

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Study Session  
January 13, 2009  
7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers \*  
1017 Middlefield Rd  
Redwood City, CA  
Ph: 650-780-7233  
Accessible to Disabled

## **APPROVED**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Borgens, Commissioner Cronin, Commissioner Gee, Commissioner Holt, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Seybert and Chair Radcliffe

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Manager Ekas, Principal Planner Passanisi, Assistant City Attorney Aranda, Senior Planner Lyon, Planning Secretary Mateo, B. Ross

**GUESTS:** Aaron Welch – Raimi & Associates; Lisa Brownfield – Hogle-Ireland; Lorraine Weiss – Consultant for 134 Maple Street

**PROCEEDINGS RECORDED:** For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, an audiocassette and DVD recording of the entire meeting is available for listening or purchase at the Planning office, located in City Hall, Redwood City.

**AGENDA POSTED:** Copies of the Agenda for this meeting are posted at City Hall on the Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

### **1. ROLL CALL**

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR:** No Items

### **5. NEW GENERAL PLAN – STUDY SESSION ON LAND USE FOCUS AREAS; PERTINENT SUSTAINABILITY LAWS; AND TECHNICAL REPORTS**

Jill Ekas, Planning Manager gave an overview of what had occurred since January 15, 2009 and the City Manager's update on the land use map. Council awaited their update and this was being prepared. The City Manager had been asked to look into the proposed concept around a stakeholder's meeting with respect to the Cargill Property. Additional information was expected to be presented and discussed with City Council on January 26, 2009. Staff will take care of this process as well as informing the public. Staff proposed that they would be ready on January 27<sup>th</sup> to continue the conversations on the Cargill Property and the Bayfront focus areas. She introduced staff who would be speaking for the evening.

Mr. Lyon, Senior Planner gave a Powerpoint for the Planning Commission Study Session, January 13, 2009:

**Overview:**

- General Plan
  - Middlefield Road Corridor
- East Downtown Study Area
  - Zoning Text and Map Amendments
  - Skilled Nursing Facility at 134 Maple
- Sustainability
  - Indicator Report
  - Assembly Bill: AB 32
  - Senate Bill: SB 375
- Special Topics
- Public Comment

**Proposed Middlefield Road Corridor** (map was shown, followed by maps of specific area, each specific area followed by a Middlefield Road Corridor Map with each area marked specifically within the corridor)

**Area Maps Included:**

- **Area 2/Mixed Use – Live/Work** (map)
- **Areas 3 & 4** (map)
- **Areas 5 & 6** (map)
- **Area 7/Public Facility – Joint Powers Board** (map)
- **Area 8/Residential – High Density (40 du/ac maximum)** (map)
- **Area 9/Residential – Medium High Density (30 du/ac maximum)** (map)
- **Area 1/Mixed Use- Live/Work** (map)

(again, each of the above area maps was followed by a Middlefield Road Map with the area specifically noted within the corridor)

**East Downtown Study Area:**

- Background
- Zoning Map Amendments
- Zoning Text Amendments
- Example: Proposed development, Skilled Nursing Facility – 134 Maple

**-Followed by maps:**

- Middlefield Road Corridor
- El Camino Real Corridor pertaining to the above.
- South Main Street Area/East Downtown Study Area/Revised Downtown Study Area

**East Downtown Study Area**

**-Purpose:**

- Create a transition from the Downtown
- Create a transition from El Camino
- Allow for smaller, lower cost space for new business
- Continue studying Live/Work options

**-Timeline/East Downtown:**

- June 5, 2007: South Main Street Area
- August 14, 2007: East Downtown Study Area
- General Plan Discussion (2008-2009)
- January 13, 2009: Revised Downtown Study Area

**Map of the IR- Industrial Restricted “Medium Industrial”**

**Proposed Zoning Map**

**General Commercial:**

- Eliminate retail
- Eliminate hotel, motels
- Eliminate gas stations
- Eliminate bars and drive-thru restaurants
- Eliminate Financial services

**Industrial Restricted**

- Eliminate major auto repair
- Eliminate outdoor commercial recreation
- Eliminate electronic equipment facilities
- Eliminate storage

**Proposed Zoning**

**-Permitted Uses:**

- Personal services
- Office < 2,500 sq. ft.
- Food production
- Studios for art & trade

**-Conditional Uses:**

- Minor auto repair
- Restaurants and cafes
- Furniture, bookstores, antiques
- Warehouse, wholesale
- Medical Office\*
- Specialized Medical Uses\*

(\*Size and Location Requirements)

**-Accessory Uses:**

- Repair or Service
- Childcare
- Incidental retail, showrooms, galleries

**Proposed Zoning**

- Height: 75 feet
- Lot Coverage: No limitation

- Setbacks: None, except for properties abutting railroad where 15 feet would be required.
- Floor Area Ratio: 2.25

**134 Maple Street/Skilled Nursing Facility** (rendering)

- 112-beds
- Approximately 66,000 sq. ft.
- 5-stories

**East Downtown- Next Steps**

-Planning Commission (January 27, 2009)

- IS/MND
- Zoning Ordinance recommendation

-City Council

- Zoning Ordinance recommendation

-Architectural Review Committee

- Design Review of 134 Maple Street project

-Zoning Administrator

- Use Permit
- Architectural Permit

**Sustainability Indicators Report AB 32 and SB 375/Special Topics:**

- Light Industrial Buildout
- Bayfront Land Use – Other Than Cargill Site
- Ongoing Land Use Clean Up

**Industrial Buildout:** (map)

- Issue: Commissions concerns with light industrial replacement.
- Responses: Veterans/Broadway Incubator Overlay

**Industrial Buildout:** Table including Light Industrial Land Study, Acres, Total Sq. Ft., Sq. Ft. Difference and Percent Changes.

**Bayfront/Land Use Other than Cargill Site** (map for future planning discussion on January 27, 2009)

**Ongoing Land Use Clean UP:**

- General Plan/Zoning Inconsistencies
- General Plan/Existing Land Use Inconsistencies
- Examples: Parks, Seven Lots adjacent to Red Morton Park
- Significant issues/concerns brought back to Planning Commission and we will keep a lot of changes.

**General Plan – Recommendations:**

- Confirm Land Use Corridors
- Middlefield Road

- Woodside Road
- El Camino Real
- Veterans/Broadway Boulevard

**General Plan – Next Steps:**

- Write New General Plan Elements and (Spring 2009)
- Confirm Council direction on the Bayfront land use (January 2009)
- Additional meetings with Boards, Committees, and Commissions (Spring 2009)

**South Elevation** (rendering)

**South Elevation** (nighttime rendering)

**North Elevation** (rendering)

**South View of Lathrop Street** (rendering)

**North View from Pennsylvania Avenue** (rendering)

**East View from Main Street** (rendering)

**1990 General Plan** (map)

**“Complete” Neighborhood** (map)

- Residential
- Community Facilities: Parks, Schools
- Goods/Services

**“Complete” Neighborhoods – Gathering Places** (map)

- Proximity to Grocery Stores, Graphic, Sustainability Report

Commissioner Smith asked for clarification regarding transition zoning for the East Downtown where some zones had changed and others had not.

Mr. Lyon noted four (4) parcels containing three uses were pulled out in the General Plan discussions to focus on corridors and properties fronting the corridor. In pursuing the East Downtown Study Area, and in keeping with the project applicant’s timing and other concerns, these properties were left open for more formal decision-making along the way. The other nine (9) parcel area was separated from the four (4) parcel area in that way. If appropriate, and if the Planning Commission and City Council agree, the same Zoning could be carried through the South Main Street area on up toward Maple Avenue in those different areas. The mixed use area would then come all the way up to the Middlefield Road corridor area. No assumptions were made in order to allow for additional input.

Commissioner Holt noted the Middlefield Corridor and Section Area 9 were moving to medium high residential usage.

Mr. Lyon reviewed the colors on the maps which may be confusing as they tried to notate the General Plan process as well as the Zoning process on one map. Parcels in Area 9 currently had a General Plan designation as residential, but the Zoning and businesses constructed on

these parcels were actually commercial. These areas required a closer look in terms of what occurred along the corridor.

Commissioner Gee asked for further elucidation of the General Plan and Zoning areas since they did not entail the same activities.

Mr. Lyon noted the General Plan information was intended to be in broader vision with a general idea of what might be expected in a particular area in regard to its land uses. The Zoning implications allowed for a more specific look at classifications for tighter control in addressing an area.

Beth Ross gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Planning for Sustainability, Redwood City General Sustainability Indicator Report, AB 32 Scoping Plan and SB 375. The report was prepared by Raimi & Associates with the presentation as follows:

**Highlights:**

- Continue to orient city policy around the City's core purpose of "Build a Great Community Together."
- Actively cultivate partnerships with community based organizations, educational institutions, civic groups and the business community.
- Expand opportunities for informed resident engagement especially among historically under-represented residents.

**RWC Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2005:** Pie chart diagram representing 6% waste, 43% Built Environment and 51% Transportation.

**Mix of City's Energy Supply 2007:** Pie chart diagram representing 1% Other, 4% Coal, 12% Renewables, 13% Hydroelectric, 17% Natural Gas and 23% Nuclear Energy.

**Making connections between land use, climate change, health and public safety:**

- Concentrate land use to take advantage of walking, bicycling and transit.
- Design Green Buildings.
- Encourage "defensible space," "natural surveillance" and a sense of order in the building environment.
- Encourage access to healthy foods and encourage access to alcohol outlets in community design.

**Community Participation in Green Efforts:**

- Conserve water and energy; promote recycling; recycle more!
- Encourage green business certification.
- Promote and encourage community involvement in urban ecology projects.

**AB 32: Global Warming Solutions Act/Climate Change Scoping Plan:**

- Sets target to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 15% from today's levels by 2020.
- Include main strategies California will use to reduce the CHG that cause climate change.
- Focuses on a range of GHG reduction actions.
- Recognizes local government as essential partners.
- Energy & the Built Environment:
  - Expand and strengthen existing energy efficiency programs.

- Achieve a statewide renewables energy mix by 33%.
- Install 3,000 MW of solar electric capacity.
- Expand the use of green building practices.
- Transportation.
  - Develop regional GHG emission standards for passenger vehicles.
  - Develop and adopt low carbon fuel standard.
  - Improve efficiency in goods movement.
  - Support implementation of high speed rail.
- Waste
  - Reduce methane emissions at landfills.
  - Increase waste diversion, composting and commercial recycling.
- Develop a California cap-and-trade Program

**SB 375: Connects Land Use and AB 32**

-Five Key Aspects of SB 375:

- 1. Creation of regional targets for greenhouse gas emissions reduction tied to land use.
- 2. A requirement that regional agencies create a plan to meet those targets, even if that plan is in conflict with local plans.
- 3. A requirement that regional transportation funding decisions be consistent with this new plan.
- 4. Tethering together regional transportation planning and housing efforts for the first time.
- 5. New CEQA exemptions and streamlining for projects that conform to the new regional plans, even if they conflict with local plans.

Commissioner Gee asked for clarification on the rail aspects of the sustainability plan and what the term regional covered.

Ms. Ross noted there were approximately 11 regional metropolitan planning organizations within the state. Redwood City fell under the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) comprised of approximately nine (9) counties.

Aaron Welch, Raimi & Associates, stated the term regional, in regard to SB-375 referred to the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (NPOs) within the jurisdiction and outside of this it was unclear how the SB-375 applied. He also clarified the terminology cap and trade, which is essentially a major part of the State’s approach to regulation of greenhouse gases. It has taken various forms around the world and was tried most broadly in Europe thus far. A cap is set at which greenhouse gas emissions should be kept and then this is ratcheted down over a designated time period. Implementation included over-cap fees and under-cap credits. The State was looking into implementation of this cap and trade scenario which applied more to industry than local government areas, although specifics have not been fully decided.

Lisa Brownfield, Hogle-Ireland, General Plan Consultant gave the following Powerpoint presentation:

**Special Topics:**

- “Complete” Neighborhood (maps included)
  - Residential
  - Community Facilities: Park, Schools
  - Goods/Services

- Proximity to Grocery Stores Graphic Sustainability Report
- Light Industrial Buildout (map included)
  - Issue- Commission's concern with light industrial replacement.
  - Responses – Veterans/Broadway Incubator Overlay
 (Light Industrial Floor Ratio Study table was also included)
- Bayfront Land Use – Other than Cargill Site (map included)
- Ongoing Land Use Clean Up
  - General Plan/Zoning Inconsistencies
  - General Plan/Existing Land Use Inconsistencies
  - Examples: Parks, Seven Lots adjacent to Red Morton Park
  - Significant issues/concerns brought back to Planning Commission and we will keep a log of changes.

Commissioner Cronin stated the slide presentation made note of the 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) versus the 0.55 ratio.

Ms. Brownfield stated when they ultimately arrived at the General Plan they would probably look at it on an area-by-area basis. Areas more conducive to traditional industrial may have a lower FAR. Areas on a broader scale may be considered for an increased FAR.

Commissioner Gee stated his understanding was that the FAR discussions were part of the Zoning strategy. In an ideal situation, he noted the general plan and Zoning came forward at the same time, although it was not likely in the instance due to time and resources. He asked in what method Staff, the Commission and Council could keep track of the progress in these areas in the next year or two after the General Plan adoption.

Ms. Brownfield noted one of the disadvantages of having the two separate processes was in tracking the institutional knowledge. She stated a number of communities adopt the General Plan and then have another document to help in the transition. This document looked at the existing Zoning against the General Plan and then highlights the most serious or common inconsistencies. This helped to guide continued decisions with new projects coming in until Zoning was fully updated. Most of the FARs were included in Zoning, but the General Plan had to establish the intensity and density levels which are then implemented through Zoning.

Ms. Ekas noted the background pieces came about during traffic studies and other items in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which included a land use model staff had been working on. This model was planned to have full documentation of all the assumptions that are made for the different areas. She assured the Committee that they were tracking Zoning all along the way.

She spoke further on the fact that they would do an end-of-meeting check to make sure everyone had all the appropriate and most up-to-date information. She noted there was a letter included which was presented to the City Council one night prior from DMB Saltworks. City Manager Ingram needed to follow-up with Council on the General Plan process, the alternatives work and the stakeholder meeting. A two-step General Plan process was suggested for consideration with a plan back to Council on this item on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Brownfield reiterated Staff's current focus on the Bayfront properties excluding Cargill. She wished to hear from the Committee and major problems or red flags regarding the proposed uses for the Bayfront area.

Commissioner Gee asked for further information on the transition from Port Industrial and the activity going on around it, particularly the adjoining waterfront mixed use areas.

Ms. Brownfield noted the office tech areas to the north which were already developed. This area was removed from the industrial use Zoning and was now resource and mixed use waterfront.

Commissioner Borgens asked if the general commercial area was the same area discussed earlier as a location for possible start-up businesses.

Ms. Brownfield noted the incubator area was for light industrial uses. She clarified again the colors on the map and their designations.

Commissioner Cronin was not inclined to make any recommendations but was comfortable with the areas as they were designated and proposed.

Commissioner Smith asked where changes were made in the Zoning and land use designations as an overview. He was looking for more clarity on where the most major changes were made.

Ms. Ekas highlighted the major vision in the area as starting with the two existing residential developments off of Bear Island Road with the 200 housing units at that location. Last year's approval of the Peninsula Park Project, in a mixed use waterfront format and 800 additional units, there was the emergence of a new neighborhood. Pete's Harbor held existing Zoning allowing for residential for approximately 400 additional units. A developer has proposed a project for Dock Town which considered whether or not that particular parcel was suitable for housing on both sides of the creek as an extension of what had been discussed for the North Main Precise Plan on the opposite side of the freeway with the creek as the corridor.

This first part of the vision was in keeping with completion and balancing of the neighborhood. There was also some clean-up in the designations further elucidating the office tech and industrial areas. A vision for the marinas in a mixed use category was also noted. A future ferry planning area was also included in the marina discussions. The above included the major changes, whereas some frontage areas an industrial stretch had fewer changes.

Commissioner Smith noted the land use designations were no longer as disjointed as previously. He appreciated the continuity in the current organized illustration of the plan. He encouraged the future thought with regard to such items such as the ferry terminal. Flexibility in certain land parcels was necessary in order to allow for future creative development proposals.

Commissioners Borgens and Gee asked for additional map clarifications including the Haven site.

Ms. Ekas noted the Haven site was not included in the Bayfront study area since it was not contiguous to the Cargill site and no changes were proposed.

Commissioner Gee stated what was shown thus far was adequate and noted the challenge was in not forgetting any details. Allowances and provisions needed to be made for floating homes and other uses.

Ms. Ekas noted that while the General Plan focus came about in map form, in actuality it was comprised of words and definitions along with the pictures and maps.

Commissioner Seybert reiterated the importance of clearly defining the water use areas and how they differ from other residential uses throughout the community.

Ms. Ekas stated several studies went into the water front designations which included looking at other waterfront and floating home communities. Fire protection and roadway access considerations were paramount as well as a desire to front the community against the residential community on the opposite side rather than immediately abutting the industrial lands. She noted the Zoning area was also sized in manner consistent with what was allowable by the Corp of Engineers as far as what could be developed versus what was required to remain wetlands. She stated there were many way to take advantage of the waterfront theme along that site. Aerial views were also taken into consideration as well as tidal influences.

Commissioner Seybert suggested an elongation of that area, which might make it abut against the industrial area, but he felt it might be a more natural transition due to the elongation. He noted there were ways to buffer the areas close to the industrial use areas at the endpoints of this area if it were elongated. His preference was for any floating community to front at the waterfront.

Ms. Brownfield reminded the Commission of September 27, 2007 when the draft land use designations were supplied which summarized the qualities of the different types of neighborhoods. Waterfront considerations, even prior to these materials of September 2007, included the discussion of how to make the existing area and its growth more dynamic and functional. Significant consideration was given to the fact that this waterfront area and its neighborhood truly address the advantages and disadvantages of being on the bay front. The land use mixes also included other commercial or restaurant-oriented uses making it a local destination of sorts versus a large tourist attraction. Housing options including floating and live-aboard options were discussed. Public access and Open Space considerations were also discussed along with their amenities. The area along the waterfront remains a distinctive location with very distinctive needs and considerations.

Commissioner Seybert noted it was important in the area of the Peninsula Park Project to keep in mind its link to the downtown area.

Commissioner Borgens was excited about the waterfront discussions. She thanked Lynn and James Jonas, members of the floating home community, who came forward with the suggestion that this area waterfront area and its functions be explored.

Chair Radcliffe stated a community gathering space for this neighborhood had also been discussed. She stressed the need to keep it under consideration.

Commissioner Gee shared the conception that the Middlefield Road Corridor contained a lot of inconsistencies. He agreed there was a great advantage to tracking and cleaning up these inconsistencies. He stated the Middlefield Road Corridor provided a great learning tool for future General Plan decision-making processes.

Commissioner Seybert suggested keeping Red Morton Park and the Shores area at the forefront when looking at clean-up issues. He also expressed concern over the Middlefield Corridor section and properties to the immediate west at Woodside and Middlefield. He looked toward some language on the potential for that area of usage since it is an additional gateway to

the downtown area. The properties in that are themselves are small but he hoped for some gateway quality to the actual intersection.

Ms. Brownfield clarified this as creating a sense of place at this intersection as the gateway to the downtown area.

Commissioner Seybert reiterated this corridor at Middlewood/Woodside Road was a definite gateway to the downtown area.

Commissioner Holt expressed continued questions regarding Zoning versus General Plan issues. She asked if there was a requirement that Zoning be consistent with the General Plan.

Mr. Lyon stated as a charter city, Redwood City was not obligated or required to do that. The goal existed to make them as consistent as possible, but an actual requirement for this did not exist.

Ms. Ekas noted this was the legal answer regarding the consistency issue. She stated Staff believed and was committed in finding a way to implement zoning as consistent as possible with the General Plan.

Commissioner Holt asked if Staff looked at changing the land use in the Stambau/Heller are to medium density. If so, she asked what the implications were for this. She stated staff had stressed the importance of maintaining the historic nature of this area.

Mr. Lyon stated they had looked at high density currently in a way to transit down with the thought towards enticing the historic preservation portion of this area. He noted that medium or high density looked at something like 30 units per acre. A challenge existed in implementation of the plans in this area in trying to have some market incentives for a change-over in some areas while other areas remained historically intact. The density in the area needed to be at a high enough level to accommodate reuse and turnover where appropriate and preservation in their appropriate areas as well.

Chair Radcliffe asked, since this area held an historic designation, did it also have an historic overlay coming into play with any projects down the line.

Mr. Lyon stated any new project coming into the area was subject to review and consideration through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Historical Advisory Committee.

Ms. Brownfield noted, in the General Plan, there was also room for a section dealing with urban design. Policies within this built environment element area would deal with maintenance of the historic character of an area while also enhancing it where appropriate and/or mixing it with other housing and land use. Guidelines were in the works for these aspects of the General Plan for this historical area.

She noted further that the Commission now could entertain a formal Motion in confirming the land use corridors as presented which included the four (4) areas of Middlefield, Woodside, El Camino and Veterans/Broadway focus areas. Confirmation aided Staff in their move towards the environmental review process and the issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP).

Mr. Lyon advised the Commission that the items could be considered on the whole, rather than piecemeal. The Maker of the Motion had control of the Motion on how to draft the Motion.

Motions were with regard to general direction as no projects were shovel-ready at this point in the process.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jim Bigelow, Redwood City San Mateo County Chamber, addressed their earlier comments towards the weakness in corridor relations to the transit and roadway transportation corridors. A handout was provided to the Commission and Staff with suggestions for consideration. He stressed the importance of further consideration of Caltrain electrification, high-speed rail, ferry service, port and increased shuttle services as part of the General Plan. Measure A funding was limited towards the projects desired. Early action by the City ensured current and future address of these concerns. He cited the Caltrain's fall newsletter for additional information.

Carole Wong, Redwood City resident, spoke on the land use cleanup aspects of the study map and the inconsistencies out at the Shores and better ways to designate the properties along the waterway. She provided copies of an earlier email she had written with regard to public transparency and noting that directions were being confirmed towards the General Plan, and the picking of projects came later. She looked for ways of integrating the CEQA process with concepts regarding future needs and wants for an area and how to handle Bayfront scenarios.

Pat Dixon, Redwood City resident, stressed the need for continued consideration towards the history of Redwood City when considering change for the area. She stated the Bayfront as a zone was an opportunity for waterfront residential projects. She looked toward a name being attached to a piece of property as the cleaned up the maps to give the public more of an idea of what and where options were being discussed.

James Jonas, Redwood City resident, spoke on a recent 75-foot sailboat launching very near his home. He recalled the transition that takes place when considering housing and boats and other water structures. He noted the need to address sea level concerns and increase the knowledge of what takes place in transitions of usage in a waterfront area.

Lou Deziel, Applicant for 134 Maple Street, noted he was the Applicant in this area. He thanked the Commission and Staff for their attention and accommodation of projects in the pipeline along with their General Plan update work. He appreciated Staff's suggestions for the East Downtown study area. He noted an area at the corner of Lathrop and Maple, owned by the Redevelopment District, which was currently a decomposed granite parking lot. He suggested designating this area as Open Space as a creek-side park.

Commissioner Seybert asked for clarification on this triangle-shaped parcel he spoke about, and was shown this in the map materials. The area existed directly across the street from Franklin.

Elizabeth Puccinelli, Syufy Enterprises, spoke on the Bayfront properties and thanked everyone for their hard work on the General Plan. She hoped for further opportunities for discussions for the projects in this area. She stressed the need for continued open consideration in the General Plan with regard to the Old Sentry Theater property.

## **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Cronin proposed a Motion on an individual basis for the Planning Commission's confirmation of the direction or preferred use for the Middlefield Road focus area. He was

interested in support of the language supported by Mr. Bigelow now or later in the transportation section of the General Plan.

Ms. Brownfield stated the wording issue was more appropriate for later in the process.

**M/S** (Cronin/Seybert) to confirm the proposed direction for the General Plan for the Middle Field Road focus area, Woodside Road, El Camino Real and Veteran's Boulevard focus areas

**Motion Passed** 7-0

Commissioner Seybert seconded the Motion since the timing was optimal for moving forward in confirming their direction.

Commissioner Borgens expressed her plan to vote in favor of the Motion with respectful recognition of Ms. Pat Dixon, a public speaker, and her comments with regard to preservation of the City's history.

Commissioner Gee, with regard to the Middlefield Corridor, noted they were respectful of the City's roots in consideration of any proposed changes from medium to high density ranges. He stressed the need, however, for a continued look at the Woodside 101 Interchange which had not yet been fully presented in the alternatives.

Commissioner Seybert reiterated that the area at Lathrup and Maple was a great location for a pocket park type of arrangement.

Mr. Lyon noted this completed their study sessions on the uses for the area. Any additional decisions were schedule for the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. Packets at that time would include the initial study of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Commission would be asked at that meeting for a recommendation regarding Zoning to the City Council as well project consideration.

Ms. Brownfield reviewed the timeline for the rest of January through the spring months in meetings with the Committee and Council.

## **7. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST**

January 20, 2009 meeting cancelled

Finger Avenue scheduled for February 10, 2009

January 27, 2009 – review of 134 Maple Street project

February 3, 2009 – Condominium Conversion at Oak Street

February 6, 2009 – training at UC Davis school in Sacramento

**M/S** (Gee/Seybert) to adjourn at 9:30pm

**Motion Passed**