

Environmental Planning Commission Meeting Notes

San Antonio Precise Plan

9/17/2014

(Items where EPC voted or had consensus are in bold.)

Public Comment

- Revise the Plan's parking requirements to avoid existing problems at Merlone Geier Phase I.
- Support for overall Plan, especially the mix of office and residential on the north of California Street parcels; priority for ground-floor retail; bike lanes; study of traffic-calming on Pacchetti Way; and tiered FAR program with community benefits.
- Plan should clarify Tier 1 FAR requirements.
- Plan should clarify how flexible FAR is applied – e.g. applicable to contiguous parcels only and at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator and/or Council – and consider ways to ensure lower intensity portions of project sites don't redevelop and result in areas exceeding allowed FAR.
- Housing and retail in San Antonio Center is okay, but office and school uses are not appropriate in San Antonio Center proper.
- Preserve small businesses.
- The community benefits requirements are insufficient at \$15 per square foot.
- The community benefit requirements are too much.
- Bicycle and pedestrian amenities should be an additional priority community benefit.
- Vehicle access improvements should also be considered as a community benefit.
- The location of the proposed central green would require the relocation of existing successful businesses and may not occur/be appropriate.

Key Topics

Office Development Cap & Phasing Program

- **Support the Public Draft office development cap of 400,000 square feet (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
 - Cap supports emphasize of building housing in the Plan Area.
- **Support the Public Draft development development phasing program (STRAW VOTE 4-3)**
 - Phasing program supports housing development; okay with draft phases given the amount of residential units already in the pipeline in the Plan Area.
- Concern that the phasing program might benefit developers on a first-come/first-serve basis, and effectively force a future property owner to produce housing for other property owners.
- Program could be an incentive for collaboration between property owners in a measured way.

Master Plan Process

- **Support the Public Draft master plan process, EPC → CC (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
- **Support the Public Draft subsequent Planned Community Permit process, ZA → CC (STRAW VOTE 5-2)**
 - Okay with Zoning Administrator review, as long as Council has final approval.
- **Support for Public Draft master plan areas and objectives (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**

Tiered FAR & Community Benefits

- **Support Mixed Use Corridor FAR Tiers (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
- **Modify Mixed Use Center Base FAR Tier from “10% addition to existing floor area (at time of Plan adoption)” to 1.35 FAR (STRAW VOTE 4-3)**
 - Provides more flexibility for incremental additions, redevelopment and improvements.
- Modifying the Mixed Use Center Base FAR will reduce the amount of community benefits; Public Draft Base FAR allows increment improvements to existing businesses.
- **Modify the Community Benefits Table 5-1 to strike “Plan Priority” for affordable housing and shift the public parking facility category to the list of “Other” benefits, to equally prioritize affordable housing, bicycle and pedestrian amenities and open space (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
 - Affordable housing is important, but as a community benefit won’t solve the issue by itself. There may be other more effective tools for affordable housing.
 - Workforce housing and affordable housing are important.
 - **Provide background analysis for estimated community benefit value/target (EPC consensus).**

Small Business – Exemptions and Exceptions

- **Support the FAR exemption and office development phasing exception, with additional criteria in the Plan for the FAR exemption (STRAW VOTE 7-0)**
 - Consider criteria to emphasize local businesses versus chain stores; size, number of employees and/or revenue metric; and community-serving qualities (i.e. non-regional destinations).

Chapter 1 – No comments.

Chapter 2

- Clarify/add information and guidelines for public open space facilities to provide amenities targeting the needs of residents, families and workers.

Chapter 3

- Reference the NACTO Street Design guidelines.
- Clarify sharrows being appropriate where traffic is light enough/slow enough for it to be safe.
- Support slip lane removal, pedestrian signal phasing and refuge island concepts.
- Revise “Private Shuttle” guidelines to ensure they also do not interfere with bicycle and pedestrian improvements (Page 3-30).
- Create an onsite, on-street parking guideline to prioritize use for shorter term parking, mobility impaired spaces, etc.
- For the Hetch Hetchy shared roadway study if it is possible to slightly grade-separate the portion of the roadway with the proposed sharrow markings.

Chapter 4

- Clarify “Setback Encroachment” allowance for building area projections only where setbacks are large enough to avoid the projection encroaching into the public right-of-way (Page 4-19).
- Correct the “Solar Exposure” guideline for direction on appropriate window design based on solar-orientation of different building facades.
- Consider guidelines to support more sustainable development.

Chapter 5 – No comments.

Overall plan – The graphics are great.

Environmental Impact Report

- **City must address future congestion, even if it is not due solely to an individual project or precise plan.**
- Interest in getting more information about any existing sites in Mountain View where there is an “on-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index” (Mitigation Measures AIR-1 & AIR-2).