

- The main issues before the Council were the following:
 - Were the change area boundaries shown in staff report what they wanted?
 - Would Council confirm land uses and intensities in draft GP?
 - Did Council want to make any changes that would affect the EIR?
 - Did Council agree they needed more study on village centers?

- Council discussed these questions and the Land Use and Mobility sections of the GP. On Dec. 7th, they will vote on what they discussed last night, as well as discuss the rest of the GP.

- Staff clarified that the range of densities along El Camino is because there are many small (and especially shallow) lots that won't be appropriate for high densities because there needs to be a transition to single-family or similar neighborhoods close by.

- “Inclusivity” and “diversity” were given brief mentions at the beginning of the meeting in a slide about overall General Plan goals.

- Staff explained that proceeding with EIR did not commit Council to allowing residential at N. Bayshore, or to any of the densities proposed, but that these would be maximum development possibilities that EIR would look at. Mitigations that come up through the EIR and/or further economic analysis to assess feasibility (for example of mixed use, village center at a particular location) would mean that a lower intensity development would be considered later. It's an iterative process.

- Staff stressed that 80% of Mtn. View would stay the same. Existing neighborhoods will remain the same; that's why they're focusing on 3 change areas - N. Bayshore, E. Whisman, and El Camino Real.

- Jac Siegal expressed concern about allowing residential at all at N. Bayshore, but the Council seemed inclined to let the EIR go forward to consider this, since it would evaluate transportation issues, sea level rise issues, etc.

- Laura especially expressed concern about higher densities (as suggested in some emails; I think especially MVCSP?). Ronit also said Mtn. View doesn't want its downtown to allow high rises as Redwood City does. (Don't think anyone was proposing that.)

- There were a few outlying areas in both N. Bayshore and E. Whisman that are far from light rail and perhaps should not be considered as part of change areas for that reason. Staff and EPC recommended they be considered for purposes of EIR.

- There was much discussion of village centers, how defined, etc. Staff explained they thought that each of the 6 identified needed to be clarified, tailored to each location, and this would be part of the process. Laura and Margaret stressed the idea of meeting places, Italian piazza concept. There was some concern that some of the intersections listed as village centers didn't make sense.

- Separately, and each in a slightly different way, John, Tom, Margaret and Ronit all asked if the proposed densities in the focus areas were actually high enough to create the intended “village centers” and if the City should consider adopting higher allowed densities or at least greater flexibility, so that a General Plan amendment will not need to be made later if it turns out the maximums were too low. Staff said that it is true that in some cases, the improvements in services that neighborhoods have said they want will not be possible with the limited growth these same residents are comfortable with. In other areas, staff believes they have hit the “sweet spot” of the amount of development needed to create street life. The specifics of what each village center should look like will be discussed more as staff proceeds with the EIR and development of General Plan policies in early 2011.
- There was much discussion of the Franzia property, with some Councilmembers being clear it shouldn't be rezoned as public facility or such as seemed too close to a taking.
- Matt Pear spoke about his 2 sites on Ortega and Showers. It seemed as if they would be considered for higher density, again at least for the EIR. Tsuda mentioned that the concept was to step down from the higher density at San Antonio Ctr. as you approached lower density residential, with Pear's property being a buffer.
- Ron Marazzo (sp?), owner of Safeway and strip mall site at California and San Antonio, asked for his property to be zoned up to 95 units per acre as he was told high density residential development would be the highest and best use of his land. Councilmembers were not inclined to allow this.
- Generally, it looked as though Council was going to approve all of what staff requested when they take up the rest of the GP December 7th.