4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section describes existing land uses in and around the plan area, as well as applicable land use policies and regulations. Information in this section was derived from a technical land use background report, *Redwood City General Plan Land Use Report*, prepared in June 2008 by Hogle-Ireland, Inc., as well as CirclePoint’s reconnaissance of the plan area.

4.9.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The plan area covered by the New General Plan consists of the corporate City limits as well as lands within the City’s sphere of influence. The plan area comprises approximately 38 square miles within a diverse physical setting, with flat lands near the Bayfront area; hills in the western portion of the City; and the San Francisco Bay, stream corridors, and tidal marshes in the north and east.

Current Land Use Patterns

The current land use patterns reflect the diverse physical features within the plan area, with most office, commercial and residential uses south and west of U.S. 101 while most open space and industrial uses are north of U.S. 101 or in the southwestern foothill areas. The City consists of residential neighborhoods with varying densities and characters; a conventional downtown with retail, restaurant, office, and civic uses; active industrial areas, including research and development and heavy industrial uses associated with the Port of Redwood City; open space areas; and civic areas, including County offices, parks, schools, and community centers. These uses have been clustered within five distinct areas of the City reflecting their specific geographies and function, described below.

Downtown and Downtown Adjacent Areas

The Downtown contains a variety of land uses, including a mix of commercial, office, industrial, and public and quasi-public uses. Small clusters of industrial uses are situated along El Camino Real and Veterans Boulevard. The public and quasi-public uses, including City and County facilities, are located within the center of Downtown, with the Kaiser Permanente Hospital campus located along the Veterans Boulevard corridor.

Central Neighborhoods

The central neighborhoods of the plan area, including the Stambaugh-Heller/Redwood Village, Sequoia, Palm, Oakwood, Centennial, Central, Arlington, North Fair Oaks and Friendly Acres neighborhoods, are developed with primarily residential land uses, as well as a mix of neighborhood commercial, light industrial, and general commercial uses. To the east of Downtown, the central neighborhoods primarily include low to medium density residential uses, with light industrial and office uses dominating the areas along the Veterans Boulevard, Broadway, and El Camino Real corridors. To the west of Downtown, the Centennial and Arlington neighborhoods contain a mix of residential uses, ranging from low to high density, with office, and commercial uses concentrated along the El Camino Real. Immediately south of Downtown in the Sequoia, Central, Palm, and
Oakwood neighborhoods, low to high density residential uses dominate the existing land uses, with several existing schools, places of assembly, and parks.

**Western/Southern Neighborhoods**

The western and southern neighborhoods, including Canyon, Roosevelt, Woodside Plaza, Farm Hill, Selby, and Emerald Hills, are developed with low-density residential uses, interspersed with some areas of open space (i.e. Edgewood County Park), parklands, schools, and places of assembly. The Woodside Road corridor through these neighborhoods also contains several neighborhood commercial, office, and general commercial uses.

**Redwood Shores**

The master planned neighborhood Redwood Shores, contains a mix of low to medium density residential uses, as well as office and commercial uses concentrated in the western portion of the neighborhood. Bird Island north of Redwood Shores is currently undeveloped and used as open space. Redwood Shores include library and school facilities serving primarily local neighborhood residents.

**Bayfront/Port of Redwood City**

Due to the proximity to the San Francisco Bay and access to a deep-water port, industrial uses have developed along the plan area’s Bayfront area. Heavy industrial uses are located near and within the Port of Redwood City (Port) along Seaport Boulevard. Heavy industrial uses, such as a recycled cement crushing and storage areas, large chemical tanks, and an active rail spur used for the delivery of industrial materials, dominate the Port land. In addition to the industrial uses, the Bayfront area contains a mix of office and marina uses, as well as a restaurant. The Bayfront area also includes open space areas on Bair Island and Greco Island.

**Existing Land Uses**

In the broadest sense, the City is comprised of residential and non-residential land uses. Table 4.9-1 quantifies the existing residential and non-residential development in the plan area as of 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Non-Residential Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>28,522</td>
<td>77,071</td>
<td>26,834,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>22,842</td>
<td>3,117,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Plan Area</td>
<td>37,181</td>
<td>99,913</td>
<td>29,951,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Redwood City, 2010.

The plan area contains a diverse mix of existing land uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, public and quasi-public, open space/water/recreation, and other uses. The distribution of these land uses within the City as shown on Figure 4.9-1 shows...
most development north of U.S. 101 with open space and small pockets of industrial and
residential uses located north of U.S. 101. The relative acreages of each land use and their
percentage of the City’s land base as indicated on Table 4.9-2 show that over 60 percent
of the City’s land base is comprised of Open Space, Recreation, and water (Redwood
Creek, San Francisco Bay, and other water bodies). Residential uses represent the next
highest acreage which comprises a little over 17 percent of the remaining land area.

Table 4.9–2 Existing Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Incorporated City Acreage</th>
<th>Unincorporated Sphere of Influence Acreage</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Quasi Public</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space, Water, and Recreation</td>
<td>14,634</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14,685</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Harvesting</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69q</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Streets, Rail Lines)</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Redwood City, 2009.

**Open Space, Parks, and Recreation**

More than half of the plan area is open space or water, including portions of San Francisco
Bay. The open space natural resource areas, including Bair Island, Bird Island, and Greco
Island, are located in the Bayfront area along Redwood Creek, Westpoint Slough, and San
Francisco Bay. In addition to the natural resource areas, the City contains substantial
parkland resources. Edgewood County Park is located within the southwestern portion of
the plan area in the unincorporated Emerald Hills neighborhood. Refer to Section 4.13,
Recreation, Parks, and Open Space, for further discussion of parks and recreation
facilities within the plan area.

**Salt Harvesting**

The salt crystallization ponds occupy a large area in the Bayfront area. The salt
crystallization ponds encompass more than 1,400 acres, which are under a Williamson Act
contract. In 2009, the property owner filed a non-renewal notice for the property’s
Williamson Act status. Non-renewal of such a contract is typically a first step prior to
initiating or requesting a change of use in an agricultural property. However, non-renewal
of a Williamson Act contract does not in itself convey any land use entitlements related to
the City’s discretionary approval. Please see Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forest
Resources, for further discussion of this property.
Residential Uses

The plan area includes approximately 3,000 acres of residential uses within City limits and another nearly 1,300 acres of residential uses within the sphere of influence. In the plan area as a whole, residential uses comprise about 13 percent of all land. As shown in Figure 4.9-1, residential uses are distributed primarily in areas south and west of U.S. 101, in Redwood Shores, and within the unincorporated areas of North Fair Oaks, Selby, and Emerald Hills. There are a variety of housing unit types found throughout the plan area, including single-family attached and detached units, duplexes, triplexes, condominiums, small and large apartment buildings, town homes, senior apartments, and mobile homes.

According to City research, the majority of residential properties are currently developed at less than the maximum density permitted by the 1990 General Plan. Table 4.9-3 summarizes the maximum density allowed under the 1990 General Plan and the current average density of residential uses.

Table 4.9-3 Permitted/Existing Residential Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Residential Land Uses</th>
<th>Maximum Allowed Density (dwelling units per acre)</th>
<th>Existing Average Density (dwelling units per acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low 0.1-4 du/ac</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 4-8 du/ac</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium 8-14 du/ac</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium High 14-20 du/ac</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 20-30 du/ac</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High 30+ du/ac</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Redwood City, 2008.

Commercial/Office Uses

Approximately 4 percent of the plan area is comprised of commercial uses. Commercial uses within the plan area include neighborhood commercial, office, general commercial, automotive sales and services, and hotel/motel uses. Commercial uses are concentrated in Downtown and along the major transportation corridors, including Broadway, Veterans Boulevard, El Camino Real, and Woodside Road. Large-scale office uses are also located in the Redwood Shores area and along Seaport Boulevard near Redwood Creek, as shown in Figure 4.9-1. Neighborhood commercial uses are also located within residential developments throughout the plan area.
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Public and Quasi-Public Uses

Public and quasi-public uses, including City and County facilities and buildings, are concentrated within the Downtown area. The San Mateo County Historical Museum is located at the center of Downtown. The Hall of Justice and other County facilities are also located in Downtown, as are a range of quasi-public uses, such as government facilities and a post office. Fire stations, libraries, medical facilities (such as the Kaiser Permanente and Sequoia Medical facilities), schools (including Cañada College and other public and private primary and secondary schools), and community centers are distributed throughout the City.

Industrial Uses

Due to the proximity to the San Francisco Bay and access to a deep-water port, industrial uses have been developed along the plan area’s Bayfront area, as shown in Figure 4.9-1. Heavy industrial uses, such as gravel and cement processing, are located near and within the Port of Redwood City (Port) along Seaport Boulevard. Light industrial uses are generally located along U.S. 101 and Veterans Boulevard, as well as areas within the North Fair Oaks, just south of the Bayfront area and east of the City limits with the City’s sphere of influence.

Vacant Lands

While the majority of the plan area consists of a built-up and developed environment, the plan area contains about 70 acres of vacant land. Vacant land does not include lands designated for open space and salt crystallization pond use. Vacant lands within the plan area are predominately located in the hillside areas in the western portion of the City and near existing low-density residential areas. Most of these lands are steeply sloped and are not readily developable. Small areas of vacant lands are also generally located near the industrial areas of the plan area along the Bayfront, particularly near the Port of Redwood City.

4.9.2 Regulatory Setting

San Francisco Bay Plan and San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is a regulatory body established under state law to regulate development along the shores of the San Francisco Bay. Two BCDC plans are pertinent to the project area.

BCDC developed and oversees implementation of the San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan), which provides guidance and policies for future uses of the Bay and its shoreline. Lands along Bayfront portions of the plan area are subject to the Bay Plan. Typically, BCDC has regulatory authority over all proposed development projects within 100 feet of the shoreline.

The San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan (Seaport Plan), also provides guidance for development or changes in or within close proximity to the Bay. The Seaport Plan identifies “priority areas” as sites around the San Francisco Bay that have a “flat,
expansive waterfront location on navigable, deep water channels with excellent ground transportation access and services... that should be protected and reserved for port priority uses, such as marine terminals and directly related ancillary activities, ship repair, supporting transportation facilities, and directly-related marine service facilities.”¹ The Seaport Plan identifies the Port of Redwood City as having suitable physical characteristics for a seaport and thus assigns to it a “port priority” designation.

San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission
The San Mateo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is a state-mandated, independent agency with countywide jurisdiction over changes in organization and boundaries of cities and special districts within San Mateo County, including Redwood City. The San Mateo County LAFCO has the responsibility to limit urban sprawl and encourage the orderly growth and development of local government agencies, prevent future conversion of agricultural and open space lands, review and approve changes in boundaries, establish a City and County sphere of influence, and assist local government agencies in improving the efficiency of urban services.

Association of Bay Area Governments
The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is responsible for regional planning in the San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG provides a framework to coordinate local and regional decisions regarding future growth and development and prepares future growth forecasts for the region. As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the San Francisco Bay Area, ABAG is mandated by the federal government to research and develop plans for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality based on the regional growth projections.

San Francisco Bay Trail Plan
The Bay Trail Plan, adopted by ABAG in 1989, proposes development of a regional multi-use trail around the perimeter of the San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay. The Bay Trail Plan proposes an alignment for what is intended to become a 400-mile recreational ring around the Bay. Specifically, Trail Alignment Policy 2 of the Bay Trail Plan is intended to minimize impacts on and conflicts with sensitive environments. Trail Alignment Policy 8 allows for the Bay Trail to be routed through wetlands if there are existing, well-maintained, and well-managed trails in the area. However, the Bay Trail Plan also notes that alternative trail routes should be provided where necessary and additional buffering and transition areas designed to protect wetland habitats should be provided where appropriate to protect wildlife.

Within Redwood City, the Bay Trail provides connections to Seaport Center, Inner Bair Island, and Redwood Shores. In the southeast, it connects to Menlo Park’s Bayfront Park and to Foster City in the northwest. A gap in the Bay Trail exists in the vicinity of the salt

¹ San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan, 1996.
crystallization ponds, through the bayside industrial area, and across Redwood Creek. Refer to **Section 4.13, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space**, for further discussion regarding the Bay Trail.

**San Mateo County General Plan**

The San Mateo County General Plan, adopted November 1986, guides land use decision-making in unincorporated sections of the County. Land use within the unincorporated portions of the plan area is governed by the County’s General Plan. The San Mateo County General Plan includes multiple goals and policies relating to unincorporated areas that serve as a coordination tool and guide to development and the local decision making process. The County General Plan includes policies related to land use, conservation and open space, scenic roads, seismic and safety, parks and recreation, noise, historic resources, and housing. Several Area Plans are also included as part of the County’s General Plan, including the Emerald Hills Community Plan and the North Fair Oaks Community Plan, which cover the unincorporated areas within the plan area. As of April 2010, the North Fair Oaks plan is being updated.

**San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan**

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) was prepared by the San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), acting as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for San Mateo County. Portions of Redwood City are located within the ALUP boundary, as shown in **Figure 4.7-1 of Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**. The ALUP contains the San Carlos Airport, a general aviation facility located immediately adjacent to the western City boundary at the confluence of Steinberg Slough and Smith Slough. The ALUP includes airport-related land use controls which apply to areas within close proximity to the San Carlos Airport that potentially could be impacted by aircraft operations. Policies, standards, and guidance relating to noise and land use compatibility criteria, restrictions on the heights of structures and/or objects near the airport, and other airport safety criteria are included as part of the ALUP.

**Redwood City Precise Plans**

There are several “Precise Plan” areas located within the plan area. Under the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, Article 52, the City may adopt a precise plan to delineate uses, relationships to other areas, intensity of use, circulation, design criteria, procedures for development review, and special conditions.

A precise plan is a zoning implementation tool that creates specific property development standards and design guidelines in combination with underlying zone standards to allow site design flexibility within areas zoned as a Precise Plan modifying district. A precise plan is not necessarily a specific plan; State law provides a number of requirements for specific plans. Foremost among these requirements is that specific plans must be consistent with a jurisdiction’s governing general plan. Frequently, jurisdictions
considering adoption of a specific plan will also consider a general plan amendment in order to ensure that consistency between the specific plan and general plan is maintained.

Article 52 of the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance does not explicitly require consistency between a precise plan and the General Plan. However, Article 52 does stipulate that a precise plan may recommend changes to the General Plan; such a Precise Plan would become effective upon approval of an associated General Plan amendment.

**Figure 4.9-2** shows the location of the existing Precise Plan areas within the City. Precise Plan areas and their adoption status are discussed below.

**Downtown Precise Plan**

The City prepared the Downtown Precise Plan (DTPP) in 2007, with the intent of revitalizing the Downtown area of the City. However, in January 2009, the City Council decided to set aside the DTPP Plan following a judicial ruling regarding the DTPP’s environmental documentation. As of spring 2010, the City is in the process of revising the DTPP and its environmental documentation. The City anticipates publication of a new draft DTPP and Draft EIR in late 2010.

The City’s intention for the DTPP is to further strengthen Downtown’s status as the area’s central urban district. The DTPP is expected to create a network of public and commercial uses, integrate transit and bicycle uses, create a central employment district, and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment. Strategies for development and specific requirements related to building height, building setbacks, street and landscaping guidelines, and architectural design would also be included.

**Peninsula Park Precise Plan**

The Peninsula Park Precise Plan area is located in the Bayfront area of the City to the north of U.S. 101 and to the northwest of Redwood Creek. The Peninsula Park Precise Plan contains land use, design, and circulation policies for creating a distinctive, water-oriented, urban community and allows for the development of residential and visitor serving uses along Redwood Creek and a marina. Specifically, the Peninsula Park Precise Plan allows for the development of nearly 800 residential units, a hotel, retail development, public parks and promenades, and public waterfront access. The Peninsula Park Precise Plan was adopted in 2007.

**North Main Street Precise Plan**

The North Main Street Precise Plan area is located between Veterans Boulevard and U.S. 101, within close proximity to the downtown area. The North Main Street Precise Plan is intended to create a physical link between the downtown and Bayfront areas via a potential crossing of U.S. 101 along Redwood Creek. This Precise Plan provides guidelines for the redevelopment of 9.5 acres of existing commercial uses with new residential and commercial uses. Similar to the vision for Downtown, the North Main Street Precise Plan encourages pedestrian and bicycle oriented uses, specifically for enhanced access between the Bayfront and downtown core. The North Main Street Precise Plan was adopted in 2008.
Preserve at Redwood Shores Precise Plan

The Preserve at Redwood Shores Precise Plan is located in the Redwood Shores peninsula in the northwestern portion of the City near the confluence of Belmont Slough and the San Francisco Bay. The Precise Plan provides for the development of approximately 115 acres of undeveloped land on the Redwood Shores Peninsula and includes the restoration of approximately 90 acres of tidal marshes. In addition to the restored wetlands, the Precise Plan allows for the development of residential uses, parkland, and an elementary school. This plan was adopted in 2007. Groundbreaking at the elementary school site began in August 2009 and is anticipated to be operational for the 2010-2011 school year.

885 Woodside Precise Plan

The 885 Woodside Precise Plan focuses on developing residential uses along the Woodside Road corridor in the eastern portion of the City. The 0.66-acre Precise Plan area allows for the development of 43 new residential units within the existing multi-family residential area. The 885 Woodside Precise Plan was developed to accommodate a portion of the City’s projected housing needs at relatively high average densities, while also adding amenity and value to the Woodside Road corridor. This plan was adopted in 2008.

Sequoia Hospital Precise Plan

The Sequoia Hospital Precise Plan includes plans to significantly upgrade the Sequoia Hospital, located at the intersection of Alameda de las Pulgas and Whipple Avenue. The Precise Plan includes renovation and seismic upgrades to the existing hospital, new hospital parking, the development of new medical office buildings, and site improvements. This plan was adopted in 2007.

Kaiser Permanente Downtown Medical Campus Precise Plan

Adopted in 2003, the 15.3-acre Kaiser Downtown Medical Campus Precise Plan (Kaiser Precise Plan) contains land use, design, and circulation policies for creating a distinctive urban health care facility, immediately northeast of Downtown. The Kaiser Precise Plan is intended to enhance the image and character of the campus area, provide assistance in the revitalization of Downtown, and encourage pedestrian access. The Kaiser Precise Plan will allow the facility to serve an increased membership. Moreover, the Kaiser Precise Plan will address requirements of Senate Bill 1953, a state law that requires all hospital buildings to meet state seismic safety standards by 2013.

Redwood City Zoning Ordinance

The Redwood City Zoning Ordinance serves as the primary implementation tool of the General Plan. The City contains various zoning districts within its planning boundaries, as listed in Table 4.9-4. The Zoning Ordinance is a regulatory document that establishes specific standards for the use and development of all properties in the City and regulates the development intensity using a variety of methods, including minimum lot size and setbacks, maximum lot coverage, height, and FAR. The Zoning Ordinance also indicates permitted land uses, conditionally permitted uses, and establishes parking and open space...
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standards. **Table 4.9-5** shows the existing residential, commercial, and industrial development standards for the City.

**Table 4.9-4  Zoning Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Code</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zoning Code</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Residential-Hillside</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Commercial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Residential – Single-Family</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Commercial Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Residential – Duplex</td>
<td>CBR</td>
<td>Central Business Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Garden Apartments</td>
<td>IBT</td>
<td>Industrial-Business Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Multi-Family – Low-Density</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Industrial-Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Multi-Family – Medium-Density</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Multi-Family – High Density</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Tidal Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td>RSB</td>
<td>Redwood Shores Bayfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Central Administrative</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agriculture-Greenhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Interim Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Central Business</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combining Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transient Residential, Office, Vehicular, Water, Residential, Pedestrian Shopping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Redwood City Zoning Code, April 2009.

The New General Plan would not result in any immediate change to the Zoning Ordinance. However, as discussed further below, an implementation program of the New General Plan calls for updating the Zoning Ordinance so as to be consistent with the New General Plan.

As a charter city, Redwood City has considerable autonomy with regard to land use regulation and is not required to comply with Section 65860 of the California Government Code, which requires that the zoning ordinance be consistent with a city’s general plan. However, this exemption applies only to zoning consistency and not to consistency requirements for subdivision map approval, public works construction, or for other subordinate land use or development approvals.

**Redwood City Redevelopment Agency**

Under California law, cities can form redevelopment agencies and adopt redevelopment plans as tools to reduce blight and facilitate community renewal. The Redwood City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) was formed in 1982 to help revitalize and redevelop areas suffering from blighted conditions. As of early 2010, the City’s redevelopment areas encompass 946 acres and are divided into three sub areas: Downtown, Marina, and Seaport, as shown in **Figure 4.9-3**.
### Table 4.9-5  Zoning Code Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (area)</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks</th>
<th>Maximum Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Maximum Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>10,000 sf</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>7 ft &amp; 8 ft or 15 ft min. total, both sides</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft (20 ft for garages)</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>40 % 28 ft or 2 ½ stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Single Family: 5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft (20 ft for garages)</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>40% 28 ft or 2 ½ stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Duplex: 7,500 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Triplex: 10,000 sf</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3, RG Single Family: 5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft (20 ft for garages)</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>60% 35 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Duplex: 7,500 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Triplex: 10,000 sf</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 units: 2,000 sf for each unit in excess of the first 3 units</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4 Single Family: 5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft (20 ft for garages)</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>60% 45 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4 Duplex: 7,500 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4 Triplex: 10,000 sf</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The Redwood City Municipal Code contains a minimum average lot width for each zoning district. Also listed under lot width for each zoning district is a minimum standard for street frontage on a public street.

3 R-2 District: For developments of more than 3 units, number standards are not part of the City’s Zoning Code but are based on code interpretation by City staff. For developments of four or more units in the R-2 district, the Zoning Code does not provide a minimum lot size or other standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (area)</th>
<th>Lot Width^2</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks</th>
<th>Maximum Lot Coverage</th>
<th>Maximum Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Rear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 3 units: 1,500 sf for each unit in excess of the first 3 units</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>5-6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Single Family: 5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft (20 ft for garages)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 ft – no stated limit on larger sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplex: 7,500 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triplex: 10,000 sf</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 units: 1,000 sf for each unit in excess of the first 3 units</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(corner lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 ft (interior lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>N/A; 15 ft when within 50 ft of a R District</td>
<td>N/A; 15 ft when within 50 ft of a R District</td>
<td>35 ft or 2 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A; 5 ft when abutting El Camino</td>
<td>N/A; 5 ft when abutting El Camino</td>
<td>100 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>2,500 sf</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>N/A; 15 when abut R District</td>
<td>N/A; 15 when abut El Camino</td>
<td>100 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>N/A; 5 when abutting El Camino; 7.5 ft when within 25 ft of R district</td>
<td>N/A; 15 when abut El Camino</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>43,560 sf (1 acre)</td>
<td>100 ft</td>
<td>25 ft; for every 1 ft exceeding 35 ft in height, add 1 ft of front set back</td>
<td>30 ft; for every 1 ft exceeding 35 ft in height, add 1 ft of side set back</td>
<td>100 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 ft; for every 1 ft exceeding 35 ft in height, add 1 ft of rear set back</td>
<td>30%; 20% additional for parking structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.9 Land Use and Planning

**Zoning District** | **Minimum Lot Size (area)** | **Lot Width\(^2\)** | **Minimum Setbacks Front** | **Side** | **Rear** | **Maximum Lot Coverage** | **Maximum Height** |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
CO | 6,000 sf | 60 ft (corner lots) | 25 ft | 30 ft; for every 1 ft exceeding 35 ft in height, add 1 ft of side setback | 15 ft; 10 ft for corner lots | 60% | 75 ft |
  |  | 50 ft (interior lots) | | | | | |
CBR | 2,500 sf | 25 ft | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 100 ft |
IBT | 2,500 sf | 25 ft | N/A; 15 ft when abut Joint Powers Board right-of-way | N/A; 15 ft when abut Joint Powers Board right-of-way | N/A; 15 ft when abut Joint Powers Board right-of-way | N/A | 75 ft |
IR | 10,000 sf | 70 ft | 5 times linear feet of building frontage facing street | N/A; 15 ft when abut R District | N/A; 15 ft when abut R District | 70% | 75 ft |
IP | 20,000 sf | 100 ft | 25 ft | 30 ft; for every 1 ft exceeding 35 ft in height, add 1 ft of side setback | 15 ft; 10 ft for corner lots | 50% | 50 ft or 3 stories |
GI | 20,000 sf | 60 ft | N/A | N/A; 10 ft when abut R District | 15 ft | 70% | 100 ft |

Note: According to the Zoning Ordinance, standards for the RG (Garden Apartments) District, are the same for the R-3 (Multi-family—Low Density) District.

Source: Redwood City Zoning Code, April 2009.
The Downtown Redevelopment Area is located between El Camino Real and Veterans Boulevard, extending from Whipple Avenue to Charter Street. The Marina Redevelopment Area is located just north of U.S. 101 near Redwood Creek. The Seaport Redevelopment Area is located in the area along Seaport Boulevard near Redwood Creek and within the Port of Redwood City.

Project Consistency Analysis

The following discussion evaluates the project’s consistency with the relevant land use plans, policies, and regulations. The project is not required to be in exact agreement with a plan or policy for a finding of consistency. Rather, policy conflicts are not considered to have a significant effect on the environment unless they would result in a physical change and are, therefore, differentiated from impacts described in other topical sections within Chapter 4.0, Existing Conditions, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of this EIR. Any physical impacts associated with such policy conflicts are addressed in the appropriate technical sections of this EIR.

The project’s consistency with the 1990 General Plan is not evaluated insofar as the New General Plan, if adopted, would entirely replace the 1990 General Plan.

San Francisco Bay Plan and Seaport Plan

The Bay Plan describes the values associated with the San Francisco Bay and provides guidance and regulations for future uses of the Bay and its shorelines. Under the Plan, BCDC requires a permit for any development projects entailing grading, fill, dredging or related activities proposed for tidal wetlands or on land within 100 feet of the Bay shoreline. BCDC permit jurisdiction also extends into waterways that flow into the Bay (such as the mouth of Redwood Creek) as well as salt crystallization ponds and managed wetlands around San Francisco Bay.

BCDC typically considers applications for such permits after a local lead agency (city or county) approves a project that is also in a BCDC jurisdictional area. Under state and federal law, BCDC is required to set conditions for these permits in order to minimize impacts to wetland and to offset unavoidable impacts.

The New General Plan would change the land use designation for the southern portion of Bair Island from Future Urban Development to Open Space - Preservation. The change would limit urban development within the Bayfront area of the plan area and, thus, along the shorelines of the San Francisco Bay and associated waterways, consistent with the vision of the Bay Plan.

The project would result in no change to permitted uses on the site containing the salt crystallization ponds in the Bayfront area. As discussed in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, the New General Plan retains the 1990 General Plan designations for the salt crystallization pond area.

The Bay Plan includes a policy encouraging “the use and maintenance of salt crystallization ponds for salt production...” The Bay Plan further states that salt production is an economically important and productive use of the waters of the Bay.
The New General Plan would continue the 1990 General Plan’s allowable land uses for this site and thus continue to allow salt harvesting across the salt crystallization pond area (see General Plan, Appendix A.) This would maintain consistency with the Bay Plan. For any future uses proposed for the salt crystallization ponds, Program BE-31 would result in the City coordinating with the BCDC to better promote consistency with the Bay Plan through approval of conforming projects or projects seeking amendments to the Bay Plan.

Policies BE-10.1 through BE-10.8 (and associated programs) address development in Waterfront Neighborhoods. Specifically, the policies and programs call for context-sensitive development in waterfront areas that emphasizes retention and/or development of public access areas along shorelines. Policy BE-10.2 would “allow for a diversity of unique housing types, including floating homes and live-aboard boats.” The policy also calls for the City to “collaborate with interested stakeholders to enhance existing floating communities and to establish floating community best practices and standards.”

Bay Plan policies discourage the BCDC from permitting any new houseboat marinas within the agency’s jurisdictional area, citing that private residential uses are inconsistent with the nature of the Bay as a public trust asset. The Bay Plan acknowledges the informal nature of many floating communities. Policies have “grandfathered” any houseboats that were existing in the Bay on or before July 1, 1985. The Bay Plan further stipulates that new houseboats be allowed only under a number of stringent conditions. These conditions include requirements for connections to municipal wastewater treatment facilities, requirements to preserve views of the Bay, and compliance with local land use regulations. The New General Plan includes programs to devise development standards for waterfront neighborhoods and would thus be consistent with the Bay Plan’s recommendation for tighter development control in waterfront residential development.

Moreover, several policies and implementation programs of the New General Plan would result in the protection and enhancement of the San Francisco Bay, specifically the San Francisco Bay baylands and marshlands, and provide encouragement of the Bay’s responsible use. Policy NR-6.1 would preclude development from encroaching into sensitive baylands habitats; Policy NR-6.2 would restore and maintain marshlands including tidal flats, tidal marshes, and salt marshes; and Policy NR-6.4 would allow for appropriate public access to Bayfront open space lands for recreation activities while protecting and restoring the Bayfront’s natural ecosystem and minimizing environmental damage. Further, Program NR-38 of the New General Plan would encourage cooperation with the BCDC to integrate public recreation and access opportunities with Bayfront restoration and preservation effects.

The project would also be consistent with the Seaport Plan, specifically in regards to the Port of Redwood City’s Priority Port designation. The New General Plan would retain industrial land use designations for the Port area. In addition, the New General Plan would not introduce uses potentially incompatible with Port operations into the Port’s vicinity. Rather, the area east of Seaport Boulevard (the salt crystallization ponds) would retain their 1990 General Plan designation.
Policies and programs of the New General Plan also reinforce the continuation of Port activities. Policy BE-21.2 of the New General Plan would ensure efficient and productive use of Port lands, while Policy BE-21.3 would include the preparation of a plan that accommodates a passenger ferry terminal at the Port to facilitate a variety of travel mode connections. Policy BE-10.4 would also ensure that the design of a waterfront neighborhood does not have an undue adverse impact on the Port area or Port uses. Thus, the New General Plan would promote continued industrial and marine serving uses as well as supporting new transportation facilities within the Priority Port area. New General Plan Policy BE-32.4 would also promote the Port of Redwood City and maintain the Port as a critically important use and protect long-term Port, Port-related, and surrounding industrial uses from the encroachment of incompatible land uses. New General Plan Program BE-95 would encourage collaboration with the Port, marine-related businesses, and other stakeholders to promote the geographic location and optimize maritime infrastructure of the Port in order to attract and/or expand marine-related industries, furthering the objectives of the Seaport Plan.

In all, the New General Plan would allow for new development to occur in areas within BCDC’s jurisdiction. The state legislation that created BCDC (also known as the McAteer Petris Act, or California Government Code Section 66600 et seq) specifically states that BCDC jurisdiction includes a portion of lands along Redwood Creek, inland from the Bay to the confluence with Smith Slough at the southern end of Bair Island. To the extent any new development should be proposed for these or other portions of the plan area subject to BCDC jurisdiction, individual project proponents will be required to get any City permits followed by the pertinent BCDC permit. The New General Plan would not encourage significant new development in BCDC jurisdicational lands and would not alter the requirement for project proponents to obtain BCDC permits.

Based on the foregoing, the New General Plan would be consistent with the Bay Plan and the Seaport Plan administered by BCDC.

**San Mateo County LAFCO**

The San Mateo County LAFCO is a regulatory authority within the plan area with the responsibility to limit urban sprawl, prevent future conversion of agricultural and open space lands, review and approve changes in boundaries, establish a City and County sphere of influence, and assist local government agencies in improving the efficiency of urban services.

As the New General Plan would establish new mixed use land use designations and would increase the density and intensity of allowable development within and near Downtown, the project would be consistent with LAFCO’s mission and responsibility of limiting urban sprawl. The character of new development under the project would be that of infill and site redevelopment, making for an overall more efficient land use pattern.

With regard to improving the efficiency of urban services, the New General Plan would include policies and implementation programs to foster interagency coordination, such as coordination with utility and public service providers. New General Plan Policy NR-1.1 would ensure adequate and sustainable water supplies and associated infrastructure.
Programs NR-1 and NR-2 would also implement water conservation programs and monitoring to track overall water use to assist in the future planning for water demand in the plan area. Policy NR-4.1 through Policy NR-4.5 of the New General Plan would also maximize energy conservation and renewable energy production in the plan area to further enhance urban energy services. Programs BE-132 and BE-133 would further promote alternative energy elements, through the consideration of adopting building efficiency technology and standards to maximize energy performance and to consider entering into solar power agreements within the plan area. These policies and implementation programs would be consistent with LAFCO’s responsibility of improving urban services and reducing redundancy through interagency coordination.

While the project would not involve changes to City or County boundaries, or annex new areas within the City or County’s sphere of influence, New General Plan Program BE-32 would encourage annexation outreach with San Mateo County to discuss annexation desires and options to facilitate safety and ease in permit review for potential future boundary changes. New General Plan Policy BC-12.5 and Policy BC-12.7 would encourage further agency and organization coordination by enhancing communication and fostering relationships between neighborhoods and City staff and continuing the cooperative nature, sharing of facilities, and joint planning efforts between school districts and the City. Program BC-50 would encourage the continuance of joint meetings involving the various commissions, boards, and committees to discuss specific topics that are of mutual and community-wide interest. Thus, the project would enhance coordination between County and local agencies, representing consistency with the objectives of the San Mateo County LAFCO.

**San Francisco Bay Trail Plan**

The New General Plan recognizes the need to ensure that public access in the Bayfront portion of the plan area along the San Francisco Bay and associated waterways does not cause harm to sensitive habitats. The Natural Resources Chapter of the New General Plan incorporates several policies targeted toward protecting and restoring baylands, natural wetlands, and ecosystems. Specifically, Policy NR-6.1 would ensure that new development does not encroach into sensitive baylands and that such development does not limit or create barriers that restrict access for wildlife.

While policies and implementation programs within the Natural Resources Chapter ensure the preservation of sensitive environments, policies within the Built Environment Chapter maintain consistency with the Bay Trail Plan’s intention of enhancing regional multi-use trails around the Bay. Specifically, New General Plan Policy BC-5.2 would encourage the completion of the Bay Trail through the City, while Policy BC-5.3 through BC-5.6 would provide connections between regional trails, establish trailheads at visible locations, establishing recreation amenities along Redwood Creek, and providing access to water-based recreation opportunities in the San Francisco Bay and bayfront lands. New General Plan Program BC-10 would require the City to coordinate with local organizations to complete the Bay Trail providing continuous connections through the City and plan area. New General Plan Policy BE-10.1 would also require that Waterfront Neighborhoods provide public access along water edges and to public open spaces and trails. New General Plan Policy BE-26.6 would require new development projects to
provide pedestrian, bicycle, and electric scooter facilities that connect to existing and planned facilities and Policy BE-26.19 would expand the existing bicycle system to provide a continuous route and eliminate missing segments. Through these policies and implementation programs, the project would promote the intention of the Bay Trail Plan within the plan area and is, thus, consistent with the Bay Trail Plan.

**San Mateo County General Plan**

The plan area contains three unincorporated areas that are within the City’s sphere of influence and, thus, under the jurisdiction of the San Mateo County General Plan. Within the plan area, the North Fair Oaks Neighborhood, Emerald Hills Neighborhood, and Selby Neighborhood, as shown on Figure 3-2, are located within the City’s sphere of influence under the purview of the San Mateo County General Plan.

The project would increase the residential density within the North Fair Oaks Neighborhood from Low Density Residential (1-7 dwelling units/acre) to Residential – Medium Density (20 dwelling units/acre) and High density (40 dwelling units/acre) and would incorporate Industrial Light and Regional Commercial land uses.

These changes proposed in the New General Plan would remove previously inconsistent land use designations and would achieve consistency with the designations identified in the North Fair Oaks Area Plan within the County’s General Plan. However, it is important to note that the New General Plan land use designations for the unincorporated areas would remain unofficial and advisory. The County General Plan would continue maintain oversight of the unincorporated areas.

The project would result in no change to land use designations within the Emerald Hills Neighborhood. The Residential – Low Density (7 dwelling units/acre) and Public Facility land use designations would be consistent with the Medium Low Density and Medium Density Residential and Institutional land use designations in the Emerald Lake Hills Area Plan (part of the San Mateo County General Plan).

The project would result in no change to land use designations within single-family residentially developed portions of the Selby Neighborhood. The plan would allow for mixed-use development on parcels fronting the Woodside Road corridor. This designation would be inconsistent with the County’s General Plan, which calls for general commercial uses in the same area. This policy inconsistency does not, however, result in a significant environmental effect. Land use authority for unincorporated portions of the plan area will continue to be established through the County General Plan. Until such time as any unincorporated areas are annexed to Redwood City, land use designations for unincorporated areas within the New General Plan are considered advisory and would result in no physical environmental effect.

Thus, the proposed land uses within the unincorporated neighborhoods in the plan area would be primarily consistent with the County’s General Plan and associated Area Plans.

**San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan**

The San Mateo Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) sets forth airport-related land use controls applicable to areas within close proximity to the San Carlos Airport. These controls were devised to address and prevent land uses that could be incompatible or
pose a safety hazard given proximity to the airport. Refer to Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for a discussion of project consistency with the San Carlos ALUP.

Redwood City Precise Plans, Specific Plans, and Redevelopment Plan

Upon adoption of the New General Plan, the City will review its currently adopted precise plans and its existing Redevelopment Plan and revise these where necessary to reflect changes made in the New General Plan, including land use, intensity/density, design, circulation, etc. Specifically, Policy BE-22.1 calls for the City to strive for consistency between the New General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and other local regulatory documents that implement General Plan policies (including precise plans and specific plans).

Notably, a number of New General Plan policies and programs call for continuation of redevelopment-related City initiatives. Specifically within the Downtown Redevelopment Area, New General Plan Policy BE-15.1 would encourage private property redevelopment initiatives along the Veterans Boulevard corridor to create new Commercial – Regional, Commercial – Office/Professional, and Mixed Uses. New General Plan Policy BE-18.6 would also prioritize redevelopment within Downtown and foster pedestrian-oriented redevelopment in areas surrounding the Caltrain Station. Further, New General Plan Policy BE-33.1 through Policy BE-33.5 focus on the revitalization of Downtown, encouraging the development of new commercial office space, improving public design features, promoting mixed use development with a range of affordability options, and creating a transit and pedestrian focus for future development. Program BE-9 and Program BE-77 would promote the identification and development of Priority Development Areas pursuant to the FOCUS program (ABAG, BCDC, BAAQMD, and MTC sponsored) and sites most suitable for redevelopment based on consideration of efficiency, circulation, compatibility of nearby uses, availability of services, safety, and proximity to residents and workers.

With regard to the Seaport Redevelopment Area, New General Plan Policy BE-21.1 would allow for the growth and intensification of industrial uses in the Port Industrial Center. The New General Plan would also promote the development of Commercial – Office/Technology uses in the southern portion of the Seaport Redevelopment Area currently designated for light industrial uses. The New General Plan does not include nor propose any modification to the composition or scope of the Redwood City Board of Port Commissioners. The Board, whose members are appointed by the City Council, govern most port operations. The City Council gives the Port Commission the authority to set policy and manage the Port actions, including budgetary policy issues and the selection of the Port’s Executive Director. The Port Commission establishes and publishes tariffs, assigns berths, and supervises cargo and industrial activities within the Port, as well as providing property management and security services to the businesses located within the Port. All of these activities in furtherance of port industrial usage would be continued under the New General Plan.
Redwood City Zoning Ordinance

A zoning ordinance is one of the primary means of implementing a general plan. Adoption of the New General Plan would require a review of the Zoning Ordinance regarding policies pertaining to land use, density/intensity, development design, conservation of natural resources, public safety, and other relevant topics to ensure consistency.

Although as a California Charter City, Redwood City is not required to maintain consistency between its general plan and its zoning ordinance, adherence to the policies and implementation programs of the New General Plan would result in consistency between the New General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

The Built Environment Chapter of the New General Plan includes policies and implementation programs that would ultimately result in consistency between the New General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, Policy BE-22.1 calls for the attainment of consistency between the New General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and other local regulatory documents that implement General Plan policies. Further, Program BE-1 calls for the zoning map to be amended to reflect the New General Plan Land Use Policy Map and to create zoning districts and specific development standards consistent with the New General Plan.

Program BE-82 would also implement zoning that provides integration of land uses, mixed-income housing of all types and densities, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, transit-oriented development, and enhanced public transportation options. Thus, the project would maintain consistency with the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance.

4.9.3 Thresholds of Significance

Redwood City has not established local CEQA significance thresholds as described in Section 15064.7 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, significance determinations are from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A significant impact related to land use and planning will occur if implementation of the project would:

a) Physically divide an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
4.9.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Issued Not Discussed Further

Conflict With Any Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency

As discussed in Section 4.9.2, Regulatory Setting, the project would not result in inconsistencies or conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation within the jurisdiction of the plan area. The project would be consistent with BCDC’s Bay Plan and Seaport Plan, San Mateo County LAFCO, Bay Trail Plan, the San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Airport Land Use Plan, the City’s Precise Plans and Redevelopment Plan, and the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Implementation of the New General Plan policies and implementation programs would maintain consistency with these plans and regulations. No impact would result.

Conflict with an Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), nor other similar approved conservation plan within or in close proximity to the plan area. The closest HCP to the plan area is the San Bruno Mountain HCP, located approximately 12 miles north of the plan area. The closest NCCP to the plan area is the Santa Clara Valley NCCP, approximately 30 miles to the south in the Coyote Valley. Owing to the distances between the closest HCP and NCCP to the plan area, implementation of the project would result in no conflict to the provisions of these pertinent HCPs and NCCPs and thus no impact would result.

Project Impacts

Impact 4.9-1: The New General Plan would continue existing development patterns by focusing new development in largely urbanized infill areas and major transportation corridors. It would improve connectivity among the various areas of the City through enhanced bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access, fostering connectivity through neighborhoods and blocks. (Beneficial Impact)

Anticipated development under the New General Plan would allow for an increase of approximately 9,103 dwelling units and 7.3 million square feet of non-residential building space over existing conditions in the plan area. A net population increase of 16,819 people is anticipated at buildout of the New General Plan (year 2030).

The New General Plan would guide the location, form, and intensity of all new development within the plan area. The New General Plan would focus new development as “infill” within several key focus areas, including Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods, as well as major transportation corridors like Woodside Road and El Camino Real. These areas that would receive new growth are largely urbanized. Individual parcels within these areas are generally not large enough that their development could result in a physical division of the City. Overall, existing
development patterns would be maintained, with intensification of uses in the identified 
“focus areas” defined in Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

The New General Plan calls for a number of transportation and infrastructure improvements that would eliminate existing divisions in the community. These improvements include railroad grade separations in locations where at-grade railroad crossings currently existing. The New General Plan also includes conceptual plans for a streetcar network. The New General Plan emphasizes a land use program along the proposed network area that would yield sufficient ridership to support such a network. If developed, the streetcar network would enhance connectivity between Downtown, adjacent and nearby central neighborhoods, and the Port area. Currently, existing transportation infrastructure (including U.S. 101 and the expressway portion of Woodside Road) pose informal barriers within the community insofar as they are difficult for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-automotive traffic to penetrate.

Moreover, the New General Plan policies and implementation programs would help improve access and connectivity in existing neighborhoods by strengthening and fostering connections between existing communities, providing pedestrian connectivity, and improving streetscapes along corridors. High-quality infill development would result in a lessening of existing divisions within the community and prevent any new divisions.

Policies BE-1.4, BE-4.1, BE-5.4, BE-7.4, and BE-8.2, as detailed in Appendix A, would promote connectivity within and interfaces between each neighborhood and corridor within the plan area. These policies would strengthen connections between the neighborhoods and schools, parks, and commercial uses and would foster pedestrian connections across major corridors. Policy BE-10.8 would encourage new development within the waterfront neighborhoods to incorporate consistent street patterns and provide connections between adjacent neighborhoods, while Policies BE-18.2, BE-18.4, BE-18.9, BE-19.5, and BE-20.3 would promote pedestrian activity for a vibrant city center, create a network of public spaces to encourage pedestrian activity Downtown and in adjacent neighborhoods, and require employment center developments to accommodate safe and convenient walking and interconnected systems of streets and to provide synergy among adjacent businesses.

Programs BE-5 and BE-17 would implement design guidelines to ensure that new developments consider relationships to neighboring properties, specifically within the Mixed Use Waterfront Neighborhoods and Historic Influence High Density Neighborhoods. Programs BE-18, BE-20, BE-25, and BE-27 focus on pedestrian connectivity, including recommendations for streetscape improvements; pedestrian connections between parks, mixed-use areas, high-density neighborhoods, and between different modes of transit. These programs also provide for the inclusion of public amenities in the corridors, such as streetlighting and benches. Refer to Table 3-4 for a description of these referenced policies and implementation programs.

The New General Plan policies and implementation programs would promote connectivity within the plan area and would have the potential to enhance existing residential communities and connections to such areas. Thus, the New General Plan
would not divide an established community and would instead serve to unify and enhance the urban character of the plan area. Therefore, this impact would be considered beneficial. No mitigation is required.