

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STUDY SESSION**

**April 29, 2020**

**Meeting Summary**



**PTC Comments on February 26<sup>th</sup> Presented Draft Version**

<b>Commissioner Name</b>	<b>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</b>	<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Open Space</b>
<b>ALCHECK, Michael</b>	--Proposals should address housing shortage. --Density is required. --Address SB35 requirements in the proposals		
<b>Additional Comments:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WG goals and need should reflect overall City's need and long-term goals.</li> <li>2. WG discussions should inform the decision makers</li> <li>3. Work on changing existing City guidelines to address state regulations and legislative changes.</li> <li>4. Option with greatest housing density preferred</li> </ol>			
<b>Commissioner Name</b>	<b>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</b>	<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Open Space</b>
<b>HECHTMAN, Bart</b>	--More dense housing required because of the plan area location and connectivity. --Density & height should be phased over time	--Parking is required now, but should be tethered back in future	--Have a centrally located park as an open space in the middle of the plan area so it's closer to all residents. --Can reduce some creek side open space to balance this
<b>Additional Comments:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did not have the opportunity to review WG proposed Alts.</li> <li>2. Proposals should return to WG members for further deliberations</li> <li>3. Alt 1 –nonstarter Alt 2 &amp; 3 –phased out development plans over next 20-30 years</li> </ol>			
<b>Commissioner Name</b>	<b>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</b>	<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Open Space</b>
<b>LAUING, Ed</b>	--Housing is a priority. --No displacement of existing residents	--No self-parking	--Realistic open spaces must be included, not only patios and balconies
<b>Additional Comments:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full mitigation to all impacts should be studied, no studies has been done to study outcomes.</li> <li>2. Very aspirational proposals.</li> <li>3. Conduct more detailed community surveys to gather more public opinion.</li> <li>4. Eminent Domain should not be used as a tool.</li> <li>5. Plan should be done right amidst all future uncertainties.</li> <li>6. Proposals should return to WG members.</li> </ol>			



Commissioner Name	Housing (Density & Height)	Transportation	Open Space
ROOHPARVAR, Giselle	--More housing density preferred		
<b>Additional Comments:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plan should have built in flexibility so it can adapt to future needs, especially to cope with economic recession and future uncertainties.</li> <li>2. Retail and office use in the Plan should be flexible enough to adapt successfully to future changes.</li> <li>3. Equitable distribution of affordable housing and density throughout the city, should not be unfairly concentrated in Ventura neighborhood only.</li> <li>4. One with more housing density preferred</li> </ol>			
Commissioner Name	Housing (Density & Height)	Transportation	Open Space
SUMMA, Doria		--Improvements to Park Blvd. for bike safety	--Realistic proposals for open space
Commissioner Name	Housing (Density & Height)	Transportation	Open Space
TEMPLETON, Carolyn	--Prefers the comparison of densities between the alts. --Prefers the ground floor retail use locations. --Concerned about infeasibility of rental units and inadequacy of BMR units	--Improvement of ECR and Page Mill Rd intersection required to accommodate higher density.	
<b>Additional Comments:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PTC should see it again, when the plan is more developed</li> <li>2. Prefers the phasing out approach in the Alts</li> <li>3. Worried to see the increasing burden of density planned for this neighborhood and not the rest of the city</li> <li>4. The NVCAP survey should have been more representative of the area residents and should be more well-rounded.</li> <li>5. Alt 1 not aspirational enough. Alt2 includes creative zoning solutions and maintains the feel of the neighborhood. Alt 3 should attempt to retain the 340 Portage Building's historic elements, but requires to be renovated for modern workspace</li> </ol>			



## Public Comments Received

Name	Comments
Becky Sanders	<p>P+W Alts does not reflect community wishes.</p> <p>WG not empowered to take community feedback, give WG chance to finish the process</p> <p>Proposals are not alts but gradations of same plans, this doesn't honor the resident's wish</p> <p>Doesn't belong in Ventura, site specific plan, existing conditions not considered</p> <p>Fry's site to revert back to housing</p> <p>Eminent Domain not to be used, use moratorium for additional development, use zoning to get rid of commercial zo. More housing additional to community retail.</p> <p>Office not mentioned</p>
Ken Joye	<p>Full mitigation of impacts of proposed developments</p> <p>What other neighborhoods absorbing the development impacts?</p> <p>Alt 3 covers entire study area, others don't</p> <p>Don't just consider uses that only pencil out for commercial developers</p> <p>Do not allow non-confirming use to exist. Enforce RM zone, no more office space</p>
Angela Della porta	<p>Additional Alts proposed by WG (5) guided by the vision of neighborhood. Those alts address concerns of the neighborhood</p> <p>Concerned about new constructions before new plan decides the use. The neighborhood and city need to decide what goes in there.</p>
Winter D	<p>No parking study, not based on existing zoning, no parkland dedication fees collected, proposals are not reality based, biased poorly designed survey, Alts 3 when developed will be 18 times denser than anything else developed in PA, consider overflow traffic.</p> <p>Alt 1—no park, Alt 2 limited open space. Under the park land dedication—the required parkland and how underserved than hood is. Economic racism.</p>
Kelsey Banes	<p>Great location for the plan to create great neighborhood. Housing greatest need add it over course of time. Prioritize affordable housing and that requires higher density.</p> <p>Do district parking rather than underground parking.</p> <p>Survey result prioritize housing, midrise building supported.</p> <p>Reach out to renters more.</p>
Kirsten Flynn	<p>Not an ideal process, wants a more robust process</p> <p>Permit freezing for new projects in the plan area</p> <p>Include affordable housing, even though density is not decided</p> <p>Prioritize Park Blvd. bike safety specially in traffic conflict area of Page Mill and Park.</p>



	<p>Improve E_W connections in addition to N_S robust bicycle blvd.</p> <p>Traffic concerns around ECR &amp;Page Mill. Cut thru traffic and safety of bike Blvd.</p> <p>Parking structure near bike blvd decreases the quality of the bike blvd.</p>
L.David Barron	<p>Housing shortage, people pushed out. Dense housing around transit required.</p> <p>Encourage the most housing density plan (even more) for city to consider. More housing required to meet the next RHNA cycle goals.</p> <p>Significant under zoning in SOFA area. Parcels still not yet fully developed.</p> <p>If zoning is not enough for developers to build it will not be built. The vision will not be realized</p>
M. Mollineaux	<p>Essential to look at conflict of interest, look at renter's interest. Preserving low density zoning is not enough. City wide comprehensive Parking Allocation study is required.</p> <p>Approve the high density but do the traffic study.</p>