

Name _____
 Address: _____
 Tel: _____

To:

Mr. Bill Wycko (bill.wycko@sfgov.org)
 Environmental Review Officer
 San Francisco Planning Department
 1660 Mission Street, Suite 400
 San Francisco, CA 94103-2414

Copy to:

Irene Nishimura, Planner in charge of the project (Irene.Nishimura@sfgov.org)

Re: Objection to Proposed Draft EIR

Planning Department Case No. 2004.0093E

State Clearinghouse No. 2003122131

We have lived in Forest Knolls for ____ years.

We object to the adoption of the proposed EIR and find that the report and recommendations are biased toward the objectives of those who paid for the report. The report is missing discussion and analysis of specific concerns that are **real quality of life issues** and furthermore the report failed to properly define the scope of the affected neighborhood / vicinity.

Our specific concerns and objections are as follows:

Compliance with Planned Unit Development (PUD) criteria

Page 6: Retaining Walls

The EIR draft states that there will be no retaining walls at the rear yard. Since the residential units proposed are over two stories, there will be a requirement for two exits plus fire department access to the rear yards. Due to the slope of the site's rear yards, grading and retaining walls to provide rear yard access will be required. **Rear yard access study and grading impact need to be included in the EIR.**

Proposition M

Change In Land use and Project Area Character:

Neighborhood Objection to the negative EIR statement of Impact LU-3 (p. 71)

The Negative EIR statement that "the project would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity" is incorrect and misleading. The proposed project density and inclusion of a block apartment building would change the character of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is mostly single homes with a small number of Duplexes and no block type building such as the proposed townhouses which would be entirely above street level.

We object to the misleading statement of the Negative Draft EIR p. 72, second paragraph.

The paragraph states that the project will be compatible with the single family residential units uphill on Crestmont, but the project as proposed will have no single family residential units and would conflict with the character of the neighborhood with the addition of townhouses on concrete podium.

Planned Unit Development Criteria:

The proposed project does not comply with the Planning Code criteria for PUD development.

1. Under *SFPC Sec. 304a(a)* the stated objective of allowing PUD is for projects "designed to produce an environment of stable and desirable character which will benefit the occupants, the neighborhood and the city as a whole... In cases of outstanding overall design, complimentary to the design and values of the surrounding area."

This is contrary to what this project would bring to the neighborhood.

Objection to the Statement of the Negative EIR Impact C-LU-1 (p. 72)

Objection: as stated in the EIR report, the future development of Lot 27 is possible and therefore foreseeable. The development of lot 27 was approved in the past as stated in the EIR report.

The future development and impact of the additional residential units with a pedestrian connection to Oak Park Drive and the future impact on the existing residential units on Oak Park Drive should be included in the report.

The EIR did not evaluate the impact difference between duplexes and single homes. The fact of life in our neighborhood is that most of the existing duplexes along Crestmont are rental units with very high use of cars as opposed to the single homes in the neighborhood.

The EIR has NOT addressed the potential cumulative impact on home values due to the higher percentage of duplexes and smaller units it would create. A study should have been included that compares the resale value of duplexes to single family homes.

The per square foot values in the neighborhood for single family homes is much higher than duplexes. There are single family homes in the neighborhood that are 2500 to 3000+ square feet that are in the 1.5 to 2 million dollar range. As part of the evaluation of OPTION B the Draft EIR should not rely on the Developer's unsupported statement that there is no market for 3,600-4,600 square foot houses. Only independent fact should be included and an independent market analysis might find that in fact the developer can in fact build 5 to 14 single residences with great economic success and keep them in character with the neighborhood and actually raise property values for existing residents.

The draft EIR needs to comply with the requirement to analyze the proposed project in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, and thereby failed to study the cumulative considerable impact on the neighborhood and the environment.

FACT: the proposed project and overall zoning were originally approved as a complete subdivision to include two additional connected lots to the south west for 13 residences. This new scheme violates the original intention and forces a denser project that will negatively affect home prices and cause major road issues. It also

ignores the open space requirements. This road was originally to be a park for the neighborhood.

The original Subdivision plan was approved as a whole, including connecting road and community structure and open space. This original Plan, based on an overall review and approval, was only partially completed. The new Plan, as proposed, adversely affects many neighboring home owners.

Cumulative Impact C-HZ-1 (p. 231): EIR states:

"The proposed project, in combination with other past and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on emergency access."

This statement is not correct and failed to assess or even discuss the further designated legal lot at the continuation of the proposed project. This lot, which currently has very little value, will suddenly have real market value as developable land once the new road is constructed. With the high value of developable land in the area the potential for this next development is evident and cannot be ignored. The code definition as noted above specifically state "reasonably foreseeable future project" and in the San Francisco real estate market and this desirable location this future development is unequivocally "foreseeable."

Emergency access issues resulting from even further extension of the narrow private road should be discussed here.

Additional items impacted but not analyzed under the same requirements: Impact C-NO-1(p.240), C-UT-1 (p.242), C-PS-1 (p.243):

Objection to "no impact" statement under C-RE-1: The Draft EIR wording misstates the definition of the impact analysis requirement. The evaluation requirement is specifically not limited to development submittal to the City, the requirement specifically requires study and evaluation of "**Foreseeable projects**." Since there was past approval for the development of the contiguous lot and a physical connection to Oak Park Drive,

AND, based on the potential increase of the market value of the land of the contiguous lot, there is no denial of the reasonable foreseeable additional development and future connection to Oak Park Drive. **The subsequent discussion of this issue (V Other**

CEQA Issues. A. Growth Inducing Impacts p. 256) defers any impact consideration to a future EIR.

Under the EIR requirements, this additional impact needs to be included in the Draft EIR.

1. Transportation Analysis and Parking Survey Area-Figure 19

"IMPACT ON EMERGENCY ACCESS" (p. 230)

Page 99. The EIR defines Crestmont as a 1,550 ft long dead-end street about 26 feet wide with parking on both sides. The report on page 99 discusses the fact that in effect, due to allowed parking on both sides, Crestmont becomes a one-lane street. The report states that "when vehicles traveling in opposite directions approach each other at the same time, one vehicle must pull over to allow the other to pass (or backup until a clear driveway or unoccupied parking space is found). This fact and the fact that delivery trucks (such as UPS ,FEDEX, etc.) and garbage trucks, or in case of emergency, one vehicle might park and block the one way Crestmont for much longer time without leaving the ability to move over and clear the lane. **This fact and potential time delay for emergency access down the road and the cumulative effect of the delays and risk to occupants was not included under "IMPACT ON EMERGENCY ACCESS" (PG. 230) and the cumulative effects of the potential time delays were not discussed or evaluated under the "CUMULATIVE EFFECT" (Pg. 231). These are real life reductions in level of safety and quality of life.**

Cumulative: (page 231):

Under "Conclusions" the San Francisco Fire Department stated that the scope of their review and "Conclusion" of the "Impact on emergency access" proposal was limited to only to the assumption that the roadway will always have the open 20 foot wide roadway. The conclusions and review did not restate the limitations contained in the traffic statements on page 99 of the EIR. There may be times when the narrow road is partially blocked by one or more obstructions (service vehicles, illegally parked cars, etc); the potential effect is not considered. Will the developer assume responsibility for possible calamities when people cannot evacuate in an emergency?

The Draft EIR did not adequately evaluate the impact of the long (one passable lane) dead-end Crestmont Drive Cul-de-sac on emergency Vehicle Access (p. 266-267):

The Draft Negative impact implies that the length of a dead end road can be unlimited. In effect we would expect better science to evaluate the cumulative effect of adding distance and road width restriction to a dead-end road on emergency response time, access, and emergency vehicle maneuverability.

We object to the comparison the 1,550 foot Crestmont Drive dead-end cul-de-sac to many other residential streets in San Francisco. It is a very rare and possibly unique street in San Francisco and we object to the statements which minimize the cumulative effects on the quality of our lives.

How do you measure the impact of making a dead-end road longer?

Earlier in the year, we had an overturned car on the corner of Devonshire. The police and fire departments closed the road while they rescued the driver and cleared the car away, interviewed witnesses, etc, which all took hours. **The EIR needs to evaluate access and evacuation in real emergencies such as this, as well as earthquakes, fires, etc.**

Crestmont is a very long dead-end road. If closure were necessary, there would be many people trapped and no emergency vehicular or pedestrian exits are proposed in this project.

Real-world experiences of firefighters and former firefighters and other personnel

who have actually dealt with emergencies on the Crestmont cul-de-sac have confirmed the extreme difficulties of access and maneuver during such events. Have any interview with these personnel been carried out, or after-action reports reviewed in conjunction with the DEIR?

Objection:

"Effects of Vehicles parked on project Area Streets on Emergency Vehicle Access" (p. 267), with no vehicle egress possible and no downhill pedestrian escape route.

A typical street in the city will always have opportunities for overflow on street parking within reasonable distance without affecting the neighborhood. This project without customary on-street parking has no opportunity to accommodate more than minimal guest parking without affecting the existing neighborhood. **The EIR needs to include analysis of guest parking demand in the absence of accessible public transportation. Forest Knolls is extremely underserved by MUNI and there is no MUNI stop on Crestmont within 0.4 miles.**

Since the street will be a private street, monitored only by the CC&Rs (as stated by the EIR), there will be no police enforcement. **The control of illegal parking is meaningless and "NON ENFORCABLE."**

Objection to:

The Draft EIR statement that the proposed project "will not Reduce Ability of Emergency Vehicles to Maneuver."

Objection to:

The Draft EIR statement that the proposed project "will not affect the cumulative increase In Emergency Service Calls Due to Project."

Objection to:

The Draft EIR statement that the proposed project "will not create Cumulative increase in "Obstruction of Access or Reduced Maneuverability to Emergency Service" Caused by Simultaneous Responses by Two or More Emergency and or Service Vehicles."

Disabled parking requirements (p. 21):

Currently there is no disabled parking provided. Inclusion of Disabled parking will require wider than standard parking spaces and in fact might reduce the number of parking provided. With 68 parking spots, under the California Building Code, **this requirement will affect the total provided parking and need to be included in the EIR study in addition to accessible path of travel.**

Objection: No evaluation of existing road deterioration or road worthiness.

The roads in this area are badly under-maintained. Every vehicle has to come and go on the same route due to the fact that Crestmont is a dead-end street. So the load is doubled.

Already, **sinkholes** have developed in this neighborhood, especially near the Crestmont intersection with Devonshire and nearer Oak Park. The city has come out to look at these sinkholes.

Several years ago, at the corner of Devonshire and Crestmont, a neighbor drilled into the road causing a major gas leak. The neighborhood nearly had to be evacuated. What will happen if the constant flow of heavy construction vehicles causes these sinkholes to break through?

Why should the City take on these types of risks, as well as risking the foundation of existing housing at the building site, plus building on a known slide area?

