



CITY OF SAN CARLOS

SAN CARLOS PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, March 6th, 2023

7:00 PM

San Carlos City Hall, Council Chambers

600 Elm Street, San Carlos, CA 94070

www.cityofsancarlos.org

APPROVED MINUTES

COMMISSIONERS

Jim Iacoponi, Chair

Kristen Clements, Vice Chair

David Roof

Ellen Garvey

Janet Castaneda

ADVISORY

Al Savay, Community and Economic Development Director

Lisa Porras, Planning Manager

Megan Wooley-Ousdahl, Senior Planner

Andrea Mardesich, Assistant Community Development Director

Greg Rubens, City Attorney

Lisa Costa Sanders, Principal Planner, Consultant

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm.

2. ASSEMBLY BILL 2449 TELECONFERENCE REQUESTS

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Garvey excused.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Approval of the Minutes from the Planning and Transportation Commission Meeting of February 6, 2023

M/S Clements/Roof motioned and seconded to approve the minutes of February 6, 2023, Planning and Transportation Commission Meeting.

The motion passed 4-0 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Castaneda, Roof, Clements, Iacoponi

Noes: None

7. PRESENTATION

- a. New and Proposed Planning and Transportation Laws, Presentation by Amy Brown and Colin Hawley with Arc Strategies.

Amy Brown, Consultant with Arc Strategies presented the item.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know the number of bills that were introduced last year.

Amy Brown estimated around 1500 to 1700 range and stated she would get the exact number to the Commission.

Vice Chair Clements, wanted to know if there was the affordability component to AB 2295.

Amy Brown shared that she did not know the answer but stated that she does not think there was the affordability component based on the Fiscal Analysis of the Appropriation Committee.

Vice Chair referred to SB4. She wanted to know if the City or County give up the institution lands for development, what would they get in return. Amy Brown stated that they would need to see how it evolves.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know more about the status of SB35. Amy Brown stated that she believed the SB4 is the follow up to SB35.

Chair Iacoponi shared that he felt the measures that took effect in January were well included in all the work that Staff did in the Housing Element.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

8. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Consideration of Design Review approval for a proposed Sign Program at 1501-1599 Industrial Road (APNs: 046-240-130 and 046-240-140).

Ralph Robinson, Associate Planner Consultant presented the item.

Commissioner Roof wanted to know if these represents are the totality of signs on the property or in addition to signs previously approved.

Ralph Robinson stated that the sign plan represents the totality of signs proposed at the site.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know why this item is before the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC).

Ralph Robinson stated that per City Municipal Code, sign programs are subject to review by the PTC.

Chair Iacoponi recalled approving a signage program for one of the properties in the Alexandria area and wanted to know if this was for another property.

Lisa Costa Sanders, Principal Planner Consultant clarified that the property mentioned by Chair Iacoponi is for a separate building owned by Alexandria at 825/835 Industrial Road. She added that the code does require that whenever there is multi-tenant at a sign program it would require approval by the PTC.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know if there are any changes in the lighting of the signs.

Ralph Robinson stated that currently only the monument sign has lighting. He added that any new lighting changes would fall under the standard code requirements and staff review.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know the definition of the banner mentioned in the report.

Ralph Robinson clarified that the banner mentioned is a temporary banner that is mounted on the fence. He added that per the City's codes, a permanent fixture is not allowed on the fence. Ralph Robinson explained that in this case, it is categorized as a banner because of the vinyl material used, the composition of the design, the color used, and it is temporary.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if there are other more attractive and durable material that could be recommended.

Lisa Costa Sanders explained that if the applicant wanted a more permanent solution such as replacing the fence with some graphics on it, the City can look at it from a site development standpoint and approve it at the Staff level.

Applicant Hormoz Ziaebrahimi from LPA provided context and reason behind the use of the vinyl graphics. He added that as a first touch it was an economical way of approaching and generating interest for the campus at the entry point. It could be reconsidered in the future.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know the durability of the sign. Applicant stated he does not know and would find out the specification for the Commission.

Commissioner Roof wanted to know if something more permanent would replace the vinyl banner.

Applicant stated that he would discuss with Alexandria and get back to the Commission with more specification of the material and Alexandria's definition of permanence.

Due to technical difficulty, Lisa Porras asked the Zoom attendees to log off and log back in.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Caller Dimitri Vandellos stated he did not have comment on the signage program but wanted to make sure the callers for the Biosafety item had a chance to log back in due to earlier technical difficulty as there was a large online attendance.

M/S Clements/Iacoponi motioned and seconded to close the public comment.

The motion passed 4-0 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Castaneda, Roof, Clements, Iacoponi

Noes: None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commission Castaneda wondered if the applicant should remove the vinyl sign or not. She added that it looks better than the existing fence and she could go either way.

Vice Chair Clements shared that she finds the vinyl sign attractive. She stated that the Code does not promote the use of vinyl sign even on a temporary basis. Vice Chair Clements stated she would take Staff's recommendation to omit the vinyl sign from the plan or take Commissioner Castaneda's idea of allowing the usage of the vinyl sign for one year.

Commissioner Roof thought the signs in terms of quantity and size were consistent with the project. He stated that he would like to define a usage period for the vinyl banner sign.

Chair Iacoponi stated that he is not a fan of vinyl signs and would not want to see another plastic get thrown away in a year. He felt that the design was good and stated he would support Staff's recommendation to not have the vinyl banner sign.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know if the applicant could come back and apply for an amended sign program if they decide to use a different material with the same graphics.

Lisa Cosa Sanders clarified that if the applicant were to come back with some other permanent material that just had the decor on it and no signage, it is not a sign anymore and the staff could approve it. She added that if the applicant were to come back with other permanent material with graphics that had a small sign of the campus, then the applicant would come back to the PTC for an amendment to the Sign Program.

M/S Roof/Clements motioned and seconded to adopt the Resolution approving the Sign Program for the site and six industrial buildings at 1501, 1531, 1541, 1551, 1561 and 1581 Industrial Road. (APNs: 046-240-130 and 046-240-140).

The motion passed 4-0 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Castaneda, Roof, Clements, Iacoponi

Noes: None

- b. Consideration of a Resolution Recommending the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending San Carlos Municipal Code Title 18 to Regulate Laboratories with Biosafety Levels (BSL)

Lisa Costa Sanders, Principal Planner Consultant presented the item.

Vice Chair Clements referred to the slide, Monitoring Compliance with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). She wanted to know if the annual report is found to be non-compliant, what would be the precipitating event for that hearing to revoke.

Greg Rubens, City Attorney explained that it is a notice hearing requirement, a due process hearing. He added that if the City found that there is a problem they would report to the state and federal agencies that have jurisdiction over the lab.

Commissioner Roof wanted to know how the City oversight would work with the state and federal rules.

Lisa Costa Sanders clarified that the City is making sure the labs are in compliance with all the rules and regulations by other agencies via peer-review.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know whether the CUP applies to the pathogen or lab space. He also wanted to know if the applicant could sublease the space, and how could the City track that.

Lisa Costa Sanders clarified that the CUP must specify it is for the tenant on the site and for a specific plan. She added that if there are any changes, the tenant needs to come forward to the Commission to present the amended plan and provide all the new reporting. At that point the PTC can determine if they want to grant the CUP.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know whether the peer-reviewed plan would require an onsite inspection.

Lisa Costa Sanders stated that annual reporting does not require an onsite inspection and that could be a condition that the Commission includes or amend the Ordinance to include onsite inspection as a requirement.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know if the City would have an expert onsite inspection and review of all plans before presenting a case for CUP for Biosafety Level 3 (BSL-3).

Lisa Costa Sanders explained that the applicant would not fit out the equipment before obtaining a CUP approval. She suggested to have a post inspection to determine if the lab was implemented as planned and failure to do so within a certain time frame would trigger revocation.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know if there are other reputable Biosafety Committees in the area that the City can leverage to do the review instead of an outside consultant.

Lisa Costa Sanders stated that based on their research, the only committees are in the east coast and there are none in San Mateo County. She stated that external consultants are the only alternative.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know more about the emergency procedures of these labs and how would the City handle a fire or flood.

Lisa Costa Sanders shared that she spoke with the Fire Marshall, and they explained that they need to know what material is inside the building, then evaluate the approach before entering. Lisa Costa Sanders listed a few procedures of how the fire department would handle the emergency.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know why the language was not specific to a certain type of research.

Lisa Costa Sanders explained that the language was written that way because the City does not want there to be a standalone BSL-3 that others could utilize, rather the CUP is for the tenant onsite and they have control over it. She added that the type of research that could be conducted would need to be evaluated through the Use Permit Process.

Greg Rubens added that a CUP is a discretionary land use approval, therefore the Commission has discretion whether to allow it or not, and condition it if necessary to make the findings.

Commissioner Castaneda was concerned with the City's lack of subject matter expert.

Greg Rubens responded that that is where the peer-review comes into play and stated that the City has other resources such as the County Environmental Health Department.

Commissioner Roof wanted to know if the City could impose more constraints and objections in the CUP application.

Greg Rubens explained that the discretionary process creates some flexibility for the City. He added that the City does not have a set of standards but could use the findings to create conditions that would be appropriate for a particular development.

Vice Chair Clements shared that the value hinges on the peer-review because the City does not have the expertise on staff. She stated that she assumed Staff would craft the Request For Proposal (RFP) as to what they are looking for in an on-call consultant and wondered how many expert consultants are in the area.

Lisa Costa Sanders stated that based on their research, there are a few consulting firms that could assist the City.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if the applicant would be able to bear the cost of the on-call consultant.

Lisa Costa Sanders stated the cost for the BSL-3 CUP would be the standard CUP fee plus the cost of the consultant.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if the market would bear the on-call consultant fee.

Lisa Cost Sanders stated they did not do that research.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Caller 1 Christy Shirilla from Biocom California Bay Area Policy Manager stated that the labs are highly regulated and shared a list of regulatory agencies that interacts with the labs.

Caller 2 Gita Dev Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter shared that the Ordinance is a good start but is not there yet. She stated that labs that are funded by private money are not required to meet all the regulations and that is a concern for the highest level of government. Gita Dev also pointed out that animal labs are not covered by the Ordinances, and it is an important consideration. She asked the City to consider the risk and decide if it is worth taking on at this time.

Caller 3 Paul Magginetti referred to the video he sent for inclusion in the public record. He stated that the video explains why Option 2 falls short of what is needed to protect the public. Paul Magginetti also stated that the link in the letter list out examples of lab accidents. He stated that there is no comprehensive oversight response mechanism in the Bay Area. He added that the City is not ready yet and Option 2 trades public safety for short-term economic gain. He stated that BSL-3 Labs should not be allowed.

Caller 4 Steve Goodale resident of Redwood Shores shared his opposition of BSL-3 Labs. He shared the example of the Corona Virus and the damage that it has caused due to the leak from the Wuhan Lab. He shared that the City should not take the chance to ruin its reputation.

Caller 5 Gary Baldocchi shared that he does not think the CUP would adequately protect the public and shared his reasons. He asked the Commission to ban BSL-3 and BSL-4 Labs in San Carlos.

Caller 6 Debbie Baldocchi urged the Commission to join other cities in the east coast to ban high containment BSL-3 and BSL-4 Labs in the community. She shared her reasons and cited two experts' concern on biosafety.

Ben Paul (in person) from San Mateo County Chamber shared that the Chamber conducted its own research and hosted a presentation on biosafety levels. He learned how regulated the

industry is and the massive level of care that goes into the operation of these state-of-the-art laboratories. Ben Paul listed the needs of having the innovative labs in San Carlos and asked the Commission to permit the BSL-3 Labs under the CUP process.

Gary Boitano (in person) shared that he agreed with Ben Paul's comment. He stated that if the City bans BSL-3 Labs it would put a big halt on businesses wanting to come to San Carlos, which will cause a big freeze on growth. He added that San Carlos would be the only city that has the outright ban on BSL-3 Lab.

Ryan Guibara (in person) shared that a ban on BSL-3 Labs will be very bad for the City, and it ought to have a CUP process in place. He shared a list of local, state, and national agencies his company, MBC BioLabs deals with. Ryan Guibara added that the CUP for BSL-3 would be the most restrictive option in the Bay Area.

Caller 7 Bryce Nickels Professors of Genetics at Rutgers University, Lab Director at the Waksman Institute of Microbiology, Co-Founder of a nonprofit called Biosafety Now. He shared that as an insider of the industry he does not understand why the Commission focus on money and not the safety of the community. Bryce Nickels added that the research related incidents would not just impact the local community but the entire global community. He stated that San Carlos has an opportunity to stand up for those special interest groups and people who are in only for the dollar and say no to them.

Caller 8 Gladwyn d'Souza from Belmont asked the Commission to ban BSL-3 Labs, shared his reasons and sighted examples of different cities that have lab accidents. He added that the City should not shoulder the risk.

Caller 9 Jennifer R from Greater East San Carlos Area stated that she is in support of banning BSL-3 Labs. She agreed with all the previous callers who believed there should be a ban on BSL-3 Labs. She pointed out that typical BSL-3 Labs are in campus-like settings and not right up next door to residents. Jennifer R shared that she asked all her neighbors and none of them wanted to be next to a BSL-3 Lab. She asked the Commission to think about public safety, cost and the liabilities involved.

Caller 10 Nina G asked the Commission to vote to prohibit high containment labs and stated that BSL-3 and BSL-4 labs have no place in the densely populated Silicon Valley neighborhood. She asked the Commission to listen to the concerned constituents and protect the community.

Caller 11 David Crabbe shared that he echoed what everyone said against the BSL-3 Labs. He shared that the dollars are trumping the safety issue. David Crabbe added his other concern was that the PTC is considering a CUP without having the expertise in how to do it. He stated that the outside experts are all connected to the Biotech Industry and it would be very difficult to be unbiased.

Caller 12 Melanie Cohn from Biocom California shared that she is concerned by the comments from the people calling as they appear to not have any understanding of the industry. She stated that there is no such thing as unregulated BSL-3 Labs unless it is operating illegally. She challenged those callers who stated that COVID was released from a lab and reminded them the COVID vaccines were developed in BSL-2 and BSL-3 Labs. Melanie Cohn also shared that she personally benefited from the industry researching a rare disease that she has.

Dino Perazzo (in person) resident of San Carlos and runs the Life Science Practice from CBRE representing and advising many Biotech companies. He shared that from his experience the broader industry exceeds the regulations for training, safety, and security in their labs. He voiced his support for a CUP for BSL-3 Labs.

Caller 13 Dimitri Vandellos President of the Greater Eastside San Carlos Community (GESCC) Neighborhood Association. He shared that the CUP for BSL-3 needed a lot more to be developed before the PTC or the City could accept any kind of CUP option. Dimitri Vandellos

stated that the CUP process that is currently outlined is nowhere near adequate and does not do the necessary notification for the community. He added that the City has a poor track record of environmental safety and cleanup.

M/S Castaneda/Clements motioned and seconded to close the public comment.

The motion passed 4-0 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Castaneda, Roof, Clements, Iacoponi

Noes: None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Roof wanted clarification on the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) rule regarding following the drug approval process.

Carla Boragno, Former Vice President of Site Services, Genentech stated she could not answer the question because she is not from the FDA. She pointed out that in the Staff Report the CUP requires the applicant to following the Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories (BMBL) which is from the National Institute of Health (NIH) and Center for Disease Control (CDC) as well as all the other requirements in California regulations. Carla Boragno stated that the CUP allows the enforcement of those regulations.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know if there is a distinction between private and public funded labs in terms of regulations and standards compliance.

Carla Boragno shared that based on her understanding the guidelines are consistent whether it is a private or public funded lab, however with public funded labs, they are required to submit their reports showing they are compliant with the BMBL to the NIH and CDC. She added that the CUP Option requires the reports to be certified by a third party consultant, and that essentially is doing the same thing as what is required by the public labs.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know if there are peer reviews of the research project itself in the private labs.

Carla Boragno shared that there are peer reviews in private companies and research organizations as well. She clarified that she could not speak for all companies as there are much research going on.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if there are standards and best practices about communication with the public on releasing reports to the public.

Carla Boragno stated that in the BMBL there are two or three requirements on incident reporting to the local authorities as well as requirement to have an emergency response plan. The CUP process has that transparency.

Chair Iacoponi wanted to know should the Commission wanted to move forward with the CUP Option but is hesitant on a point, could they clarify a point and amend the conditions.

Greg Rubens explained that if the PTC felt that Staff's recommendation on the CUP option is insufficient, they could give the Staff specific recommendation or addition and that would become part of the recommendation to the Council. He added that the Staff would like to have a recommendation tonight because the item has been before the PTC once and the PTC's recommendations is required for a Zoning change before it can be considered by the City Council.

Chair Iaconi asked the Commissioners to share where their thoughts are on the two options.

Commissioner Castaneda shared that she has been told that the National Science Advisory Board for Biosafety (NSABB) is concerned with the trend of the growing BSL-3 and BSL-4 Labs, and they have issued proposed reforms and the reforms have been sent to the Federal Government. She also shared that the NSABB is concerned about the nature of the research over the safety of the labs themselves, and until the issues are addressed she is reluctant to go ahead with the CUP as it is. Commissioner Castaneda shared that she would have support if it was limited to public government sponsored controlled research because she believed those kind of research should have adequate peer review to consider the benefits of the research itself versus its risk. She added that she did not think a consultant is sufficient for peer review.

Commissioner Roof shared that he is excited the City could nurture and welcome the Biotech Industry because of the potential medical benefits that it brings to the society. He stated that he does not see the benefit as financial profits, but the drugs that would be developed to benefit the society. Commissioner Roof added that he does not think a blanket ban of BSL-3 makes sense. He shared that he preferred the CUP Option because it would allow the City to decide whether something was appropriate based on what it is.

Commissioner Roof stated that it would be an easier discussion to have when there is a specific request instead of imagining the worst possible situation.

Vice Chair Clements shared that she could go either way with the options. She stated that the way the Ordinance is written it is unclear to her if the City could retain its rights to say no to a particular use by a particular tenant, based on the research and the product itself, and not based on the conditions of the lab or the presence of the safety techniques. Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if the City has latitude to make decisions on a case by case basis and not confined by the opinion on lab space, safety and standards for the practices and not the product.

Greg Rubens, City Attorney clarified that the Zoning Ordinance is not drafted with that level of specificity to the types of uses. He added that with a CUP process it means there is no by right development for that particular use, and the City still has discretion to deny uses based upon any one of the findings. Greg Rubens stated that one of the drawbacks of drafting a law is that Staff could not analyze every specific situation that might come forward, but they would try and give the City the discretion to say yes or no to a project based upon those facts.

Greg Rubens clarified that the Ordinance is supplemental to the standard findings that the Commission has to make for health and safety consistent with the General Plan. He stated that the Ordinance is designed to allow the Commission to analyze all different aspects of a potential project. Greg Rubens stated that it is open-ended on purpose because it allows the PTC to look at the individual situation of any application.

Vice Chair Clements stated that with Greg Ruben's clarification she is leaning in the direction of a CUP process that adds transparency to the public when there may not be one now.

Vice Chair Clements referred to Section 2, page 104 in the report, Operational and Performance Standards. She suggested to make a recommendation to state that once the plan gets approved, there needs to be an inspection to confirm that those improvements were made and that those conditions match the report in the plan.

Chair Iaconi wanted to know once a CUP is approved would there still be a set of inspection requirements before granting the certificate of occupancy to utilize the facility. He wanted to know who owns the last step of confirming the applicant performed what they set out to do according to the plan.

Lisa Costa Sanders agreed that a peer review inspection post CUP approval to ensure that everything has been adequately implemented could be an added requirement.

Chair Iaconi stated that he would ask for the peer review inspection post CUP approval.

Commissioner Roof added that in addition to the peer review inspection post CUP approval as a final sign off, there needs to be an annual report inspection to ensure compliance and continuous oversight.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know what the effect of any government standards on the CUP would be.

Greg Rubens clarified that in a typical CUP there is the condition to comply with the standards, and in a BSL-3 CUP there would be a long list of standards to comply. He stated that if the Commission wanted to add a particular standard or if they wanted the recommendation to say all standards, the Staff could develop for them tonight to recommend to the Council.

Lisa Costa Sanders stated that the recommendation of requiring an inspection to ensure everything has been implemented prior to operation of the lab should be added to Section C, last category in the Operational and Performance Standards.

Chair Iaconi wanted to clarify one additional point, the local, state and federal standards are fully implemented.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to clarify Commissioner Roof's point of annual inspection. She stated that the inspection is not just the initial inspection, but an annual inspection confirmed by the consultant to certify that the lab plan was still being followed.

Commissioner Roof wanted it to be explicitly written.

Chair Iaconi gave a summary. He shared that a CUP Option would create an opportunity and an environment which would benefit the community and a straight-out ban would eliminate that. He appreciated the risk raised by the community, on the other hand the Staff has set a high bar to be met and gave the Commission the latitude to reject a CUP if it did not meet the standards.

Chair Iaconi shared that while he is not an expert in any organization, he believed that there is the collective ability to ask the right questions amongst the Commission and to seek help from expertise wherever needed. He added that with the work that the Staff put forward there is a mechanism to determine whether public safety is met, and in that instance determine whether the risk versus the opportunity is balanced. The Commission has the latitude to say yes, or no to the application. Chair Iaconi stated from a land use perspective he is supportive of the CUP process with the written amendments and additions that was just framed.

Commissioner Castaneda asked the Commission if it is necessary to add a statement that they do not want gain-of-function research and certain potential pandemic pathogen research.

Chair Iaconi stated from his point of view he does not think it is necessary.

Commissioner Roof shared that they could not prejudge everything in advance. He stated that he does not think it would be appropriate.

Vice Chair Clements shared that it is not an exhaustive list and the conditions could change over time. She added the process is flexible enough that they could ask for the findings and a lot more information about the actual use of the lab and then decide if they are comfortable enough to decide.

Chair Iaconi wanted to first get confirmation on the modification discussed before they vote for the CUP. He stated to have a 10min break for the Staff to amend the language.

Commissioner Castaneda wanted to know who will pay for the decommissioning of the lab.

Greg Rubens stated that the applicant would have to pay for it and the City is never obligated to pay for it.

Vice Chair Clements wanted to know if there was an edit on current standards being periodically reviewed or implemented.

Greg Rubens stated that there is a reference to guideline set forth in the BMBL 6th edition as well as CDC and NIH Standards.

Commissioner Roof shared that he believed San Carlos is the first city in San Mateo County to bring biosafety labs under land use purview. He added that this is a progressive nature that San Carlos is taking in addressing BSL-3 Labs.

Staff read the revised wording for the Ordinance as follows.

“An inspection shall be conducted, and a compliance report shall be submitted at the expense of the owner, operator, or tenant prior to initiating operations, and on each anniversary of the effective date of permit approval, and on the closure or discontinuance of the Biosafety Level (BSL) 3 facility. Such reports shall be made by a qualified third party demonstrating continued compliance with the guidelines set forth in Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories (6th Edition or most recent) authored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and National Institutes of Health (NIH).”

M/S Roof/Clements motioned and seconded to Adopt a Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending San Carlos Municipal Code Section 18 to require to prohibit BSL-4 activities and to allow for BSL-3 activities with a conditional use permit as specified in the Ordinance and as amended this evening.

The motion passed 3-1 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Roof, Clements and Iacoponi

Noes: Castaneda

Greg Rubens addressed the members of the public. He stated that the PTC made a recommendation to the City Council therefore this matter would go to the City Council for final review of the recommendation.

9. REPORTS, CORRESPONDENCE AND GENERAL INFORMATION

- a. Report on recent City Council actions – None
- b. Planning and Transportation Commission comments or reports

Commissioner Castaneda shared that she attended the Downtown Coffee and Comments Open House at the Library on March 4 and thought it was an excellent program. She added that it was well attended and wanted to compliment everyone for the exhibits that were put up, the ability for people to make choices and it was an excellent presentation.

Commissioner Roof shared that he also attended the Open House and echoed Commissioner Castaneda's comment fully.

Chair Iaconi shared that his household went through the Objective Design Review Survey. He added that he appreciated the opportunity and thought it was well done, especially the simple examples.

Chair Iaconi appreciated the Staff's work and their help in guiding the Commission through the Biosafety item.

c. Correspondence

Lisa Porras stated that prior to the distribution of March 6 PTC packet, the City received a total of five public comments from Paul Maggini, Gail Ghose, Gary and Debbie Baldocchi, Joe and Kelly Haws, and Terezia Nemeth. She added that they were all forward to the PTC this evening.

d. Planning Staff comments, reports and updates of current projects

Lisa Porras gave the following updates:

The Downtown Coffee and Comments Open House on March 4, 2023 had a great turnout. Approximately eighty people attended. The Staff is compiling the comments and would be presenting to the PTC in late April. Staff would share the community's response on the preliminary design concepts that the City put forward.

An additional online survey is available at sancarlosdowntownplan.com for those who did not have a chance to attend the February 15, 2023 Downtown Community Workshop. The online survey is available from March 1 to April 1.

The Northeast Specific Plan Virtual Workshop will be on Wednesday, March 15, 2023. An email invitation was sent to the commissioners, and they are welcome to distribute to their friends and network.

In the next PTC Meeting, March 20, 2023 Staff would bring forward the Objective Design Standards – Single Family Home Building Types. That would be a Study Session and no formal request is asked of the Commission.

On March 20, 2023, 888 Branston, a new Life Science development would be coming forward before the Commission.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 pm.