# CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 6, 2017

#### 5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Public Hearing for Consideration of Amendments to the P-5 (460 Shoreline Boulevard) Precise Plan; a Planned Community Permit and Development Review Permit to Construct 62 Affordable Units to Replace 12 Existing Affordable Units at an existing affordable housing community (Shorebreeze Apartments), Heritage Tree Removal Permit for the Removal of 22 Heritage Trees, and a Preliminary Parcel Map to Merge Five Existing Lots Into One Lot on a 3.4-Acre Project Site Located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC):

- 1. Recommend that the City Council adopt an Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Shorebreeze Apartments Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (see Exhibit 1).
- 2. Recommend that the City Council adopt an Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impacts (EA/FONSI) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (see Exhibit 2).
- 3. Adopt a Resolution recommending that the City Council approve Amendments to the P-5 (460 Shoreline Boulevard) Precise Plan (see Exhibit 3).
- 4. Adopt a Resolution recommending that the City Council conditionally approve a Planned Community Permit and a Development Review Permit to construct 62 affordable units to replace 12 of existing affordable units at an existing affordable housing community (Shorebreeze Apartments), and a Heritage Tree Removal Permit for the removal of 22 Heritage trees on a 5.3-acre project site located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard (see Exhibit 4).
- 5. Adopt a Resolution recommending that the City Council conditionally approve a Preliminary Parcel Map to merge five existing lots into one lot on a 3.4-acre project site located at 460 North Shoreline Boulevard (see Exhibit 5).

## PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The Commission's agenda is advertised on Channel 26, and the agenda and this report appear on the City's Internet website. All property owners and tenants within a 300' radius were notified of this meeting. A City Council meeting will be held regarding this project, and property owners and interested parties will be notified.

## BACKGROUND

## **Project Site**

The approximately 5.3-acre project site is located on the west side of North Shoreline Boulevard Montecito between Avenue and Wright The Avenue. surrounding land include uses commercial and



Location Map

multi-family residential development to the north and east, and residential development to the west and south.

The site is currently developed with the Shorebreeze Apartment community, which includes 120 units in five, two and three story apartment buildings. MidPen leases approximately 1.95 acres along the northern edge of the project site which is owned by the City and County of San Francisco and is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The 80' wide property contains the regional water pipeline owned and regulated and managed by the SFPUC. Under the current lease agreement, which commenced in February 1980 and terminates in March 2031, the SFPUC property can only be used for parking, access, and landscaping. MidPen is renegotiating the lease to extend the term beyond 2031 to accommodate at least the 55-year term of affordability and construction of the proposed new units. The lease agreement also contains an emergency parking plan should maintenance and repairs to the pipeline require the closure of this parking area.

#### Area Amenities

The neighborhood offers a wide range of amenities for residents including several schools and parks. Theuerkauf Elementary School/park is approximately 0.5 mile to the west and Crittenden Middle School and Whisman Sports Center are approximately one mile away. The site is also in close proximity to the recreation and jobs in the North Bayshore Area. North Rengstorff Avenue has a Class III bike path, and is considered a transit corridor, connecting to U.S. Highway 101, Central Expressway, and Highway 82 (El Camino Real), and public transit. A shopping center is located at the corner of Montecito Avenue and North Rengstorff Avenue, less than one-eighth mile to the north with a supermarket, retail stores and services, restaurants, and gas stations.

Transportation is easily accessible from the site with three Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) bus routes within a one-half mile radius. VTA bus Route 34 is located in front of the Shorebreeze Apartments and bus Routes 32, 51, and the Mountain View Community Shuttle are within a one-half mile distance. The Mountain View Transit Center is also within one-half mile of the site, allowing resident's access to light rail or Caltrain service.

## **Project Description**

The applicant, MidPen Housing, is proposing a Precise Plan Amendment to the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan and a Planned Community Permit to construct 62 affordable units to replace 12 existing affordable units at an existing affordable housing community (see Exhibit 3 – Draft Precise Plan Revisions and Exhibit 6 – Project Plans).



The existing Shorebreeze Apartment complex consists of 120 affordable apartments for families and seniors. The proposed project would demolish 12 existing units and develop 62 affordable housing units on the western portion of the site, resulting in a net increase of 50 units. After project construction, the complex would consist of a total of 170 affordable housing units. The new units would consist of 21 studios, 21 one-bedroom units, 8 two-bedroom units, and 12 three-bedroom units. The units will be offered at rates at or below 60 percent of the Area Median Income. On-site amenities will include a community room with kitchen, computer stations, laundry facilities, and space for support services.

#### **Previous Meetings**

#### Gatekeeper and NOFA Funding Reservation

In September 2016, the City Council reserved City Below-Market-Rate funding and authorized a Gatekeeper request to review the Precise Plan Amendments for the proposed development project (see Exhibit 7). The City Council and the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Review Committee encouraged MidPen Housing to continue negotiations with the SFPUC on a long-term lease on the SFPUC property. Although the lease has not been fully executed, MidPen and the SFPUC have agreed in concept to a 60-year lease of the SFPUC property with a below market rent and the SFPUC has provided a Notice of Intent (see Exhibit 8). This new lease term will allow for MidPen Housing to construct the proposed project and apply for four percent tax credits which will be leveraged with a City loan to fund the project.

#### Community Meetings

The applicant held two community meetings on August 25, 2016 and July 15, 2017. Approximately 20 people attended the meetings and asked questions and raised the following issues:

- Increased traffic and parking demand, especially on Wright Avenue.
- Noise from the basketball court, play area, and dumpster area.
- Noise from construction activities. Requested to notify neighbors of the work schedule.
- Removal of nuisance trees and replacement with "good neighbor" native trees.
- Light spillover to the adjacent residences.

• Provide secure bike lockers.

In response to the concern that the project provides insufficient parking, the new project will add 96 parking spaces, including 29 guest spaces. The property manager will also reallocate parking spaces among the existing residents, with the goal of freeing up more spaces for shared areas, visitors, and caregivers. There will be 29 visitor parking spaces and 10 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and van spaces, and two staff spaces both of which meet the requirements. There were previously inadequate guest parking spaces and many unused spaces. The Plan specifies 1.5 spaces per family unit and 0.35 spaces per senior unit which, with the proposed parking plan, would exceed the required parking. Previously one space was assigned per senior unit instead of 0.35, which resulted in inefficient use of parking spaces. There will be a total of 188 spaces at completion versus the 141 spaces currently on the property. The expansion building will house both seniors and families as it includes studio and three-bedroom units and will have an elevator. Bicycle parking includes 62 spaces, including 28 long-term locker spaces, 34 secure wall-mounted spaces, and 16 short-term guest spaces.

Noise concerns which were raised at the community meeting will be addressed by removal of the basketball and play areas near neighboring residences and a new recreational area will be located closer to the community room as part of a future renovation and an active play area will be in the center of the site. The applicant moved the proposed trash enclosure to the current location of the maintenance shed toward the center of the site and the bike lockers were moved to a more secure location near the entry doors. Rooftop AC units will be set back from the building edge and management will monitor the noise on the balconies and site in general.

A photometric plan was required to be submitted for the project to ensure that lighting fixtures are shielded and there was not lighting spillover onto adjacent properties. The lighting on the SFPUC property will remain and no new lights will be added.

#### Development Review Committee

The project was reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) in April 13, 2017 and July 5, 2017, when they recommended approval of the project.

## ANALYSIS

This report outlines the project's consistency with the General Plan the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan; describes the proposed development; and the proposed density, parking, and architectural design.

## **General Plan Designation**

The General Plan Land Use Designation for the project site is High-Density Residential (36 to 80 du/acre). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation with a proposed density of 32 dwelling units per acre and complies with the following General Plan Policies:

- *LUD 6.1: Neighborhood character.* Ensure that new development in or near residential neighborhoods is compatible with neighborhood character.
- *LUD 6.3: Street presence.* Encourage building facades and frontages that create a presence at the street and along interior pedestrian paseos and pathways.
- *LUD 9.1: Height and setback transitions.* Ensure that new development includes sensitive height and setback transitions to adjacent structures and surrounding neighborhoods.
- *LUD 10.1: Sustainable design and materials.* Encourage high-quality and sustainable design and materials.

#### **Precise Plan Amendments**

The current 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan allows a maximum of 125 units. The proposed amendments would allow an increase in the number of units on site to 170 units. The increase in units is within the range allowed by the General Plan designation. Proposed amendments also include the deletion of the requirement that 50 percent of the parking spaces be provided in carports.

## Project Design

The new buildings incorporate materials and colors that are similar to the existing buildings. The existing buildings are typical of a 1980's era design with rectangular shapes with horizontal and vertical lines, wood shingles, railings and balconies. The new buildings are an updated version of this design and include sections of horizontal siding, wood balconies, railings, patio fences, and entry trellises in tan and brown color tones.



Northeast Perspective

The Precise Plan states that the development standards of the R3 (Multiple-Family Residential) district are to be used as the development standards in the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan area. The proposed project complies with all of the required development standards as shown in the following table:

R-3 Development Standards		
Standard	Requirement or Maximum Allowed	Proposed
Density (Precise Plan)	125 units = 37 du/ac on 3.37 ac or 24 du/ac on combined 5.3 acres (General Plan: High Density Residential 36-80 du/acre)	170 units = 50 du/ac on 3.37 acres or 32 du/ac on combined 5.3 acres
Floor Area Ratio	1.05	0.61
Front Setback	15' (not including porches)	N/A
Side Setbacks	10' for 1st and 2nd Floors 15' for 3rd Floor	18' 29'
Building Coverage	35%	22%
Height	45' 36' to Wall Plate	36′ 19′
Open Area	55% 40 S.F. Per Unit Private	41% 48 S.F. Per Unit Private
Private Storage	164 S.F./Unit	34 S.F./Unit
Minimum Parking	1.5 Spaces Per Family, 0.35 Per Senior Unit + 0.15 Guest Spaces	188 Total If 50% Family Units = 120 Spaces and 29 Senior Spaces + 29 Guest Spaces + 3 Staff Spaces

## Parking and Circulation

Access to the project site would be via two driveways along North Shoreline Boulevard. An existing driveway currently provides access to the parking lot on the north side of the project site. This driveway and the sidewalk on North Shoreline Boulevard in the vicinity of the driveway would be upgraded to meet City standards and ADA regulations. A second driveway farther south along North Shoreline Boulevard connects to a small parking lot and existing walkway. The walkway would be widened in some locations to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles to the project site.

Pedestrian circulation would include internal pathways and sidewalks along the street frontages adjacent to the project site. Parking would include assigned spaces for residents, as well as spaces for staff. The project would replace 49 existing parking spaces and construct a total of 96 new parking spaces. A total of 188

parking spaces would be provided, exceeding the required 177 spaces. Required guest spaces are 0.15 spaces of the total 188 spaces (29 spaces). Three spaces will be designated for staff, and at least five spaces will be wired for electric vehicle charging stations. Bicycle parking includes eight bike racks (16 short-term spaces), 14 bike lockers (28 long-term spaces), and 34 wall-mounted bike racks in a storage room (34 long-term spaces) for a total of 76 bike spaces on the project site.

## **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

A formal TDM Plan is not required for the project, but as additional density would be developed, staff asked for a TDM Program to reduce the traffic and parking demand on-site. The required parking is provided for the additional (net 50) units including guest spaces, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) spaces, caregiver and van spaces, and staff spaces, and bicycle parking spaces in the site plan. Senior parking spaces will be reallocated (0.35 per unit according to the Precise Plan) resulting in additional spaces available for the project. To encourage alternative modes of transit, VTA Eco passes or similar transit passes are required to be provided free of charge to all residents. Additionally the developer shall appoint an on-site commute coordinator to manage and monitor commute alternative programs and provide a kiosk or similar area to post carpool or other shared transit opportunities and events (such as Bike to Work and Bike to School).

#### **Open Space and Trees**

A tree survey was completed for the project site by HortSicence. The tree survey identified, measured, mapped, and rated the trees for preservation, which took into consideration the trees' age, health, structural condition, and proximity to the proposed structures and site development. The project proposes to retain 51 healthy Heritage trees and remove 22 Heritage trees. The trees proposed to be removed are too close to, or in the new building footprint, parking lot, or the drainage swales along the southern perimeter. A total of 44 replacement trees would be planted throughout the project site. The replacement tree canopy would equal the existing eight percent canopy on the 5.3-acre site.

Project site landscaping would include trees and vegetation along the edges of the project site and the buildings and in the landscaped strips in the parking lot. The proposed landscaping complies with the City's Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations and would be watered by a fully automatic, water-conserving irrigation system with a weather-based operation controller.

## Preliminary Parcel Map

Currently, the project site consists of five legal lots. Three of six existing buildings, Buildings 1, 2, and 3, were built across the lot lines. The project includes a Preliminary Parcel Map to merge the five lots into one lot. Staff finds that the project is consistent with the requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and the General Plan and recommends approval of the Map based on the draft Conditions of Approval see (Exhibit 5 - Resolution for a Preliminary Map with Conditions of Approval).

## **TENANT RELOCATION**

The tenants in the 12 existing units would be temporarily relocated for approximately 12 months during demolition and construction. After construction, the displaced tenants would have the right to return to a three-bedroom unit in one of the new buildings. The developer, in coordination with Autotemp, the relocation firm, would provide all required relocation assistance to the displaced households.

Autotemp developed a relocation plan to outline the relocation assistance program and evaluate the housing requirements of the existing tenants. As part of the plan, Autotemp conducted a survey of the nearby area and found sufficient available housing to accommodate the temporarily displaced households, including marketrate apartments and corporate housing. As such, the project would not include the construction of any temporary replacement housing. Relocation support would be mainly in the form of rental assistance vouchers. Aside from negligible short-term changes in localized travel routes for these temporarily displaced residents, this relocation plan would not result in physical changes that could cause other secondary environmental impacts.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Initial Study was prepared for the proposed project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and project-specific technical studies were also prepared to provide technical guidance in the areas of: air quality, trees, geotechnical, greenhouse gas emissions, hazardous materials, and transportation. The analysis determined that with the implementation of the 2030 General Plan, the 460 Shoreline Boulevard Precise Plan, State Regulations and the City standard conditions of approval, the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental impacts, and a Negative Declaration was prepared for the project (see Exhibit 1 - Initial Study – Negative Declaration).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND), along with a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration (NOI), was circulated for public review for a 20-day comment period, which commenced on September 1, 2017 and ended on September 21, 2017. Staff received two comment letters on the Draft IS/ND, one from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and one from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (see Exhibit 9 - Letters from the Public for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration). Responses to the comments are provided below.

#### San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Water Enterprise:

This letter acknowledged that a portion of the site is within SFPUC right-of way (ROW) for its water transmission pipelines owned in fee by the City and County of San Francisco, and requested that the property description be corrected to state that the "SFPUC Property". This correction is acknowledged and is corrected in this report.

#### Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA):

This letter commended the project for including a bike storage room on the first floor of the new development directly adjacent to the building entrance, but requested that the City clarify how this development will include TDM measures. Because this project is an infill affordable housing project, a TDM plan was not required for this project; however, the project does have reduced parking for seniors. Staff has also added a Condition of Approval which requires a TDM Program for the entire apartment community.

#### **NEPA Environmental Assessment**

In addition, because the proposed project is seeking Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) project-based Section 8 vouchers, an Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impacts (EA/FONSI) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was also prepared. The Environmental Assessment (EA) and supporting environmental studies concluded that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is the appropriate NEPA document for the proposed project. The EA was prepared in accordance with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) NEPA requirements, including the Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects (24 CFR 58) form and checklist. The EA was circulated for the required 15-day review from October 11 to October 26, 2017 and no comments were received.

The FONSI and Request for Release of Funds (RROF) were published on October 11, 2017. No public comments on the EA/FONSI or the RROF have been received.

## NEXT STEPS

Following a recommendation from the EPC at this public hearing the project will be heard at a City Council public hearing tentatively scheduled in January 2018.

## CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that the EPC recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed Planned Community Permit and Development Review Permit to construct 62 affordable units, to replace 12 of the existing affordable units, and a Heritage Tree Removal Permit for the removal of 22 Heritage trees.

The proposed subdivision, together with the provisions for its design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium-High Density Residential, and the R3 Zoning District requirements including all the requirements applicable to the property. The redevelopment of the site will further the goals of the Precise Plan and provides new affordable units in the community consistent with the City's goals. The site layout and architecture of the building, including color and materials, and architectural elements are well-designed and compatible with the surrounding area. In addition, the Preliminary Parcel Map meets all the requirements specified in the Mountain View City Code. Additionally the project would not result in and any substantial negative effects on the environment with the implementation of the conditions of approval.

#### ALTERNATIVES

- 1. Recommend that the City Council approve the project with modified conditions.
- 2. Refer the project back to the DRC for additional consideration.
- 3. Recommend denial the project.

Prepared by:

Approved by:

Paula Bradley	Stephanie Williams
Associate Planner	Planning Manager (Acting)/
	Deputy Zoning Administrator

Vera Gil Project Manager – Affordable Housing

- Exhibits: 1. Initial Study Negative Declaration
  - 2. Environmental Assessment/FONSI NOIRROF
  - 3. Resolution for Amendments to the Precise Plan and Draft Precise Plan
  - 4. Resolution for a Planned Community Permit, Development Review Permit, and a Heritage Tree Removal Permit with Conditions of Approval
  - 5. Resolution for a Preliminary Parcel Map with Conditions of Approval
  - 6. Project Plans
  - 7. <u>City Council Report Dated September 13, 2016 for NOFA</u>
  - 8. Letter of Intent from the SFPUC
  - 9. Letters from the Public for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration