

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

December 28, 2012

TO: All Design Review Board Members

FROM: Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst [415/352-3643 ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov]
Erik Buehmann, Coastal Program Analyst [415/352-3645 erikb@bcdc.ca.gov]

SUBJECT: Pete's Harbor Residential Community, City of Redwood City, San Mateo County
(For Board consideration on January 7, 2013, Second Pre-Application Review)

Project Summary

Project Applicant: RWC Harbor Communities, LLC

Project Representatives: Paul Powers, RWC Harbor Communities LLC; Brian Fletcher, Callander Associates; Joe Wilson, RWC Harbor Communities LLC; Matthew Gruber, Callander Associates.

Project Site. The proposed project is located at One Uccelli Boulevard, in the City of Redwood City, east of Inner Bair Island, on the northernmost parcels between Smith Slough and Redwood Creek. The 13.25-acre site currently operates as a marina, with an RV park, storage facilities, and parking. The proposed public access is located along the northern and western boundaries of the property as well as along the western side of Bair Island Road and Uccelli Boulevard just south of the project site. Currently there is no dedicated public access located on the property. The site is mostly paved with minimal landscaping.

Proposed Project and Public Access. The project involves the construction of a residential development consisting of one 311-unit residential building (five stories high) and ten 10-unit residential buildings (three stories high each) with a footprint totaling approximately 578,000 square feet (13.27 acres). The residential development would include an approximately 10,000-square-foot (0.23 acre) clubhouse, an approximately 212,000-square-foot (4.87 acre) parking garage, and the installation of approximately 835 parking stalls. The residential buildings proposed within the 100-foot shoreline band would be no more than 41 feet high and set back from the Bay shoreline from approximately 30 to 100 feet. The marina would be used as a private marina for residents of the development.

The proposed public access would cover an approximately 70,666-square-foot (1.62 acre) area. A new 12-foot-wide, 1,260 feet long shoreline path would be provided. The proposed shoreline path would connect to future Bay Trail segments along Bair Island Road and south of Steinberger Slough, and would also connect to future Inner Bair Island public access trails via a bridge. The project includes approximately 34,359-square-feet (0.79 acre) of public access landscaping and the installation of a public playground, bocce ball court, a gazebo, seating areas, bike racks, and overlooks.



The applicant proposes to dedicate three view corridors to afford views of Smith Slough. The applicant is proposing a water trail site to accommodate hand-launch boats. The water trail site would be open to the public at all hours and would not be gated. A staging and wash-down area for boats is proposed near the water trail access point. This water trail site may serve as an officially designated site on the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail once established. The applicant has proposed to provide seven parking stalls for public access parking, which would be located within close proximity to the playground and water trail site.

Proposed landscaping would consist of water-wise and Bay-friendly plants, taking guidance from BCDC's *Shoreline Plants: A Landscaping Guide for the San Francisco Bay*. Stormwater run-off would be handled by self-treating areas and rain gardens.

Bay Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Bay Plan's* policies on Public Access state that "[i]n addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront...should be provided in and through every new development...on the shoreline..." and that the public access improvements "...should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline..." The policies state that the *Public Access Design Guidelines* be used as a guide to siting and designing public access consistent with a proposed project. The Bay Plan policies on Appearance, Design and Scenic Views further state that "all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay." The Bay Plan policies on Recreation state that "[d]iverse and accessible water-oriented recreational facilities...should be well distributed around the Bay and improved to accommodate a broad range of water-oriented recreational activities of all races, cultures, ages and income levels."

First DRB Review. In its first pre-application review of the project on November 5, 2012, the Design Review Board (DRB) requested that the project applicant consider the following, as stated in the minutes from the meeting:

1. The three parking spaces at the northern end of the eastern view corridor should be removed, and the Board cautioned that any use of trees within the three view corridors must be carefully planned to avoid obstructing the view corridor;
2. There should be a stronger definition between the public access areas and the residential areas, to be achieved through the use of common materials in each of these areas;
3. The shoreline path route should be made more clear and direct, and bicycle usage of the trail should be carefully considered and designed for throughout the site;
4. The diversity of uses provided within the public access areas is pleasing and, in particular, the Board believes that the water trail site will be successful and would like to see further detailed development of this aspect;
5. The circular seating areas appear "contrived" and should be simplified and redesigned;
6. The main entry to the public access area should be simplified and made more direct and obvious;
7. The applicant should explore providing direct physical access to the water by adjusting the edge of the shoreline and providing a beach area if possible; and
8. The plant palette should be rethought in order for the landscape "to be more of the place," and the Board suggested that the palms be pulled back from the shoreline and placed closer to the residential structures.

The project proponents responded to DRB's request in the following manner:

1. **Parking spaces and view corridors.** The three parking spaces at the northern end of the eastern view corridor have been removed and relocated as shown on Exhibits F and I. Same trees have also been removed in order to avoid obstructing the view corridor.

2. **Definition between public access and residential areas.** In order to clearly communicate a division between the public access and residential spaces, planting and pavement materials in the public access areas would differ from those used in the residential portion of the property. The planting palette and paving would be uniform generally throughout the public access area. These changes are shown in Exhibits F and Q.
3. **Clear and direct shoreline route.** The applicants have modified the public access pathway to clearly distinguish the multi-purpose bicycle pathway from the more pedestrian-oriented areas. Furthermore, the route has been modified to offer a smooth and direct alignment around the other public access amenities such as the playground, bocce court, and seating areas. These changes are shown in Exhibits F, H, and I.
4. **Water trail.** An enlarged plan for the water area and additional imagery, including a proposed transfer system, has been added to the submittal. These changes are shown in Exhibits U and V.
5. **Circular seating areas.** The northwestern overlook has been modified from its original circular appearance. The northeastern overlook point has remained circular to fit the natural curvature of the point and to emphasize panoramic views. These are shown in Exhibits F and H.
6. **Main entry to the public access area.** The main entry to the public access area has been straightened to provide a more direct and obvious path. This is shown in Exhibits F and K.
7. **Direct physical access to the water.** The project applicant states:

“Providing direct physical access to the water and adding a beach area involves additional reviews with and approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Projected rising sea levels require the need to increase site elevation by three feet and the need to construct future perimeter walls/mounds per the adaptive management plan. The adaptive management plan conflicts with providing a beach, which will erode over time, and direct physical access to the shoreline. By providing an accessible path of travel to the docks as part of the Water Trail Access plan will provide the direct water access desired in a sustainable and accessible manner. The lower level floating kayak launch will also provide easier access to the water.”
8. **Plant palette.** The plant palette in the public access areas has been revised to better reflect the Bay environment, using the plant list provided in BCDC’s *Shoreline Spaces – Public Access Design Guidelines for the San Francisco Bay*. The palms and other trees that were located in the public access area have been moved closer to the residential areas of the property.

The DRB should consider whether the project proponent has adequately responded to and addressed its earlier request to further enhance proposed public amenities and provide additional design details for the proposed project.