

**Rincon Consultants, Inc.**

180 North Ashwood Avenue  
Ventura, California 93003

805 644 4455 OFFICE AND FAX

info@rinconconsultants.com  
www.rinconconsultants.com

# M E M O R A N D U M

**Date:** 06/10/22

---

**To:** Julia Gonzales, Deputy Director  
City of Pico Rivera, Community and Economic Development Department  
6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, CA 90660

---

**Via:** Email – [juliagonzales@pico-rivera.org](mailto:juliagonzales@pico-rivera.org)

---

**From:** Kimiko Lizardi  
Director, Environmental and Long-Range Planning  
[klizardi@rinconconsultants.com](mailto:klizardi@rinconconsultants.com)

Michael Rocque, MS  
Senior Planner  
[mrocque@rinconconsultants.com](mailto:mrocque@rinconconsultants.com)

---

**Subject:** The Mercury Project Specific Plan Peer Review comments -2<sup>nd</sup> Round Review

---

**Project Number:** 21-11657

---

## Specific Plan Peer Review comments

Please see below, Rincon's 2<sup>nd</sup> round of comments regarding The Mercury Project Specific Plan Peer Review. Comments are divided by each section of the draft SP document, dated March 24, 2022.

## Contents

### Chapter I: Introduction

#### 1.2 Community Benefits (New Section)

- This section highlights key benefits to the City in general but does not specifically identify provisions that can be implemented. The project is seeking to exceed baseline densities, height, setbacks, and FAR. The proposed 5% of units you are providing as affordable is minimal, particularly given the density/number of units you are providing. Has there been any further discussion with the City on additional Community Benefits provisions?

#### 1.7 Specific Plan Organization

- The chapters identified in this section should provide a brief narrative explaining the purpose and intent. While not a requirement, Rincon is recommending this be completed.



## Chapter 2: Land Use

### 2.4 Project Summary

- Table 2-1.
  - Revise the residential notes section to specify which floors (1-6) include residential units.
  - Under the open space notes, the proposed Community Room should not be counted as open space. This is an amenity space for the residential use. Provide a clear definition and be sure to differentiate between the ground floor/rooftop outdoor open spaces and amenity spaces.

#### Initial review comment:

- *In Table 2-1 it mentions that the project will be providing 13 affordable units, however there is no commitment to this or mention of this throughout the plan. The plan should specifically address how it is going to offer affordable housing and at what income levels, unit mix, and other concessions.*

#### Round 2 comment:

- The table mentions that 13 units will be provided as affordable, however there is no mention of what income level they are being provided at or breakdown of unit mix/type. The City should confirm if they want a commitment as to the income levels/unit types for the affordable units.

### 2.7 Recreation and Open Space

#### Initial review comment:

- *Where is the open space in the land use summary? In the plan, you are only showing the rooftop recreation area. This doesn't match the areas identified in the concept exhibit.*

#### Round 2 comment:

- It is noted that you will update this based on the final landscape plan, but a more comprehensive breakdown of open space vs. building amenity space should be provided for what is already being proposed.

### Exhibit 2-3: Site Use Concept-Ground Floor

#### Initial review comment:

- *In previous discussions with the City there was the idea of relocating the leasing office to the south end of the building. Was this ruled out?*

#### Round 2 comment:

- Your response is noted. However, follow up and confirmation from the City should be completed. If so, then please disregard this comment.



### Exhibit 2-6: Open Space Concept

Initial review comment:

- *The Open Space concept as presented does not appear to represent functional open space. The areas defined are merely sidewalk areas and does not provide any amenities within these areas. Please provide the minimum sizes as well as a complete breakdown (total SF) of each open space area.*

Round 2 comment:

- In your response you agree with the above comment, however there is no breakdown of the functional open space areas proposed.

## Chapter 3: Infrastructure and Services

### 3.1.1 Transportation Demand Management

- The inclusion of this subsection is supported and beneficial. Have any other TDM Plan program measures or incentives been thought about to be included?
  - Parking cash outs
  - Incentives for employees who live within ½ mile radius
  - Transportation allowance for residents for monthly regional transit passes

### Exhibit 3-1: Vehicular Access

Initial review comment:

- *Is garage access happening across the ground floor retail and across the pedestrian plaza as shown in the subsequent exhibit? This does not appear to be a functional use of open space and should not be included in the open space exhibits or counted towards the projects overall open space calculations.*

Round 2 comment:

- In your response you agree to the above comment, however the open space exhibit 2-5 still shows resident ground floor open areas as part of the open space. All ground floor areas that include parking or drive aisles should be excluded from any open space areas.

### 3.2 Infrastructure Plan

Initial review comment:

- *Has the City reviewed this plan against water and wastewater master plans?*

Round 2 comment:

- If this has not been completed, it should be reviewed and vetted that it does not conflict.



## Chapter 4: Development Standards and Design Guidelines

### 4.2 Development Standards

Initial review comment:

- Consider creating table/matrix for all development standards

Round 2 comment:

- Noted. However, for readability purposes it should be considered. The City can make this final determination.

#### 4.2.1 Site Development

Initial review comment:

- Please refer to all corrections/edits for this section in the attached track changes document

Round 2 comment:

- Please see track change comment as provided:

70' (floors 1-6, excluding roof parapet). No building or structure shall exceed this maximum building height except rooftop elements such as recreation facilities and infrastructure are allowed up to an additional 11' excluding roof parapet or screening of rooftop mechanical equipment.

#### 4.2.5 Waste Collection

Initial review comment:

- See previous comment above on Solid Waste. The trash area needs to be defined as to location, size, and accessibility. Current code requires the following for commercial and residential uses:

*Commercial: 36SF:5000SF gross floor area*

*Residential: 6SF/per unit*

*This can be a starting point to determine appropriate size.*

Round 2 comment:

- Based on your response, the proposed 823SF trash room appears to be undersized based on the City's current standards above. However, confirm this with the City and trash hauler that both the size and location of the trash/recycling area are sufficient.

#### 4.2.7 Bicycle Parking

Initial review comments:

- *Project should include a dedicated electric bicycle-sharing program for residents to promote non-vehicular mobility in conjunction with the future rail line.*
- *Include space to accommodate and promote active transportation such as a dedicated and secure bicycle center that integrates bike storage/parking, showers, lockers, and repair services. The center could also be designed to be partially available to the public. (Community Benefit)*

Round 2 comment:

- Consider incorporating the comment above into the specific plan as a potential amenity/use rather than a requirement/commitment.

#### 4.3 Land Use Matrix

Initial review comments:

- *Use classifications listed in Table 4-4 should be consistent with the use classifications listed in PRMC 18.40.040 for consistency purposes.*
- *Due to the limited area of approximately 5,000sf of commercial space provided on the ground floor, should consider trimming this down to retail serving uses or personal service and restaurant type uses. Seems to be an array of uses for such a small commercial area.*

Round 2 comment:

- Noted on the intent of keeping the amount of uses, however it seems that most of these can be categorized into personal services or general retail store consistent with the Pico Rivera Zoning Code definitions. This would streamline the specific plan allowable uses chart. Additionally, the permitted uses at the rooftop or floors 2-6 are an ancillary use to the residential development and do not need to have their own set of permitted uses.

#### 5.2 Design Guidelines

Initial review comment:

- *Per SB 330 and SB 35, both bills require cities to review residential development based on objective standards rather than subjective standards. Recommend that City require objective design standards for the Specific Plan.*

Round 2 comment:

- It is noted that you have contained some objective design standards within the development standards section such as building massing/projections, etc. However, development standards do not define design standards such as materials, color and other elements. Rincon



recommends that this be expanded upon and further described within the plan. The City can make the final determination to ensure that the Design Guidelines are satisfactory.

#### 4.4.4 *Open Space Amenities*

Initial review comment:

- *Please insert a new section here and expand on the amenities offered as part of this development.*

Round 2 comment:

- See same comment above. Final Plan should incorporate this section.

#### 5.2.7 *Walls & Screening Concept*

Initial review comment:

- *Please provide more details as to what kind of walls, height, and design is being proposed.*

Round 2 comment:

- Conceptual wall and screening exhibit should include at a minimum type and height of walls proposed.



**Rincon Consultants, Inc.**

180 North Ashwood Avenue  
Ventura, California 93003

805 644 4455 OFFICE AND FAX

info@rinconconsultants.com  
www.rinconconsultants.com

# M E M O R A N D U M

**Date:** 01/07/22

---

**To:** Julia Gonzales, Deputy Director  
City of Pico Rivera, Community and Economic Development Department  
6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, CA 90660

---

**Via:** Email – [juliagonzales@pico-rivera.org](mailto:juliagonzales@pico-rivera.org)

---

**From:** Kimiko Lizardi  
Director, Environmental and Long-Range Planning  
[klizardi@rinconconsultants.com](mailto:klizardi@rinconconsultants.com)

Michael Rocque, MS  
Senior Planner  
[mrocque@rinconconsultants.com](mailto:mrocque@rinconconsultants.com)

---

**Subject:** The Mercury Project Specific Plan Peer Review comments

---

**Project Number:** 21-11657

---

**Attachments:** SP Peer Review-Track Changes word document

---

## Specific Plan Peer Review comments

Please see below, Rincon’s initial comments regarding The Mercury Project Specific Plan Peer Review. Comments are divided by each section of the draft SP document, dated November 5, 2020.

### Contents

- Please clarify if a General Plan Amendment is proposed as part of the adoption of the Specific Plan. If so, this needs to be addressed in the plan to indicate what specific amendments are needed.

#### *Chapter 3.1 Circulation and access*

- The Circulation and Access sub chapter should be its own separate chapter as it is an important piece to this plan.

#### *Chapter 4 Development Standards & Design Guidelines*

- The Design Guidelines should also be separated and be its own chapter.



## Chapter I: Introduction

### 1.1 The Vision

- The proposed on-site self-storage needs to provide more clarity as to its intended use. There is a new public self-storage facility proposed less than 1,000 feet away from this site and could conflict with some ongoing amendments to the code that are tied to the project. A proposed self-storage facility in a subterranean garage seems like a very undesirable use of the site. Also, the feasibility of its future conversion to TOD parking seems challenging. Please see additional comments to Self-storage throughout the rest of plan via track changes.
- If on-site self-storage is proposed, please add language that states the self-storage facilities “to be provided for residents only”.
- Under Destinations on Site, please explain and identify what are the recreational onsite or next-door opportunities mentioned in this section?
- Under Transportation Choice, please clarify if the statements in this section are referring to the Gold line extension? There should be reference or discussion to the transit station.
- Clarify and confirm with the City if the future transit station is planned on the north or south side.
- Under Destinations on site and Growth With Per Capita Trip Reduction, clarify as to what these opportunities are?

### 1.3 Existing Conditions

- Revise the existing General Plan Land Use designation to read “Mixed-Use Development (MU) (Opportunity Area-Housing Element Site)”.

### 1.4 Project Objectives

- Revise the existing General Plan Land Use designation to read “Mixed-Use Development (MU) (Opportunity Area-Housing Element Site)”.

#### *Exhibit I-4: Existing site and context photos*

- Add a cross reference in the narrative to this exhibit.

### 1.6 Specific Plan Organization

- Please see edits in track changes as to the organization of the plan. This includes separating Circulation and Access and Design Guidelines as mentioned above.

## Chapter 2: Land Use

### 2.2 General Plan Policy Guidance-Policy 3.6-2 Sustainable Development

- This policy needs to include the following additional practices:
  - Encourages capture and reuse of stormwater on site for irrigation
  - Orientation of buildings to maximize opportunities for solar energy use, daylighting, and ventilation
  - Use of landscapes that conserve water and reduce green waste





- Use of permeable paving materials or reduction of paved surfaces
- Shading of surface parking, walkways, and plazas and incorporation of solar technology

### 2.3 *Specific Plan Policies*

- Are these new policies that are part of the Specific Plan? If so, this needs to be explained here.

### 2.4 *Project Summary*

- Please see edits in track changes in Table 2-1
- In Table 2-1 it mentions that the project will be providing 13 affordable units, however there is no commitment to this or mention of this throughout the plan. The plan should specifically address how it is going to offer affordable housing and at what income levels, unit mix, and other concessions.

### 2.5 *Residential*

- Please be sure the unit breakdown is consistent with the IS/MND.

### 2.7 *Self-Storage Facilities*

- See comments in track changes as to Self-Storage use

### 2.8 *Recreation and Open Space*

- Where is the open space in the land use summary? In the plan, you are only showing the rooftop recreation area. This doesn't match the areas identified in the concept exhibit.

#### *Exhibit 2-3: Site Use Concept-Ground Floor*

- In previous discussions with the City there was the idea of relocating the leasing office to the south end of the building. Was this ruled out?

#### *Exhibit 2-6: Open Space Concept*

- The Open Space concept as presented does not appear to represent functional open space. The areas defined are merely sidewalk areas and does not provide any amenities within these areas. Please provide the minimum sizes as well as a complete breakdown (total SF) of each open space area.

## **Chapter 3: Infrastructure and Services**

### 3.1 *Circulation and Access*

- The project should show a complete street network and connections for young, elderly and those confined to a wheelchair or other disability.
- "A second point of ingress will be possible from southbound Rosemead north of Washington via a right turn and from northbound Rosemead via an existing signalized left turn". This movement is not shown in the traffic analysis.



### 3.1.3 *Fire Access*

- Have any plans been reviewed by LA County Fire for compliance? Is the 28-foot-wide drive aisle shown in Exhibit 3-3, a LA County Fire Department requirement?
- Add language as shown in track changes.

### *Exhibit 3-1: Vehicular Access*

- Is garage access happening across the ground floor retail and across the pedestrian plaza as shown in the subsequent exhibit? This does not appear to be a functional use of open space and should not be included in the open space exhibits or counted towards the projects overall open space calculations.

### 3.2 *Infrastructure Plan*

- Has the City reviewed this plan against water and wastewater master plans?

### 3.2.5 *Solid Waste*

- This needs to be expanded and provide specifics as to location and size of trash area and if commercial/residential will have separate locations, etc.

### 3.3.1 *Schools*

- Has there been any coordination with the School District?

## **Chapter 4: Development Standards and Design Guidelines**

### 4.2 *Development Standards*

- Consider creating table/matrix for all development standards

#### 4.2.1 *Site Development*

- Please refer to all corrections/edits for this section in the attached track changes document

#### 4.2.2 *Residential Standards*

- Consider adjusting the minimum dwelling unit sizes for the Studio and 1 bedroom (only 25SF difference between both unit types).
- In Table 4-2 you identify a Jr. 1 bedroom unit, however it is not provided under minimum dwelling units sizes above.
- Table 4-2 has multiple inconsistencies with the common open space areas as it relates to other sections of the plan.



- In Table 4-2, under private open space unit types, there should be an established minimum area/unit as opposed to a range.

#### 4.2.3 *Commercial Standards*

- Section 4.2.1 indicates that the ground floor retail uses, and lobby area shall not exceed 5,500SF. Please revise this to be consistent.

#### 4.2.5 *Waste Collection*

- See previous comment above on Solid Waste. The trash area needs to be defined as to location, size, and accessibility. Current code requires the following for commercial and residential uses:

Commercial: 36SF:5000SF gross floor area

Residential: 6SF/per unit

This can be a starting point to determine appropriate size.

#### 4.2.6 *Parking*

- Please provide a conceptual parking plan.
- Include an electric car sharing program such as zip car, etc.
- In Table 4-3, please provide the total number of EV and carpool/carshare spaces

#### 4.2.7 *Bicycle Parking*

- Project should include a dedicated electric bicycle-sharing program for residents to promote non-vehicular mobility in conjunction with the future rail line.
- Include space to accommodate and promote active transportation such as a dedicated and secure bicycle center that integrates bike storage/parking, showers, lockers, and repair services. The center could also be designed to be partially available to the public. *(Community Benefit)*
- The number of bicycle parking spaces seems low based on number of units being provided. Number of bicycle spaces should be established by number of bedrooms/units or total residential floor area not number of total vehicle parking spaces.
- Please see additional edits in this section in track changes.

#### 4.3 *Land Use Matrix*

- Use classifications listed in Table 4-4 should be consistent with the use classifications listed in PRMC 18.40.040 for consistency purposes.



- Due to the limited area of approximately 5,000sf of commercial space provided on the ground floor, should consider trimming this down to retail serving uses or personal service and restaurant type uses. Seems to be an array of uses for such a small commercial area.

#### 4.4 *Design Guidelines*

- Per SB 330 and SB 35, both bills require cities to review residential development based on objective standards rather than subjective standards. Recommend that City require objective design standards for the Specific Plan.
- Please review comments/edits in track changes for additional language to be added throughout all sections of the Design Guidelines chapter.
- Exhibit 4-11 does not match or is not consistent with the area shown as pedestrian plaza in front of the building. Revise these rendering for consistency throughout.

#### 4.4.3 *Landscape Guidelines*

- Please provide a conceptual landscape plan as part of the plan.

#### 4.4.4 *Open Space Amenities*

- Please insert a new section here and expand on the amenities offered as part of this development.

#### 4.4.6 *Walls & Screening Concept*

- Please provide more details as to what kind of walls, height, and design is being proposed.

#### 4.4.7 *Wireless Telecommunication Facilities*

- All language under this section should be consistent with the PRMC Wireless baseline code. See edits/comments in track changes.

### **Chapter 5: Implementation**

- This chapter should include a project schedule or illustration/chart to show implementation of the project.
- Overall, there are no real commitments in the plan. Need to discuss proposed Community Benefits with City Staff.