



Subject: FW: CPP corrections

From: rick ehrenfeld
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 1:41 PM
To: Scott Huth; Kathleen A. Garcia; Joseph Smith
Subject: CPP corrections

Just read the CPP response and wanted to offer a couple of corrections:

Neighbor concern

Concerns that the proposed 8-ft high wall parallel to the west property line will not be tall enough to provide for adequate noise, light and privacy to west neighbors, in addition to concerns that the wall should have a full extension to the south property line and run east to provide additional privacy to west and southwest neighbors.

Response

The EIR requires an 8-ft high solid wall to run the length of the surface parking lot, setback 10 feet from the property line for the control of light and noise from the parking lot. While the 8-ft high solid wall provides mitigation for surface parking light and noise, neighbors also desire the wall for privacy.

The noise and light from the surface parking lot are very much the issue. The EIR measures noise and light impacts from the the surface parking **at the property line**. It does not consider the noise and light impacts to my second story. The EIR recommendation was for a minimum of an 8 foot wall -this may mitigate the noise and light impacts to my first story. CEQUA does not consider the configuration of the existing neighbors, so I have impacts from the parking lot that are not addressed in the EIR. My second story master bedroom is far above the elevation of the City Hall property line and my bedroom window is well above the top of the proposed mitigation wall. From my second story I can see over the proposed 8 foot wall and see cars parked on the east side of the proposed lot- if I can see them, I can hear them and see their lights. The City should be addressing concerns beyond the narrow scope of the EIR? (All I see now is the wall of the TV station) I would suggest a minimum of a 10 foot wall- vegetation is not the answer for light and sound.

Concern with the devaluation of property values of the adjacent neighborhood with homes. The City does not have a designated historic district along 10th Street, although there are a number of original homes in the area. Redevelopment of the public property may also improve property values.

My concern regarding "value" has been misstated and was not about land value. The impact is on the historic value and that value is being diminished. The City Hall project as planned is not compatible with this old house. We don't have an historic district but the DRO for the R2 zone (and the community plan) makes specific reference to this area and "historic values." (I know the city hall site is PF, but it is affecting the R2)

30.20.060 Design Review. All development in the R2 Zone shall be subject to design review by the Design Review Board pursuant to the Municipal Code.

In reviewing development in the R2 Zone, the Design Review Board shall implement the following criteria in addition to the criteria contained in this Code:

A. The design of all development and the landscaping, scale, height, length, width, bulk, coverage, and exterior appearance of all structures shall be in harmony with neighborhood character and with development on nearby

lots. **Between Eighth and Fourteenth Streets, any development shall not result in the diminution of the historic values of the older, existing residences of the area.**

Thanks,
Rick Ehrenfeld