

## EPC Questions – November 18, 2020

### Item 5.1 – Office and Retail Development at 365 San Antonio Road

1. What is the anticipated residential development in the SAPP area? What is the timeline for that development?

Since the adoption of the 2030 General Plan, 1,357 units have been approved. All these units are complete or under construction. Anticipated completion of the 632 units approved as part of the Greystar project (2580 & 2590 California St; 201 San Antonio Circle) is the end of 2022.

The SAPP does not have a policy cap on the number of residential units allowed.

2. Would it be possible to get a chart comparing the SAPP development standards with what the applicant is requesting?

Table 1 shows some basic development standards in the SAPP. This is not a comprehensive or exhaustive list of development standards. Furthermore, the SAPP has many qualitative and flexible standards that cannot easily be listed in a table and could impact the quantitative standards below.

**Table 1**

<b>Development Standard</b>	<b>San Antonio Precise Plan</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>FAR</b>	0.75 FAR (maximum for Tier 1 projects)	4.23 FAR
<b>Setback *</b> California & San Antonio (measured building to curb)	18'	18' with encroachments
<b>Right-of-Way**</b> California	102'	95'
<b>Right-of-Way**</b> San Antonio	130'	127'
<b>Setback *</b> Silicon Way & Promenade (measured building to curb)	10'	10' with encroachment
<b>Right-of-Way**</b> Silicon Way	40'-56'	47'
<b>Right-of-Way**</b> Promenade	58'-62'	83'
<b>Upper Floor Step Backs</b>	80% of a building's linear frontage above 4 stories must step back a minimum of 10 ft on every street the project faces.	No stepback prior to 6 <sup>th</sup> floor. 6 <sup>th</sup> floor is setback 12'-15' from California Street and San Antonio Road.
<b>Height</b>	6 stories/75' or 8 stories/ 95' on a case by case basis	7 stories/111'

\*Minimum setback. Additional setback can be required based on design, building height, and road functionality.

\*\*Right-of-Way includes building setback, walkway, amenity area, planting area, street parking, and vehicle/bike travel lanes.

- Page 2: "The project's open space is primarily located on private balconies facing California Street and San Antonio Road." How well does the proposed project satisfy the open space requirement?

The SAPP encourages centrally located and publicly visible open space. A minimum 6,470 square feet of open space is required (15% site area). The applicant is proposing

approximately 25,000 square feet of open space. The general locations and amount of the proposed open space are compliant with the Precise Plan.

4. Page 5: “does not meet the minimum setbacks” -- please provide details on what is not in compliance?

Please see response to Question 2.

5. Page 8: key corner of San Antonio and California: Is there sufficient space in the planting area for a specimen tree as suggested by staff?

Since receiving the recent direction from DRC to study placing a specimen tree at this key corner, the applicant has not had sufficient time to study the idea. However, staff is confident that there is sufficient space for a planter large enough to accommodate a specimen tree.

6. Page 9 - southern facade: Would staff be able to provide a graphic/picture to demonstrate the idea of “a partial pedestrian arcade along at least a portion of the frontage”?

The applicant provided a quick sketch of the first floor setback an additional 5'. As with all design, the process is iterative and this should not be viewed as a final response to the direction of the DRC/staff.



7. What are the project’s proposed public benefits?

The project is early in the process and has not yet proposed specific public benefits.

Projects requesting additional floor area through the LASD TDR process are exempt from public benefit contribution requirements for TDR square footage, as moneys used to purchase the excess square footage would assist with the development of a school site, which is deemed a public benefit. This does not exempt entire projects from public benefit requirements, just the additional TDR square footage.

This project proposes a Tier 1 FAR project in addition to the 150,000 square feet of purchased TDR. The area breakdown is located in the table below.

Mixed Use Center Sub Area Base Intensity	Mixed Use Center Sub Area Tier 1 Intensity	Purchased TDR	Total Area Proposed
0.35 FAR (~15,098 SF)	0.75 FAR (~32,352 SF)	150,000 SF	182,352 SF

The project is subject to a public benefit contribution of \$24.01/net new sq. ft. for the difference between the Tier 1 and Base intensity.

8. It looks like the project is built on the former Milk Pail AND David Pilling properties (the old blue industrial looking building). Is that right? Is it a land purchase or land lease? On both properties?

This is correct. Merlone Geier Partners purchased all properties that are part of the project site.

9. While looking over the site and adjacent buildings, I noticed that the ground floor retail facing California Street of Merlone Geier Phase 2 is unoccupied. Has there been any effort on the part of the developer to lease out this area? Any help or encouragement from the city to help them find a client? I understand that it is more difficult during COVID, but this was also the situation pre-COVID.

The SAPP allows a wide range of uses - by right or through Provisional Use Permits - and that process is the City's main tool to incentivize certain uses. Per the applicant, "the retail facing California has been part of the overall strategy to lease up the Village at San Antonio Center and there has been interest. The lack of foot traffic from San Antonio towards Pachetti Way has been a deterrent to the leasing activity on the spaces, with more interest from tenants focused on the interior stretch of spaces. Prior to COVID, however the space on the corner closest to the theater entrance on California was leased, however the COVID closures prevented the tenant from moving forward."

10. L1.02: Are there any minimum percentage requirements for “public planted area” and “private planted area”?

No, the SAPP does not have separate quantitative standards for public and private planted area.

11. L1.02: What does it mean by “part of future offsite public improvement plans”? What do these plans entail?

Off-site improvement plans are construction-level documents submitted with the Building Permit that provide all details of improvements in the public right-of-way. They include utilities, sidewalks, planting areas, and roadways on public property.

12. L2.02: 6th level plan: Are the trees on the 6th level balcony planted in planter boxes? If so, did tree canopy coverage calculation take into consideration trees planted in planter boxes are not likely to grow to their full potential?

Yes, trees on the 6<sup>th</sup> level are planted in planter boxes. As this project is early in the development review project, technical details and depictions in the plans are still under review. The City Arborist is reviewing the details of the landscape plans and will make sure the tree canopy coverage calculations are accurate.

13. A community member sent in a letter about a June 2018 meeting in which developers agreed to save a small number of heritage trees, but is coming back with an additional 5 trees to be removed. Not having taken part in that meeting, can someone confirm whether the developer made that promise? Was the underground parking already a known factor at that time?

The project referenced in the letter was a completely different project by a different developer. The previous project referenced in the email is noted as the “Greystar Project” in the clarifying map below; with the proposed project highlighted in RED. City Council approved the Greystar Project in June 2018.



Staff is working with the applicant and arborist to preserve as many trees as possible with the proposed project, including considering if any trees are viable candidates for relocation. This project is early in the development review process and has not yet received any approvals.

14. Why does the SA Precise Plan call out for active frontage along 1/2 of the south side of the building instead of:
- the entire way from the Promenade to San Antonio along Silicon Way, or
  - no active frontage along Silicon Way, leaving to be back-of-house activities?

The SAPP was adopted by the City Council after extensive technical research, community input, and decision-maker feedback. Many standards in the SAPP, like the ones mentioned in the question, are flexible to allow for varied development and project-specific design review and feedback from the City. Overall, the SAPP prioritizes active frontage area along public streets and key internal corridors/corners; the active frontage area required along Silicon Way roughly aligns with the large plaza in the Phase 2 development, and allows space for back of house activities along the remainder of that frontage.

15. I understand the project was approved after the developer stated they could not meet the setback requirements in the Precise Plan. Was there an agreed upon minimum setback for the adjacent streets established at that time?

This project is early in the development process and is not approved. Council authorized the project to submit a Planning Application with increased FAR through the LASD TDR Program, with the understanding that some development standards could not be met given the proposed intensity on the site above what

would normally be permitted. The actual design and specifics of the project will be determined on a project-specific basis with guidance from the applicable development standards and input from advisory bodies, decision makers, and the community.

16. Is a pedestrian crossing planned across California St. north from the Promenade to the Greystar site?

The Greystar project will construct a midblock, signalized crossing of California Street. The exact location is being verified with Public Works staff, but it will be near the Promenade.