



City of Santa Clara

1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050
santaclaraca.gov
[@SantaClaraCity](https://twitter.com/SantaClaraCity)

Agenda Report

20-117

Agenda Date: 3/17/2020

REPORT TO COUNCIL

SUBJECT

Related Santa Clara Development Area Plan (DAP) 1 located on Vacant Parcels at Tasman Drive and Centennial Boulevard (Council Pillar: Promote and Enhance Economic and Housing Development)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Related Companies (Developer) has filed an application for a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the Related Santa Clara Project (Project) located on an approximately 240-acre site north of Tasman Drive. The Related Santa Clara Project was previously referred to as the "City Place Project" and is referenced as such in various City documents. The entire Project includes the development of up to 9.16 million gross square feet of office buildings; retail, food and beverage, and entertainment facilities; residential units; hotel rooms; surface and structured parking facilities; new open space and roads, landscaping and tree replacement; and new/upgraded/expanded infrastructure and utilities.

On June 28, 2016, the City certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), approved General Plan Amendments, and approved the Planned Development - Master Community (PD-MC) Zoning and accompanying Master Community Plan document (MCP) to allow for the phased development of the Project. The MCP (Attachment #8) sets forth the development standards, design guidelines, phasing constructs, project implementation procedures, development transfer provisions among parcels, permitted and conditional uses allowed within the proposed land use areas, and City Approval standards for DAP applications. The adopted Project entitlements also include a Development Agreement (DA) and a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA). Consistent with these Project approvals, development of the entire Project is anticipated to occur in approximately eight phases.

Before the Developer may ground lease portions of the Project site from the City, it must receive City approval of a "Phase Option Notice" defining the boundaries of the development phase and of a DAP, which is intended to implement the approved PD-MC Zoning and the MCP. The Developer submitted the Phase 1 Option Notice on November 4, 2019, and the City approved it on December 5, 2019 (Attachment #3). This DAP 1 application is the next step in the land use entitlement process for the first phase of the Project.

As discussed in the following Analysis section and the attached report to the Planning Commission, staff has evaluated the DAP and found it to be consistent with the Project's Development Obligations as set forth in the DDA and MCP, as well as consistent with other applicable City standards.

The Planning Commission at a public hearing on February 20, 2020 considered the DAP and recommended that the Council adopt a First Addendum to the previously-certified Project EIR and approve the DAP application subject to conditions of approval, including a request that the Council

engage in additional discussions with the Developer regarding Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and provisions for affordable housing.

BACKGROUND

The DAP 1 area is a 14.3-acre portion of the Project site located along Tasman Drive (generally on Parcel 5 as identified in the MCP) as highlighted in red in the attached Key Map Plan (Attachment #1). DAP 1 includes the proposed development of up to 1,047,000 square feet of gross building floor area consisting of 440,000 square feet of office space, 51,000 square feet of retail/food and beverage space, 381,000 square feet of hotel area for up to 480 rooms, and 175,000 square feet of residential for 200 residential serviced apartments (apartments that are not for transient occupancy but that may receive hotel services).

DAP 1 development would occur on three new blocks generally within the Parcel 5 area, identified in the approved MCP as Block 5A, Block 5B and Block 5C. The City owned Tasman Drive parking garage is not part of DAP 1, but access to the east entry of the garage will be altered by the development at the Developer's expense. The Transit Center is also not part of the DAP 1 application and will be retained by the City.

The Planning Commission considered DAP 1 at a Special Meeting on February 20, 2020 and after conducting a public hearing, recommended that the Council adopt an Addendum to the previously certified EIR and approve the DAP 1 application, subject to specified conditions of approval.

The Planning Commission staff report and its attachments, which include detailed analysis of how the DAP 1 application conforms to the adopted MCP, are included in this report (Attachment #2).

DISCUSSION

The following discussion provides an evaluation of the DAP 1's consistency with the Project's Development Obligations as set forth in the DDA and MCP; a description of the Council's authority for reviewing the DAP and ability to modify existing or impose new conditions of approval; and a summary of the February 20, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Additional analysis of the DAP 1 application's consistency with City standards is included in the Planning Commission staff report and its attachments.

Development Obligations

The MCP requires that specific materials be submitted in connection with a DAP application. The following discussion details how the Developer's application complies with the requirements of specific sections of Appendix C to the MCP.

As required by Section 1.4.1, and DDA Section 5.3.1, the Developer submitted a design and construction schedule, along with construction documents and architectural materials documents, for the temporary Fire Station No. 8 in connection with its application. The necessary improvements to Fire Station No. 8 to temporarily house operations from Fire Station No.10 were approved and permitted and the construction is complete.

Section 1.4.2 requires the DAP to show the proposed locations and square footages of "Minimum Initial Buildings" as defined in the DDA. DDA Section 5.3.2 requires at least 600,000 square feet of total office, hotel, and/or retail buildings during Phase 1 of the Project, including: a 300-room or larger hotel and at least 50,000 square feet of retail/food and beverage/entertainment uses; and at least

200 residential units in the aggregate between Phases 1 and 2. The DAP 1 application demonstrates that it will include 872,000 square feet of office, hotel and retail buildings, which includes 51,000 square feet of retail/food and beverage uses and a 480-room hotel. DAP 1 also includes 200 residential units in approximately 175,000 square feet, for a total of 1,047,000 square feet during Phase 1. Therefore, DAP 1's program exceeds the requirements to develop the Minimum Initial Buildings.

Section 1.4.3 requires the DAP to also show the proposed locations and square footages of "Additional Initial Buildings." For the Additional Initial Buildings, DDA Section 5.3.3 requires that the Developer use its "best efforts" to develop an additional 200,000 square feet of total office, hotel, and/or retail buildings during Phase 1, for a total of at least 800,000 square feet. As summarized above, DAP 1 provides more than 800,000 square feet of office, hotel, and/or retail buildings development, a hotel with more than 300 rooms, at least 50,000 square feet of retail/food and beverage uses, and 200 residential units. Therefore, DAP 1 satisfies the programing requirements in the MCP and the DDA.

Sections 1.4.4, 1.4.5, and 1.4.7 are not applicable to Phase 1. Section 1.4.6 requires DAP applications to show proposed locations and square footages of any proposed major department stores. DAP 1 does not propose any major department stores, and neither the MCP nor the DDA requires any such stores during Phase 1. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

Section 1.4.8 requires the DAP for Phases 1 through 3 to include a cumulative summary of uses constructed and proposed to date, plus a balance of development required in future phases (through Phase 3). DAP 1 includes this information on page 22 of the application, which shows a minimum cumulative development total of 1,300,000 square feet, with the cumulative additional development total that the Developer must use its best efforts to meet equaling 1,730,000 square feet. DAP 1 provides 1,047,000 square feet of office, hotel, and/or retail buildings, a difference of only 253,000 square feet between the Phase 1 total and the total minimum amount of development required for Phases 1 through 3. There is a difference of 683,000 square feet of additional development between the Phase 1 total and the total additional development that the Developer must use best efforts to build over Phases 1 through 3.

Finally, Exhibit 1.4.9 on page 22 of DAP 1 shows the Developer's proposed parking management plan as required by Section 1.4.9. In accordance with DDA Section 5.5, Exhibit 1.4.9 illustrates how at least 3,000 parking spaces to serve non-NFL events at Levi's Stadium on a non-reserved basis can be accommodated on the portions of the Project site that have not been taken down. The necessary parking can be accommodated on the City-controlled Parcel 1, Parcel 2, and Parcel 4.

Authority for DAP 1 Review and Conditions of Approval

In addition to the Development Obligations summarized above, the MCP defines City Approval standards for DAP applications. Specifically, Section 2.7.2.6 authorizes approval or conditional approval of a DAP if the Council finds that (1) the DAP conforms to and is consistent with the applicable project approvals, transaction documents, and the MCP; (2) the Infrastructure that the Developer proposes to construct in connection with the applicable phase is sufficient to serve the proposed development on the subject property; and (3) the proposed shared outdoor space provided for in the applicable phase in accordance with the MCP is reasonable and appropriate to the proposed level of development.

Under Section 2.7.2.5 of Appendix C to the MCP, Council has the authority to approve, approve with conditions, or deny a DAP application. However, Section 2.7.2.6 limits the Council's authority, only permitting Council to alter or supersede previously imposed conditions of approval if they are consistent with the standards of review and acceptable to the Developer. Moreover, the DA prohibits any conditions of approval that would conflict with the adopted Project entitlements, including, without limitation, conditions that would alter or change the permitted land uses, limit the Project's height or bulk, limit or reduce the density or intensity of the Project, or materially increase the Developer's obligations.

When it approved the Project site rezoning and MCP in 2016, Council adopted conditions of approval that apply to the Project in addition to the development standards identified in the MCP. Among other requirements, the conditions of approval require the Project to comply with the terms of the DA and with the mitigation measures adopted as part of the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program following certification of the Project's EIR.

Therefore, Council has authority to adopt new conditions of approval that are required to ensure that DAP 1 is consistent with the MCP with respect to the findings listed above. However, modifications to existing conditions, which include all of the Project's mitigation measures, would require the Developer's consent under the DA and the MCP. Accordingly, City staff and the Planning Commission have recommended specific conditions of approval in connection with DAP 1 that either (1) are within the City's discretion to adopt under the MCP and the DDA or (2) have the Developer's consent to modify.

Specifically, the Developer has agreed to modify three former Conditions of Approval. Proposed Condition of Approval C3 would replace former Condition of Approval P15 to permit the Comprehensive Sign Program to be considered in conjunction with the DAP for Phase 2 rather than DAP 1. In addition, proposed Condition of Approval ST1 would replace former Condition of Approval P11 to clarify that the Developer's stormwater control plan shall be required to demonstrate that each DAP shall meet its C.3 requirements on its own merit, and that if a banking system is to be created to achieve a compliance for the entire project's full implementation, there first must be area treatment surplus (credit) during the earlier DAP phase(s) to be used by subsequent project phase(s). Finally, proposed condition of approval E10 would replace former Condition of Approval E2 to allow the developer to file Final Maps for DAP 1 prior to any certificate of occupancy within DAP 1, instead of prior to the issuance of building permits.

Planning Commission

At the February 20, 2020 Special Meeting, staff provided a report on the DAP 1 application, and the Developer made a presentation regarding its application and DAP 1's relationship to future phases of the Project. After the staff report and Developer presentation, the Planning Commission asked clarifying questions regarding several issues, including:

- The pedestrian environment proposed along Centennial Boulevard and Tasman Drive, including sidewalk widths and landscape treatments;
- The conceptual nature of the architecture included within the DAP and the desire to further develop the character and articulation of the buildings in the Phase 1 DAP to match the level of quality depicted in the applicant's presentation of Phase 2;
- The potential to add Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies to achieve a greater level of trip reduction for the project;

- Plans to incorporate “Smart City” measures and provide 5G cellular coverage;
- The rationale for the proposed reduction of parking spaces from the numbers described in the MCP; and
- Consideration of environmental concerns including potential for flooding and methane gas exposure.

Following the Commissioners’ questions, the only member of the public speaking during the public comment period, David Ebrahimi, expressed his concerns about existing traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project site and with the development of the proposed plan, as well as concerns about methane gas releases from the landfill. An email from Gary Wesley (Attachment #10), an attorney representing Mr. Ebrahimi, was also provided to the Planning Commission for the public hearing. Assistant City Attorney Alexander Abbe addressed Mr. Ebrahimi’s comment at the hearing and the earlier email by summarizing the adequacy of the prepared Addendum and the previously certified EIR with respect to both traffic and landfill gases. Additional discussion about DAP 1’s environmental effects and environmental review of the Project is provided in this Report under the heading “Environmental Review.”

After the close of the public hearing, the Commission expressed their support for the overall Project, particularly the program and design elements depicted in the applicant’s conceptual architectural renderings of the Project’s second phase. The Commission’s discussion examined the DAP 1’s consistency with the MCP, including additional analysis with respect to DAP 1’s development area, parking supply, and impact on area traffic. The Commission also expressed frustration over the fact that the MCP authorized a deferral of architectural review after the initial stage of DAP approval to a second stage review and approval process by the Community Development Director. The Commission went on to discuss a desire for Centennial Boulevard to incorporate more landscaping and an enhanced pedestrian environment, and a desire to see more creative architecture in the Phase 1 DAP akin to the Developer’s concepts for future phases. The Commission also discussed the importance of the DAP 1 architecture’s compliance with the MCP’s requirements regarding bird-safe design.

After a lengthy discussion of various issues related to the Project, the Commission focused the discussion on its preference for more affordable housing in the Project and a more robust TDM program with larger trip reduction targets than were required when the Project was first approved. On both points, clarification was provided by the Assistant City Attorney that under the MCP and the DA, the City may not modify existing conditions of approval (such as that related to TDM) or alter the Development Agreement provision concerning affordable housing without the voluntary agreement of the Developer. The DAP 1 proposal is consistent with the City’s previously-adopted conditions and Development Agreement provisions regarding affordable housing and the TDM program. Accordingly, the Planning Commission did not propose any conditions of approval related to affordable housing or TDM requirements. However, the Commission made a formal request for the Council to discuss these points with the Developer further.

With respect to affordable housing, when the Council approved the Project, the City Code did not include requirements regarding the provision of affordable housing. However, the Developer voluntarily agreed via the Project’s DA to provide 10 percent of the total units in the Project as affordable housing dedicated for use by households with incomes no more than 120 percent of the Area Median Income for Santa Clara County. As authorized by the DA, the Developer will develop

the 20 affordable units otherwise required as part of DAP 1 as part of the DAP for Phase 2.

With respect to traffic, as required by the MCP, the Developer submitted a Traffic Report as part of its application, which was peer reviewed by City staff and its consultant team. The Traffic Report, which is provided as Attachment B to the First Addendum to the Project EIR, includes parameters for the DAP 1 TDM program. As required by Mitigation Measure TRA-1.1, the TDM program must achieve a reduction in Project office-generated daily traffic by a minimum of 4 percent with a peak hour trip reduction of at least 10 percent and a reduction in Project residential-generated daily traffic by a minimum of 2 percent with a peak hour trip reduction of at least 4 percent.

The Final EIR for the Project included detailed responses to comments from a Planning Commissioner and other parties expressing similar concerns that these trip reduction targets were too low. (FEIR, 3-8 to 3-10 and App. B.2-71). The FEIR explained that these reductions are much larger than they may appear because the traffic generation estimates against which these reductions will be measured already reflect substantial reductions from the trip generation estimates for standard office projects in the *Trip Generation Manual and Handbook* published by the Institute for Traffic Engineers. The estimates used as the baseline for the City Place TDM targets were based on rates from Silicon Valley high-tech office developments, which have higher employee densities than standard office developments. The City Place estimates were further reduced to adjust for proximity to transit, and for the fact that it is a mixed-use development with residential, office and retail uses. The FEIR noted that, taking these adjustments into account, the City Place TDM targets "yield a total trip reduction of 15 to 18 percent," similar to the 16 percent target that the City had recently required for a project one of the commenters had suggested as a model for the City Place TDM program. The FEIR also provides detailed responses to comments suggesting the TDM targets for the North Bayshore (Google), Apple, and Stanford University projects would be appropriate for City Place. The responses noted substantial differences between Stanford's unique circumstances as a university and other projects, including City Place, and further noted that the North Mountain View and Apple targets had not in fact been achieved, concluding: "The trip reduction targets for City Place are similar to the actual trip reductions achieved at North Bayshore and more aggressive than what has actually been achieved at the Apple campus".

As shown in the Traffic Report, DAP 1 includes potential measures and strategies for reducing traffic generated by office and residential uses, along with an annual monitoring program to evaluate TDM effectiveness and determine if the trip reduction requirements required by Mitigation Measure TRA-1.1 are satisfied. In addition, the Addendum to the Project's EIR concluded that the overall number of trips generated by DAP 1 was less than the number of trips initially analyzed under the EIR, and that approval of DAP 1 would not result in any new or more severe environmental impacts than previously analyzed for Phase 1.

The Planning Commission adopted two Resolutions: 1) recommending that the Council adopt a First Addendum to the previously-certified Project EIR in connection with the DAP 1 application (vote 6-1; Becker opposed), and 2) recommending that the Council approve the DAP 1 application subject to conditions of approval, including a request that the Council engage in additional discussions with the Developer regarding Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and provisions for affordable housing (vote 6-1; Becker opposed).

Next Steps

Architectural Review

Under the City's review process as set forth in Appendix C of the MCP (Attachment #8), the Developer has elected to defer the submittal of architectural materials, building architectural designs, and building site designs, including building setbacks and building coverage details for each of Blocks 5A, 5B and 5C to a later submittal for review by the Community Development Director, who has approval authority under the MCP. Staff will post the application materials submitted for Architectural Review on the City's website, on the project web page as soon as a complete application is received.

Sign Program

The applicant has also submitted with the DAP 1 application a proposed comprehensive sign program for Parcels 4 and 5, which is under review by staff and will be brought forward for consideration during the DAP 2 process.

Ground Lease

The City and the Developer are working towards preparing a final ground lease that is consistent with the DDA terms and DDA form of Ground Lease for the transfer of the Phase 1 area, with the goal of executing a ground lease in May 2020. Execution of implementation agreements and other City actions are necessary prior to the conveyance of the Phase 1 Ground Lease (e.g., Landfill Operation and Maintenance Agreement, Temporary Parking Agreement, street vacation, etc.). These actions will be brought forward for Council consideration over the next two months.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On June 28, 2016, the Council certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project. Although the EIR and MMRP identified mitigation measures to reduce most project impacts to less-than-significant levels, the SOC was required given the EIR's conclusion that the proposed Project would have significant unavoidable impacts in the areas of land use, transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and biology; and cumulative significant unavoidable utilities impacts (Attachment #4).

Although there are certain differences between the project described in DAP 1 and the description of Phase 1 development in the MCP and certified EIR, DAP 1 is consistent with the MCP. To ensure that the potential impacts of the Project continue to be thoroughly analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City worked with consultant Environmental Science Associates to prepare an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Related Santa Clara / City Place Project; the Addendum is attached to this report (Attachment #5).

The Addendum provides substantial evidence to support the conclusion that implementation of DAP 1 would not result in substantial changes or introduce new information not already analyzed in the previously-certified Project EIR, primarily because the level of development now proposed for the site is within the broader development assumptions analyzed in the EIR, and would not cause new significant environmental impacts not previously identified in the EIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant unavoidable impacts. Therefore, the potential environmental impacts associated with DAP 1 have already been adequately analyzed in the Project EIR, and no further review or analysis under CEQA is required.

As noted above, prior to the February 20, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the City received correspondence from David Ebrahimi's lawyer asserting that further environmental evaluation is required because the Project and "other circumstances" have changed. The correspondence claims that traffic stemming from changes to the proposed development is significant and that traffic would be "greatly impacted." It also requests that methane and other hazardous material "be evaluated, and mitigation measures should be considered." Apart from these two vague and unsubstantiated examples, the correspondence makes no attempt to provide evidence that the Addendum is inadequate.

With respect to the correspondence's traffic claims, the Addendum provides substantial evidence that no new or more severe environmental impacts would occur. As discussed above, the DAP 1 Traffic Study shows that the amount of trips generated by DAP 1 development would *decrease* as compared to the projections analyzed in connection with the EIR. Moreover, the Addendum includes traffic counts collected in connection with other recent projects developed in the City that show that background traffic conditions are *less severe* than projected in the EIR. Because there is less traffic in the area than projected, and the DAP 1 would generate fewer new trips than projected, approval of DAP 1 would not result in new significant traffic impacts.

With respect to the request for analysis and mitigation related to hazardous materials, the EIR includes a robust discussion of potential hazards (see, for example, Section 3.11: Hazards and Hazardous Materials in the Draft EIR). Section 6.12 of the Addendum summarizes the EIR's conclusions with respect to Hazards and Hazardous Materials and includes an updated analysis to reflect the modifications proposed by DAP 1. Both the EIR and the Addendum identify mitigation measures related to hazards and hazardous materials, the implementation of which would ensure that impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. With respect to methane specifically, to address any potential concerns about methane gas migrating from the closed landfill into buildings in Phase 1, Mitigation Measure HAZ 5.3 requires the installation of a methane gas mitigation system in each building, even though not required by state regulations. The system must include automatic gas sensors and a quarterly monitoring program. Therefore, the requested analysis and mitigation measures have already been incorporated. Accordingly, the correspondence does not raise any issues that would require additional environmental analysis under CEQA.

At the February 20, 2020 Planning Commission meeting the Commission voted to find that the Addendum provides substantial evidence that that the criteria of CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requiring additional environmental review under CEQA have not been met and to recommend that the Council adopt the Addendum prior to acting on the DAP 1 application. After the Planning Commission meeting, staff made a correction in Section 4.3 of the Addendum to update references to the Project program adopted after certification of the Final EIR. The edits are shown in an errata sheet attached to this report; the errata sheet clarifies the record but does not change any of the conclusions in the Addendum or affect the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval (Attachment #6).

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact to the City for processing the requested application other than administrative staff time and expense, which is included in the FY2019/20 Adopted Budget.

As was previously considered by the Council in the decisions to offer development of the project site

and subsequent approval of the initial land use entitlements, it was noted there will be social and economic benefits that will accrue to the City and region in terms of new retail and entertainment opportunities not readily found in the South Bay area, as well as creation of jobs, property tax and sales tax revenues, and land lease revenues. Development of the Project will provide substantial land lease revenues to the City. Development fees and other exactions paid for and provided by the Project (including up to \$17.4 million for implementation of a multimodal improvement plan and a voluntary contribution to VTA of approximately \$16 million) will also benefit the City.

COORDINATION

This report was coordinated with the City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office and Finance Department.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public contact was made by posting the Council agenda on the City's official-notice bulletin board outside City Hall Council Chambers. A complete agenda packet is available on the City's website and in the City Clerk's Office at least 72 hours prior to a Regular Meeting and 24 hours prior to a Special Meeting. A hard copy of any agenda report may be requested by contacting the City Clerk's Office at (408) 615-2220, email clerk@santaclaraca.gov or at the public information desk at any City of Santa Clara public library.

Public Notices and Comments:

The notice of public hearing for this item was posted on March 6, 2020, in at least three conspicuous locations within 300 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners, residents and businesses within 1,000 feet of the project site. A joint meeting notice for this meeting and for the Planning Commission meeting held on February 20, 2020 was published in *The Weekly*, a newspaper of general circulation for the City, on February 5, 2020. Notice was also posted on the City's website under the development project page and on the City's social media accounts including Nextdoor, Facebook, and Twitter.

Letters of opposition were received from Gary Wesley on behalf of David's Restaurant and Gregg Rose (received after the Planning Commission public hearing), are attached to this report under Correspondence (Attachment #10).

The Developer held a Community Open House meeting from 5:30 to 7:00 pm on January 15, 2020 at the Santa Clara Convention Center to provide an update to nearby residents and businesses about the current plans and schedule. The event was attended by the Applicant's project team, City staff and approximately 24 members of the public. A summary of the open house event provided by the Applicant's consultant is attached (Attachment #9).

ALTERNATIVES

Adopt resolutions for the Related Santa Clara (City Place) Phase 1 Development Area Plan application located at 5155 Stars and Stripes Drive to:

1. Adopt the EIR Addendum for DAP 1 for the Related Santa Clara project,
2. Approve the DAP 1 Application for the Related Santa Clara project subject to conditions; or
3. Deny the DAP 1 Application for the Related Santa Clara project

RECOMMENDATION

Alternatives 1 and 2:

Adopt resolutions for the Related Santa Clara (City Place) Phase I Development Area Plan application located at 5155 Stars and Stripes Drive to:

1. Adopt the EIR Addendum for DAP 1 for the Related Santa Clara project; and
2. Approve the DAP 1 Application for the Related Santa Clara project, subject to conditions.

Reviewed by: Andrew Crabtree, Director of Community Development

Approved by: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Key Map Plan
2. Web Link Slip Sheet - Planning Commission Staff Report - February 20, 2020
3. Developer Phase Option Notice for DAP 1
4. Web Link Slip Sheet - 5155 Stars and Stripes Drive City Place FEIR and MMRP
5. EIR Addendum for DAP 1
6. DAP 1 EIR Addendum Errata Sheet
7. Resolution to Adopt EIR Addendum for DAP 1
8. Web Link Slip Sheet - Master Community Plan Volume I
9. Applicant-provided 01.15.2020 Open House Summary
10. Correspondence
11. Resolution to Approve DAP 1
12. Conditions of Approval
13. DAP 1 Document Plans