

From: Garril Page [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 5, 2023 3:58 PM
To: Distrib- City Clerk <city.clerk@cityofsanrafael.org>
Subject: 1515 Fourth Street Appeal

May 5, 2023

San Rafael Councilmembers:

The report from PHA Traffic Consultants aligns with my own concerns about the 1515 4th street proposal. These are questions that should not be delegated to staff and the developer: the Council has both responsibility and obligation to study and resolve issues brought before you for decisive comment and action. The Appellant's traffic study is concerned with conflicts. I believe the more likely outcome is grievous bodily harm and potential deaths caused by the project. I have been familiar with the Latham/Shaver neighborhood for many years.

With specific regard to the thus far ill-defined Monahan parking and traffic proposals:

1.) interior garage spaces will be low ceiling, congested areas where circulation must prevent both pedestrian injury and vehicular collisions;

(a.) it does little good to assign bike storage and parking if riders cannot readily access their bikes. This is particularly true of bikes parked in front of cars which may be restricted by both length and width of each space;

(b.) where bikes are clustered, as in the proposed Bike Room, circulation must be safe for pedestrians, bikes, and cars for ingress and egress;

(c) circulation in spaces are so constricted that vision is limited are dangerous and should be remediated;

(d.) It must be kept in mind that children as well as adults use bikes and therefore, are to be considered here.

2.) E street access is clearly safer than the proposed traffic plan for Shaver and Latham streets. The development should modify driveways and tenant circulation to recognize this fact.

3.) Concerns over traffic signals and security gating are well founded and integral to the development plan as well as San Rafael's traffic circulation along major arterials. Resolution of what is needed and what will be supplied by the developer must be answered before any approvals are given.

4.) Losing on-street parking in this area will negatively impact all the surrounding neighborhoods and should be given higher priority, not be minimized when evaluating this project's impacts.

5.) Storm drainage and sub-surface water are identified and known challenges in the area. This development must not exacerbate the hazards and hardships from them.

These specifics are a small fraction of what has been left unaddressed and unanswered about this project. The proposal needs further modification, not unquestioning approval granted because of some perceived threat from state mandates *which do not apply in this instance*. The consequence of approval is to trigger opposition that blocks future needed housing projects. One very bad apple can indeed rot an entire barrel!

Yours sincerely,

Garril Page
San Anselmo