

MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 14, 2009  
7:00 p.m.

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

## APPROVED

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Borgens, Commissioner Seybert, Commissioner Schmidt, Vice-Chair Radcliffe & Chair Gee

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Holt

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** J. Spotorno, A. Raymundo, Dr. Howard

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:** T. Gilman, S. Drotos

**STAFF PRESENT:** Principal Planner Passanisi, Assistant City Attorney Aranda, Senior Planner Riordan, Planning Secretary Mateo

**GUESTS:** Janet Stone – San Mateo County Housing Department & HOPE Inter-agency Council Board; John Donahoe – Senior Entitlement Planner for Stanford; Lucy Wicks – Community Relations at Stanford University; Dave Lennox

**PROCEEDINGS RECORDED:** For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, an audio cassette 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: None

### 5. HOPE (HOUSING OUR PEOPLE EFFECTIVELY) PLAN – REVIEW AND

#### DISCUSSION

Janet Stone, San Mateo County Housing Department, gave a PowerPoint on the following:

**Housing our People Effectively (HOPE) ... Ending Homelessness in San Mateo County**

- In the 1970s, there were 300,000 *more affordable housing* units in the nation than households that needed them.
- In 2005, there were 4.4 million households who *needed affordable housing* and were unable to find it.

**Why Create a Plan?**

- The HOPE Plan is a **blueprint for action to end homelessness** in San Mateo County, with specific action steps leading to concrete results.
- Supervisor Mark Church and Jerry Hill initiated HOPE by bringing together representatives from all sectors of the community with a mandate to create and implement the plan.

**Who is Homeless in San Mateo County? – Homeless Estimates:**

<u>2009</u>	<u>Point in Time</u>	<u>Annual</u>
Total Number of Homeless Persons	1,798	2,712
Total Homeless Households	1,482	2,238
Homeless Households with Children	132	199

**Who is At-Risk for Homelessness in San Mateo County? – Household Estimates:**

<u>Type of Household</u>	<u>Number</u>
Total Households in San Mateo County	254,103
"At-Risk of Homelessness" Households	9,375

- At-risk: Thos earning below 30% area median income (AMI) and paying more than 50% of income for rent

**Total Homeless and At-Risk Households:**

<u>Type of Household</u>	<u>Number</u>
Homeless Households	2,238
"At-Risk of Homelessness" Households	9,375
Total Households: Homeless and At-Risk	11,613
Total People: Homeless and At-Risk	12,087

**The HOPE Plan: Key Concepts**

1. Prevention: "Closing the Front Door" ... Reducing the number of people who become homeless through resource collaboration.
2. Housing: "Opening the Back Door" ... Creating affordable housing to low income residents and providing services to help them to sustain their housing.
3. Planning for Outcomes ... Understanding who is homeless, why, and what they need to end their homelessness.

**The HOPE Vision: Key Recommendations**

- Housing Solutions

By 2015, make available:

- 4,700 units of housing for extremely low income households
- 1,600 units through tenant-based housing subsidies
- 1,600 units through master-leasing by county or service provide

➤ Homeless Prevention

By 2015, make available:

- Coordinated, short-term services for 4,300 homeless and at-risk households to help maintain or access appropriate housing
- Affordable and/or supportive housing upon discharge from institutions (jail, hospital, foster care, etc.)

**Housing Element Update: General Recommendation**

- Unique opportunity for community to advance its goals as articulated in the Hope Plan
- Partnership between City and County plans to address housing issues
- Appeal to incorporate HOPE Plan specific recommendations into the Housing Element Update

**Housing Element Update: Specific Recommendations**

- Following an analysis of local housing needs, identify available resources (suitable sites, financing, etc.) for affordable/supportive housing for extremely low-income households and mitigate identified governmental constraints
- Adopt common methodology for identifying and analyzing housing and service needs of homeless persons based on framework used in the HOPE Plan

**Housing Element Update: Specific Recommendation**

- Adopt a program to ensure that zoning treats transitional and supportive housing as residential use
- Support policies which encourage financial and other incentives for including supportive and extremely low-income units in *all new affordable* housing projects
- As a specific action of the Housing Element program, hold a study session to consider endorsing the HOPE Plan

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Radcliffe stressed the importance of the HOPE Plan's forward thinking and focus on homeless prevention.

Commissioner Seybert stated the more partnerships created with regard to the HOPE Plan, the better the outcome. This included businesses, nonprofits and the public sector. He asked what was perceived as the next potential Planning Commission step with regard to the HOPE Plan.

Mr. Tom Passanisi, Principal Planner, noted that many of the components in the HOPE Plan PowerPoint were also discussed as part of the new General Plan process. Housing consultants also had received a copy of the HOPE Plan PowerPoint presentation. More was expected on the HOPE Plan at a later date when the Planning Commission met to discuss the Housing Elements of the new General Plan.

Commissioner Schmidt asked how San Mateo County compared to other counties in relationship to the HOPE Plan.

Ms. Stone noted a number of communities have ten-year plans. Redwood City had more collaboration among their private and public sectors than a number of the other communities. The City had a solid commitment when addressing homelessness along with resources devoted toward providing affordable housing and support. While the City was doing well, she stressed the challenge of finding and securing the funds and resources for this affordable and supportive housing.

Commissioner Schmidt asked if it was difficult to find funding due to the economy, or were there other reasons for this challenge.

Ms. Stone stated there were institutional constraints from zoning density issues to subsidizing issues for the extremely low-income homeless faction. She reiterated Redwood City does well with their collaborative efforts but needed to dig deeper to find ways to make it all come together.

Chair Gee agreed the HOPE Plan was a great program. He stressed the importance of bringing the public and private sectors together in educating the community about the City's housing needs. He noted when the Zoning was updated in the General Plan, a transitional housing or homeless overlay was included. This inclusion was State-mandated. Further community outreach and education regarding all issues affecting housing and homelessness risks was needed. He stressed the importance of in-fill housing in the General Plan Housing Element as this plays an important role in the HOPE Plan's goals. A collective community voice on the issue was paramount.

## **6. STANFORD IN REDWOOD CITY CONCEPT PLAN**

Dr. Steven Howard noted Stanford Project, a large nonprofit organization coming into the City, was not subject to taxation. However, he asked how any in lieu fees would be paid, and how this may or may not change the project and its components. He questioned whether some of these concerns might need to be dealt with prior to the project moving forward in the approval process. He stressed a large amount of discussion time was being spent on these issues, which was time lost if the project never reached the approval stage.

Maureen Riordan, Project Planner, stated they were actually in discussions over the Development Agreement with a format set up for this to occur in tandem with the environmental process and the Precise Plan process. These discussions were keeping time with the current discussions as the project moved towards the approval stage.

Ms. Riordan gave a PowerPoint on the following:

## **Stanford in Redwood City Project Update in Joint Study Session – Planning Commission and Architectural Review Committee**

### **Purpose of Meeting:**

To obtain Planning Commission (PC) and Architectural Review Committee (ARC) input on Stanford in Redwood City Project Campus Development Concepts (as revised) that responds to design-related input from the Community and City staff.

Of note, this Study Session is not a decision-making meeting nor a discussion of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. A public hearing on the environmental analysis – the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – and a 45-day public/review comment period on the Draft EIR will occur in the Fall.

### **Agenda:**

#### 1. Presentations:

- City Staff – Brief Project Description and Planning Process
- John Donahoe, Stanford Project Manager – Project Objectives
- Lucy Wicks, Stanford Community Relations – Community Outreach --- What we heard from the Community.
- David Lenox, Stanford Campus Architect – Stanford’s Revised Development Concepts Plan – How we responded to Community input.

#### 2. Discussion – PC/ARC and Public input

Note: Terry Bottomley, City’s Urban Design Consultant, was present for questions from the PC or ARC.

### **Stanford in Redwood City Project Description**

Application Request – General Plan and Zoning Map Amendments/Precise Plan that would change project site from Light Industrial to Commercial/Office Professional uses and that would allow greater intensification of the site (from 0.7% floor area ratio (FAR) to 1% FAR).

- Demolish 537,000 sq. ft. of existing office/research and development (8 buildings)
- Replace, in multiple phases, with 1,525,000 sq. ft. (13 commercial buildings):
  - Administrative office; research and development (R&D); and medical clinic uses
  - Four (f) parking structures, surface lot and street parking
  - Common support uses (i.e. cafeteria, childcare, fitness center and other employee amenities) and ...
  - Open Space

**Existing Site:** Overhead/aerial map with dotted-line blocking of Douglas Avenue, Existing Building, Broadway, Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center, Spinus Park and the Fire Station

**Original Site Plan:** Drawn map with dotted-line blocking of the same elements as listed above.

### **Public Hearings to Date:**

- July 15, 2008 Planning Commission public hearing on initiation of General Plan/Zoning Map Amendments & Precise Plan study
- August 11, 2008 City Council Hearing – Approved Initiation of General Plan/Zoning Map Amendments & Precise Plan study
- October 14, 2008 – Public Environmental Impact Report Scoping Session

### **Community Outreach**

- Purpose – To obtain community input (likes/dislikes/concerns and recommended solutions) on Stanford in Redwood City Project
- Three Community Meetings/Workshops held (in English and Spanish) with over 3,000 notices mailed to households/businesses:
  - November 20, 2008 – Police Activity League (PAL) building
  - December 3, 2008 – Summit Preparatory School
  - January 9, 2009 – Hoover School
- Facilitated by Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC)
- Most PCRC facilitators are volunteer mediators who have received special training in assisting others to communicate clearly, listen for new information, find common ground, make decisions, and move forward. PCRC facilitators do not tell the group what to do, make decisions, and/or take sides. Their role is to be natural, helping the group to accomplish the goals, and work together well.
- Community input is posted on the City's Website: [www.redwoodcity.org](http://www.redwoodcity.org) (under "Hot Topics")

Jon Donahoe, Senior Entitlement Planner for Stanford, gave a PowerPoint on the following:

### **Stanford in Redwood City Project Team Introductions Project Objectives**

**Project Context:** Overhead/aerial photographic map with labeling for components encompassed

- Within one mile of Downtown
- Within 1-1/2 miles of Caltrain Station
- Within 7 miles from Stanford's main campus

### **Project Objectives**

- Create a Stanford University satellite location in a campus setting to accommodate the long-term needs of the University and its employees with an allowable density of 1.0 Floor Area Ratio.
- Plan the campus with sufficient flexibility to allow the phased development of office, R&D, and medical uses.
- Understand the City's and community's goals and collaborate for success.
- Conserve natural resources through sustainable land use components and building features, including those affecting transportation, energy, water and air quality.

- Promote and enhance a healthy and diverse economy in Redwood City by investing in the community.

### **Design Attributes**

- Strong sense of place
- Contemporary yet timeless design with a sense of warmth
- Exterior and interior collaborative spaces
- Creative workplace strategies
- Intimate courtyards, gateways, and public spaces
- Incorporate the best qualities of Stanford and Redwood City
- Establishing a new “standard of living” – better office environment for employees
- Sustainability

### **Elements of the Precise Plan**

#### -Land Use Program

- Administrative offices
- Research and Development
- Medical Clinics

#### -Site Planning Concepts

- Block configurations, access and phasing approach
- Building focus on Broadway, parking on Bay
- Relationship of Project Open Space to Spinax Park

#### -Building Height and Intensity

- Average 4-5 floors, 1.0 FAR (1.5 million square feet)
- The Precise Plan will dictate lower heights near residential neighborhoods, higher near U.S. 101

#### Design Elements

- Streets and public spaces (including building entrances)
- Building forms and materials (contemporary, warm)
- Parking structures (form, setbacks, location, relationship to Bay Road)
- Building materials

Lucy Wicks, Community Relations at Stanford University, gave a PowerPoint on the following:

**Community Outreach:** Overhead/aerial view map with host areas notated

-Three City-hosted Community Meeting (held in English and Spanish):

- November 20, 2008 (PAL building)
- December 3, 2008 (Summit Preparatory School)
- January 9, 2009 (Hoover School)
  - 3,021 households received the notice in English and Spanish

-Friendly Acres and Redwood Village Neighborhood Associations, North Fair Oaks community, Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Business Group, Rotary, Redwood City 2020 and the Peninsula Chapter of the Sierra Club

## **What We Heard from the Community, City Staff and Commissioners regarding campus design**

-What do you like about the project:

- Revitalization of the area
- Catalyst for safer neighborhoods and streets
- Inclusion of more open space and greenery
- A more sustainable development
- New circulation improvements
- Increased linkages to downtown

## **What We Heard ... continued:**

-What concerns do you have about the project? What can be improved?

- Building/parking structure height and massing
- Sense of linear barrier along Broadway
- The inward orientation – “turns back on the neighborhood”
- Traffic/Parking

Dave Lennox, Stanford University Architect, gave a PowerPoint on the following:

## **Stanford in Redwood City Project – Project Response to Community Input**

-Drawn overhead map with dotted-line blocking, solid red line blocking and arrows, along with red circle/oval areas.

-Additional mapping with key component and “Campus Heart” in green oval.

-Color picture representations.

-Overhead drawn map with green oval focus area of Broadway Pedestrian Promenade, the Collaboration Loop and the Heart Campus

-Continued color photo overlays of the proposed plan area

**Environmental Sustainability Programs** – Color photo blocks representing Transportation, Waste, Energy, Green Building and Water

-Stanford University ranked as one of the top 15 college sustainability leaders in this year’s College Sustainability Report Card.

-“Sustainability must become a core value in everything we do.” - John Hennessy, President, Stanford University

Ms. Riordan gave a PowerPoint:

## **Future Public Hearing Tentative Schedule:**

- Fall '09 – Draft EIR and Precise Plan available for 45-day public review/comment period
- Fall '09 – Planning Commission hearings on Draft EIR and Precise Plan
- Winter '10 – Planning Commission hearings on Final EIR and Precise Plan
- Winter '10 – City Council hearings on adoption of General Plan/Zoning Map Amendments/Precise Plan

## **COMMISSIONER/COMMITTEE CLARIFYING QUESTIONS**

Committee Member Spotorno discussed the following:

- The existing Broadway improvements. He noted their description as being pedestrian-oriented, but asked how this was incorporated into the plan, since this was not directly evident.
- The importance of preserving the existing band of pine trees on Bay Road.
- The existing utilities and the large power lines running along Bay Road. He asked if these were planned for underground installations to prevent urban clutter.
- What does the project phasing look like in terms of the amenities in the area? What is the timeline for the opening of parks and open spaces?
- Public and private space usage concerns. He was curious to see how the resident and employee usage accessibilities overlapped, which were noted as shared usages, and which were specifically designated as public versus more private.
- The general sketches and map-generated square footage and parking ratios.
- At-home and/or site buildings architectural qualities. He looked for a softening of the sharper edges to the plan and a more cohesive architectural flow.
- Wind analysis concerns. He hoped these would be addressed as part of the EIR process.
- Congratulatory comments towards sustainability accolades with the hope for continued best practices for the planned project.
- Concerns over the barbell effect of the downtown flow, with the hope for better overall connections between the downtown area and traffic from Mountain View.

Chair Gee summed up the above comments as including the following components:

1. Building and Orientation.
2. Height and Massing.
3. Pedestrian and Vehicle Circulation.
4. Open Space, Landscaping and Amenities.
5. Architectural and Landscape Design preferences.

He suggested the Commission keep these project suggestion and discussion aspects in mind as they moved forward with their comments and questions.

Commissioner Borgens addressed the following:

- Continued focus on making sure the project does not put its back to the neighborhood. She was appreciative of the plan's efforts to address this thus far.
- Changing the concept of minimizing the potential parking concerns to one of eliminating these parking concerns since the area was already over-parked and realistically had no room for additional parking.
- Notation of the continued green space elements of the parking structures near Spinas Park. She appreciated the green buffering attempts in this widely used park space.
- The project plan's reflection of the community input received thus far was appreciated.
- Appreciation for the parking flow components in the plan which now address the ease of parking and flow through the area.
- Suggestion that Second Avenue be noted as the start to the residential neighborhood. Homes begin at this location, making it a better designation as the opening to Friendly Acres, versus the designation of Douglas as the residential in-point.

- Continued concern over truck routing in the area, and continued study of these routes to minimize truck flow issues to the site.

Committee Member Raymundo spoke on the following:

- Sustainability issues with regard to tearing down a large existing building with the hope that there would be further study towards using some of what existed as part of the plan development process.
- Recycling and green activity plans for any parts of the existing site which will be essentially scrubbed to make room for the newer building aspects.
- Continued hope that the park areas will be maintained as busy, dynamic spaces with high activity flow and usage.
- Appreciation over the larger green space contiguous to the park area. However, he expressed concern over how the park's current usage would be affected during the various phases of the plan and construction.
- The usage numbers as 75-80% administrative, 10-15% R&D and 10-15% medical clinics. He questioned how these ultimate build-out percentages met long-term needs for the area.
- Project phasing. He asked for clarification on how the projected phased out to completion. He asked if usable spaces would finish out in an ongoing fashion, or versus which components were not available for use until project completion.
- The City Master Plan and its ability to correctly identify the usage areas in the large common use open spaces versus what is perceived as the Heart of the Campus. He asked how the PC's usage input and specifics matched with the project's planned usages and needs.
- Lighting issues for the project and spillover issues regarding any light effects on the residential area.
- Consistent usage of terminology and actual numbers to describe the actual height of the project's various components at complete build-out to prevent any misunderstandings on actual heights.
- Allocation of parking in the parking garages towards which garages served which buildings in the plan.

Commissioner Seybert comments included:

- Appreciation that the height of the project stepped away from the neighborhoods.
- Notation the parking garage and building heights did not necessarily coincide. He looked for further clarification on why there were parking garages at five to six stories in height to accommodate buildings of four to five floors in height, for example, in the Bay Road area.
- He looked for additional information on massing and building treatments for the area.
- An understanding of the ripple effect of what the Stanford Project ultimately brings to the area. He asked what the project planners might add in addition to the already discussed uses and designations in the areas as specified by the Planning Commission and depicted in the General Plan.

As stressed, four areas where Stanford has much to offer in collaboration with the City:

1. A rich history of sports. He encouraged this but also looked to further planning on additional sports' area designations above and beyond the existing park usage areas.

2. A family-friendly commitment and childcare space. He hoped any additional openings in the childcare facilities, not already filled by Stanford employees, would be made available to the public in the area.
3. Shuttle plans, and the suggestion that both Stanford employees and other residents can make use of the shuttle as a way to enter the downtown usage area.
4. Additional collaboration with Stanford's educational opportunities with members of the community. He stressed the importance of involving high school age students in mentoring programs showing them what real work experience looks like.

Committee Member Dr. Howard agreed there were tremendous opportunities with regard to the phasing of the project. He noted, however, a project of this great size greatly affected the community during construction. He noted the importance of studying the needs and expansion of Spinas Park so that it addressed the needs and uses of the future. He stressed the importance of Caltrain's involvement in traffic flow issues, taking some stress congested vehicle traffic areas. A hook-ramp setup was discussed.

Commissioner Schmidt again stressed the continued efforts to ensure that Stanford did not overpower the neighborhood, but combined with its overall nature. He looked to a genuine community effect to the project.

Commissioner Radcliffe expressed her excitement over the project and its addition to the downtown area, but remained concern over the overall disconnect. She cited her areas of concern as including the Heart of the Campus, the childcare center, fitness center, dining and free shuttle. She noted the possible adverse effect of these in-house areas on the same downtown area business types, especially that of the fitness center. She hoped the usage areas on campus would not preclude employees and visitors from making use of some of these same usage areas within the downtown area. She expressed the importance of streetcar expansion in the area to improve traffic flow as well as bring more people into the downtown area.

Chair Gee stated his appreciation over the continued public engagement process and noted its positive effects on the planned development process. He looked to further discussion on way-finding and addressing efforts to make the front door of the Stanford project visible, accessible and easily oriented by visitors to the campus. He stressed the importance of the sense of arrival into Stanford and the Redwood City downtown area. He suggested continued focus on the setbacks in the area especially in the Broadway area. He agreed with the importance of very specific notation of height levels/floor levels so the public and Council are not surprised by the actual size of the overall project and its height components. He noted the importance of addressing the traffic on Broadway, Veterans and Bay Road. He noted the importance of local hiring, also keeping in mind the lay-offs at Genentech and Roche, as potential employee pools.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Greg DeLong, Menlo Park resident, spoke on the Stanford Development Plan. He discussed Woodside Park and Woodside Road, along with their usage and parking

concerns which will be further stressed by commuters to the area. He asked that this be kept in the forefront in continued discussion on traffic flow, parking and alternative transportation and/or shuttle routing.

### **COMMISSIONER/COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Committee Member Spotorno spoke to the following:

- Urban design components, making sure that there is cohesive flow and understanding of parking lots, drives and walkways.
- Further development of these usage areas, their gateways and entrances to ensure the public can find their way around.
- Warrington and cross-intersection traffic concerns.
- Creation of a more direct traffic entrance for the Stanford Clinics area.

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

Mr. Passanisi noted a meeting was scheduled for July 21, 2009 to discuss the Land Use and Urban Form of the General Plan.

**8. M/S** (Seybert/Borgens) to adjourn at 8:35 p.m.