



Memorandum

AGENDA NO:

MEETING DATE: April 1, 2019

To: City Council

Date: April 1, 2019

From: Vice Mayor Emily Beach

Subject: Committee Report

Friday, 3/15/19: City Commissioner's Thank You Event

- Great job by staff member Ana Silva and Mayor Colson!

Saturday, 3/16/19: Constituent meetings regarding:

- Development
- Zoning
- Peninsula Health Care District Wellness Community

Monday, 3/18/19:

- League of Cities Quarterly Luncheon Housing Legislation coordination meeting
- Constituent meeting: concerns about Post Office development, El Camino Real, zoning

Tuesday, 3/19/19:

- SMCTA Managed Lane meeting
- Meeting at Caltrans Headquarters with District 4 Director & staff team, Burlingame staff, and Councilmember Brownrigg
 - Cautiously optimistic about Caltrans' understanding of the importance of our El Camino Real Task Force's recommendation for rehabilitating ECR. They seemed receptive to our template.
 - Burlingame emphasized particular importance of tree spacing and utility undergrounding recommendations.
 - Next steps:
 - Caltrans will develop a project schedule

- Caltrans will develop a site plan proposal (what pilot area will look like) with strong consideration given to ECR TF recommendations
- Once site plan proposal is developed for the pilot area, we will re-convene the ECR Task Force to review prior to widespread public outreach and community meetings
- Caltrans seems committed to working closely with the City, engaging our TF, and our general public in a constructive, context sensitive way

Wednesday, 3/20/19:

- Chaired the League of Cities Peninsula Division Quarterly Meeting, current housing legislation discussion
- Sold-out 75+ crowd
- Constructive follow-up from January's CASA Pen Division quarterly luncheon
- Format: breakout groups discussed key policy principles inspired by CASA that are being debated in Sacramento in proposed housing legislation (rather than focusing on any one piece like SB 50, or the specifics of CASA.)
- Small-group facilitated discussions centered around six major themes: density, CEQA reform, renter protections, parking requirements, impact fees, and financial incentives. See attached questions, they are insightful.
- Legislative staff from offices of Senator Hill, Senator Wiener, Senator Beall, Assemblymember Mullin, Assemblymember Low, Assemblymember Berman listened to breakout group discussions. Attached summary of meeting highlights and presentation slides.

Thursday, 3/21/19:

- Monthly meeting with City Manager

Friday, 3/22/19:

- SMCTA and C/CAG Ad Hoc Managed Lane Subcommittee
- Committee is working through differences of opinion about appropriate staffing models for JPA; conversation will continue on 4/6

- Agreement reached regarding policy making authority (toll policy and revenue expenditures) shared equally between C/CAG and SMCTA representatives

Monday, 3/25/19:

- C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee Meeting (CMEQ)
 - Received update on SB 743 implementation: Caltrans transition from “level of service” metric to “vehicles miles travelled” and impact on cities
 - Received update on Smart Corridor project; fiber connecting cities for emergency services communications
- Peninsula Health Care District Town Hall @ Lane Room
 - Large turn-out (apx. 40) from residents and affordable housing advocates about the Wellness Community. Mostly Burlingame residents spoke. Nearly 20 individuals spoke and asked questions of the developers and PHCD staff. Two PHCD Board Members attended the entire meeting but did not speak.
 - Advocates want PHCD to re-evaluate their Wellness Community vision within context of current housing crisis (recognized they did not have same visibility on this when vision was formed 5-10 years ago.) Suggested Wellness Community development must and include more (and deeper) affordability than RFP proposed.
 - Developers and PHCD staff say they are working to come up with a plan to include more than 10% BMR units, but they seem resistant to revisiting their current vision for a wellness community, which prioritizes community amenities.
 - PHCD indicated they hope to have clearer plan to address affordability by their next June 24 Town Hall.
 - CEO suggested their Health Care District charter allows them to provide clinics, hospitals, senior housing, and workforce housing for their employees --- but not general workforce housing on their land.
 - CEO clarified they are still within ENA period with developer to evaluate the project, but agreement is not a “done-deal” yet. Targeting August to finalize developer deal.
 - Staff from office of Supervisor Dave Pine, and BSD Trustee Elizabeth Kendall also attended.

Wednesday, 3/27/19:

- Grand Boulevard Task Force
 - Presentation on multi-modal safety design improvements on ECR in Redwood City and Palo Alto (grant from Caltrans)
 - Presentation on “Vision Zero” Policy which many cities have adopted: zero deaths or major injuries on roadways
 - Vision Zero has been extremely successful in Europe and many US cities: policy commitment helped reduce traffic fatalities by 50%
 - El Camino Real accounts for 1% of roadways in San Mateo County, but 15% of all collisions for pedestrians and cyclists happen on ECR. Indicated pedestrian and multi modal safety needs attention on ECR.
 - As cities increase housing density, presenter suggested prioritizing safety for pedestrians and cyclists (which includes slowing vehicle speeds and infrastructure improvements) so we have safe modes for all, and will help reduce congestion on streets from cars.
- Constituent group meeting: topics/areas of concern included El Camino Real safety improvements, housing legislation in Sacramento and CASA compact, traffic safety and calming in all neighborhoods – but particularly Lyon Hoag
- SMCTA admin meeting

Thursday, 3/28/19:

- League of California Cities Environmental Quality Policy Committee Meeting, Costa Mesa (day trip)
- Caltrain Local Policy Makers Group
- C/CAG BPAC (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee)

Exhibits

- League of California Cities Breakout Questions
- 2019 Housing Bills of Concern

**League of California Cities
3/20/19 Peninsula Division Quarterly Luncheon**

Breakout Group Conversation Guidelines:

- Please share the air. Don't dominate the conversation and allow everyone the chance to speak.
- Listen respectfully, without interrupting.
- Listen actively and with an ear to understanding others' views. (Don't just think about what you are going to say while someone else is talking.)
- Criticize ideas, not individuals.
- Commit to learning, not debating. Comment in order to share information, not to persuade.
- Avoid blame, speculation, and inflammatory language.
- Avoid assumptions
- Seek common ground

Facilitated Questions:

- 1) Opening question (3 minutes): What is the biggest obstacle to fulfilling housing needs in your community?

DENSITY (12 minutes)

- 2) To better understand communities represented here today, very briefly (10 seconds or less) everyone please share what "high density housing" means in YOUR City? *For example, urban cities might say high density means 12-story buildings; while single-family residential communities might say 4-unit quadraplexes.*
- 3) Are any cities represented at this table currently on target to meet or exceed your market rate housing RHNA numbers by 2023? How about your affordable housing RHNA numbers by 2023?
- 4) If a proposed housing development fits within your city's height limits, how do you feel about unlimited density within it – in other words, allowing developers to fit as many units as possible within the building envelope?
- 5) Do you feel that allowing duplexes in single-family neighborhoods is similar or substantively different than allowing ADU's in single family neighborhoods – which are already required by law?
- 6) Does your community allow (or could your community consider) duplexes, triplexes, or fourplexes in single-family neighborhoods? How about on vacant land within single-family neighborhoods?
- 7) Does high density housing with minimal parking requirements near bus stops (not rail or ferry stations) work for your community? Why or why not?

CEQA REFORM: (5 minutes)

- 8) Has your City considered or successfully implemented processes to streamline housing production?

- 9) How do you feel about design review being limited to “objective standards” (pre-determined, not subjective) in exchange for a below market rate housing development?
- 10) What concerns do you have about "stadium type" CEQA exemptions for affordable housing? This means if someone sues over the environmental impact report, the court must make a final decision within 270 days.

RENTER PROTECTIONS (5 minutes)

- 11) Has your city adopted any renter protection measures? If so, can you describe the policies and whether you think they've been effective? Are they need-based?

PARKING REQUIREMENTS (10 minutes)

- 12) Describe any reduced parking requirements your City has adopted, and how is it working?
- 13) Has your City eliminated (or could your City consider eliminating) parking requirements for new housing units located:
- within ¼ mile of fixed rail station or ferry terminal?
 - within ¼ mile of a bus stop?
 - within ½ mile of fixed rail station or ferry terminal?
 - within ½ mile of a bus stop?
- 14) There is data to suggest that people who live near their workplace might walk, bike, or ride the bus to their jobs instead of driving an automobile. Are you comfortable lowering parking requirements in neighborhoods within one mile of job centers that are NOT served by rail or ferry service?
- 15) Would ½ (.5) parking space per housing unit located within one mile of a job center work for your community -- if that job center is not served by any kind of public transit?

CITY FEES (5 minutes)

- 16) What non-essential developer impact fees would you be willing to reduce or waive in return for housing creation? Examples of non-essential fees might include public art, open space, parks, libraries and other quality of life services.
- 17) Under what circumstances (if any) would you be willing to waive residential impact fees on market-rate housing units?

INCENTIVES (5 minutes)

- 18) What incentives would help your city most effectively tackle the housing crisis?

2019 Housing Bills of Concern

AB 1279 (Bloom) Planning and Zoning: Housing Development: High-Resource Areas.

- Would require HCD to determine "high-resource areas", areas of high opportunity and low residential density not experiencing displacement or gentrification.
- Would require by-right approval for up to 100 units and 55 ft., if the project meets affordability requirements and site limitations.
- Projects would not need to be near transit.

AB 1568 (McCarty) General Plans: Housing Element: Production Report: Withholding of Transportation Funds.

- Would withhold and divert critical transportation funds from the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1, Beall), for cities' basic maintenance and road repair needs, if the jurisdiction has not produced enough housing units to satisfy state housing goals (RHNA).

AB 1763 (Chiu) Density Bonuses: Affordable Housing.

- Would greatly expand existing Density Bonus Law to allow developers to receive a density bonus of 80% and four additional concessions if 100% of project's units are affordable to low-income households.
- For projects that are 100% affordable to low-income households and are within one-half mile radius of a major transit stop, a city would have to allow unlimited density and an additional three stories or 33 ft.
- If the development is within one 1/4 mile of a high quality transit corridor, a city would have to allow unlimited density and an additional two stories or 22 feet.

SB 4 (McGuire) Housing.

- Would require up to fourplexes on vacant lots in single-family neighborhoods, by-right housing approvals, TOD heights one-story above existing heights; based on city population.

SB 13 (Wieckowski) Accessory Dwelling Units.

- Would cap/limit impact fees and other mitigation fees.
- Would require jurisdictions to act on an ADU application within 60 days of application submittal.
- If HCD finds that a jurisdiction's ordinance is out of compliance, the department would notify the Attorney General that the jurisdiction is in violation of the law.

SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and Zoning: Housing Development: Incentives.

- Would require cities to allow development up to 55 feet and unlimited density within one 1/4 mile of a major transit stop.
- Would require cities to allow housing projects that adhere to existing height limitations unlimited density within one 1/4 mile of a major transit stop.
- Would limit single-family only zoning by allowing housing projects that adhere to existing height limitations unlimited density in single-family zoned neighborhoods near high quality public schools and jobs.
- Would limit or eliminate parking requirements.
- Would award Density Bonus Law concessions and incentives.

SB 330 (Skinner) Housing Crisis Act of 2019.

Until Jan. 2030, a city would not be able to:

- Downzone.
- Impose parking requirements.
- Increase impact fees.
- Apply any fees to affordable housing
- Impose a housing moratorium.
- Impose design standards that are costlier than those in effect in 2019.
- Establish a maximum number of conditional use permits.
- Adhere to a voter approved initiative that limits density or intensity of housing, and infrastructure.