

# Environmental Planning Commission Meeting Notes

## El Camino Real Precise Plan

### 8/28/2014

(Items where EPC voted or had consensus in bold)

#### Public Comment

- Desire for the plan to include a more explicit moratorium or prohibition of drive-throughs
- Plan doesn't do enough to address regional issues.
- Plan should include more detail on mode-share targets, affordable housing targets, and transportation demand management measures.
- EPC involvement is essential in project review, desire for EPC to continue to have a role, especially for Tier 1 projects (multiple speakers).
- Identified traffic growth is unacceptable.
- Plan should provide more transportation goals; we should try to understand how many trips are from within the Plan area.
- There is no plan for public transportation.
- Travel is not going to be improved for all modes.
- It takes more than buffers and transitions to preserve neighborhoods – consider character.
- Moratorium on drive-throughs is a bad idea.
- Plan needs more teeth to require affordable housing.
- Small parcel strategy is not clear in the Plan.
- The EIRs cannot mitigate all the problems away.
- Developers should replace retail and businesses that are displaced.
- Desire for more-frequent pedestrian crossings.
- The cost of one parking space is equal to 1400 Eco-Passes – all projects should provide Eco-Passes to all residents for life.
- Provide more specificity in Community Benefits requirements.
- There should be more housing units.

#### Chapter 1

- Create a policy goal for affordable housing production.
- Create an implementation item to monitor traffic changes and mode share over time.
- Encourage or require senior units and other housing that we find desirable in particular places.

#### Chapter 2

- Change the General Plan to address Density Bonus issue?
- **Desire for the EPC to be involved in the review of Tier 1 projects (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
  - ZA is only one person, no discussion, meetings are during the day; 1.85 FAR does not seem to be the community consensus

- **Request for an additional 5' setback for 4<sup>th</sup> floors. (STRAW VOTE 6-1)**
- **Change “Americana Apartments” subarea to something more general. (EPC consensus)**
- **Separation between vehicle areas and buildings should be a standard, not a guideline. (STRAW VOTE 4-2)**
- **Provide a goal for tree canopy. (EPC consensus)**
- Monitor intersections over time.
- Include mode share targets (but do not do a trip-cap).
- Require Eco-Passes from development.
- **Interest in studying a potential moratorium on drive-throughs. (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**

### Chapter 3

- Prioritize paths to schools
- **Study signals for pedestrian all-way movement at major intersections and the timing needs to minimize impacts to vehicle congestion. (STRAW VOTE 6-1)**

### Chapter 4

- Additional community benefits: preserving existing businesses, helping fund community shuttle, achieving goal for affordable or senior housing, eco-passes for people outside the project.
- Add a goal for medium income housing.
- **Prepare language in the Plan for a new affordable housing policy and implementation strategy. State a goal of 10% of new units. (EPC consensus)**
- **Remove section allowing for lower developer contribution if benefit is of particular value to the City. (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**

### Environmental Impact Report

- **Traffic is not being adequately addressed if the cumulative case is going to “F” in so many places.**
- **City must address future congestion – it is not “our fate.”**
- **How to address traffic if no single project is responsible for it?**
- Provide data on how the Plan is encouraging people to take alternate modes.
- Interest in getting more information about legal changes to how traffic is measured and impacts are assessed.