

June 9, 2022

Subject: Mallard Pointe Resubmittal, May 24, 2022

To: Members of City Council, Members of Planning Commission, City Manager, and Director of Planning & Building

I am writing on behalf of Belvedere Residents for Intelligent Growth (BRIG). Our group has over 550 members, a great many of whom are long-term Belvedere residents. We were formed in response to the proposal to demolish and redevelop the existing residences along Mallard Road. Our primary purpose is to support intelligent, well-planned growth to preserve the charm and existing character of Belvedere. Among other matters, we are concerned about adherence to Belvedere's General Plan and zoning requirements; traffic congestion; adequate water supplies; geotechnical issues; and the health of the lagoon and the environment.

We have reviewed the developer's May 24 resubmittal of its housing development application. We will be submitting extensive substantive comments on the resubmittal in connection with "Step Five: Review Project for Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies," as specified in "The City's Process for Review of the Mallard Pointe Housing Development."

We are writing now solely to point out one misstatement (one of several) in the resubmittal because of its significance. In the "Density Bonus Application," and elsewhere, the developer states that the total number of units allowed the project site without a density bonus is "56." This figure is incorrect.

Pursuant to the General Plan, the project site is allowed a maximum density of 20 units per **net** acre (*see, e.g.*, City of Belvedere General Plan 2030, Vol. 1 (Goals, Policies, and Actions), Exhibit 3 ("2030 General Plan Land Use Map"), p.21; *see also* table on p. 25 re "Medium Density Multi-Family Residential"). Here, per the developer's resubmitted "Tentative Map," the "Net Area of the Site" is 2.4 acres (*see* Map's "Land Use Summary"). Accordingly, the maximum number of units allowed for the project site without a density bonus is "48" (20 units x 2.4 **net** acres), not "56" as the developer incorrectly asserts. If the developer has an alternative basis to support its claim of "56" units, it should provide that information to the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

s/John Hansen  
BRIG Chair