

Parkline
EIR Scoping Comments (received between 1/10/23 and 2/6/23)

General Public

[Table of Contents](#)

Brittani Baxter	1
Nicola Diolaiti	3
Jonathan Hahn	4
Steve Pang.....	5
Marlene Santoyo (Menlo Together)	6
Omar and Mary Adham	13
Larry Anderson.....	15
Anna Hall	16
Judith Asher	17
Christopher Baldwin.....	20
Susan Bryan.....	21
Daryl Camarillo and Yolanda Font.....	22
Angel Chen	24
Sue Connelly.....	26
Dr. Harvey Fishman.....	28
Patti Fry	31
JoAnne Goldberg.....	32
Katherine L. Goodell.....	34
Tom Hall	35
Betsy Henze.....	36
Nancy Hosay.....	39
John Henze.....	42
George and Lauren John	45
John Kadvany	48
Kenneth Mah	50
Rob McCool.....	52
Peter C.....	53

Susan Stimson	54
Karen Wang.....	56
Philip Bahr	57
Susan Brophy	60
Katherine Dumont	61
Cliff Fitzgerald	63
Karen Grove	64
Lorri Holzberg.....	66
Brad Hoo	68
Dennis Irwin	69
Jenny Michel	71
Geeta Karmarker	72
Joy Kosobayashi	73
Margarita Mendez	75
Menlo Together Letter	77
Jennifer Michel.....	82
Henry Riggs	84
Sarah Zollweg.....	85

From: [Brittani Baxter](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support of Parkline, item G1
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 6:48:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for all of your long hours of service to the community during this recent busy season that's included reviews for the Housing Element and many more projects!

Unfortunately I won't be able to attend tonight's meeting, but wanted to voice my support for the Parkline project and share why I'm so excited for it.

A parcel this large turning over represents a once in a multi-generational opportunity to think ahead to what our community could and should be for the future. I think the homes in general represent an opportunity for our community to remain resilient and vibrant by creating homes at a mix of income and affordability levels, and I encourage us collectively (as a community) to think about all the factors impacting commutes and circulation in our city.

I remain very excited for the increased walkability and bikeability that the redesign will bring to the neighborhood. Not just for people like myself who are already here, walking or biking — but also for the new residents. Who, I suspect, will choose to live near downtown for exactly the same reason I did — its easy access to what I need for much of my daily activities without getting in a car.

In viewing and attending past meetings about this project and others, I hear a strong desire from all sides of the discussion to reduce the traffic impact of new homes. I'm writing because I very much share the desire to reduce traffic — our community is safer, healthier, and friendlier without gridlocked streets. I personally believe that a great way to get people out of cars is to just make it appealing (and as a first step, simply possible) to use other methods of getting around. And therefore, I believe this project represents a gem of an opportunity to do just that — by creating homes in an especially great location that's steps away from existing jobs, schools, and transit. Let's make the most of it!

Our housing element cites a stat saying that, I think (going from memory), 96% of our workforce commutes in. I wish we had good location data on where the individual commuters are coming from, but anecdotally the traffic patterns that I see when out and about seem to indicate lots of cross-bay commutes — i.e. drives from pretty far away. I hope and expect that this project will reduce overall traffic by allowing more community members to live near their work.

I wanted to close by sharing a recent finding published by Arlington, VA's government that I found fascinating. **Despite adding to their population in recent decades, they found that car traffic has steadily declined to 1980s levels.** This seems to be due to their emphasis on fostering walkable communities and clustering of homes near Metro stops — otherwise known as transit-oriented development, just like Parkline. Here's the report:

<https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/Projects/Documents/Historic-Traffic-Counts.pdf>

This project is a great opportunity to build in this same direction of vibrancy and energy, with a community focused around seeing each other when out for a walk, rather than being stuck behind the wheel of a car.

Thank you again,

Brittani Baxter
District 3 resident
(Apologies for any typos, writing from mobile)

From: [Nick](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Comments Proposed SRI/Parkline Project expansion
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 5:57:15 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Menlo Park Planning Commission,

I have recently learned that in this evening's meeting (Jan 23, 2023), a proposed expansion of the SRI/Parkline development project will be discussed.

As a resident of Linfield Oaks, I am concerned that increasing the number of units from 400 to approximately 600 will place an unsustainable burden and impact on the neighborhood and the community.

We all recognize that we are in a housing crisis, but the project does not address the impact on our local services (schools, transportation, traffic). As a parent and a resident, I am worried about the impact that a project of this size will place on the school infrastructures and on their accessibility: access to the schools (Encinal, Hill View) will become much harder because of the increased traffic on Laurel, Ravenswood and presumably Willow Rd.

I was initially pleased by the community outreach by SRI and Parkline and by their willingness to work with the residents and neighbors to include their feedback; this 11th hour change in plans seems however motivated by other reasons, and I would like for the Planning Commission to encourage SRI/Parkline to resume the work on the previous project that was discussed in 2022.

Best Regards,

Nicola Diolaiti

From: [Jonathan Hahn](#)
To: [PlanningDept; CCIN](#)
Cc: [Wolosin, Jen](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 6:40:32 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

I have just become informed about the situation with the SRI project under consideration. The state mandates that office development results in creation of housing that the city is having trouble meeting. The burden ends up falling on existing residents in many forms. Why doesn't the city manage and limit office development to manage this mandate? I think the residents deserve to know. Other cities do.

Also, when I saw that the SRI project has two driveways on Laurel, it's clear that's going to generate a lot of cut-through traffic through Linfield Oaks rather than direct it to Ravenswood and Middlefield which are intended for this purpose. Cars cutting through neighborhoods do so at unsafe speeds because all they care about is saving time and avoiding traffic. Traffic that's made significantly worse by these projects! It's just one of the many ways existing residents are burdened by these projects and the city should do more to protect the existing residents and neighborhoods.

Jonathan Hahn
340 Sherwood Way
Menlo Park

From: [Stephen Pang](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Sue Connelly](#)
Subject: SRI project feedback
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 5:59:21 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Commission,

As an owner in The Classics at Burgess, I with other Classics residences that call for a lower-impact, smaller development for the SRI property.

1. The percentage of units designated as BMR should be increased from 10% to 25%, to address the City's primary concerns for the development. If Parkline is truly attempting to address the housing affordability problem itself, it should understand and accept such an increase. In this way, the number of BMR units will increase and the number of total units, currently 400, can be maintained.
2. Any approval of the SRI project should not even be considered until the "dedication" of one acre to a homeless, transitional shelter, or the like is fully planned. Listening to the discussions regarding the Independence Drive project, I was struck by how well thought-out and planned was the "dedication" of units / land to Habitat for Humanity. It seems to be a mature project that seems to have been fully planned at the same time as the Independence Drive project. In contrast, here in the SRI project, there is a nebulous "donation" to an organization that has not been selected, for a development that has not even been imagined. Any approval for the SRI project should be performed with full knowledge and consent of the commission.
3. The driveways for the SRI project should be maintained on Middlefield road. This road already has a stop light and is a major access to the SRI project. One of Parkline's major talking points is the opening of the SRI campus as a park. Integrating traffic for residents through the campus and onto Middlefield will serve to unify this feeling for residents. Contrary to this, as currently designed, residents are actively funneled away from the campus and onto Laurel street. As previously stated by others, this additional traffic onto Laurel street causes serious safety problems at the Laurel Ravenswood intersection. Additionally, cut-through traffic will greatly increase through Linfield Oaks.

Thank you for your continued attention.

Steve Pang

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Marlene Santoyo](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda G1
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:57:53 PM
Attachments: [M2G Letter - Agenda G1.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Members of the Menlo Park Planning Commission,

38 members of your community have signed the following letter about the SRI proposal you will be studying tonight. In addition, twelve neighbors have written a personal note, which I encourage you to read. You will find the full letter and notes attached below.

Please consider the input from these residents who support the increased number of homes and increased affordability of the current proposal and ask you to go even further towards planning for housing equity and sustainability in Menlo Park.

Thank you for your consideration,
Marlene Santoyo

--

Marlene Santoyo | Organizer | (she/hers)
Menlo Together
510-945-7490
<https://menlotogether.org>



January 23, 2023

Members of the Menlo Park Planning Commission,

38 members of your community have signed the following letter about the SRI proposal you will be studying tonight. In addition, twelve neighbors have written a personal note, which I encourage you to read. You will find the notes beneath the letter.

Please consider the input from these residents who support the increased number of homes and increased affordability of the current proposal and ask you to go even further towards planning for housing equity and sustainability in Menlo Park.

Regards,

Marlene Santoyo and The Menlo Together Team

Members of the Menlo Park Planning Commission,

We, and the residents listed below, believe that our city can and must build more homes across all levels of affordability, especially near transit and downtown services, for a variety of household sizes and for people of all abilities.

We are glad to see that the Parkline proposal has increased the number of homes to 550, including a much needed and appreciated 100 deeply affordable homes for people of all abilities. We are pleased that the EIR will study up to 600 homes, and hope that the plans will grow to include that number of homes. Thank you for these important changes to the proposal.

We encourage the city and the developer to do even more.

A sufficient and diverse housing supply is required for a sustainable, welcoming and thriving community. Additionally, state law requires that we meet our fair share of and affirmatively further fair housing by planning for affordable homes in high resource areas. The State will make sure that we achieve our goals - willingly and through our own planning, or unwillingly through by-right development.

To that end, we:

- Celebrate the plan to dedicate an acre of land within the development to be donated to a non-profit housing developer and developed to meet our most pressing needs: deeply affordable housing for families and people of all abilities.

- Support increasing the number of homes beyond 550, and increasing the inclusionary Below Market Rate (BMR) units from 15% to 20%. We encourage reimagining the proposal to produce 100s more homes on this once-in-many-generations opportunity site that is walking distance from downtown services, transit, recreation and schools.
- Support reducing the amount of parking to attract non-driving residents and reduce local traffic, and to leave more space for community-enhancing amenities.

No matter where you begin, success in life starts at home for all ages and all people. When we have safe, secure places to live, parents earn more, kids learn better, health and well being improve, and our community is strengthened because it now has the building blocks needed to thrive.

Let's take full advantage of the Parkline project to build a strong community of people and families of all incomes and abilities who thrive.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

1. Anna Zara (Menlo Park)

I would also like to add that lately most of the new large housing developments in Menlo Park have been clustered in the Belle Haven and Linfield Oaks neighborhoods. It is time to look at adding housing to other Menlo Park neighborhoods as well and to even out the new housing units between the Menlo Park City School District and the Las Lomas School District.

Thank you for your coordination.

Anna

2. Michal Bortnik (Menlo Park)

3. Bridgit Louie (Menlo Park)

4. Beanie Zollweg (Menlo Park)

5. Caroline Beckman (Palo Alto)

6. Caroline Kory (Menlo Park)

7. Connor Gilbert (Menlo Park)

8. Dayna Schocke (Menlo Park)

9. Dennis Irwin (Menlo Park)

I want the benefits of living in a more diverse community. The more affordable housing there is in the Parkline project, the more we'll be going in that direction!

10. Hannah Gilbert (Menlo Park)

11. Julian Cortella (Menlo Park)

More housing near downtown is great! Please support the Parkline proposal with the increased number of homes.

12. Jessica Clark (Menlo Park)

13. Jennifer Johnson (Menlo Park)

14. Joseph Grass (Menlo Park)

15. JP Garcia (Menlo Park)

16. Julie Shanson (Menlo Park)

More housing at all income levels near transit and schools helps the whole town.

17. Karen Grove (Menlo Park)

I got interested in local housing issues as a way to "act locally" to achieve racial justice. I know others are interested in housing as a way to minimize our climate impact by reducing local traffic and emissions from people commuting to work in Menlo Park or nearby, because they cannot afford to live here (or near).

I support the increase in number of units, and the dedication of land to a partner who will develop 100 units of homes for those most impacted by housing insecurity.

But this proposal could be SO much more and go a lot further towards achieving fair housing and climate action in our city.

We should be looking at Willow Village - a 59 acre site (as compared to this 64 acre site) as a model. Willow Village is going to produce over 1700 homes including extremely low income affordable senior homes through a partnership similar to the one being contemplated for the SRI site.

What's good near Belle Haven would be even better at the SRI site, which is an easy walk from Caltrain, El Camino busses, downtown, parks, schools and restaurants.

This is a once in more than a generation opportunity to share a vibrant, equitable and sustainable future for Menlo Park.

18. Katie Behroozi (Menlo Park)

I'm enthusiastic about the redevelopment of this centrally located under-utilized land – but I'd like to see less parking, less office space, more housing at all income levels, well-integrated bike-ped

facilities and open space, and public access to all on-site amenities so that adjacent neighbors can use not only the open spaces but also whatever cafes and fitness facilities are developed (I don't think cities benefit from the Google/Meta in-house private amenities that have become the norm.)

19. Katherine Dumont (Menlo Park)

I live just one-half mile from the Parkline site, so I'm very interested in this project. In several meetings with the developer, I've been very impressed by their willingness to build housing for a range of needs and abilities. We should jump at this chance to provide more diverse and affordable housing in this location, which is so close to transit, Burgess Park, the community center, and to downtown shops and services.

This is a great opportunity to reverse the trend of pushing people to live further and further away from their jobs. It's hard on individuals and families, and it's hard on the environment. It's going to cost us all a lot more in the future if we don't take bold steps now.

Thank you for considering more housing on the Parkline site so we can move forward in a more sustainable and equitable way.

20. Lesley Feldman (Menlo Park)

21. Lorri Holzberg (Menlo Park)

22. Mary Kelly (Menlo Park)

I believe in increasing density and affordability!

We all benefit from the diversity!

23. Michael Arruza (Menlo Park)

24. Marijane Leonard (Menlo Park)

25. Margarita Mendez (Menlo Park)

26. Marlene Santoyo (Newark)

27. Nathan Rolander (Menlo Park)

I support this petition to build new homes

28. Nina Wouk (Menlo Park)

29. Jennifer Michel (Menlo Park)

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioners, Staff, Neighbors,

Thank you for listening to us and granting us much needed vibrancy in our City! I support the Parkline project and applaud the applicant for increasing housing.

Further I support:

Housing at all income levels keeps our community resilient, inclusive, and thriving. Do you have children? Where are they going to live in a few years? Have you been housing unstable? Do you have issues obtaining and retaining labor?

There is a cool recent batch of data from Arlington VA who saw a net decrease in traffic despite adding more units to the city, because of how the units are smartly clustered around transit. We will not meet our Climate Action Plan goals without reducing the number of miles people commute to work in or near Menlo Park, simply because they cannot afford to live here. New York Times also came out with a map of your carbon use mapped by neighborhoods showing that those of us working near where we live, who live within their means, generate climate stability. It's no longer cool or something to boast if you are an empty nester in an SFR on a 10,000 SF lot. Parkline gives us much needed dignity to get out of the car and use much less carbon.

I support local businesses and want them to have a robust, local workforce who are able to thrive and contribute to the community in which they work. Parkline would give a much needed infusion of new mouths to feed and serve. Our local businesses will see a much needed economic lift. Because Parkline is walking distance to downtown and major transportation infrastructure, the residents will also thrive! The current neighbors will feel welcome to walk and get out of their vehicles! What a win win win!!

I value equity and welcome people who have been discriminated against into all neighborhoods, parks and our schools.

Dedicating land in this prime location to a non-profit affordable housing developer is a great way to meet hard-to-meet housing needs: seniors, large families, single-women headed households, people with developmental and physical disabilities. I've mentioned before that I can't get labor to service my buildings because of the overly burdensome commute, but this project would help bridge that gap!

This site will be a strong applicant for federal, state, and county funds because of its proximity to transit and services.

The developer has shown that they are willing and open to building more housing for people of all incomes and abilities. We should take advantage of this opportunity and work with them.

Additionally, we are sending a message to all parties and stakeholders that our residents, workforce, families, and retirees all are incredibly valued and we stand with them, us, to meet the moment with our various housing needs. I'm proud to call Menlo my home and the City where we raise our son.

With all my love,

Jenny Michel from the Coleman Place Neighborhood Block

30. Frances Kieschnick (Menlo Park)

31. Sandy Sloan (Menlo Park)

We need more affordable homes west of Middlefield.

Thank you!

32. Sara Matlin (Redwood City)

33. Sarah Zollweg (Menlo Park)

34. Sharika Thiranagama (Menlo Park)

35. Sarah Brophy (Menlo Park)

This is the type of project that Menlo Park City council should encourage.

36. Tim Clark (Portola Valley)

37. Tom Kabat (Menlo Park)

38. Vikas Maturi (San Mateo)

From: [M. ADHAM](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan Review
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 1:39:45 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning commission members:

We have been residents of Linfield Oaks for 30 years, and raised our family here. Please do not approve the proposed changes in the density and size of the SRI/Parkline development as it is unfair for our neighborhood to disproportionately bear the impact of the initial 400 units, not to mention increasing it to 600 units. It's also not fair as we have taken on the additional housing of the Morgan Lane Development that was completed in 2008.

Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units of the SRI Development to 600 jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and increased traffic congestion in this area. Further:

- The apartment complex and townhome driveway should be removed from residential streets.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Residential streets leading to the new development are not used The office traffic can be significantly reduced if Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.
- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage.
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there

is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development.

Omar and Mary Adham
157 Linfield Dr
Menlo Park, CA. 94025

Sent from my iPhone

From: [larry anderson](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 1:08:49 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area.

Larry Anderson
321 Linfield Place

From: [Anna Hall](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 3:12:24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning Commission Members

Adding 400 housing unit in Menlo Park was intended by the State for more housing for people who need to live and work in Menlo Park. On the other hand, adding 200 additional units is questionable, especially if many of those units are earmarked for Office Space. Most people living near SRI know that 400 new units will seriously impact traffic, parking, infrastructure, and quality of life. It will have deleterious effects on students, teachers, and staff who work at Menlo-Atherton high school. Thus, plans to build numerous units so close to M-A should include input by school administration.

Most important, the Planning Commission must not ignore or minimize the impact that tens of thousands of recent job cuts in the Computer Sector in this area will create less need, if any, for more Office Space. Looking around Downtown Palo Alto, or El Camino Blvd., one sees countless signs for empty Office Space.

A responsible Planning Commission will need to go back to the drawing board and re-evaluate the SRI/Parkline Plan before proceeding any further. Failure to do so would indicate that members of the Planning Commission are not beholden to the residents of Menlo Park, but to Real Estate Developers.

Anna Hall
212 Gilbert Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [Judith Asher](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: SRI/Parkline Plan Review - requested changes
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 7:56:03 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my next door neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The **project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400**, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if

Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Quoting from my next door neighbor, Sue Connelly:

" SRI/ParkLine will have highly profitable housing and office revenue annually, but the costs will be borne by the taxpayers.

Based on current Menlo Park office rates, the office project stands to generate \$50M per year. This doesn't include ANY of the apartment rentals, for which most will be at very high rents (see the current rents for the new SpringLine apartments!). There will be some city revenue, but since SRI is a non-profit, this massive development will not offset many of the costs residents must pay for infrastructure (schools, police, fire, water and roads). Yet it will create a significant reduction in our quality of life (and possibly home values), bike/pedestrian safety for school children and residents, and increasing the state-mandated affordable housing units even more.

We need to require that any new office development provides/includes the affordable housing that the office spaces

and employee densities will be required to be built in Menlo Park."

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development .

Judith Saltzman Asher
530 Barron Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [Christopher Baldwin](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]Planning commission meeting Jan 23, 2023 for the SRI/ParkLane Plan Study Session
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 3:14:09 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear commission,

As a resident of Menlo Park, I am providing my comments regarding the **SRI/ParkLine Plan Study Session** which is being held tonight to be captured in the public record.

1. **The SRI/ParkLine project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing.**
2. **Reduce the amount of office to comply with the current C1 zoning.**
3. **Remove the apartment complex driveway on Laurel Street to protect bike safety for school children and pedestrians.**
4. **Use the (currently gated) SRI driveway onto Middlefield.**
5. **Increase parking for renters and employees.**
6. **Provide underground parking for the housing units and for the offices.**
7. **Include the emergency water storage tank.**

Thank you.

Christopher Baldwin
345 Claremont Way, Menlo Park, Ca 94025

From: [Susan Bryan](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Parkline Study session Jan 23, 2023
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 10:58:10 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning Commissioners: I am writing to remind you that members of Trinity Church, Menlo Park are neighbors of the new Parkline Development. Last year, we submitted the signature of some 30 church members asking for the maximum amount of affordable market rate housing to be included in the developer's plans. That means we would be in favor of the extra 50 units being proposed at the study session tonight.

Thank you - Susan Bryan, church member, Trinity Church, 330 Ravenswood Avenue, Menlo Park

From: [Daryl Camarillo](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/ParkLine project request
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 7:48:54 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Corrina and Planning Commission,

As a resident of The Classics at Burgess, we are requesting a third level in the EIR scope to review a lower-impact, smaller development option -- especially since the proposed plan **INCREASES the affordable housing deficit.**

In this smaller-scope project, we request the EIR to measure the following:

1. The SRI/ParkLine project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing that the amount of office planned will require Menlo Park to build.
 - o Reduce the amount of office to comply with the current C1 zoning. The planned office use will actually **NEGATIVELY** impact the affordable housing deficit and result in increasing the deficit due to the proposed office use. The risk of the projected lab use FAR being changed to higher employee densities per 1000 square feet will further increase the affordable housing deficit. In short, the office size and density is creating a bigger housing problem.
 - o Keep the housing at 400 apartments, but have 25% of them be BMR (Below Market Rate) units, so the separate one-acre donation being considered for an affordable housing development will not be required.
2. Study the option of removing the apartment complex driveway onto Laurel to preserve bike safety for school children and pedestrians and to reduce the existing gridlock on Laurel Street. The smaller driveway for the townhome residents can remain as indicated in the current plan.
3. Measure the use of the (currently gated) SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow as a viable alternative to the removal of the Laurel Street for the apartment buildings. The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if the Middlefield driveway opens (it will reduce Ravenswood gridlock to/from Middlefield and El Camino) and direct commuter traffic closer to Willow and Highway 101.
4. Increase parking for renters and employees since inadequate parking forces apartment renters, visitors and employees to clog residential streets with traffic while looking for parking and for taking up limited residential parking
(Note: In the 12/12 Planning Commission meeting on the SRI EIR, some commissioners wanted to reduce the proposed parking to force renters/employees to use public transit. But the representative from the firm that will conduct the EIR said that studies showed that reducing parking spaces did NOT reduce cars or numbers of car trips. It just pushed drivers to surrounding residential areas to take street parking, which added traffic as well. There were no reductions in Greenhouse Emissions or in number of car trips.)
5. Provide underground parking for the housing units and for the offices to reduce the overall height of the project (notably to reduce the height of the 3-story parking garage behind the Barron Street homes) and the potential of five six-story apartment

buildings if the project is approved for the 600 total housing unit option being reviewed.

6. Include the emergency water storage tank since there is no emergency water for residents and workers west of El Camino (per the latest water report) which said the emergency well in the city yard is not online yet. The risk of toxic contamination of the city yard emergency well makes it a problem since the city's gas tanks and city yard with other toxic substances (oil, pesticides, etc.) are above it could leak into the groundwater, especially in the expected large earthquake event at some point in the future.

Thank you for your help in getting this lower-impact option included in the EIR so we have a solid comparative analysis of the other two scenarios, especially the much larger scope option, that are being proposed in the EIR scope.

Daryl Camarillo/ Yolanda Font
525 Barron Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650-269-1493

From: [Angel Chen](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/ParkLine Building Project - Impact on Classics of Burgess Neighborhood
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 1:01:26 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Attention:
Corrina Sandmeier -- Acting Principal Planner
and the Menlo Park Planning Commission

Dear Corrina and Planning Commission,

As a resident of The Classics at Burgess, we are requesting a **lower-impact, smaller development** -- especially since the proposed plan actually **INCREASES the affordable housing deficit**.

In this smaller-scale project, we request the following:

1. **The SRI/ParkLine project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing** that the amount of office planned will require Menlo Park to build.
 - o **Reduce the amount of office to comply with the current C1 zoning.**The planned office use will actually **NEGATIVELY** impact the affordable housing deficit and result in increasing the deficit due to the proposed office use. The risk of the projected lab use FAR being changed to higher employee densities per 1000 square feet will further increase the affordable housing deficit. In short, the office size and density is creating a bigger housing problem.
 - o **Keep the housing at 400 apartments**, but have 25% of them be BMR (Below Market Rate) units, so the separate one-acre donation being considered for an affordable housing development will not be required.
2. **Remove the apartment complex driveway onto Laurel** to preserve bike safety for school children and pedestrians and to reduce the existing gridlock on Laurel Street. The smaller driveway for the townhome residents can remain as indicated in the current plan.
3. Instead of the Laurel Street driveway, **use the (currently gated) SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow** as a viable alternative to the removal of the Laurel Street for the apartment buildings. The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if the Middlefield driveway opens (it will reduce Ravenswood gridlock to/from Middlefield and El Camino) and direct commuter traffic closer to Willow and Highway 101.
4. **Increase parking for renters and employees** since inadequate parking forces apartment renters, visitors and employees to clog residential streets with traffic while looking for parking and for taking up limited residential parking.
(Note: In the 12/12 Planning Commission meeting on the SRI EIR, some commissioners wanted to reduce the proposed parking to force renters/employees to use public transit. But the representative from the firm that will conduct the EIR said that studies showed that reducing parking spaces did NOT reduce cars or numbers of car trips. It just pushed drivers to surrounding residential areas to take street parking, which added traffic as well. There were no

reductions in Greenhouse Emissions or in number of car trips.)

5. **Provide underground parking for the housing units and for the offices** to reduce the overall height of the project (notably to reduce the height of the 3-story parking garage behind the Barron Street homes) and the potential of five six-story apartment buildings if the project is approved for the 600 total housing unit option being considered.

6. **Include the emergency water storage tank** since there is no emergency water for residents and workers west of El Camino (per the latest water report) which stated that the emergency well in the City Yard is not online yet. The risk of toxic contamination of the City Yard emergency well makes it a problem since the city's gas tanks and city yard with other toxic substances (oil, pesticides, etc.) are above it and risk leaking into the groundwater, especially in the expected large earthquake event at some point in the future.

Thank you for your help in seriously considering this lower-impact development solution.

Best,
Angel Chen

From: [Sue Connelly](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [PlanningDept](#); [Sandmeier, Corinna D](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]Request to reduce the office and housing for SRI/ParkLine
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:45:58 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Ms. Sandmeier and Planning Commissioners,

I'm a Board Member and resident of The Classics at Burgess HOA. I would like to reiterate the requests I submitted for the EIR scoping deadline on January 9th regarding concerns about the massive size of the SRI/ParkLine development.

We are requesting a smaller development that reduces the negative impact of a development of this large scale -- especially since the plan **INCREASES the affordable housing deficit with the quantity of office space and density proposed.**

In this smaller-scale project, the following is requested:

1. **The SRI/ParkLine project should net out** to provide the affordable housing that the amount of offices and workers that the State mandates Menlo Park to build to accommodate the number of new workers.
 - o **Reduce the amount of office space** to comply with the current C1 zoning since the planned office use will actually **NEGATIVELY impact the affordable housing shortage** and result in increasing the number of affordable housing units that will need to be met by yet another development project. The risk of the projected lab use FAR being changed to higher employee densities per 1000 square feet will further increase the affordable housing deficit. Currently, it appears SRI has 1,000 employees on the Menlo Park campus. Even at the lab and biotech use of 4 employees per 1,000 square feet raises the number of workers on the site to 4,000. In short, the office size and density is creating a bigger housing problem. If the office FAR changes to even denser use for start ups and high tech companies, the density of workers per 1,000 square feet will go up significantly, and drive the deficit even deeper.
 - o **Keep the housing at 400 units**, but have 25% of them be BMR (Below Market Rate) units, so the separate one-acre donation considered for an affordable housing development will not be required and the community open space for a soccer field or other public use will be preserved. Also, with a reduction in office space, the housing can be reduced in height and density and spread out more on the SRI campus. With the possibility of five 6-story apartment buildings, in addition to the five 3-story buildings, this height will be 300% higher than any of the surrounding apartments and homes. Also, the apartment complex does not currently have a play area or community area, or pool. Burgess Park across the street is already overbooked and unavailable to soccer and baseball teams. How will we accommodate so many new residents who are in high-density housing without an open space?
2. **Remove the apartment complex driveway onto Laurel** to preserve bike safety for school children and pedestrians and to reduce the existing gridlock on Laurel Street. The smaller driveway for the townhome residents can remain as indicated in the current plan.

3. **Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield** to redirect traffic flow as a viable alternative to the removal of the Laurel Street for the apartment buildings. The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the SRI/ParkLine office and apartment driveways on Ravenswood if the Middlefield driveway opens. It will reduce Ravenswood gridlock to/from Middlefield and El Camino and direct commuter traffic more efficiently to Willow Road and Highway 101.

4. **Increase parking for renters and employees** since inadequate parking forces apartment renters, visitors and employees to clog residential streets with traffic while looking for parking and for taking up limited residential parking.
(Note: In the 12/12 Planning Commission meeting on the SRI EIR, some commissioners wanted to reduce the proposed parking to force renters/employees to use public transit. But the representative from the firm that will conduct the EIR said that studies showed that reducing parking spaces did NOT reduce cars or numbers of car trips. It just pushed drivers to surrounding residential areas to take street parking, which added traffic as well. There were no reductions in Greenhouse Emissions or in number of car trips.)

5. **Provide underground parking** for the apartment buildings and for the offices to reduce the overall height of the project (especially to reduce the height of the 3-story parking garage behind the Barron Street homes facing bedrooms and private living spaces on both floors of the homes) and the potential of five six-story apartment buildings if the project is approved for the 600 total housing unit option being considered. Although developers say underground parking is costly, based on current Menlo Park office rental pricing, the one million square feet of office can command an estimated \$50M per year. Considering the negative impact on the surrounding areas of this project, the cost of underground parking for the benefit of the community will be offset by the profits from just the office space alone. The apartment rental income will be another large annual revenue generator since most of the units will be at high market-rate pricing (e.g. SpringLine's rental pricing).

6. **Include an emergency water storage tank** since there is no emergency water for residents and workers west of El Camino (per the latest Menlo Park Municipal Water Report that was mailed to residents) which stated that the emergency well in the City Yard is not online yet. The risk of toxic contamination of the City Yard emergency well makes it a problem since the city's gas tanks and city yard with other toxic substances (oil, pesticides, etc.) are above it and risk leaking into the groundwater, especially in the expected large earthquake event at some point in the future.

Thank you for your serious consideration of a lower-impact development solution,

Sue Connelly

From: [Dr. Harvey Fishman](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]New development comments
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:52:11 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if

Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Sent from my iPhone.

Best Harvey
650-387-8481 cell

From: [Patti Fry](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [CCIN](#)
Subject: SRI Parkline project
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 8:22:39 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning Commissioners --

Please be sure that the project is modified so it improves rather than worsens the jobs/housing imbalance in Menlo Park.

There are decades of precedent with SRI to manage the number of allowed workers on site, well-documented by a submission in the public record by former Council Member Paul Collacchi, The current proposed project blows out prior precedent, including when land was spun off for housing. Managing the number of workers continues to be an important lever.

The proposed EIR scope continues to include worker density metrics that likely would greatly underestimate the potential number of workers and related negative impacts. The staff report describes office worker density assumptions of 250 SF/worker whereas tech companies have allocated 50-150 SF/worker, 66% to 400% more. Be sure that the metrics used will measure realistic impacts. Fix the metrics to be used in the analysis.

Patti Fry, former Menlo Park Planning Commissioner

From: [JoAnne Goldberg](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Cc: [CCIN](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]Planning commission meeting January 23: item G1, Parkline Study Session
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 11:55:13 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning Commissioners and Staff:

Thank you for accepting comments on this important project.

First, I want to endorse the information and analysis that former council member Paul Collacchi sent the Council and Planning Commission two weeks ago, asking for a big picture EIR analysis of the entire project, including the longer-term impact on housing requirements. His analysis points out that the overall project will increase the new housing obligation by over 2,000 units. Long-term consequences always need to be a consideration.

Meanwhile, tonight's study session focuses on the addition of 400-600 housing units in high-rise apartment buildings with few (if any) amenities offered to those new residents, or to current residents of the city. Burgess Park is across the street, but as the only city park with diverse facilities designed to meet the needs of a large segment of the population, it is already fully utilized (until this year, I scheduled practices and games for our local non-profit, all-volunteer youth soccer organization, AYSO. Space all over town is severely limited, especially at Burgess. We don't have enough room for our kids to play as is).

Next, proposals for this housing project specify that it be massively underparked, with (paid) housing advocates suggesting even less housing, holding up visions of a utopian community in which everyone -- no matter their age, physical health, or work/family obligations -- can bike or walk everywhere. In reality, the residents are going to have cars, which will either have to be parked at Burgess or in adjacent neighborhoods.

In the past, the city Planning Commission has rejected projects that did not meet parking requirements. I urge you to continue that tradition with this project.

Although most people in Menlo Park seem unaware of the Parkline project, it will impact almost all neighborhoods and have a deleterious effect on east-west connectivity. I second's Paul's request to expand the EIR to encompass most of the city, with particular note to the fact that Ravenswood and Laurel Street are heavily used by children bicycling to school.

I ask that you consider the needs of all residents and take a long-term approach to this proposal. Once the project has been approved, the change will be irrevocable.

JoAnne Goldberg

From: [Kathy Goodell](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Springline Project Requests
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 6:30:08 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

For the SRI/Springline project I respectfully request that you not exceed the 400-residential unit plan and keep office at the current C1 level, have the apartment complex not exit onto Laurel, and provide additional (not less) parking --including underground parking for offices and renters.

For those wishing to go west on Ravenswood (to connect to downtown and El Camino) our only street exit from Linfield Oaks is at the Laurel/Ravenswood intersection and in case of emergency and everyday travel (and for vehicles coming from the police station on Laurel) it's important to not have huge traffic bottlenecks at the Laurel/Ravenswood intersection. Opening up the Middlefield gate for the SRI/Springline folks would seem a logical alternative to reroute and help alleviate traffic pressure at Laurel/Ravenswood.

Thank you for your consideration of my requests.

Sincerely,

KATHY

Katherine L. "Kathy" Goodell
21 Willow Road
Menlo Park

From: [Tom Hall](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI Property
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 8:49:28 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area.

Tom Hall
212 Gilbert Ave.
Menlo Park

From: [Betsy Henze](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 10:46:57 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The **project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400**, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if

Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Quoting from my neighbor, Sue Connelly, who says it far better than I :

" SRI/ParkLine will have highly profitable housing and office revenue annually, but the costs will be borne by the taxpayers.

Based on current Menlo Park office rates, the office project stands to generate \$50M per year. This doesn't include ANY of the apartment rentals, for which most will be at very high rents (see the current rents for the new SpringLine apartments!). There will be some city revenue, but since SRI is a non-profit, this massive development will not offset many of the costs residents must pay for infrastructure (schools, police, fire, water and roads). Yet it will create a significant reduction in our quality of life (and possibly home values), bike/pedestrian safety for school children and residents, and increasing the state-mandated affordable housing units even more.

We need to require that any new office development provides/includes the affordable housing that the office spaces

and employee densities will be required to be built in Menlo Park."

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development .

Betsy Henze
320 Sherwood Way
Menlo Park

From: [Nancy Hosay](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan Review - requested changes
Date: Sunday, January 22, 2023 11:22:12 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The **project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400**, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if

Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Quoting from my neighbor, Sue Connelly, who says it far better than I :

" SRI/ParkLine will have highly profitable housing and office revenue annually, but the costs will be borne by the taxpayers.

Based on current Menlo Park office rates, the office project stands to generate \$50M per year. This doesn't include ANY of the apartment rentals, for which most will be at very high rents (see the current rents for the new SpringLine apartments!). There will be some city revenue, but since SRI is a non-profit, this massive development will not offset many of the costs residents must pay for infrastructure (schools, police, fire, water and roads). Yet it will create a significant reduction in our quality of life (and possibly home values), bike/pedestrian safety for school children and residents, and increasing the state-mandated affordable housing units even more.

We need to require that any new office development provides/includes the affordable housing that the office spaces

and employee densities will be required to be built in Menlo Park."

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development .

Nancy Hosay
325 Linfield Place
Menlo Park

From: [John Henze](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan Review - Requested Changes
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 3:11:59 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbors regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The **project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400**, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be

significantly reduced on the Ravenswood driveways if Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Quoting from my neighbor, Sue Connelly, who says it far better than I :

" SRI/ParkLine will have highly profitable housing and office revenue annually, but the costs will be borne by the taxpayers.

Based on current Menlo Park office rates, the office project stands to generate \$50M per year. This doesn't include ANY of the apartment rentals, for which most will be at very high rents (see the current rents for the new SpringLine apartments!). There will be some city revenue, but since SRI is a non-profit, this massive development will not offset many of the costs residents must pay for infrastructure (schools, police, fire, water and roads). Yet it will create a significant reduction in our quality of life (and possibly home values), bike/pedestrian safety for school children and residents, and increasing the state-mandated affordable housing units even more.

We need to require that any new office development provides/includes the affordable housing that the office spaces and employee densities will be required to be built in Menlo Park."

Please don't forget about all of the long-time Menlo Park residents that value the quality of life that Menlo Park has long afforded. Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development.

Thanks,

John Henze

31 year Menlo Park resident
320 Sherwood Way

Confidentiality notice: This message may contain confidential information. It is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not that person, you should not use this message. We request that you notify us by replying to this message, and then delete all copies including any contained in your reply. Thank you.

From: [Lauren John](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 9:50:19 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning commission members:

I am in full agreement with my neighbor Sue Connelly regarding proposed changes in the density and size of the development. Taking the already extremely large total housing number from 400 units to 600 units, is a 50% increase! At 400 units the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods, and jeopardizes basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area .

- The **project should net out to provide the state-mandated housing number of 400**, in the amount required by Menlo Park for the developers planned amount of office space. Keep 400 apartments according to the original plan, but create a BMR (Below Market Rate) number of 25% of those 400 housing units, so no separate acreage for affordable housing will be required.
- Reduce the amount of office to comply with current C1 zoning. Do NOT increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- The apartment complex driveway on Laurel St, should be removed to reduce traffic on Laurel St., and to preserve bike and pedestrian safety, such as it is, on Laurel St. The smaller driveway for townhome residents would be less problematic and can remain as is in the current plan.
- Use the currently gated SRI driveway onto Middlefield to redirect traffic flow so Laurel St is not used by the apartment residents (see above point) . The office traffic can be significantly reduced on

the Ravenswood driveways if Middlefield driveway opens, providing more egress options, and directing traffic closer to their destinations of Middlefield and 101 access.

- Increase parking commensurate with office worker numbers and apartment dwellers. Fewer parking spaces onsite only pushes traffic into nearby neighborhoods, as the research recounted to the Commission during the 12/12/22 meeting indicated. Fewer parking spots than the number of workers' and residents' cars do NOT encourage use of public transit, but to using neighborhood streets for parking.
- Provide underground parking for both offices and housing units, reducing the need for car parking to take up valuable above ground space in the form of an above ground parking garage .
- Include the emergency water storage tank , because 1) there is no options for workers west of El Camino and 2) the city yard emergency well is in danger of possible contamination during an earthquake from existing onsite gas storage and toxic substances in the ground.

Quoting from my neighbor, Sue Connelly, who says it far better than I :

" SRI/ParkLine will have highly profitable housing and office revenue annually, but the costs will be borne by the taxpayers.

Based on current Menlo Park office rates, the office project stands to generate \$50M per year. This doesn't include ANY of the apartment rentals, for which most will be at very high rents (see the current rents for the new SpringLine apartments!). There will be some city revenue, but since SRI is a non-profit, this massive development will not offset many of the costs residents must pay for infrastructure (schools, police, fire, water and roads). Yet it will create a significant reduction in our quality of life (and possibly home values), bike/pedestrian safety for school children and residents, and increasing the state-mandated affordable housing units even more.

We need to require that any new office development

provides/includes the affordable housing that the office spaces and employee densities will be required to be built in Menlo Park."

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development .

George and Lauren John
331 Laurel Street
Menlo Park 94025

From: [John Kadwany](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [CCIN](#)
Subject: Parkline/SRI proposal comments
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 11:11:08 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Following are comments on the land use policies implied by the Parkline/SRI redevelopment proposal, followed by recommendations.

– This project presents as a large office park with some housing included. The parking including three multi-story parking garages is significantly out of scale for a transit-oriented proposal. There is a commercial-to-housing ratio of about 2:1 or 3:1 (including old buildings) by square footage. Given that the Specific Plan major developments (Stanford, 1300 ECR) are about 50:50 residential compared to office + retail, for square footage, that amount of commercial space is out of step with recent transit-oriented development.

– Given the scarcity of housing in the Bay Area, this proposed office-residential ratio should not be encouraged by the PC or the city. A better use of this site would be to include more housing and less commercial and parking space. I do not know of city policy or resident preferences for this projected level of commercial space, especially given over-built office capacity today.

– The current proposal is not that of a 'neighborhood' or 'mixed-use' as stated in the Master Plan. This is principally an office park. While pedestrian and bicycle circulation through the project is good, the site space is dominated by the commercial and parking buildings. The two amenity buildings do not create a mixed-use plan. (That's not to suggest significant retail should be included, so the 'mixed-use' goal needs clarification. Certainly the office + residential design is not 'mixed-use'.) The 'open space' is numerically generous, and the designated use areas are good, but the overall layout is not that of an inviting public space. The plan does provide desirable benefits including the planned affordable housing area and the playing field.

- The current configuration of commercial buildings and parking garages, while apparently (and gratefully) not designed as 'secure' areas, are not oriented to encourage interaction with the community, or even the planned residences. The busy scenes full of pedestrians or office workers shown enjoying walkways in the project slides will not likely materialize.

– The rezoning and General Plan amendments options are open-ended. I do not agree with changes which would allow the development as proposed. It's a poor use of this site, more appropriate to urban planning now several decades past. I would not want amendments or zoning allowing new or existing buildings to be sold off to others, at least for significant periods of time. Plans for existing buildings including 'P', 'T' and 'S', and options for the affordable housing plan area, should be clarified.

- I understand the applicant is assuming that existing commercial entitlements, based on square footage, justify the proposed commercial space and parking. Instead, the applicant should acknowledge the very low intensity uses SRI has enjoyed in Menlo Park for decades. The applicant, PC and CC should use past site use intensities as a point of comparison for overall benefit-cost comparisons. A smaller total commercial use target should be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The plan needs a different balance of residential-commercial use of the site, and reduction of multi-story parking. For that, the site perimeter and large site size are sufficient to accommodate higher buildings for the site interior, keeping in mind existing streets and neighborhoods. For comparison, San Mateo and Palo Alto have several higher and older residential buildings mixed in smaller scale neighborhoods or downtowns. Consideration should be given where relevant to additional height for residential and commercial buildings to add floor area. Affordable housing plans could be integrated with these changes.

- Given fewer and possibly taller buildings, the remaining open space can be consolidated into a larger space shared by commercial and residence buildings. Such an approach could create a genuine shared open space, and a distinctive neighborhood less isolated from the adjoining residences, streets and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
John Kadvany / College Avenue

From: [Kenneth Everett Mah](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/ParkLine Study Session with Planning Commission public comment
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:33:26 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Menlo Park Planning Commission and Planning Department,

My wife and I are writing to express our concerns about the project overall and EIR, and request additional items be added to the scope and be studied/changed. We, along with our 4.5yo daughter and 7mo son, bought our home in the Burgess Classic neighborhood ~1 year ago (November 2021) and live directly on Laurel St across from Burgess Pool. We have lived on Laurel St for now 6+ years total.

Generally, we are concerned about the impact of the size of the residential and commercial development on local safety and resources. Specifically, traffic on Laurel St, safety of biking and walking on Laurel street especially for children since it's a safe route to school, and utilization of Burgess Park amenities.

- Entrances/exits on Laurel St
 - These should all be removed. All traffic, both residential and commercial, should be routed to Middlefield and Ravenswood. There is an opportunity to create an additional network of roads within SRI to either offload current traffic or at a minimum keep new traffic that will be added by this project off Laurel St, which is residential. We requested this in writing and verbally to both the City Council/Planning Commission and Lane Partners, but continue to be ignored and have not received any explanations on why they want to direct the new residential traffic onto Laurel as opposed to the internal SRI roads or Ravenswood. Furthermore, not having driveways onto Laurel would encourage new residents to use alternative modes of transportation rather than drive.
 - Request: Please remove all entrances/exits on Laurel St, or study the impact on traffic on Laurel St and demonstrate there will be no difference from the current state. Also, study the impact at the different variations of housing density.
- Safety on Laurel St
 - Laurel St is a residential street that is designated a safe route to school. Any increase in car traffic or driveway use (the current SRI driveways on Laurel have minimal traffic to no traffic) will compromise the safety of children. Walking and biking will be more dangerous due to traffic and more intersections. We have verbally requested Lane Partners extend truly protected (by physical barriers such as curb, and not just paint) bike lanes in both directions on Laurel from Ravenswood to Burgess, and they verbally agreed, but we don't see it on the proposal.
 - Request: Please remove all entrances/exits on Laurel St, or study the impact on traffic on Laurel St and demonstrate that traffic accidents (car vs car, car vs bike, car vs pedestrian) will not increase, and the impact of at the different variations of housing density.
 - Request: Install truly protected (by physical barrier such as curb or

- immobile ballard) bike lanes in both directions on Laurel St from Ravenswood to Burgess.
 - Request: Install truly protected (by physical barrier such as curb or immobile ballard) bike lanes in both directions on Burgess Drive from Laurel St to SRI/Menlo Park Corporation Yard (since this will be open to bike/pedestrian traffic).
 - Also, would like protected bike lanes the full length of Burgess between Alma and SRI whether as part of this Parkline Project or the Middle Tunnel.
- Utilization of Burgess Park amenities
 - Adding 400+ units and commercial space will severely overcrowd the amenities at Burgess Park, and decrease how current residents can use them. These include the pool, tennis courts, playground, library, gymnastics center, etc. and the associated classes with them, such as gymnastic and dance classes, swim lessons, etc.
 - Request: Study the impact on Burgess amenities by specific amenities, not generally, and class/course offerings at each amenity, and demonstrate there will be no difference than current state. Also, study the impact at the different variations of housing density.
 - Request: Give Burgess Classics residents priority and discounted/free access to Burgess Park amenities if the Parkline development will impact access in any way.
- Menlo Park Corporation Yard Parking lot
 - This parking lot is primarily used by MP staff during the day, and Burgess Classics residents at night. We are currently not allowed to get annual overnight parking passes despite our limited street parking, but we can use the lot and tennis court. We are concerned that Parkline residents and workers will use the lot, as will other people who come to use the public space and amenities in Parkline as it is the closest parking lot to SRI/Parkline.
 - Request: Study the impact of the development on use of the Corporation Yard parking lot during the day, evening, and overnight, and demonstrate there will be no impact.
 - Request: If there is an impact, make lot not accessible to Parkline residents or workers nor the public, and give Burgess Classic residents access to overnight annual parking permits for free so we can park on the streets of Burgess Classics (Thurlow, Hopkins, and Barron) and the Corporation Yard parking lot.

Please let me know if you have questions or need clarification about these concerns or requests.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Kenneth Mah

From: [Rob McCool](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]please reconsider SRI/ParkLine site specifics
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:24:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Menlo Park City Council,

Reducing housing to office space imbalance by increasing housing should be a priority for us all. Increasing the housing to 600 units at this site, from 400, while still allowing 4000 more employees into the site, does nothing to relieve this imbalance.

I am also disappointed to see that parking is being reduced in an attempt to reduce car traffic. Our peninsula cities are simply not correctly set up for this to be realistic at this time, meaning that anyone living in these new properties will absolutely have a car, as will many of the employees commuting into the site each day. I urge the council to be realistic as to how people will get around our city from this new development, which is going to remain car-based due to the last mile problem associated with caltrain.

Finally I would also urge the council to consider Laurel Street, and not include a driveway onto Laurel from this complex. Middlefield is far more well set up to handle this increased traffic, and would be the more appropriate way to direct traffic. Our police frequently use Laurel Street to get to and from various parts of town and introducing more traffic blockage on Laurel is not going to be positive.

Thanks, Rob McCool 360 Sherwood Way

From: [Peter C](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]Traffic at SRI
Date: Sunday, January 22, 2023 5:07:35 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Department,

It is apparent that the Planning Department and City Council are acting counter to the concerns of the Burgess Classics neighbors. Yes, we have a housing deficit in the Bay Area, but replacing it with this project does not solve the area's housing problem.

My concerns are as follows:

- 1) Major traffic along Laurel, Ravenswood and Middlefield. We need to make sure the trip caps are low enough to manage this large project.
- 2) This project will create an imbalance to jobs to housing units, further exacerbating the region's housing crisis. Let's not use tax receipt collections as a smoke screen to endorse the project. We need to ensure it does not impact schools and our local infrastructure.
- 3) 600-unit mid-rises don't conform to the area's existing uses.

I'm generally supportive, but let's go back to 400 units the original proposal by the developer.

Thank you

Peter C (District 3 resident)

From: [Susan Stimson](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#); [_CCIN](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan Review - requested changes
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 3:50:22 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

City Council and Planning Commission Members,

As a 14 year resident of Menlo Park, I urge you to curtail the scope of the Parkline housing project to protect safety and accessibility in Menlo Park.

As you know from past examination of the railroad crossings, the crossing at Ravenswood is especially tenuous during high traffic hours which surround both business hours AND very importantly school hours.

In addition, the accessibility to and from Highway 101 via Willow road has deteriorated. Of course, there was respite amidst the pandemic, however, the existing two lane road is insufficient to accommodate future growth.

The city has expressed interest in forward and future thinking which I think is apt. Preparing for additional housing is an important part of that for certain.

That said, the plans must be coupled with forward thinking and planning regarding infrastructure to accommodate additional neighbors such as above/below grade railroad crossings and additional routes to access highways 101 and 280. Not doing so puts current and future neighbors at risk and lacks prudence.

The Parkline project is scoped to add over twice as many units as the 2 large developments yet to be inhabited (Springline is open but not at capacity and the Stanford project is still under construction). Despite how the city chooses to draw district lines, all properties are adjacent to downtown. While convenience to public transit is a benefit, it is not realistic or fair to assume that new residents will give up their freedom of owning and using an automobile. People have lives off of El Camino... kids sports activities, jobs off highways vs downtown, jobs like sales or construction that require daily driving, hiking in the hills, volunteering on the coast for example.

While I understand that speculative models have been generated regarding the potential effects to traffic and safety, I urge the city to "digest" the new additions from other downtown adjacent developments before adding extensively to them.

I am fully supportive of adding new housing on the SRI campus and the campus development overall. I also support stipulating that a higher percentage become affordable housing.

My asks:

- Perform a traffic and safety assessment subsequent to the large developments on El Camino being inhabited. That will be possible very soon if the need for housing near downtown is dire.
- Perform a survey of those new neighbors to see how they in fact are commuting and using / not using public transit.
- Ensure city of the future planning includes near term investments in infrastructure to improve access to highways 101 and 280 and also above or below grade RR track crossings

Thank you for your consideration regarding rejecting this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development.

Susan Stimson

From: [Karen Wang](#)
To: [PlanningDept](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI/Parkline Plan Review - requested changes
Date: Monday, January 23, 2023 4:29:25 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Planning Commission and City Council members:

I object to proposed changes in the density and size of the SRI/Parkline development for the following reasons.

- At even 400 housing units, never mind 600, the density of this development far outstrips anything in the adjoining neighborhoods and will negatively impact basic quality of life issues including resultant lack of parking, crowding, school and infrastructure impacts and traffic in this area.
- We should not increase the jobs-housing imbalance by adding any more office space to this proposal. We need to stop big office development until we meet the affordable housing deficit for the offices already built and others already approved in the pipeline. We need to bring jobs and housing in balance, not keep widening the gap between them.
- It is fantasy to believe workers and residents will exclusively use public transit and not have cars. The traffic and parking impact on the surrounding neighborhoods will be terrible.

I hope you reject this enlarged and negatively impactful proposal for this development. Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Wang
29 Willow Road
Menlo Park

MEMO

To: Planning Department (PlanningDept@menlopark.gov), Corrina Sandmeier, Jen Wolosin

From: Phillip Bahr

Date: 2/06/2023

Re: SRI Comments 2/06/2023, 5/10/2022 and various dates. Staff Report #22-073-PC and #22-091-CC Item G.

We applaud SRI and their efforts toward proposing a project that offers Menlo Park well-being, green design and sustainability goals.

C-1. HOUSING FOR OUR CHILDREN, LAW ENFORCEMENT, TEACHERS, ETC. The proposed project does not meet the needs of those residents and want-to-be residents who are in the income middle. What I hear and am told is that we need affordable two and three bedroom homes to buy not just more apartments. FACT, a couple with two children, working a job in law enforcement and a healthcare provider, can't afford a home here. The middle class is priced out of Menlo Park. We want this group to be able to get started in the housing market. How can we be assured by the City of Menlo Park, SRI and the Developer that our own Menlo Park children and residents will have housing priority?

C-2. TRAFFIC/SAFETY. Study the option of removing the apartment complex driveway on Ravenswood (across from Pine Street). The vehicular access from the proposed Parkline housing along Ravenswood and Laurel is aligned with Pine Street. The proposed street intersection of Ravenswood/Pine Street is not acceptable for several reasons.

- A. There is already a traffic problem with traffic exiting from SRI onto Ravenswood.
- B. The Pine/Ravenswood intersection is too close to the intersection of Laurel/Ravenswood.
- C. There is major traffic congestion at commute hours now in the vicinity of Ravenswood/Laurel now. Imagine how this will be once the project is complete and all other traffic returns to Menlo Park.

If vehicles and delivery trucks originating from the Parkline housing units enter and exit from the proposed housing units and cross across Ravenswood to Pine Street *this* will create a disastrous and deadly situation to the pedestrians and vehicles. Also, Pine Street can only accommodate one lane of traffic with parking on one side. For example, the existing traffic situation is unsafe and does not allow police or fire truck access. This point must be addressed by the City of Menlo Park now. Furthermore, to install traffic barriers on Ravenswood to

prevent exiting from the Parkline project will not work. Currently the Springline project used this solution and I have personally observed cars simply going around the barriers and going straight across Oak Grove.

BACKGROUND: We have a bigger and yet connected problem on Pine Street. Safety and Accessibility. Pine Street is approximately 23'-10" in width. This width does not comply with current transportation standards. Cars and trucks oftentimes park illegally on our sidewalks and California Water Service meter covers. I've been told that the reason folks park on our sidewalk is to avoid getting their vehicles damaged. They've damaged our sidewalks, street tree planting areas and utility covers.

Vehicles also use our street as a short cut (as depicted on the Waze app and google maps) I have witnessed cars darting across Ravenswood and Oak Grove onto Pine Street as they leave from a local business and school.

Of most concern, fire trucks and ambulances are unable to drive down our street in an emergency if cars are parked on both sides of the street. This is a hazardous condition and the City was notified by me in writing on February 13, 2019.

C-3. SITE PLAN The proposed site plan adds over 1,000,000 sf of new office space. This adds to our housing deficit! The additional office/commercial sf adds to the existing traffic, parking and all other environmental impacts. Ironically, should SRI continue at their current level of employees and services, then the additional sf impacts will be additive and potentially put this area in gridlock. The ensuing gridlock will cut off access into and out of Menlo Park Downtown from 101. Generally, the access and flow of the site master plan does not respond to traffic conditions. For example, access points to site are from Laurel and Ravenswood. Study a site plan that has access from Middlefield Road or close to Menlo Atherton High School.

C-4. BUILDING DESIGN AND SETBACK The proposed building design in a mission style is not reflective of good design. A six-story mission style building? The proposed setback for the residential location is too close to Ravenswood and Laurel streets. The housing should be set back at least the same distance as the existing SRI building on Ravenswood.

C-5. HOUSING LOCATION AND BUILDING HEIGHT. The height of the residential buildings was depicted by the Architect and Developer not to exceed two stories on Laurel or Ravenswood, not three to six stories as stated during tonight's presentation. The density of residential building massing does not reflect the surrounding neighborhoods of Pine, Laurel, etc. I am not saying that it's not desired to have taller buildings, but don't place them at the corner of Ravenswood and Laurel. Keep the building close to the street at the originally discussed one and two stories.

C-6. TRAFFIC COMMENT The traffic congestion on El Camino/Ravenswood/Laurel/Middlefield is already a problem. The HEU Update Draft SEIR depicts a population increase of over 30% for Menlo Park. The baseline used is traffic from 2021. This is not an apples-to-apples comparison as our traffic was down from 2020 through 2022 and continues to be low. Also, the newly

approved or constructed projects, i.e. Parkline, are not fully occupied and some not constructed.

The assumption of the distance to mass transit will reduce traffic is not viable in our case. Until the public transit system is improved to go to more destinations, with more connections it will not entice patrons to ride the bus or train.

C-7. PARKING COMMENT: The Park assumes that many of their residents will be enticed to take public transportation. All housing units need to provide enough parking garage or parking grade level parking to accommodate the Parkline's additional cars. The residential streets do not have the capacity to absorb all of the Parkline's additional parking. For example, Pine Street does not have parking capacity to allow additional parking from Menlo Atherton High School, businesses and nearby projects. Pine Street in front of our house is less than 23'-10" wide with parking on both sides of the street. This street is much too narrow to provide the health and safety necessary to the residents and visitors. The additional traffic from the Parkline/SRI project as well as traffic short cuts will increase traffic flow on Pine Street.

All of these comments have been made in writing by me and others previously as well as some other comments. It appears that SRI and their Developer & Architect have not addressed these community comments made during the outreach process.

Respectfully Submitted,

Phillip Bahr
Menlo Park, CA 94025

From: [Sarah Brophy](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 4:28:37 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear council members,

I'm writing to support this development. There is a huge need for housing at all income levels in Menlo Park. I have lived in this community with my family for 12 years. In that time many friends and their families have left the Bay Area because of housing affordability, mostly high income professionals who were unable to afford to buy a home and who grew tired of the precariousness of renting with no tenant protections. The situation for low income workers is more dire, with rising housing costs leading to longer commutes and worsening quality of life for them. This also has environmental costs for all. This development is a first step in changing the unsustainable and unfair housing conditions in Menlo Park and I urge you to vote in favor.

Sincerely,

Sarah Brophy
1376 Johnson Street
Menlo Park

From: [Katherine Dumont](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 11:16:10 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I live in Linfield Oaks, and I support more housing--and more deeply affordable housing--at SRI Parkline because:

- 1) This development will help Menlo Park to achieve its climate goal of reducing greenhouse gases. It's better for the environment to create more housing closer to where people work. This is especially true here in Menlo Park, where over 90% of workers commute in from elsewhere.
- 2) Because SRI-Parkline will be located close to transit and downtown amenities, we have the opportunity to both add housing AND manage traffic impacts. It is an ideal location for reduced parking minimums and other measures to minimize car trips and manage traffic congestion.
- 3) I walk and ride my bike for errands. But many people I know won't ride bikes because they don't feel it is safe. I really appreciate that the developers have planned for walkways and bikeways within the site, and we should take these ideas as inspiration to prioritize the creation of safe routes to school and work on the streets around this project, including Ravenswood, Willow, Alma, Burgess, and Middlefield.
- 4) Creating more housing--especially deeply affordable housing and housing for a range of needs and abilities--on the west side of 101 AND close to transit and services will help the city achieve its goal of affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Thank you,
Katherine

Katherine Dumont
khdumont@gmail.com
225 Waverley St Apt 3
Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [Cliff Fitzgerald](#)
To: [Sandmeier, Corinna D](#)
Subject: Parkline Off-site Plan / Traffic Mitigation
Date: Friday, January 27, 2023 11:44:08 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Corinna,

I am a MP resident living on Marcussen Drive, which is situated across from the main SRI entrance on Ravenswood. Marcussen Drive is a narrow residential street that unfortunately is used by "short cutters" from both directions to avoid traffic signals on Middlefield. Short cutters too often drive too fast, so there is already a concern on our street about unnecessary traffic, even before the advent of the Parkline Project.

I do not see in the Parkline Master Plan (link below) any mention of traffic impact mitigation regarding surrounding residential zones. Can you please let me know when and how public comment will be solicited for this aspect? Is the city planning to measure traffic baselines before the Parkline Project gets underway? Is there someone I can talk to who would be interested in and responsible for these concerns?

Thank you,

Cliff Fitzgerald
1128 Marcussen Drive
Menlo Park
650.380.3179

From: [Karen Grove](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: SRI - Jobs-Housing fit and balance, getting out of our cars and building community
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:07:35 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for your tireless volunteer service, and thank you for your support of jobs/housing balance and jobs/housing fit in your discussions of the SRI Parkline project to date.

I am writing to emphasize the value and importance of the proposed land donation and partnership with an affordable housing developer to build homes for people of all abilities, people with very and extremely low incomes, and households of all sizes in this high resource location. This is paramount. This proposal includes 80-100 lower-income housing for people with unmet housing needs. Can we do more? Doing so would help to reduce our decades-in-the-making deficit in this category of housing need.

At the same time, if we do not build enough homes for the new workers this project brings into the community, we create pressure on community members who rent older units, because increased housing demand leads to redevelopment and displacement.

There is no site in Menlo Park more amenable to alternatives to driving than this one. A robust Transportation Demand Management program can reduce local traffic. Encouraging active transportation and getting people outdoors where they can meet their neighbors will also increase quality of life and build community.

I ask that you work towards the maximum housing possible (to avoid displacement pressures), the greatest possible number of deeply affordable homes (to meet our most urgent unmet housing needs), and a very high level of transportation demand management (to reduce traffic congestion); and please move the project forward.

Regards,
Karen Grove

Karen Grove
karenfgrove@gmail.com
3826 Alameda de las Pulgas
Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [Lorri Holzberg](#)
To: [_Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 8:05:44 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

I have been fortunate to have been a resident and home owner in Menlo Park since 1978. I am in complete support of more housing at the SRI site and support affordable housing for workers in Menlo Park. We need to have more balance in our housing.

Lorri Holzberg
lorriholzberg@gmail.com

Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [Sandmeier, Corinna D](#)
To: [Sandmeier, Corinna D](#)
Subject: FW: Do not Approve Zoning Changes for SRI Project
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 12:55:57 PM
Attachments: [CMP Email Logo 100dpi 05d92d5b-e8e3-498f-93a6-d0da509bd60211111111.png](#)
[CMP Email Logo 100dpi 05d92d5b-e8e3-498f-93a6-d0da509bd60211111111.png](#)



Corinna D. Sandmeier
Principal Planner
City Hall - 1st Floor
701 Laurel St.
tel 650-330-6726
menlopark.gov
*Note our emails have changed to @menlopark.gov

From: Brad Hoo [<mailto:bradshoo@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2023 11:38 AM
To: _CCIN <city.council@menlopark.gov>
Subject: Do not Approve Zoning Changes for SRI Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear City Council members, Why are we approving zoning changes which increase the Menlo Park housing deficit? Obviously this is not about making housing more affordable in Menlo Park. What benefit will the residents of Menlo Park enjoy from more office development and a larger housing imbalance? The State has already rejected recent plans to develop more housing for Menlo Park as "unrealistic", and yet you move to increase the housing deficit. SRI will benefit, who else? In approving this project you undermine the moral authority of our representative city government. Whom do you serve?

Brad Hoo
26 Year Resident of Menlo Park

From: [Dennis Irwin](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 10:23:16 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Most people living in Menlo Park aren't even close to being able buy a house at market-rate around here, and that includes me and my wife. I believe our city would benefit greatly by increasing its diversity. That will only be possible if more affordable homes are made available, and SRI Parkline is a perfect opportunity to make that happen. For that reason I support incorporating as many affordable units as possible into this project.

— Dennis Irwin

Dennis Irwin
hairpoosh@yahoo.com

Menlo Park, California 94025

Public Comments - Planning Commission Meeting 02.06.2023 7pm - Item F1

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioners, Staff, Neighbors and Members of the Public,

I'm Jenny Michel from the Coleman Place Neighborhood Block, a recovering homeless teacher, by trade a commercial property manager representing LL interests, and a former luxury real estate agent in Menlo Park.

Item F1: Personal Comments

While we wait for HCD to review our housing element for substantial compliance, the SRI development project is our opportunity to affirmatively further fair housing in action.

I made a mistake that I need to correct. Although I applauded the applicant for adding additional housing units, I failed to tie our environmental justice element. This project is larger than the Willow Village, by several acres of land.

Because of the proximity to mass transit, downtown, grocery, medical, and educational services, we have the exciting opportunity to increase the density to a comparable level, exceeding the 1730 units that Willow Village is approved for.

As many neighbors have mentioned the once in a generation opportunity for resilient growth on this land, I ask the applicant and this body to consider up to 1850 units of housing, at least 30% being affordable.

53 acres of land dedicated to office/life science/R&D product is a massive development. I appreciate that the applicant, SRI, has engaged a local for profit stakeholder, Lane Partners, I ask all of you:

Where are your children going to live when they grow up? When they graduate high school, where are they going to live? Why do we mandate that our kids must move away from their native land? Why not keep our invested stakeholders, our youth, here continually invested in and enriching our City with their families?

Drive this further, Where are the day porters, security guards, admins, technicians, aides, butchers, hair stylists, and day care providers living? What are you doing to ensure that those of us living off of entry level wages can live and work on this campus? Does the 53 acres solve for this need? We know it is solving for the high yield spread demanded by investors, but that is now an antiquated model. The new hotness is a 10 min City abandoning the single use vehicle for those of us interested. Office products are failing as we watch more and more sublease product flood the market and more than likely will need to be converted to housing across this region. Let's get the allocation right from the get go. Please reconsider your approach and increase the density of housing to the same allocation as Willow Village.

Thank you for your time.

From: [G. Karmarkar](#)
To: [PlanningDept; _CCIN](#)
Cc: [G. Karmar](#)
Subject: [Sent to Planning]SRI Expansion and housing deficit for Menlo Park
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 6:10:54 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

To the Planning Commission and City Council members of Menlo Park

As a resident of Linfield Oaks I have learned to my dismay that the city and Parkline propose to expand the housing available at the SRI location from 400 to 600 units. A project of this size will add countless cars on the streets when it is already difficult to navigate the neighborhood and traffic to/from the freeway and downtown Menlo Park. Traffic will increase exponentially. It's already a nightmare. 400 units = 400+ cars.

Good luck getting to the hospital if you need care. It has taken me up to 3 light changes just to make it across Ravenswood during 'rush hour' (which now begins at 3:30 and lasts until 6:30) The train tracks also hold up traffic as they run more frequently during those times . Nt to mention that the lights are badly timed as well. It just adds to the overall frustration.

I am not sure why the city feels the need to add more units and more office space. The added office space simply adds to Menlo Parks housing deficit. We already have more than one large housing/office space development on El Camino. Do we really need 200 more units here?

Who benefits from this? The existing residents certainly do not. If this is simply to raise the coffers I have bad news. Large developments bring change that requires more investment in policing, fire and infrastructure which Menlo Park will soon need to address. Who will pay for these costs? The residents?

I urge you to think carefully about where Menlo Park adds more housing. Palo Alto for instance has added multiple large housing developments away from downtown and high traffic areas, and in areas where roads and infrastructure can accommodate more cars and residents. That's called city planning.

Sincerely

Geeta Karmarkar

From: [Joy Kosobayashi](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support more housing at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 3:08:00 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

In reading about the comparison of housing planned for Meta's Willow project vs SRI--I can't understand why there is such an imbalance. I doubt there would be many future opportunities that could potentially provide as much housing as the SRI site. I support an even larger increase to the housing component.

Joy Kosobayashi
gj.koso@gmail.com

Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [Margarita Mendez](#)
To: [_Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 8:18:42 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Dear commissioners:

I am an 18 year resident of MP and was active in the campaign to defeat measure V. Over and over again my neighbors in Suburban Park stated they wanted housing in high resource areas. While I do believe our neighbor is in a high resource area, SRI Parkline is much closer to transit than Lorelei or Suburban Park. Having housing in that location and reducing the amount of parking needed to make the project viable would help relieve the traffic concerns.

I bike to work in Palo Alto every day and would appreciate the bike lanes through this development so that I could avoid the Middlefield and Ravenswood. I do believe we have to imagine a world where more and more of us are getting out of our cars, biking and walking to downtown and to work.

Margarita Mendez

Margarita Mendez
mlmendez@me.com

Menlo Park, California 94025



February 6, 2022

Dear Menlo Park Planning Commissioners and Staff,

We, the Menlo Park residents and nearby neighbors who work, worship, and shop in Menlo Park, believe that our city can and must build more homes across all levels of affordability, especially near transit and downtown services, for a variety of household sizes and for people of all abilities.

We are glad to see that the Parkline proposal has increased the number of homes to 550, including a much needed 100 deeply affordable homes for people of all abilities. We encourage even more housing! We also appreciate the proposal's commitment to including recreational and passive open space, improved bike and pedestrian connectivity through the site, and heritage tree preservation.

We appreciate and echo the numerous public and commissioner comments at the January 23rd meeting:

- Encouraging more housing at this high resource location in Menlo Park (that is walking distance from downtown services, transit, recreation, and schools) to affirmatively further fair housing and to build enough new homes to balance the number of new jobs at the site.
- Encouraging and appreciating the donation of land for 100% affordable housing within the development to meet our most pressing needs: deeply affordable housing for families and people of all abilities.
- Requesting to locate the donated land for 100% affordable homes with the other residential buildings.
- Asking to significantly increase investment in alternatives to driving (the technical term for this is "Transportation Demand Management" or TDM) to reduce driving to and from the site.
- Asking to reduce parking to the minimum viable parking to further reduce traffic congestion, and to leave more space for community-enhancing amenities.

A sufficient and diverse housing supply is required for a sustainable, welcoming, and thriving community. Additionally, state law requires that we meet our fair share and affirmatively further fair housing by planning for affordable homes in high resource

areas. The State will make sure that we achieve our goals - willingly through our own planning, or unwillingly through by-right development.

No matter where you begin in life, success starts at home for all ages and all people. When we have safe, secure places to live, parents earn more, kids learn better, health and wellbeing improve, and our community is strengthened because it now has the building blocks needed to thrive.

We have a golden opportunity to build such a community with this project. We look forward to the outcome.

Sincerely,

1. **Alex Dersh** (*ZIP code: 95126*)
2. **Amy Hinckley** (*ZIP code: 94025*)
3. **Ann Banchoff** (*ZIP code: 94025*)
4. **Andrew Slater** (*ZIP code: 94025*)

Please approve this project to allow working class people to live in Menlo Park!

5. **Michal Bortnik** (*ZIP code: 94025*)
6. **Celeste Chapman** (*ZIP code:)*

Dear Menlo Park Planning Commission, I am writing to support this excellent proposal - great to locate housing in an area within walking distance of the train, the library, schools, parks and downtown.

Thank you!

Celeste Chapman

7. **Elidia Tafoya** (*ZIP code: 94025*)

I am a current employee at the SRI site where Parkline will be built. I love the idea of more houses, but I propose the low to moderate income homes be below market value without a nonprofit handling a portion of the land. It should be among the mixed used housing similar to the Hamilton Park homes since the homes are integrated in the community and ownership is far beneficial to advance prosperity in Bay Area.

8. **Estee Greif** (*ZIP code: 94305*)
9. **Molly Finn** (*ZIP code: 94025*)
10. **Joy Kosobayashi** (*ZIP code: 94025*)

This is a perfect opportunity to build more housing. Why are the proposed number of units here so much smaller than the project Meta has backed?

11. **Carolyn Shepard** (ZIP code:)

I am supporting this opportunity to include housing for those with special needs. I represent a group of aging parents in San Mateo County who are supporting their adult children who have mental health challenges and cognitive issues. These adult children are at risk of becoming homeless once the parents pass away. They need supportive housing that is located near transit, shopping and is safe. Thank you.

Carolyn Shepard

President

Solutions for Supportive Homes

12. **John Contreras** (ZIP code: 94025)

Yes.

13. **Jennifer DiBrienza** (ZIP code:)

14. **jp garcia** (ZIP code: 94025)

15. **Judith Holiber** (ZIP code: 94025)

16. **Julian Pedro Garcia-Mendez** (ZIP code: 94025)

17. **Karen Grove** (ZIP code: 94025)

18. **Katie Behroozi** (ZIP code: 94025)

19. **Kirk Gould** (ZIP code: 94025)

We need more affordable housing in Menlo Park. This development/location is ideal and should be improved by adding more affordable housing.

20. **Kristin Howell** (ZIP code: 94025)

21. **Kendra Armer** (ZIP code:)

I grew up in Menlo Park, and now live in San Carlos. I know how deeply needed affordable housing is in the area! Thank you for your consideration.

22. **Lesley Feldman** (ZIP code: 94025)

23. **Liz Simons** (ZIP code:)

Affordable housing allows us to be part of a more equitable society.

24. **Lydia Lee** (ZIP code: 94025)

25. **Nancy Goodban** (ZIP code:)

I live in Redwood City but of course am often in Menlo Park - new housing near downtown and transit will reduce the traffic burden for those who live in Menlo park as well as those of use who drive to/through. Thank you!

26. **Dianne Otterby** (ZIP code: 94025)

Over Due and so needed

Dianne Otterby

27. **Pam Jones** (ZIP code: 94025)

28. **Renee Kee** (ZIP code: 94025)

As a teacher, I know how important it is to have affordable housing near our schools. We have lost so many good teachers due to our high housing costs. Please create affordable housing so we can all live here and build our community.

29. **Robert Cronin** (ZIP code: 94025)

30. **Rebecca Barfknecht** (ZIP code: 94025)

31. **Sarah Kahle** (ZIP code:)

32. **Sarah Zollweg** (ZIP code: 94025)

33. **Shelly Masur** (ZIP code:)

34. **Gloria Stofan** (ZIP code:)

It is so important to provide housing for those who are struggling to just keep a roof over their heads. Please consider SRI Parkline Housing for those who need job housing and deeper affordability at this site especially for those who are of special needs.

35. **Tracey Bobrowicz** (ZIP code:)

It is so important for teachers to be able to live in the county they work in. So many young people I work with in Education have to travel great distances for work and it is really sad that our communities have not done anything at all to make sure we have housing for service providers.

36. **Timi Most** (ZIP code: 94025)

Affordable housing is the right thing to do. It is good for our community and morally the right thing to do.

37. **Vlada Bortnik** (ZIP code: 94025)

38. **Yvonne Murray** (ZIP code: 94025)

NEW since last submission:

39. **Keyko Pintz** (ZIP code: 94025)

40. Andrea Reyna (*ZIP code: 94025*)

41. Sarah Brophy (*ZIP code: 94025*)

I have lived here for 12 years. In that time so many of the friends I have made have left the Bay Area, primarily because of housing affordability. The current housing situation is not sustainable.

From: [Jennifer Michel](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 4:59:57 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Dear Applicant and Commission,

Please be comparable to the Willow Village housing density of 1,730.

Thank you

Jennifer Michel
restorativeeco@gmail.com
565 Willow Rd Apt 9
Menlo Park, California 94025

From: [Henry Riggs](#)
To: [Sandmeier, Corinna D](#)
Cc: [Cynthia Harris](#); [Wolosin, Jen](#)
Subject: Parkline EIR
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 3:57:19 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Corinna

I think it became clear after last night's PC meeting, as we continued our December 21 meeting re Parkline, that the EIR scope needs to include an alternative with a housing unit count similar to Willow Village. It's also my reading of the commission that the non-residential component should not exceed the trip count of the existing use permit, rather than turning the existing square footage that is low-intensity R&D use into the higher office space intensity.

Please confirm that these options can be an alternative or alternatives to the applicant's scope in the EIR.

Thanks as always,

Henry

From: [Sarah Zollweg](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Support jobs-housing balance and deeper affordability at SRI Parkline
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 11:22:09 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, DO NOT click links, open attachments or reply.

Menlo Park Planning Commission Menlo Park Planning Commission,

Dear Menlo Park Planning Commission,

I'm writing to express my very strong support for maximizing affordable housing at SRI Parkline and placing the affordable housing adjacent to the other residential buildings for better downtown accessibility, inclusivity, and overall design. I also strongly support reducing the parking to the absolute minimum that's viable and investing in driving alternatives.

We have an extreme affordable housing shortage in our area and it's hurting our community -- in addition to the horrific impact of housing insecurity on individuals and families who experience it, even those who can afford housing are negatively impacted. For example, if low wage earners can't afford to live where they work, this means more commute traffic in our community. By increasing affordable housing in a highly resourced location, we help alleviate such problems by making downtown more accessible and decreasing traffic and congestion. This could also give our sleepy downtown the chance to bounce back. We need more investment in affordable housing and driving alternatives if we want a thriving community.

On a personal note, I support more housing and design strategies to reduce driving because I share a car with my partner, so I don't have access to a car during the day or when they're on work trips. Many of my neighbors are in similar situations, whether due to an intentional choice to be "greener," to save money, or both. Our typical modes of transportation are walking and biking, and this would be much safer and more livable to have a direct and protected route rather than unprotected busy streets.

Maximum affordable housing at SRI Parkline (adjacent to other residential buildings), reducing parking to the minimum viable, and investment in driving alternatives will contribute to a thriving community and set Menlo Park up for a better future.

Thank you so very much for your consideration,

Sarah Zollweg
818 Fremont St
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Sarah Zollweg
sarahzollweg@gmail.com

818 Fremont St
Menlo Park, California 94025