



# Memorandum

**TO:** HONORABLE MAYOR  
AND CITY COUNCIL

**FROM:** Planning Commission

**SUBJECT:** SEE BELOW

**DATE:** April 23, 2020

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 6

**SUBJECT: SP19-064. SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ON-SITE RESIDENTIAL AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, THE REMOVAL OF TWENTY-EIGHT (28) ORDINANCE SIZE TREES AND THIRTEEN (13) NON-ORDINANCE SIZE TREES, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A MIXED-USE PROJECT CONSISTING OF: 233 AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS (EXCLUDING TWO MANAGER'S UNITS), 1,780 SQUARE FEET OF GROUND-FLOOR RETAIL, AND INCENTIVES UNDER THE STATE DENSITY BONUS LAW TO REDUCE THE FRONT SETBACK AND MINIMUM VEHICLE PARKING.**

**THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WOULD BE LOCATED ON AN APPROXIMATELY 2.09-GROSS ACRE SITE AT 961-971 MERIDIAN AVENUE, MIDBLOCK BETWEEN FRUITDALE AVENUE AND CURCI DRIVE, ON THE WEST SIDE OF MERIDIAN AVENUE.**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the City Council take all of the following actions:

1. Adopt a resolution certifying the Environmental Impact Report for the Meridian Apartments Project (SCH#2019050006) and making certain findings concerning significant impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a related Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, all in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
2. Adopt a resolution approving, subject to conditions, the Special Use Permit and Incentives under State Density Bonus Law to allow the demolition of two residential buildings, accessory structures, a warehouse, and removal of 28 ordinance-sized trees and 13 non-ordinance-sized trees, for the construction of a 100% affordable housing project (excluding two market rate manager's units) with up to 233 multi-family residential apartment units with subterranean parking inclusive of an alternative parking design, 1,780 square feet of ground-floor retail, and incentives to reduce the required front setback along Meridian Avenue, and reduce the amount of required vehicle parking, all on an approximately 2.09-gross acre site.

3. Adopt a resolution approving the Density Bonus Regulatory Agreement pursuant to San José Municipal Code [Chapter 20.190.100](#).

### **OUTCOME**

If the City Council approves all the actions listed above, the applicant will be able to move forward with the building process to demolish the existing on-site buildings, remove twenty-eight (28) ordinance size trees and thirteen (13) non-ordinance size trees, and construct a 6-story mixed-use project consisting of: 1,780 square feet of ground-floor retail and 233 affordable multi-family units (excluding two manager units) with incentives under the State Density Bonus Law to reduce the front setback along Meridian Avenue to seven feet and reduce the total vehicle parking spaces required from 289 to 113 parking spaces.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On April 8, 2020, the Planning Commission considered the Environmental Impact Report with a Statement of Overriding Consideration for the demolition of a historic resource and Special Use Permit to facilitate the mixed-use development with 231 affordable units, two manager units, and 1,780 square feet of ground-floor retail on April 8, 2020. One member of the public spoke in favor of the project and also requested that the Planning Commission consider the addition of project conditions to enhance the use of alternative modes of transit to and from the project site. The Planning Commission discussed the merits of the affordable project and the need to promote alternative modes of transportation city-wide. The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend adoption of the environmental resolution and approval of the project to the City Council with an added condition of approval to require the applicant to coordinate with Planning Staff on the implementation of additional and cost-effective transit measures.

### **BACKGROUND**

On April 8, 2020, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing to consider and make a recommendation to the City Council on the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Special Use Permit.

#### *Staff Presentation*

Staff provided an overview of the proposed project and its conformance with the General Plan designation, Zoning Ordinance, and city policies. Staff provided an update on the status of the Regulatory Agreement and Subordination Agreement required under State law and the City's State Density Bonus Ordinance. The Regulatory Agreement provides assurance that the affordable units will be constructed and restricted for 55 years in exchange for the requested incentives. Staff received a fully executed Regulatory Agreement prior to the Public Hearing and the Subordination Agreements (Exhibits K and L) would be removed pending an updated

Title Report. Additionally, staff noted, since the posting of the draft staff report for Planning Commission, public comments were received recommending project revisions to enhance the use of alternative modes of transportation to and from the site including additional bicycle parking, bicycle lane improvements, and the creation of a more direct route to the Fruitdale VTA transit station. Staff identified minor corrections to be made to Exhibit F; these corrections included updating the total manager units and the total parking count.

### *Public Hearing*

The applicant, Drew Walstrum, representing ROEM West, Inc., offered insight into the anticipated affordability levels (30-80% AMI), highlighted the building's contemporary classic architecture with active ground-floor spaces, reiterated the need for the incentives, and as a point of clarification, noted that although the density bonus incentive would reduce parking from 389 required spaces to 113 vehicle parking spaces, 290 parking spaces are proposed for the project.

Alex Shoor spoke on behalf of Catalyze SV. Mr. Shoor explained that the project had been presented to Catalyze SV on February 26, 2020, and that it had scored well on their review system with 3.8 points out of a possible 5.0 points. He stated that while the affordable housing project has never been more important, Catalyze SV did have a few suggestions for project improvement including, improvements to transit options to and from the site, bicycle usage and connectivity, and energy efficiency in the building design (i.e. LEED). He asked the Planning Commission to have a discussion on the suggestions and consider making some or all the suggestions as conditions of approval.

The applicant, Drew Walstrum, responded to the comments made by Catalyze SV. He stated that while it appeared that the project had an expeditious review, in fact, the project was delayed because of the Environmental Impact Report and they were excited to finally have the project before the Planning Commission. Furthermore, he stated that ROEM was not opposed to considering some of the suggestions made by Catalyze SV; however, a commitment to an easement across private properties was unlikely to be feasible. Mr. Walstrum expressed that the biggest design influence for ROEM is to service the residents the best way they can; vehicle parking is an anticipated need given the suburban nature of the neighborhood and therefore, the project proposes 290 parking spaces. He ended by stating that ROEM is willing to look at transit passes or bike share but would prefer not to have it as part of the entitlement.

### *Planning Commission Discussion and Staff Response*

Commissioner Caballero asked if the Department of Public Works (PW) could speak on whether Meridian Avenue would include a bike lane in the future. PW staff provided an overview of the Department of Transportation plan line – a concept roadway plan line – that does include bike lanes on the project frontage on Meridian Avenue. He added that midblock developments, such as this project, need special consideration when planning street frontage improvements because it would not make sense to have a partial bike lane in the middle of the block. He noted that PW staff would coordinate with the applicant.

Commissioner Allen asked if the applicant could expand on easements needed to provide the recommended connection to the light rail transit station and whether the applicant had actually approached the surrounding property owners to consider an easement. Mr. Walstrum said that ROEM had not approached the property owners but by looking at a map of the site, he envisioned it would be difficult to coordinate easements wide enough to support a walkway with two separate property owners. He added that the connection proposed by Catalyze SV (towards St. Elizabeth Drive) would cut through a parking lot and access to a trash enclosure on the adjacent properties, making this option even more difficult and unlikely. Further, if they were to secure an easement, it would be no more than five feet based on experience with other projects. The applicant stated that the feasible easement area is very narrow, and this would not be a tree-lined path, but rather a paved walkway.

Commissioner Allen stated he was sympathetic to the difficulties associated with private easements and returned the conversation to the future of the bike infrastructure in the neighborhood. PW staff reiterated that there was a plan line and that the implementation of the bike lane was the Department's goal. When Commissioner Allen followed up with a question about funding for the bike lane, PW staff stated that midblock development upgrades are not desirable and that the applicant would pay their share for the improvement under a long-term plan. Commissioner Oliverio indicated that a bike lane project would be part of a larger city project and that a single project should not be conditioned to provide an entire bike lane. He noted that the applicant is paying for public improvements in general which fund improvements such as bike lanes.

Commissioner Oliverio made a motion to approve the staff recommendation to recommend that the Council adopt a resolution certifying the EIR and adopt a resolution approving the Special Use Permit for the project. Commissioner Yesney seconded the motion.

Chair Ballard asked Planning staff what could be done to increase transit usage. Staff explained that additional bike infrastructure could be studied when work commenced on the Southwest Expressway Urban Village Plan and staff would engage the community on the desired transit infrastructure. Staff added that the project is providing the minimum Code-required bicycle parking and that additional parking was not a concern or need raised at either of the two community meetings the City hosted for this project.

Chair Ballard clarified her question by asking what could be done programmatically to encourage public transit and bike usage. Staff informed the Commission that typically, programmatic elements come about as a result of the traffic analysis and are usually measures packaged in a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. However, this project did not require a TDM plan. Staff noted that the Planning Commission could recommend additional project conditions to City Council to increase transit ridership or bicycle usage by the project.

Commissioner Oliverio cautioned that additional conditions may be onerous, especially on affordable projects requesting density bonuses and stated the project should be approved as recommended by staff.

Chair Ballard stated that the Council should be aware of the Planning Commission's message in support of alternative transportation usage and that the citywide project requirements should be increased to encourage other modes of transportation. Chair Ballard added that providing new residents with a public transit information packet with information on alternative/public transit options and the nearby trail could encourage behavior changes.

Commissioner Bonilla noted that the larger bike infrastructure was the responsibility of the City and the County and would be onerous on developers. Commissioner Griswold echoed sentiment that additional conditions like these would be burdensome on affordable housing developers. Chair Ballard noted that ROEM was a for-profit developer. Commissioner Allen noted, while transit and bicycle ridership is a concern, he was hesitant to tie the citywide issue to this project alone, especially given it is a 100% affordable project.

Commissioner Caballero agreed with Chair Ballard's thoughts on improving the project's viability by incorporating additional measures to encourage bike and public transit usage.

Commissioner Allen reiterated Commissioner Bonilla's statement and shared that this is a citywide issue and the actual standards should be elevated to City Council, separate from this project.

Commissioner Yesney indicated that she did not think it was appropriate to apply conditions on the basis that the applicant was a for-profit developer. Commissioner Yesney added that she was grateful ROEM is building affordable projects and would not like to send a signal to the larger development community that the Planning Commission was fragmented or uncertain on affordable housing projects. She noted that the Planning Commission should not come up with conditions on the fly to meet a condition that is not quantitative.

The Senior Deputy City Attorney indicated she understood there were two aspects to what might be a friendly amendment: recommend conditions on the project with specific transportation amendments or recommend Council review larger policy on transit requirements. She asked the Commissioners to clarify their request for a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Ballard made a motion for a friendly amendment to the motion made by Commissioner Oliverio (seconded by Commissioner Yesney) to direct that staff and the applicant to work together on how to get people out of cars in a cost-effective manner and called on staff to collect thoughts on how this might be accomplished and make a recommendation to the Council. Staff noted possible solutions could include referring to the language in the TDM measures identified in the Zoning Code for parking reductions (Section 20.90.220) or looking to increase bicycle parking spaces on the project site.

Chair Ballard asked the applicant if he was amenable to the changes. Mr. Walstrum responded that the applicant team was not against the proposed changes; however, it would have to be cost-effective. He added that the Fruitdale Light Rail Transit Station was a seven-minute walk from

the project site taking the long way and additionally, there are bus stops and a trail less than 200 feet from the project site.

Commissioner Oliverio noted his unease with conditions that are not concrete and recommended a revised motion to approve the project as recommended by Staff with the additional condition that Staff and the applicant look to implement cost-effective measures to increase the use of alternative modes of transportation for the project.

Commissioners Oliverio and Yesney agreed to amend the original motion to include Commissioner Ballard's request for a friendly amendment to recommend the Council adopt a resolution certifying the EIR and adopt a resolution approving the Special Use Permit with staff and the applicant to discuss adding various transportation measures, such as bike share and Ecopass, so long as those transportation measures are cost effective and do not jeopardize the feasibility of the project. The motion with the friendly amendment passed unanimously (7-0-0).

*Correspondence in support of Catalyze SV's letter to Planning Commission, April 8, 2020*

Planning Commission received four emails on April 8, 2020 from the public in favor of the suggestions made in the original letter dated March 26, 2020 from Catalyze SV. The original letter and the emails received on April 8, 2020 are included in the project's public record (Exhibit H).

## **ANALYSIS**

Analysis of the proposed CEQA clearance and Special Use Permit, including conformance with the General Plan, and City Council policies are contained in the attached staff report.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend to City Council the adoption of the environmental resolution, approval of the subject project, and adoption of a resolution approving the Density Bonus Regulatory Agreement. The Planning Commission directed staff to work with the applicant to identify project design features or programmatic elements to encourage use of public transit and bike usage. The follow-up resulted in a proposed added condition of approval to which the applicant is in agreement.

## **EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP**

Should the City Council (i) certify the EIR and adopt the associated MMRP, (ii) approve the Special Use Permit, and (iii) approve the Regulatory Agreement, the project site would be able to move forward with the building process to demolish the existing on-site buildings and remove twenty-eight (28) ordinance size trees and thirteen (13) non-ordinance size trees, and construct a

6-story mixed-use project consisting of: 1,780 square feet of ground-floor retail and 233 affordable multi-family units (excluding two manager units) with incentives under the State Density Bonus Law to reduce the front setback along Meridian Avenue to seven feet and reduce the total vehicle parking from 289 to 113 parking spaces.

Since the Planning Commission hearing, staff discussed with the applicant additional transit measures that could respond to Planning Commission's suggestions. The following condition of approval was drafted:

**Additional Transit Measures:** Prior to issuance of any and all Building Permits, the applicant and the Director of PBCE or her designee shall coordinate and determine cost-effective project design features or programmatic elements to encourage alternative modes of transportation to and from the site. These design features or programming may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Development of a transit use incentive program for tenants, such as on-site distribution of passes or subsidized transit passes for local transit system (participation in the region-wide Clipper Card or VTA EcoPass system will satisfy this requirement).
- b. Implementation of a car-share program on-site.
- c. Implementation of an information packet and assigned transit manager to provide transit information for all new residents to the site. The information packet and manager could provide information such as education regarding alternative transportation options near the site.
- d. Provide a bicycle-share program or free use of bicycles on-site that is available to all tenants of the site.
- e. Unbundled parking.

The applicant reviewed the condition language and is willing to review and implement measure(s) as long as it remains cost-effective.

### **CLIMATE SMART SAN JOSÉ**

The recommendation in this memorandum aligns with one or more Climate Smart San José energy, water, or mobility goals. The project would increase the density of the site and would implement design features for a high-performing, energy-efficient building.

### **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

Staff followed Council Policy 6-30: Public Outreach Policy, whereby, the project is considered a large development proposal. Following City Council Policy 6-30, the applicant posted the on-site sign to inform the neighborhood of the proposed project. Two community meetings were held to discuss the project on May 30, 2019 and October 24, 2019. Comments received during the

community meeting and project review are further discussed in the attached Planning Commission Staff Report. Both community meetings were coordinated with Council District Office 6.

Staff's contact information has also been available on the community meeting notices and on the project webpage. The staff report is also posted on the City's website. Staff has been available to respond to questions from the public.

### **COORDINATION**

Preparation of this memorandum has been coordinated with the City Attorney's Office.

### **COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the project recommendation, as described above.

### **CEQA**

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse Number 2019050006) was prepared by the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement for the Meridian Apartments Project (SP19-064) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study prepared for this project concluded that implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact on a historic resource; therefore, an EIR was prepared which focused the analysis on Cultural Resources.

The EIR determined that demolition of the residence at 971 Meridian Avenue, a candidate City Landmark structure, would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Even though mitigation measures that include documentation, relocation, and salvage would lessen the impact, the residence and its historic connection to the current location would be lost. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation measures were also developed to lessen the following impacts to less than significant levels: exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, disturbance and/or destruction of migratory nesting birds, exposure of workers to residual contamination from previous industrial operations at the project site, exposure of sensitive receptors to construction noise, and damage to adjacent structures from construction vibration.

Standard Permit Conditions are also required to ensure no impacts occur during construction and operation of the project. These Standard Permit Conditions include best management practices for construction related air quality impacts, compliance with the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan, compliance with the California Building Code for seismic safety of the proposed building,



erosion control during construction activities, protection of unknown subsurface resources, protection of construction workers from hazards related to asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint, water quality impacts during construction, and impacts to public facilities.

The Draft EIR is available for review on the project page on the City's Active EIRs website at: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments/planning-building-code-enforcement/planning-division/environmental-planning/environmental-review/active-eirs>.

*EIR Recirculation Unnecessary*

Catalyze SV submitted comments to the applicant and copied City staff and the Mayor on March 26, 2020, after the Draft EIR comment period had ended. Their letter stated that the positive elements of the project included affordability, sustainability, and a vibrant active ground floor. The letter further stated that the project elements that could be improved included transportation, connection with St. Elizabeth Drive, community engagement, and intensity/zoning.

These comments do not identify inadequacies in the Draft EIR or present new previously unidentified significant impacts that require recirculation. The recirculation of an EIR is required when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft SEIR for public review but before certification. "Information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to a Draft EIR is not "significant" unless the Draft EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5).

No new information has been added to the EIR since publication of the Draft EIR; therefore, it does not need to be recirculated.

/s/  
ROSALYNN HUGHEY, Secretary  
Planning Commission

For questions, please contact Planning Official, Robert Manford, at (408) 535-7900.

Attachments: [Planning Commission Staff Report<sup>1</sup>](#)  
Emails -- April 8, 2020

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=56382>

## Blanco, Maira

---

**From:** Carlin Black <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 9:54 AM  
**To:** PlanningSupportStaff; Blanco, Maira; Van Der Zweep, Cassandra; Mahamood, Reema; Keyon, David; Hughey, Rosalynn; advocacy@catalyzesv.org; projects@catalyzesv.org; semami@roemcorp.com; lthomas@roemcorp.com; dwalstrum@roemcorp.com  
**Subject:** My Input on Meridian Apartments by ROEM (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Dear Planning Commissioners, Planning staff, & ROEM,

Can you please implement some or all of the suggestions Catalyze SV members offered on March 26 for improving the project?

The most critical is the St. Elizabeth direct connection for bikes and pedestrians.

Since this is a low income project car ownership should be discouraged by unbundling parking and additional reduction in the resident parking ratio.

I would also strongly suggest extra floor(s) with no more parking to add units to the project.

The other Catalyze SV suggestions for better bike provisions are desirable, but will probably evolve naturally as the project is occupied.

I want the best possible development projects to be built in our community. Catalyze SV has some good ideas for how to make this project even better.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,

Carlin Black  
95129

Sent from my iPad

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Blanco, Maira

---

**From:** kirk vartan [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 12:37 PM  
**To:** PlanningSupportStaff; Blanco, Maira; Van Der Zweep, Cassandra; Mahamood, Reema; Keyon, David; Hughey, Rosalynn; advocacy@catalyzesv.org; projects@catalyzesv.org; Stephen Emami; lthomas@roemcorp.com; dwalstrum@roemcorp.com  
**Subject:** My Input on Meridian Apartments by ROEM (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Dear Planning Commissioners, Planning staff, & ROEM,

Can you please implement some or all of the suggestions Catalyze SV members offered on March 26 for improving the project?

I want the best possible development projects to be built in our community. Catalyze SV has some good ideas for how to make this project even better.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,

Kirk Vartan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Blanco, Maira

---

**From:** Debra von Huene <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 12:49 PM  
**To:** PlanningSupportStaff; Blanco, Maira; Van Der Zweep, Cassandra; Mahamood, Reema; Keyon, David; Hughey, Rosalynn; advocacy@catalyzesv.org; Project Specialist; semami@roemcorp.com; lthomas@roemcorp.com; dwalstrum@roemcorp.com  
**Subject:** My Input on Meridian Apartments by ROEM (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Dear Planning Commissioners, Planning staff, & ROEM,

Can you please implement some or all of the suggestions Catalyze SV members offered on March 26 for improving the project?

I want the best possible development projects to be built in our community. Catalyze SV has some good ideas for how to make this project even better.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,  
Debra von Huene

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Blanco, Maira

---

**From:** Alex Shoor <alex@CatalyzeSV.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 5:48 PM  
**To:** Blanco, Maira  
**Cc:** Van Der Zweep, Cassandra; Mahamood, Reema; Keyon, David; Project Specialist; Hughey, Rosalynn; Planning Commission 4  
**Subject:** Re: Catalyze SV's Evaluation of ROEM's project at 961-971 Meridian Avenue (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Maira,

Thank you for your thorough response to our note. Thank you to Planning for considering our ideas.

On the bike parking spaces: where the developer is doing is the minimum number of spaces, we wonder if 60 spaces for 200+ homes is not enough, especially for a site near light rail and even closer to the Los Gatos Creek Trail where biking is easy.

Yes, I will be speaking on behalf of Catalyze SV during tonight's hearing on Item 4.b.

- Alex

Alex Shoor  
Executive Director  
Catalyze SV  
[alex@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:alex@CatalyzeSV.org)  
[www.CatalyzeSV.org](http://www.CatalyzeSV.org)

On Apr 7, 2020, at 12:28 PM, Blanco, Maira <[Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov)> wrote:

Hi Alex,

Planning staff has earlier internal deadlines for hearing packets; however, the correspondence was forwarded to the Commissioners and is now available online. I checked this morning and was able to locate your comments on the agenda, see page 345 of the PDF for Item 4.b.

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=56384>

On that note, I did read through the score card and feedback form and coordinated with the Department of Public Works to see how feasible the implementation would be for the bike lane and this is the update:

DPW is reviewing a plan line from DOT; bike lanes are not unreasonable along the project frontage, however, 400 feet of striping to the trailhead may not be feasible. DPW and DOT to look at the connection to see if it is something the City could implement – would be great to bring up to the DOT

bike program. Of course, this would be part of a larger discussion and plan and not contingent on the approval of this project.

I also reviewed the connection being proposed from the project site to the Fruitdale LRT and think it is an excellent idea, however, the City could not condition this. The property owners would have to work out private easements with the other private properties. This would be a great study for the future Urban Village Plan when that work commences. Per the Urban Village team, outreach will begin in the next couple of years for the Southwest Expressway Urban Village.

With respect to additional bike parking – this was not a need that was raised in the couple of community meetings we hosted. The project is providing the minimum bicycle parking required per the Code (short-term and long-term) and may be something the applicant could incorporate in the future, especially if and when, a bike lane is considered on Meridian Avenue. As you’ve noted, the ground-floor retail space provides great activation for the frontage and has potential to become a “stop” for bicyclists.

2. Please find below the Zoom invitation for the 4/8 Planning Commission hearing. The streaming will start at 6:15, but the hearing will officially start at 6:30 p.m. sharp on Wednesday, April 8, 2020 . The Meridian Apartments project is currently on the consent calendar (item no. 4.b). If you wish to comment on the project or request a public hearing, please email me your name(s) as they will appear on Zoom and phone number (back up option).

1. Please log into Zoom Webinar at **6:15 p.m.**

- At 6:15 p.m. we will start streaming the meeting
- At 6:30 p.m. meeting will start

2. Zoom:

- Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device, please click this URL to join. <https://zoom.us/j/892466121>
- Or join by phone, dial: [+1 669 900 9128](tel:+16699009128)
- Webinar ID: [892 466 121](https://zoom.us/j/892466121)
- If you run into any issues, please contact Jennifer Provedor at (408) 535-3505 for assistance.
- Zoom 101: [link](#)
- Zoom introduction: [link](#)

You will be muted during the session until the Planning Commission cues you up to speak, if appropriate. To enable this, we need to know prior to the meeting: (1) the Zoom “name” you’ll use when signing into the Zoom Conference Call (your first and last name is fine) and (2) your phone number you’ll use to call into the call (even if you plan to use your laptop, we need to know your phone as a back-up in case your audio on your computer fails).

With all this said, I have some time later on today to hop on a call if needed.

Thank you,

Maira

---

**From:** Alex Shoor <[alex@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:alex@CatalyzeSV.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 3:46 PM  
**To:** Blanco, Maira <[Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <[Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov)>; Mahamood, Reema <[reema.mahamood@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:reema.mahamood@sanjoseca.gov)>; Keyon, David <[david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov)>; Project Specialist <[projects@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:projects@CatalyzeSV.org)>; Hughey, Rosalynn <[Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov)>; Planning Commission 4 <[PlanningCom4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:PlanningCom4@sanjoseca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Catalyze SV's Evaluation of ROEM's project at 961-971 Meridian Avenue (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Maira,

Thank you for confirmation of the day of the hearing being this Wednesday. Thank you as well for forwarding Catalyze SV's input to the Commissioners.

We emailed the documents to Planning staff on March 26. Do you know why they weren't adjointed to the agenda? I notice they still aren't on the online version. Should they be as a form of official public comment?

Did you have any input for us on our comments? Any of them that you think merit ROEM (or the City) implementing them?

FYI - We are considering requesting to pull this item from consent.

Thank you,  
Alex

Alex Shoor  
Executive Director  
Catalyze SV  
[alex@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:alex@CatalyzeSV.org)  
[www.CatalyzeSV.org](http://www.CatalyzeSV.org)

On Apr 2, 2020, at 6:19 PM, Blanco, Maira <[Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Maira.Blanco@sanjoseca.gov)> wrote:

Alex,

The subject project (SP19-064) is on the 4/8 Planning Commission agenda, please see agenda and hearing documents below:

<https://www.san Joseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/planning-building-code-enforcement/planning-division/commissions-and-hearings/planning-commission/agendas-minutes-2020>

Although we missed the deadline to adjoin your comments as an exhibit, the letter, feedback form, and score card were forwarded (or will be forwarded tomorrow) to the Planning Commissioners and thus will be available to them prior to the hearing. The item is on consent (no public hearing) and Staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council to approve the project.

Thank you,

Maira

---

**From:** Alex Shoor <[alex@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:alex@CatalyzeSV.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, March 30, 2020 11:50 PM

**To:** Blanco, Maira <[Maira.Blanco@san Joseca.gov](mailto:Maira.Blanco@san Joseca.gov)>

**Cc:** Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <[Cassandra.VanDerZweep@san Joseca.gov](mailto:Cassandra.VanDerZweep@san Joseca.gov)>; Mahamood, Reema <[reema.mahamood@san Joseca.gov](mailto:reema.mahamood@san Joseca.gov)>; Keyon, David

<[david.keyon@san Joseca.gov](mailto:david.keyon@san Joseca.gov)>; Hughey, Rosalynn <[Rosalynn.Hughey@san Joseca.gov](mailto:Rosalynn.Hughey@san Joseca.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Catalyze SV's Evaluation of ROEM's project at 961-971 Meridian Avenue (SP19-064)

[External Email]

Maira,

Thank you for the information; we didn't know it is scheduled for next week's Planning Commission! Is that still the plan?

Yes, thank you for adding our letter to the public record leading into the Planning Commission meeting. I trust it got added before the deadline if the packet is going out for 4/8?

Thank you - Alex

Alex Shoor

Executive Director

Catalyze SV

[alex@CatalyzeSV.org](mailto:alex@CatalyzeSV.org)

[www.CatalyzeSV.org](http://www.CatalyzeSV.org)

On Mar 26, 2020, at 4:25 PM, Blanco, Maira  
<[Maira.Blanco@san Joseca.gov](mailto:Maira.Blanco@san Joseca.gov)> wrote:



Dear Alex Shoor,

My name is Maira Blanco and I am the project manager for SP19-064.

Thanks for your comments on the ROEM mixed-use, affordable housing development at 961-971 Meridian Avenue (SP19-064) – I have added your letter to the public record. As you may know, we have tentatively scheduled this project for the 4/8 Planning Commission hearing (followed by 4/28 City Council hearing); hearing documents will be published and available on our website shortly. If we can answer any questions, we would be happy to do so via email or via a video conference call.

Best,

Maira

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.