

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
Station Area	Revise the plan to remove any elements (e.g., curb extensions) that would preclude the ability of the City to modify the central portion of El Camino Real to provide 3 lanes of automobile travel in each direction and/or Class II bike lanes (either option potentially limited to peak hours)	References to corner bulbouts on ECR in Station Area to be deleted (many draft text edits already made by staff), and emphasis shifted to crosswalk marking and other improvements. Central ECR (between Oak Grove and Menlo/Ravenswood) sidewalk widening may or may not have to be removed from plan- Consultants to analyze to see if 3 lanes in each direction could fit with expanded sidewalks- if not, then consultants to consider whether building setbacks on central portion of ECR should be increased. Note: bulbouts elsewhere on ECR may still be included, if they would not affect 3-lane auto travel or potential bicycle lanes.	D18, D20, F1, F2 (legend)	Possibly-diagram of what Central ECR 3-lane scenario would look like and how wide would sidewalks be	n/a	Delete or replace p. D44 (top) and p. F6	Y
Station Area	Reduce the façade height from the proposed 45 feet by one full story; staff and consultants to recommend a specific dimension to achieve the reduction	Consultants to conduct preliminary design analyses and propose measurement for staff sign-off. Consultants to consider whether Building Profile standard remains 'as is' (meaning, applied at 45-degrees from new façade height measurement) or whether that should be altered in order to produce high-quality aesthetics.	C3, C5, E30, E31, E32, E33, E34	n/a	E2, E9, E10	cover; p. A4, C15, C17	Y
Station Area	Staff to work with consultants to determine alternative mechanisms to limit maximum building height to a portion of the building with the intent of increasing the architectural interest of the building; possible mechanisms include changes in the bulk restrictions, added setbacks, and/or requirements for architectural merit.	Consultants to consider options and discuss with staff and discuss prior to detailed design analyses or revisions. Results could include: 1) a completely new standard, 2) a tighter/more specific version of the Bulk control, or 3) the existing Bulk control, explained/diagrammed better. Solutions should recognize feasibility issues (in other words, controls should not result in upper floors that are so small that they would never be built).	C3, C5, E16	Possibly	E9, E10	Possibly-more examples of buildings with modulated upper floors?	Y
Station Area	Reduce SA W maximum height from 60' by one full story.	Consultants to conduct preliminary design analysis and propose measurement for staff sign-off. Staff generally assuming that something around 45'-50' would be the revised measurement. Note: Consultants to consider general SA direction on façade height reduction, and ensure that max height is aesthetically balanced with that.	C3, C5, E4, E32, E33, E34	n/a	E2, E10	p. C15, p. C17 (bottom right) [also cover image]	Y
Station Area	On Alma Street portion of SA E zoning district, increase minimum upper-floor setback from 10' to 15'	Consultants to go ahead and make change, unless there could possibly be negative design or construction implications (in which case, discuss with staff).	C3, E30, E31	n/a	E9	n/a	
Station Area	a. The Planning Commission recommends that the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists at the intersection of the railroad tracks and Ravenswood Avenue be a high priority and possible solutions to the safety issues be expedited either through the Specific Plan or alternative programs. b. Revise the plan to include "quad gates" as an option at Ravenswood and Oak Grove Avenues rail crossings	Staff has added text in Chapters F and D. Consultants to review.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Station Area	Civic Plaza: Consider large-growing trees such as maples, sycamores, or redwoods as 'iconic' plantings, in addition to oaks (which grow very slowly).	Staff has added text with additional signature tree options; Consultants to review.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Station Area	Civic Plaza: Add an enhanced pedestrian connection to Oak Grove Avenue	Consultants to add expanded sidewalk, highlighted yellow similar to other expanded sidewalks, and label it ("Oak Grove Avenue Pedestrian Linkage" or equivalent) to W side of Merrill (as opposed to E side, which doesn't line up with Oak Grove crosswalk and which doesn't seem to have room due to Caltrain parking requirements). Staff has added minor text edits in Chapter D- Consultants to review.	D6, D15	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
Public Benefit	1. Move the Plan forward with the retention of the thresholds for public benefit as currently stated in the Plan, but provide the Council with additional information and analysis to enable further consideration of that threshold level 2. Return with discussion points and potential recommendations around possible incentives for retail development over other types of development 3. Retain in the Plan a general discussion of a Development Agreement approach to public benefits and a general listing of possible types of benefits with the understanding that it may become part of a broader discussion through the Planning Commission of public benefit in general 4. Include the Santa Cruz Avenue Plaza improvements in the list of possible public benefits 5. Revise the "Public Benefit Bonus and Structured Negotiation" process to be clearly subject to public review in one or more public meetings; documents estimating value should be provided as part of this process 6. Public Benefit: explore potential for a simpler public benefit process that could apply to smaller projects which wouldn't require a Development Agreement; if not feasible, explain why	Staff is establishing next steps. Consultants will likely need to work with financial subconsultant to review/update/expand the earlier Feasibility Studies to better relay how proposed Base standards address revitalization and other project goals. Consultants should make sure numbers are current (some fees may have been added/increased in interim) and accurately account for Plan requirements (e.g., LEED Silver, sidewalk dedication, etc.). Consultants may need to conduct additional studies (different sites, smaller/larger parcels, other assumptions varied) in order to effectively address related concerns.	TBD	n/a	TBD	n/a	Y
Parking	1. Modify the parking ratio for the Station Area from the proposed 1.85 spaces per unit for residential development to a minimum of 1.0 space per unit and a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit with an emphasis on the accommodation of shared vehicles, guest parking, shared parking and unbundled parking, subject to review and comment by staff and the consultant. 2. Commission recognizes that reduced parking ratios may encourage development of smaller units and senior housing and potentially reduce traffic and school impacts. 3. Explore potential for extending Station Area residential parking requirements to other appropriate transit-oriented/walkable areas	Consultants to discuss and propose response for staff consideration. Initial consultant response indicated comfort with making this change for Station Area, where transit/walkability are highest. Extending it elsewhere appears warranted, although areas farther from Caltrain station may not be as appropriate. Solutions could include: a) changing rates only for zones closest to center of town (between Valparaiso/Glenwood and Middle, possibly); b) only by reducing the minimum (not establishing a maximum); c) establishing findings/action for the Planning Commission to consider on a project-by-project basis.	n/a	Possibly- if applied differently in a geographic way that doesn't line up with w/ Zoning Map	F1	n/a	Y
Other	Add language clarifying that "Illustration of Standards + Guidelines" graphics are examples and are not necessarily binding in and of themselves	This is the result of some confusion about Chapter E district diagrams- e.g., thought Figure 24 indicated that retail could only go a certain distance back, and then parking was required to be the rest of the first floor. Staff has added note at beginning of Zoning District section: "Graphics are intended to illustrate how different standards are measured, and are not intended to necessarily dictate the placement of different uses or parking within a development." Also added in A.4 (How to use this document). Consultants to review and propose something else if that's not ideal.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Other	Procedures for Approval of Future Projects- If not adequately addressed in the Specific Plan, add language to the Specific Plan that states that during Architectural Control review by the Planning Commission, the Commission will look for overall quality of materials, and specifically look for a change of materials, setbacks, and break-up of massing of upper floors.	This came out of initial PC discussion about building height/bulk, and may be somewhat pre-empted by subsequent direction about Bulk controls. However, consultants to consider and propose something for staff consideration if warranted- could be additional design guidelines, new Architectural Control finding, or other standard.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Other	Maximum Allowable Development: provide more context/analysis around this concept and explanation of what occurs when cap is reached	Consultants to discuss with staff (including contract attorney).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Other	Recommend that the Finance and Audit Committee review the FIA for the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan and provide input to the City Council	Completed during CC review process.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Land Uses	a. Restaurants with Live Entertainment – where C (Conditional), change to A (Administrative) b. Day Care Center – where C (Conditional), change to A (Administrative)	Consultants to make changes in table.	n/a	n/a	E1	n/a	
Land Uses	Restaurants (Limited Service) – reexamine comprehensively to determine appropriate categorization based on definition of use	Consultants to consider pros/cons, although staff is generally in favor of keeping it 'as is'. Concern seemed to be that the regulations were discouraging such restaurants (not take-out-only, but a step down from a full-service restaurant) downtown, but it seems like allowing them (if relatively small-scale) is appropriate.	n/a	n/a	E1 (possibly) and Appendix	n/a	
Land Uses	Consider adding new category for Live/Work Lofts, in particular around Station Area	Consultants to consider and propose something for staff consideration. Research with other cities' experiences may help- understand that they tend to go "all office" or "all residential" depending on market forces. If no changes are ultimately recommended, need to explain why.	n/a	n/a	E1 (possibly) and Appendix	n/a	Y

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
Land Uses	Explore potential revisions regarding retail uses and whether/how they could be encouraged/required	Consultants to consider and propose something for staff consideration. The thrust of the idea seems to be to encourage retail on ECR (or at least not unnecessarily discourage it). If idea is infeasible, a response will still be needed in the document- may benefit from 'case studies' of cities where requirements for retail on arterials are now being altered. Possible requirements for ground-floor retail/restaurant for ECR SE lands @ Burgess Park Linkage/Open Space Plaza may be feasible.	n/a	n/a	Possibly (E2, maybe)	n/a	Y
Land Uses	Recommend revisions to encourage senior housing, such as through increased density, lower parking ratios, or other incentives; note that this encouragement should not be necessarily interpreted as a mandate, and that senior housing should not necessarily dominate the Plan area.	Consultants to consider and propose something for staff consideration. Options may include establishing a new land use definition for senior housing, and then setting up unique development regulations for it (e.g., higher du/ac standards, lower parking rates). Consultants to look at City's existing R-L-U district as one guideline.	n/a	n/a	Possibly (E2, maybe)	n/a	Y
ECR SE (also Bicycle)	a. Require protected bicycle network between the Middle Avenue bicycle/pedestrian crossing and Cambridge b. Explore potential for requiring protected bicycle network between the Middle Avenue bicycle/pedestrian crossing and Roble	Concept is the result of initial interest in requiring a Class 1 bike path at the rear of the property, which was not recommended by staff (would duplicate Alma and ECR routes, not link to much, create potential security issues). Result is to require some sort of comprehensive bike/ped path through properties when they're redeveloped, which allows Stanford etc. to do something at front/back/middle/combo, depending on building layout. Could benefit properties themselves, as Middle bike/ped crossing would be more accessible. Consultants to discuss and propose something for staff review/discussion.	F3	Possibly- diagram of areas in question and types of networks that could meet reqs.	n/a	n/a	Y
ECR SE	Façade height at the 10' minimum setback to be reduced from the proposed 45 feet by one full story; staff and consultants to recommend a specific dimension to achieve the reduction; façade height may remain at 45 feet at the 20' maximum setback	Consultants to conduct preliminary design analyses and propose measurement for staff sign-off. Consultants to consider whether Building Profile standard remains 'as is' (meaning, applied at 45-degrees from new façade height measurement) or whether that should be altered in order to produce high-quality aesthetics. Consultants to consider how 'sliding scale' should work (meaning, between the two extremes at 10' and 20', what is proper facade height?) and propose something for staff review.	C2, E23, E24, E25	n/a	E6	p. C11	Y
ECR SE	Staff to work with consultants to determine alternative mechanisms to limit maximum building height to a portion of the building with the intent of increasing the architectural interest of the building; possible mechanisms include changes in the bulk restrictions, added setbacks, and/or requirements for architectural merit.	NOTE: Same direction as Station Area- Consultants to consider options and discuss with staff and discuss prior to detailed design analyses or revisions. Results could include: 1) a completely new standard, 2) a tighter/more specific version of the Bulk control, or 3) the existing Bulk control, explained/diagrammed better. Solutions should recognize feasibility issues (in other words, controls should not result in upper floors that are so small that they would never be built).	C2, E16, E23, E24, E25	Possibly	E6	Possibly- more examples of buildings with modulated upper floors?; p.C11 could change	Y
ECR SE	Revise district regulations to address Stanford University concerns regarding development feasibility while still achieving Plan objectives, along the lines of the initial guidance: a. The width of the proposed Middle Avenue may be reduced from 120' to approximately 90' b. The requirement for the Cambridge Avenue publicly-accessible building break may be made more flexible, to allow for options such as a U-shaped building c. The requirements for two private frontage breaks each north and south of Middle Avenue may be changed to one each, and made more flexible with regard to location d. The rear setback may be eliminated, although as Stanford notes, Fire District regulations may effectively require the same kind of setback e. The open space requirement of 40% minimum may be lowered to 30%, which would be similar to several comparable El Camino Real districts)	Consultants to review preliminary guidance, propose final changes for staff review/approval, and then finalize.	C2, D5, E12, E24, E25	n/a	E6	n/a	Y
ECR	In the ECR NE and ECR NE-R zoning districts, establish a new Public Benefit Bonus standard for overall height, equivalent to one additional story.	Consultants to conduct design analysis and propose new max height measurement for staff review (likely the same as SA W height). Not specified by CC, but staff believes that a lower facade height (also likely the same as the revised SA W facade height) should be applied with the Public Benefit bonus height. Somewhat complex to relay, as Public Benefit is the trigger- may need double sections/axonometrics to show both scenarios.	E4, E20, E22	Possibly- if too busy to include 2 height limits on same section or axo, add second set	E2, E4, E5	n/a	Y

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
ECR	Amend the Building Façade Modulation regulations for the ECR NE-L and ECR SW zoning districts to call for compatible modulation of form on facades adjacent to residential or residential mixed-use zones.	Intent is that building facades on side streets (Cambridge Ave, Spruce Ave, etc.) should have a similar rhythm to the other properties along those streets (mostly single-family residential, 50'-60' wide). Consultants to think about and propose something for staff review, although it may just be text edits in Section E.3.4 (Massing and Modulation) and Tables E3 and E8). Graphics might help, if easy/quick.	Possibly-E18/E29 could be amended with w/ notes	Maybe	E3, E8	Possibly a new photo of typical forms on such streets	
ECR	Amend the Massing and Modulation regulations for all ECR zoning districts as follows: Major portions of the building facing a street should be parallel to the street.	Simple text change. Intent is to allow for some flexibility for interesting angles/arcs, as long as majority of building is parallel to street.	n/a	n/a	E3-E12	n/a	
ECR	In order to accomplish more with regard to east-west connectivity along El Camino Real, recommend more creative and aggressive efforts at signal timing and signal modifications, including 4-way crossings and bicycle safety.	Consultants to think about and propose ideas for staff review. It is possible there aren't any 'easy' fixes that don't have other implications (cost, N-S vehicle flow, etc.), but discussion/response needed.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Possibly	
Downtown	Chestnut Street Paseo/Market Place: a. With outreach to and participation by the Downtown merchants and property owners to ensure success, pursue implementation of the Chestnut Paseo and Market Place in a phased approach. The first phase would include a temporary closure of Chestnut Street as delineated in the Specific Plan, with functional access for the operation of the Farmer's Market, seven days per week to be used as a public space with seating, food vendors (food trucks), landscaping, and possibly decorative paving. The temporary phase would be maintained for several months and would be used as the basis for a review and consideration of the permanent installation of the Paseo and Market Place. b. With both the temporary and permanent installations, consideration should be given to Menlo Park merchants for access to the public space and should build upon successful existing businesses, including the Farmer's Market. c. The recommendation is based on the recognition that the Chestnut Paseo and Market Place are closely linked in functionality and that the success of the space will be dependent on uses that would attract people.	Consultants to consider and discuss with staff prior to response. Solutions likely mostly text-based, as concept is primarily about implementation/timing, although additional photos/graphics of similar temporary installations could be warranted.	n/a - existing figures are pretty schematic to start with	Possibly-show how temporary phases could lead to permanent solutions	n/a	New photos of temporary or "light" options may help- food trucks and the like.	
Downtown	Retain the sidewalk widening elements and guidelines of the Specific Plan with implementation starting on a temporary basis for smaller block or half-block areas where there is a logical relationship to an adjacent use or purpose in order to assess the viability of the widening and whether to expand and make permanent the widened sidewalks over time.	Consultants to consider and discuss with staff prior to response. Solutions likely mostly text-based, as concept is primarily about implementation/timing, although additional photos/graphics of similar temporary installations could be warranted.	n/a	Possibly-show how 'parklet' style installations at restaurants could work	n/a	New photos of 'parklets' may help relay concept.	
Downtown	Utilize trial/temporary installations for the pocket parks to determine the impacts on circulation.	Consultants to consider and discuss with staff prior to response. Solutions likely mostly text-based, as concept is primarily about implementation/timing, although additional photos/graphics of similar temporary installations could be warranted.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
Downtown	<p>Parking Structures:</p> <p>a. Include Parking Plaza 2 in addition to Parking Plazas 1 and 3 as a possible site for a parking structure. (Factors considered by the Council in discussing preferred locations included the proximity of Parking Plaza 1 to transit, the Downtown merchants' and property owners' support of Parking Plaza 2, and the interest of the Presbyterian Church to work with the City on Parking Plaza 3.)</p> <p>b. Encourage utilization of portions of parking structures by parking permit users and preserve street level parking for customers.</p> <p>c. Provide opportunities for businesses to contribute to the financing of parking structures to the benefit of the business through reduced parking permit costs or other incentives.</p> <p>d. Require high aesthetic standards for the parking structures, including landscaping within required setbacks or as a vertical element of the structure.</p> <p>e. Encourage the preservation of as much surface parking for customers as possible within the structures.</p> <p>f. Limit the height of parking structures to be consistent with the scale of adjacent planned and existing buildings that can be no taller than 38'.</p> <p>g. Downtown property owners must be presented with a viable financial model for funding the construction of the garages, so as not to create a burdensome cost drain on either businesses or the city (i.e., preferring in-lieu parking fees, public/private partnership, permit revenues, or other funding mechanism). Over 50% of downtown property owners must approve a garage if they are going to be assessed for construction costs.</p>	<p>Staff has made initial edits to F.9 (Downtown Parking); Consultants to review that, conduct detailed PP2 garage feasibility analysis, review/update parking counts, and conduct graphical revisions. Maximum height likely to be reduced from 48' to 38'. Several items will require other text changes to Design Guidelines and Implementation, to be discussed after overall approach is agreed upon.</p>	C5, D1, D6, D7, E4, E37, F6	Possibly-schematics of PP2 layout and/or sections	F2	n/a	Y
Downtown	<p>Not including the Market Place, eliminate small mixed use buildings on the parking plazas (as shown on lots 4, 5, and 2) and discourage infill of the current parking plazas for purposes other than parking, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and other limited public spaces.</p>	<p>Staff has made initial edits to E.2.4 (Special Land Use Topics) F.9 (Downtown Parking), G.4 (Sale or Lease of Publicly-Owned Properties); Consultants to review that, review/update parking counts, and conduct significant graphical revisions</p>	A1, C3, C5, C6, D1, D6, D7, F6	n/a	F2	n/a	
Downtown	<p>Eliminate the residential option associated with the parking structure on Parking Plaza 3.</p>	<p>Option to be comprehensively eliminated. Staff has made several text edits throughout.</p>	A1, C5, C6, D6, D7, E37, F6	n/a	F2	n/a	
Downtown	<p>Staff to continue to work with Fire District to review Station 6 site standards and to consider flexibility where warranted</p>	<p>Staff discussing internally and will recommend approach.</p>	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
Downtown	<p>Staff to reach out to John Hickson/Live Oak Lions Club to 'debrief' on City Council direction and review how to continue to reach out to Farmer's Market</p>	<p>Staff responsibility.</p>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Bicycle	<p>a. The Plan should include and encourage bike lanes rather than bike routes wherever and whenever feasible, even if doing so will, in the long term, mean that the City adopt new or creative lane and parking arrangements. Using bike lanes will increase the use of bicycles by giving far greater comfort to those who would like to bicycle but are uncomfortable riding directly in traffic.</p>	<p>Consultants to consider and propose response for staff consideration. It is generally understood that ROW can limit ability to put lanes everywhere without impact to parking/travel lanes. Response could take the form of something like establishing more "Class II Priority Upgrade Lanes", with some sort of process for the City to go through when deciding when/if to enhance them from Class III (e.g., construction of one Downtown parking garage would be necessary before implementing any lanes that affect on-street parking downtown, or development of larger ECR parcels might be a trigger for ECR lanes.)</p>	D4, F3	Maybe	n/a	n/a	Y
Bicycle	<p>b. For that reason, the Commission supports the Plan's introduction of bike lanes on Oak Grove Avenue.</p> <p>c. The Plan currently includes University Drive as a north-south bike route into and out of downtown. The Commission believes that University is a key route and would also suggest that the Plan include the possibility of installing bike lanes on University in the future.</p> <p>d. The Commission would also comment that it would be appropriate for the Plan to include bike lanes on El Camino Real the entire length within the City limits and/or consider and examine other north-south paths/lanes/routes, including a potential path along Caltrain tracks/Stanford lands.</p> <p>e. The Commission believes that the presence of schools on Middle Avenue, Encinal Avenue, Ravenswood Avenue, and Valparaiso Avenue, because they are routes from schools to the downtown area, in particular should include improved bicycle facilities, such as bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, and sharrows.</p>	<p>Noted. Generally supports Bicycle Commission recommendation (a)</p>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Zone or Topic	Direction	Notes	Figures Affected	New Figures	Tables Affected	Photos, Renderings	Potentially Out-of-Scope
Bicycle	f. The Commission believes that the Caltrain pedestrian/bicycle undercrossing at Middle Avenue is a key aspect of the Plan's east-west transportation for bicycle and pedestrians.	Noted. No changes necessary.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Bicycle	g. The Commission is in support of the proposed downtown parking garages because they take parking load off of the street and give the City more flexibility for adding bicycle facilities to downtown streets without undue impact to the availability of parking downtown. Parking garages and surface parking plazas may be used for pedestrian and bicycle parking/circulation.	Noted. Consultants to consider whether any text changes are needed to highlight this, although staff feels like these concepts generally come through well already.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Bicycle	h. The Commission believes that the Plan should include and encourage bicycle related improvements as public benefits, such as: i. Bike parking (racks or bike corrals) ii. Signage (to Downtown, Station, etc) iii. Pedestrian/bike undercrossings iv. Intersection improvements, such as 1. crosswalks, 2. bike through lanes 3. bike-specific left-turn lanes v. Bike share pods	Consultants to consider and propose response for staff consideration. May consist of highlighting what the Plan already includes- seems like most are already covered. Public benefit list may be revised to include some of these, depending on result of that overall discussion.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Possibly some new photos to relay these concepts	Y
Bicycle	Examine potential for bicycle improvements (signage, lanes, etc.) on Ravenswood Avenue east of El Camino Real, and on Menlo Avenue west of El Camino Real.	Consultants to consider and propose response for staff consideration. May require more detailed design study. Limited ROW constrains solutions, but response needed- if nothing is possible without taking away auto lanes or waiting until adjacent properties are redeveloped, need to show/explain that.	Possibly	Possibly	n/a	Possibly	Y