

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
1	Valley Oak Partners	20.010.002	F	I, 1	We believe that the intent and location of the T3C zone by the city makes a lot of sense, particularly in light of the single-story residential adjacent to much of Spruce Ave. However, the density range of 40-60 du/acre seems incongruous with this goal and can lead to incompatible forms and structures adjacent to the existing residential. For example, at 40-60 du/acre allowed in the T3C zone, an owner/developer could utilize State Density Bonus Law by providing 18 affordable units at low income to achieve a 20% density bonus and construct 215 total units with eligible concessions and development standard waivers. This would result in a structure and building form as shown on Exhibit A of this Memo.	We believe that a density range of 15-25 du/acre would more appropriately support the transitional concept of the T3C zone while still achieving the City's housing goals.	With triplex, fourplex, rowhouse, and flex-low as allowed building types, reducing the min density is appropriate. As there is no conflict with Housing Element, min. density reduced to 20 du/ac.
2	Genentech	20.100.002	Table 20.100.002	II, 37	A priority expressed by several stakeholders early in the General Plan process was for the General Plan Update and revised Zoning Ordinance to address Resolution 84-97 (ideally eliminating it, or, at minimum, providing clarification). We understand that "Freight/Truck Terminal and Warehouse" and "Parcel Hub" have been added as terms with definitions, and that these uses are conditionally permitted in the MIM and MIH districts. Please clarify whether Resolution 84-97 remains in effect and that "freight forwarding" is not permitted or is only grandfathered in for parcels in the BTP districts. The resolution does not appear to be discussed in the Draft General Plan. "Chemical, Mineral, and Explosives Storage" is not permitted in the two BTP districts. Please clarify that this does not limit biotech companies from storing necessary chemicals for R&D/manufacturing on site.		The resolution will be repealed. This will be clarified in Staff report and/or resolution. Text OK as is, and freight-forwarding will be like every other nonconforming use. The definition of Chemical, Mineral, and Explosive Storage updated to clarify that it excludes such uses ancillary to an R&D use.
3	Community member	20.135.020	E.2. T3C Zone Density	III, 5	Community member was not able to achieve the minimum density in his zone (T3C) with a Rowhouse Building Type. Also, Rowhouse Building Type page indicates a typical density of 15-30 du/ac, which is below the stated minimum for the T3C.		See comment 1.
4	Valley Oak Partners	20.135.020	E.2. T3C Zone Density	III, 5	Given this unique excess capacity, the city could revise and lower the density range in the T3C area and not risk falling below the 4,747 unit RHNA benchmark. Lowering the T3C density would allow the construction of a product type more compatible with adjacent residential even after accounting for any density increases allowed by the State Density Bonus Law.		
5	Summerhill	20.135.020	I.5. Parking Setback	III, 9	Limiting projects to a single 20' wide curb cut for a frontage is incompatible with Flex Mid-rise design, particularly on interior lots with only one frontage. It will prevent the development of projects as it will prevent the creation of secondary driveways for refuse pick-up, move-ins, and other associated uses.	We recommend removing the limit of 1 curb cut per street frontage or adding "a second curb cut is permitted on interior lots".	In T5C and T6UC, standard edited to be "max. 1 per street frontage up to 300 ft, max. 2 per street frontage exceeding 300 ft."
6	Valley Oak Partners	20.135.030	TC3 Description vs. Density Range	III, 18	The three building types (Triplex/Fourplex, Rowhomes & Flex Low Rise) would not be able to achieve the minimum density of 40 du/ac. Generally speaking, for a site that is not constrained by topography or shape, we find the average Rowhome density to be 15-25 du/ac. It appears the city concurs with this finding, as on the "Rowhome" summary page (on PDF page #14 of attachment 1e), it notes Rowhomes as "typically providing 15-30 du/ac". We have seen attached Rowhomes that push into the high 20 du/ac, but these require a majority of the units having tandem garages, as well as being much narrower, less functional unit types.		See comment 1.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
7	Valley Oak Partners	20.135.030	Min. Density vs. Allowed Building Heights	III, 18	When we look at the three building types that are allowed in T3C, it seems infeasible for a Triplex/Fourplex or Rowhome to achieve 40 du/ac. The T3C "Maximum Height" is 50 feet, but Section 20.135.030 further reduces this maximum height to 3-3.5 stories (depending on Building Type).	Again, we believe a minimum density of 40 du/ac with only 3-3.5 stories would not be achievable (from a design, parking & cost perspective).	See comment 1. The two different height limits is intentional and okay.
8	Summerhill	20.135.030	J.4. Building Size and Massing, Flex Mid-Rise	III, 18	The draft code's maximum Flex Mid-Rise building base width and depth of 200' is prohibitive. This short dimension will prevent full utilization of many Housing Element housing sites throughout the City as it restrictively limits building size. We believe that implementation of this standard will render many future projects infeasible while preventing the fulfillment of the Housing Element.	Rather than limiting the base size of the building, we recommend requiring a significant massing break in elevations facing public streets. For example, Burlingame's Rollins Road Mixed-Use Zoning District requires a 15' deep by 15' wide mid-block plaza and massing break in elevations facing public streets on façades more than 300' long. San Jose requires a 10' deep x 15' wide massing break on facades facing public streets every 200 feet. Santa Clara's recent Specific Plans require a 15' deep x 40' wide massing break every 330' feet. This type of design standard is commonly used, mitigates building mass, and is feasible to execute.	This dimension was derived from typical downtown block and project sizes. To allow for larger floorplate projects, the following edits were made: - Flex Mid-rise max building dimension increased to 350 ft - Flex High-rise max building dimension increased to 500 ft - 20.310.004.B edited to add required building breaks for facades exceeding 300 ft in length
9	Summerhill	20.135.030	J.7. Allowed Frontage Types, Flex Mid-Rise	III, 18	Buildings will require various spaces that require access from a public street that may not be compatible with the Frontage Types.	We recommend that the draft code be updated to acknowledge that there will need to be electrical, fire, refuse pick-up, and other utility spaces along public frontages. Additionally, we request that "Dooryards" be added to the list of permitted frontage types for Flex Mid-Rise buildings as an option.	Dooryards added to permitted frontage types. Also added access to utilities (see 20.135.040.C.5).
10	Summerhill	20.135.030	J.9. Private Open Space	III, 18	It is not always feasible to provide a private open space area in each unit.	We recommend including clarifying language stating that the 50 sq ft per unit is an <u>average</u> across the building.	Revised standards for Flex Mid-Rise and Flex High-Rise to be a combined private/common minimum area and dimension (can be satisfied by either or both).
11	BDE Architecture	20.135.030	K.4. Building Size and Massing, Flex High-Rise	III, 19	BDE understands the intent of this provision appears to be to break up the massing of buildings, so they do not appear to be massive buildings over 300 feet. As drafted, this standard could require the design of completely separate buildings with duplicate systems, which does not seem to be the City's intent, because it would prevent the full utilization of larger housing sites, as well as restrictively limit building size—thus drastically reducing the delivery of much need housing units. Previous zoning codes and similar housing codes in other jurisdictions recommend a minimum building size, not a maximum.	We recommend this provision be revised to require form-based design and architectural modulation on larger building expanses that will achieve the same result of breaking up the massing for a better visual effect, without undermining the optimization of larger housing sites, such as 7 South Linden. For the Project, BDE is proposing to add larger setbacks of approximately 35' wide x 15' deep and changing the building design on each segment including features, such as materiality, color, and window design, to give the appearance of separate buildings to meet the intent of the Update to break up the massing, while still maximizing the delivery of units and allowing the building systems to remain efficient.	See response to comment 8
12	BDE Architecture	20.135.030	K.6. Pedestrian Access, Flex High-Rise	III, 19	Pedestrian access at primary building frontage is too restrictive for sites with more challenging grading or utility setbacks.	The overall look and feel of primary building frontages at a pedestrian/street level can and should be addressed through overall design standards and reviewed on a case by case basis taking into account the site constraints and other factors that impact direct access to the building. For example, an unintended consequence of this provision being applied to the Project would be that the addition of stairs and sidewalks at each patio along Linden would severely limit landscaping opportunities and increase impermeable surfaces. These new provisions must be considered in light of the City's other goals and policies and contain the necessary flexibility throughout the process to accomplish them all. It is important that the City be careful not to establish a "ceiling" while trying to actually establish a "floor" for these design considerations.	Pedestrian access for ground floor spaces of Flex High-Rise buildings edited to be from primary building frontage <u>or</u> publicly accessible open space.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
13	Summerhill	20.135.050	B.1.b & B.2. Required Public Open Spaces	III, 29		We recommend clarifying that the public access trail along Colma Creek required by 20.180.005.D.2 (copied below) shall be included and count as one of the required open spaces for a project over 3 acres in size. Creek Access. <i>Unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of City staff that no feasible alternative exists, any property with frontage on Colma Creek or San Bruno Creek shall be required to provide, as a part of the on-site landscaping plan, a paved public-access trail along the top of the bank for the portion of the creek bank on the site. The trail shall be compliant with specifications of the City Public Works Department and BCDC, if applicable. Each such trail segment shall connect directly to the creek bank on each adjacent property or a trail segment along the Shoreline (e.g., the Bay Trail).</i>	Following edits made: - Suggested text added to 20.310.002.G - Exception added to 20.135.050.B Applicability - Exception also noted on page 20.135.050.H Greenway.
14	Valley Oak Partners	20.135.060	Table 20.135.060.B.1 Uses in the Transect Zoning Districts	III, 36	Table states that a residential multifamily-unit is "Permitted" in T3C, however there is a footnote of "P3". P3 states (w/respect to a residential use) "Permitted on upper floors only; MUP required if located on the ground floor. MUP may only be approved if the Review Authority first finds that, based on information in the record, it is infeasible to locate any active pedestrian oriented use on the ground floor". Requiring a commercial component to a Triplex/Fourplex or Rowhome development would further render the project unable to achieve the minimum 40 units per acre.		Footnote 3 removed from Multifamily and Senior Citizen Residential in the T3C and T4C to provide more flexibility on Spruce, Linden and Railroad.
15	Comments on GP	20.180.002	B	IV, 2	B probably shouldn't reference the General Plan.	It should probably reference State SLR guidance, which establishes a process about how to select SLR projections for a project. It's based on project type, project lifespan, and risk tolerance. The updated policy in the GPU response to comments matrix reflects this – see rows 272-275. You may still consider establishing a baseline SLR scenario, but you may also consider those other factors, plus adaptability of the science over time. Food for thought.	Edited to reference State SLR Guidance.
16	Genentech	20.180.005	E. Elevation of Lowest Floor	IV, 6	Please confirm the interpretation that there can be no habitable space below SLR BFE (77 inches above current sea level) unless the site is protected by a levee or sea wall system. Are there minimum standards for what qualifies as a levee or sea wall system? Does this need to be built to withstand a certain sea level elevation/storm surge? How do property owners know whether the current Bay Trail serves this purpose? Are Recommend adding language that clarifies what flood or sea level elevation the levee/sea wall system needs to be designed to protect against		All design guidance appropriate to the Zoning Code has been included.
17	Summerhill	20.180.005	F. Mechanical and Electrical Equipment	IV, 6	Given that buildings within this overlay will already be elevated such that their lowest levels are at least 3' above base flood elevation to account for sea level rise (SLR) it appears unnecessary to require the equipment listed above to be located on a building's roof.	As such, we recommend that this requirement be removed from the code.	Deleted
18	Summerhill	20.300.130	C.2. Solid Waste Recycling Location	V, 26	This is code and its intent is confusing.	We would recommend clarifying that in a large single apartment building, a trash and recycling room should be included at every floor as an alternative. Also, large apartment buildings typically have one garbage <u>pick-up</u> area serving the entire building. We also recommend revising this language to clarify that this is still permitted.	Edited to reference pick-up area and specify that this section is regulating outdoor spaces (not the programming of indoor spaces).

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/ Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
19	Summerhill	20.310.004	B.2. Multi-Family Residential and Residential Mixed-Use Design, Over 75'	V, 41		We recommend specifying that this only applies to facades fronting public streets. We also recommend modifying the requirement limiting façade bays to no greater than 50' and eliminating the requirement for 8' changes in building height. We recommend this change as most modern floor plans are typically 24' to 38' wide, meaning this effectively limits a façade bay to one unit wide or requires façade bay breaks mid-unit. We recommend the following additional text: <i>When a building façade exceeds 125 feet in length, it must be separated into façade bays no greater than 80 feet.</i> We recommend relying on the suggested text below under Section 20.310.004.B.8.e for changes to the roof.	All building modulation standards (for up to 75 ft, 75-300, and over 300 ft) apply to facades along right-of-way. We recommend keeping the 50 ft bay dimension as-is since the 4 ft depth that defines the bay is small enough not to limit the bay to occurring at the end of a unit. For example, a balcony would count.
20	Summerhill	20.310.004	B.3. Maximum Façade Length	V, 42	It is not appropriate for large sites on which Flex Mid-Rise and Flex High-Rise buildings will be proposed.	We recommend that this section be removed and rather recommend using the Zoning's objective design standards to ensure the desired design goals listed above are achieved.	Standard deleted.
21	BDE Architecture	20.310.004	B.3. Maximum Façade Length	V, 42	This maximum requirement is not appropriate for larger housing sites and is redundant given other design standards in place.	Rather than establish a separate and time-consuming exception process, we recommend that massing and building articulation concerns be addressed through design standards and design review—not through restrictive façade dimensions and additional discretionary review. For the project at 7 South Linden, BDE has previously provided an exhibit highlighting the building articulation and façade features. BDE agreed to adjust the parapet heights to be 8' difference every 50' per the City code.	Standard deleted.
22	Summerhill	20.310.004	B.8.e. Multi-Family Residential and Residential Mixed-Use Design Parapet Roofs	V, 44	As written, the draft code effectively requires parapet modulation at the transition from every unit, or if units are aligned parallel to the corridor, could require a step mid-unit. In order to provide cohesive design.	We recommend revising 8.e.ii as follows: <i>At the third floor and above, break up roof lines at intervals no greater than 80 linear feet by changes in direction, pitch, or similar approaches.</i>	Suggestion taken, but dimension edited to be 50 to be consistent with bay width (see response to Comment 19).
23	BDE Architecture	20.310.004	F.5. Private Storage Space	V, 46-47	In our experience, it is recommended that the square footage in the units be used for actual living space and that any storage requirement allow for storage to be provided elsewhere in the building or be eliminated, as it is not as valued by the residents. 200 cubic feet of storage in each unit will have a negative impact on any multi-family project's viability.	Therefore, we believe this provision should be eliminated completely.	Recommendation taken.
24	Summerhill	20.310.004	F.5. Private Storage Space	V, 46-47	In our experience, storage is valued less by residents than livable square footage and other amenities. Large apartment buildings might include storage as an option for residents, but it is separated from units.	This is very impactful to apartment feasibility and we recommend eliminating this requirement. If this requirement is retained, we would recommend revising as follows: <i>For every ten units, a minimum of one 200 cubic foot enclosed weather-proofed and lockable private storage space with a minimum horizontal dimension of four feet shall be provided within the project common area.</i>	
25	Summerhill	20.310.004	H.3.a. Structured Parking	V, 49	This design is not feasible in flood plains where floor levels will have to be raised to account for the flood plain and three additional feet for sea level rise [SLR] as it would require the site to be raised several feet beyond what is required or result in the finished building requiring flood insurance because the floor of the garage would be below the floodplain.	We recommend that the requirement of lowering the floor of the parking level a minimum of 4' be removed. Alternatively, we recommend text requiring architecturally treated garage facades using building massing, articulation, and other architectural treatments to screen the parking, similar to as required in Section 20.310.004.H.3.c.ii.	Added "This standard does not apply to parking structures within the SLR overlay" to this standard.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
26	Summerhill	20.330.004	Multiple-Unit Residential Table	V, 63	It far exceeds demand and will render projects infeasible.	We recommend that the guest parking requirement be eliminated. Developers are incentivized to provide adequate guest parking meet their operational needs. If a guest parking requirement is retained, assuming the Zoning's proposed parking ratios per unit and based on our experience, we would recommend a maximum guest parking ratio of .05 guest spaces per unit.	Guest parking requirement deleted per recommendation.
27	Summerhill	20.330.010	F. Standard Parking Space and Aisle Dimensions Table	V, 79	Other cities have reduced standard parking stall dimensions to 8'-6" x 17'-0". Most cities allow 24' wide drive aisles.	We recommend modifying Table 20.330.010 to allow 17-foot deep parking stalls and 24'-0" wide drive aisles as standard.	Modified accordingly.
28	Childcare Community	20.350.014	B&C	V, 113	Section 3 of the CCMP have child care-type program descriptions and contact info for the local licensing office.	The correct definition of the first highlighted phrase ("Day Care Centers") is " Family Child Care Home ". As both item B. and C. are covered under Title 22, Child Care Licensing Regulations, it may make sense to delete those two... or at least item C. Fencing is already described in Title 22 and Community Care Licensing has been known to grant outdoor space waivers (less space per child based on staggered schedules, access to a park, etc.) so having it in the GP/Municipal code may prevent a program from operating in SSF that could in fact obtain a state waiver.	Edited accordingly.
29	F&P	20.400.003		V, 194		Suggest eliminating "requirements" from title and adding an introductory sentence that says something like "the following measures may be incorporated into a project's TDM program to meet its Tier requirements." This section represents the menu of options but not all of these items are required.	Edited accordingly.
30	Genentech	20.400.003	A. Participation in Commute.org or Transportation Management Association	V, 194	Without any introductory language, this reads as though every single project must meet every single one of these requirements.	Recommend clarification and/or reversing the order of 400.003 and 400.004. Sites that participate in Commute.org programs shall partner with Commute.org or join a Transportation Management Association (TMA) <u>or other qualified shared transportation consortium</u> with comparable Transportation Demand Services (TDM) services, whose role is to coordinate transportation-related programs and services in specific geographic areas. This ensures that Oyster Point properties who choose to participate in Genentech's shared transportation services receive credit for doing so even though the program is not a formal TMA per se (though it may become one in the future).	Edited accordingly.
31	F&P	20.400.004		V, 199		Suggest adding a sentence in the middle of the first paragraph that says "Required points are intended to align with the approximate level of auto travel reductions to achieve consistency with city, regional, and state environmental goals based on applicable industry research." We received a comment from a land use attorney that a statement along these lines would particularly help align the residential requirements with state requirements for objective standards in development review.	Edited accordingly.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
32	Genentech	20.400.004		V, 199		<p>First paragraph: There are multiple incorrect section references here that need to be corrected (e.g. "Applicability" is not 410.002; the list of measures is not 410.004)</p> <p>Last paragraph: It would be extremely helpful to be able to see this table, with the assigned points, in order to assess the ordinance. Consider including the table and point values in the ordinance itself, or at least making this available for public review before adoption.</p>	References fixed.
33	Summerhill	20.400.004		V, 199	The two code sections (410.002 and 20.410.004) referenced appear to be in error.		Edited accordingly.
34	Genentech	20.400.006		V, 201	Genentech has some general concerns about the consistency and methodology of TDM monitoring in the district, but this is something that we would welcome the opportunity to work on with staff and does not necessarily need to be resolved in the ordinance.		No change
35	BDE Architecture				<p>20.135.030.K, SSF Zoning Code, Division III: Public Open Space b. All projects 3 acres or more in total site area must provide at least two open space types.</p> <p>We are able to comply with this by counting our EVA lane as open space.</p>		Unless the Emergency Vehicle Lane: is not intended for regular vehicular use; remains publicly accessible; is improved with amenities; and satisfies the standards of an allowed open space type, this would not be allowed. Text OK as is.
36	F&P		Design guidance limiting use of meandering sidewalks			We suggest adding language that sidewalks should be designed to provide the shortest practical distance for pedestrian travel. The context is that even though we've removed the previous code language requiring meandering sidewalks, we recently heard that the Design Review Board is still asking projects to do this, so we feel like there needs to be clearer direction that staff can point to. There is similar language for walkways connecting to sidewalks in 20.210.002.F.3 that may be a good example to expand upon in the same section or somewhere else. There is also mention of meandering sidewalks in the TDM ordinance in 20.400.003.F, but it may not be explicit enough as a design standard.	23.310.002.H.1.b: Walkways shall be the shortest practical distance between the main entry and sidewalk, generally no more than 125 percent of the straight-line distance.
37	Staff ALUC Consistency Errata	Various	Various	II and III, Various	Add Section 20.300.003 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Consistency; Add references to Sec. 20.300.003 throughout Div II and III development standards as appropriate; Add reference to 20.300.010 Performance Standards.		Edited accordingly.
38	Staff Div II Errata	Various	Various	II, Various	Add subsection 20.300.003.H Reduced Side Setbacks to account for extensions of nonconformities and address setbacks on substandard lots; Edit subsection 20.300.003.I Reduced Rear Setbacks.		Edited text and graphic accordingly; added graphic for Reduced Side Setbacks.
39	Staff Div IV Errata	Various	Various	IV, Various	Edits to Site Clearance Application Review requirements; addition of Shoreline Infrastructure standards and alternative; edits to Elevation of Lowest Floor standard, addition to Stormwater Runoff and Drainage standard.		Edited accordingly.
40	Staff Div V, 320-350 Errata	Various	Various	V, Various	Change "Parking and Circulation Study" to "Parking Management and Monitoring Study," edit requirement of Study, edit Location of Required Parking requirements for residential uses to address existing residences on through-lots where residence faces Grand or Miller; add requirements for Parking Management and Monitoring Study for drive-through facilities		Edited accordingly.
41	Staff Div V, 370-430 Errata	Various	Various	V, Various	Edit Applicability to include ETC; add Approval section to Agreement Requirements; reverse order of 20.400.003 and 20.400.004.		Edited accordingly.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
42	Staff Div VI Errata		Table 20.440.009 Review Authority	VI	Add "Affordable Housing Agreement" as a review item		Section 20.135.020.B 2
43	Staff Div VII Errata			VII	No substantive changes		No change
44	Staff	Div II	Various		Is it possible to incorporate the following policy into the ZO (it is in the GP and the Housing Element): Policy PRSV-6 No net loss in housing. Require no net loss in the number of residential units during reconstruction or renovation. (GP) Program PRSV-6.1 Update Zoning Code to require no net loss: The City shall update the Zoning Ordinance to require that there is no net loss in the number of residential units during reconstruction or renovation.		Added the following to ensure no let loss of units on any one given development site. - Section 20.135.020.B.2 - "or existing density, whichever is greater" to all conventional zone min. density requirements
45	Comments on GP	5	General Plan Land Use Map	60	Will El Camino retain zoning height?	The El Camino Real area plan includes an allowance for height up to 160' and with the General Plan, the density will remain the same but height would be limited to 85' in the area, consistent with Downtown. No change is recommended.	No change
46	Comments on GP	5	General Plan Land Use Map	61	"Linden Neighborhood Center" should be used rather than "Lindenville Neighborhood Center"	Change name: "Linden Neighborhood Center"	No change
47	Comments on GP	5	Land Use Designation Table	63	Desire to preserve industrial uses. Does that mean R&D use will be precluded from the gray zones in the future?	The updated Zoning Code allows Research and Development uses, including biotechnical, with a conditional use permit. No change is recommended.	No change
48	Comments on GP	5	Land Use Designation Table	63	Policy enforcement - if I am in zoning area, and a use is grandfathered, but now mixed-use that doesn't allow life sciences, how long can life sciences stay in operation?	Billy? How is the new code addressing?	No change, addressed in Non-Conforming section.
49	Comments on GP	5	Land Use Designation Table	64	"Linden Neighborhood Center" should be used rather than "Lindenville Neighborhood Center"	Change name to "Linden Neighborhood Center"	No change
50	Comments on GP	5	Policy Framework	72	For the industrial land use designations shown in grey on the General Plan land use map, would R&D uses be allowed?		No change, refer to use tables
51	Comments on GP	5	Policy Framework	72	Per the General Plan's policy goals, namely LU 5.1 and LU 5.4, the stated goal is to help keep and foster Life Sciences and innovation in South San Francisco. The question I raised in the public comments Zoom session is: What is the city doing to attract and retain early stage Life Science companies in South San Francisco? Most of SSF's policy initiatives around Life Sciences seem to be designed for large companies and campuses. What of the smaller companies? Because we know that these smaller companies seed the growth of future large corporations here in SSF. Early stage companies need smaller, cheaper space that has good infrastructure (power, water and access to public transport). Industrial condo spaces are the best suited for this sort of conversion from warehouse use to early stage life science use. Condo buildings are particularly useful because they have common amenities, have high power and are by nature smaller and are conducive for future expansion by taking on neighboring units for future growth.	Here is my recommendation: There are vast sections of Lindenville and East of 101 where there are such condo buildings. Regardless of future zoning some or all of these facilities would benefit from an expansion of use to accommodate life science companies (at least up to Bio Safety level 2 (BSL-2) and below; i.e. BSL2 equals low risk contamination, equivalent to the needs of a butcher or a grocer for example). That way landlords or the companies themselves can embark on cheap conversions to plan their entrepreneurial seed in South San Francisco and continue the cycle that Genentech started in the late 70's. Because companies that start here invariably grows here. Here is my fear. If policy priorities are driven solely to attract larger companies, then smaller startups companies are going to look elsewhere for space. We have seen this happen in San Carlos for instance, which has seen a several-fold increase in newer life science companies. Some of this may just be growth overtaking available space. But policy has a place in this if we are to retain talent and entrepreneurs here in SSF. Per the existing General Plan most of the mixed use industrial space accommodates Life Science use, especially in Lindenville. Please do not change that by restricting Life Science use in the new General Plan.	OK for now as-is. Staff may consider permitting small (limited FAR) R&D in some T Zones.

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
52	Comments on GP	9	Policy Framework	197	Shift to reduce single occupancy vehicles, will you prohibit parking lifts? How will parking ratios be affected?	Parking lifts will not be prohibited. The updated Zoning Code includes revised parking ratios. MOB-3 addressed parking. No change is recommended.	No change
53	Comments on GP	9	Policy Framework	197	Considered parking for conversion from Industrial to CGMP environment - same ratio? Current Good Manufacturing Practice - life science - therapeutic manufacturing for local distribution. High tech manufacturing environment.	The updated Zoning Code includes revised parking ratios. MOB-3 addressed parking. No change is recommended.	No change
54	Comments on GP	10	Policy Framework	223	Need for green space, especially in areas where a lot of housing has been built. Need usable space.	Goal PR-4 contains policies to support the development of new park and open space with new development. The Zoning Code includes specific standards for development. No change recommended.	No change
55	Comments on GP	12	Policy Framework	267	As stated in your "Our Place" housing element and "Community Health and Environmental Justice" section, we appreciate your acknowledgment of frontline communities disproportionately bearing the burden of environmental injustices due to discriminatory land use practices and environmental loopholes. However, your draft policy does not define how you intend to protect residents, especially residents in affordable housing, on your brownfield revitalization sites or near toxic sites in the projected flood zone. In Policy CHEJ-4 1-5, toxic sites need to be fully remediated rather than adequately remediated given what research dictates about legacy contaminants and their emergence through flooding. We encourage you to insist that hired consultants and DTSC create remediation strategies that withstand temporary or longstanding surface flooding, erosive tidal or wave energy, and elevated groundwater levels or remove all contaminants before development begins.	This comment is about Policy CHEJ-4.2. It also relates to the EIR and Zoning Code.	If the GP policy language is changed from "adequately" to "fully," no changes are needed in the Code.
56	Comments on GP	13	Community Resilience	303	In your Community Resilience section, you mention rising seas and flooding as environmental risks to your community. We are happy to see that you used the current gold standard on SLR projections from the Ocean Protection Council (OPC). We recommend that your planning and development decisions are based off SLR projections to the years 2070 and 2100 using the medium-high risk aversion column on the OPC chart. In addition, to develop accurate flood inundation zones in your community, we recommend detailed mapping of shallow groundwater aquifers overlaid with SLR to predict where potential hotspots of emergent groundwater flooding could occur.	This is a zoning code question	Stay with GP exhibit (36 inches) for now. City will continue conversation re: how many inches/what year.
57	Comments on GP	15	Policy Framework	354	Goal ES-4: Can we add something about adding an environmental or tree preservation survey as part of development project requirements?	What does the Zoning say about this?	No change, Code requires compliance with Chapter 13.30 Tree Preservation
58	LWC		Frontages	III	Small fixes in positions of graphic dimension labels.		Corrections made to dooryard, stoop, storefront standards/labels.
59	080922 PC				Update Zoning Map to show permitted Building Types as easier way to illustrate the new form based code		See attached slides.
60	080922 PC				Ensure sustainability standards in new Zoning Code		Reference to Chapter 15.22 added to in General Site and Building Design Standards.
61	080922 PC				Ensure mobility access for open spaces in new Zoning Code		Addressed in Section 20.310.002.G.1
62	080922 PC				Consider columns for edges and corners of building in new Zoning Code		Added "columns" to Section 20.310.002.F.3 and 20.310.004.B.8

#	Source	Chapter/Section	Subsection	Div/Page	Comment	Recommendation from Source	LWC Action
63	080922 PC				Consider requirement for stacker parking or be pro stacker in the new Zoning Code		Included mention of stackers/lifts throughout discussion of parking access and design (20.310.002) and standards for multi-family and residential mixed-use structured parking (20.310.004.H). Also added definition of "Stackers" to Defs of Terms.
64	Commissioner email				Is there a way we can require historic structure evaluation for buildings over X years in age, so that projects relying on findings of a Program EIR aren't overlooked?		Inserted the following section 20.470.003.A.2 into the Site Clearance Review and Decision section: 20.470.003 Review and Decision A. General. Before the City may issue any business license, building permit, subdivision approval, or lot line adjustment, the Chief Planner shall review the application to: 1. Determine whether the use, building, or change in lot configuration complies with all provisions of this Ordinance or any design review, Use Permit or Variance approval issued pursuant to the Ordinance requirements; 2. <u>Review application for, and issue a certificate of alteration authorizing alteration, demolition or construction affecting, historic resources; and</u> 3. Determine that all conditions of such permits and approvals have been satisfied.
65	May 16 team meeting	20.350.028	Use tables and Specific to Uses	II (all use tables); V,132	Discussion about standard requirements for Mobile Vendors on private property and if/where this use should be restricted.	Add requirement for SSF business license, requirement to comply with state and county health codes (includes requirements for bathroom letter), make sure definition says food must be prepared on-site (ice cream truck is different). Add rows for Mobile Vending in the Accessory Uses section of the use tables with reference to the Specific-to-Uses/Mobile Vending section.	Edits: - Business license and health code compliance added to Section 20.350.028 Mobile Vending Services. - Mobile Vending Services added as P in all non-residential and mixed-use districts with reference to section 20.350.028 - Definition of Mobile Vending Services moved from Definitions of Terms to Definitions of Uses.
66	Staff rec. based on CAC/PC comments	30.395.003	Community Benefits Review and Approval	V, 193	Create three "tiers" of community benefits; up to 1.5 extra FAR by-right, 1.5-2.5 by-right with fee; 2.5+ negotiated		Edited accordingly.
67	H&K	30.395.003	Community Benefits	V, 193		Add "On-Site or Off-Site Affordable Housing" as a Community Benefit. Specify that if a community benefit is provided, the value is credited against the fee required in accordance with the Community Benefit Fee Schedule	Edited accordingly.