

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION****STAFF REPORT**

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2014

5. PUBLIC HEARING**5.1 San Antonio Precise Plan**

Public Hearing for Consideration of a City-Initiated General Plan Map Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Draft San Antonio Station Precise Plan Amendment, Draft San Antonio Precise Plan, and San Antonio Precise Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

RECOMMENDATION

That the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) recommend to the City Council approval of the following:

1. Certification of the San Antonio Precise Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, including a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and incorporating the attached findings (Exhibit 1);
2. Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Map to change the properties on the west of San Antonio Road, as shown in Exhibit 2, from General Mixed Use to Mixed-Use Corridor, incorporating the attached findings;
3. Amendment to the Zoning Map to change the San Antonio Precise Plan Area, as shown in Exhibit 3, from CRA (Commercial/Residential-Arterial), P (Planned Community) District, P(8) San Antonio Station Precise Plan, P(9) San Antonio Center Precise Plan, P(11) California Street-Showers Drive Precise Plan, and P(12) 394 Ortega Avenue Precise Plan to P(40) San Antonio Precise Plan, incorporating the attached findings;
4. Adoption of the Precise Plan Amendments to the P(8) San Antonio Station Precise Plan to remove the properties rezoned as part of the San Antonio Precise Plan, as shown in Exhibit 4, incorporating the attached findings;
5. Adoption of the San Antonio Precise Plan (Exhibit 5), as amended by Exhibits 6, 7, and 8, incorporating the attached findings (Exhibit 9); and

6. Adoption of a public benefits value of \$20 per square foot on building area over Base FAR in each subarea, except for a value range of \$10 to \$20 per square foot on building area over Base FAR in the East San Antonio Center Master Plan Area, as described in the San Antonio Precise Plan.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

A notice was sent to property owners and residents within 300' of the Plan Area. Meeting notices were also provided by e-mail to interested parties. In addition, the meeting agenda and staff report were posted on the City's website, the San Antonio Precise Plan website, and announced on Cable Television Channel 26 and the City calendar.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this meeting is for the EPC to review the San Antonio Precise Plan (Plan), Public Draft Plan changes, and to provide a recommendation on the Plan to the City Council.

BACKGROUND

The San Antonio Precise Plan process has included 16 EPC and City Council meetings and public workshops. These meetings are in addition to the San Antonio visioning process, which collected public input in late 2012. The Public Draft of the Precise Plan was released on August 22, 2014.

On September 17, 2014, the EPC reviewed the Public Draft Precise Plan (see Exhibit 5) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR). On October 7, 2014, the City Council reviewed the Public Draft Precise Plan, including EPC recommendations. The following Council input was provided:

1. **Office Development Cap and Phasing Program.** The Public Draft includes a draft office development "cap" of 400,000 square feet and a two-tiered phasing program to link allowed office development with housing units analyzed in the Plan's EIR.

EPC and City Council Direction: After considering potential challenges associated with the phasing program, the EPC supported both the office cap and phasing program as drafted. As discussed later in this report, the Council supported increasing the cap to 600,000 square feet and removing the phasing program. They noted the phasing program could result in a

potentially unfair system where one property owner would effectively be dependent on the actions of another property owner.

2. **Master Plan Process.** A Master Plan is a tool to ensure coordinated and integrated planning, typically for larger developments and/or projects requiring coordination across multiple properties. The Public Draft identifies three required Master Plan areas; procedures for Master Plan review (EPC recommendation to Council); and permitting process for subsequent Planned Community Permits (Zoning Administrator recommendation to Council).

EPC and City Council Direction: Both the EPC and Council supported the Master Plan areas and procedures. The Council also recommended an exemption from Master Plan requirements for projects “deemed complete” at the time of Plan adoption. They noted the requirement would only apply to the Merlone Geier Phase II Gatekeeper if Council reviewed the project after the Plan is in effect, and that the project was far along in the review process and essentially met the criteria for a Master Plan.

3. **Tiered Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Community Benefits.** The Public Draft includes two tiers of allowed intensity for the Mixed-Use Center and Mixed-Use Corridor subareas, respectively, including both “Base” (no community benefits required) and “Tier 1” (community benefits required) FAR maximums, as follows:

Public Draft Plan Excerpt: Tiered FAR and Community Benefit Requirements

	BASE	TIER 1
Mixed-Use Corridor Subarea	1.35 FAR 3 Stories/45'	1.85 FAR 4 Stories/55'
Mixed-Use Center Subarea	An addition of <10% of Existing Floor Area (at time of Plan adoption)	2.35 FAR
Community Benefits	Not Required	Required

EPC Direction: The EPC supported the draft FAR tiers, with a recommendation to:

- Revise the Mixed-Use Center Base FAR (maximum) to 1.35 FAR from “An addition of less than 10% of existing floor area at the time of Plan adoption”;
- Provide equal priority to affordable housing, pedestrian and bicycle amenities, and public parks and open space public benefits; and
- Provide the economic analysis supporting the proposed community benefit value for the Plan Area to allow EPC input.

City Council Direction: The Council did not support the EPC-recommended modification to the Mixed-Use Center Base FAR, noting it would reduce potential community benefits; by decreasing the difference between the Base FAR and Tier 1 FAR, the community benefit value would be applied to less floor area. As discussed later in this report, Council provided input for a less significant increase to the Base FAR, raising it to the lesser of an addition of 20 percent of existing floor area or a 0.35 FAR, to allow greater flexibility for incremental development in balance with community benefit provision. Council also did not support the EPC recommendation to change the community benefit priorities. Instead, Council removed the Plan’s identified priority for affordable housing in favor of determining priorities on an ongoing basis through Plan implementation actions.

4. **Strategies for Small Businesses.** The Public Draft includes an FAR exemption for small business floor area and an exception from the office development cap to develop limited office space for existing or new small companies.

EPC and City Council Direction: The EPC supported the programs, but requested the Plan include additional FAR exemption criteria such as a cap on the size of the exemption and definition of what qualifies as a small business. The Council supported the EPC recommendation.

5. **Height at Frontage Setback Line.** The Public Draft includes a standard for maximum height at the frontage setback line to limit taller building heights located at the minimum building setback from the street. In the Council report on the Public Draft, staff noted the Merlone Geier Phase II Gatekeeper project largely complies with this standard, except in a few identified locations.

EPC and City Council Direction: The EPC supported this standard along with other Public Draft setback standards and guidelines, but did not provide input on how the standard should be applied to the Phase II project because the information was not available at the time of EPC review. The Council supported the Public Draft standard, but also an exemption from the standard for the Phase II project if the Plan is in effect when the project is considered by Council.

6. **Environmental Impact Report (EIR).** The EIR analyzed a number of topics, including the Plan's potential impacts on roadways and intersections in Mountain View, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, and Los Altos. The EIR found no substantial evidence that the Plan would result in significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

EPC and City Council Direction: The EPC stated that the City needs a comprehensive plan to address congestion in collaboration with area cities and agencies. The City Council did not discuss the issue. Staff will soon begin work on a City-Wide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan to guide transportation improvements for major transportation routes.

Council also:

- Expressed concern about the width of the shared roadway portion of the Hetch Hetchy Greenway, and requested staff consider revisions to improve bicycling conditions.
- Requested the Latham Street bicycle improvements implementation action be identified as a short-term action and the Community Services Department be added as an involved party for the "Parks and Public Spaces" action.

The Analysis section below includes more discussion of key changes to the Plan.

ANALYSIS

Since the Public Draft was released, the Precise Plan team has refined Plan content in response to EPC and City Council input, public comment, and for clarity, accuracy, and ease of use. The remainder of this report will describe proposed major changes.

Exhibit 6 provides a comprehensive table of proposed Plan changes which include the major changes discussed in this report and other changes with less effect on

policy or meaning which are not discussed in this report. The table identifies the page number for original Public Draft content, proposed changes, and a brief explanation of the reason for the change. Where it can be done legibly, text changes are shown with track changes. Otherwise, text changes are shown in two columns showing original and revised text separately. A full strike-out version of the Plan will not be available due to technical and time constraints.

I. **Proposed Key Changes Based on EPC and City Council Direction**

1. **Office Development.** At their October 7, 2014 Study Session, the City Council supported the following Public Draft modifications:

- Increasing the office development cap to 600,000 square feet;
- Removing the office phasing program;
- Allocating office development under the cap to preferred Plan Areas (up to 400,000 square feet of the cap was allocated to the Northwest San Antonio Master Plan Area, with the remaining 200,000 square feet of the cap available to other Plan areas); and
- Retaining the office development exception for small company space.

Proposed Changes:

- “Development Phasing Program” in Chapter 2 has been amended (see Page 2 of Exhibit 6).
- “Office Development Phasing Exception” in Chapter 5 has been adjusted to reflect removal of the phasing component (see Page 7 of Exhibit 6).
- “Mixed-Use Corridor Subarea” and “Mixed-Use Center Subarea” language in Chapter 2 has been adjusted to reflect these changes (see Page 2 of Exhibit 6).
- “Table 4-1: Allowed Land Use” has been adjusted in Chapter 4 to require a Provisional Use Permit for office uses in the Mixed-Use Corridor subarea to ensure limited office development occurs in locations that match Plan policies (see Exhibit 7).

2. **Master Plan Process.** The EPC and Council supported the Public Draft content for Master Plans. The Council recommended the Plan exempt “deemed complete” projects from Master Plan requirements.

Additionally, in reviewing the Public Draft Master Plan administrative processes, staff noted language that would make administrative procedures more complicated to implement. Specifically, after a Master Plan has been approved, the Public Draft would require all subsequent Planned Community Permits to be approved by the City Council, including relatively small projects under the Base FAR. This would place a greater administrative burden on incremental projects within required Master Plan areas, above typical permitting processes in the Plan. Proposed changes include minor modifications for subsequent permits in approved Master Plan areas to match the permitting processes for the rest of the Plan Area.

Proposed Changes:

- “Master Plan Administrative Process” in Chapter 5 has been amended (see Page 7 of Exhibit 6).
 - “Mixed-Use Center Subarea” and “Master Plan Areas” sections in Chapter 2 have been adjusted with minor language changes to reflect this amendment (see Page 2 of Exhibit 6).
3. **Tiered FAR and Community Benefits.** The EPC and Council supported the Public Draft’s tiered FAR approach, but recommended different modifications to the Base FAR tier for the Mixed-Use Center Subarea. The Council recommended a Base FAR maximum of “0.35 FAR or a 20 percent addition to existing floor area at the time of Plan adoption, whichever is less.”

Although overall development in the Mixed-Use Center Subarea is less than 0.35 FAR, some smaller parcels have existing FAR above 0.35. On those sites, any addition will require community benefits. However, without parcel assembly, redevelopment on these sites is less likely to occur or is likely to involve smaller additions (and therefore less required community benefits) due to small lot constraints and the challenge of providing additional parking.

Council also recommended removal of the specifically identified priority for affordable housing in the Public Draft in favor of establishing priorities on a periodic basis through Plan implementation actions.

Proposed Changes:

- “(Plan priority)” language has been deleted from the Community Benefits Table 5-1 in Chapter 5 (see Exhibit 7).
 - “Table 4-4 Mixed-Use Center Intensity and Height Standards” in Chapter 4 has been amended to include the new standards and clarify terms (see Exhibit 7 and Page 5 of Exhibit 6).
4. **Strategies for Small Businesses.** The EPC and Council supported both the Public Draft FAR exemption and office development exception for small businesses, and recommended additional criteria be added to the Plan for the FAR exemption in particular. The proposed changes include:
- A cap on the maximum size of a proposed FAR exemption (7,500 square feet) to balance objectives for small business preservation with limits on the amount of bonus floor area that might be granted. This cap could allow approximately three small businesses to be preserved in a redevelopment project. For reference, the Milk Pail is approximately 4,000 square feet and the Greystar development on El Camino Real is preserving five existing small businesses totaling 10,800 square feet.
 - Flexible guidance on the type of businesses that might qualify for the FAR exemption. This strategy is proposed to provide direction, but maintain some flexibility to support a variety of goods and services providing uses.
 - Requirements for recordation of an agreement or notice of development restriction on the property deed to identify the proposed FAR exemption and reservation of FAR-exempt space for qualified small businesses.

Proposed Change: Proposed language has been added to both the “Mixed-Use Corridor Intensity and Height Standards” and “Mixed-Use Center Intensity and Height Standards” sections in Chapter 4 (see Pages 4 and 5 of Exhibit 6).

5. **Height at Frontage Setback Line.** The EPC and Council supported this and other development standards in the Public Draft. Council also recommended the Plan exempt projects “deemed complete” prior to Plan adoption from complying with this standard. This input was based on new information about the limited locations where the Merlone Geier Phase II development would not comply with this standard, and would be relevant only if final action on the development occurs after the Plan is in effect.

Upon further review, staff noted the Public Draft standard would be confusing for buildings that face a Plan-identified flexible connection because there is no required minimum frontage setback line and, therefore, no maximum height at the frontage setback line. These connections could serve a variety of purposes and provide varying frontage conditions such as primary pedestrian connections, access to open space/ commercial frontages, service alleys, etc. As such, staff has clarified that the maximum building height standard along these on-site flexible connections will be determined through the Development Review Process based on the function and configuration of the connection.

Proposed Changes:

- Permit process “Exemptions” in Chapter 5 have been amended to address the Council recommendation (see Page 6 of Exhibit 6).
 - “Table 4-5 Frontage and Setback Standards” in Chapter 4 has been amended (see Exhibit 7).
6. **Hetch Hetchy Greenway.** Council noted the width of the shared roadway and expressed concern about vehicle speeds and bicycle safety given the roadway width. The roadway needs adequate width for emergency vehicle access and vehicle staging during calls for service. However, staff has determined the roadway width can be reduced by 2’ to have a minimum 20’ shared roadway. Additional design guidance

has also been drafted to identify how special grading, markings, and materials should be used to ensure the road is designed to comfortably and safely accommodate all travel modes.

Proposed Changes:

- “Figure 3-8 Hetch Hetchy Greenway Section” amended to show the reduced roadway width (see Exhibit 8).
- “Hetch Hetchy Greenway” language amended to include clear guidance on design expectations for the roadway portion of the greenway (see Page 3 of Exhibit 6).

7. **Additional Topics.** EPC and Councilmembers also commented on other minor changes, including additional language for the “Private Shuttle” guideline to avoid conflicts between shuttles and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle circulation; clarification to confusing language in the “Solar Exposure” guideline regarding objectives for north- versus south-facing windows; adjustments to implementation actions; and a new guideline addressing the primary objective for new on-site street parking.

Additionally, at their July Study Session, Council clarified that easement dedications will be required along public streets for bicycle/pedestrian improvements unless future study determines modifications are feasible within existing rights-of-way.

Proposed Changes:

- In Chapter 3, the “Private Shuttle” guideline has been revised and a new “On-Street Parking” guideline has been added (see Page 3 of Exhibit 6).
- The “Solar Exposure” guideline in Chapter 4 has been revised (see Page 6 of Exhibit 6).
- “Table 5-5 Implementation Actions” has been updated (see Exhibit 7).
- In Chapter 3, clarifying language has been added to public street descriptions per prior Council input (see Page 3 of Exhibit 6).

II. Proposed Changes Based on Public Draft Comments

Several architects, developers, property owners, and other interested parties have commented on the Plan, identifying questions and concerns about certain standards and/or guidelines. Staff proposes the following changes to clarify requirements based on this input, having found them consistent with the Plan's intent.

1. **Flexible FAR.** The Public Draft proposes that FAR be calculated cumulatively across multiple parcels that comprise one project site.

Proposed Change: The proposed change would clarify the flexible FAR standard applies only to major redevelopment and Master Plan projects to allow averaging of FAR on multiple, adjacent parcels comprising a project site and would not be applicable to smaller, incremental redevelopment projects and additions (see Pages 4 and 5 of Exhibit 6).

2. **Surface Pavement Coverage.** The Public Draft proposes no more than 50 percent of the total site area to be used for automobile pavement areas, inclusive of surface parking and new streets. This improves on existing conditions throughout the Plan Area, but may still be a little high when considering objectives for open space and likely building coverages.

Proposed Change: The proposed change would reduce the maximum surface pavement coverage to 40 percent, which should accommodate the new street grid with some flexibility for additional roadways/a smaller street grid beyond what is identified in the Public Draft (see Page 5 of Exhibit 6).

III. Changes for Clarity and Ease of Implementation

The following changes are based on staff and consultant review of the Public Draft to clarify intent and/or simplify implementation. In most cases, they result in little or no change in meaning or results.

1. **Land Use Table.** The Plan provides a table of allowed land uses, which specifies permitted uses, provisionally permitted uses, and prohibited uses. The Plan also includes a section on other land use requirements, which includes additional land use standards to supplement the table of allowed uses.

Proposed Change: As noted earlier in the report, proposed changes include allowing office uses only through a Provisional Use Permit in both of the main subareas (see Exhibit 7). Additional proposed changes simplify the land use table and footnotes to improve ease of use, and relocate requirements for some general land uses from the land use table to the section on “Other Land Use Requirements” (see Exhibit 7 and Page 4 of Exhibit 6).

- 2. Public Access Easements for Public Street Sidewalks.** The Plan proposes to increase sidewalks (including planters) to a typical width of 14’ and improve bicycle facilities on public streets. These improvements will require a portion of the proposed sidewalk improvements to be located on private property and dedication of a public access easement. The easement would not affect allowed floor area, but may require adjustments to curb lines (and therefore setbacks) in some locations. The Public Draft identifies when easements would be required as development occurs.

Proposed Change: The proposed change clarifies when easements and improvements will be required (see Page 9 of Exhibit 6).

- 3. Public Access Easements for Connections Through Private Property.** The Plan also proposes on-site improvements to create a smaller and more walkable/bikeable grid of on-site access providing more street-like conditions. The Plan expects these roadways to be publicly accessible and privately maintained, with easements assuring public access. The Public Draft identifies when easements would be required as development occurs.

Proposed Changes:

- Given the variety of functions new connections may provide, the proposed changes clarify when easements and improvements will be required, and include a new discretionary exception allowing the City to consider locations where an easement may not be required (see Page 10 of Exhibit 6).
- In Chapter 3, easement callouts on “Street Section” graphics have been revised (see Exhibit 8).

4. **Neighborhood Transition Setbacks.** The Public Draft contains two to three different setback standards for key neighborhood transition areas, depending on the scale of adjacent development and whether it is a side or rear setback. However, in identified transition areas, some affected setback areas could be defined as either a side or rear setback. There are also very few cases where the adjacent structure in these transition areas is a single-family home.

Proposed Change: The proposed change creates a single minimum setback of 25', which was the midpoint of the Public Draft's 15' to 35' range. The proposed change also identifies a potential exception for minor reductions in the required setback in cases where the new building has lower heights and compatible use (see Table 4-5 in Exhibit 7). While this type of exception could be considered on a case-by-case basis through the Plan's "General Exceptions," the proposed exception defines specific parameters for considering an alternate proposal. Overall, these changes are consistent with recently approved residential projects such as the Tropicana Lodge project (1616-1720 El Camino Real) and the 100 Moffett Boulevard project.

5. **Diagrams and Tables.** Diagrams and tables are used throughout the document to illustrate and/or concisely identify standards and guidelines.

Proposed Change: Diagrams and tables, including some discussed earlier in this analysis, have been revised to more clearly show future Plan requirements and/or objectives. Other changes improve accuracy to standards and guidelines, or provide a more illustrative example of future conditions. Key graphic or table revisions include:

- Revised "Figure 2-6 Open Space and Urban Form" to show a more general building and open space layout illustrating Plan objectives, rather than mirroring the most recent Merlone Geier Phase II conditions. If EPC and Council support the layout changes on this graphic, base layer conditions such as the open space layout will be added to other Plan graphics for consistency.
- Revised "Table 3-1 El Camino Real Standards" to correct sidewalk standards to match existing San Antonio Center Precise Plan standards and continue existing improvements along the Plan frontage.

- New “Figure 4-5 Illustrative Example of Height and Frontage Standards” to provide conceptual information on key development standards.

Revised tables and diagrams are included as Exhibits 7 and 8.

IV. Public Benefits Value

The Plan allows applicants to request additional square footage in exchange for providing public benefits. A detailed description of this process is contained in Chapter 5. To provide consistency in applying this requirement and predictability to applicants, a required public benefits value is proposed for adoption by the City Council along with the Plan. This value serves as a target for applicants to develop public benefits proposals, to be reviewed and approved by Council on a project-by-project basis for Tier 1 developments.

The Plan’s economic consultants conducted a feasibility analysis to determine an appropriate community benefits value. The value was based on maintaining a reasonable developer return of 10 percent and ensuring that development costs in Mountain View remain competitive with surrounding cities, taking into account existing fees and Plan requirements. The Community Benefits and Financing Strategy Memo (see Exhibit 10) contains this detailed analysis.

The total value of public benefits will be based on the additional building square footage requested by the applicant over the Base FAR in both Plan subareas. For example:

- In the Mixed-Use Corridor subarea, if a project proposes a 185,000 square foot project on a 100,000 square foot site (2.3 acres at 1.85 FAR), public benefits would be provided for 50,000 square feet. The 50,000 square feet is the difference between the 185,000 square foot project and the 135,000 square foot “base” floor area (100,000 square foot site at 1.35 FAR).
- In the Mixed-Use Center subarea, a comparable project would provide public benefits for approximately 200,000 square feet (the difference between a 100,000 square foot site at 2.35 FAR versus an approximately 0.35 FAR “base”).

Public Benefits Value Options

In most of the Plan Area, the feasibility analysis supports a \$20 per bonus square foot public benefits value. The exception is within San Antonio Center, where unique development conditions in the East San Antonio Center Master Plan Area (Master Plan Area No. 3) suggests a value range of approximately \$10 to \$20 per bonus square foot.

Master Plan Area No. 3 is comprised of multiple parcels and underlying property owners, as well as some long-term leases for existing businesses. Significant physical improvements are also planned, such as the centralized open space, which will require collaboration between property owners. Additionally, retail-commercial development is a key goal for this area, but typically provides a lower return than residential and office. Given these conditions, the timing and composition of future development is uncertain.

It is expected that development potential in the Master Plan Area will support a final value of \$20 per bonus square foot. However, the actual scope of future development and associated improvements, agreements across the multiple parcels in the Master Plan Area, the cost of structured parking, and future market conditions will affect public benefits value available when development occurs.

Based on the feasibility analysis, the Precise Plan has identified two options:

- **Require a value of \$20 for the Plan Area, but do not adopt an initial value for the East San Antonio Master Plan Area.**
- **Require a value of \$20 for the Plan Area, except for a value range of \$10 to \$20 for the East San Antonio Master Plan Area.**

Option 1 acknowledges the challenges of establishing an initial public benefits value for Master Plan Area No. 3 at the time of Plan adoption, and would defer establishing the value until there is more certainty about how the different parcels in the Master Plan Area will contribute to future development, required improvements, and public benefits value.

Option 2 also acknowledges these challenges, but provides initial direction for expected public benefits accounting for a range of potential values based on the feasibility analysis of prototype projects in the Master Plan Area.

Under both options, the ultimate public benefits value would be determined through the Master Plan process. Staff recommends Option 2 because it establishes expectations for public benefits proposals, but allows the value to be adjusted based on conditions at the time development is proposed.

The example project would provide \$1,000,000 worth of public benefits in the Mixed-Use Corridor subarea and up to \$4,000,000 worth of public benefits in the Mixed-Use Center subarea.

Public Benefits Calculation Options – Mixed-Use Center Subarea

As noted earlier, the total value of public benefits is based on the additional building square footage requested above the Base FAR in each subarea. The Public Draft Plan includes aboveground structured parking in the floor area on which public benefits value is applied. However, the feasibility analysis raises a policy question on this topic.

To regulate the size of structures in mixed-use districts, aboveground structured parking counts as floor area. The Mixed-Use Center subarea will have significant retail development, with high parking demand but lower returns on development. While future development is expected to include as much underground parking as feasible, particularly for office and residential development, some aboveground parking is expected in the subarea.

The intent of the public benefits program is to provide benefits in exchange for additional intensity, and development value is principally derived from leasable floor area. For these reasons and given the high cost of structured parking, staff recommends not requiring public benefits value for aboveground structured parking floor area. This exemption would apply to the Mixed-Use Center subarea.

Proposed Changes:

- Proposed changes would clarify that public benefits proposals are required as part of the Master Plan preparation, given its role in establishing community benefit value for Master Plan Area No. 3, and aboveground parking structure floor area is exempt from public benefits value provision (see Pages 7 and 8 of Exhibit 6).

V. Additional Recommended Actions

The recommended actions on Page 1 of this report are needed to implement and adopt the new San Antonio Precise Plan. They include two action items requiring additional explanation:

1. **Amendment to San Antonio Station Precise Plan.** The new San Antonio Precise Plan will apply to properties currently regulated by a mix of standard zoning districts and existing Precise Plans. In most cases, the Plan Area will completely replace existing Precise Plans because their boundaries overlap. The exception is the P(8) San Antonio Station Precise Plan, where only three of five subareas will be incorporated into the new San Antonio Precise Plan. As a result, a Precise Plan amendment is required to remove those three areas from the existing San Antonio Station Precise Plan (see Exhibit 4).
2. **General Plan Amendment (West Side of San Antonio Road).** The new San Antonio Precise Plan implements the General Plan vision and policies for the Plan Area, with the additional recommendation to amend the west side of San Antonio Road, between California Street and the south side of Fayette Drive, from General Mixed Use (1.35 FAR/3 stories) to Mixed-Use Corridor (1.85 FAR/4 stories) as shown in Exhibit 2.

The General Plan Amendment has been supported through the Precise Plan process because it creates a transition area between the medium-density residential neighborhood and higher-intensity areas in San Antonio Center. It also closes a gap between existing Mixed-Use Corridor areas to the north and south of the affected area, to create a consistent Mixed-Use Corridor designation on the west side of San Antonio Road. The amendment is part of the San Antonio Precise Plan actions because the Plan is proceeding ahead of the 400 San Antonio Road (Pillar Group) Gatekeeper project. Adoption of the General Plan Amendment will allow the Plan to include development standards for future development under the Mixed-Use Corridor designation.

VI. Environmental Impact Report

The Draft EIR (Exhibit 11) was made available for public review on August 22, 2014. It was posted on the City's website, hard copies were made available at City Hall and the Library, a notice of its availability was

published in the newspaper and provided to interested parties, and notice was included on postcards sent to property owners and residents within 300' of the Plan area ahead of the EPC review of the Draft EIR.

The EPC reviewed the Draft EIR at their September 17, 2014 meeting. The Draft EIR was also distributed to local and State agencies. The CEQA-mandated 45-day public comment period ended on October 6, 2014. Questions and comments from the EPC, City Council, agencies, and the public during this period are included in the Final EIR (Exhibit 1), along with formal responses to these comments and clarifying edits to the Draft EIR.

The Final EIR was made available for review on November 7, 2014, and was distributed to all agencies and individuals that commented on the Draft EIR. It was also posted to the City website and hard copies were made available at City Hall and the Library.

The Final EIR did not identify any significant unavoidable impacts. A more detailed discussion of identified impacts, mitigations, and EIR alternatives can be found in the October 7, 2014 Council Report (Exhibit 12). Required mitigations will be included in the Precise Plan as an appendix.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

The Zoning Ordinance requires a fiscal analysis for new Precise Plans and Precise Plan amendments. The 2030 General Plan analysis found that new development would be expected to bring increases in revenue from public improvement and park fees and property and sales taxes. The study also found that City costs may also increase for public services due to an increase in City population. However, the analysis found that the growth associated with the General Plan would result in a net fiscal balance or growth.

This Precise Plan is consistent with the 2030 General Plan and the General Plan's fiscal analysis completed in 2012, except that additional office development is studied in the Public Draft EIR and assumed in the Plan. The projected office development under the Precise Plan is not expected to negatively impact the City's net fiscal balance because it would result in comparable increases in revenue and would not result in significant new costs, such as maintenance of new public streets or increased emergency services due to increased City population. These costs can be two major demands on City services from new development.

OPTIONS

For any of the actions listed under Recommendation on Page 1 of this report, the EPC may:

1. Recommend modifications. Proposed modifications should be substantially consistent with overall principles, policies, and objectives; strategies; and implementation to avoid triggering additional environmental analysis.
2. Recommend denial.

The EPC may also make the following alternative recommendation on public benefits based on the discussion in this report:

3. Recommend a public benefits value of \$20 per square foot on building area over Base FAR in each subarea, but do not adopt an initial value for the East San Antonio Center Master Plan Area, or some other public benefits value.

CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Staff is recommending that the EPC make a recommendation to the City Council on the San Antonio Precise Plan, the Precise Plan EIR, and other actions related to the Plan's adoption. The City Council is scheduled to take action on the Plan on December 2, 2014.

Prepared by:

Rebecca Shapiro
Associate Planner

Approved by:

Terry Blount
Assistant Community Development
Director/Planning Manager

Randy Tsuda
Community Development Director

RS/7/CDD
803-11-17-14SR-E

- Exhibits:
1. Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program
 2. General Plan Map Amendment Exhibit and Findings
 3. Zoning Map Amendment Exhibit and Findings
 4. Draft San Antonio Station Precise Plan Amendments and Findings
 5. [Public Draft San Antonio Precise Plan](#)
 6. Changes from the Public Draft San Antonio Precise Plan
 7. Revised Land Use and Other Plan Tables
 8. Revised Plan Diagrams and Figures
 9. San Antonio Precise Plan Findings
 10. Community Benefit and Financing Strategies Memo
 11. [Draft Environmental Impact Report](#)
 12. [October 7, 2014 Council Report](#)