

EPC Questions – August 18, 2021

Item 5.1 – Gateway Master Plan and North Bayshore Precise Plan Amendments

1. Can you explain the Bonus FAR status for North Bayshore and how it affects the Gateway area?

Council allocated about 1.3 msf of Bonus FAR to Google earlier this year for use in their North Bayshore Master Plan. Of this amount, 250,000 sf is allocated to their properties in the Gateway area.

About 250,000 sf of the City's North Bayshore Bonus FAR remains unallocated. Staff is proposing a process to allocate this remaining 250,000 sf to properties within the Complete Neighborhood area of North Bayshore—the three neighborhoods of Joaquin, Shorebird, or Pear. The Joaquin area includes the Gateway area. The City could receive applications for this remaining amount from properties within or outside of the Gateway area.

2. I don't understand Figure 3.12, namely how "B" relates to "A" nor how "B1" and "B2" relate to each other or "B". The key below explains "A" and "B" in words, but the diagram does not portray what is stated, therefore the intention is not clear.

The A dimension should be located on the same side as the B dimension. We will make this correction and update the diagram.

3. If traveling north across the 101, at what point on block 2 or 5 does the bike/ped overpass get to street level?

This has been redesigned because the two major Gateway land owners have not been able to collaborate on a joint proposal. Because of this, the current entrance to the property at Shoreline /101 needed to be retained. The bike/ped overpass is currently being designed as part of another City process with a compact ramp so bike/peds can land at street level at La Avenida.

- 3a. Why is there specifically a No-Office Option due to the uncertain economic circumstances outlined in the Study of Environmental Significance? I was under the impression Office was the economic engine that facilitated Residential development.

The options are presented in the CEQA document because CEQA requires that a preferred option be identified. For the Gateway Master Plan, there is no formal preferred option as we have created a flexible set of land uses to respond to different

conditions and circumstances. While office has traditionally been a very valuable land use in North Bayshore, due to COVID there is some uncertainty surrounding this land use. The Gateway Master Plan's intent is to create the most land use flexibility for property owners while still achieving the key elements envisioned by the Plan.

3b. Where will the Bonus Office FAR go if not at the Gateway?

Staff has outlined a Bonus Office FAR process where this FAR can be allocated within Complete Neighborhood areas for the reasons outlined in the staff report. Most of this property is owned by Google, although there are several smaller property owners who may be interested in applying for some or all of this FAR.

3c. What is staff's reasoning for preferring the Office Option?

Per CEQA, we had to select one option for analysis----but only within CEQA. The Plan itself does not include a preferred option. Staff had previously considered Office as a preferred option due to the economic benefits that office uses can provide. One advantage of office uses is that it would allow for a good amount of employees in the area during the day to support the area's neighborhood retail and restaurant uses.

4. In the VMT assessment, existing Gateway vehicle volume was taken during Spring 2020. I was under the impression Google allowed employees to work remotely in March 2020. Would that affect the assumption of the base number for existing traffic?

The Spring 2020 North Bayshore Gateway observations were collected between February 2, 2020 and February 15, 2020 prior to voluntary shelter-in-place policies by large technology firms in the Bay Area beginning the first week in March 2020 or the shelter-in-place rules issued by Santa Clara County Public Health Department that took effect on March 17, 2020 to slow the spread of COVID-19. This Spring 2020 data was collected before these substantial changes in travel patterns occurred.

5. GMP.6 open spaces: Given the Gateway Master Plan area's close proximity to high traffic volume on hwy 101 and Shoreline Blvd, is there consideration for requiring a minimum tree canopy coverage for the plan area to help mitigate pollution and noise?

The North Bayshore Street Tree Guidelines include standards for new street trees that may be adjacent to streets and open space areas. The guidelines require specific species and distances between each street tree to ensure a good canopy coverage.

Additionally, any open space in the area can be buffered by new buildings adjacent to 101 to help mitigate some of the effects from the freeway.

6. GMP.11 paving area: Since the Gateway Master Plan area is close to the bay, it's especially important to manage stormwater runoffs. In addition to the upper limit on paving area, is there consideration for requiring a minimum percentage for permeable surface, because impervious surfaces negatively affect the quantity and quality of water resources?

Because of the density of the development, much of the plan area will be covered by building footprints and new streets/sidewalks. The street sections however do require integrated stormwater management as prescribed in the Precise Plan to address stormwater runoff issues.

7. GMP.13 Parking: Theater and fitness require a lot more parking than retail (according to table 3.B). If these types of businesses don't come back to the plan area, there may be less parking needs. What's the best way for the master plan to allow for parking flexibility based on use?

One strategy is for the area to include a wide diversity of land uses that can utilize parking spaces in a shared garage. This will allow some flexibility for different uses over time to use an efficient shared parking resource that can accommodate different uses over time.

8. GMP 7 b and c - Please explain the rationale behind these dimensions

(b) - 70% of the frontage will allow for a near continuous retail frontage along the "main street" while providing space for access to upper floor uses.

(c) - Retail spaces that are 60 feet deep allow for 'back of house' uses such as storage or kitchens for restaurants. Deeper spaces also allow for more storefronts per linear feet. Newer retail models have less need for back of house uses. The standard proposes a mix of depths to provide flexibility but ensuring that a minimum amount of the storefront uses have a greater depth. This will most likely occur at the corners.

9. GMP 13 - It seems like residential can complement the other parking options. Why not require inclusion.

The plan does not preclude residential parking from the district parking strategy. However, the location of a shared parking garage is intended to be in the 'entertainment mixed use area'. This area allows for different commercial uses to locate parking spaces in a shared parking garage. While residential uses are allowed in this area, most of the residential uses will be in the other two subareas, so it may

not be the most practical to include residential parking spaces in a structure not in close proximity to the actual units.

10. The plan is very specific to the Gateway area. There is a large office parking garage on the Sobrato property just west of the Gateway area. Does the plan as written permit consideration of using that for some shared parking? Would it allow shared parking with a structure just north in Joaquin?

The Sobrato project includes shared parking just for the uses at their site and has no additional capacity to accommodate parking from other projects. However, the Precise Plan encourages shared parking, so shared parking garages could be proposed for other areas.

11. GMP 9 - The 4 options are very widely different from each other. So much so that I can't understand their rationale. Please explain how these were developed and why they were chosen?

These options were chosen so that special architectural or open space features are located at the Key Corners. We provided options to allow for flexibility. Under the new state laws regarding objective design standards, we had to provide quantifiable ways to define those special features.

12. GMP 9 (a) a - Why is this a specific height rather than a relative height to the adjusted parts of the building? ie. 20' or 30' higher than adjacent spaces. This would seem to serve to create the tower idea without making it so specific.

This standard could be reworded to address this comment, and is open to this suggestion and further review and edits.