



City of Emeryville

CALIFORNIA

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 17, 2022

TO: Christine Daniel, City Manager

FROM: Charles S. Bryant, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Study Session – 58Fifty Shellmound Life Science Tower, 5850 Shellmound Way

RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests that the City Council consider this staff report and provide direction by responding to the questions posed under the section “Issues to be Considered”.

BACKGROUND

On May 10, 2021, CA Ventures filed a preapplication for a 14-story, 265-foot high building accommodating 388,090 square feet of life science use (“Research and Development”) with approximately 10,000 square feet of ground floor retail/amenity space. The Mixed Use with Residential (MUR) zoning of the site requires a mix of uses, one of which must be residential, unless the applicant can convincingly demonstrate that a mix of uses is infeasible. The applicant contended that a residential use is infeasible on this site. A Planning Commission study session was held on August 26, 2021, at which the Commission generally supported the project, while expressing skepticism that a residential use was not feasible. The Commission directed the applicant to provide a comprehensive analysis at the next study session of why residential use is not viable at this site.

On September 2, 2021, CA Ventures withdrew their previous application for an 8-story mixed use building with 244 residential units on the same site, and on October 6, 2021, application fees were paid for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review for the life science tower project. A community meeting was held on October 21, 2021, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee reviewed the project on November 1, 2021, and a second Planning Commission study session was held on February 24, 2022. One of the key policy questions that the Planning Commission was asked at this study session was regarding the mix of uses.

As the project parcel size is between 1 and 5 acres and is in the Mixed Use with Residential (MUR) Zone, the proposal needs to include a mix of uses, one of which must be residential, as required by Section 9-3.303(b)(2)b of the Planning Regulations. A single use may be allowed with a conditional use permit provided that the following finding can be made in addition to the regular findings required for a conditional use permit:

That the applicant has convincingly demonstrated that it is infeasible to develop a project with a mix of use groups on the site. (Section 9-3.303(c)(1))

In response to the Commission's direction at the August 26, 2021 study session, the applicant prepared the attached "Emeryville Residential Analysis" (Attachment 3). Economic Development and Housing Division staff worked with a consultant to peer review the applicant's analysis of the feasibility of housing on this site and presented the results to the Commission at the February 24, 2022 study session (see "5850 Shellmound Residential Feasibility Review, Economic and Planning Systems, Attachment 4). In general, the City's consultant concurred in the applicant's analysis. The majority of the Commissioners indicated that they understood the conclusions of the applicant's and City's consultant's analyses, that a large residential development is not financially feasible on this site at this time but stated that at least some amount of housing should still be considered as part of the proposal. It was suggested that a few townhouse units could be located on the ground floor and would therefore not require elevators. As a result the applicant revised their project to include six townhouse units and this revised proposal was reviewed by the Commission on April 28, 2022. The Commission's comments are outlined below under the section "Planning Commission Comments".

The project requires City Council approval because it includes a General Plan Amendment (GPA). The reason for the GPA is that the General Plan Land Use Map shows a revised location of Shellmound Way that is approximately 150 feet north of the existing location, and the project has not been designed to comply with the relocation of Shellmound Way as shown in the General Plan. This issue is discussed below under "Staff Comments".

Project Proposal

The project proposes a 14-story, 265-foot-high building accommodating 385,740 square feet of life science use ("Research and Development"), six townhouse residential units, and approximately 2,300 square feet of ground floor retail/amenity space at 5850 Shellmound Way (see Sheet 18 of Project Plans dated April 4, 2022, Attachment 1).

The two-level townhouses are each approximately 1,377 square feet and will all be Below Market Rate (BMR) units with four allocated to be Very Low-Income units, and the remaining two to be Low-Income units. These are currently being conceived to be rental units.

These townhouse units are sited along the bicycle-pedestrian path along the northern property line and will be of wood construction and a separate building from the life science building. The 265-foot steel frame building will cantilever over the 27-foot tall townhouses (See Sheet 20). See Sheets 19 and 28 for townhomes elevations.

The building lobby occurs off Christie Avenue as does the entrance to parking and loading. Loading occurs within the building on the ground floor and 409 vehicular parking spaces are provided on six levels of parking. Sheet 25 illustrates typical floor plans

whereas Sheet 20 provides a north-south sectional view of the parking structure and townhouse units. The building reaches a roof height of 240 feet with an additional 25 feet accommodating mechanical support equipment. Since the building would have continuous exterior cladding from the ground to the top of the mechanical level, it would appear to be 265 feet tall, although the “official” building height would be 240 feet, as measured to the top of the roof. Sheet 17 provides an illustration of heights of surrounding high-rise buildings and a shadow study is provided on Sheet 30.

A 15,000 square foot terrace for tenants is provided on the fifth level above the parking structure (see Sheet 25) and approximately 19,150 square feet of open space is provided on the ground level in the form of a plaza at the corner of Christie Avenue and Shellmound Way (see Sheet 18).

The design of the building is preliminary at this time. Potential cladding for the life science building that is being considered is an aluminum and glass curtain wall system, with a custom perforated metal system for the garage cladding.

DISCUSSION

Conformity to General Plan and Planning Regulations

General Plan

Shellmound Way Relocation: The General Plan Land Use Map (see Attachment 2) shows a revised location of Shellmound Way that is approximately 150 feet north of the existing location. The project would need a General Plan Amendment as the project has not been designed to comply with the location of Shellmound Way in the General Plan. This issue is discussed further below under “Staff Comments”.

Land Use: The General Plan Land Use Diagram (Figure 2-2) classifies the project site as “Mixed Use with Residential”, which is described in Section 2.4 of the General Plan as “One or more of a variety of residential and non-residential uses including but not limited to offices, retail and hotel. On larger sites, a mix of residential and non-residential uses is required; on smaller sites, a single use may be permitted.” The project provides a mix of commercial uses and now provides residential as one of the uses. Please see further discussion under “Zoning District” below.

Planning Regulations

Zoning District: The base zoning district for the site is “Mixed Use with Residential” (MUR), which allows for a variety of commercial uses as well as multi-unit residential use.

The site is also in the Transit Hub (TH) overlay zone where all parking requirements are reduced by 50%, and in Pedestrian Priority (PP) which calls for wider sidewalks. This is further discussed below.

Use Classification: The proposed life sciences use is classified as a “Research and Development” Industrial use type which requires a conditional use permit in the MUR Zone, and the proposed six townhouses are classified as Multi-Unit Residential, which is allowed by right in this zone.

Mix of Uses Required: As the parcel size is between 1 and 5 acres, a conditional use permit and mix of uses, one of which must be residential, is required by Section 9-3.303(b)(2)b of the Planning Regulations. The regulations do not specify the proportion of the mix between residential and non-residential uses, and it is up to the discretion of the decision-making body to determine whether the proposal qualifies as “mixed use”.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

The Floor Area Ratio for the site is 3.0 and can be increased to a bonus FAR of 6.0 with a conditional use permit and the provision of increased affordable housing impact fee and community benefits. The proposed FAR for the project is almost exactly 6.0 (388,090 square feet of floor area/64,682 square feet of site area). The project therefore will require 100 bonus points for FAR.

Height

The site falls within the 75/100+ foot height district, which can be increased to a bonus height of over 100 feet with a conditional use permit. The proposed height of the building is 240 feet. The project therefore will require 100 bonus points for height.

Residential Density

The maximum residential density for the site is 85 units per acre and can be increased to 170 units per acre with a conditional use permit. Based on a 64,682 square foot (1.48-acre) site, the permitted base density calculates to 126 units and 252 units with bonus points. The proposed density of 6 units on 1.48 acres calculates to 4.05 units per acre, which is permitted by right and requires no bonus points.

Bonus Points

Pursuant to Section 9-4.204 of the Planning Regulations, the project requires 100 bonus points, the greatest of the number of points required for FAR (100), height (100), and residential density (0).

For non-residential project components, such as the proposed life sciences tower, pursuant to Section 9-4.204(d), the applicant will need to obtain half of the bonus points (50) by paying an additional affordable housing impact fee. As such, the applicant will need to pay an additional 100 percent of the affordable housing impact fee at the time of building permit issuance. For reference, the current affordable housing impact fee for Research and Development is \$4.83 per square foot, so the applicant would need to pay \$9.66 per square feet to obtain 50 bonus points if the building permit were issued today.

This calculates to approximately \$3.75 million. The actual fee required will be whatever is in effect at the time that the building permit is issued.

The remaining 50 bonus points must be earned through the provision of community benefits, pursuant to Section 9-4.204(e). Possible benefits include additional public open space, zero net energy, public improvements, utility undergrounding, a contribution to the City's small business fund, and/or the "Flexible Community Benefit", a currently undefined community benefit proposed by the applicant. The applicant has not yet specified exactly how the community benefits bonus points will be obtained and has suggested providing additional public open space and public improvements.

Parking and Loading

Vehicular Parking: Typically research and laboratory businesses need space for laboratory and office on a half and half basis, and the City has used this criterion for other such projects including the recently approved BMR Emeryville Center of Innovation project.

As the site is in the Transit Hub (TH) overlay zone, all estimated demands for parking are reduced by half. Therefore, the estimated parking demand for Office is 1.2 spaces per 1,000 square feet; for Research and Development it is 0.75 space per 1,000 square feet; for Multi-Unit Residential units the estimated demand is 0.5 spaces per unit.

Section 9-4.404 (c) requires that, for all non-residential uses with area-based estimated parking demands, the first 1,500 square feet be subtracted from gross square footage of the use. Allowing for this exclusion brings the Research and Development square footage to 384,240 (385,740-1,500).

The estimated parking demand for the office space (192,120 square feet) is 231 spaces (1.2 spaces per 1,000 square feet of office space ($192,120 \times 1.2/1000$); and for Research and Development space the estimated demand is 144 spaces (0.75 spaces per 1,000 square feet ($192,120 \times 0.75/1000$)). The estimated demand for 6 townhouse units is 3 (0.5 x 6). This brings the total estimated parking demand to 378 spaces.

There is no minimum parking requirement and the maximum allowed is 10% more than the estimated demand. So, the maximum parking permitted is 415.8 or 416 spaces (378 x 1.1).

The applicant is proposing 409 spaces and therefore complies with the City's regulations.

Bicycle Parking: The project will trigger one short-term and one long-term bicycle parking space for every ten automobile parking spaces indicated as the estimated parking demand. As the estimated demand is 756 spaces, 76 long term bicycle parking and 76 short term parking spaces will be required. (Note that there is no Transit Hub Overlay reduction for bicycle parking since the intent of this overlay zone is to encourage alternative transportation such as bicycles.)

A bicycle parking room (presumably for long term parking) is indicated on the ground floor, although its design and number of bicycle parking spaces is not indicated. The applicant is not showing provision of any short-term bicycle parking spaces at this preliminary stage.

Loading: The project will trigger 2 medium loading spaces and 1 large loading space. The plans show three medium sized loading spaces and one large loading space and therefore comply with the City's requirements.

Open Space

Section 9-4.303(a)(3) requires new commercial buildings or additions that exceed 100,000 square feet to provide a minimum area of common open space and/or Privately Owned Public Open Space (POPOS) that totals at least five percent of the gross floor area. Included in this requirement, the developer must provide a minimum area of POPOS that totals at least one percent of the gross floor area. For the proposed project (385,740 square feet of commercial space) this equals 19,287 square feet of open space, including a minimum of 3,857 square feet of POPOS.

Sheet 31, "Building Area Summary", shows 19,150 square feet of open space on the ground floor and 15,000 square feet on the fifth level, which should be sufficient to meet the requirements. However, a portion of the ground floor open space appears to be in the public right of way. The applicant needs to provide clarification whether 3,857 square feet of open space (POPOs) will be accommodated entirely on its property.

For Multi-Unit Residential uses, the open space requirement is 60 square feet per unit, consisting of 40 square feet of private open space (balconies, decks, patios, etc.), and 20 square feet of common open space. If it is infeasible to provide private open space, common open space may be substituted for private open space at a 2:1 ratio. Thus, if no private open space is provided, 100 square feet of common open space per unit is required ($20 + (40 \times 2)$). Therefore, if the six townhouse units have private open space, a total of 120 square feet of common open space is required (6×20), whereas if the townhouse units do not have private open space, a total of 600 square feet of common open space is required (6×100). At this time, open space for the housing units has not been indicated.

Sidewalk Design Guidelines

Pursuant to the Emeryville Design Guidelines provisions for sidewalks in Pedestrian Priority Zones, the project is required to provide a 12-foot wide sidewalk with a minimum 8-foot clear pedestrian pathway and a 4-foot landscaped area (including a 6-inch curb). In addition, Christie Avenue is a Green Street that requires a minimum of 15-foot sidewalk. The project complies with these dimensions, although some of the sidewalk will be on the

applicant's property and will therefore require a public access easement for 24/7 public use (see Sheet 18).

Stormwater and WELO Plans

The applicant will need to submit stormwater plans and show compliance with the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (WELO).

Housing Feasibility Analysis

As noted above, in response to the Planning Commission's direction at the August 26, 2021 study session, the applicant has prepared the attached "Emeryville Residential Analysis" (Attachment 3). The applicant's analysis provides an overview of the Emeryville residential market (including supply and rent trends and a summary of recent multifamily residential developments), a comparison of the Emeryville residential market to the broader regional residential market and area projects, and a feasibility analysis comparing the development of the 5850 Shellmound site with 244 dwelling units (i.e., the residential mixed-use project previously proposed for this site) under three scenarios: A "base case" assuming standard Planning Regulation requirements (including 29 affordable units), a "reduced affordable" scenario assuming the provision of 20 affordable units, and a "removal of permitting fees" scenario that eliminates all permit fees to reduce development costs by \$11.1 million.

The conclusion of the applicant's analysis is that construction of a 244 unit mixed-use residential building at 5850 Shellmound is likely infeasible under all three presented scenarios, due in part to the expected "Return on Cost" rates, which range from 4.76% to 5.09% at Year 2 of project operations. The applicant states that capital partners require Return on Costs of near 6%.

In simplified terms, the applicant's analysis says that the current estimates of development costs and rents do not result in a residential project that is profitable enough for investors to provide the capital necessary to build it.

To evaluate the validity of the applicant's conclusions, staff retained the services of Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. ("EPS") to conduct an independent review of the applicant's analysis (see Attachment 4). EPS reviewed the applicant's assumptions underlying their analysis, the applicant's methodology, and mathematics. EPS' key findings are:

- EPS concurs with the applicant's assessment that a building that mixes residential and life science laboratories in a vertical format is unlikely to be market supportable or financeable.
- EPS finds the applicant's feasibility assessment of a 244-unit residential project with ground-level retail to be reasonable and concurs with the finding that the project is infeasible in today's market.

- EPS developed an independent proforma financial analysis to calculate supportable land value and tested feasibility under various market conditions, finding that a significant market shift would be necessary for a multifamily residential project at 5850 Shellmound to meet land price expectations.

As noted above, the applicant's conclusion that residential is infeasible is due to the current rents relative to development costs and the expectations of capital providers. EPS evaluated each of the applicant's assumptions underlying this conclusion, as follows:

Rents: EPS reviewed current rents for multifamily projects in Emeryville delivered over the last ten years, including Parc on Powell, 3900 Adeline, Emme Apartments, and Avalon Public Market. The analysis found that the applicant's estimated rents are 15% above current rents and that because 5850 Shellmound would be new and well-equipped with tenant amenities, this assumption is reasonable.

Development Costs: EPS reviewed construction cost data to determine whether the applicant's assumptions for development costs are reasonable and found that the applicant's estimate is lower than data indicates. Specifically, the applicant estimates construction costs at \$99 million to \$106 million, and utilizes the \$99 million figure for the development scenarios tested. The data reviewed by EPS suggests construction costs would be in the range of \$113 million.

To address land costs, EPS reviewed sales data for sites with MUR zoning in Emeryville between 2016 and 2021. This analysis suggests per-acre land values between \$11.3 million and \$28.4 million. The applicant's analysis relies on a land purchase price of \$22 million which is approximately \$14.8 million per acre, within the range of recent transactions.

Investor Requirements: As noted above, the applicant's analysis asserts that projects must yield nearly 6% Return on Cost to be attractive to capital investors. EPS states that certain residential projects in the region can attract investor interest with Return on Cost as low as 5% in inflation adjusted terms, however, the applicant's base case development scenario shows the residential project does not meet even this 5% threshold until 2028-2029 (the fourth year of operations) and therefore 5% in real terms is unlikely; thus, the applicant's conclusion is supportable.

Summary: In summary, EPS's review indicates that the applicant's analysis demonstrates that development of a 244-unit, mixed use residential building at 5850 Shellmound is infeasible at this time, due to the combination of rents, development costs, and investor requirements.

Further Considerations and Qualifiers: The analyses described above apply to a specific development proposal (the 244-unit building previously proposed on this site) at a particular point in time (now). The analyses did not test whether a smaller or larger residential project may be feasible; however, it seems likely the 244-unit proposal was

advanced in the prior application precisely because it maximizes yield and is the highest and best residential use of the property.

Rents, development costs, and investor requirements can all change both relative to each other and in absolute terms over time. Because of the number of variables and their interplay with each other, it is not possible to predict when market conditions will arrive that make residential development financially feasible again; however, EPS has provided sensitivity analyses that can gauge the magnitude of market shifts required for residential project feasibility using the assumptions proposed by the applicant and confirmed by EPS.

These analyses suggest that an increase in rents of 15% over the applicant's estimated rents (or, 30% over current market rents), without changing any other assumptions, would yield a residual land value commensurate with the applicant's estimated purchase price of \$22 million and is a potentially feasible project. As another example, rents that are 10% over the applicant's estimated rents (or 25% over market rents) in combination with construction costs at \$350 per square foot (i.e. removing the contingency assumed in the applicant's analysis) result in a project that is potentially feasible at a slightly lower land cost (\$19 million).

Finally, the factors that contribute to the infeasibility of development of residential at this property also apply more broadly to the East Bay region. Construction costs, rents and investor requirements are relatively consistent for the inner East Bay, which prompts the question of whether other cities in the area are seeing a slowdown in residential development. According to data provided by Costar (a commercial real estate data service), from February 2021 to January 2022 there were only 14 multifamily project starts in Alameda County, and five of those were 100% affordable housing projects. (Affordable housing projects are developed in a different market context due to the unique sources of capital available for these projects.) Between August 2021 and January 2022, only four market rate mid- or high-rise multifamily rental projects have broken ground in Alameda County. By comparison, in 2019 there were 21 market rate project starts. These data evidence a current slowdown in residential development in the region.

Feedback on the Project

To date, the project has been reviewed by staff, at a community meeting sponsored by the applicant, by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and by the Planning Commission at three study sessions. This feedback is summarized below.

Staff Comments

Shellmound Way Relocation and Pedestrian-Bicycle Path:

In 2007, prior to the adoption of the General Plan, a traffic analysis was conducted for the Powell-Christie area which recommended that Shellmound Way be relocated about 150 feet to the north of its current location in order to improve circulation in the area, provide

simplified access to the property at 5801 Christie Avenue, and create a larger development parcel south of Shellmound Way. When the General Plan was adopted in 2009, it included this relocation of Shellmound Way. (See Attachment 2: General Plan Land Use Map).

During 2017-2018, the Planning Commission held three study sessions on the residential project previously proposed at 5850 Shellmound Way. On January 25, 2018, the Planning Commission recommended amending the General Plan to modify the location of Shellmound Way such that it is consistent with its existing configuration.

On March 5, 2018, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) recommended that the proposed General Plan Amendment include an east-west pedestrian and bicycle path in the approximate location where the General Plan currently shows the relocated Shellmound Way. The City Council considered the proposed General Plan Amendment on March 6, 2018, and continued the item, directing staff to bring back a General Plan Amendment that includes the path as recommended by the BPAC. The applicant incorporated the General Plan Amendment into its proposal, to modify the location of Shellmound Way such that it is consistent with its existing configuration, and to add an east-west pedestrian and bicycle path in the approximate location where the General Plan currently shows the relocated Shellmound Way. The applicant also offered 10 feet along the northern property line to be dedicated for this path with the anticipation that an additional 10 feet would be added in the future from the adjacent City-owned parcel to the north, to allow for construction of a standard 20-foot pedestrian and bicycle path. This is shown on Sheet 18 of the attached plans, which actually show a 20-foot path because that much width is required for fire department access.

Development Coordinating Committee Comments

The project was reviewed at the April 13, 2022, Development Coordinating Committee meeting. Outlined below are staff comments discussed at the meeting.

Staff from the Building Division and Alameda County Fire Department indicated that they did not foresee a code issue for the concept of two separate buildings built with different materials. The Committee unanimously agreed that the inclusion of BMR townhomes was a good addition to the proposal and had a potential to create a unique alley that would be lined with residential development on both sides after the adjacent City property is developed with a housing project. A suggestion was made that, with the right treatment such as a shaded canopy, the alley had the potential of creating a unique open space. Increasing the height of the cantilever was also suggested as a way of creating some relief at the pedestrian scale and providing an opportunity for rooftop open space for the townhouse units. There was discussion on the adequacy of the passenger drop off/loading proposed off Christie Avenue. Use of bonus points to fund potential public improvements in the Shellmound/Christie/Powell loop area was also discussed.

Planning Commission August 26, 2021 Study Session Comments

Three public comments were received from the residents of Christie Commons and Pacific Park Plaza, who raised concerns regarding the proposal's height, increased traffic, wind impacts, and the need to provide amenities that would benefit the community. They also questioned the applicant's explanation of why housing was not possible at this site.

The Commissioners were not opposed to the proposed life sciences tower, and offered a number of suggestions, including adding retail and/or community-oriented ground floor active uses; providing the neighborhood's residents with amenities that they could use; and doing a preliminary traffic study now to assess how mitigations could be incorporated into the design at this early stage. However, they all expressed skepticism at the applicant's claim that a residential use is infeasible at this site, as stipulated in the Mixed Use with Residential (MUR) zoning regulations. They directed the applicant to provide a comprehensive analysis at the next study session of why residential use is not viable at this site.

Community Meeting

The applicant held a virtual community meeting on October 21, 2021. Seven community members were present. Concerns were expressed regarding increased traffic and non-inclusion of housing as part of the proposal. One community member suggested moving the building south and opening up the bike path along the north of the building to accommodate a wider path that could be used by both pedestrians and cyclists. It was suggested that a widened path would allow for retail along the path and create a thoroughfare that could be used by the community and not just bicyclists. It was noted that an addition of a cantilever over the bike path would expand the open area and provide cover on rainy days. It was suggested that the ground floor of the building fronting Shellmound Way be used for life science uses, as Shellmound Way is not friendly for pedestrians due to the high volume of vehicular traffic on this roadway.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Comments

The BPAC reviewed the project at their regular meeting on November 1, 2021. The Committee expressed the need for bicycle circulation improvements in the general area, and suggested that there be adequate activation and lighting on the proposed bicycle path in order to make it a successful facility. Suggestions regarding resources for e-scooters and bicycle parking were made, and one Committee member suggested that the applicant review the comments that have been received on the Active Transportation Plan in order to get ideas for improvements.

Planning Commission February 24, 2022 Study Session Comments

The second Planning Commission study session was focused on soliciting input from the Commission regarding one issue: the financial feasibility of a residential use on the site.

There were eleven public comments, with one expressing support for the project and the other ten opposed. Those in opposition to the project expressed concerns regarding the proposed height and potential shadow impacts, and the amount of additional traffic that would be generated along Christie Avenue, which is designated as a Green Street in the General Plan. One resident suggested greater setback from the street, given the height, and/or a reduction in the height of the building. This person also stated that the provision of additional open space to obtain bonus points should not be considered at this location.

A majority of Commissioners indicated that they could not make the finding “that the applicant has convincingly demonstrated that it is infeasible to develop a project with a mix of use groups on the site”, and indicated that they would like to see an option that included a few residential units on the ground floor of the research and development tower. Alternatively, it was suggested that the ground floor contain uses that would serve as amenities for the adjacent residential neighbors. The applicant was directed to prepare these two options for future consideration by the Commission.

Planning Commission April 28, 2022 Study Session Comments

The Commission held a third study session on the project on April 28, 2022. The Commission appreciated the applicant’s inclusion of townhomes and generally felt that the proposed mix of uses was acceptable, but encouraged the applicant to explore the possibility of adding a few more residential units. Several Commissioners opined that the applicant should consider reducing the building massing along Christie Avenue by moving the tower towards the east portion of the site, as was also suggested by a public commentor. Commissioners stated that it was important to create a continuous pedestrian experience along Christie Avenue and that the project should include an element that would draw community members to the site.

ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

1. Mix of Uses

The project is primarily a Research and Development building with six townhomes.

Does the Council feel that this mix of uses is appropriate for the site?

2. Bonus Points

Does the Council have any suggestions for the type of community benefits that the project should provide to obtain bonus points?

3. Design and Other Issues

Does the Council have any comments on the preliminary design and concept?

Environmental Review

A traffic report and visual simulations will be prepared for the project. At this time, we do not have enough information to determine the project's CEQA status.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

STAFF COMMUNICATION WITH THE PUBLIC

Staff has had no communication with the public on this City Council item. As noted above, a community meeting was held by the applicant on October 21, 2021, and the project was reviewed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee on November 1, 2021, and by the Planning Commission at three study sessions on August 26, 2021, February 24, 2022 and April 28, 2022.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

CONCLUSION

After hearing a presentation from the applicant and receiving public testimony, staff requests that the City Council provide comment on the issues noted above and any other issues identified by the Council.

PREPARED BY: Miroo Desai, Senior Planner
Chadrick Smalley, Economic Development and Housing Manager

APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EMERYVILLE:



Christine Daniel, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Project Plans dated April 18, 2022
2. General Plan Land Use Map
3. Emeryville Residential Analysis, CA Ventures, December 2021
4. 5850 Shellmound Residential Feasibility Review, Economic and Planning Systems, February 10, 2022