

Janneth Lujan - Sr. Christina PLN 2015 00263 (2626 & 2642 Marlborough)

From: Janet Davis <iadiadiad@sbcglobal.net>
To: Linda Lopez >, Laura Caplan < ..
Date: 10/4/2015 12:33 PM
Subject: Sr. Christina PLN 2015 00263 (2626 & 2642 Marlborough)
CC: Graciela Eulate < >, Christina Heltsley <schristina...

NFOCC SPECIAL MEETING THURSDAY OCTOBER 8, 2015
 (To be followed by Planning Commission Meeting Wednesday October 14, 2015)

Sr. Christina's Proposed Apartment Should be Approved by the NFOCC unanimously, as recommended by the Planning Dept., since this would provide much needed, safe, housing for 15 very low income families in dire need, and the objections raised at the prior hearing by neighboring property owners had no merit.

Affordable Housing is a Major Priority in this County, Especially in NFO:

The BOS has set up a Task Force to examine *all and any* ways in which housing opportunities could be provided. They have even allocated \$1,000,000 to help fund this particular project since the need is so great, and the project has such merit.

At the last NFOCC hearing there were three objections to the proposal made primarily by neighboring *property owners*:

- (a) Purported lack of information as to notice given to the three families that will be displaced,
- (b) Hypothetical possibility that prospective tenants might be "double-ups" with multiple vehicles, and
- (c) Parking problems in the area theorized to be exacerbated by the proposed apartments.

Had sufficient research been done, it would have been clear that (a) and (b) are non-issues. As to (c), not only has Sr. Christina eliminated several parking problems that previously existed where her present apts. are located, but Parking is a NFO-wide problem that is not being adequately addressed by the Sheriff or by Code Enforcement. There are specific instances of this in the immediate area of the proposed St. Leo's, *completely unrelated to the proposed project*. Below are some items that the NFOCC *should* focus on.

(a) Notice given to Existing Tenants:

Currently there is **no** Ordinance requiring that **any** extended notice or compensation be given to tenants displaced because of Code Enforcement actions, although other jurisdictions do have such ordinances. Throughout NFO tenants are being summarily evicted by speculators seeking to remodel, enlarge and/or sell buildings, which are then rented out at exorbitant rates forcing families to "double up." which creates parking problems. Often these landlords are out of State and little management is exercised. Sr. Christina and her Board are probably unique in that their rents are very low, stable, and only law abiding and deserving families are accepted. The apts. are well managed and maintained. She and the President of her Board detailed to the NFOCC exactly the **extraordinary** steps that they are taking to help the three families: **all of whom have been made aware of these provisions.**

The NFOCC should be urging County Counsel to expedite a relocation ordinance specific to situations where tenants are evicted because of code violations by the landlord.

(b) Presumed Possibility of Multiple Families/Vehicles per Apt.:

In addition to the very close supervision of the apartments, the need for affordable housing is so dire, and the apts that have been built by Sr. Christina are so beautiful, that no tenants are going to risk being evicted by breaking their leases.

(c) Parking Problems:

This is endemic throughout NFO and is primarily owing to

(i) past incompetence/neglect by Planning and

(ii) current lack of diligence by the Sheriff and by Code Enforcement.

THE MAIN ISSUE IS THE PARKING PROBLEM IN THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD WHICH IS NOT BEING ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY PLANNING, CODE ENFORCEMENT OR THE SHERIFF

Planning Dept. Negligence:

(i) **Zoning “cross over”:** Many of the commercial enterprises along El Camino are on lots that stretch back into the residentially zoned Blenheim. Many of them have changed use/intensity over the years, but the parking has not kept up with these changes. The result is that parking associated with these enterprises flows onto residential streets. A good example would be 2701 ECR which used to be a warehouse with roll up doors and curb cutouts for loading docks on Buckingham. This now has a laundromat fronting onto ECR, and the roll-up doors have been converted into a Deli/Bistro, and a car repair place, **none of which have any parking. (The County was not even aware of the Deli conversion and then, this year, granted an after the fact permit!)** That corner also has a fire hydrant and a red zone! Next door is an art gallery with no parking but a green zone. Next to that is Beltran Tires also with no parking but a green zone.

A similar situation appears to exist next to the Mini Market at the corner of Dumbarton. This used to be a furniture store, the back door of which appears to have morphed into yet another store. There is a parking area on Blenheim for some of the little stores, but it has been used by a very large Winnebago and a dump truck (piled high with scrap metal) to my observation.

(ii) **Curb cut-outs** To maximize build out, many of the area duplexes and apts have been constructed with no driveway, just a curb cut out stretching across the width of the property. This vastly reduces the on street parking availability since it is impermissible to park across the cut out.

Sheriff Failure:

(i) **Inoperable vehicles:** Several driveways are blocked by inoperable vehicles. Some have even been up on jacks for a while. Some are left on the street in clearly inoperable condition. Some have outdated license tags which itself means the vehicle is inoperable. It is also fairly common to see people fixing cars on the road which is illegal under the State Vehicle Code.

(ii) **Commercial Vehicles:** There are strict prohibitions against these in a residential area. However, this appears to be ignored by both the Sheriff and Code Enforcement. Below is the applicable Muni Code provision:

7.28.030 - Parking of commercial vehicles. No person, firm or corporation, nor any agent

or employee thereof, shall stop, leave standing, or park for the period of more than one (1) hour any commercial vehicle, whether attended or unattended, upon a street, road, highway or other thoroughfare, or place of whatever nature, publicly maintained and open to the use of the public for the purpose of vehicular travel, located in any residential zone in the unincorporated area of said County, except when such vehicle is in actual use for the transaction of any lawful business in said zone or is temporarily disabled. (on the books since 1951!)

I have personally seen multiple instances of e.g.: Dump trucks, Cement trucks, Plumbing vans, Recycle trucks, Roofing trucks, Landscaping vehicles, even the odd semi, Construction equipment, trailers, etc., etc. At the last NFOCC meeting it was even disclosed that Hertz was storing its inventory on surrounding streets and using runners to retrieve them when needed. Little if anything, is being done by the Sheriff or Code Enforcement to address this issue, despite assurances that more officers would be available to address parking problems.

Code Enforcement Failure:

(i) **Blocked Driveways/Garages:** Many of the driveways in the area are unusable for parking because the residents have construction equipment or inoperable vehicles blocking access. Despite repeated complaints nothing has been done to resolve instances of which I am aware. One nearby apt. complex has all the garages filled with storage, requiring 8-12 vehicles to be parked on the street or front yard. Nothing has been done to rectify this. It would also appear that there are *multiple* other instances where the garages and driveways are not available for parking.

(ii) **RVs:** There have been instances of large RVs being parked on the road or in driveways blocking off-road parking for other vehicles. **(There is no specific ordinance covering these)**

(iii) **Boats:** Sometimes there are boats (even on large trailers) parked on residential streets taking up 2 or more parking spaces. **(There is no specific ordinance covering these)**

(iv) **Auto Repair Facilities:**

This is *one of the major problems* in the immediate area of the proposed apts. and throughout NFO, that has been ignored by Code Enforcement.

Zoning Ordinance 6261 (b)(1) permits Auto Repair Garages, including storage facilities, only where *all operations are conducted in a building enclosed on all sides.*

There are three such businesses in the area, the worst of which is Ky's Auto at 2633 ECR and stretching back along the first block of Buckingham. This outfit has numerous vehicles parked alongside Buckingham.

(v) **Parking Ordinances:** The situation at Hertz emphasizes just one of the many problems of the parking ordinances. The office at Hertz is small although the business itself requires considerable space for parking of rental cars. However, the spaces mandated for such a business are merely 1 for every 160 sq. ft. of office space. ***This makes no sense and needs to be revised.***

CONCLUSION:

The need for low income housing throughout NFO is at crisis point, as even the County has finally realized and is now trying to deal with. The longstanding neglect of this area by the County has resulted in widespread victimization of tenants by unscrupulous investors, and in residential areas being flooded with the problems caused by unregulated businesses. The one bright light in the ECR corridor has been Sr. Christina and her work to provide safe housing for needy families. They should not be penalized because of the County's failure to control the rapacious speculation and blatant disregard for existing laws by some property owners.

Land Use decisions are (or should be) based on FACTS not speculation. Those property owners who

complained at the last hearing about theoretical future parking problems (especially when Sr. Christina's existing apartment buildings eliminated dozens of parking issues that previously existed!) need to address the problems that exist NOW in the area, and report parked commercial vehicles, inoperable vehicles, and blocked driveways to the Sheriff and to Code Enforcement.

Janneth Lujan - Fwd: St. Francis Center Proposal of Lot Merger/Rezone from R3 to PUD-138

From: Tiare Pena
To: Janneth Lujan
Date: 10/7/2015 12:59 PM
Subject: Fwd: St. Francis Center Proposal of Lot Merger/Rezone from R3 to PUD-138

>>> Lety M Tapia < > 10/7/2015 10:32 AM >>>
Tiare,

I was planning on contacting you before the next meeting but we jut received last Thursday the notice of the Public Hearing about the 3 Unit apartment complex proposal from St. Francis Center of Redwood City for Thursday October 8th. On Friday we received the notice of public hearing for San Mateo County Planning Commission the week after on October 14,2015 for the same matter. I thought at the Sept 24th meeting we were to come back October 22 for the North Fair Oaks Council to then make their decision. Did this get requested as a special meeting so it can then be taken to the San Mateo County Planning Commission the following week on Oct 14th? It just feels like this is trying to get rushed for approval without any consideration for all who live in this neighborhood.

I do plan on going this Thursday and voice my concerns once again. It's not that I am against low income housing I have heard how tough it is to find affordable housing here in the area and there is a need for it. My concern about this 3 story 15 unit apartment complex is that it is being built in an already overcrowded neighborhood and parking really is at capacity. I grew up in this neighborhood and seen the changes and how the parking has got difficult for people who live here or even visit here. There are already too many residents in this neighborhood that rely on the street parking. It is hard to find any parking especially after 4 or 5pm during the week and on the weekends. We also already have the overflow of employees or customers who park on the streets here for the nearby businesses off El Camino. Has the consideration been done to just build two story? Maybe with less units the neighborhood would not be so impacted or if they build 3 story then they really should put underground parking.

My other main concern is my privacy as this will be built along my backyard. As I reviewed more of the proposal I see they are asking for relief of the setback requirements which would be 5 feet from my fence than the normal 20 ft setbacks for rear of this proposed building. We definitely were not aware of those setbacks. What can be done about our privacy? What barriers/walls are they putting up to protect privacy? What about noise control? Having the setbacks 5 feet from our fence is definitely taking away our privacy and has my family concerned as tenants will look directly into our backyard. My daughter loves playing in our backyard and often has friends over. Is mature landscaping going to be done? How tall is the fence allowed to be built? I know at the previous meeting the council was more concerned about the displacement of the current people and a bit of the parking issue and maybe that is why they were not ready to make a decision. I just feel like it's not fair when when proposals like this come along and bring this great idea of what it will bring to the neighborhood without really considering the impact it will have on the neighborhood and the current homeowners/residents that live here. I would hope that consideration is really taken before all final approvals for this project are done.

Regards,
Leticia Maldonado