites are not suitable for affordable housing:

- The “Commercial Corridor” sites are too few in number to result in sufficient applications to meet State requirements.

- The Farm Hill site is constrained by General Plan designation & (according to the General Plan) a deed restriction as “open space for the preservation of natural resources”. Access to the site is only possible through one of the two Barkley Fields parcels. The deed to these parcels restricts their use, on penalty of reversion of title, to “community park or sports field facility”. Has the Town researched title restrictions on this property and access to it?

- The Runnymede site is adjacent to extensive wildland chaparral and oak forest on the adjacent watershed lands. It is a sitting duck for wildfire. This site, along with the entire neighborhood is accessed by a single road with no alternate emergency access.

  A dense project here would not integrate with the surrounding neighborhood. Its proximity to the freeway invokes concerns for “environmental justice”.

  The Draft Element shows lands along Runnymede as “contiguous” to a sewer. The sewer in Cañada Road is on the opposite side of I 280 and generally at a
higher elevation than Runnymede Road. The site is also within a few hundred feet of the Hermit earthquake fault.

Has the Town researched title restrictions on this property? Why did the Town acquire it?
The Runnymede site is within the I 280/Cañada Road Scenic corridor. Placing a large building here would certainly not be consistent with the Town’s criteria for scenic corridors. These criteria include requirements that the project “conserves the property's open space, natural features, vegetation, and wildlife by subordinating development to the site's natural conditions” and “preserve(s) Woodside’s rural residential character, and maintain(s) the visual continuity of natural landforms”. Is this proposed development the northern gateway to town that we want?

- The 733 Cañada Road site is within the only CalFire “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” in Town which is completely outside of the Western Hills. This week the Edgewood fire encroached to within 2000 feet of this site. The fire was a terrifying demonstration of how vulnerable the site, within the Edgewood Fire evacuation zone, is to wildfire.

The site is constrained by Emerald Lake Hills Specific Plan prohibiting sewer connection for development purposes.

The site slopes steeply upwards from Cañada Road and I 280 with no shelter from freeway noise. Its direct exposure to freeway noise and fumes raises “environmental justice” concerns.

Like the Runnymede site the Cañada Road site is within the I 280/Cañada Road Scenic corridor. It is subject to the same esthetic standards mentioned above.

Are these twin developments on each side of I 280 the northern gateway we want?

The Cañada Road site is an important wildlife habitat frequented by foxes, coyotes, deer, rattlesnakes, rabbits and, of course, mountain lions.

- The High Road site is constrained by geologic instability and a difficult site configuration. It was acquired as open space. Has the Town researched title restrictions on this property? Is this project the eastern gateway that we want?

All the chosen sites except the “Commercial Corridor” are remote from commercial and cultural services. This would result in social isolation/lack of integration with the social fabric of the Town and unavailability of convenient transit, walking or bicycling.
The Town owned sites are not “surplus land” as they have been treated, but open spaces acquired for specific purposes.

The Draft Housing Element states:

The State’s Land Use Priorities include (1) Promoting infill; (2) Protecting natural and working landscape and recreation areas; and (3) Encouraging efficient development patterns adjacent to existing developed areas, that are served by transportation and that minimize ongoing costs associated with Natural Disasters.

The Element’s “Action Plan” does not reflect these priorities.

The sites identified for low income housing in the Draft Element fail to meet almost all of the criteria identified on pages 3-20 & 3-21 for AFFH.

The State seems to have defined low income housing as apartment buildings with 10 to 200 units and a density of 20 units/acre or greater. This is not a model which will integrate with Woodside. Projects following this model would leave their residents isolated and stigmatized. We must work to develop a model of affordable housing which can integrate with the fabric of the Town.

The Council has not considered inclusionary zoning which could allow small projects which fit the scale of the Town.

As an alternate to the proposed Housing Element we should encourage a range of small-scale housing close to town center and reimagine the town center as a diverse, compact, walkable community surrounded by our rural landscape.

The “Missing Middle” proposal that was rejected by the Town Council was a good start at a new vision for but did not go far enough.

To the extent the State can be brought along, the Town should consider the following strategy:

Zone an area within walking distance to town center to allow multiple units (10 units/acre?) while retaining overall building coverage similar to the existing regulations. The Town’s generous coverage allowances would allow many additional small housing units within the existing development pattern but limit the magnitude of new projects.

Zone an area within bicycling distance to allow an increased number of units (5 units/lot?).
Require the additional units be available to a range of income levels. This could be accomplished by requiring some units be restricted to low income occupants in projects with a larger number of units and by an inclusionary housing fee on smaller projects.

To encourage the construction of low income units they could be subsidized with proceeds from an inclusionary housing fee. This fee would apply to additional units (allowed by rezoning) as well as to subdivisions, large houses and major additions.

This zoning could be implemented through the creation of rent controlled units or by deed restricted subdivisions for owner occupied units.

Consult with SamTrans to co-ordinate housing with a potential bus route.

The building of ADU’s has increased housing opportunities without a large disruption to the character of the Town. Like ADU’s the strategy outlined above would be implemented by individual property owners and allow an organic increase in housing opportunities without going against the grain of the existing development pattern. This strategy would allow the development of an open market for these units, available to all landowners within the designated districts. It would eliminate the appearance of spot zoning and the granting of special favors to a few landowners.

Unlike ADU’s and SB 9, homegrown zoning would allow more local control over design of the units.

The large houses paying the inclusionary housing fees play a significant role in creating additional employment in town. This employment contributes to housing shortages and traffic, so it is appropriate that these houses contribute to alleviating the problems. Since not all the housing shortfall is due to new construction, we should also consider a town-wide affordable housing tax based on house value.

NAHB and Opticos Design have prepared a report: Diversifying Housing Options with Smaller Lots and Smaller Homes. This report suggests options for how housing in the zoning I propose could be designed.

Dear Woodside Town Council,

I am writing today in regards to the public hearing scheduled for July 12th, 2022 for the Draft Cycle Six Housing Element Update. First and foremost, I want to express that I, and my family, are vehemently opposed to the proposal for potential higher density and/or multifamily development in the town of Woodside, and most specifically we against the private development at the 733 Cañada Road location.

Having attended the previous public hearing on May 10th focused on high-density housing (10-20 units per acre), what was not addressed is that the 733 Cañada location is actually in the development list more than once and in more than one context. In any other situation, the focus of discussion would have been on splitting this parcel into five subdivisions, each with its own home and ADU. Unfortunately, this part of the plan went completely under the radar due to the additional (and greater threat), of further splitting the lot into sixths to allow for an acre of additional high-density housing (10-20 units/acre). In other words, while the focus of 733 has been on the 10 units per acre (originally 20), what we are really taking about is five, brand new full-sized houses, complete with ADUs, along with 10 additional high-density homes, all built by a private developer on private, non-town-owned land. How is this even being considered acceptable?

As an adjacent neighbor to 733 Cañada, I have serious and legitimate concerns about this massive proposed development. It will directly affect our property value, quality of life and safety. This last point was poignantly emphasized June 21st with the Edgewood fire that not only closed Cañada Rd, but mandated evacuations for ourselves and surrounding neighbors. High-density housing would have compounded the emergency.

I understand that all towns and cities are required to plan for the development of new housing by the state. I recognize the Town Council is working hard to meet this mandate while trying to preserve the natural, rural feel of Woodside. If the property at 733 Cañada has already been approved for five new full homes and five additional ADUs, I ask that it be removed from the list of proposed additional high-density housing (10-20 units/acre). To do both on one site where there was previously a single ranch-style home and modest horse stable is simply too much for one site. Housing needs can be met without concentrating it all in any one location.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

Jonathan MacSwain
Dear Jackie Young,

Please see attached PDF document and include with Council members packet.

Thank-you,

David J Malloy
Redwood City CA. 94061
Dear Mayor Dick Brown and Members of the Town Council,

My name is David Malloy and I and my wife Mary and family have resided at [redacted] Drive, Redwood City since 1984. I operated a consumer electronics retail chain based in Redwood City for 38 years.

I was confused when a neighbor just two days ago presented me with a notice indicating That the Green Belt Open Space at Barkley Field was going to be reconfigured as a housing development.

Further I was informed that I had but two days to respond to his action. While I did not receive the “courtesy” of a notice, it all seemed improbable to me. Years ago, the issue of the Open Space near the park had been settled. Residents of Redwood City, environmental groups and most notably the Woodhill Estates homeowner’s association had agreed on a deal, in perpetuity. The Open Space green belt would be saved.

This covenant, recorded November 17th, 2009 includes the following language:

B. Covenantor [“Town of Woodside”] has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent [Barkley] park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property [the “Farm Hill” parcel you are proposing for development] as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside’s General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor [Town of Woodside] voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in “Exhibit A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town’s General Plan (“Remainder Property”).

NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor herby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town’s General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. NO IMPROVEMENTS, STRUCTURES, OR APPURTENANCES SHALL BE PLACED, CONSTRUCTED OR DEVELOPED ON THE REMAINDER
PROPERTY AT ANY TIME with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and
waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be
constructed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining the existing vegetation, placing landscaping on
the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. THESE COVENANTS ARE TO RUN WITH THE LAND AND SHALL BE BINDING ON
COVENANTOR AND ITS HEIRS, SUCCESORS AND ASSIGNS.

Please acknowledge receipt of the above and immediately remove the Barkley Field open space
Green belt from the Draft Housing element.

Sincerely,

David and Mary Malloy

[Address] Drive, Redwood City
Dear Ms. Young,

We reside at [redacted] Court in Woodhill Estates and received notice of the public hearing now scheduled for July 12 regarding sites slated for higher density/multi-family development. We write regarding the proposed location off Farm Hill Blvd., adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park, and abutting homes on Woodridge Court. As you have heard from residents of Woodhill Estates on previous occasions when development has been proposed, we believe further development will impact our quality of life and continue to erode the benefits we enjoy as residents in this neighborhood. In particular, we cite increased traffic and noise from any such development, as well as the loss of views and a habitat for wildlife, including owls currently nesting in the trees on the parcel.

The Town will recall the concerns raised ahead of the construction of Barkley Fields. Extensive negotiation was undertaken between the Woodhill Estates HOA and the Town, and a positive result for all was reached. That result included a deed restriction on the parcel that now appears under consideration for the Draft Housing Element. Our understanding is that this parcel would not be developed, so its inclusion on a list of parcels for proposed development is confusing at the least. Hopefully, this was merely an oversight and the parcel will be removed from consideration.

Sincerely,

Bill and Pamela Martinson
Jackie Young

From: Holly Nash
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 8:30 PM
To: Jackie Young
Subject: Letter To Town Council Regarding SB9
Attachments: SB 9 letter - Nash.pdf

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
To: The Woodside Town Council and Staff

From: Holly Nash

Subject: Proposed Low-Income Housing at Runnymede/Raymundo Town Property

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the town residents to address the SB 9 mandate. However, I have very serious safety concerns about the proposed use of the town property at the corner of Runnymede and Raymundo Drive.

I recently read of the Portola Valley “town plan for more housing ... to create a new voluntary upzoning program that property owners with sites 1 acre or greater to develop up to 4 units per acre, assuming they meet the safety criteria:

- Accessible to two ways of ingress and egress.
- Located on a slope less than 30%.
- Outside of a very high fire hazard severity zone.
- Outside of a fault zone.
- Outside of areas identified with unstable soils or at risk of landslide or liquefaction.”

The article is entitled, “Find where Portola Valley is proposing to put new housing” and appeared in The Almanac dated June 17, 2022.

I have not seen a similar set of safety criteria for Woodside; therefore, with our two towns being so close and so similar, I will address the criteria above that apply to the Runnymede/Raymundo proposed site.

- Accessible to two ways of ingress and egress.

This is a common sense safety issue. Runnymede/Raymundo Road is a two-lane road with both entrance and egress only from Canada Road. It dead ends at Huddart County Park. There is only one way in and out. I will address this issue at length in the next applicable criterion.

- Outside of a very high fire hazard severity zone.

The Draft Housing Plan relied on Fire Maps dated 2007 -- they are 15 years old! Town Council members made decisions based on bad information. While the end of Raymundo is designated “very high fire hazard severity,” the Open Space behind the town parcel is listed as “moderate fire severity.” In 2007, it may have been; however, “over the past 20 years, CA has had three stretches of drought: 2000-2003, 2007-2009 and 2012 to 2016. According to the Drought Monitor, almost 96% of CA is now under severe drought conditions, which means that the wildfire season is longer, and trees are under stress. “ Public Policy Institute of CA June 1, 2022. All of Raymundo needs to be re-evaluated for fire danger. The park at the end of the street is “very high fire hazard severity zone” with 6 houses on
Raymundo, 2 houses on Marva Oaks and the Sculpture Garden abutting on this highest fire designation. While Raymundo has not been fully evaluated, it is surrounded by the very high fire hazard severity zone, drought parched trees and the entire Open Space. 15-year-old fire maps should not be used to crowd more residents into this fire trap of a street with only one way to exit and enter. The danger of Runnymede/Raymundo was brought home with the Edgewood fire on June 21. The fire was across the freeway and yet, residents of Runnymede/Raymundo could not access their properties due to this one ingress/egress road. Cars were backed up in both directions of Canada Rd. and those trying to get home to Runnymede/Raymundo on Woodside Rd. were stuck in a very long procession of cars.

The town parcel abuts an Open Space Preserve that has become increasingly dry with the past several years of drought. In fact, the town of Woodside, Fire Agencies, PG&E, the San Francisco Water Department and Law Enforcement each have designated locks on the gate to this Open Space. It is to keep vehicles out of the Open Space to prevent trespassing, illegal hunting, and fire. In fact, every year since I purchased my home, the Crystal Springs Trail aka the Sand Trail, which is the walking trail accessed by pedestrians and equestrians through this gate, is closed by the Fire Marshall on the week preceding the 4th of July through the 5th due to extreme fire danger, known as a Red Flag Warning. This danger will only increase in the future as climate change continues to ravage our state and dry up this area. The danger does not magically disappear after a given date in July. This fire danger is a high risk to public safety.

There is a “No Smoking” sign at the trail head. Clearly, smoking in this fire risk area is dangerous and prohibited. While we cannot legislate smoking in one’s home, it is concerning to note that, according to The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services CDC Office on Smoking Health that, “In the U.S., people living below the poverty level ...have higher rates of cigarette smoking than the general population.” “Nearly 3 in 4 smokers are from lower income communities. This accounts for 72% of all smokers.” It is an obvious concern that a careless smoker could easily start a catastrophic fire in this drought parched area.

This is where the two criteria collide: When, not if, a fire occurs in the Open Space or the adjacent Huddart Park Forest, there is only one exit point on Runnymede/Raymundo. All residents from the top of Raymundo down must evacuate through this one exit. In addition to human residents, we are talking about a large population of horses as well (estimated at 100).

I have recently purchased a larger horse trailer out of fire fear. I regularly practice hitching up and loading horses, in anticipation of this possibility. Every horse on the street will have to be evacuated either by the homeowner or professional horse evacuators. Consider the chaos of fire trucks parked by the hydrants along the street, blocking one lane of traffic and all residents, human and equine, trying to evacuate simultaneously on the only open lane.

Add to this scene, many more residents now living on the town parcel, with many cars and family members trying to exit as all are streaming down the hill or going up to save what they can. It is unsafe and terrifying. This narrow, winding logjam of a road with only one way out is contrary to fire safety. It is a high risk to public safety.
The potential chaos of such an occurrence was brought home last week (June 21) when a fire suddenly sprang up in Edgewood Park, located about 1/2 mile north of the Runnymede/Raymundo parcel. Evacuations were immediately ordered for properties north of I-280 and access along Canada Rd. was prohibited. Our street and neighborhood were cutoff and isolated. Alarmingly, those racing home to Runnymede/Raymundo were in long lines, trying to gain access through the only entrance (and exit) to the street. Many who were trying to gain access to their boarded horses were turned away. This dead-end road is a dangerous trap even when the fire is not immediately on Runnymede/Raymundo. Why would you endanger additional new residents on a proven fire trap of a one exit street? You will exacerbate the high danger to present residents by adding more residents.

- Outside of a fault zone.

Is this proposed high density housing parcel outside of a fault zone? The Town geologic map shows the Hermit Fault running on or adjacent to this town parcel. The town of Woodside prohibits new construction within 125 feet of an inferred fault or 50 feet of a known fault. Is this a proper location to plan new housing construction? This is a high risk to public safety.

I cannot help but wonder why the Runnymede/Raymundo parcel was chosen. It is such a potentially dangerous location, not accessible to two ways of ingress and egress, which has already borne itself out with the June 21 Edgewood fire; it is in a very high fire hazard severity zone, with the potential of being the starting point for a huge, town-wide fire; it is on or near an earthquake fault; and it is far from public transportation. Public Safety was clearly not a consideration in selecting this parcel.

I truly hope that the Town Council revisits their decision. We need to minimize risk to public safety and maximize success with our housing plan.
Hello,

Hello,

In response to your invitation to submit comments regarding the proposed development of high density/multifamily housing on the parcel of vacant land adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park (APN 068-322-390), as a Woodhill Estates homeowner I want to go on record as adamantly opposed to the proposal as it is prohibited by your own prior agreement. This is based on the existence of an agreement Woodhill Estates negotiated with The Town Council in 2004 regarding the development of Barkley that includes several conditions to mitigate various adverse impacts it would have had on Woodhill Estates, including traffic and noise.

One major condition included in the agreement was a deed restriction the Town placed on parcel (APN 068-322-390) designating it to be … maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements… See copy attached.

Consequently, the Town must remove this parcel from consideration of any type of development.

Sincerely.

Jim

James G. Ochsner
[Redacted] Drive, Redwood City
RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
Town of Woodside
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
650.851.6790

Exempt from Fee Pursuant
To Government Code,
Section 6103.9

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Town of Woodside
Town Clerk
P.O. Box 620005
Woodside, CA 94062

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

COVENANT

THIS COVENANT TO RETAIN A PORTION OF PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE, made on the date hereinafter set forth, by the Town of Woodside (hereinafter referred to as "Covenantor") is made with reference to the following facts:

A. Covenantor is the owner of certain property located in the Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, State of California, more particularly referred to as Assessors Parcel No. 068322390 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

B. Covenantor has developed a portion of the Property to support the adjacent park and has agreed to maintain the remainder of the Property as open space.

C. Pursuant to the Town of Woodside's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Elements, the Town desires to retain certain areas in the Town as open space to assure the continued availability of land for the production of food and fiber, the enjoyment of scenic beauty, and the conservation of natural resources.

D. To eliminate detrimental impacts from the development of a park adjacent to the Woodhill Estates residential development, Covenantor voluntarily and willingly agrees by this document to restrict development of that portion of the Property, more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, and to retain that portion of the Property as open space in conformance with the Town's General Plan ("Remainder Property").
NOW, THEREFORE, Covenantor hereby declares that the Remainder Property described above shall be held, sold, leased, mortgaged, encumbered, rented, used, occupied, improved and conveyed subject to the following limitations, restrictions, covenants, and conditions, which are imposed as covenants running with the land for the purpose of complying with the desire to provide and protect open space, and which shall run with the Property and be binding on Covenantor and its successors and assigns.

1. USE OF THE PROPERTY. Covenantor hereby voluntarily and willingly agrees to restrict development of the Remainder Property to open space purposes consistent with the Town's General Plan, Open Space Element and Conservation Element. No improvements, structures, or appurtenances shall be placed, constructed or developed on the Remainder Property at any time with the exception of an existing pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle trail and waterline on the south-easterly boundary of the property. Nothing in this covenant shall be construed to prevent Covenantor from maintaining existing vegetation, placing landscaping on the Remainder Property or from maintaining the trail and water line in useable condition.

2. TERMS. These covenants are to run with the land and shall be binding on Covenantor and its heirs, successors and assigns.

3. ENFORCEMENT. Enforcement of these covenants shall be by proceedings at law or in equity against any person or persons violating or attempting to violate covenant either to restrain a violation or to recover damages.

4. BREACH. Breach of any of the covenants or any re-entry by reason of such breach, shall not defeat or render invalid the lien of any mortgage or deed of trust made in good faith and for value as to the Property or any part thereof; but such covenants shall be binding and effective against any owner of the Property whose title thereto is acquired by foreclosure, trustee's sale or otherwise.

5. Time is of the essence hereof and any individual waiver of time in any instance shall not constitute any subsequent waiver of these provisions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Covenantor has executed this declaration this 17th day of November, 2009.

TOWN OF WOODSIDE

[Signature]
Peter Mason, Mayor

Document Number: 2009-151344 Page: 2 of 6
RESOLUTION NO. 2009 - 6771

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
APPROVING A COVENANT TO RETAIN PORTION OF TOWN PROPERTY AS OPEN SPACE
AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE COVENANT ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN
(WOODHILL DRIVE, APN 068-322-390)

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside was granted a Conditional Use Permit
on June 2, 2004, to establish a public park at Farm Hill Boulevard &
Woodhill Drive; and

WHEREAS, Condition 23 of the Conditional Use Permit required that
"a deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town's current parcel on
Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be
maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than
the walking path and utility line associated with the initial
construction of the park".

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Town Council of the Town
of Woodside does hereby approve a Covenant to Retain Portion of Town
Property as Open Space, attached as Exhibit "A", and authorizes the
Mayor to execute the Covenant on behalf of the Town.

* * * * * * * * * *

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Town Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, at a meeting thereof held on the 22nd of September 2009 by
the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmembers: Boynton, Gordon, Hodges,
Tanner, Mayor Mason
NOES, Councilmembers: None
ABSENT, Councilmembers: Burow, Romines
ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: None

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Mayor of the Town of Woodside

[Signature]
Clerk of the Town of Woodside

[Signature]
I hereby certify that the above is
a true copy
of Resolution 2009-15344
Date October 29, 2009
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July 12, 2022
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California

County of San Mateo

On November 17, 2009 before me, Lynn Shortsleeve, Notary

personally appeared Peter Mason

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to
the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/their authorized
capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of
which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph
is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature of Notary Public

(Seal)

ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Court

(Title or description of attached document)

Gov Code Sec. 6103.9

>Title or description of attached document continued)

Number of Pages 4

Document Date 11-17-09

(Additional information)

CAPACITY CLAIMED BY THE SIGNER

☐ Individual(s)

☐ Corporate Officer

☐ Partner(s)

☐ Attorney-in-Fact

☐ Trustee(s)

☐ Other: Mayor of Woodside

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

Any acknowledgment completed in California must contain verbiage exactly as appears above in the notary section or a separate acknowledgment form must be properly completed and attached to that document. The only exception is if a document is to be recorded outside of California. In such instances, any alternative acknowledgment verbiage as may be printed on such a document so long as the verbiage does not require the notary to do something that is illegal for a notary in California (i.e. certifying the authorized capacity of the signer). Please check the document carefully for proper notarial wording and attach this form if required.

- State and County information must be the State and County where the document signer(s) personally appeared before the notary public for acknowledgment.
- Date of notarization must be the date that the signer(s) personally appeared which must also be the same date the acknowledgment is completed.
- The notary public must print his or her name as it appears within his or her commission followed by a comma and then your title (notary public).
- Print the name(s) of document signer(s) who personally appear at the time of notarization.
- Indicate the correct singular or plural forms by crossing off incorrect forms (i.e. his/her/their is/are) or circling the correct forms. Failure to correctly indicate this information may lead to rejection of document recording.
- The notary seal impression must be clean and graphically reproducible. Impression must not cover text or lines. If seal impression smudges, re-seal if a sufficient area permits, otherwise complete a different acknowledgment form.
- Signature of the notary public must match the signature on file with the office of the county clerk.
- Additional information is not required but could help to ensure this acknowledgment is not misused or attached to a different document.
- Indicate title or type of attached document, number of pages and date.
- Indicate the capacity claimed by the signer. If the claimed capacity is a corporate officer, indicate the title (i.e. CEO, CFO, Secretary).
- Securely attach this document to the signed document.
Corporation GIFT Deed

The undersigned grantor(s) declare:

1. The grantor(s) are: [List grantors]
2. The grantor(s) address is: [Address]
3. The grantor(s) is/are a [Type of entity]
4. The grantor(s) is/are located in: [Location]

The undersigned grantee(s) declare:

1. The grantee(s) are: [List grantees]
2. The grantee(s) address is: [Address]
3. The grantee(s) is/are a [Type of entity]
4. The grantee(s) is/are located in: [Location]

The undersigned grantor(s) and grantee(s) agree to the terms of this deed and acknowledge their respective duties and responsibilities under the law.

In Witness Whereof, the grantor(s) has/have caused this instrument to be executed by [Signature].

[Stamp of office]

[Date]

[Seal]

[Notary Public]

[Signature]
Dear Kevin,

Can you help me get a copy of the deed that conveys the Runnymede-Raymundo lot (known as 100 Raymundo Drive) from the State of California Dept. of Transportation to the Town of Woodside? It’s title is Director’s Deed DD-034363-01-01, dated 23 September 1975.

This transfer from the state to our town happened in late 1975, following the completion of the freeway I-280. This property at “100 Raymundo Drive” had been taken earlier by the state of California under eminent domain from the nearby residents, then not needed. According to Janet Estep, who is very knowledgeable about the history of this area, the state was legally required to offer the property back to the original owner, who then declined; the next required step was to offer it to the appropriate public body, which in this case was the Town of Woodside. That’s how the Town got title to this lot that is now being proposed as a site for multi-unit housing.

I’ve been at the county recorder’s office hunting down this deed, but all I’ve come up with to date is the official recording of the Town’s Resolution no. (1975-3007): “A Resolution of the Council of the Town of Woodside Authorizing Acceptance of Deeds and/or Dedications of Rights of Way in Real Property.” This resolution to accept this deed was passed and adopted by the Town Council on 14 October, 1975. The Deed in question was evidently appended as Exhibit A to this town resolution. But it is not included in the photocopies of materials that the recorder’s office dug out for me from the warehoused vol. 6961 (which I do have and can scan and share with you if needed). The page numbers in this volume for the Certification and Resolution are pp. 465-467 in vol. 6961. It is highly likely that the deed itself occupies the subsequent pages. We need to know precisely what it says and whether it details any easements or restrictions of use on that property.

I’m headed out of town for over a week and can continue the investigation when I return. But if the Town records can locate this deed sooner than I can get back to the county recorder, it would certainly help us citizens to clarify some important aspects of the question of use (or restrictions on use) of this land, which was evidently also subsequently proposed (and turned down) as a soccer field for AYSO kids.
Please let me know ASAP.

Thank you,
Karen Offen
Perfect. Thank you, Kevin.
The director’s deed to that 1.77 acre lot is on pp. 3-4-5.
PP. 1-2, 6 of these photocopies are the pages that also turned up in my search in the county recorder’s warehoused volumes and were photocopied for me last week. The deed should have been part of that offering.

The important clause is on the 2nd page of the deed, concerning public purpose and forfeiture ("It is expressly made a condition herein that the conveyed property be used exclusively for public purposes . . . ." or be forfeited. The question now is this: what constitutes a “public purpose”? I seriously doubt that multi-unit housing in private hands would fall into that category.

Note that a 1970 utility easement is mentioned as belonging to Pacific Tel. & Tel. — that is probably where the power lines and telephone lines run on the backside of this lot, and is not the same as the next-door easement that was deeded, also by the State of California, Dept. of Transportation to the SF Water District in 1975t, also via a Director’s Deed (of which I have a copy, thanks to Chris Anderson).

Thank you very much for transmitting this material. It doubtless will lead to further discussion pertinent to the “Report” before July 12.

Karen O.
This is to certify that the interest in real property conveyed by dedication, deed or grant dated September 23, 1975, from Edwin W. Thomas, Attorney in Fact for Sidney McCausland, Director of Transportation, State of California, to the Town of Woodside, a municipal corporation, situated in the County of San Mateo, California, is hereby accepted by order of the Council of the Town of Woodside on October 14, 1975, and the grantee consents to recordation thereof by its duly authorized officer pursuant to the provisions of Resolution No. (1957-61) adopted by the Council of the Town of Woodside, and on file in the office of the County Recorder of San Mateo County in Book 3531, page 472, official County Records.


Town of Woodside

By

Clerk of the Town of Woodside
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Type of Instrument</th>
<th>Executed by</th>
<th>Date of Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director's Deed DE-034360-01-01</td>
<td>Edwin W. Thomas, Attorney in Fact for Sidney McCausland, Director of Transportation, State of California</td>
<td>September 13, 1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTOR'S DEED
SEP 1975

The STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by and through its Director of Transportation, does hereby grant to

TOWN OF WOODSIDE, an incorporated city

all that real property in the City of Town of Woodside,

County of San Mateo, State of California, described as:

A portion of Lot 1, as said lot is shown on the map entitled "TRACT NO. 567 RANCHO CANADA", filed for record December 10, 1946, in Book 26 of Maps, Pages 39, 40, and 41, in the office of the Recorder of San Mateo County, described as follows:

COMMENCING at the westerly corner of said Lot 1; thence along the northwesterly line of said Lot 1, N. 50°38'50" E., 231.73 feet; thence along a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 65.00 feet, through an angle of 73°59'00", an arc length of 90.74 feet to a line parallel with and distant 60.00 feet southwesterly, measured at right angles to the northeasterly line of that certain 2,112 square foot easement described in DIRECTOR'S DEED NO. 34363-DED to THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, recorded January 6, 1970, in Volume 5734, Page 521, Official Records of San Mateo County; thence along said parallel line S. 49°25'10" E., 146.42 feet; thence along a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 20.00 feet, through an angle of 90°00'00", an arc length of 31.42 feet to the general northwesterly line of Raymundo Drive.
(50.00 feet wide); thence along said general northwesterly line S. 45° 34' 50" W., 126.47 feet, and along a tangent curve to the left, with a radius of 524.96 feet, through an angle of 28° 53' 35"", an arc length of 191.48 feet to the southwesterly line of said Lot 1; thence along said line, N. 39° 25' 02" W., 300.98 feet to the point of commencement.

CONTAINING 1,770 acres, more or less.

Together with underlying fee interest, if any, appurtenant to the above-described property in and to Raymundo Drive.

There shall be no abutter's rights of access appurtenant to the above-described real property in and to the adjacent State freeway.

The bearings and distances used in the above description are on the California Coordinate System, Zone 3. Multiply the above distances by 1.0000751 to obtain ground level distances.

It is expressly made a condition herein that the conveyed property be used exclusively for public purposes; that if said property ceases to be used exclusively for public purposes, all title and interest to said property shall revert to the State of California, Department of Transportation, and the interest held by the grantee, named herein, or its assigns, shall cease and terminate at such time. It is understood and agreed by the grantee, herein named, and its assigns, that the foregoing provision constitutes a forfeiture and will cause all interest to revert in the State of California, Department of Transportation, if the conveyed property ceases to be used for public purposes.
Subject to special assessments if any, restrictions, reservations, and easements of record.

This conveyance is executed pursuant to the authority vested in the Director of Transportation by law and, in particular, by the Streets and Highways Code.

WITNESS my hand and the seal of the Department of Transportation of the State of California, this 23rd day of September, 1975.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Sidney McCauley
Director of Transportation

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

Robert Brinkman
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

On this 23rd day of September, 1975, before me, J. L. Kroeger a Notary Public in and for the State of California, residing therein, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared

Edward E. Thomas, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument as the Attorney in Fact of Sidney McCauley, Director of Transportation of the State of California, and known to me to be the person who executed the within instrument on behalf of the State of California, and he acknowledged to me that he subscribed the name of Sidney McCauley, as Director of Transportation, and his own name as Attorney in Fact, and that the State of California executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

J. L. Kroeger
Notary Public

THIS IS TO CERTIFY That the California Highway Commission has authorized the Director of Transportation to execute the foregoing deed at its meeting regularly called and held on the 18th day of September, 1975, in the City of Monterey.

Dated this 23rd day of September, 1975.

Harold A. Chalmers
Assistant Secretary of the California Highway Commission

July 12, 2022
RESOLUTION No. (1975- 3007)

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF DEEDS AND/OR DEDICATIONS
OF RIGHTS OF WAY IN REAL PROPERTY.

100 RAYMUNDO DRIVE
DIRECTOR'S DEED DD-034363-01-01

RESOLVED, by the Council of the Town of Woodside,
California, that those certain deeds and/or dedications of rights
in real property, executed by the persons, on the dates set forth
in Exhibit "A" hereto attached and made a part hereof by reference
granting this Town various interests in certain real property
more particularly described in said deeds and/or dedications,
are hereby accepted and the Town Clerk is hereby directed to
record the said deeds and/or dedications, together with certified
copies of this Resolution, in the office of the County Recorder
of the County of San Mateo, California, being the County within
which said properties are located.

********

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true, full and
correct copy of a resolution duly passed and adopted by the
Town Council of the Town of Woodside, California, at a meeting
thereof held on the 16th day of October, 1975,
by the following vote of the members thereof:

AYES, and in favor thereof, Councilmen: Crowell, Landes,
Zwerlein and Mayor Moses.

NOES, Councilmen: None.

ABSENT, Councilmen: Burgess, Mayer and Weeks.

[Signature]

Clerk of the Town of Woodside
Inna Lewis
Dear Mr. Schaan,

Please find attached a letter regarding some errors that the Campaign for Fair Housing Elements found in your RHNA Annual Progress Reports. These errors will affect your housing production projections for the 6th Cycle Housing Element. We urge you to fix them at once, and revise your 6th Cycle projections accordingly.

--

-- Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Dear Mr. Schaan:

The Campaign for Fair Housing Elements is a coalition dedicated to ensuring that every city in California produces a Housing Element which complies with the California Department of Housing and Community Development’s requirements. We have some concerns about the City of Woodside’s previous reporting of their housing production.

The City of Woodside has been reporting production numbers of single family houses in their Annual Progress Reports that include replacement houses. That is, when someone buys a house, demolishes it, and builds a new house, that’s being reported as a net new home.

There may have been a misunderstanding. HCD’s instructions explicitly require the number of net new units be reported, which would be 0 in the case of a new home replacing a demolished home. But there is also a field in the spreadsheet for the number of units demolished, and Woodside may have thought that reporting 1 unit created and 1 unit destroyed was correct.

Nevertheless, the numbers are incorrect. Net new homes, not replacement homes, must be reported. Most of the permits Woodside issues for single family homes are for replacements, so this has resulted in Annual Progress Reports that report considerably more net new homes than are actually being built. Woodside is planning to use these incorrect numbers as a basis for its 6th Cycle Housing Element. This would be an error.

It is contrary to state law to count the replacement of an existing house as housing production. Please update your Annual Progress Reports and adjust your projections accordingly.

The following is the data for the 2018-2021 reports. Woodside reported 33 net new single family homes, but only 9 were actually new homes. The rest were teardowns followed by rebuilds. The data for earlier years is not publicly available, but looking at the totals, it appears that teardown/rebuilds were counted as new in earlier years of the 5th RHNA cycle as well.

---

1 [https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/housing-element-annual-progress-report-instructions.pdf](https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/housing-element/docs/housing-element-annual-progress-report-instructions.pdf), page 9: “Net new units: If a building is being demolished to build the new units, the APR should report net new units. For example, if 10 units are being demolished on a site to build a 100-unit building, the APR should report 100 new units and 10 units in the demolished/destroyed column.”
The following homes were actual net new homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New SFHs on Woodside's Annual Progress Report</th>
<th>2018-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 Stadler</td>
<td>new 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Mountain Wood</td>
<td>new 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Roan Place</td>
<td>new 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 Crest Road</td>
<td>new 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Blue Ridge Lane</td>
<td>new 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219 Jefferson</td>
<td>new 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Marva Oaks</td>
<td>new 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 Olive Hill Lane</td>
<td>new 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Hillside</td>
<td>new 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following homes were teardown-and-rebuilds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacement SFHs on Woodside's Annual Progress Report</th>
<th>2018-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3577 tripp rd</td>
<td>replacement 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455 maple way</td>
<td>replacement 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3793 woodside road</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890 mountain home road</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970 mountain home road</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 mountain wood lane</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 mountain home road</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450 tripp road</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 eleanor</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 eleanor</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2195 greenways</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150 ward way</td>
<td>replacement 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 maybury</td>
<td>replacement 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660 fernside</td>
<td>replacement 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3575 tripp road</td>
<td>replacement 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2150 greenways replacement 2020
210 woodside drive replacement 2020
349 Manuella replacement 2020
1040 Canada replacement 2021
4105 woodside road replacement 2021
115 harcross replacement 2021
60 prospect st replacement 2021
410 whiskey hill road replacement 2021
119 croydon replacement 2021

The Campaign for Fair Housing Elements assumes this error was inadvertent. We look forward to seeing it promptly fixed. We expect Woodside will send corrected data to HCD, and no longer use the incorrect numbers as a basis for the projection of future production in the 6th RHNA Cycle.

Sincerely,

Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Dear Mr. Schaan,

The Campaign for Fair Housing Elements has discovered some significant issues in the draft Housing Element presented in the May 10 Woodside Town Council meeting.

We have examined the “Shawkowski” plan, labeled Item A Page 635 in the May 10 Town Council Agenda Notes. We assume that the base ADU estimate will be increased to 25 per year, as discussed at that meeting. We’ve identified the following issues:

**Single family home estimates too high:** The plan bases its SFH estimates on Woodside’s RHNA Annual Progress Report, which has been erroneously including teardown/replacement homes, as we documented in our previous letter.

**Double counting SFHs and ADUs:** After projecting the total single family homes and total ADUs that will be produced based on past production, the report inexplicably pulls out some potential homes and ADUs and counts them again.

**Pipeline:** The SFH pipeline also probably erroneously includes replacement homes.

**SB 9:** Jurisdictions cannot count SB 9 lot splits without identifying the lots that will be split, which the draft housing element does not do.

**ADUs:** The report claims the rate of ADU production will nearly double in the 6th cycle from the rate of the last four years, while committing to nothing to make this happen.

As a result of these issues, the plan does not include any rezoning, yet assumes eye-popping increases in production of housing. The plan must be revised to reflect reality. Submitting a plan so unrealistic, a plan that is sure to be rejected by HCD, merely postpones the necessity of producing a plan including rezoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018-2021</th>
<th>2023-2026</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family homes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>156%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details follow.
**Single family homes:** As we discussed in our previous letter, we examined Woodside’s RHNA Annual Progress Reports for the years 2018-2021, and discovered that Woodside has been including replacement single family homes as net new homes. Although a total of 33 homes were listed, only 9 were net new homes.

The single family home projections in the RHNA Plan are based on the reported annual progress. But since the results in the 5th Cycle are wrongly reported, wrongly resulting in 6 SFHs per year, the RHNA Plan projection of 6 SFHs per year is also far too high. It should be about 2.25 per year.

**Double counting of SFHs:** After coming up with the projection of the total expected SFHs, by using the past data, the RHNA Plan then adds in some units that would result from land divisions. This is an unreasonable calculation: The projection is for the total number of homes expected, from land divisions and every other source of new houses; the projection is based on past performance; there are no planned zoning changes or other changes that would alter the trajectory. Therefore there is no justification to add numbers to the initial total projection. Past single family home production, about 2.25 homes per year, should be the projection for the RHNA plan.

**Pipeline:** The single family home pipeline almost certainly includes homes that are not net new homes. They must be removed. Moreover, the pipeline units, both for ADUs and for single family homes, should be itemized, so that they can be verified.

**SB 9:** [HCD’s Fact Sheet on SB 9](#) clearly states that SB 9 units must not be included in the RHNA unless the projected sites are listed. Woodside did not do this. Therefore, no units can be projected from SB 9.

Housing Element Law. To utilize projections based on SB 9 toward a jurisdiction’s regional housing need allocation, the housing element must: 1) include a site-specific inventory of sites where SB 9 projections are being applied, 2) include a nonvacant sites analysis demonstrating the likelihood of redevelopment and that the existing use will not constitute an impediment for additional residential use, 3) identify any governmental constraints to the use of SB 9 in the creation of units (including land use controls, feCalifornia Department of Housing and Community Development – SB 9 Fact Sheet 7 and other exactions, as well as locally adopted ordinances that impact the cost and supply of residential development), and 4) include programs and policies that establish zoning and development standards early in the planning period and implement incentives to encourage and facilitate development. The element should support this analysis with local information such as local developer or owner interest to utilize zoning and incentives established through SB 9.

**ADUs:** In the last four years, Woodside permitted 19, 8, 16 and 15 ADUs, for a total of 58 ADUs. The HCD safe harbor for ADUs is the average of the last four years, 14.5 units per year. Woodside’s RHNA Plan as amended starts with a baseline of 25 ADUs per year, and then adds in another 13 ADUs, for an average of 26.625 per year. The Plan commits to nothing to achieve this, promising only to “consider” several inducements, inducements which would be unlikely to result in this enormous jump even if they were enacted rather than just being considered. This ADU projection is far too high and must be reduced.

We urge the town of Woodside to revise the draft Housing Element, with realistic projections, including realistic plans to generate the town’s RHNA.

Sincerely,

Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Dear Mr. Schaan,

The Woodside Draft Housing Element released today projects 80 units of housing at Cañada College, based, supposedly, on a conversation with Mitch Bailey, the Vice Chancellor at the community college district that includes Cañada College. Vice Chancellor Bailey is the person in charge of planning building projects in the community college district.

In a phone call today, Vice Chancellor Bailey denied the existence of a plan for 80 units of housing at Cañada College in the next eight years. He denies telling Woodside that the district has a plan for 80 units of housing at Cañada College in the next eight years. He denies that such a plan exists.

He explained that the district is doing its facilities master plan, which identifies locations for potential future housing but does not specify the number of units, the location, or the date by which they would be constructed. The district currently has a 250 person waiting list for their existing employee housing in the three colleges in the district, but the existence of a waiting list does not imply that the college is able to satisfy that demand in the short time frame of 8 years.

Unless Woodside can show something in writing from the Community College District, detailing a plan for 80 units of housing, these units must be removed from the Housing Element projections.

Sincerely,
Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Dear Mr. Schaan,

The Campaign for Fair Housing Elements has alerted you to numerous issues in the Draft Housing Element. Here is a summary:

### Woodside RHNA Plan, Woodside Projections Vs Reality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Reality</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Allocation</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 20% Buffer</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Allocation plus Buffer</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 ZONING SUPPORTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU pipeline</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDs pipeline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Divisions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily projects (Canada College)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS - CURRENT ZONING</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA 6 Deficit/Surplus</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Woodside increased the HCD safe harbor by 72% without committing to any changes to cause the big jump.
- Woodside has been counting teardown/replacement houses as new, and bases their forecast on this inflated total; should be 2.25 per year.
- Adjusted to remove teardown/replacement.
- Can't count SB 9 units unless the lots to be split are identified.
- These were already counted in the SFD and ADU projections! Why are they being added in again???
- Replacement unit, plus an ADU already counted in the ADU projections.
- San Mateo Community College District denies plans to build more employee housing in the RHNA cycle timeframe.
Sincerely,

Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements
Thanks. Odd that Google can't find it. It’s been 11 days.

On Sun, May 29, 2022 at 11:36 AM Sage Schaan <SSchaan@woodsidetown.org> wrote:

Dear Anne,

The Housing Element remains available using the link on the Town’s Homepage (https://www.woodsidetown.org/).

When clicking on the homepage link Draft Housing Element for Public Comment (https://www.woodsidetown.org/planning/draft-housing-element-public-comment), one can see the links to the PDF documents. One link includes the Draft Element, and one link includes the appendices. The link is towards the center of the page under the label “What’s New”.

These are the PDF links on the Housing Element Page


Regards,
Hi HCD,

I'm trying to audit the Woodside Draft Housing Element, supposedly released May 18. It cannot be found by searching online, or at least I can't find it. It was revealed to a city mailing list, which is why I know where it is, but others who would be interested can't find it. The webpage where it should be linked is now 404 Not Found. When I google "woodside housing element update" Google shows a Housing Element Update webpage:

https://www.woodsidetown.org › planning › housing-e...

Housing Element Update | Town of Woodside California
Housing Element Update. All cities and towns are required by the State of California to plan for the development of new housing. The Town of Woodside is ...

but when I click on it, I get:

The public can't comment if the public can't even find the draft.
It isn't a contest. Enjoy the ride.
May 26, 2022

Re: Constraints on Building Multifamily Housing

Dear Mr. Schaan:

The Woodside Draft Housing Element should list sites for low income housing that are already zoned for low income housing, analyze the process of building multi-family housing in Woodside, and identify constraints on building multi-family housing in Woodside. It does not.

Currently, Cañada College is the only site listed in the Housing Element for multi-family low income housing. But Cañada College is not zoned for multi-family housing, and is not proposed to be re-zoned for multi-family housing, nor is any other site in Woodside. Instead, Cañada College has a “Multi-Family Residential Development Zone” overlay, which requires an applicant to get discretionary approval to develop a portion of the site at 10-20 du/acre. That is, an applicant has to apply for the zoning, and Woodside can reject the application. Any other parcel subsequently given this Multi-Family Residential Development overlay, either at the time of...
adoption of the Housing Element, or later when Woodside is not developing enough housing, would face the same hurdle.

No one has ever built a multi-family project in Woodside. When Cañada College, then entirely in Woodside, wanted to build some multi-family staff housing, the town boundary was moved so that the site was in Redwood City, to avoid having Woodside oversee the project. It is therefore unclear how the site approval is supposed to proceed.

According to the Woodside Residential Design Guidelines, which have the force of law, the applicant for a multi-family project must

1. Meet with the Planning Department;
2. Discuss the project with neighbors;
3. Submit an application for staff review for completeness;
4. *(Perhaps) meet with the Citizen Advisory Subcommittee, as directed by staff;
5. *Have a Conceptual Design Review hearing with the Architectural and Site Review Committee (ASRC);
6. *Have a Formal Design Review hearing with the Architectural and Site Review Committee; and/or
(Asterisks indicate public hearings.)

The site selection can be vetoed by the ASRC during their Conceptual or Formal phase, or by the Planning Commission. So either the process is that the applicant goes through the process twice, once for site selection and a second time to approve the buildings—which would be at least six hearings, one more than is allowed by SB
the architect has to design the buildings without knowing whether they're even allowed to use the site.

Site approval and project approval are no small task in Woodside. The site could be rejected for many subjective reasons, including:

1. The site is too visible from Highway 280 (Cañada College is on a hill overlooking Highway 280).
2. The site would not be “in keeping with and contribut[ing] to the rural character and aesthetics of the Town.”
3. A project on this site cannot “respect[] the character of scenic corridors and vistas.”
4. The necessary grading would not “preserve natural and scenic features.”
5. The site blocks a wildlife corridor.

If the applicant is allowed to build on the site, the project still faces a minefield of subjective constraints, as listed in the Design Guidelines. Woodside might not like the building placement. Maybe the parking or the garages aren’t hidden well enough. Maybe the building would create a silhouette against the sky when viewed from someone's house. Maybe the Planning Commission would decide that the building forms don't connect the residences to the hillside. Maybe the bulk would be deemed insufficiently limited.

Woodside is a town that in the past has been hostile to development; for example, recently Woodside purported to designate the entire town as a mountain lion sanctuary to evade state law. Therefore, this lengthy and complex approval process, with many opportunities for disapproval on subjective grounds, constitutes a considerable constraint on multi-family development.
Woodside must:

- **Include a Site Inventory in the Housing Element.** Currently there is none: Appendix G does not begin to comply with Gov. Code § 65583.2(b) as explained on p.7 of HCD’s Site Inventory Guidebook.

- **Satisfy its Low and Very Low Income requirement by listing sites that are actually zoned for 20 du/acre**, rather than sites that require discretionary approval for 20 du/acre on small portions of the site.

- **Reduce the constraints on building multi-family housing caused by the lengthy and subjective approval process.**

Sincerely,

Anne Paulson  
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements

Keith Diggs  
YIMBY Law
Sage Schaan, Principal Planner  
Town of Woodside  
Via email: sschaan@woodsidetown.org  
Cc: HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov

May 26, 2022

Re: ADUs and Woodside’s Low Income Housing Projections

Dear Mr Schaan:

Woodside must reduce the number of ADUs projected in the draft Housing Element, and change their affordability allocation to reflect the fact that Woodside ADUs are large and not likely to be Low/Very Low Income housing.

The Woodside Housing Element is projecting 213 new ADUs over the cycle,¹ 27 a year, far above the safe harbor of 14.7 based on the average over the last four years. The Town does not commit to any new actions to achieve this goal other than printing and distributing a brochure, publicizing names of builders who specialize in ADUs, and developing an amnesty program to permit existing non-permitted ADUs. Yet in the May 10 meeting, the Town acknowledged that many non-permitted ADUs cannot be offered amnesty because they have non-conforming sewer/septic systems, which are a safety issue. The projection of 27 ADUs per year is far too large and must be reduced to a number that can be justified.

¹ Draft Housing Element p 3-33.
Moreover, Woodside proposes to use the ABAG default allocation for income levels for ADUs, 30% to Very Low Income, 30% to Low Income, 30% to Moderate Income, and 10% to Above Moderate Income. This allocation is not appropriate for Woodside’s ADUs, because of their size.

The ABAG report on the Affordability of Accessory Dwelling Units justifies their default income allocation because “[g]iven their smaller size, typically between 400-1000 square feet . . . , [ADUs] frequently offer a housing option that is more affordable by design.”\(^2\) The median size of an ADU permitted in Woodside in 2021 was 1420 square feet;\(^3\) that is not a naturally affordable home in the Bay Area.

Furthermore, the ABAG report says that jurisdictions that have fair housing concerns—as Woodside’s draft Housing Element acknowledges it has\(^4\)—should consider using a more conservative allocation for ADU affordability.\(^5\)

Given the large size of Woodside’s new ADUs, and the fair housing issues in Woodside, the ADU affordability recommendations should be altered to ABAG’s more conservative affordability allocation: 5% Very Low Income, 30% Low Income, 50% Moderate Income, 15% Above Moderate Income.

Sincerely,

Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements

Keith Diggs
YIMBY Law

---

\(^2\) Draft Housing Element Appendix, pdf p. 109.
\(^3\) Id. at 157.
\(^4\) Id. at 222ff.
\(^5\) Id. at 110.
Sage Schaan, Principal Planner  
Town of Woodside  
Via email: sschaan@woodsidetown.org  
Cc: HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov

June 14, 2022

Re: Post-Certification Rezoning Programs in Draft Housing Element

Dear Mr. Schaan:

We commend Woodside for pledging in the Draft Housing Element to rezone certain sites if the town falls behind pace on its sixth-cycle housing targets (Draft, pp.3-30 and -38). We offer two ways to make this pledge a commitment. First, the Town should clarify how it measures the pace of production. Second, the Town must make lower income housing feasible on reserve sites.

I. The Town Should Clarify How It Measures the Pace of Production.

In the Draft’s discussion of strategies to meet the RHNA, Woodside mentions “monitor[ing] building permits issued on a yearly basis” (Draft, p.3-30; accord id. at 3-32). But in the Housing Programs, the Town commits merely to rezoning “if the Town is not on pace to meet RHNA Cycle 6 housing targets by the end of 2023” (id. at Draft, p.3-38, italics added). The rezoning program on p.3-38, unlike the strategy discussions on pp. 3-30 and -32, does not commit to any monitoring or rezoning later
in the cycle. The Town should commit to monitoring building permits at the end of 2023 and yearly thereafter.

Woodside then commits to upzoning three Town-owned sites to 10 du/acre if it falls behind its RHNA. (Id. at p.3-30.) The Town also says it “could ... rezone[]” one of five acres at 773 Cañada Road “for above moderate-income units.” (Ibid.) The Town should clarify that only net new building permits will count in pacing the Town’s production.

The Town’s annual permit metric should omit “pipeline” projects that already received permits in the fifth cycle. There are currently 28 homes listed in the pipeline. (See id. at table 3-5, p.3-33.) That leaves 300 units to be issued permits during the sixth cycle, meaning 38 homes per year. The Town should clarify it will keep that pace.

II. The Town Must Make Lower Income Housing Feasible on Reserve Sites.

The Town’s commitments also fail to make lower income housing feasible on reserve sites. There are two problems here.

First, to accommodate lower income housing, opportunity sites must be zoned at “Mullin density.” Recall that if the Town falls behind pace, it commits to rezone three Town-owned properties to 10 du/acre for lower income housing. (Draft, pp. 3-30 and -38.) This proposed density is too small for low income housing. State law requires lower income housing in Woodside to be zoned for 20 du/acre. (See Gov. Code, § 65583.2, subds. (c)(3)(B)(iii), (f) [Mullin density for suburban jurisdictions].) The Town must plan for that higher density.

1 The Town should commit to rezone 773 Cañada Road now, rather than later, to account for the shortfall of sites we identified in our previous letter.
Second, the Town suggests, but does not commit to, a “partnership with an affordable housing developer” for its reserve sites. (Draft, p. 3-30.) As the owner of these sites, the Town can do more, and now, to attract such a partnership. Affordable housing developers often require densities \textit{above} 20 du/acre to cover their costs. The Town should be requesting proposals now for a partnership to deliver affordable units within eight years.

In sum, to make lower income housing feasible on reserve sites, the Town must commit to:

- Rezone reserve sites to 20 du/acre or greater, \textit{and}
- Find and partner with an affordable developer in the 6th Cycle to build lower income homes.

Sincerely,

Anne Paulson
Campaign for Fair Housing Elements

Keith Diggs
YIMBY Law
Dear Town Council Members,

Please find my letter attached.

Sincerely,

Paul John Poletti  
Woodside Resident 33 years
FREDOM IS THE POSSESSESION OF THOSE ALONE WHO HAVE THE COURAGE TO DEFEND IT!

This is the most important Town Council Vote in the history of our Town. The Town Council, if they vote to approve this Low-Income Housing Project including a percentage of Very Low-Income housing, referred to as “affordable housing” “managed by the State”, will turn the Town's local authority and Woodside’s sovereignty over to the State.

The number one job of any Town Council is to protect all our Individual Property Rights. Our Town Council Members swore an oath to protect not only our Enumerated Rights, but also all of our Individual Property Rights. Property Rights are not second-class Rights, they enjoy the same status as any of the Enumerated Rights such as freedom of speech!

Why else would we have a Town Council, Building Department, and Planning Department, if not to protect all the residents’ Individual Property Rights?

When we purchase property, we are purchasing a bundle of Rights to that property. Private ownership of property is the foundation of our Country.

Why?

When my grandparents came to this Country in 1905 they purchased 20 acres in Colma, California and started a farm. This farm made them independent, and self-sufficient. They were never dependent on our government for their existence. This is truly living the American dream! Freedom and independence through private ownership of property is the foundation of this country.

Private ownership of real estate has created more wealth, for more people, than any other vehicle for accumulating wealth! The State of California has eviscerated R1 zoning. The State legislators voted to undermine the Rights of millions of residential property owners in the State of California, without the consent of the people most affected.

R1 zoning was part of the contract we signed when we purchased our properties. When we purchased our residential properties, these properties were zoned R1. With a stroke of a pen, the California legislature changed all of
that, destabilizing the entire residential real estate market, the foundation of our country.

The State and local Authority, including our Town Council, believe with a stroke of a pen, they can change the zoning of any property in a residential neighborhood without consequence and without the consent of the governed, the people most affected.

Is there any consideration for the consequences of the impact of their decision on the residents, the property owners most affected? You be the judge.

When any government employee or government entity violates a Citizen’s Rights under the color of law, that person or persons can be held personally liable.

The US Constitution and State Constitution protect Individual Citizen’s Rights, including Property Rights, from the whims of an arbitrary, capricious, and transitory Government whether Federal, State or Local.

We are not Subjects. We are American Citizens, we have Rights. Subjects are the property of the State, they have no Rights. Because Subjects have no Rights their Governmental authority can impose its will on them without consequence.

Our founding fathers fought the revolutionary war ... resulting in the greatest legal documents ever written. These enumerated Rights distinguish Citizens from Subjects.

The US Constitution and the California State Constitution are shields, protecting all of us individually from people in Authority, people who believe we are their subjects and find our protestations tiresome, and irrelevant. They truly believe if they have the votes, they can impose their will on us... without consequence, after all who's to stop them?

The number one job of any Town Council is to protect its Citizens’ Individual Property Rights.
*Our Town Council Members swore an oath to protect our Rights.
As property owners in this Town, **we demand to be treated equally** without prejudice. Equal protection under the law is guaranteed by both the 5th Amendment and 14th Amendment.

*In the 1934 the F.D.R. Administration as part of the New Deal, created the Federal Housing Administration, which included the creation of Fannie Mae loans. Another New Deal measure was the creation of the National Housing Act, meant to improve housing conditions, and make housing and mortgages more accessible and affordable, and to reduce the foreclosure rate during the Great Depression.*

To reduce foreclosures all lending institutions in the United States were compelled by Federal law to draw lines around areas in their cities that were considered high risk districts and having a low probability of these Federally guaranteed loans being paid back.

This was commonly referred to as: Redlining

This remained Federal law until 1961 when the Supreme Court ruled that Redlining was unconstitutional.

Why?

These Redlining districts were largely made up of minority races, however the Supreme Courts decision had little to do with minority status or skin color.

The Supreme Court ruled that the people inside these Redline districts were being treated differently than the districts outside of these Redline districts. The people inside these Redline districts were entitled to Equal Protection Under the Law as guaranteed by both the 5th Amendment and the 14th Amendment.

What is equal protection of the law?

*equal protection*, in United States law, the constitutional guarantee that no person or group will be denied the protection under the law that is enjoyed by similar persons or groups. In other words, persons similarly situated must be similarly treated. Equal protection is extended when the rules of law are applied equally in all like cases and when persons are exempt from obligations greater than those imposed upon others in like circumstances. The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, one of
FREEDOM IS THE POSSESSION OF THOSE ALONE WHO HAVE THE COURAGE TO DEFEND IT!

three amendments adopted in the immediate aftermath of the American Civil War (1861–65), prohibits states from denying to any person “the equal protection of the laws.”

The Town Council has decided that the Raymundo Drive neighborhood will have to the bear the burden for the rest of the Town with the building of a Low-Income Housing Project. Have you noticed that none of the Town Council Member’s or Planning Commission Member’s neighborhoods are affected by the placement of this Low-Income Housing project in our neighborhood?

Let that sink in.

Ask yourself is the Raymundo Drive neighborhood being treated differently than all the other neighborhoods in the Town of Woodside?

Let’s ask our fellow Citizens if they believe building Low-Income Housing Project on the corner of the only entrance and exit to Raymundo Drive will have a negative effect on our property values?

A Realtor selling any home in the Raymundo Drive neighborhood will have to disclose that the Town plans to build a Low-Income Housing Project, managed by the State, on the corner of the only entrance and exit to those properties. Prospective buyers, once hearing the words, Low-Income Housing Project, won’t be able to get back to their car fast enough.

Our Raymundo Drive neighborhood is being treated differently than all the other neighborhoods in the Town of Woodside. The Town Council and Planning Commissioners have selectively excluded their own neighborhoods and have transferred the entire burden of Low-Income Housing to the Raymundo Drive neighborhood.

There’s only one way around this blatant discrimination of the Raymundo Drive neighborhood.
The Town Council would have to approve the building of Low-Income Housing Projects in every neighborhood in Woodside, with no exclusion of
FREDOM IS THE POSSESSESSION OF THOSE ALONE WHO HAVE THE COURAGE TO DEFEND IT!

any property, or exclude the Raymundo Drive neighborhood. We demand equal protection under the law.

Let's ask my fellow citizens if they believe the Town Council’s actions by approving this low income housing project will likely lead to a discrimination lawsuit in Federal Court?

Why wouldn’t the residents in the Raymundo Drive neighborhood file for relief.

After all, the Supreme Court already ruled on this.

Paul John Poletti
Raymundo Drive Resident for 33 years

*All government employees including the military swear an oath with very similar wording.

I solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter: So help me God.
Dear Town Council members,

Please find attached my letter regarding the State’s Housing Mandate.

My best to you,

Susan Poletti
Resident of Woodside since 1989
June 30, 2022

Dear Town Council Members,

The Supreme Court in 2019 ruled unanimously that the Constitution’s prohibition on excessive fines also applies to state and local governments, limiting their abilities to impose financial penalties. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg delivered the opinion of the Court that the Eighth Amendment’s excessive fines clause protects against government retribution at all levels. To fine Woodside, or any town, up to $100,000.00 per month for noncompliance is government retribution and the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that these fines are unconstitutional.

“For good reason, the protection against excessive fines has been a constant shield throughout Anglo-American history. Exorbitant tolls undermine other constitutional liberties,” Ginsburg wrote. “Excessive fines can be used, for example to retaliate against or chill the speech of political enemies.” She added, “Even absent a political motive, fines may be employed in a measure out of accord with the penal goals of retribution and deterrence.”

Oxford defines deterrence as "the action of discouraging an action or event through instilling doubt or fear of the consequences". The state threatens to impose excessive fines in order to force Woodside to comply with their state mandates. The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that imposing fines as a deterrent violates the Eight Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The Town Council does not have to bow down to the bullying
tactics of the state. If the state mandates were right and just, the state would not have to threaten fines as intimidation to force Woodside to comply. When people know what you fear they can control you.

The U.S. Constitution was not written by we, the government, it was written by we, the people, as a contract to establish and limit the powers of governing institutions. We are not subjects of our government we are citizens. The U.S. Constitution grants specific powers from the people to the government and it places particular limits on the government. Simply put, it spells out what the government can and cannot do.

Instead of trying to appease the tyrant, in this case the State of California, why don’t we use the U.S. Constitution and go on the offensive and fight this Affordable Housing mandate. It is clear that the longer we comply with the tyranny of the state, the worse this is going to get. Just look at the increase in housing units requested of us, and other towns and cities, in this cycle. I shudder to think of the amount to be imposed on us in the next cycle. Appeasement and compliance only embolden tyrants and bullies.

You do not have to give up the sovereignty of Woodside to the State of California. We have nine million dollars in the town’s bank account and allocating funds to fight this mandate would be the highest and best use of our taxpayer dollars you as a Council Member could ever allocate. **There has never been a more just reason to spend our taxpayer dollars than in the defense of our neighborhoods.**

The Supreme Court also ruled that claiming a Civil Rights Violation, (the State of California has violated our Civil Rights
by violating the Eighth Amendment); we can file this lawsuit in Federal Court, bypassing a state court.

**The Town Council is no longer under a time crunch** to make a bad decision and violate our Woodside General Plan. Say no to the state. You have nothing to fear as we the citizens of Woodside make up the Town of Woodside and the state cannot violate our Constitutional Right as protected by the Eight Amendment. It is unconstitutional for the state to excessively fine the citizens of Woodside, in other words, the town.

You need the consent of the governed, we the property owners of Woodside. You do not have our consent to make any decision that would desecrate the rural character of our neighborhoods or violate our Town’s General Plan.

We are the land of the free because of the brave. Stand up and fight the tyranny of the state. Protect our Woodside neighborhoods.

Susan Poletti
Citizen of Woodside since 1989
Dear Ramzi,

Our Town Manager, Kevin Bryant, has been speaking with Dr. Richard Storti, Executive Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chancellor’s Office, San Mateo County Community College District.

Warmest regards,
Jackie

Jackie C. Young, AICP CEP
Planning Director
Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
(650) 851-6790
jyoung@woodsidetown.org

"The best way to predict the future ... is to create it."

Got it, thanks Jackie. Is there a contact person / point at Canada you've been interacting with?

Thank you

On Tue, Jun 21, 2022 at 6:27 PM Jackie Young <JYoung@woodsidetown.org> wrote:

Dear Ramzi,

Thank you for contacting us with your question. Cañada College is preparing a Master Plan. There is currently no specific identified location for the needed housing on campus.
Hi Jackie,

Hope you are doing well. We live at [redacted] Pl, Woodside, CA 94062 and received a notice regarding the new construction planning for the new housing developments. We are near Canada College, but there were no details on where the multi-family units within Canada college were planned.

Do you have any more specific details on where within Canada college the construction is planned?
Thanks
Dear Ramzi,

As I mentioned in my previous email, Cañada College is preparing a Master Plan. There is currently no specific identified location for the needed housing on campus.

When the College has something more specific, I can contact you.

Warmest regards,

Jackie

Jackie C. Young, AICP CEP
Planning Director
Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA  94062
(650) 851-6790
jyoung@woodsidetown.org

"The best way to predict the future ... is to create it."

Thanks Jackie. I tried emailing Dr. Richard a few times but have not heard back.

I know a number of residents in this area are concerned about where specifically in Canada the proposed site would be. Adding 80 multi-family, very low income units (likely college kids), up the road is concerning. It's hard to assess the impact of this without having some more clarity on the specific sites being considered.

Would it be possible if the Town could request from Canada College to share their proposed sites by the July 12th meeting?

Thanks
On Wed, Jun 22, 2022 at 8:22 AM Jackie Young <JYoung@woodsidetown.org> wrote:

Dear Ramzi,

Our Town Manager, Kevin Bryant, has been speaking with Dr. Richard Storti, Executive Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chancellor's Office, San Mateo County Community College District.

Warmest regards,

Jackie

Jackie C. Young, AICP CEP
Planning Director
Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
(650) 851-6790
jyoung@woodsidetown.org

"The best way to predict the future ... is to create it."

From: Ramzi Ramsey
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 8:18 PM
Dear Ramzi,

Thank you for your email.

The video you attached is the final community forum held for the SMCCD Facilities Master Plan on 5/6/22. This Plan has a ten-year horizon. (The Woodside Housing Element has an 8-year horizon, 2023-2031.)

Minute 12 describes (site plan) “Planned Projects” at Cañada College for the 2023-2027 Five-year Capital Construction Plan, which includes: B13, Classrooms; and B3, Performing Arts.

Minute 20 describes (site plan) a “Long Term Vision” for Cañada College. This includes employee housing, student housing and student (family) housing. These sites have been described as “potential” sites by Mitchell Bailey in his email of 5/23/22, which was copied to us in response to a Housing Element comment we received. There is/are currently no specific housing project proposal(s). I have attached the slide from their Forum presentation which shows “potential” dashed areas for housing.

I have yet to receive the final Master Plan from the SMCCD. Their last posting was the 5/6/22 forum:
https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php

Warmest regards,
Jackie

Jackie C. Young, AICP CEP
Planning Director
Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA 94062
(650) 851-6790
jyoung@woodsidetown.org

"The best way to predict the future ... is to create it."

From: Ramzi Ramsey
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 11:23 PM
To: Jackie Young <JYoung@woodsidetown.org>
Cc: Kevin Bryant <KBryant@woodsidetown.org>
Subject: Re: Draft Cycle 6: Question

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
Hi Jackie
Dr. Richard shared their campus master plan, which was presented last month. Please forward to minute 21 of the video and you'll get a visual of the plans.

https://smccd.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=7d95a512-4601-47f2-8945-ae9201080305

I know a number of the neighbors (especially myself) will have an issue with the proposed site of the employee housing. I'm coordinating with Canada college on how best to share our feedback on the sites (the other locations seem reasonable as they are tucked away within their campus). You may want to consider sharing or including a screenshot of these locations during the July 12th session

Ramzi

On Mon, Jun 27, 2022 at 2:16 PM Jackie Young <JYoung@woodsidetown.org> wrote:

Dear Ramzi,

As I mentioned in my previous email, Cañada College is preparing a Master Plan. There is currently no specific identified location for the needed housing on campus.

When the College has something more specific, I can contact you.

Warmest regards,

Jackie

Jackie C. Young, AICP CEP
Planning Director
Town of Woodside
P.O. Box 620005
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA  94062
(650) 851-6790
jyoung@woodsidetown.org

"The best way to predict the future ... is to create it."
Thanks Jackie. I'm speaking with Richard tomorrow and will let you know what I hear / learn

Best  
Ramzi

On Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 12:55 AM Jackie Young <JYoung@woodsidetown.org> wrote:

Dear Ramzi,

Thank you for your email.

The video you attached is the final community forum held for the SMCCD Facilities Master Plan on 5/6/22. This Plan has a ten-year horizon. (The Woodside Housing Element has an 8-year horizon, 2023-2031.)

Minute 12 describes (site plan) “Planned Projects” at Cañada College for the 2023-2027 Five-year Capital Construction Plan, which includes: B13, Classrooms; and B3, Performing Arts.

Minute 20 describes (site plan) a “Long Term Vision” for Cañada College. This includes employee housing, student housing and student (family) housing. These sites have been described as “potential” sites by Mitchell Bailey in his email of 5/23/22, which was copied to us in response to a Housing Element comment we received. There is/are currently no specific housing project proposal(s). I have attached the slide from their Forum presentation which shows “potential” dashed areas for housing.

I have yet to receive the final Master Plan from the SMCCCD. Their last posting was the 5/6/22 forum:  
https://www.smccd.edu/facilities/masterplan.php

Warmest regards,
Dear Ms. Young,

Thank you for your courtesy notice about the Town of Woodside’s proposed development of Parcel 068-322-390. I am writing to make you aware of an agreement between the Town of Woodside and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association relating to the “Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval” which would prohibit the proposed development. At the time of the development of Barkley Park, the Town of Woodside Planning Commission and the local Redwood City community reached an agreement in good faith that acknowledged the impact on our neighborhood of the additional noise and traffic and the importance of preserving open space and provided clear restrictions against further development. It was subsequently updated by the Town of Woodside Planning Commission to acknowledge the environmental sensitivity of the land and the need to avoid development to protect an endangered butterfly species.

I’ve attached copies of the documents and would like to draw your attention specifically to Exhibit A:

- Sections 9 and 20 which place restrictions on traffic and noise to the area.
- Section 23 which commits to maintaining the area as open space in perpetuity:
  
  “A deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than the walking path and utility line associated with the initial construction of the park.”

- Section 26 which commits to planting trees. The Town of Woodside later stated it could not plant the trees as agreed upon because it was discovered to be an environmentally sensitive area and necessary for the preservation of an endangered species of butterfly.

We all acknowledge the importance of thoughtful development, offering low-income housing in our community, and the need to comply with state regulations, however as you can see, this parcel of land is not a viable option for a variety of reasons.

1. It is restricted by a legal agreement and prior commitment to the local community.
2. It is needed for the preservation of open space on the Peninsula.
3. It is a uniquely sensitive environment space and home to an endangered butterfly species, something deemed so delicate and precious at one point that the Planning Commission didn’t even want to plant trees on this land, much less develop it.
4. Development of this land, given its history and the above factors and commitments, would meaningfully damage the Town of Woodside Planning Commission’s reputation for negotiating in good faith and the trust that local communities could place in it.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Maria Reiling & Reza Jamei

[Redacted] Court

Redwood City, CA 94061

Attachments:

- Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit and Exhibit A
- Printable copy of this letter in Word

--

Maria Reiling
June 26, 2022
Housing Element Update 2023-2031
To: Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director

Dear Ms. Young,

Thank you for your courtesy notice about the Town of Woodside’s proposed development of Parcel 068-322-390. I am writing to make you aware of an agreement between the Town of Woodside and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association relating to the “Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval” which would prohibit the proposed development. At the time of the development of Barkley Park, the Town of Woodside Planning Commission and the local Redwood City community reached an agreement in good faith that acknowledged the impact on our neighborhood of the additional noise and traffic and the importance of preserving open space and provided clear restrictions against further development. It was subsequently updated by the Town of Woodside Planning Commission to acknowledge the environmental sensitivity of the land and the need to avoid development to protect an endangered butterfly species.

I’ve attached copies of the documents and would like to draw your attention specifically to Exhibit A:

- Sections 9 and 20 which place restrictions on traffic and noise to the area.
- Section 23 which commits to maintaining the area as open space in perpetuity:
  
  “A deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than the walking path and utility line associated with the initial construction of the park.”

- Section 26 which commits to planting trees. The Town of Woodside later stated it could not plant the trees as agreed upon because it was discovered to be an environmentally sensitive area and necessary for the preservation of an endangered species of butterfly.

We all acknowledge the importance of thoughtful development, offering low-income housing in our community, and the need to comply with state regulations, however as you can see, this parcel of land is not a viable option for a variety of reasons.

1. It is restricted by a legal agreement and prior commitment to the local community.
2. It is needed for the preservation of open space on the Peninsula.
3. It is a uniquely sensitive environment space and home to an endangered butterfly species, something deemed so delicate and precious at one point that the Planning Commission didn’t even want to plant trees on this land much less develop it.
4. Development of this land, given its history and the above factors and commitments, would meaningfully damage the Town of Woodside Planning Commission’s reputation for negotiating in good faith and the trust that local communities could place in it.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Maria Reiling

Attachment: Barkley Fields Conditional Use Permit and Exhibit A
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 - 002

BEING A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE FINDING THAT THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, CUP 2004-002, FOR THE OPERATION OF A PUBLIC PARK (BARKLEY FIELDS AND PARK) LOCATED AT 5001 FARM HILL BOULEVARD (APNs: 068-322-330 & 068-322-360) AND MODIFYING CONDITIONS TO ALLOW AMPLIFIED MUSIC AT ANNUAL ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS AT THE PARK.

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2004, the Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002, to establish a public park (Barkley Fields and Park) in the SR (Suburban Residential) Zoning District; and,

WHEREAS, Condition 9 of CUP 2004-002 requires that the Planning Commission review the Conditional Use Permit at a noticed public hearing two years after the park construction project has been accepted by the Town from the construction contractor, or after two fall seasons of play by authorized league teams; and,

WHEREAS, two fall seasons of play have been completed; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Condition 9 of CUP 2004-02, the Town had updates prepared to the traffic and noise studies which were originally prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration circulated on March 31, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Woodside has requested modifications of Conditions 6, 16, and 19 to allow the use of amplified music at annual anniversary celebrations at the park; and,

WHEREAS, on January 20, 2010, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the compliance with Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings, as further discussed, detailed and supported by the Planning Commission staff report of January 20, 2010:

1. The Town is in compliance with Conditional Use Permit, CUP 2004-002, for the operation of a public park (Barkley Fields and Park) at 5001 Farm Hill Boulevard.

2. Allowing the use of amplified music at annual anniversary celebrations will not have a significant negative impact on adjacent properties.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission hereby modifies Conditions 6, 16, and 19 of CUP 2004-002 as follows:

6. There shall be no sound amplification utilized on site.
16. No amplified sound shall be permitted in the park, except as allowed by Condition 19.
19. The Town may utilize the park facilities for one Town-sponsored “Park Opening” celebration,
after construction is completed and before it is put into public use, and on an annual anniversary basis thereafter. The Town shall ensure the management and control of this event in a manner that would have minimal, if any, impact upon the Homeowners. For example, to address parking and traffic concerns, participants shall be shuttled to the park from Town Center. To ensure compliance with this, no parking shall be allowed on the site except for delivery and other essential vehicles; Farm Hill Boulevard and the entrance to Woodhill Estates shall become “No Parking” zones for the day of the event, with ticketing and towing enforced, and the Town shall have an adequate number of Deputy Sheriffs specifically assigned to the event to enforce the parking restrictions. The use of amplified sound shall be limited to the official program, not Amplified sound may be used for an official program and amplified music may be used during any annual anniversary celebration. Formal notice of the event will be provided to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the property owner/resident at 75 Woodhill Drive at least thirty days prior to the event.

The modified Conditions of Approval for CUP 2004-002 are hereafter as listed in Exhibit A, “Barkley Fields and Park, 5001 Farm Hill Boulevard, Conditional Use Permit (CUP 2004-002), Conditions of Approval.”

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of January 2010, by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners: Elder, Voelke, Yost and Chair Thompson
NOES: Commissioners: None
ABSENT: Commissioners: Brasher, Hobson and McDevitt
ABSTAIN: Commissioners: None

APPROVED: 

Sandra Thompson, Chair

ATTEST: 

Planning Secretary
EXHIBIT A

BARKLEY FIELDS AND PARK
5001 FARM HILL BOULEVARD
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 2004-002)
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

As modified January 20, 2010

1. That the emergency access gate along Woodhill Drive be redesigned to mirror the fencing style that is proposed along that roadway and so as to prevent pedestrian access from Woodhill Drive.

2. That the trees planted along Farm Hill Blvd. be Valley Oaks or another species of oak.

3. That non-deciduous trees be utilized at the entry to the parking lot.

4. That a bike rack be located on the site so as to provide a secure place for the storage of bicycles.

5. That a hitching post be located on the site to accommodate any equestrians visiting the site.

6. [Not used.]

7. Outdoor lighting shall be limited to bollards not to exceed a height of 4.5 feet, with the location limited to the parking area. Prior to erecting the lights, the applicant shall provide a photometric survey demonstrating an average foot candle in the parking area of 1 foot candle with a maximum of 3 foot candles.

8. Only one play structure, similar to the one that is in Woodside Elementary School’s kindergarten yard and only one swing set that includes two (2) bucket swings and two (2) regular swings shall be constructed at the park. No other play structures will be added to the park.

9. Pursuant to Woodside Municipal Code Section 153.252 (C), the Conditional Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a noticed public hearing two (2) years after the park construction project has been accepted by the Town from the construction contractor, or after two (2) fall seasons of play by authorized organized league teams. Prior to this review, the Town shall cause updates to the traffic and noise studies contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration to be prepared by licensed professionals. The review shall focus upon actual impact of park operations on the Woodhill Estate neighborhood, including, but not limited to, a review of noise and traffic generated by the park use. This will also include a review of the impact of field usage by specific individual organized league teams. During the public hearing, the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and others may present evidence regarding the impacts of the project. If no impacts or only insignificant impacts are identified, the Town may add picnic tables to the park, subject to any applicable permitting processes. If impacts are identified, the Town will take all reasonable and necessary steps to mitigate these impacts. If the impacts cannot be mitigated or the Town and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association fail to reach agreement about the potential impacts and their mitigation, the Town shall schedule a revocation hearing before the Planning Commission pursuant to Section 153.254 of the Woodside Municipal Code.

10. The Town shall manage the scheduling of usage of the playfield through a formal application process, including requirements for security deposits by field users and adherence to all Town policies, regulations, and laws. The Town shall include a provision in field usage regulations that the failure of authorized field users to comply with all Town policies, regulations, and laws will result in suspension of privilege of field use.

11. The Town shall only accept and approve field usage applications from official, organized youth leagues that serve the residents of the Town of Woodside. No other reservations shall be permitted.
Other teams, including adult teams, may use the field on a first come, first served basis during those times when the field has not been reserved.

12. The Town will provide the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association with quarterly reports detailing the specifics of field usage applications received and approved, including types of sport, age categories, and any specific usage conditions imposed as a basis for approval of the application and advance quarterly schedules of the planned usage of the fields.

13. Reservations for the use of the fields shall include a one-hour interval between scheduled events.

14. The park shall not be used for tournament play, except that single tournament games may be scheduled in which an official youth league team that serves the residents of the Town of Woodside is a participant and that meet all Town operating policies, regulations, and laws.

15. No barbeque grills shall be installed by the Town and portable grills and/or fires of any kind will be prohibited in the park.

16. No amplified sound shall be permitted in the park, except as allowed by Condition 19.

17. No alcohol shall be permitted in the park.

18. The Town shall not approve the use of any part of the park facility, other than youth sports, for private or commercial purposes, including, but not limited to, weddings, concerts, reunions, private sports lessons, and private club activities.

19. The Town may utilize the park facilities for one Town-sponsored “Park Opening” celebration, after construction is completed and before it is put into public use, and on an annual anniversary basis thereafter. The Town shall ensure the management and control of this event in a manner that would have minimal, if any, impact upon the Homeowners. For example, to address parking and traffic concerns, participants shall be shuttled to the park from Town Center. To ensure compliance with this, no parking shall be allowed on the site except for delivery and other essential vehicles; Farm Hill Boulevard and the entrance to Woodhill Estates shall become “No Parking” zones for the day of the event, with ticketing and towing enforced, and the Town shall have an adequate number of Deputy Sheriffs specifically assigned to the event to enforce the parking restrictions. Amplified sound may be used for an official program and amplified music may be used during any annual anniversary celebration. Formal notice of the event will be provided to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the property owner/resident at 75 Woodhill Drive at least thirty days prior to the event.

20. “No Park Parking” and “No Park Access” signs will be installed on Woodhill Drive. The curb on the west side of Woodhill Drive will be posted with “No Parking” signs and be painted red from the intersection with Farm Hill Boulevard to the Town limits.

21. The park shall be closed one-half hour after sunset and shall be patrolled during both open and closed hours by a private security company to be hired by the Town to ensure the security of the facility and to ensure compliance with park operating regulations, including those operating regulations that emanate from the park’sConditional Use Permit.

22. There shall be no lighting in the park except for security lighting in the parking area.

23. A deed restriction shall be placed upon the Town’s current parcel on Woodhill Drive (APN 068-322-390) designating that the parcel shall be maintained as open space in perpetuity, with no improvements other than the walking path and utility line associated with the initial construction of the park.

24. The fencing around the perimeter of the project facing Woodhill Drive shall be a like material to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association’s fencing.

25. The Town shall plant the initial landscaping outside the project’s proposed fence on Woodhill Drive in landscape materials that are of a type and design acceptable to the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association. The installation of the landscape materials will not be undertaken until the landscape
phase of the project is underway. The Town shall thereafter grant the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association an encroachment permit to maintain the landscaping and irrigation along Woodhill Drive. 26. Subject to the agreement of the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association and the Town Manager, the Project plans shall be revised to incorporate the planting of additional and larger trees by the Town near the drainage swale on the southeast corner of the Fields.
-----Original Message-----
From: Pam Roberts
Sent: Saturday, May 21, 2022 1:14 PM
To: Town Hall email <townhall@woodsidetown.org>
Cc: Mark Dickey Helen Miller
Subject: Town council meeting May 24

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Town Council and Town Staff,

Thank you for sending out an email containing all of the documents regarding the Draft Housing Element.

I would like to request a summary of decisions that have been made by the town council be provided by you to town residents as the length and breadth of all of the email documents is quite overwhelming.
For those not accustomed to governmental documents and jargon it would be immensely helpful to have a summary so that we can see what you have agreed upon for cycle 6 and how it differs from the last cycle.

Thank you for your consideration,
Pam Roberts

Sent from my iPad
Dear Woodside Town Council Members-

At the town council meeting on 5/10/2022, we were surprised to learn that there were plans in the works to create a zoning overlay of our property at 3110 Woodside Road in order to comply with California housing requirements. It was explained that this overlay would allow for 20 units per acre (which was later lowered to 10 units per acre at the same council meeting). This overlay would be placed on our property as well as adjacent properties. It is clear that this plan was quickly developed and without the input of the residents/property owners in the proposed Commercial Corridor, at least not on record. No one from the town or town council reached out to us, as property owners, to see if we would be interested in developing our land to help meet the town’s housing requirements.

Though we support the town’s efforts to comply with the RHNA, we are not interested in developing our property beyond our current plans of adding an ADU, rebuilding our barn for livestock, and adding a small non-habitable structure. We have painstakingly been stewards of our land, following town plans and ASRB recommendations during our land improvements. We have kept the rural character of the property to match what originally attracted us to Woodside. We purchased this property with the intention of raising our children here and living out our lives in Woodside. We have no intention of building units on our property to satisfy the town of Woodside’s housing requirements, and we have no intention of selling to allow this to happen.

We have discussed this zoning overlay with neighbors who have come to the same conclusion that we have; that this zoning overlay has no feet under it, and to propose it to the state of California as potential sites for 10 units per acre would be disingenuous.

We understand that the Town of Woodside is in a tricky position in having to submit something to the State of California, but in the words of Council Member Chris Shaw, one of the developers of the now dubbed “Shawkowski” proposal, in reference to a nearby town’s Housing Element, “The plan can’t just be B.S.”. Submitting this plan, as is, to the state, knowing that this zoning overlay is opposed by the affected landowners would be just that.
This Commercial Corridor plan has the potential to alter properties that have added to the rural nature of Woodside. Three of the six properties listed have visible barns from Woodside Road and two others have barns set back on their properties. Allowing for 10 units per acre would erode that “visible ruralness”, a part of what makes Woodside unique in the Bay Area. The power to rezone private property is a serious responsibility that should be done carefully, and sparingly. It can result in major reductions in the value of affected properties, leading to serious economic harms, and if done negligently, can end in legal liabilities for the city. Adding a zoning overlay to six properties with the hope that one of them might be redeveloped, and no guarantee that it will result in any new housing units, is an irresponsible use of rezoning power. Altering zoning should be done with a scalpel; this plan would be altering zoning with a sledgehammer.

Even though council members are on record as stating that the zoning overlay would account for 10 units in the current cycle, the fact that the zoning overlay allows for 10 units per acre has the appearance of council members hoping that the Commercial Corridor properties could be a source of future ‘below the line’ housing unit padding for future cycles. Many residents spoke up at the May 10th town council meeting about added congestion that many proposed sites would create. Adding the potential of over 100 units (10 per acre on 10 acres of land in the Commercial Corridor plan) could add upwards of 200 vehicles trying to enter/cross Woodside Road. Not only would this add congestion directly into the already congested bottleneck of town, but it would also add multiple vehicles crossing our Safe Routes to School and add traffic in front of the fire station, slowing their response times. Placement of high-density housing in this area of the town center is irresponsible.

The zoning overlay is further ill-advised given the statement on page G-4, "The town anticipates being able to meet its RHNA mandate with units developed under existing zoning." Jeopardizing the property values of existing homeowners who have no intention of selling their properties, which the Town admits will not be necessary anyway to meet its RHNA mandate, is glaringly irresponsible.

The plan calls for new housing to be located within walking distance of the Town Center. While locating housing within walking distance of a sizeable downtown could reduce vehicle traffic, Woodside is a small town and has limited services and businesses in the town center. The majority of daily trips (for work, shopping, school drop-offs, health care visits, etc.) will still require leaving the Town Center, and given the absence of public transportation in Woodside, the majority of those trips will be car trips. In short, centralizing new housing units near the Town Center would not substantially reduce private vehicle trips in the city, and it would in fact increase the vehicle trips beginning and ending downtown. This contradicts the stated goal of not adversely affecting the existing neighborhood character (page G-5).

Encouraging higher density housing can be an effective means of increasing housing supply without drastically altering the town for existing residents. And sometimes a city's downtown area can be a good place for this, when the following factors are present:

- Underutilized commercial or industrial buildings which could be converted to housing
- Significant retail businesses and services in walking distance of the planned housing, which can reduce vehicle trips
- Transit stations or bus routes within walking distance of the planned developments
- Ability to locate the new high-density housing in ways that minimize the impacts on existing nearby residents and the town as a whole

The planned Commercial Corridor zoning overlay contains none of these suitability factors. On the contrary:

- There are no underutilized buildings on the properties slated to add the zoning overlay; in fact, the plan targets occupied homes, throwing all the included properties into uncertainty with no guarantee of the intended results--actual new housing.
- There are very few retail businesses or services in Woodside's downtown area. If dozens of the housing units Woodside manages to create are located on some of these six properties, it will further concentrate the town's
vehicle traffic in its busiest area, which includes an active fire station, and an elementary school just beyond. Very few of the vehicle trips of the new residents would be walking trips.

- There are zero bus stops or other public transport options in downtown Woodside, meaning 100% of the vehicle trips the new units' residents take to destinations outside of Woodside will begin and end in this short, already busy stretch of Woodside Road
- If one or two of the six properties are redeveloped, the impacts on the other residents will be enormous and disproportionate; dozens of units, and the accompanying noise and other impacts, would spring up directly adjacent to, and possibly on both sides of, these single-family lots which for years the Town has required its owners to follow the very opposite rules on density, setbacks, etc.

Rezoning or zoning overlay of this nature requires due diligence that includes engineering, infrastructure, and other studies to determine how appropriate and feasible high-volume, high-density housing in this location would be, plus hearings where the public can learn the details and weigh in—not to bog the process down but to ensure the plan passes at least a basic threshold of appropriateness. But dropping the Commercial Corridor rezoning plan into the Housing Element without any of this, which is what has taken place, borders on the negligent. It needs to be said that any future rezoning or zoning overlay discussions should include the property owners. Offering property owners a few minutes during an open session of a council meeting is not a sufficient amount of time for discourse on decisions that could negatively and significantly affect us as property owners on multiple levels.

Woodside is sparsely populated, compared to the rest of the Bay Area. The town's goals for new housing can be achieved without subjecting anyone to high-density housing right up to their fences. Encouraging ADUs, streamlining permitting, and leveraging Woodside's ample space can achieve new housing that doesn't concentrate vehicle congestion, create new problems downtown, or subject any families to numerous and disproportionate impacts. We oppose the Commercial Corridor zoning overlay plan and submitting this Housing Element Plan to the State of California including the Commercial Corridor zoning overlay, knowing that property owners have gone on the record to indicate that they have no intention of adding 10 units per acre, or any additional units for that matter, opens up the Town of Woodside to liabilities and would just be plain dishonest.

Torrey and Fiona

Road
Dear Mr. Schaan and members of the town Council,

My husband and I have serious concerns about the rezoning plans for the "Commercial Corridor" proposed in the Draft Housing Element.

We are currently working with our daughter and her family to build an ADU on her property at Road which is one of the six properties on Woodside Road proposed to be rezoned to allow construction of up to 10 units per acre. We have jumped through numerous hoops, designing the ADU to meet stringent requirements intended by the town to keep the property and its structures in line with those surrounding it, which has been both time consuming and expensive. But we trusted in the town's rules and process, and proceeded accordingly. The plans were submitted months ago and are awaiting approval.

Because my daughter's family has no intention of selling to a developer--they have put years of work into building their single-family house and putting the land into productive use--the new zoning overlay won't achieve any new housing on her property, but it may well result in one fewer housing unit in Woodside. Because if these six properties are rezoned to allow high-volume, high-density housing right up to the fence, on both sides of the property, my husband and I will not want to build this ADU. We wouldn't want to pour two years of work into building a little home to live out our retirement if at any point it could become surrounded by literally dozens of units.

We need new housing in Woodside, and we're willing to accept some changes if the burdens are evenly spread. But concentrating so many new units, so densely, right up against existing properties which have been developed following existing, low-density ordinances is bad town planning and completely unnecessary in a Town which is not lacking for space.

This part of the plan was dropped in without much analysis or consideration. We implore you to remove the Commercial Corridor rezoning from the draft Housing Element.

Sincerely,

Pauline and John Ryan,

Woodside.
Ms. Young,

In response to the courtesy notice sent to us in relation to the Drat Cycle 6 (2023-2031) Housing Element Update, attached our written comments on the proposal.

Respectfully,

Jacob and Valeria Shulman

[Redacted] Court
Redwood City, CA 94061
To Jackie Young, Town of Woodside Planning Director
Via E-mail: jyoung@woodsidetown.org

From Jacob and Valeria Shulman

Court, Redwood City, CA 94061

Comments on Courtesy Notice, Town of Woodside Housing Elements Update

We received a copy of the Courtesy Notice from our neighbor regarding proposed higher density and/or multi-family housing at Farm Hill, adjacent to Barkley Fields and Park. We reside in Woodhill Estates and our house located right next to the open space lot included in the proposal. We oppose to the proposal as it will negatively impact our quality of life and result in financial damage to us.

The open space serves as a sound barrier between our house and the Barkley Field and Park. The park operates from sunrise to sunset and serves the needs of youth soccer and little league baseball. It also has a playground and is the only Town’s park and playing fields. The park is attended by hundreds of visitors daily and is a source of significant noise as a result. Therefore, a sound barrier is required between the park and our house. The proposed development of the open space will not just remove the sounds barrier but will add to the level of noise either during the construction or thereafter. It will also significantly increase foot and car traffic in the neighborhood and right next to our house. As there are no nearby facilities for grocery shopping, dining, entertainment it will require new residents to travel to access these services.

Moreover, our house and the lot were designed specifically taking into account its location next to an open space. The house has very large windows and there is a pool on lot. The house was built mere 26 ft from the open space parcel and the pool is located between the house the parcel. Building high density / multi-unit residence right next to it will result in full visibility into our house and the back yard with the pool. It will prevent us from using this property as intended. As a result, this proposal will result in significant negative impact on our quality of life.

In addition, this parcel provides habitat for various birds, including owls, rare butterflies, frogs, raccoon, deer, mountain lions and other animals. This proposal will result in removal of large Eucalyptus trees growing on this parcel and destruction of the habitat.

Finally, the proposal violates the agreement between the Town of Woodside and the Woodhill Estates Homeowners Association reached for the construction of the Barkley Field Park as well as Sections 9, 20, 23 and 26 of The Conditional Use Permit filed with the deed for parcel 068-322-390.

For these reasons we believe the Town of Woodside should remove this proposal from consideration.

Regards,

Jacob and Valeria Shulman
Jackie Young

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2022 3:37 PM
To: Jackie Young
Cc: 
Subject: Woodside Draft Cycle Housing Element - Farm Hill
Attachments: CCF_000193.pdf

[CAUTION]: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jackie
Please see the attached PDF Letter Dated 7-1-22 regarding Woodside Draft Cycle Housing Element – Farm Hill.
Thank You

Victor Sloan
President – Victor Aviation Service, Inc.

The information contained in this transmission is considered privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above.
If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.
Jackie Young  
Planning Director  
Town of Woodside  
2955 Woodside Road, Woodside, Ca.  

July 1st, 2022  
DELIVERED BY HAND  

Reference: Woodside Draft Cycle (2023-2031) Housing Element – Farm Hill  

Dear Jackie,  

I strongly object to your inclusion of the “Farm Hill” parcel as a potential site for development in your Draft Housing Element.  

The Town Council, if they vote to approve this Low-Income Housing Project hereafter called Farm Hill, including a percentage of very Low-Income housing, referred to as “affordable housing,” may become a financial disaster for the Town of Woodside.  

If this Low-Income housing development were constructed it would cause a “Taking Away of Woodhill Estates and Woodside Hills Property Owners Property Assets by the diminution of their property values.” This is an “Inverse Condemnation” and governed by California Law. The homeowners affected would then be due just compensation.  

This housing development if approved could turn the homeowners in Woodhill Estates and Woodside Hills property owners into a large group of incredibly angry homeowners once they have been contacted and have reviewed their rights. Only a very small group of affected homeowners received the Town of Woodside’s Courtesy Notice on this matter.  

Has the Town of Woodside taken in and evaluated the risk of litigation costs and just compensation required to the affected homeowners of Woodside Hills and Woodhill Estates for the taking away of their property assets?  

All government employees as well as the Town Council are required to swear an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the US Constitution which lays out our Bill of Rights, and our Individual Property Rights.  

When we purchase property, we are purchasing a bundle of Rights to that property. Private ownership of property, including the bundle of Rights associated with any purchase of Real property is the foundation of our Country.  

The State of California and local Authority, including the Woodside Town Council, believe with a stroke of a pen, they can change the zoning of any property in a residential neighborhood arbitrarily and capriciously, without consequence and without the consent of the governed, the people most affected.
The Farm Hill site location falls into Woodside’s Zoning District as OSN Open Space for Natural Resources and is deed restricted by a Covenant Agreement Document #2009-151344 dated 11/17/2009 restricting development. There is no consideration for the consequences of the impact of their decision on the neighboring residents, wildlife, and the property owners most affected. It would appear that this Covenant has been ignored by the Town of Woodside.

The US Constitution and State Constitution protect Individual Citizen’s Rights, including Property Rights, from the whims of an arbitrary, capricious, and transitory Government decision whether Federal, State or Local.

As property owners, we demand to be treated equally without prejudice. Equal treatment under the law is guaranteed by both the 5th Amendment and 14th Amendment.

*equal protection, in United States law, the constitutional guarantee that no person or group will be denied the protection under the law that is enjoyed by similar persons or groups. In other words, persons similarly situated must be similarly treated. Equal protection is extended when the rules of law are applied equally in all like cases and when persons are exempt from obligations greater than those imposed upon others in like circumstances. The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, one of three amendments adopted in the immediate aftermath of the American Civil War (1861–65), prohibits states from denying to any person “the equal protection of the laws.”

The Town Council has arbitrarily and capriciously decided that the Woodhill Estates and Woodside Hills property owners will have to the bear the burden for the rest of the Town with the building of an Ultra Low-Income Housing Project. Does the Town Council have the Consent of the Governed, the property owners most affected? Our Constitution protects Individual Property Rights from mob rule.

Ask the people directly affected, the Woodhill Estates and Woodside Hills property owners, whether they believe they are being singed out with the burden of an Ultra Low-Income Housing Project proposed by the Town of Woodside. Is it a just coincidence that the Farm Hill Site just happens to be on the furthermost northern boundary of the Town of Woodside?

Are the Woodhill Estates Subdivision and Woodside Hills districts being treated differently than all the other neighborhood districts in the Town of Woodside?

Ask the owners of Woodhill Estates and Woodside Hills if they believe the Town Council’s actions, approving this Ultra Low-Income Housing Project in our districts, and excluding their own neighborhoods, would qualify as Redlining? The Supreme Court has already ruled Redlining as discriminatory, and therefore it violates Constitutional law.

Sincerely
Victor Sloan
Redwood City

Town Council Meeting
July 12, 2022
Dear Mr. Butler and Team,

I am a resident of Woodside, Road, near the 773 Canada Road property you recently purchased and plan to develop. Much has been discussed with the Town of Woodside on how to address the state’s requirements to increase affordable housing in our town. Since this property is a primary target to meet part of the 250 plus new residence required per the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for our town, I reaching out to ask that you stay true to your history and values and consider our community. Many of us agree the state needs more affordable housing. It is so painfully apparent even near your Redwood City corporate office where many of the homeless camps have sprung up, but to overdevelop this property near our home is not the answer.

Tuesday (6/21) we were evacuated due to the Edgewood Fire, which prompts me to write you today and ask for your consideration in planning development. Please leverage your 45 years of experience and help our community, specifically our neighborhood, by providing guidance to the town that will result in better planning for this property. Our neighbors are so fearful that your development will increase the fire danger and water shortage, and all that comes with over expansion of this area. Even your history with fire reconstruction might give you a sense of this impact.

I am asking you to become a part of the solution, NOT seen as part of the problem. Utilize your creative experience and collaborate with the community by offering advice and make suggestions on how to better approach these property development issues. Your expertise could even assist in reasonable asks to the state agencies.

We appreciate your consideration. There will be a Town Hall Meeting on Tuesday June 28th and it would be impactful if Mr. Butler or a senior representative could attend and participate in the discussion.

Meeting Information below.

Town Council Meeting
June 28th, 7 PM
Independence Hall
2955 Woodside Road
Woodside, CA.

Kind Regards,
MaryFrances Truebridge
Joe Browne

W. L. Butler | Full-Service General Contractor (wlbutler.com)
For over 45 years, W. L. Butler has approached every project with the same dedicated focus on quality, collaboration, and fairness. From our start in fire reconstruction to today's multifaceted approach to commercial construction, we have grown by delivering time and time again. Every project, regardless of the size or product type, is viewed with the same commitment to excellence. We started in the back of a pick up truck and today we build everything from corporate campuses to shopping centers. But we haven't forgotten where we came from or the lessons we learned along the way. Treat people right. Stand by your work. Live by your word. These values have shaped our history and always will.
To the Woodside Town Council,  
Please see attached.  
Thank you!  

Ripal  

--  
Ripal Vijaykumar Shreyas  
[redacted] Road  
Woodside, CA 94062

This email may contain information which is sensitive in nature, confidential, and or/privileged. Please be aware that emails are not guaranteed to be a secure form of communication and your confidentiality cannot be ensured. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately. No one other than the intended recipient is permitted to review, copy, disclose, disseminate, or use the contents of this message for any purpose. Unauthorized interception of this email message could be a violation of the law. Please do not use email for urgent communications including medical emergencies.
To the Woodside Town Council,

I am the current sole resident of [redacted] Road. It is my understanding that this property is being discussed in a plan for a zoning overlay. While the ownership and characterization of [redacted] Road is expected to occur on August 23, 2022 through the Superior Court of San Mateo, the purpose of this letter is intended to provide my perspective on this proposal by the Town of Woodside, in anticipation of your upcoming decision on the matter.

While I cannot imagine the tremendous stress that the Town faces due to the new developments from the RHNA, I perhaps ignorantly fail to recognize how the selection of several residential properties that are privately owned (without input from these residents), and a zoning overlay to allow these properties to build an arbitrarily selected number of 10 units per acre, suffices this requirement. It seems to me that there is a significant difference between allowing units to be built, and having units built. The new state requirements encourage additional units being constructed to increase housing options for our citizens. It is my understanding that none of the 6 properties in question intend to do so. Therefore, simply allowing units to be built, via a zoning overlay, does not appear to help the Town progress towards its long term goals or meeting the requirements that the state has set out, while also promoting tension and unwelcome strategizing within our neighborhood. This appears to be a lose-lose for all.

Selecting a home in which to live and raise children is not a decision many take lightly. A major factor, for many, is the micro-location of the home. Stripping residents of the ability to have certainty regarding what they are getting into not only removes the sense of safety and security that settling into a home often is intended to provide, but also makes for a tenuous reputation for the Town going forward. While the Town can obviously not be expected to be responsible for meeting and holding permanency to residents’ expectations, the current timeline of changes appears sudden, abrupt, and without due diligence. A change such as this seems plausible in a 20-30 year plan, but not in a 5-10 year plan. When changing the culture and aesthetic of a neighborhood, it would only be fair to allow residents to determine if the area still fits in with their values and priorities – these are decisions that cannot happen overnight.

Densely populated and metropolitan areas have their own benefits, yes, and those who have chosen to live in Woodside likely prioritize a rural community and dark skies. It seems ironic that a Town that will not allow string lights on a fence without a code permit, will allow 1 out of 5500 residents to make changes to their property that impact anyone that drives by and particularly those who live nearby. It doesn’t follow to have ordinances about the wattage of lights, but then also allow one resident to make a decision that affects the entire neighborhood. Additionally, allowing residents to make the choice regarding developing their property promotes a lack of transparency. While we should be working together to come up with solutions, this plan divides us and forces us into a game of chess where we must anticipate our neighbors’ moves and feel pressure to act before someone else does.

Aside from the effects on those of us in these 6 downtown properties, there are obvious concerns about the safety of the Town at large, if entry and exit from the fire station becomes difficult due
to increased congestion on Woodside Road, on top of an already high-traffic area near the school, library, and church. As a physician, I have concerns about my own ability to get to the hospital quickly, which was a major factor in selecting this property.

If I continue to reside here, I do not intend to build 10 units on this property. I am unable to fund the construction of these units myself, and have no desire to sell this land to a developer. What I can contribute to this issue, however, is offering my ADU as a rental unit, and I imagine there are 327 others in this Town who can offer the same. Rather than building new units, or purporting to allow units to be built, and pitting neighbors against one another, it makes more sense to use the units that are already here or waiting to be built – by waiving fees and limiting fines for getting ADUs up to code. This is a green solution that is better for the environment, and in line with the culture of the Town.

Thank you,

Ripal Vijaykumar Shreyas
Woodside, CA 94062
To whom it may concern,

The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) recently published a letter in response to Temple City’s implementation of Senate Bill 9 (SB 9) which has sweeping implications for other jurisdictions in this process. The letter focuses on the city’s ill-founded attempt to reduce the intensity of land use for SB 9 projects without any attempt to concurrently increase intensity elsewhere, as required by the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA). Any change in intensity of units or size without counterbalancing affects feasibility. HCD has found this violates state law.

Temple City’s SB 9 ordinance—and HCD’s response—also contains a laundry list of don’ts which may affect a jurisdiction’s Housing Element compliance. Specifically, the letter called out Temple City’s use of square footage restrictions, height and story restrictions, courtyard requirements, parking limitations, LEED standards, underground requirements, and even affordability deed restrictions. All told, such requirements for SB 9-related projects which go beyond standards for other projects may be construed as governmental constraints. Jurisdictions will have to identify and justify such constraints in their Housing Elements.

Lastly, the letter stresses that a jurisdiction’s implementation of SB 9 is covered by state laws other than the HCA and State Housing Element Law. This includes, but is not exclusive to, State ADU Law, AFFH, and Anti-Discrimination in Land Use Law.

How a city implements SB 9 has wide-reaching considerations. Jurisdictions should be fully aware that SB 9-related projects are not separate nor exempt from their ordinary zoning laws and instead should be included within existing codes. The point of SB 9 is to give homeowners the means to increase the density of their properties. It is not a dead-end in state law.

Attached to this email is HCD's letter to Temple City for reference.

Sincerely,
Davis White

--

Davis White he/him
April 29, 2022

Scott Reimers
City of Temple City
Community Development Director
Temple City, CA 91780

Dear Scott Reimers:

RE:  City of Temple City – Housing Crisis Act, Letter of Technical Assistance

The purpose of this letter is to provide technical assistance to the City of Temple City (City) regarding the relationship between its recently adopted Senate Bill (SB) 9 implementation ordinance (Ordinance Nos. 21-1058 U, 21-1059) (“Ordinance”) and the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Gov. Code, § 66300), among other relevant state housing laws. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) received a complaint in which concerns were raised that certain provisions of the Ordinance may violate state law. HCD subsequently reviewed the adopted ordinance and other publicly available materials. This letter identifies several concerning provisions of the Ordinance and describes the ways in which these provisions likely violate the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (HCA).

This letter also identifies provisions of the Ordinance that raise concerns under other housing laws, such as State Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, § 65580 et seq.), Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Law (Gov. Code, § 65852.2), Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) (Gov. Code, § 8899.50), and Anti-Discrimination in Land Use Law (Gov. Code, § 65008). These additional concerns are addressed briefly in anticipation of the forthcoming 6th Cycle Temple City Housing Element review letter.

Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Gov. Code, § 66300)

The HCA limits the ability of a local agency to reduce the intensity of land use anywhere where housing is an allowable use without concurrently increasing the intensity of land use elsewhere to compensate for the loss of residential development capacity. The HCA defines reductions in the intensity of land use to include the addition or modification of development standards. Specifically, the law provides the following:

Changing the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use
designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district in effect at the time of the proposed change, below what was allowed under the land use designation or zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018, except as otherwise provided in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) or subdivision (i). For purposes of this subparagraph, “reducing the intensity of land use” includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce the site’s residential development capacity.

(Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(1)(A).) In addition, the HCA is to be broadly construed to maximize the development of housing.

HCD’s analysis of the adopted Ordinance involved identifying new or modified development standards, comparing those development standards against the development standards applicable to the R-1 Zone District and in effect on January 1, 2018\(^1\), and noting instances that suggested a reduction in residential development capacity. In reviewing materials from the October 5, 2021; November 9, 2021; December 7, 2021; and January 4, 2022, Planning Commission and City Council meetings, it appears that the potential impacts of the HCA on the Ordinance were not discussed. For this reason, HCD assumes that no HCA analysis was undertaken and no concurrent and compensatory increase in the intensity of land use pursuant to subdivision (i) of Government Code section 66300 occurred.

**Development Standard 1: Maximum Unit Size of 800 Square Feet.**\(^2\): The Ordinance creates new maximum size standards for residential development that appear to reduce the intensity of land use. The Ordinance limits the maximum size of a dwelling built under SB 9 to 800 square feet (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.c). The development standards of the R-1 Zone District currently impose no equivalent limitation on the absolute maximum size of dwellings. Rather, the R-1 Zone District regulates the size of dwellings by a combination of maximum floor area ratios and maximum floor areas, which vary depending on lot area, depth, and whether the dwelling is one or two stories in height. It is beyond the scope of this letter to comprehensively describe the intricacies of these development standards; however, by examining the maximum lot

---

\(^1\) For the purposes of this analysis, HCD assumes that the relevant current development standards were in effect on January 1, 2018.

\(^2\) While it is beyond the scope of this letter to address potential violations of SB 9 itself, Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(2)(A), seems to contemplate units that are “at least 800 square feet in floor area,” not limited to a maximum of 800 square feet, as required by the Ordinance.
coverage standard, it is possible to see how the new standard represents a reduction in residential development capacity. This section examines only the maximum lot coverage standard in order to provide a comparison; other development standards could also serve for this purpose.

Table 9-1G-3 (R-1 Zone District Residential Development Standards) provides that the maximum lot coverage shall be calculated according to the following formula: \((.275 \times \text{lot area}) + 1,125 \text{ square feet}\). The resulting figure represents the maximum amount of ground level residential floor area that a development can have. Lots with existing development (e.g., a single-family home) can receive additional floor area by constructing additions or by constructing new structures until the maximum lot coverage limit is reached. Vacant lots are subject to the same maximum lot coverage limit as already developed lots. HCD is particularly concerned by scenarios under which the Ordinance will prevent a property owner from developing its lot to the extent permitted under the previously existing development standards.

For example, a typical 7,200 square-foot lot in the R-1 zone is generally able to be developed with a house approximately 3,000 square feet in size. Were the same size lot developed with “urban dwellings” pursuant to the City’s SB 9 implementation Ordinance, the size of each home would be limited to 800 square feet. This represents a reduction in floor area of approximately 75 percent if one urban dwelling were constructed and approximately 50 percent if two urban dwellings were constructed. As demonstrated here, the Ordinance’s 800 square-foot maximum unit size reduces the site’s residential development capacity dramatically in certain instances. One potential remedy to this situation would be to impose the same suite of floor area-related development standards to lots with SB 9 units as to lots with one single-family dwelling.

**Development Standard 2: Height Limit:** The Ordinance limits the maximum height of a new attached or detached dwelling built under SB 9 to one story and 18 feet (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.f). The development standards of the R-1 Zone District currently limit building heights depending on the lot characteristics. Lots wider than 75 feet allow one-story or two-story dwellings up to 32 feet in height. Lots narrower than 75 feet allow one-story or two-story dwellings up to 28 feet in height. On flag lots, uniquely shaped lots, or lots with less than 35 feet of street frontage, the building height is limited to one story and 18 feet. The Ordinance would impose the smallest, one-story, and 18-foot height limitation on all units built under SB 9 regardless of the size or other characteristics of the lot. This limitation, to the extent it prevents development of equivalent floor area compared to that allowed under the existing development standards as described above, reduces the intensity of land use and represents a reduction in residential development capacity.

**Development Standard 3: Courtyards:** The Ordinance requires that all new detached dwellings built under SB 9 provide an open space courtyard with a minimum area of 1,000 square feet or ten percent of the lot area and with a minimum width and depth of 20 feet,
whichever is larger (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.6.m). The development standards of the R-1 Zone District currently impose no such requirement on other dwellings. As a point of comparison, in the higher density R-2 Zone District, a courtyard is required only for sites proposing more than two units and having a lot width of 50 feet or more. As with the height standard discussed above, imposing a courtyard requirement in the R-1 Zone District creates a reduction in residential development capacity if it prevents development of equivalent floor area compared to that allowed under the existing development standards.

**Governmental Constraints under Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580-65589.11)**

Housing elements are required to contain analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints on the development of housing for all income levels. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).) This includes, but is not limited to, analysis of land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, and locally adopted ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development. After identifying governmental constraints, the City must implement programs to remove those governmental constraints to the development of housing where legally possible. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(3).) Therefore, the City should be aware that HCD will examine the City’s SB 9 implementation Ordinance in the context of the commitments made in the City’s forthcoming draft 6th Cycle Housing Element.

In addition to Development Standards 1-3 discussed above, the following provisions of the Ordinance appear to create governmental constraints on the development of housing that would reduce the economic feasibility of projects.

**Parking Requirements:** The Ordinance prohibits a property owner from constructing off-street parking spaces that would serve the residents of an SB 9 unit (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.j; 9-1T-21.11.f). Additionally, the property owner must remove existing driveways and driveway aprons that might facilitate off-street parking. The development standards of the R-1 Zone District currently impose no such prohibition on the creation of additional off-street parking spaces beyond the two-space-per-dwelling minimum provided they meet the requirements of subsection G (Vehicle Parking and Driveways) of the R-1 Zone District development standards. These requirements impose a new burden on property owners seeking to develop housing under SB 9—a burden which is not borne by any other property owner in the R-1 Zone District. Coupled with the Ordinance’s prohibition on the issuance of on-street overnight parking permits to residents of SB 9 units (TCMC 3-3A-23.B.1.i), these requirements likely represent a governmental constraint on the development of housing.

Additionally, these requirements raise concerns related to AFFH and housing discrimination. Materials reviewed by HCD indicate that the City did not perform an analysis to demonstrate that, within the R-1 Zone District in Temple City, households with protected characteristics that do not have a personal vehicle can access resources in a manner equivalent to households
that do have a personal vehicle. If the City is concerned with environmental impacts associated with personal automobile use, a more defensible policy may be to make off-street parking and on-street parking permits optional for SB 9 units and their residents while encouraging active transportation and transit use. Policies that encourage these behaviors can include covered and secure bicycle parking, subsidized bus passes, etc.

**30-Year Affordable Housing Deed Restriction:** The Ordinance requires that all units created under SB 9 be deed-restricted to low- or very low-income households (9-1T-21.A.4.l). While inclusionary zoning requirements are a well-used and important tool for the creation of affordable housing, this requirement is equivalent to a 100 percent inclusionary requirement that is not imposed on any other type of residential development in Temple City. A typical inclusionary requirement is 15 or 20 percent and is applicable to a broad range of residential development. This requirement has the potential to render development of SB 9 units economically infeasible, and as such may constitute a governmental constraint to housing development. As a part of the ongoing housing element update process, the City will need to demonstrate that local development costs and anticipated affordable rents will result in projects that are economically feasible.

Additionally, Government Code section 65850, subdivision (g), authorizes local agencies to adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance that includes residential rental units affordable to lower- and moderate-income households. In certain circumstances, HCD may request the submittal of an economic feasibility study to ensure the ordinance does not unduly constrain housing production. For additional information, see HCD’s [Rental Inclusionary Housing Memorandum](#).

**LEED Platinum Certification:** The Ordinance requires that all new detached dwellings built under SB 9 achieve LEED Platinum certification (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.o). While environmental sustainability is a laudable goal, the development standards of the R-1 Zone District currently impose no such requirement on other dwellings. For a building to achieve a LEED Platinum certification, it must provide the very highest level of energy efficiency—far beyond the requirements of the state building code. To achieve this highest-level of sustainable design, specific building design, siting, materials, fixtures, appliances, and heating/cooling systems are required. These additional physical requirements will substantially increase the cost of development of SB 9 units and will therefore likely result in a governmental constraint to the development of housing.

3 This may also raise concerns under 2 CCR § 12060(a) regarding practices with a discriminatory effect. Discriminatory effects occur when the policy or practice predictably results in a disparate impact on a group of individuals, or creates, increases, reinforces, or perpetuates segregated housing patterns based on membership in a protected class. See also Anti-Discrimination in Land Use Law (Gov. Code, § 65008) and AFFH (Gov. Code, § 8899.50).
As stated above, housing elements must contain an analysis of governmental constraints on the development of housing for all income levels (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5)) and implement programs to remove those constraints (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(3)). The concerns raised above may constitute such constraints.

Subterranean Third Story Requirement: In certain instances, the Ordinance requires that a portion of the floor area of a dwelling built under SB 9 be located underground (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.f). Under SB 9, when a local agency’s development standards would physically preclude the construction of up to two residential units at least 800 square feet in size, the local agency is required to modify or waive one or more development standards to accommodate a development of that size. (Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (b); 66411.7, subd. (c).) Anticipating that in some cases SB 9 units may need to be built as three-story dwellings to meet this statutory requirement, the City appears to have included this undergrounding requirement. In no other instance is a dwelling in the R-1 Zone District required to build habitable floor area that is otherwise consistent with other development standards such as maximum floor area, FAR, etc., as underground living space. This requirement could substantially increase the cost of development of some SB 9 units and may result in a governmental constraint to the development of housing.

State ADU Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65852.2 and 65858.22)

SB 9 and State ADU Law are complementary. Both laws can be implemented in ways that result in developments with both “SB 9 Units” and ADUs. When combined, up to four units may be built in the same lot area typically used for a single-family home. The calculation varies slightly depending on whether a lot split is involved, but the outcomes regarding total maximum unit counts are identical. After reviewing the City’s Ordinance to verify consistency with State ADU Law, the following concern was noted.

Accessory Dwelling Units – No Lot Split: The Ordinance establishes a limit of two residential units on each lot developed under SB 9 and requires that ADUs and Junior ADUs (JADUs) count toward that limit (TCMC 9-1T-21.A.4.b). As written, this limitation applies to situations in which a lot split is proposed as well as to situations when a lot split is not proposed. This inaccurately implements SB 9 and denies property owners the right to develop ADU(s) consistent with State ADU Law. (Gov. Code, §§ 65852.2; 65852.22.) The provisions of SB 9 that allow a local agency to impose a limit of two residential units specifies that ADUs/JADUs are to be counted towards that limit only in instances when a lot split is proposed. (Gov. Code, § 66411.7, subd. (j)(1).) In instances when a lot split is not proposed, these limitations do not apply and the local agency must allow ADUs as it typically would pursuant to State ADU Law. (Gov. Code, § 65852.21, subd. (f).)
Conclusion

Separately and collectively, these development standards and other requirements reduce the intensity of land use, raising concerns under the HCA. They also raise concerns under State Housing Element Law, State ADU Law, AFFH, and Anti-Discrimination in Land Use Law. The implementation of these policies will almost certainly have a chilling effect on the production of housing under SB 9 by rendering projects economically infeasible. HCD would like to remind the City that under Government Code section 65585, subdivision (j), HCD has enforcement authority over these and other housing laws. Accordingly, HCD may review local government actions to determine consistency with these and other laws. (Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (i).) If HCD finds that a city’s actions do not comply with state law, HCD may notify the California Office of the Attorney General. (Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (j).)

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. HCD recommends the City conduct a comprehensive review of the HCA and other applicable state housing laws and update its SB 9 implementing ordinance accordingly. Additionally, HCD requests that the City respond in writing within 30 days of receipt of this letter. The City’s response should include a proposed timeline for corrective actions. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Brian Heaton, of our staff, at Brian.Heaton@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

David Zisser
Assistant Deputy Director
Local Government Relations and Accountability

cc: Brian Cooke, City Manager
    Greg Murphy, City Attorney
Dear Woodside Town Council,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed development project at Runnymede and Raymundo Drive.

We understand that Woodside, like towns all across California, is required to plan for a substantial increase in approved housing, and that meeting this challenge without harming the rural community feeling that is so essential to Woodside, or creating safety issues for a town that is already facing car and bike traffic problems, is a daunting challenge for the Town Council.

However, we feel strongly that the Runnymede/Raymundo project is one of the worst ways the Town Council could pick to meet this challenge, for the following reasons:

1. Runnymede/Raymundo is a small, very rural part of Woodside. More than half of the properties here are horse properties. The proposed development would have an outsized, destructive effect on the rural nature of this part of Woodside.

2. Runnymede is a special, almost park-like area that people across Woodside enjoy. Our children learned to ride bikes on this street (when we lived in a different part of Woodside) as did many kids who grew up in Woodside. Every day people can be seen biking, jogging and horseback riding here. The proposed project would destroy this important part of our town.

3. Adding traffic to this area would be very dangerous. Already cars drive too fast right next to the joggers, bikers and horseback riders on the straightaway of Runnymede. Raymundo is also already too dangerous with cars going too fast around blind turns. The proposed project will add traffic here and almost certainly lead to more serious accidents. This would be irresponsible to allow.

We know that the Town Council faces a challenge in finding ways to meet our California requirement without destroying our great community. We urge you to find better ways to do this than the Runnymede/Raymundo proposal.

John and Katherine Williford
Ms Young,

Thank you for accepting comments based on the housing element update. I have been in contact with my neighbors, especially within the Somerset HOA, and agree wholeheartedly and very strongly against any further housing proposals in Canada College, especially the south/south west side of Canada College.

I have read all comments from my HOA members and agree with all comments made and do not wish to repeat their sentiments.

The concerns are not only admitted to protect the immediate neighborhood, but also to protect and to preserve the image that Woodside throughout its history has gone to great lengths to ensure, was never forgotten.

Our very clear ask is to ensure that the areas south of the Loop rd, in the red shaded areas below, remain untouched.

Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,
Town Council Meeting

July 12, 2022
Dear Woodside Town Council and Members of the Housing Element Task Force,

I’m writing to express my objection to including the town-owned property near the intersection of Runnymede Road and Raymundo Drive in the draft housing element list, which is being submitted to the state.

There are multiple attributes specific to this property that make it unsuitable for development, including:

- The site is located at the nexus of multiple public, protected, open space properties (city, county, and national park—GGNRA) and public trail networks. Residential development of this area is highly likely to eliminate or disrupt public access to these parks and trails. We would be irreversibly chipping away at one of San Mateo County’s wild jewels, that has been protected through decades of environmental advocacy work.
- The proposed site is located in an earthquake fault zone. This is a safety concern.
- The proposed site is located immediately adjacent to an area designated as “subject to substantial forest fire risk”. This is a major safety concern.
- The site lacks access to sewer service. The closest sewer lines are nearly one mile from the site. Extension of sewer lines to serve the proposed area is an expensive proposition and will not be a effective use of taxpayer funds to serve the objectives of the housing element.
- Ingress and egress from properties on Raymundo drive is highly limited. In an emergency evacuation scenario, the presence of additional residents trying to enter and exit a multi-unit residence in the proposed location could severely disrupt and limit the ability of other Raymundo residents to evacuate their families, their horses, and other larger pets from the area. This is a REAL danger that cannot be ignored.

I’ve had numerous conversations with neighbors who have participated actively in Town Council meetings and other public and private discussions about the state housing program, about the Town of Woodside’s proposed plan to address the program’s requirements, and about the Runnymede/Raymundo property specifically.

Because of the safety, fiscal responsibility, environmental preservation, and public recreation considerations I have mentioned above, I am requesting that the Runnymede/Raymundo property be removed from the draft housing plan.

I support the development of more housing in the Bay Area, but the housing allocation number that the state has imposed is too high.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Stephan Thomsen
Dear City and County Planning Leaders,

On behalf of the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council (CCPC), the publicly appointed, state-mandated local child care planning entity for San Mateo County, and our partner Build Up San Mateo County, we are writing to encourage your city/county to include policies that support the development of child care facilities in your updated Housing Element. For working families with young children, having accessible child care near their home reduces traffic and commute times, and generally improves the quality of life for these residents. Including policies that are supportive of child care in or near housing is a straightforward way for cities to contribute to creating sustainable communities where families with young children can thrive. Your city/county’s Housing Element update provides an opportunity to address the housing and child care needs of all working families, while examining the housing and child care needs of special populations, such as single-parents and female-headed households, in particular.

High-quality child care is essential to families and to vibrant economic development, yet operators of potential new child care facilities face numerous barriers to opening new programs to meet community needs. While many of the challenges for child care facilities development are similar to housing, the child care sector lacks the mandates, financing sources or expertise that exist for housing developers. One of the biggest challenges is finding a location for a child care facility. Ideally, child care facilities are located in or near housing and close to family-friendly transportation options.

Housing affordability also affects the child care sector. In our high-cost area, family child care providers, those who provide licensed child care in their homes, may struggle to afford their rent or mortgage. As older providers retire, new providers cannot afford to buy homes in our communities. Those who rent a house or apartment often face business instability. In addition, child care programs across San Mateo County are struggling to hire enough workers – the child care workforce is predominantly low-income women of color. Many are struggling with their own housing needs.

In examining Housing Elements from throughout California, we have noted that a number of cities and counties have included goals and policies that support the development of child care in or near housing. We have compiled sample policies in the attached document in hopes that your city/county will include a number of them in your Housing Element update.

If you have questions or would like further support for connecting child care and housing in your city/county, please contact us: Sarah, [contact info], or Christine, [contact info].

Sincerely,

Sarah Kinahan
Coordinator
San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council

Christine Padilla
Director
Build Up San Mateo County

Sample Housing Element Language to Support Child Care near Housing
Christine Padilla
Director, Build Up for San Mateo County's Children
Sobrato Center for Nonprofits – Redwood Shores

An initiative designed to preserve, grow and improve the supply of child care and preschool facilities in San Mateo County.

Read our Case Study: A Multi-Sector Approach: Childcare as an Infrastructure Priority
June 30, 2022

RE: Policy recommendations for Housing Element Updates

Dear City and County Leaders,

On behalf of the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council (CCPC), the publicly appointed, state-mandated local child care planning entity for San Mateo County, and our partner Build Up San Mateo County, we are writing to encourage your city/county to include policies that support the development of child care facilities in your updated Housing Element. For working families with young children, having accessible child care near their home reduces traffic and commute times, and generally improves the quality of life for these residents. Including policies that are supportive of child care in or near housing is a straightforward way for cities to contribute to creating sustainable communities where families with young children can thrive. Your city/county’s Housing Element update provides an opportunity to address the housing and child care needs of all working families, while examining the housing and child care needs of special populations, such as single-parents and female-headed households, in particular.

High-quality child care is essential to families and to vibrant economic development, yet operators of potential new child care facilities face numerous barriers to opening new programs to meet community needs. While many of the challenges for child care facilities development are similar to housing, the child care sector lacks the mandates, financing sources or expertise that exist for housing developers. One of the biggest challenges is finding a location for a child care facility. Ideally, child care facilities are located in or near housing and close to family-friendly transportation options.

Housing affordability also affects the child care sector. In our high-cost area, family child care providers, those who provide licensed child care in their homes, may struggle to afford their rent or mortgage. As older providers retire, new providers cannot afford to buy homes in our communities. Those who rent a house or apartment often face business instability. In addition, child care programs across San Mateo County are struggling to hire enough workers – the child care workforce is predominantly low-income women of color. Many are struggling with their own housing needs.

In examining Housing Elements from throughout California, we have noted that a number of cities and counties have included goals and policies that support the development of child care in or near housing. We have compiled sample policies in the attached document in hopes that your city/county will include a number of them in your Housing Element update.

If you have questions or would like further support for connecting child care and housing in your city/county, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Sarah Kinahan
Coordinator
San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council

Christine Padilla
Director
Build Up San Mateo County

Attachments:  
Sample Housing Element Language to Support Child Care near Housing
Partner Organizations that Support Including Child Care Policies in Housing
Site Inventory Narrative

Table A
The Town of Woodside prepared a Site Inventory in accordance with the California Department of Housing and Community Development’s (HCD) Site Inventory Guidebook (Government Code Section 65583.2). This Narrative describes key information included in the Inventory.

Characteristics of Vacant and Underutilized Sites
The Town identified a total of 159 Vacant and Underutilized sites in its Site Inventory ([https://bit.ly/3bQEjRv](https://bit.ly/3bQEjRv)). Of these sites, 111 are Vacant and 48 are Underutilized. Vacant sites do not have improvements. Underutilized sites have some structures and improvements such as sheds, solar panels, animal enclosures, vineyards, parking lots or driveways, or old barns, but do not have a single-family residence, other type of residential unit, or substantial improvement(s). In some cases, the Underutilized parcels adjoin a parcel with a single-family residence and are used for additional yard space.

The initial list of parcels for the Site Inventory was developed by the Town’s GIS Consultant from the Vacant Lands Map included in the 2015-2022 Housing Element. The GIS Consultant used Google Maps, which shows improvement footprints, and Google Satellite Imagery to identify level of improvements on the different sites. ‘Ground-truthing’ of sites and their improvements was conducted by Town staff, to the extent that improvements were visible from public roadways. Several additional sites were added based on the site visits.

Identified Vacant and Underutilized sites range from 0.2 acres to 33.67 acres in size. Sites are mapped according to size, as described below, and depicted on Attachment G, Vacant and Underutilized Parcels by Area:

1. 0.2 – less than 0.5 acres
2. 0.5 – less than or equal to 10 acres
3. Greater than 10 acres

Sites in the middle category (0.5 – 10 acres) are considered to have the greatest potential for development with higher density housing units.

Infrastructure
With respect to infrastructure, sewer service is the primary limiting factor for higher density development in the community. Between 60-70 percent of all residential parcels within Woodside rely on septic systems (or would rely on septic systems if developed). Sites within or immediately adjacent to Sewer Districts may be connected, if certain criteria are met. Water service and dry utilities are available throughout the community; therefore, with sewer service being the limiting factor, if the site is within or immediately adjacent to a sewer district, it is listed as “Yes-Current” for sewer service in Column L of the Site Inventory.
Distribution Methodology by Income Level

This section describes how income levels are distributed in the Site Inventory.

All single-family residential parcels, by right, are allowed one single-family residence, an 800 square foot ADU, and a Junior ADU — for a total of 3 units.

Single-family residences in Woodside are all identified as Above Moderate-Income units; therefore, as a start, each single-family residential property was allocated one Above Moderate-Income unit.

For ADU income distribution, the Town utilizes research developed by 21 Elements and ABAG (Draft Housing Element, Appendix E – Draft Affordability of ADUs) in which 30% of ADUs are allocated for Very Low-Income households; 30% are allocated for Low-Income households; 30% are allocated for Moderate-Income households; and 10% are allocated for Above Moderate-Income households. This distribution is referred to as the “30-30-30-10 ADU Distribution”.

In the Site Inventory, Table A, Column P, Lower Income Capacity includes only Very Low- and Low-Income households; therefore, for purposes of this Site Inventory, the Town utilizes a “60-30-10 ADU Distribution”. The Town therefore distributed the Total Capacity of 3 units per parcel evenly among all single-family residential parcels. The Lower Income Capacity (Column P) was identified as having 1.2 units (60%); the Moderate-Income Capacity (Column Q) was identified as having 0.6 units (30%); and the Above Moderate-Income Capacity (Column R) was identified as having 1.2 units (1 SFR and 10% ADU). These allocations add up to the Total Capacity of 3 units per parcel.

There are 3 parcels that are designated as ‘Open Space’. Each of these parcels is allowed one residential unit (1,500 square feet in size). One Community Commercial (CC) parcel was also included, where a single-family residence and associated uses are allowed.

Optional Information in Column T

Optional Information included in Column T describes improvements or conditions that are visible from public roadways. In some cases, sites have solid fences, so visibility is limited. In other cases, sites are landlocked or are located along private rather than public roadways, where access is not permitted. Additionally, flag lot configurations preclude visibility of some sites. Given the limited visibility of many sites, the San Mateo County GIS Portal and Google Earth were also viewed. Where there was apparent instability of some slopes, the Town Geologic Map was also consulted.

Table B

Table B identifies 10 sites proposed for rezoning using a Multi-Family Overlay Zone that would allow up to 10 units per acre.
Table C
Table C describes allowable density in each of the zoning districts where residences are permitted.
July 15, 2022

California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
Via email: HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov

Re: Town of Woodside, Submittal of Draft Housing Element & Compliance with AB215, Public Review Requirements

Dear Reviewers,

Please find attached the draft Housing Element for the Town of Woodside for your review. Also attached is our Site Inventory, on the HCD-required form.

In compliance with AB215, the Town’s draft Housing Element was put out for public comment for more than the required 30 days (44 days). The draft was noticed in the newspaper and posted on the Town website on May 18, 2022. The comment period was closed on July 1, 2022, at 5pm. The Town received a total of 65 comments by this deadline, and three additional comments after the deadline. A formal response to comments was prepared and presented at a noticed Town Council hearing on July 12, 2022. At this meeting, the Town Council made changes to the RHNA approach and added several new programs—in response to the public comments received.

We look forward to receiving your comments and working towards certification.

Warmest regards,

Jackie C. Young, AICP
Planning Director

650-851-6790
Fax: 650-851-2195
townhall@woodsidetown.org