

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
January 17, 2006
7:00 p.m.

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

DRAFT

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Claire, Commissioner Coddling, Vice-Chair Cronin, Commissioner Paulson, Commissioner Radcliffe, and Chair Seybert

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Gee

STAFF PRESENT: Principal Planner Passanisi, City Attorney Yamamoto, Principal Planner Jany, Senior Planner Riordan, Associate Planner Mehra

GUESTS: Sharon DeBell, Callander Associates, Gary Ernst, Applicant, Ray Pendro, Wagstaff & Associates

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED: For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, a tape recording and video recording of the entire meeting is available for listening 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:** December 6, 2005

M/S: (Radcliffe/Paulson) to approve the Minutes of December 6, 2005, as submitted.
Motion Passed 6-0; 1 absent (Gee)

3. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None

4. **PRESENTATION ON "DAYLIGHTING" CREEKS IN THE DOWNTOWN**

Mr. Jany gave a brief description of Sharon DeBell's work. Ms. DeBell works for Callander and Associates and has a background in Urban Design and Landscape Architecture from Oregon State.

Sharon DeBell gave a power point presentation on the item mentioned above.

By focusing attention on the downtown it feels like there is the most potential for revitalization as well as looking at how redwood creek could be a revitalizing tool for the downtown. Redwood creek holds a lot of cultural history. The main reason why Redwood City developed was its deep water channel that it created that allowed for the shipping.

The issues with redwood creek are the lack of visibility that it has within the downtown due to the historical changes in regards to transportation. Redwood Creek has been culverted, covered over, and at other times it has remained in somewhat of a natural state, yet with the architecture completely turning its back to it.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Claire thanked Ms. DeBell on her hard work. The presentation was excellent and exciting. The creek was culverted primarily for flood control. He believes that the creek could and should be opened up.

Commissioner Cronin commented he was impressed with the presentation and this would be a great opportunity for Redwood City to consider.

Chair Seybert commented that this was an excellent presentation and opportunity.

Mr. Jany said that this may take a lot of engineering to happen. It will not happen tomorrow. Just the simple fact of highlighting the creek crossing at Middlefield Road with glass blocks at night would reinforce two things: the pedestrian connection and the fact that the glass is a metaphor for water. The whole value is the pedestrian connection from the El Camino Real to the bay.

5. TENTATIVE MAP – 718 CANYON ROAD (Public Hearing) TM-2005-08

Associate Planner Mehra stated that this item was originally reviewed on November 21, 2005 by the Subdivision Committee. The subject parcel is roughly 34,000 square feet and is located in the R-1 zoning district at the intersection of Bain Place and Canyon Road.

The Subdivision Committee approved the meeting with a 2-1 vote. When there is an application that is not unanimously approved by the Subdivision Committee then it reverts to the Planning Commission for review and possible approval or action. The dissenting vote was from the City Engineer who cited two reasons for not voting in favor of the proposed sub-division. The first reason being that the proposed subdivision does not comply with section 30.117 of the Subdivision Ordinance which relates to lot designs. According to this section lot depth shall generally not exceed two and a half times their average width. In this case two of the four parcels exceed this threshold Parcels 3 and 4. Secondly per the Subdivision Ordinance the side property lines of all lots shall be perpendicular to the streets or not less than seventy degrees. Some of the property lines that have been approved in the past do not follow this criterion. This hearing and the Subdivision hearing were published and noticed in the newspaper ten days prior to the hearing. To date staff has only received one letter from the property owner directly opposite on Canyon Road. Who opposes the project on the grounds that it will take away street parking.

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve the tentative parcel map with those conditions.

Commissioner Coddling asked if the City Engineer voted against this project is there a way for the applicant to correct those deficiencies. Mr. Mehra replied that the applicant has a right to request or carry forward the current request and the Planning Commission can deny it. The applicant also has the option of re-designing the proposed subdivision. Commissioner Coddling asked if the Planning Commission does deny the tentative

parcel map can the applicant come back with a redesign. Mr. Passanisi replied that the applicant would have to make a new application and Planning Commission would review it for conformance. If it met the criteria then it would go before the Subdivision Committee again and it would then be approved.

Commissioner Radcliffe stated that anything that is approved for these lots would have certain parking requirements so that should not add to the neighborhood street parking. Mr. Mehra replied that each house would have to provide two off-street parking spaces. Commissioner Radcliff stated that the project should not have much of an impact as far as parking in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Paulson asked how the lot lines were drawn and why they were put there. Mr. Mehra replied that because the parcels have a minimum average lot width and lot size which the applicant has to meet. This configuration yields the required lot widths 50 feet and minimum lot sizes of 6,000 square feet.

Commissioner Claire asked how many lots can be put on this site. Mr. Mehra replied about five lots.

PUBLIC HEARING

Gary Ernst, applicant, stated that the property lines are at such angles because average lot depth of 2 ½ times of the lot width. He is trying to build homes that conform to the neighborhood in home and lot size rather than just fewer homes that would have to be larger.

M/S (Cronin) to close Public Hearing

Motion Passed

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chair Seybert stated that the word most debated was the term “Generally”. What is being asked here is not to bend the ordinance, but to clarify the term generally. In one case generally was taken to mean that two out of the four lots do not meet the requirements. Generally the entire project doesn’t conform, versus “generally” that out of four lots there was a grand total of just seven feet over the requirements. This was the discussion that took place at the General Plan Sub-Committee meeting.

M/S (Claire/Radcliffe) motion to uphold the decision of the Sub-Division Committee and approve the tentative parcel map.

Motion passed 6-0

6. SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) – SCOPING SESSION LOCATION: 420, 440, and 450 Broadway EA-2005-04 (Public Hearing)

➤ Purpose of Scoping Session

To obtain early input that will help to define the scope and breadth of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Stanford Outpatient Center Project

➤ **Stanford Outpatient Center Project Description**

Stanford Medical Clinic Outpatient Center at 420, 430, 440 & 450 Broadway

- Four Existing commercial buildings comprised of 360,500 square feet
- On 11-acre portion of the 48-acre Midpoint Technology Park campus

The Midpoint Technology Park campus is an approved 1,070,658 square foot office/R&D commercial park

➤ **Stanford Outpatient Center Programs and Services**

- **Core Programs** – Musculoskeletal Center, Spine Center, Sleep Disorder Center, Outpatient Surgery Center, Imaging Center, Dermatology Center, Pain Management Center, and Primary Care Center;
- **Clinical Outpatient Services** – Physical and Occupational Therapy center, and a Laboratory;
- **Patient Services** – Educational Library, In-House Conference Center, Pharmacy, and Cafeteria;
- **Central Support Services** – Materials Management, Sterile Processing, and Environmental Services; and
- **Administrative Support Services (temporary uses)** – Registration, Information Technology, and Medical Records. Will eventually become clinic space.

Each of the Core Programs would include teaching and clinical research functions in addition to its outpatient health care function.

Urgent care, emergency room, and in-patient hospital services will not be provided.

➤ **Stanford Outpatient Center Staffing, Patients & Operations**

▪ **Number of Employees & Patients**

- Maximum employee staffing/day would be 670+/-
- Maximum number of patients/day = 1,032+/-; Average patients/day = 855 +/-

Days/Hours of Operation – Monday through Friday only

▪ **Scheduled Patient Visits**

- Appointments – 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM
- Outpatient surgery – 7:00 AM – 6:00 PM
- Sleep Center – Open 24 hours a day

▪ **Unscheduled Patient Visits**

- Users of the health library, laboratory and pharmacy

➤ **Stanford Outpatient Center Staffing Proposed Tenant Improvements**

- **Patient Drop-off Area** – leading to covered walkways & building entrances;
- **Covered Walkways** – leading from curbside drop-off points to front doors;

- **Enclosed Pedestrian Bridges** – replace 3 uncovered pedestrian bridges;
- **Covered Loading Dock** – rear loading dock roof between 430-440 Broadway;
- **Rooftop Mechanical Systems** – HVAC fan systems and rooftop screen walls;
- **Emergency Generator** – two new & one replacement with screening;
- **Underground Storm Water Retention Basin** – beneath surface parking lot, possibly at NE site quadrant;
- **Landscaping & Other Site Modification** – “Campus Quad”, outdoor dining terrace, decorative paving, seating areas & street trees;
- **Signs (Parapet & Monument)** – freeway & entrances.

➤ **CEQA History & Process**

Midpoint Technology Park Project EIR & Supplemental EIR

- On December 17, 1996, the Planning Commission certified the Midpoint Technology Park Campus EIR.
- On December 1, 1998, the Planning Commission also certified the 415 Broadway Supplemental EIR (a proposed 60,000 square foot addition to an approved 47,000 square foot office/R&D building). However, due to the recent economic downturn, this approved 107,700 square foot building was not constructed. The parcel remains in use as a surface parking lot.

Stanford Outpatient Center Project Supplemental EIR

The Stanford Supplemental EIR will address only the differences between the proposed project and the original office/R7D project described and evaluated in the 1996 Midpoint Technology Park EIR and 1998 Supplemental EIR.

➤ **Stanford Outpatient Center Potential Environmental Impacts**

The environmental factors checked below may be affected by this project:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Land Use/Planning
- Public Services
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

➤ **Next Steps**

- **Planning Commission Hearings –**
 1. Stanford Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – 3/06 or 4/06
 2. Stanford Final Supplemental EIR certification, PD Amendment (site, building and landscape improvements) & Use Permit (parking variance & outdoor emergency generator)
- **Architectural Review Committee**
Recommendation to Planning Commission on building & signage Improvements
- **Other City Ministerial Approvals:**
 - Grading, building, water and sewer hook-ups
- **Other anticipated jurisdictional reviews and approvals include:**
 - City/Council Association of Governments of San Mateo County (in its role as the Congestion Management Agency) – Approval of a Transportation Impact Analysis
 - San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board – Approval of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Radcliffe asked Senior Planner Riordan to clarify the number of employees because in the original EIR the employee numbers were greater than what was just given (of 670 employees at Stanford).

Ray Pendro, Wagstaff & Associates EIR Consultant, replied the number of employees under Midpoint Technology Park was projected to be greater. The issue that is being looked at here is related to people on the site as generated by the visitors who have appointments. The number of employees would be less but we are examining potentially greater traffic because of the appointments of people coming and going.

Commissioner Radcliff asked if traffic would be a little more equalized over the day versus peak coming and going to a job. Mr. Pendro replied without having done the research in general that is correct.

Commissioner Radcliffe asked if theoretically the traffic would be a little more spread out throughout the day versus rush hours. Mr. Pendro replied the EIR would still identify peak hour's morning appointments.

Ms. Riordan mentioned when the original EIR was approved there was a 107,000 square foot office, R&D building, that was approved and certified by the Planning Commission, but was never built because of the "dot com bust." They never did build the buildings and that may weigh out some of the impacts that Stanford could have.

Commissioner Cronin mentioned if the additional building would have been built and staffed then were the numbers going to be less than what are proposed with Stanford?

Chair Seybert asked if the numbers studied will be compared to what the potential build out could have been, not what was actually built. Mr. Pendro replied that was correct, but one issue to keep in mind is that the EIR requires them to examine impacts based on the existing environments. For example, your traffic report will have current traffic counts at intersections because those conditions changed since 1996 and the outpatient center will be added into the existing traffic conditions. Any conditions that have changed since 1996 have to be looked at as new.

PUBLIC HEARING

Janet Borgens attended the meeting presenting the Friendly Acres Neighborhood's issues and concerns for the neighborhood. She asked where will the on-site fuel storage be located or is currently located on the property. If there is an emergency transportation need, what agency will be responsible for that and will Stanford handle the emergency or will it tax some of the neighborhoods services? What is the regulation for the overflow parking in the neighborhood? Currently what is being advertised to get to the site is via Marsh Road to Page Street to Second Avenue, which is directly through the Friendly Acres neighborhood. Is there a way to work with Stanford to put out a different map via Bay Road or Rolison? Neighbors would like to see better signage on the location, how to get to the site. She is concerned because the neighborhood is in a flood zone and would like to make sure the testing isn't just done for the EIR, but that it is done periodically. There is an apartment complex that is currently there (Broadway Towers) and because they are so high they will be getting the blunt of any of the air or noise pollutants. Neighbors would like the applicant to be respectful to current tenants.

Chair Seybert recommended that these comments be put in written form and given to staff and Planning Commissioners as well as the recommendations.

Mr. Passanisi stated that there will be a public review period once the EIR draft is completed and it will be an opportunity for neighbors to present those suggestions at that time.

Eric Schwimmer, researcher with Service Employees International Union Local 715 a labor union representing about twenty eight thousand public and private sector workers in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties. Fourteen Hundred of those workers work at Stanford's two hospitals and a number of those workers, about seven hundred of their members, live in Redwood City and approximately three hundred live in the zip code 94063. As a labor union interested in the welfare of the members, both as employees and also as residents, they consider themselves a stake holder in this project. Mr. Schwimmer passed out a petition to staff and Planning Commission members. It was presented to the City Council on December 19, 2005 with two thousand signatures of Redwood City residents most of them from the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the project site. In this petition it is very clear that the community is concerned about a lot of the issues that the friendly acres neighborhood association is very concerned about: good jobs and access to health care. He supported the idea of developing a list of community development principals that would apply to Stanford's project and future development projects.

M/S (Cronin/Codding) to close public hearing
Motion Passed

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Claire asked when Excite@Home was occupied, Bay Road took the brunt of the traffic and a vast majority of patients utilizing this facility will be coming from the south. The City needs to take a particular look at that and do some research and studies as to whether or not that traffic pattern will mostly be on Bay Road and try to avoid Woodside Road at all costs. He is interested in the economic impact, if any, and whether or not that plays a role in the EIR. We have two hospitals in our community and there should be an EIR section devoted to the economics of this facility in Redwood City that would be appropriate. Commissioner Claire commented that Wagstaff & Associates did a very good job with the rest of the document.

Mr. Pendro replied that the traffic intersections and distribution are being worked out very closely with Redwood City Traffic Engineer Rich Haygood. Under CEQA, economic impact is not included in an EIR unless a physical impact from one of those issues on the checklist would result. These studies result in speculation which is also not required under CEQA. Just because it is not inside the covers of the EIR doesn't mean someone can't ask to do that work.

Commissioner Claire asked Mr. Pendro if any traffic counts were taken during the time that Excite@Home was on Bay Road. Mr. Pendro replied no.

Commissioner Paulson asked a question on behalf of Mayor Pierce: did the original EIR discuss childcare, would it be appropriate for this new EIR to address child care needs and issues or would it be more appropriate to discuss that when the project comes up.

Ms. Riordan replied more likely when the project comes up. Mr. Pendro added that it is not in this scope of work, but as for to other EIR that was prepared for Redwood City Wagstaff & Associates put in a short section on childcare for information only. The child care coordinator for the City provided Wagstaff with information and a couple of paragraphs were added directly about child care in Redwood City.

Commissioner Paulson asked about the Economic issues: Who got the notice or who will get the notice, because in the final Draft EIR there were strong letters against the initial EIR from Pacific Shores. What measures were completed and accomplished in the original EIR, did they do the job and if not how is that going to affect this EIR?

Mr. Pendro responded that mitigation measures can still be applied. Measure would be repeated as one of the conditions of project approval from the original EIR. If you have an opportunity to apply mitigation measures that have already been adopted for the site, plus the supplemental EIR, it will add additional mitigation measures in other areas if the impact is different or substantially greater.

Commissioner Paulson asked about the building that did not get built and does Stanford have a right to build on that property.

Ms. Riordan replied that Stanford does not own the property that the building is on.

Commissioner Cronin needed clarification on the need for an underwater stormwater retention basin; it was not in the original design, has something happened since then to make that necessary.

Mr. Pendro replied that since the site was vacant it is in fact meeting the requirement because it is restricting the flow in the pipe underground.

Commissioner Radcliffe brought up the original EIR and discussed the interchange on Broadway and Woodside Road, how is the upgrading of that intersection going to affect the traffic? The intersection has still not been upgraded and is there any background as to when that will actually happen.

Commissioner Coddling referred to the petition Mr. Schwimmer presented, and stated it includes good paying jobs, which Mr. Coddling assumes is part of any economic study. The labor union should be a party brought into this EIR, so that what is being addressed can be discussed.

Mr. Pendro suggested that any clarifying comments not wait for the EIR to be drafted and for public to provide staff with a checklist at the end of the week by mail or e-mail.

Chair Seybert asked why not just completely overturn the EIR that was done? It is important that the EIR address what the impacts of this project could be versus what could have been if the buildings were fully occupied.

Mr. Pendro replied what could have been can be identified as one of the alternatives in the alternative chapter and go through the same environmental issues if the information can be pieced together. The supplemental EIR is required for this site because you have a certified EIR for the project on a site whose mitigations you can still apply to anyone who wants to develop on this site. The original EIR can no longer be challenged in court and you are able to use that EIR as conditions of approval to help identify impacts. The important part is that the supplemental EIR does not eliminate the need to evaluate environmental impacts. You get to use both documents, mitigation measures that are still applicable plus new mitigation measures in the supplemental EIR. The Supplemental EIR has the identical public notification and review requirements of an EIR. If you were starting an EIR from scratch you still have a 45 day draft EIR review. Consultants have to respond to all written comments pertinent to Environmental impacts and public hearings. The term supplemental EIR is a technical term in the CEQA guidelines and is not removing any review or evaluation requirements. It is just adding the existing EIR for you to use for mitigation requirements for this project

City Attorney Yamamoto stated that CEQA is a state statute and is not a municipal ordinance. They are state guidelines that are adopted that the City is required to follow. One of the guidelines talks about the use and encourages public agencies to use existing documents and EIR's because what the state was concerned about was unnecessary delay and the costs of going through the CEQA process and to the extent that municipal agencies, for our purposes, are able to use existing EIR's or supplemental EIR's. That is what the state law encourages so it isn't a simple matter if the state law allows us to do it, that is rely upon previously certified EIR's, but in fact doing so it meets the very purpose of the states stature.

Mr. Passanisi stated that the consultant will take this input given tonight, including discussions and topics, and prepare the draft EIR. It is then scheduled for a 45 day public review period. The consultant will then prepare the Final EIR (the draft including response to comments). The final EIR will be certified by the Planning Commission meaning that it complies with CEQA. The certification can always be appealed to the City Council, if need be. The Draft EIR will be prepared in about three to four months.

7. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST

➤ **General Plan Update**

The public and Planning Commission will experience the next open public process. There will be a series of community workshops that will present developed ideals that turned into the guiding principals. The next public process will be a series of community workshops in various formats and locations where the community will be able to give some input on land use ideas.

Commissioner Cronin stated when these meetings take place it needs to be clearly identified as to what was heard and feedbacks on the meetings to the public.

➤ **Neighborhood meeting on Mezesville/Centennial Neighborhood Historic Designation (Monday, Feb. 13 – Orion School at 6:30 PM)**

Planning Commission members are invited to attend and discuss the neighborhood historic designation of Mezesville

Commissioner Radcliffe added that the last meeting held on this item was very well received. Commissioners Paulson and Coddling will be attending.

➤ **Neighborhood meeting on the Tuscan Tower Precise Plan Project (Tuesday, January 31 – Orion School at 6:30 PM)**

The date has changed to February 7, 2006.

Chair Seybert read an e-mail from Patricia Wright a member of the Redwood City School Board. "Redwood City School District is beginning to plan for the future with new school sites. Could you give us any insights into what plans are on the table of future growth in Pete's Harbor, the Cargill Salts area, the Century 12 area? We have little space now, if any, for schools and minor influx could have disastrous consequences when it comes to families moving into the district." Chair Seybert recommended the school board be advised on any major developments in Redwood City and would ask school board to put thoughts in writing to distribute to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Passanisi stated that he would make contact with Redwood City school board staff.

Commissioner Claire stated that he would not be attending the next two Planning Commission meetings in February.

7. ADJOURNMENT

M/S: (Claire/Cronin) to adjourn the meeting in memory of Mario Biagi a former Chairman of the Planning Commission, former Mayor, and former Council Member of Redwood City who passed away on January 4, 2006.

Motion Passed

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m. to reconvene at the next Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for February 7, 2006 at 7:00PM in the City Hall Council Chamber, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, California.