

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Misrepresentation of 841 Capitola Road project in Supervisor Koenig's recent email newsletter  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 1, 2025 9:32:44 AM

---

---

**From:** Mike Reis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2025 3:06 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Manu Koenig <Manu.Koenig@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Jamie Sehorn <Jamie.Sehorn@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Cc:** County Counsel <CountyCounsel@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Misrepresentation of 841 Capitola Road project in Supervisor Koenig's recent email newsletter

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hi Supervisor Koenig,

Does your office have any comments or updates on this request?

We have yet to receive a corrected newsletter, or at the very least a confirmation of the inaccurate representation in the original promotion.

As my email below details, the imagery used in the newsletter detailing the 63 unit project was from the original revision from April of last year. The renderings for their latest version (in which they increased the unit count by 97%!) have been available since at least January 30th; I personally reviewed the renderings during the three occasions that I was at the records office.

Given the project's scope, its massive negative impact on the community you represent, and the speed with which Workbench is trying to ram it through approval, accuracy and honesty from your office is paramount.

I hope to hear from you soon with an update on this correction.

Thanks

--

Michael Reis

(b) (5) DPP

(e) (b) (5) DPP

On Mon, Mar 24, 2025 at 15:42 Mike Reis (b) (5) DPP > wrote:

Dear Supervisor Koenig, and other members of the Board,

We are frustrated, as neighbors to 841 Capitola Road, that the imagery and language utilized in **your newsletter** that we just received by email **is misleading and inaccurate**.

Firstly, the imagery used in your newsletter is **grossly inaccurate**. The image used in your newsletter is from the original preliminary application from **April of 2024**; the image in your newsletter is for a two-building, 3-story, 28-unit development. The current proposal from Workbench, **which I personally reviewed on the 24th of February and again on the 24th of March**, is for a **5-story, 63-unit single-building development**. The imagery used in your newsletter (see copy below) makes the development seem more benign than it really is, and **we strongly urge you** to send out an updated newsletter indicating this mis-information and use an image that shows the truth of the situation. To not do so, in light of our **numerous** attempts at a dialogue, would be a serious oversight.

Secondly, your newsletter espouses the "benefits" of the project, such as sustainable design and "landscaped open spaces", when in fact the developer proposes to nearly cover the property with a building and parking lot. The proposal plans to raze **all existing greenery** on the parcel, and add back the barest amount in the areas of not taken up by a parking lot (a **33 space lot**) - this includes **26 trees marked on their 2025 arborist report** (included with Workbench's 3/17 PLG-130 submission) **as heritage trees** in the eyes of the city of Santa Cruz. Workbench is also suggesting that neither a traffic nor parking study are required, and given the **obvious traffic congestion concerns that already exist** at 7th and capitola, **and** given the reality of the situation created if a parking deficit of **at least 38 spaces** is approved (SDBL normally requires 71 spaces for this project's scope), residents of Live Oak will be irreparably harmed by the lack of such a study.

Workbench is making callous and unsupported assumptions (parking, traffic, razing of

green space) without the **slightest** concern on its community impact reflects poorly on them as a "community builder", and would do the same on members of the County staff in charge of reviewing and voting on this project, should it proceed as-is.

We hope to hear back from your office on a way that we can move forward, together (with Workbench) on an *actual* sustainable development that would benefit the community.

Thank you

--

--

Michael Reis

(c) [REDACTED]

(e) [REDACTED]

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Community concerns about Workbench, 841 Capitola Road (63 unit / 5 story building), and a potential conflict of interest  
**Date:** Monday, March 24, 2025 9:49:29 AM

---

---

**From:** Mike Reis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 23, 2025 8:55 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <[boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Community concerns about Workbench, 841 Capitola Road (63 unit / 5 story building), and a potential conflict of interest

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hello members of the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors,

I'm reaching out to you all in the hopes of getting traction on some of the technical and subjective concerns that we, as the community residents who will be directly impacted by this project, have. I also, personally, have some concerns about a potential conflict of interest between one of the Supervisors, Mr. Manu Koenig, and Workbench's CEO (Tim Gordin, who was appointed by Manu to the County Commission in 2020 before resigning in 2024). It's worth noting that 841 Capitola Road was purchased through an LLC by Tim Gordin *while* he was acting as the County Commissioner in 2022.

As for our concerns, the full details can be shared (if people are interested), but the high level summary is as follows (all of which has been shared with Manu directly on a few occasions):

- It's remains unclear whether Workbench's preliminary application from April 9th 2024 (PA241013) met SB330's requirement to qualify as a builder's remedy project
  - Specifically, we have not received confirmation from the County planning office that this application met the requirement of 20% affordable units
- Workbench's October 3rd revision (submitted within the 180d window from their preliminary application) was followed up with a response letter from the County highlighting its deficiencies on November 1st 2024. Workbench was required to submit their updated proposal by **1/30/2025** (90d).
  - **On 1/30**, Workbench submitted a signed PLG-130, which is a resubmittal request form. That form lays out a process through which the applicant would be able to **upload** the revised documents, on the **following**

**Monday.** Given that PLG-130 was submitted on 1/30, the **earliest** document upload appointment would've been on **2/3** - past the 90d deadline set by the County's November 1st letter. We have **yet** to receive a justification for this obvious (to us) discrepancy

- This new revision also increased the total units from 32 to 63 (**+97%**), which is **well** above the 20% revision requirement that was added to State law via SB330 (65941.1 (d) )
- As of 2/24, when I physically reviewed the plans, Workbench was providing **33 parking spaces** (inclusive of 3 ADA) for their 63 unit development. They were requesting a waiver under CDBL (California Density Bonus Law) to reduce their required parking / unit ratio to 0.5. Normally, they would be required to provision **71 spaces** (to meet CDBL, 69515(p)(1) )
  - Parking provisions in the CDBL, which can be found at the State level as 69515(p) and Santa Cruz code 17.12.020 / 090, provides a mechanism (69515(p)(7) ) for the County or City to mandate a higher ratio (though not to exceed the ratio set in 69515(p)(1) ) through the results of a parking study
  - Despite requests to the County project planner on several occasions, and across different email threads, no information on parking studies (nor how to request them) have been provided
  - Given the **reality** of the parking situation that this development will impose, and given the **clear and obvious lack** of available parking on Grey Seal, Capitola road, 7th ave, or the surrounding neighborhoods, a parking study **must be conducted as soon as possible**
- On a subjective note, while we collectively understand and support the construction of more housing, we feel that the current proposal does not **fit** in Live Oak
  - Parking aside, a 5 story building in the heart of the residential section of Live Oak (which will **raze all existing greenery on the parcel in the process**) would likely be the largest *structure* in Live Oak
  - My children spend nearly every sunny day outside playing with our neighbors on the cul-de-sac - this proposal, which seeks to use Grey Seal as a through-street, will **directly and severely** impact the well-being of the residents, and **significantly** reduce the safety of the environment which our children currently enjoy
  - The intersection of Capitola road and 7th ave is already **heavily** congested throughout the day. Adding 63 more units (ignoring the

fact that only 33 parking spaces would be provided on the parcel) will exacerbate an already troublesome situation

We have a community meeting scheduled for April 1st, where we hope to get **some** questions answered. In the meantime, I hope this email finds you all well, and I look forward to working with all involved on finding a sustainable path forward, which enables the creation of reasonable housing.

Thanks,

--

Michael Reis

(c) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]