COUNCIL AGENDA: 10-3-06
ITEM: 11.1(e)

CITY OF SAN JOSE
CAPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

Memorandum

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Planning Commission

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW

DATE: September 14, 2006

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 10
SNI AREA: Not Applicable

SUBJECT: PDC06-019. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONING FROM A(PD) PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AND CO(PD) PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONING DISTRICTS TO A(PD) PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONING DISTRICT ON A 6.4 GROSS ACRE SITE, LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF CAPITOL EXPRESSWAY APPROXIMATELY 200 FEET WEST OF SNELL AVENUE.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission voted 6-0-1, Commissioner Pham absent, to recommend the City Council approve the proposed rezoning.

OUTCOME

Approval of the subject Planned Development Rezoning would allow the applicant to proceed with a Planned Development Permit for demolition of three existing mini storage buildings totaling 27,769 square feet and allow the construction of two new mini storage buildings and additions to existing buildings totaling 83,180 square feet for a total net increase of 55,411 square feet.

BACKGROUND

On September 13, 2006, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the proposed Planned Development Rezoning. The Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement recommended approval of the proposed Rezoning.

No members of the public spoke in support of, or opposition to, the proposed project.

After the public hearing was closed, the applicant Timothy Reeves of Public Storage, said that they were upgrading the site by combining the two separate parcels into one parcel, which would provide smooth on-site circulation, and that they would also be upgrading the landscaping and exterior finishes on the existing buildings.

Commissioner Kalra questioned the applicant whether the building would look like the A-1 Storage building opposite the site on Capitol Expressway. The applicant responded that the nature of this use typically results in a box like structure and that it would be similar in mass. He indicated that they are proposing that the new three-story building have some height variations which would help to break up the mass.

Commissioner Kamkar asked staff to clarify the amount of parking required for the project. Staff said that if the site were entirely rebuilt, the 91 said parking spaces would be required. Staff said that it is appropriate to only require parking for the new construction. Adequate parking spaces are available for patrons to park in front of the roll-up door in front of their storage units.

Commissioner Kamkar asked if the applicant if they planned to install photovoltaic panels according to the recommendation in the Environmental Services Department (ESD) memorandum, and what would it take to install them. The applicant responded that they have not looked into installing a photovoltaic panel system and have not evaluated the cost. The applicant stated that they could not commit to installing them with this project.

ANALYSIS

As is typical for a Planned Development Rezoning, the architecture that is shown is considered "conceptual" and will undergo further review by staff at the Planned Development Permit stage. Massing, building materials, roofing, colors, and other details will also be selected for their compatibility with the neighborhood development pattern. It is anticipated that alternative building design elements that vary in height will be evaluated at the Planned Development Permit stage to reduce or soften continuous three story vertical wall planes.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

Not applicable.

PUBLIC OUTREACH/INTEREST

- ☐ **Criteria 1**: Requires Council action on the use of public funds equal to $1 million or greater.
  (Required: Website Posting)
- ☐ **Criteria 2:** Adoption of a new or revised policy that may have implications for public health, safety, quality of life, or financial/economic vitality of the City. **(Required: E-mail and Website Posting)**
- ☐ **Criteria 3:** Consideration of proposed changes to service delivery, programs, staffing that may have impacts to community services and have been identified by staff, Council or a Community group that requires special outreach. **(Required: E-mail, Website Posting, Community Meetings, Notice in appropriate newspapers)**

Although this item does not meet any of the above criteria, staff followed Council Policy 6-30: Public Outreach Policy. A notice of the public hearing was distributed to the owners and tenants of all properties located within 500 feet of the project site and posted on the City website. The rezoning was also published in a local newspaper, the Post Record. This staff report is also posted on the City's website. Staff has been available to respond to questions from the public.

COORDINATION

This project was coordinated with the Department of Public Works, Fire Department, Police Department, Environmental Services Department and the City Attorney.

FISCAL/POLICY ALIGNMENT

This project is consistent with applicable General Plan policies and City Council approved design guidelines as further discussed in attached staff report.

COST SUMMARY/IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

BUDGET REFERENCE

Not applicable.

CEQA

Mitigated Negative Declaration, File No. PDC06-019.

JOSEPH HORWEDEL, SECRETARY
Planning Commission

For questions please contact Lesley Xavier at 408-535-7852.

JH:JMH:LX