MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
March 21, 2017
Regular Meeting
7:00 p.m.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Guerrero, Commissioner Hale, Commissioner Hunter, Commissioner Schmidt, Commissioner White, Vice Chair Bondonno and Chair Radcliffe

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Turner, Assistant City Attorney Rasiah, Assistant City Manager Aknin, Housing Rehabilitation Specialist Avila, Associate Planner Adams

GUESTS: None

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

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

1. ROLL CALL
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None
4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None
5. CONSENT CALENDAR: No items
6. STAFF REPORT
   A. Annual Action Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) Programs – Fiscal Year 2017-18

Commissioner Bondonno recused himself from this item as he owns rental property that is in close proximity to one of the items that may receive funding.

Housing Rehabilitation Specialist Avila gave a presentation on the following:

Consolidated Plan / Annual Action Plan

As a condition of receiving federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) the City must prepare, adopt, and submit
a three or five year Consolidated Plan (Plan) to HUD. The City has prepared a three-year Plan and Fiscal Year 2017-18 represents the third and final year of the Plan. The Plan is a strategic policy document that provides priorities and strategies for meeting the needs of the low-income community members. The process for preparing the Plan involves assessing the needs of the community with stakeholders and establishing priorities and strategies for the use of the federal funding resources. The Plan consists of three major components: a Community Needs Assessment; the three or five year Priority Needs and Strategies; and an Annual Action Plan that identifies the programs and activities to be funded with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds each year of the three or five year plan.

The Consolidated Plan is carried out through Annual Action Plans, which provide a concise summary of the actions, activities, and the specific federal and non-federal resources that will be used each year to address the priority needs and specific goals identified by the Consolidated Plan. The Action Plan includes an executive summary (Attachment 1) and budget (Attachment 2) which identifies sources of funding, specific activities recommended for funding, and required narrative regarding the location of activities to be funded.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Hale asked if 1512 Stafford housing is for low and very low income or want if they want to make it available for low and very low income. She also asked if there will be existing tenants coming over and if this is solely for the acquisition or are there improvements that need to be made.

Specialist Avila stated that the property is naturally affordable and there are no restrictions on it for it to be affordable. The tenants that currently reside in the building will continue to. She further stated that it is simply for acquisition.

Commissioner Hunter asked if the funds are secure or if they are at the whim of whatever Congress passes.

Specialist Avila stated that they have received advice from the US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development to continue as they normally do in the process to meet regulatory statutes for fiscal year 2017-18. She stated they were advised that there will probably be a 10% decrease in funding but it is unknown for fiscal year 2018-19. She further stated that if it should be over or under 20% of the funding received, they would have to go back to the House and Human Concerns Committee.

M/S (Schmidt/Hale) to recommend approval of the Annual Action Plan of the CDBG and the Home Program fiscal year 2017-18 to the City Council.
Motion Passed 6-0

M/S (Schmidt/Hale) to determine capital projects in the 2017-18 Annual Action Plan conform to the General Plan.
7. PUBLIC HEARING:
A. Request by Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco for a Downtown Planned Community Permit (DPC2015-011) including fifteen guideline deviations, Tentative map and Condominium Permit (TM2015-007), Planned Development Permit (PD2016-006), Density Bonus Parking Ration and Parking Reduction, to develop a new 6-story, 24,239 square foot, residential condominium building consisting of 20 affordable housing units at 612 Jefferson Avenue

Associate Planner Adams gave a presentation on the following:

The project site is a 5,015 square foot vacant lot with 50-feet of frontage on Jefferson Avenue. Historically the lot contained a single-family dwelling, but it has been vacant since the mid-1980s when the residence was demolished. The site is within the Downtown General Use Zone of the Downtown Precise Plan (DTPP), and the surrounding uses include multi-family residential and offices. Under the DTPP the site has a maximum building height of 12-stories/136 feet. In terms of the allowed architectural character, the site is in the North of Marshall District which allows for the broadest range of architectural styles, including Contemporary, Art Deco, Mediterranean, Craftsman, and Neoclassical. The block on which the site is located contains three historic resources: 620 Jefferson Avenue, 605 Middlefield Road, and 611 Middlefield Road.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project includes a request for a Tentative Map to subdivide one parcel for condominium purposes, and the development of 20 affordable residential condominium units. The units would be sold only to persons/families that qualify at or below the low-income level of affordability.

The ground floor of the building would contain an enclosed garage with a mechanical car stacking system for the parking of 14 vehicles, as well as one regular accessible parking stall. The ground floor would also contain a pedestrian entrance facing on Jefferson Avenue, a lobby, an elevator, two sets of stairs, a bike storage room, and building operation rooms (mechanical/electrical, trash, etc.). A mezzanine level above the garage would contain an exit corridor to provide a secondary means of egress to the street at the southeast corner of the building. Floors 2 through 6 would each contain four residential condominiums. Each of these five floors would contain one 1-bedroom unit, two 2-bedroom units, and one 3-bedroom unit. Three of the units on the second floor would have private outdoor patios.

The building’s architectural style would be consistent with the Contemporary Architectural Character Type, which is permitted in the North of Marshall District. The overall proposed height of the building is 80’ 5” to the top of the parapet, with the rooftop elevator and mechanical rooms, and a stairwell extending an additional 6-feet.
beyond the parapet height, all of which is well below the maximum heights of the DTPP. The Building Disposition Type is Rearyard, which is intended to shift building masses forward to create spatial definition for the street, and to create a relatively open central area in the back of the lot.

Historic Resources Review and HRAC Recommendation

The project site is located adjacent to three historic resources: 620 Jefferson Ave.; 605 Middlefield Rd.; and, 611 Middlefield Rd. Of these three properties, 620 Jefferson Ave. and 611 Middlefield Rd. are identified in the DTPP as Historic Resources to be Preserved, and 605 Middlefield Rd. is a Historic Resource which may be Altered, Relocated, or Removed.

The report by Mr. Brandi concluded that the Project would not have any adverse effects on the historic resources, and that they would still be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources since the project does not physically touch or alter the resources, and because the historical feeling and setting of the downtown area has changed greatly since the construction of the three historic resources. At their special meeting of November 17, 2016, the HRAC voted 4-0 that, upon reviewing the historian’s report and other associated materials, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the surrounding historic resources, and that they will remain eligible for listing in the California Register.

DTPP Guidelines and AAC Recommendation

Pursuant to Section 2.0.3, projects that conform to the DTPP Standards, but not the Guidelines, shall be reviewed by the AAC to determine the acceptability of the aspects of the project which do not conform to the Guidelines. As originally proposed, the project sought deviations from ten DTPP design Guidelines. At their October 20, 2016 meeting, the AAC reviewed the proposed project and the requested deviations. The Committee voted 3-0 to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the proposal with nine of the ten requested Guideline deviations. The one deviation recommended for denial by the AAC pertained to the size of the rear yard area. The AAC voted to recommend denial unless the Applicant revised the project to either: (1) meet the guideline recommendation for the minimum rear yard size of 800 square feet; or (2) include more open space, and/or create a design that allows most of the units to have access to light and air.

The Applicant revised the plans to increase the size of the rear yard to 625 square feet from 480 square feet, and to address some of the AAC’s general architectural design comments and suggestions. During its review of the revised plans, Staff identified two additional deviations pertaining to the newly proposed bay windows, as well as three deviations relating to the window inset depths. The revised plans were then reviewed by the AAC at their December 1, 2016 meeting. Upon their review and discussion of the revised plans, the
AAC voted 3-0 to recommend approval of the deviations related to the bay windows and window inset depths, and to again deny the deviation for the rear yard size. In summary, the AAC recommended approval of fourteen of the fifteen guideline deviations that were requested.

State Density Bonus Law Parking Ratio and DTPP Parking Reduction

Based on the unit and bedroom count of the proposed residential units, the Project would require 28 parking spaces per the regulations of the Downtown Parking Zone; however, provisions in the State Density Bonus (SDB) law (Government Code 65915 (p) (2)), allow qualifying development applicants to request a reduction in the amount of required parking. The State law says that, upon the request of the developer of a project that includes the maximum percentage of low or very-low income units, the city shall not impose a parking ratio (inclusive of handicapped and guest parking) that exceeds 0.5 spaces per bedroom when the project is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, and there is unobstructed access to the transit stop (i.e. no natural or constructed impediments). All of the project’s 20 units would be provided at the low-income level of affordability, and the project site is approximately one-third of a mile from the Caltrain station via public sidewalks. Therefore, the Applicant qualifies for a reduced parking ratio not to exceed 0.5 spaces per bedroom under the State Density Bonus law, and the Applicant has made this request. The Project contains a total of 40 bedrooms, which equates to a total of 20 parking spaces if the State maximum of 0.5 spaces per bedroom is applied.

Affordable Housing Impact Fee

All new residential development projects consisting of 5 or more net new dwelling units are subject to the City’s Affordable Housing Impact Fee (AHIF) Ordinance. This is a fee imposed on new residential and commercial developments to mitigate a project’s impact on the need for affordable housing; however, residential units that are affordable in the moderate, low, very-low or extremely-low income ranges are exempt from the fee as long as they are deed-restricted at one of these income ranges. All 20 units in the project will be deed-restricted at the low-income level of affordability for a period of no less than 30 years, and therefore the Project is exempt from the AHIF.

Project Traffic Analysis

As part of the individual project environmental review for downtown projects, applicants must typically submit a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). The TIA examines the amount of traffic that would be generated from a specific development project, and how that traffic would distribute to nearby intersections. The TIA then compares the results to the cumulative trip projections in the DTPP EIR.

Due to the small size of the Project and the fact that residential uses do not generate large numbers of trips, the City determined that a
formal TIA was not required. The City’s Senior Transportation Coordinator instead prepared a memorandum outlining the project’s estimated trip generation using rates for the “Residential Condominium/Townhouse” land use category from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, Edition. The analysis also relied upon data from the TIA prepared for the 603 Jefferson residential project located directly across Jefferson Avenue. The 603 Jefferson TIA analyzed a 92-unit project; however, the project that was ultimately approved was reduced in size to 68 units.

When the Project is considered with the 68-unit project approved for 603 Jefferson, the total number of units between the two sites is less than the number of units analyzed in the TIA for 603 Jefferson (i.e. the original 92-unit project). Based on the small estimated number of trips generated by the Project and the intersection operations analysis prepared for the 603 Jefferson TIA, the memorandum concluded that the 612 Jefferson project will not result in any new significant impact or substantially increase the severity of any previously identified significant impact related to transportation, traffic, or circulation.

He stated that an initial study checklist was prepared and documented that the project is consistent with the certified Downtown Precise Plan EIR, and that Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Downtown Plan Community Permit, including the 15 guideline deviations, the tentative map, the condominium permit, planned development permit, density bonus parking ratio and parking reduction by adopting the amended Resolution 1706.

Maureen Sedonaen, CEO Habitat Greater San Francisco gave a presentation on the following:

Habitat has been a long-time developer in Redwood City and that the local chapter has built 52 homes in the last 28 years in Redwood City, and that they would like to build 20 more residential units at 612 Jefferson Avenue. Habitat has a unique funding model that serves families who cannot afford a market rate home or makes too much income for an affordable subsided rental.

Chris Haegglund, President at BAR Architects, gave a presentation on the structure to be built at 612 Jefferson Avenue.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS - NONE

PUBLIC HEARING

M/S (Bondonno/Hale) to open the public hearing

Sally Keyes of 620 Jefferson Avenue stated that she supports Habitat’s mission to provide affordable and livable housing to Redwood City residents, but that she is opposed to the current construction proposal. She expressed concern for the safety of children that play in the area. She stated that she is not opposed to the construction next to her building but that she would like the construction to champion community, livability,
health, and safety for the residents, and feels that the current proposed construction project does not provide this for their future occupants, and that the rear yard should be held to the minimum of the 800 sq. ft. of the DTTP.

Richard Keyes of 620 Jefferson Avenue stated that the construction is the wrong size for the space at 612 Jefferson.

Kevin Frederick, 605 Middlefield, stated that he opposes the project for this lot due to the size of it and the lack of adequate parking.

Geoff Carr, 605 Middlefield, stated that he is opposed to the project.

Adrienne Figone-Granahan stated that she hopes Habitat gets the project.

Teresa Ramirez, Habitat homeowner, stated that she has lived in Redwood City her entire life and owning a Habitat home changed her life and gave her and her family the opportunity to grow spiritually, financially and academically.

Marisela Diaz stated that she wants others to have the same opportunity as her family to own a Habitat property.

Patricia Bury, 1st Congregational Church of Redwood City, stated that as a preschool teacher she understands others’ concerns regarding children play area availability. She further stated that there are ways to optimize small spaces for children to have playscapes that are safe. She read a letter to the Committee from the church that states their support of the project.

Manuel Garcia, Habitat homeowner, voiced his support for the project and talked about the positive impact being a Habitat homeowner has had on him and his family.

Isabella Chu gave a presentation showing that allowing people to be in high opportunity areas has a positive impact on their health and well-being. She stated that the well-being of families moving into the new building needs to be weighed against the personal preferences of people who currently live in the area.

Julia Granahan stated that she has seen the positive affect that Habitat homes have for people and their families and that she plans to apply to this housing development.

Mollie Ricker, Dostart Development, voiced her support for the project.

Leora Tanjuatco, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County, voiced her support for the project.

Nori Jabba voiced her support for the project.

Rocio Astoquilca voiced her support for the project and the benefits it has given her and her family as residents of a Habitat property.
Shirley R. Ong, Habitat homeowner, voiced her support for the project.

Hang Ho stated that Habitat helped her obtain an affordable home on a ground floor for herself and her disabled son and voiced her support for the project.

M/S (Schmidt/White) to close the public hearing

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Schmidt asked if there is a way to dress up the concrete base of the building, maybe some vines crawling up the concrete. He asked how many feet there are between 612 and 690 Jefferson and the project architect responded that it is 3-feet. He asked if the building is blocking windows and light at 690 Jefferson, and if it is, what is the response from the building owner. He asked if the alleyway will be lit and made safe.

Stephanie Amend, BAR Architecture, stated that there is no setback at the ground level to the right side of the proposed building.

Stephanie Amend, BAR Architects, stated that there was a conversation with the City and originally the building had an opposite orientation in that the opening courtyard was facing the building on the corner with a setback in excess of 6-feet. The planning staff felt that the south facing façade with all of its windows was more desirable, and the Keyes would be more comfortable with the project facing this way as it would provide more light to the units on this side and make it more livable.

Commissioner Schmidt asked how residents moving into 612 will get light.

Stephanie Amend, BAR Architecture, stated that there are no units that rely on getting light from that direction.

Commissioner Schmidt stated that opportunities are being provided for families who would not otherwise be able to live in such a prosperous community and that the returns on that investment are huge and that he is ok with what staff recommends in regard to space for children to play.

Assistant City Manager Aknin stated that at the last Council study session they gave direction to move forward quickly with a feasibility study for a downtown park.

Commissioner Hunter stated that he appreciates the benefits the project brings to the community and that he is excited for the project. He further stated that he likes the planning elements regarding the parking. He asked if the City or the project has a means to prevent spillover effects with the unbundled parking.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that they are working with neighboring businesses to look into alternative parking for the homeowners, and also looking into permitting the street parking where people actually pay a fee for the parking permit.
Commissioner Hunter asked if there is a plan that the City has to permit parking.

Jessica Manzi, Senior Transportation Coordinator, stated that currently there are no plans to sell parking permits for on-street parking spaces.

Commissioner Hunter asked if there is a common open space.

Stephanie Amend, BAR Architecture, stated that the open space on the project is accessible directly through the unit and is not common open space.

Commissioner Hunter asked if there is a way to make it an accessible common area.

Stephanie Amend, BAR Architecture, stated that they looked at ways to take the rear yard and make it accessible to all of the tenants; however, it is very tight and a public corridor would have to be created. To do that would mean getting rid of a 2-bedroom unit and taking it down to a studio.

Chris Haegglund, President at BAR Architects, stated that if the rear yard was all common space another exit would be needed.

Commissioner Hunter stated that he agrees with the AAC’s recommendation to soften the impact of the concrete block wall that’s next to the historic building on 620 Jefferson with greenery or differentiated materials.

Commissioner Hale asked how many units Habitat has done in the Bay Area in the last five years.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that they have done 36 in Daly City and that they just closed 11 Habitat homes and 17 below market homes in San Francisco. She further stated that Redwood City has 52 homes that have been built over time and that these 20 would move that to 72.

Commissioner Hale voiced her excitement for the project. She stated that there is a park within walking distance for families and their children, and also suggested that if a living wall doesn’t work for the building then perhaps Habitat could reach out to other groups in the community that could create a mural. She asked if the three rear yard options were evaluated and what the thoughts were on them.

Stephanie Amend of BAR Architecture stated that the biggest constraint in making the space 800 square feet is that in order to do so they would have to take another 3-feet out of a unit, and that with 3-feet already having been taken out they would lose 25% of the units in the building. Regarding providing common space elsewhere in the project, they looked at making a common route through the building which would cause parking space loss. Regarding providing private open space for the providing the majority of the units with a balcony or a bay window, the majority of units do end up with a
bay window in the proposed design. In order to provide a balcony that is accessible to someone with a wheelchair and not extend more than the maximum 3-feet beyond the property line, would cut into the bedroom space and make it only 7-feet wide. They found that providing the bay window was a better option.

Commissioner Hale asked how Habitat has implemented TDM’s in other communities and how it has worked out.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that this is one of the most transit-oriented projects of all Habitat projects, and that the families at the 36-unit Daly City Habitat community are very happy to be so close to transit. She further stated that they see the half mile proximity to transit at this project on Jefferson to be very valuable to the homeowners.

Commissioner Hale stated that she would like to see more bike spaces and bike accessible routes. She also stated that 6-stories is a good compromise for a 20-unit project.

Commissioner Guerrero stated that she agrees with the recommendation from Staff regarding the common space. She also stated that she would like to see more bike spaces made available. She voiced her agreement with the other Commissioners regarding the wall.

Commissioner White expressed how happy he is with Habitat and appreciates all that the organization does for the community. He asked if there was any analysis that could have made it feasible to have open space alternatives for the property.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that they looked at the possibility of a rooftop deck area for the residents and while it was technically feasible it was not cost effective and could increase the cost of the project by about 10%.

Commissioner White asked if a solution could be developed, would it necessitate removing a unit or two to accommodate it.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that putting common space on the roof takes away space that would be utilized by solar panels that provide power for the project.

Commissioner White stated there is also a safety and liability issue with a rooftop common space.

Commissioner White voiced concern with the height of the concrete wall and would like to know what could be done to soften it.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that painting a mural or something green that imitates a living wall would be something they would definitely entertain.

Commissioner BonondoHo voiced his support for the project.
Commissioner Schmidt stated that 625 square feet is quite small and asked if it's even worth having that open space since they have the square and a park nearby. He also asked if open space is required.

Associate Planner Adams stated that the DTPP does not require common or private open space.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that if they did not have that requirement then they could potentially add additional bedrooms and living space for the families.

Commissioner Schmidt asked if the Council has looked at this.

Planning Manager Turner stated that there has been some funding that has been given to the project but it is not an endorsement of the project, and unless there is an appeal the final approval would be from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hale feels that Commissioner Schmidt's thoughts on the open space are good to bring up for discussion. She asked staff if they were to entertain an idea like that, would it be possible to make a motion this evening.

Assistant City Manager Aknin stated that if there was a change like that it would probably need to go back to the AAC for some type of review, and also some type of staff review would need to be done to make sure it meets all the disposition requirements and other guidelines, and then it would come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hale stated that she would like to see this project move forward and does not want to delay it.

Commissioner Bondonno stated he would like to leave the project as-is so it can be approved tonight.

Commissioner Schmidt asked why the project needs to be approved quickly.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that they have a sense they will be appealed and potentially have some litigation which will delay things, and that they are trying to respond to the need for the housing as much as possible. Also, they have seen an increase in the construction prices by almost $2 million just from the delays they’ve had to date.

Chair Radcliffe asked if there are any plans for parking spaces that are underparked.

Maureen Sedonaen of Habitat Greater San Francisco stated that would be up to the HOA on how they want to utilize those spaces.

Chair Radcliffe stated that she is okay with the rear yard since there is a park and a library nearby.
8. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST

Progress Update on the El Camino Real Corridor Plan

Lindy Chan, Senior Planner, gave a presentation on the following:

The El Camino Real Corridor Plan will provide a comprehensive land use, transportation, and streetscape approach to the sections of the corridor recently rezoned to Mixed Use Corridor - El Camino Real (MUC-ECR), Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN), Mixed Use Live/Work (MULW), and Downtown Precise Plan (DTPP), consistent with the General Plan’s principles. In doing so, the Plan would help achieve General Plan’s goal for an El Camino Real Corridor that “supports walking, transit, bicycling, and economic development,” and links adjacent neighborhoods to community resources. The Plan will achieve this by including urban design standards to ensure that new development is high quality, a plan for street improvements to make the Corridor more pleasant to walk along and safer to cross, and policies that support small businesses and a range of housing choices along the Corridor, as well as other elements. In addition, it will incorporate economic development, community benefits, and financing strategies for implementation. The Plan would include a series of recommended programs for implementation, such as revisions to zoning, streetscape improvement plans, and additional policies. Environmental review will be provided at each of these subsequent steps as appropriate.

The feedback received on community benefits include onsite production of affordable housing, parks, plazas, and openspace, childcare facilities, community facilities, public parking, public art, neighborhood programs and shared parking.

Based on feedback received, staff will be refining the options that will ultimately inform our community’s vision for the Corridor Plan, then further analyze potential impacts and tradeoffs associated with these options. There are still many questions that require answers before formalizing recommendations. Staff will present the refined options based on this analysis, and prepare a draft outline of the Plan later this spring.

Commissioner Bondonno gave a presentation on the themes for the corridor.

Commissioner Schmidt stated that he would like to be able to keep parking and create safe ways for bicyclists to go up and down El Camino. He stated that he would like to have some nice architecture along El Camino. He mentioned he would like to have some lights or something for pedestrian safety. He stated that the red zones should
be looked at and possibly updated as there may be no need to have them anymore.

Commissioner Hale stated that she is excited for the plan. She further stated that she feels what is missing from the plan is some sort of sense of a metric or a goal for the themes. For example, justify an activity center by saying this is going to increase the walkability scores of every property within a mile by “X” and make a measurable impact on the value of that property. She stated that there should also be some pedestrian improvements, especially when it comes to safety. She stated that she would like to see activity centers tied to outcomes compared to other cities. She stated she would like to see improvements made for bicyclists.

Commissioner Bondonno stated that he wants people passing through Redwood City to feel something special and know they’ve left Redwood City when they enter the next city.

Commissioner Hale agreed with Commissioner Bondonno and stated that it would be nice to have some sort of aesthetic continuity.

Commissioner White voiced concerns about safety along the corridor and agreed with other Commissioners comments regarding pedestrians and aesthetics and the activity centers.

Commissioner Hunter stated that he didn’t hear much about housing and it should be discussed.

Commissioner Guerrero stated it would be nice to give transit more of a priority. She asked how business outreach has been handled. She also asked if other cities are working as intensely as Redwood City.

Lindy Chan stated that when they did their stakeholder interviews they did a physical walk and staff identified businesses that were local to the community and introduced themselves and talked about the corridor plan. They encouraged them to be part of the plan and then followed up and found a couple of business members attending the meetings. She stated they are doing more business outreach. She stated that in terms of what other cities are doing, Mountain View has adopted a quarter plan and that Sunnyvale is looking at doing a quarter plan and have been working on it for some time. She stated that she believes Palo Alto has a plan in place but believes they are doing some updates to it. She stated that San Mateo County is currently working on the portion along Fifth Street. She stated that Burlingame is part of it and are doing improvement plans. She stated that the Grand Boulevard initiative, specifically SamTrans, applied for a grant to do a walkable safe community analysis, and as part of it they reached out to Redwood City and Palo Alto to be case studies. She stated that the grant was received and Redwood City will be receiving an analysis and will present design studies for the El Camino Real segment from Maple Street to Center Street.

8. MOTION TO ADJOURN
M/S (White/Schmidt) to adjourn the meeting of the Planning Commission
Motion Passed 7-0

The meeting adjourned at 10:45PM to reconvene at the next Regular Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for April 2, 2017 at 7:00PM in the City Hall Council Chamber, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, California.