From: Keyon, David
To: Hill, Shannon

Cc: <u>Downtown West Project</u>
Subject: Fw: Downtown West review

Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 8:18:37 AM

# **David Keyon**

Principal Planner, Environmental Review City of San Jose (408) 535-7898 david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov

From: Gerry Haas <gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org>

**Sent:** Friday, February 12, 2021 5:54 PM **To:** Andy Wang <wangan@google.com>

Cc: Bethany Windle <bethanywindle@google.com>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Downtown West review

#### [External Email]

That would work on the second issue. Dual purposing the pedestrian pathway and open space would not technically be a request to build a road within the setback and should be fine. David would need to agree, as well.

We'll talk next week.

## Gerry

From: Andy Wang <wangan@google.com> Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 5:42 PM

To: Gerry Haas <gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org>

Cc: Bethany Windle <bethanywindle@google.com>; Keyon, David

<david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov> **Subject:** Re: Downtown West review

Thank you for this update, Gerry. I appreciate your attentiveness on this! We'll of course look forward to hearing back next week.

On the second issue: I should clarify that the project will require that new roadways be outside the 35-foot setback (and new buildings would be set back further, at 50 feet or more). Since there would be no new roadway within the 35-foot setback from the top of channel, emergency vehicle access as currently contemplated would be permitted over the planned open space area and/or pedestrian pathway within the 35 feet.

Bethany and I would be happy to chat more about this by phone on Tuesday if you think that

could clear up any confusion as well.

Thanks, and have a great long weekend.

On Fri, Feb 12, 2021 at 2:27 PM Gerry Haas < gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org > wrote:

Hello Andy,

thanks for clarifying the information request. I've just let David know that we have been in discussion with the Wildlife Agencies about the 35-foot setback issue and we are very close to a determination that should resolve the first issue. I may not hear back from them until early next week, but will reach out to you the moment I do hear from them.

The second issue seems to be challenging because technically only pedestrian trails/paths are allowed within the setback, not new roads (even if just an emergency access). Please see Page 6-53 - Exemptions for the list of allowable uses within a stream setback: <a href="https://scv-habitatagency.org/DocumentCenter/View/128/Chapter-6-Conditions-on-Covered-Activities-and-Application-Process">https://scv-habitatagency.org/DocumentCenter/View/128/Chapter-6-Conditions-on-Covered-Activities-and-Application-Process</a>

Once I have clarity on the 35-foot setback issue, I'll reach out to David to set up another meeting with all of us to discuss the process moving forward.

Regards,

## **Gerry Haas**

Conservation Planner Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency <u>669-253-6127</u> Mobile: <u>530-401-0721</u> <u>www.scv-habitatagency.org</u>

From: Andy Wang <<u>wangan@google.com</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:49 PM

**To:** Gerry Haas <<u>gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org</u>> **Cc:** Bethany Windle <<u>bethanywindle@google.com</u>>

Subject: Re: Downtown West review

Thanks for your note, Gerry, and certainly appreciate what it means to juggle a heavy workload!

On your question regarding the two issues: you are correct, with minor nuances on both questions. The material we sent over does explain them each a bit more, but in short:

• On the first issue: we're seeking confirmation on our approach to reusing and renovating existing buildings that are within the 35-foot setback from Los Gatos Creek. Our definition of renovation is premised on the reuse of existing foundations. We're seeking confirmation that the Habitat Agency agrees that such a definition would be within the bounds of the

- Habitat Plan's contemplation of the continued use of existing buildings within the 35-foot setback. Additionally, to the extent we pursue new building footprint (i.e. new foundations), these would occur outside of the 35-foot setback.
- On the second issue: you'll find that our development, on a site that is currently developed, proposes new buildings and a roadway set back 35 feet from the Guadalupe River top of channel. On this issue, we're not questioning the setback; rather, we're seeking confirmation on two components that are designed to be within the 35-foot setback due to the complexity of many components at this site. The components within the 35-foot setback are: a pedestrian pathway only (not vehicular pathway), and emergency vehicle access.

Again, these are described a bit more in the material we sent over late last week, although I hope that this explanation clarifies the questions a bit more. I'm more than happy to discuss more, including by phone if we could provide more detail or answer any follow-up questions you and your executive officer may have.

Much appreciated, Andy

Thanks much, Andy

On Wed, Feb 10, 2021 at 1:55 PM Gerry Haas <<u>gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org</u>> wrote: Hi Andy,

I've looked over this and there is quite a bit to unpack, and with our current workloads, I simply haven't had time to complete a response. You mention two issues, and I want to make sure I understand them both. As I recall, the first issue is the definition of "reuse" or "redevelop" when applied to existing structures within the 35-foot setback from Guadalupe Creek. The second issue is the requirement for setbacks to apply to the sections of Guadalupe Creek that consist of a concrete-lined engineered channel. If this is the correct understanding of the two issues, please confirm today, and I will discuss them both with our Executive Officer first thing tomorrow morning.

Please also bear in mind the existing language in the Habitat Plan for Condition 11: "Regardless of project location, stream setback exceptions may not reduce a Category 1 stream setback to less than a distance of 50 feet for new development or <u>35 feet for existing or previously developed sites with legal buildings and uses</u>." Recall that the San Jose City Council approved the Habitat Plan in 2013, which is in conflict with the Council's action to approve a 30-foot setback from Guadalupe Creek in 2016, three years after the Habitat Plan became effective.

Regards,

### **Gerry Haas**

Conservation Planner Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency 669-253-6127 Mobile: 530-401-0721 www.scv-habitatagency.org From: Andy Wang < wangan@google.com > Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 4:40 PM

**To:** Gerry Haas <<u>gerry.haas@scv-habitatagency.org</u>> **Cc:** Bethany Windle <<u>bethanywindle@google.com</u>>

Subject: Re: Downtown West review

Good afternoon Gerry,

I thought I'd check in with you to see whether you've had a chance to review the material we sent over last week, and whether you have any sense of timing for feedback from your end. We have a number of documents that we'd like to begin to finalize and your input in the near term will be vital. Bethany and I would be happy to chat further if at all helpful as well.

Much appreciated! Andy

On Fri, Feb 5, 2021 at 10:09 AM Andy Wang < wangan@google.com > wrote:

Good morning Gerry,

Thank you for your time the other day. As discussed I've attached a few figures here to aid your review. We've included on each figure a narrative as well. As supplemental reference, I've included the city staff report for the previous project entitled on the site depicted on the last page.

We do happen to have an internal design meeting with key consultants early next week, and if at all possible it would be very helpful if we could get your clarification on these two areas by the end of day Monday, Feb 8.

Thanks again! Andy



**Andy Wang |** Senior Development Manager Working for Lendlease at Google Sunnyvale, CA | 626.922.0436

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.