

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION****STAFF REPORT****WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2017****5. STUDY SESSION****5.1 North Bayshore Precise Plan – Land Use and Transportation Topics****RECOMMENDATION**

That the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) provide input on North Bayshore Precise Plan land use and transportation topics.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The Commission's agenda is advertised on Channel 26, and the agenda and this report appear on the City's Internet website at www.mountainview.gov. Notices were also sent to the North Bayshore Precise Plan interested parties list.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

The purpose of this meeting is to present North Bayshore Precise Plan land use and transportation topics that are further refinements of previously presented topics and discussion related to adding residential uses in North Bayshore. The EPC will discuss and provide input on these topics which will be forwarded to the City Council. No formal action will be taken at this meeting.

BACKGROUNDProcess Update

The following are summary comments from the most recent Council and EPC meetings on the North Bayshore Precise Plan.

City Council Meeting – April 25, 2017

- Maintain the Plan's proposed household characteristics for smaller unit size mix and a parking maximum of 0.6 space per unit, but allow this to be phased in over time by allowing more parking for initial projects.

- Study a new Stevens Creek transit-only bridge at Charleston Road; potentially allow carpool use of the bridge.
- Study a new Charleston Road underpass of Highway 101.
- Include a residential vehicle trip performance standard.
- Study the feasibility of reducing the Plan's single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) rate for office at some point in the future (though not a high priority).
- Include a district transportation performance monitoring policy and action item.
- A congestion pricing study is not recommended now, but this could be potentially considered in the future.

EPC Meeting—April 20, 2017

- Maintain the Plan's proposed household characteristics for smaller unit size mix and a parking maximum of 0.6 space per unit; important to restrict.
- Majority support for a Stevens Creek bridge at Charleston Road; some support for carpool in addition to transit.
- Support for a new Charleston Road underpass of Highway 101.
- Support for adding a trip performance standard; should be consequences if projects do not meet the standard.
- Majority support for a feasibility study to reduce the SOV rate for office; not a priority item.
- Support a congestion pricing feasibility study, but low priority.
- Support for a district transportation performance monitoring policy and action item.

ANALYSIS

The following is a discussion and proposed text to address key remaining Precise Plan land use and transportation policy issues.

Policy Issue No. 1: Residential Units and Gateway Capacity

The EPC and City Council reviewed transportation analysis in April 2017 regarding the number of residential units that could be supported by the planned transportation infrastructure in the area (i.e., a new Highway 101 off-ramp; a realigned Space Park Way; a new north-south Inigo Way extension; and other improvements). In sum, the transportation analysis revealed that the existing gateways, plus the Plan's priority transportation improvements, could support a maximum of between 1,500 and 3,000 residential units in North Bayshore, depending on the parking ratio. More restrictive parking standards will limit the number of vehicles on-site, thereby generating less project vehicle trips. Therefore, the Precise Plan team estimates that approximately 1,500 units could be accommodated in North Bayshore with a 1.2 parking space/unit standard while approximately 3,000 units could be accommodated with a 0.6 parking space/unit standard (Draft Plan standard). The City will continue to monitor the timing of the improvements, any proposed residential development, and any gateway vehicle capacity to ensure new entitlements will not exceed the North Bayshore "trip cap."

The following draft "residential phasing policy" reflects the findings of the additional transportation analysis completed earlier this year. It is proposed to provide clarity on the amount, timing, and tracking of new residential development in North Bayshore.

Phase I Residential. *Phase I Residential of the North Bayshore Precise Plan shall allow between 1,500 to 3,000 new dwelling units. Tracking of Phase I progress will occur either through the North Bayshore Precise Plan annual district transportation monitoring or through individual development projects. As the number of occupied dwelling units in North Bayshore approaches approximately 1,500, the City Council shall review development progress in the area, and how it may limit or allow additional dwelling units beyond Phase I. The City Council shall then consider adopting a policy allowing an additional phase of residential growth. The policy could state how many residential units could be permitted and any additional conditions for the next phase of residential development.*

Comments:

- The proposed language gives Council a clear “check-in” point when they can consider additional information and decide if more residential units could be allowed. If the policy language is not adopted, Council will still have information provided to them biannually (through the trip cap reports) that could also be used to inform how much residential development should be permitted.
- The proposed language does not limit Council’s ability to adopt the North Bayshore Precise Plan and certify an EIR that could allow up to 9,850 residential units.

Question No. 1: Does the EPC support including a Phase I residential growth policy for the Precise Plan?

Policy Issue No. 2: Office Development

The 2015 North Bayshore Precise Plan “Bonus FAR” process determined which proposed office projects in North Bayshore would be eligible to submit a development application. Through this process, all of the office square footage certified in the 2014 North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR (approximately 3.4 million square feet) has been allocated. The Draft Precise Plan does include policy language to allow demolished office FAR to be transferred but not add any additional office FAR beyond this amount.

The following language is proposed to track and monitor new development and would also require Council Gatekeeper approval for any additional development proposals, primarily office development, that would exceed what will be certified in the updated North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR.

Maximum Allowable Development. *The Planning Division shall monitor development in North Bayshore to ensure it does not exceed the maximum allowable net new development certified in the North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR (i.e., 9,850 units and 3.6 million square feet of office commercial uses). Any proposals exceeding this amount of net new development shall require City Council “Gatekeeper” authorization, in addition to any other development review requirements or processes, including, but not limited to, Master Plans and any additional CEQA review.*

Question No. 2: Does the EPC support a Precise Plan policy to require Gatekeeper authorization for development that exceeds what was certified in the North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR?

Policy Issue No. 3: Master Plans

Master Plans

The Draft Precise Plan allows Master Plans to be submitted to provide an integrated approach to larger phased development projects, particularly mixed-use office and residential developments. It allows applicants to receive approval of a Master Plan and allow a streamlined development review process with future Planned Community Permits that conform to the adopted Master Plan. Per previous Council direction, the EPC shall recommend approval of a Master Plan to the City Council. Future Planned Community Permits in conformance with an approved Master Plan shall then be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator who will forward a recommendation to the City Council.

As noted above, all of the office FAR in the Precise Plan area has been allocated. However, to maximize the potential for creating complete neighborhoods in North Bayshore, the Precise Plan could add an action item specifying under what conditions additional office development could be considered if granted Gatekeeper authorization by the City Council. The following draft action item acknowledges this potential scenario.

North Bayshore Master Planning. *Additional net new office development beyond what was certified in the North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR may be considered only if the City Council provides "Gatekeeper" authorization and is part of a Master Plan application. Any Master Plan application under this authorization shall identify the locations and size of new office, residential, retail, and other uses, and how the uses are integrated to meet the Precise Plan's vision and intent, complete neighborhood strategy, affordable housing goals, and other standards and guidelines, including any necessary area transportation infrastructure improvements. The Master Plan shall also fund any additional transportation analysis and improvements in order to comply with the North Bayshore Precise Plan trip cap. Additional CEQA analysis or other City requirements may also be required.*

Comments:

- The proposed Precise Plan action item acknowledges that Master Plans could be used by applicants to propose future additional office development under

certain conditions, such as complying with key Precise Plan goals like providing substantial amounts of new housing, including affordable housing.

- Any Master Plan proposing new office development could result in funding of significant new transportation infrastructure identified in the Precise Plan area, such as a new Stevens Creek transit bridge at Charleston Road, the Highway 101 underpass at Charleston Road, or other potential strategies.
- Any development requesting additional office square footage would be subject to the Precise Plan's Bonus FAR tier system, which could require community benefits as was reviewed during the Bonus FAR allocation process in 2015.
- The Sobrato Project at 1255 Pear Avenue is using a similar process to determine how their new office development will address any transportation issues, particularly new office trips.
- An applicant could still propose a Gatekeeper application regardless of this policy language; however, this action item language acknowledges the process and potential benefits with an application for additional office development.

Question No. 3: Does the EPC support a Precise Plan action item specifying a Master Plan application process for additional office square footage if granted by Council through the Gatekeeper process?

Policy Issue No. 4: Schools

City staff has been communicating with local school districts regarding the North Bayshore Precise Plan EIR. The school district has submitted comments on the document, and the City will respond formally to their comments as part of the Final EIR. The school district believes the City can dedicate/require land for a new school, and the City is continuing to discuss the legal issues surrounding this with the school district.

The following is proposed additional draft Precise Plan policy language regarding how the City could assist local schools.

- ***City and School District Collaboration.*** Assist local school districts in identifying potential school locations to serve North Bayshore growth.

- ***Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).*** Allow areas adjacent to North Bayshore, such as the Terra Bella or North Rengstorff areas, that identify a location for a new school site to use Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). These school sites can transfer their unused site FAR to any location in the City at the discretion of the City Council. If extra office FAR in North Bayshore becomes available in the future, potential school sites in North Bayshore can transfer any unused FAR using TDR to any location in the City at the discretion of the City Council.
- ***City and School District Partnerships.*** Continue partnerships with local school districts on sharing of open space at school sites.

Comments:

- Beyond the proposed draft policy language, the City will continue to actively discuss strategies to support local school districts. The City Manager's Office will continue to update the City Council on these discussions.
- Land donation or financial contributions to local school districts for new school facilities are included in the Bonus FAR community benefit list in Section 3.3.4.

Question No. 4: Does the EPC support draft Precise Plan policy language regarding City and school district collaboration?

Policy Issue No. 5: Updated Vehicle Trip Cap

The adopted North Bayshore Precise Plan vehicle trip cap is 18,900 inbound a.m. peak-period vehicle trips. This number was established in 2014 to address gateway congestion and the significant inbound trips from new office development.

An updated trip cap is recommended based on additional Precise Plan transportation analysis, particularly how new residential uses affect traffic flow and movement at the gateways. The proposed new trip cap would be **22,390** inbound and outbound a.m. vehicle trips (17,010 inbound; 5,370 outbound) and would be based on the Precise Plan project description of up to 9,850 residential units (40 percent micro-units; 30 percent 1-bedroom; 20 percent 2-bedroom; and 10 percent 3-bedroom) and up to 3.6 million square feet of net new office and commercial uses.

Comments:

- A “two-way” vehicle trip cap is recommended as both inbound and outbound trips can be monitored to reflect changing vehicle patterns from new residential uses.
- The proposed cap of 17,010 inbound trips is less than previous adopted 18,900 inbound trips because new residential outbound trips crossing or turning onto Shoreline Boulevard would lengthen traffic-light timing at the gateway, thereby restricting the amount of vehicles that can enter into North Bayshore.
- The June 2017 trip cap report included a total inbound a.m. peak-period vehicle total of approximately 12,000 vehicles across all three North Bayshore gateways, with Shoreline Boulevard being the most congested gateway.

Question No. 5: Does the EPC support adjusting the North Bayshore trip cap to reflect the Precise Plan’s proposed land use changes?

Policy Issue No. 6: Parking

As noted earlier, Council directed that the Plan maintain an average parking maximum of 0.6 space per unit but allow this to be phased in over time by allowing more parking for initial residential projects. The following draft language responds to this direction by allowing a flexible but clear process for how parking maximums can be phased in.

Parking Maximum Exception. Projects requesting a higher parking maximum than permitted by the Plan shall submit a parking study completed by a traffic engineer. The request shall follow the process and requirements outlined in Section 3.5.6 of the Plan (Development Standard Exceptions).

The parking study shall include a justification to support an alternative parking maximum. The study shall include, but is not limited to, the following: comparison of parking rates between the proposed project and similar projects, including density, mix of units, FAR, market data, office/residential internalization rates, available TMA services, and TDM strategies; and a confirmation that surrounding commercial parking facilities are infeasible to be shared by the proposed residential project. Information from the City’s North Bayshore District transportation performance monitoring, including recent transportation infrastructure improvements, may also be used to help inform a project’s specific parking ratio.

The study shall also include a strategy for monitoring and reporting parking usage at the site, and shall recommend a process and design strategy for eliminating and converting excess parking spaces to other uses, such as usable building area, electric vehicle (EV) charging or car-share spaces, personal storage, bike parking, amenity areas, landscaping, etc.

Comments:

- This approach provides flexibility for new development to be phased in at different parking ratios greater than the 0.6 average space per unit maximum standard. It would be challenging to adopt strict parking maximums for different phases of residential development in the area. The amount of parking needed by phased development would depend on the mix and size of units as well as other factors such as TDM strategies, shared parking, or percentage of trip internalization.

Question No. 6: Does the EPC support the Precise Plan's proposed parking maximum exception policy language?

Other Topics

The EPC and City Council previously provided direction on several other Precise Plan policy topics noted below. Additional edits on these topics will be included in the final Draft Precise Plan to be considered by the EPC and City Council at adoption hearings in the fall.

- **Policy Language**
 - *District Transportation Performance Monitoring.* Expand the trip cap report to monitor and report on the district's transportation performance, including data that supports additional residential development in North Bayshore.
 - *Residential Vehicle Trip Performance Standard.* Include a new residential vehicle trip performance standard to ensure new residential development limits their number of new vehicle trips.
- **Action items**
 - *Feasibility Studies.* Add Stevens Creek transit bridge feasibility study, Highway 101/Charleston Road underpass feasibility study; add SOV

feasibility study (low priority) and congestion pricing study (potential future study).

- **Other**

- *Bonus FAR Guidelines Amendment.* These guidelines are proposed to be amended to include a December 1, 2018 deadline for 2015 Bonus FAR recipients to submit a development application to the City.
- *Urban Design.* In the Fall, staff will be proposing some additional edits to the draft urban design standards and guidelines to provide more clarity on the Plan's urban design vision for a new urban neighborhood in North Bayshore.

Question No. 7: Does the EPC have any other Precise Plan policy-related questions?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, staff is seeking EPC comments on the topics included in this report.

NEXT STEPS

The City Council will consider this item at their June 27 meeting. The Draft Precise Plan will then be finalized based on any direction from this meeting. EPC and Council meetings will then be scheduled to consider adoption of the Precise Plan.

Prepared by:

Martin Alkire
Principal Planner

Approved by:

Randal Tsuda
Community Development Director

MA/5/CDD
891-06-21-17SR-E