

# City Council Questions

## April 28, 2020 Council Meeting

### ITEM 3.1 SHORELINE BOULEVARD AT HIGHWAY 101 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE, PROJECT 16-60- PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

1. Bike ridership to and from North Bayshore has steadily declined since 2017. What is the preliminary mode share for bikes in the most recent trip cap study and what days were used to count the trips?

The most recent trip count was conducted between February 2 – 15, 2020 on a Tuesday, Wednesday, and/or Thursday and showed a 3% bicycle mode share during the peak AM count.

2. Is the bridge designed to a certain capacity (bicycles/hour)? If so, what is the capacity?

There is no standard metric for calculating the capacity of a bicycle facility. There are also no widely accepted methods to evaluate bicycle travel demand that translates to travel capacity. Designers generally follow the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines when determining the appropriate travel width and clearance for new bicycle and shared facilities. The 20-foot travel width for the proposed shared bicycle and pedestrian bridge is consistent and exceeds appropriate AASHTO guidelines.

One reference statistic found by staff was for the Hawthorne Bridge in Portland (<https://multco.us/bridges/hawthorne-bridge>). This bridge has a 10-foot wide sidewalk shared by bicyclists and pedestrians. According to the report, this bridge is one of the busiest traffic bridges and carries 8,000 bicycles/day. In another study on the bridge, the author reports a bicycle saturation rate of 2,000-3,500 bicycles per hour. By comparison, the 101/Shoreline bridge is proposed to be double this width.

In terms of potential demand for the 101/Shoreline bridge, the North Bayshore Precise Plan has a target of 10 percent bicycle/pedestrian mode share, which would equate to around 1,700 bicycle/pedestrian trips during the peak hour entering North Bayshore. This demand would be spread over various bicycle/pedestrian gateways, including the Steven Creek Trail, the Permanente Creek Trail, the bike lanes/sidewalks to be maintained on the existing Shoreline road overcrossing, and the new 101/Shoreline bike/pedestrian bridge. Based on the Hawthorne Bridge experience, the proposed width of 20 feet will accommodate far more than the full 10 percent bicycle/pedestrian mode split on its own.

For additional comparison purposes, the table below includes some statistics of local bicycle/pedestrian bridges and illustrates how the proposed bridge's width exceeds other bicycle/pedestrian bridge widths in the area.

Bridge Name	Travel Width	Overall Length
<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>20'</b>	<b>3,540'</b>
Permanente Creek Trail Bridge	12'	1,125'
Stevens Creek Trail Bridge	12'	354'
<i>Mary Avenue Bicycle /Pedestrian Bridge *</i>	<i>16.3'</i>	<i>503'</i>
Ralston Avenue Bicycle/ Pedestrian Bridge	8'	1,384'
Bay Bridge for Bicycle/ Pedestrian	15'	10,304'
Clark Avenue Bicycle/ Pedestrian Bridge	12'	1,080'
Adobe Creek Bicycle/ Pedestrian Bridge	12'	815'

\* Shown in structure width. Travel width would be a few feet less depending on the type of bridge structure and amenities.

3. How much input has been received from the bicycle community on the plans?

Staff met twice with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee Bicycle (B/PAC) and held two community meetings during the development of the Shoreline Boulevard Corridor Study, which included discussions about designating separate bicycle and pedestrian path areas on the bridge. The discussions resulted in a recommended travel width of 20 feet.

4. What is the maximum capacity of this bridge? How many bicycles per hour would it be able to convey (approximately), and how many pedestrians?

See response to Question 2 above.

5. If the width of the bicycle lanes were expanded to allow more room for passing, how much additional cost would the project incur? (Is there a rough projection of additional cost for each added foot of space?)

The rough order of magnitude cost estimate for each additional foot in width is between \$600,000 and \$1,000,000 assuming no additional structural support or right-of-way is required. The additional costs for structural support and right-of-way would depend on the overall dimensions of the structure.

6. What type of landscaping is staff proposing adjacent to the bridge? Is there a chance the landscaping could create visibility hazards?

Landscaping alternatives will be evaluated in the next stage of design concept alternatives development. Maintaining visibility will be a key criteria for the landscaping alternatives.

7. Will B/PAC be reviewing this project and have the opportunity to provide recommendations to the Council?

Yes, B/PAC will have the opportunity to review the design concept alternatives before staff's next presentation to City Council.

8. Has staff considered the lighter weight bike bridge types that are now becoming popular around the world because they are more streamlined and fit well into urban environments, like that pictured [HERE](#)? I've heard that they are less expensive and that the heavier weight-type is not needed if cars are not going to drive on the bridge, but have not explored it myself and do not know if that is true.

Lightweight bridges generally may be suitable for short spans with multiple support columns, and where right of way is not an issue for column placement. However, it is not feasible for a bridge design such as the current project that needs to span over the 12-13 traffic lanes on Highway 101 with a minimum number of supporting columns. The design also needs to comply with Caltrans structural and seismic design requirements, which may not be required for the lightweight bridge featured in the article. The proposed bridge must also be able to support a future recycled water main filled with water, apparatus such as lighting and drainage facilities, and small maintenance and emergency vehicles. These loading considerations are also key factors in determining the appropriate structure type.

#### **ITEM 4.1 2019 HOUSING ELEMENT AND GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS**

1. It seems like the city has enough funds to fund all affordable housing projects and so the NOFA process is not being used. Has the city had a true notice of funding availability process in the past several years? Or are projects just being funded without the notice of funding availability process?

The City last released a Notice of Funding (NOFA) for affordable housing development in 2014 and, after receiving Council feedback in 2015, has not closed the NOFA process. Applications for funding continue to be accepted in an over the counter format and the City currently has a healthy pipeline of seven projects, including Lot 12, the VTA Evelyn lot, and Pear Avenue. The primary reason that the NOFA process has not closed is that the City has continued to have steady revenue generated from housing impact fees. However, the development costs of all the proposed projects does exceed the current balance of the Affordable Housing Fund by approximately \$40M at this time.

#### **ITEM 6.1 ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS REGARDING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, FAMILY DAY-CARE HOMES, AND PLANNED COMMUNITY PERMITS**

1. Do these proposed amendments trigger a review by the Airport Land Use Commission? (Similar amendments to San Jose's zoning have been run by the ALUC.)

No, the ALUC reviews legislative acts (such as zoning code amendments) that would result in changes in land use within the Airport Influence Area. The modifications to the City's existing accessory dwelling unit and residential daycare facility regulations do not alter the land use, therefore review from the ALUC is not required.

2. On page 3 of the staff report in the Setbacks section – what are the City's current requirements?

Existing ADU regulations require attached ADU's to meet the setbacks for the main house which are generally a minimum of 5' on the sides, 20' in the front, and 15' or 20% of lot depth (whichever is greater) in the rear. Detached ADUs require 5' side setbacks, 10' rear setbacks and must be located in the rear half of the lot.

3. On page 3 of the staff report in the Reconstruction section – what are the City's current requirements?

Currently, if a nonconforming detached accessory structure were to be demolished, a new ADU could not be built in its location unless it met the setbacks and other development standards of today.

4. On page 6 of the staff report in the Short-Term Rentals section – please clarify if staff's proposal also includes junior accessory dwelling units and accessory dwelling units in multi-family zones.

State law prohibits multifamily ADUs and junior ADUs from being used as short term rentals.

5. Have we considered providing incentives to ADU owners to provide parking similar to what Los Altos Hills is looking to do?

Los Altos Hills is considering allowing homes to be built with additional height and floor area if additional parking for an ADU is provided. Staff does not recommend this for Mountain View as the lot size and other development standards are much smaller than Los Altos Hills and the City's height and FAR limitations are

intended to provide a level of continuity with building form and character and privacy within neighborhoods.

6. Page 4 of the staff report indicates that “state law mandates that local jurisdictions allow JADUs in single-family homes.” There are single family homes in Mountain View on properties zoned R2 and R3. Since single family homes are a permitted use in R2 and R3 districts, shouldn’t JADUs similarly be permitted in those districts?

Staff proposes that ADUs in multifamily zones should be subject to the multifamily ADU standards because additional units could be built on R2 and R3 properties which could limit these additional unit provisions with the existence of a JADU. The multifamily standards would still allow for existing, nonliveable space to be converted into an ADU and for a detached ADU.

7. On page 14 of the draft ordinance, staff is recommending a 10 ft. minimum interior setback, from primary dwelling or other structure, if detached. This seems excessive, particularly if “state law mandates that local jurisdictions require no more than a 4’ side and rear setback for all ADUs” (staff report p3). Why is staff recommending a 10 feet interior setback? What problem does this solve?

The 10’ interior separation standard is consistent with the required 10’ interior separation between single-family homes and other (non ADU) detached accessory structures which is largely driven by building and fire code provisions for minimum separation between structures. Therefore, staff is recommending the setback to be consistent with requirements for other accessory structures.

8. How great would the administrative burden of an ADU BMR program be? What are the administrative requirements that would be imposed on the homeowner?

Creating an ADU BMR program may pose the following challenges:

- Under current BMR guidelines, the unit would need to be deed restricted affordable in perpetuity. This could pose a challenge for many homeowners that have eventual plans of selling their property as future buyers may not be inclined to rent a BMR ADU.
- Renting the unit and annual recertification of tenant eligibility would be administered by Palo Alto Housing. The property owner would need to be comfortable coordinating with Palo Alto Housing on a regular basis and be comfortable with limited control of the tenant selection process. This would also limit family member move in, unless that family member is already on the BMR waitlist.
- Rent would need to be set within the range for a rental unit (50-120% AMI).

9. The CRA district allows residential development. Shouldn’t small and large family day-care homes also be permitted in residential developments in the CRA district?

SB 234 states that small and large family daycare homes shall be permitted in zones that allow for residential uses. Council could further modify the commercial land use table to include small and large family daycare homes as permitted in the CRA district.

10. Regarding ADUs, the staff report says, “If Council would like to implement an amnesty program, staff recommends a five-year amnesty program.” What would the advantages of a five-year program be over more extended period?

Staff is proposing a five-year amnesty program to align with the state’s time frame for delayed enforcement of code violations for five years. Council could choose to extend the program.

11. Regarding family day care, staff is proposing we do what SB 234 requires, no more and no less, right?

That is correct.

**ITEM 7.2 POLICY ON DISCONTINUATION OF RESIDENTIAL WATER SERVICE FOR NONPAYMENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE WATER SHUTOFF PROTECTION ACT (SB 998) AND INTRODUCTION OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO DISCONTINUATION OF WATER SERVICE FOR NONPAYMENT**

1. On page 3 of the staff report, line 2, c, iii, I think part of the sentence is missing. Should it say “Partial/full reduction of unpaid balance financed without additional charges to other ratepayers”?

Correct, the summary as contained in the staff report was truncated and should read as you noted. However, the actual provision in the policy Resolution 1, Exhibit A, is stated correctly.