



**NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN
NVCAP WORKING GROUP
DRAFT MINUTES
Tuesday, May 26, 2020
Virtual Meeting
5:30 PM**

Call to Order

Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director of Planning called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Present: Gail Price, Heather Rosen, Lund Smith, Yunan Song, Tim Steele, Lakiba Pittman, Alexander Lew, Keith Reckdahl, Doria Summa, Waldemar Kaczmariski, Angela Dellaporta, Kristen Flynn, Terry Holzmer,

Absent: Siyi Zhang,

Welcome and Housekeeping:

Ms. Tanner explained the procedure for the meeting. The creators of each alternative will share what their vision was for that alternative with display. After each alternative there will be a round robin and each member can comment on the alternatives, thinking about: one aspect of that alternative appreciated the most, one aspect that could be improved, one aspect included in that alternative that might be missing from others. The goal is to listen to others and understand their perspectives. There was a proposal to break the large group into two smaller group meetings for more dialogue. Each small group will likely have a virtual meeting in June then the large group back together in July. The goal of the smaller meetings would be to try to condense all versions down to two alternatives to bring forward to decision makers. J

Oral Communication:

None.

Working Group discussion of the draft alternatives:

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Each alternative and its creators will have 3 minutes to provide a brief overview of their alternative followed by a round robin where each Working Group member has up to 1 minute to provide feedback.

Ms. Dellaporta hoped the presentations today would allow all Members to make some specific suggestions. Regarding the proposals, they were not professional, the measurements were approximate, based on the measurements and apartments sizes that PNW used for their alternatives. All the proposals reflect vision of the Group and features that are cared about can be included in a reasonable proposal. The first assumption in her proposal was that no property owner should be expected to make any changes to their property unless and until they are ready. That lead to the question, if no property owners are required to make any changes, how will changes happen? Changes can be incentivized by making changes in the zoning. People can also be encouraged to recreate the vision through the City Council. Current uses of the buildings there could continue until the property was sold or remodeled or rebuilt. It was assumed most of the buildings will be self-parked or have underground parking. Open space or parks could be bought with a public assessment district. Another assumption was to try to provide as much affordable and middle-income housing as possible.

Ms. Dellaporta presented Alternatives G and K. Both alternatives have a town square and park space adjacent to the historic Cannery Building which had been refurbished. On the bottom floor is a pub or café space so people can sit outside in the town square area. Is biking, family space and there can be community. As she sees it, the entire NVCAP area has permeability in all directions for bikes and pedestrians. The cars are mostly located on the periphery. Parking is on Lambert and underneath and along the railroad spur. Parking for residents is underground. The buildings are all two, three or four stories high at the most, except for the one on Page Mill which is six stories. Specifically, the cottage courts along Olive are two stories at the most. As depicted, there are 25 to 30 units per acre. In both alternatives, the apartment buildings were placed to create small courtyards with a neighborhood feel. The most important feature is the town square area. The main difference in Alternative K is the plaza and park area are along Park Boulevard and the apartments are along the creek. Both alternatives have the pink community space on top of the global playground which would be kept as is. There is a rooftop garden in front of it. The dormitory building is retained which housed the Mayfield Medical Clinic which could expand into the office buildings across the street.

Mr. Kaczmariski commented regarding Alternative G, it was keeping the parking and structures close to the main circulation corridors. Regarding Alternative K, the improvement on this was a better opening into the Park Avenue with the plaza and bringing people from the pedestrian alley into the space. He would like to see more transparency horizontally for pedestrians going through. Olive Avenue together with the ground parking created a barrier to connection from left to right.

Ms. Song remarked regarding Alternative G, as a resident she really liked this alternative. It was balanced. The map did not reflect the new building on Page Mill that is four to five stories. She felt if a lot of building were added near the Cloudera parking lot, the residents on Parker and Olive would be surrounded by high buildings. At Pepper and Olive at least one side should be opened up. Currently the traffic from the Cloudera parking is through Park Boulevard and one exit on Page Mill. What would the traffic flow look like when more units are added? Maybe Olive Avenue could be more pedestrian, bike lane. Alternative K was very similar so she had no additional comments.

Ms. Pittman, addressing Alternative G, she concurred with the previous comments. She noted the look of intensity of building up around the residents on Pepper a little bit of Ash and Olive. Asked if, down Olive, were those new cottages?

Ms. Dellaporta answered yes, but only when people were ready, then cottage courts could be put in.

Ms. Pittman continued for Alternative K, it looked like there were no cottages on her property so she liked this one better. She was happy with the opening in the middle that went out to Park Boulevard. It was intense with high buildings across the street. The community on Pepper and Olive use the whole green area that is the parking lot as a park. There was a meeting with the owners of that lot when they were getting ready to redesign, and they purposefully designed it to have a park-like quality.

Ms. Flynn remarked she really liked the bridge that was in both plans, the clerestory section, some of the architectural charm was retained from the Fry's Buildings and it respects the upgrades to portions of the Fry's Building already done. She liked the idea of incentivizing those upgrades to happen to the most historical portions of the Fry's Building to retain a sense of place. She enjoyed the addition of density, especially close to Caltrain and it incentivizes the car traffic to go up Portage, over on Ash then out Lambert. Care should be taken to the treatment of the western side of the Cloudera site as it faces Ash. She adored the idea as people turn over properties, if they want to add a duplex on their site, they should be allowed to, and to combine two sites to make a five-plex. For Alternative K, she sees the benefit of opening both the retail and the park space out towards the bike boulevard as that is a source of customer.

Mr. Holzmer thought there were some good qualities with Alternative G. The park space was good, but he would like to see more. He had concerns about having the office space period, the density, the traffic flow. He wondered how impacted Park Boulevard and Oregon Expressway, Page Mill Road would be impacted by the traffic there. Everything needed to be factored in because neighbors having access to their residential streets was important. Addressing Alternative K questioned traffic flow, a lot of housing going out on Park Boulevard and head toward Oregon Expressway which is severely impacted in the morning and evening.

Mr. Lew, addressing Alternative G, he liked breaking down the scale of housing into smaller courts and courtyards. As a cautionary note, the prices in the Bay Area are so high so that is becoming very difficult because of the cost. Also worrisome was trying to change the existing Fry's Building to housing. The Building Code triggers a complete upgrade. For housing you usually need very small rooms which conflict with the huge floor plate of warehouses, factories and offices. Regarding Alternative K, he liked putting the central space on Park Boulevard which seemed to fit in perfectly with the existing pattern on the street now. He liked the housing along the creek.

Mr. Reckdahl liked the layout, the bike paths, the park area which could be a little bigger, not enough open park area to play soccer. Having the bridge go over the creek will make it more cohesive. The cottages were a way to involve Olive without having a huge impact on the neighbors. Was the parking on Lambert for people living in the general area?

Ms. Dellaporta replied it was put in there because people are worried about parking. It could be housing instead of parking if there was enough parking otherwise. Also, if you have retail you need parking.

Mr. Reckdahl related he would like to see the park on the right side spread out more instead of the large space for parking. He felt there was still too much office space in both alternatives. He liked the open plaza with a lot of options for use.

Ms. Rosen remarked in Alternative G she liked the plaza feel in the different spaces, where the retail space was laid out beneath some of the high rises. She liked the positioning of the high-density. She indicated it seemed the office space was intermixed a lot with the residential that didn't feel quite as cohesive as some of the other plans. She was happy with the bridges and rooftop gardens. For Alternative K, she liked the placement of the housing and office space and the plaza opening on Park Boulevard. The red retail space on Ash Street seemed out of place.

Ms. Dellaporta answered it was because she looked at the dormitory building which is beautiful and it seemed the perfect place to put a café.

Ms. Rosen liked the idea of a café there.

Mr. Smith thought the housing emphasis and green space was great. He noted Ms. Dellaporta said we tried to come up with plans to incentivize development through changes in zoning and that was an important concept. There are some gaps in this plan. Right now, at Ash and Lambert there are office buildings or small office spaces. Realistically, to incentivize development there will have to be some tradeoff between letting developers keep the office they have and then adding housing. He thought there might be some development if property owners were allowed to keep what was there but then add to it for housing stock. He liked the green space. He asked if the bike path going through Olive and Ash would be eminent domain,

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

transfer development rights? He felt Alternatives G and K had similar qualities but smaller cottages would be very expensive. The housing along the creek probably would not happen either due to cost.

Mr. Steele reported he would echo a lot of the economic challenges Mr. Smith touched on. A common thing with both Alternatives, Portage going through to Park, that connection probably couldn't happen. The idea that pieces of the building would stay with high density around it would be an economic incentive to move forward with redeveloping portions of the Fry's Building. He thought at the Cloudera site there was no reason to look at some level of new housing in that parking lot.

Ms. Summa addressed both alternatives. She thought one thing missing was any consideration for changing zoning to acquire more housing along Park Boulevard and improving the experience for bikers. These were lovely ideas but didn't seem like planning because they assumed that Fry's would sell part of their lot to the City for the park. These plans depend on the City acquiring a lot of land. It was important to remember the lots in the Olive, Pepper R1 area were small lots. Assumptions were made that somebody would like to have a use that reduces their revenue stream. There was no utilization of the parcels already on the housing element in this area and she didn't see an optimization of the potential of mixed use in CS. She thought it was unrealistic to project the yellow buildings on the corner of Page Mill. They have recently been rebuilt. In the upper left-hand corner, there is a big mixed-use building and she would like to see that pattern of mixed-use residential along Park Boulevard and consider ways to improve the bike boulevard. She didn't think it was realistic to chop up the Fry's Building.

Ms. Price thought Alternatives G and K were similar. She liked the open space and green areas. She remarked it may be a possible improvement to have a larger green space area that could serve multiple purposes. These alternatives reflect a lot of the goals and visions of the NVCAP in general. She remarked for both alternatives, there was not sufficient commercial and retail uses to support the immediate area and make it accessible to residents and employees who work in the office areas. Because of the proximity to California Avenue and Caltrain, there are many uncertainties. It is likely both of those areas will intensify over the next ten to fifteen years. It would be desirable to have additional retail and commercial uses. In Alternative K, the expansion of the bike and pedestrian connections would be useful, especially east/west because there didn't seem to be an easy connection going in that direction. In the areas of Olive and Pepper, there would probably be a strong desire to keep those single family. She liked the cluster concepts, but there is a major housing shortage, so the properties on Olive and Pepper should have mixed opportunities for housing.

Ms. Flynn presented Alternative H. She noted the structure of the neighborhood is what it is. A good, thoughtful, human-centered design based on those parameters would still be good design no matter what the economic reality is. The Cloudera site is perfectly situated for dense housing and office. It is close to Caltrain and Page Mill. There are bike improvements planned at

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

either Olive or Pepper for crossing El Camino. Page Mill is wide and in good design if a roadway is about 1 to 1 with the height of the building, it is not considered overwhelming to the roadway. With narrower roadways, height is more challenging to come out balanced. You can center some of the height next to Page Mill, as long as the height steps down toward Ash and there is a good deal of green space and setback next to the sidewalk. Lots on Olive and Pepper should be protected from being combined into single-family housing. Current law states you can't combine two residential lots into a residential lot of over 10,000 square feet. You should be able to build ADU's or duplexes or combine two lots if you are going to create more than four units on the two-lot combination. This does preserve parts of 340 Portage. It is very hard to create a sense of place and neighborhood identity and easy to erase history and charm. Allowing a prospective tenant to respectfully rehab that building at their expense is a win for the future. Either retail or office allows a partial use of a large floor plan structure which is not beneficial for housing. Portage is the entrance from El Camino to Ash, the grand entry to the site, allowing glimpses of the green spaces and retail. Further up Portage does go through to Park in this plan, but it is slowed so bicycles, pedestrians and cars can share the street. There is one- and two-story housing, U-shaped structures that turn toward green space. She left the playground because it was impractical that it would change purpose, but allowed other small zones of office that might accommodate startups, smaller businesses or professional offices.

Mr. Kazmarski's comments were as follows. One of the more critical elements of all of the schemes was that they all seem to think greenway typography was better than the private courtyard enclosures. He liked the connection to Park Boulevard. He didn't like that it was very striped vertically to keep the Portage building and to keep Olive and the parking behind it. That separates the community into those stripes with no circulation left to right.

Ms. Song liked that this alternative kept the existing residents on Pepper and Olive as they are. She liked keeping the green area on the Cloudera property and keeping the Fry's Building. It was not very balanced.

Ms. Pittman agreed with previous comments. This alternative left the residential areas as they are and created a plan around them. This plan seems to include somewhat equally all of the components. She liked the pathway that was open to Park Boulevard.

Mr. Holzmer did like the fact that the Fry's Building and the historic office building were adaptively reused as well as some of the mobility to move through the site. There is a walkway along the creek. He disliked the massive office in the middle and the masses around the edges and was concerned about traffic and parking.

Ms. Flynn responded that her vision was that traffic was permeable up from El Camino then there were options between cutting across Acacia and Portage, across Ash to the parking structure next to the clinic area. There isn't much connection between Olive and Portage for

automobiles. There were several horizontal pathways and often parallel pathways, one for car, one for bikes.

Mr. Lew liked the preservation of the railroad spur but it is a good idea only if it connects through Stanford to Bull Park which would be very difficult. He liked the corner park at Ash and Olive.

Mr. Reckdahl liked the retail which would be an asset to the Ventura Neighborhood as well. Another asset was the Mayfield Clinic. There is connectivity with the bike pathways. The density was moved over near Page Mill which was a good spot for it and it did ramp down to protect the neighborhoods. He felt there was not enough park land and there were too many offices.

Ms. Rosen remarked she liked the rooftop gardens on lots of buildings and the reuse of the Fry's Building. She was happy the existing housing in the area was prioritized. She wondered if there would be enough parking given the amount of office and retail space added and where the parking was located. This plan didn't seem very well balanced and the office space was spread out and mixed in with the residential spaces.

Ms. Flynn assumed the new structures would be self-parked. The buildings on Page Mill are six stories so there is more density there than it looks like.

Mr. Smith commented this plan did a good job of addressing the need for more housing but thought there could be more housing. At the Fry's Building, he asked how much office was shown in this plan compared to what is there now. Was the clinic envisioned to be in the pink building?

Ms. Flynn answered yes, if possible.

Mr. Smith continued, in this environment great care need to be taken with retail and it really needs to be centered in very core locations in order to survive.

Mr. Steele remarked he did appreciate that Portage in this scenario went all the way through to Park. He believed one of the bike plans talked about that being an extension connection through there. He agreed retail was getting knocked around. For retail at this site, challenges are frontage, no identify, no surface parking. Mike's Bikes isn't shown completely as it is. It sits on top of the old rail line alignment, so preserving the rail line for future transportation won't work. The arched portion on the upper piece doesn't connect to anything on the other side of Park and it does not connect to El Camino any longer. He again encouraged housing on the Cloudera parking lot.

Ms. Summa indicated there was no consideration of sites already identified in the housing element. Not all were made housing. This alternative preserved the Fry's Building as an Historic

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Resource. There doesn't need to be as much thought to saving particular parcels, especially those the City has no control over for particular uses such as the clinic. She didn't know how to get to a workable plan with zones and development standards. She asked if rooftop gardens would be a requirement in the code? She liked the idea of rezoning the Cloudera site and that the R1 area had been left alone in this plan.

Ms. Flynn explained the rooftop gardens, especially on the taller buildings was a way to offset both the urban heat island affect and some of the damage to pollinators. It's an amenity that developers might want to do on the larger buildings. It would reasonable to in code ask that most rooftops either have solar or a greenspace on them.

Ms. Dellaporta appreciated that Ms. Summa was very aware of the transitional areas, lowers the height from more density to single family homes. She liked the park area along the creek but she worried about putting cars along Portage. It becomes less pleasant and more dangerous for families. Regarding green roofs, they are very expensive which increases the cost of the buildings and are not accessible to the general public.

Ms. Price was happy with the recognition of the rail spur and a mention of the medical clinic because it is important to have social services and human services mixed with residential, office and commercial uses. This plan seemed to have very low and modest housing densities and only about 40 percent of the site showed much change. Because of the housing shortage, she would like to see a little more variety in design, height and numbers of stories. It is also important to remember this is near the Caltrain commercial area and California Avenue so it should be assumed those areas would be modified and probably more intensified. How do the plans for this area compliment plans for adjacent corridors that serve the area? She would discourage office and retail a little more but agreed with all the uncertainties regarding the fate of retail and office.

Mr. Kaczmariski explained his alternative. The two aspects of the project were: 1) Providing the best housing opportunity for middle-class families, emphasizing pedestrian circulation, open public space, shared outdoor amenities and landscape environments. 2) Taking advantage of the unique location in relation to the metropolitan circulation corridors. His plan created three zones through the space. Zone 1 had a concentration of offices in multistory buildings giving opportunities to redevelop the area and concentrate the office area close to the pedestrian access from the railway station, at the same time keeping the cars in the parking structure close to Oregon and El Camino, not allowing them to drive through the space and park underneath their buildings. Zone 2 through the middle is the residential zone. He tried to provide a lot of new units in the area, but this zone should not be over developed. It should have a lot of green space, shared accessible, easy for pedestrian circulation and connecting to the bike network. He put strong emphasis on connecting the space to Park Boulevard with a small park which is a public plaza with small local commercial businesses. Zone 3 is along El Camino and Oregon Expressway. This should be a buffer zone to the whole area but also recognize the fact that

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

those arteries are serving a larger metropolitan area and should have some commercial activities that serve the larger area, not exclusively for that neighborhood.

Ms. Song commented the existing residents on Pepper and Olive are surrounded by all the buildings. Most of the buildings are added to the existing residential area which makes the access harder for the residents. There would be more traffic on this side. The right side had more parks, the creek, more roads and bike lanes.

Ms. Pittman agreed with Ms. Song's remarks. She thought this was a lot going on and looked like if you had nothing and were going to create something, it could potentially work, but it appears to have the most in it that is new and different.

Ms. Flynn felt this was a very well thought out proposal. She liked the way taller buildings were used to buffer the noise from busy thoroughfares and the added retail was placed behind the retail and in front of the single-family homes. She would like to have seen more focus on a center of the neighborhood.

Mr. Holzmer liked the park space especially along the creek and the bike path. He had issues with the large destruction of the historic sites and concern about the Olive and Pepper neighborhood surrounded by tall buildings.

Mr. Lew remarked that he was intrigued with the large retail space on El Camino, but how much retail can this area support? He liked the comprehensiveness of this plan but trying to do six story buildings next to existing single family one- and two-story buildings is challenging.

Mr. Reckdahl indicated this was a thoughtful design. He liked that all the buildings were not parallel to each other and the residential above retail along El Camino. He worried about the transition and about cut-through traffic.

Ms. Rosen remarked the walk along the creek was good and she liked the zones and placement of the office space compared to the housing space. The retail on the bottom floors focused on El Camino made a lot of sense. She was happy with the interconnections and location of parking garages. She noted there was only one central park space but would like to see more.

Mr. Smith shared if this was a clean slate with nothing to start with, this would be a great master plan community. There were abundant mixes.

Mr. Steele agreed with Mr. Smith but the problem he had with this was that it disregarded too many things that are given for the foreseeable future such as the Mike's Bikes has currently been approved, the Palo Alto housing project is under construction, the project on Park Avenue, Page Mill and El Camino projects were not integrated in this plan.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Ms. Summa agreed with the comments about a blank slate but didn't take into account the built-out aspect of the neighborhood. She was missing the housing elements currently there, the historic buildings being retained. She liked the continuation of the park along the creek and going over to connect Boulware Park, using the existing smaller historic building as a community center. She was intrigued by the bike path that went behind the buildings instead of continuing on Park Boulevard, but how do bikes get safely across El Camino. She felt the six story buildings in the Cloudera site were too tall.

Ms. Dellaporta liked the park plaza area on Park and the park area on the creek and also the focus on bikes and pedestrians. She worried about the cut throughs for cars and more retail on El Camino because the retail there already is not surviving.

Mr. Kaczmariski clarified there was no connection of the car circulation to Park Avenue. There was a green belt that went along Park Avenue separating the car circulation from El Camino and not allowing it to Park.

Ms. Price felt this plan was very well thought out. The overall design of land usage was very thoughtful. The take back concept of Olive and Pepper is one that is gaining momentum when talking about safe streets and allowing possibilities for bikes and pedestrians. She agreed the retail needed to possibly be pushed a little closer to Park. The open space and landscaping are good. She liked the idea of residential near the creek but there are issues about feasibility, regulatory issues and environmental issues.

Ms. Price presented her alternative. Her intent was clear in using this site as a real opportunity for a balance of different uses and a lot of residential, various heights, design, density, orientation setbacks, to address the current housing crisis. In her design the calculation of retail and office was a little low. She felt strongly about all the uncertainty about what the ratios will be related to retail and office in the future that maybe these scenarios would benefit from flexibility in zoning based on the emerging conditions. She was a huge fan of combining the residential with retail on the ground floor and parking areas would benefit from having residential above. She would like to keep some parking underground, reduce surface parking or have alternatives for parking not yet imagined. The brown areas were intended to be an all-purpose residential zone, depending on the size of the parcels. The community building was located on Portage next to the path on the right, designed to be about 15,000 square feet. They are a lot of bike and multi-use paths. She looked at the balance of retail and commercial that served residents and employees in the area. Significant office square footage historically provided a good economic anchor. She believed the site could be evolved in phases depending on the economic conditions. The heights of the multi-family residential buildings range from four to six or seven stories, up to eight. The towers for office are between three to five stories. The only way affordable housing is feasible is to have at least four or five stories.

Mr. Kaczmariski noted he liked the mixed use between residential and commercial. He was concerned about bringing large offices deep into the residential space and the connection from left to right.

Ms. Song felt this alternative had too much density. She supported more housing for low income and middle-income families. Were there any constraints when increasing housing, enough schools, public transportation?

Ms. Pittman remarked this plan was quite intense. She understands the need for more housing, but with the current situation, people's needs may shift.

Ms. Flynn liked the network of paths and green spaces. This didn't believe there was enough space between the towers to allow daylight down to the lower stories. She was also concerned about the level of density with cars coming to a halt on El Camino and Oregon. She felt if the retail was too close to California, it might be competing with the California Avenue retail.

Mr. Holzmer liked the green spaces especially around the creek and should be developed in all the plans. He disliked the destruction of the historical aspects of the building and some of the massing of the buildings.

Mr. Lew noted this was an alternative with tall buildings and this should be considered. The shapes of the buildings were too small for mid-rise buildings. He would like to see how the green space around the towers could be designed at a human scale.

Mr. Reckdahl commented that the advantage of going high was to be able to have more space and more park land that that space here was used for more buildings. He would be concerned about the parking, traffic and daylight impacts. This alternative probably doesn't make much impact on the office/housing imbalance because there were a lot of offices.

Ms. Rosen felt the general layout seemed okay and trying to get more housing was good. She would prefer the office space be spread more to ward El Camino and Page Mill, especially with the large buildings. She agreed the park space didn't seem feasible with the tall buildings. She also questioned the viability of this plan, given some of the other projects already in progress.

Mr. Smith remarked this was a very creative plan. It made a big statement on adding housing. In some ways this was a most practical plan in terms of what is needed to incentivize doing affordable housing, but it is also the least viable given the constraints already talked about.

Mr. Steele agreed with Mr. Smith. This is an ambitious and thoughtful plan. It would be challenging to figure out how to phase this in.

Ms. Summa noted the project ignored Park Boulevard completely, it didn't look at housing sites. There is too much density, the historic buildings were completely gone. The vehicular circulation would make traffic worse. It looked like Olive was blocked, there is no creative use of the creek.

Ms. Price explained the bottle green is park land and Olive was not blocked.

Ms. Summa indicated this was mostly new housing and that would not be affordable housing. The most affordable housing is what currently exists.

Ms. Dellaporta liked the bike and pedestrian pathways, but worried about car cut throughs along Olive, Portage and Lambert. This plan put green space and housing in but she was uncomfortable with eight stories in the neighborhood.

Mr. Reckdahl started the presentation of his group's alternative. Affordable housing in Palo Alto is a huge problem. Economic incentives can't be given to builders to get the neighborhoods that are needed. This option says if this is the highest priority of the Council this year, have the City buy the property, finance the debt and service the debt with a combination of rent and a stipend from the City. In return the City would get about 400 units of affordable housing. The problems are, the property owners have no desire to sell, and the City does not want to spend the money. This is a long-term plan to take advantage if Sobrato decides to see and the City wants to buy. If it is not considered, it will be a lost opportunity and never be able to address it in time.

Mr. Holzman continue with Alternative M, one of the most important elements in this proposal was to preserve the Bayside Cannery Buildings. This alternative proposes to adaptively reuse the main Cannery structures for below market housing, and turns the smaller white office building into a community center that could be used by the residents in the new area but also in the Ventura area and could possibly create a neighborhood-serving café. The current parking lot is larger than needed and the extra space could be turned into dedicated park space. This proposal helps hundreds of residents who need the BMR housing. The housing over retail would be about three to four stories.

Mr. Kaczmariski remarked that he would really like to support low income housing, but it is not so much a zoning aspect as a financial issue and could be incorporated into any of the alternatives presented today.

Ms. Song supported the idea of keeping the Fry's Building. Regarding the housing, she supported the idea about increasing the housing but is still concerned about how realistic this plan is. She would like some research about how many units could be added and consider where they could be added.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Ms. Pittman appreciated the amount of housing in this plan. The Fry's site looked like it was utilizing more space for housing than she would like. This puts housing in the space that was Fry's. She would prefer retaining part of the Fry's site for something other than housing.

Ms. Flynn liked the location of the park land, the community use of the older white building and retaining the Fry's building. She was concerned this didn't fix the north/south flow through of pedestrians and bikes because the houses along Olive and the 340 Portage building both break off that flow. Also, large floor planes aren't easily broken into housing because housing required light.

Mr. Reckdahl explained there would be wells coming down to provide light inside.

Mr. Lew commented that it seemed like a nonstarter to try to change the Fry's Building to housing. Light wells are not fire truck access.

Ms. Rosen liked the focus on housing, preserving the current residences, the park with the community center and the location of the retail space. She questioned the feasibility.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Lew. Converting the Fry's warehouse is extremely challenging if not impossible. The building may not have to stay, but there should be some commemoration and acknowledgment that as important.

Mr. Steele agreed with Mr. Smith.

Ms. Summa noted this was a very intriguing proposal. She asked how this becomes below market-rate housing and how the City acquired the 340 Portage site? She was happy Park Boulevard was addressed and it looked like the Cloudera site was rezoned. She appreciated this alternative didn't depict setbacks, courtyards and private rooftops as park land.

Mr. Reckdahl advised the other units like Cloudera would be rezoning, which would be market rate. They arbitrarily picked 340 Portage to be BMR so the City would have to subsidize that. The City could buy that, bonds the construction costs and pay it off over time. It is not feasible for the City currently but may be in the future.

Ms. Summa indicated this alternative calculates the potential of housing units in the other parts, the CS zoned areas. This looks like the neighborhood, it retains the historic, adds a part and doesn't misrepresent parks. It looks like it would potentially make the traffic better.

Ms. Dellaporta liked the idea of using the offices on the other side of Park and Cloudera as housing. She didn't know how expensive it would be to turn offices into housing. She supported affordable housing but if the City wants to contribute to affordable housing, they can do that with any of the schemes by buying property. She liked the idea of using a business tax to

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

support that. If 340 Portage wasn't used as it is and try to adapt it, maybe there could be more affordable housing put in. She would rather have more affordable housing than keep the historic building.

Ms. Price agreed with previous comments. She was not in favor of intensive efforts to do adaptive reuse of the Cannery Building and felt there were many ways to honor Thomas Chew. She felt people had to be careful about using the term BMR. That is often related to a number of units in a particular development and/or funds that are given by the developer to the City as a requirement of development. They are deed restricted. To do affordable housing, you have to have partners, nonprofit developers, city, state and federal money and that is currently very uncertain. Taking on a project of this magnitude would be very difficult and in this economy, it is very unlikely the City of Palo Alto would take this on.

Discussion of possible Ad-hoc Subcommittees to Facilitate Small Group Meetings:

Ms. Tanner indicated in the parlance of the Brown Act, subcommittees would be ad-hoc subcommittees. Several dates and times would be put out in late June that might work. A pole will be sent out to members about which dates would work best. The idea would be that staff would try to understand all the things the Group has come up with and hopefully have a way to present these, such as placing more business and retail nearer to Caltrain or having it be more on El Camino. The goal of the small groups would be to work to whittle the proposals down to two.

Mr. Kaczmariski thought the most dramatic difference was keeping the Cannery in place versus not. One option should be to follow one direction or the other.

Ms. Summa asked if the idea of the ad hoc subcommittees to refine the two options and then meet as a whole group?

Ms. Turner answered yes. This is a large group and it is hoped the smaller groups would be more opportunity for dialogue within the bounds of the meeting time.

Ms. Dellaporta liked Mr. Kaczmariski's idea of each of the two groups with a different perspective on the Cannery. She felt it shouldn't be either the entire Cannery or none of it, but maybe parts of the Cannery.

Ms. Price asked if this would be in the absence of consultants, just the Working Group members and staff? Is it possible at this point to make any assumptions about what percentage of this Group is interested in saving part or all of the Cannery Building versus not?

Ms. Turner replied yes, without consultants. The idea was that Group members would self-select into the group they preferred, for or against and that could be done today with a raise of hands.

Ms. Flynn assumed Group Members were capable of working out agreement in the groups but may need more than one meeting.

Mr. Turner explained the ad hoc meetings could be set up more quickly because they are less than a quorum.

Mr. Holzmer believed the key issue was if a structure of this kind could be separated and Group members don't have that information. Before a compromise could be made, there would have to have an analysis if this concept was possible.

Ms. Turner advised that kind of analysis was probably not possible due to budget constraints.

Ms. Summa remarked there should be an environmental review because it is unknown if the building can be destroyed.

Ms. Turner responded that CEQA was disclosure so the Council ultimately decides if the building could be removed. If it was deemed historic and there was no way to mitigate the loss of this historic structure, Council would have to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This is deemed historic mostly for cultural features and events. There has to be a plan in place to go through CEQA.

Ms. Summa thought in both options there should be a Fry's Building in and out. The present property owners don't wish to demolish the building. Maybe both options should contain adaptive reuse, sustainable and environmental of the building and removal of the building.

Ms. Price commented that alternative concepts to be evaluated were good. In the keep Fry's or a portion of the Cannery Building, that could be a subset of one category. The other would be the one without preservation of the original building. Some suggestions need to be made even without all the information.

Oral Communications

Becky Saunders believed Alternative M was a visionary proposal that would hit all the priorities many people wished to see, regardless of whether they pencil out, including housing, park land, reduced traffic impacts and more parity with other neighborhoods. Unfortunately, serving the people who live here rarely results in high profits for businesses, and anything that truly benefits the public rarely pencils out. She was struck by Ms. Pittman's suggestion of working with property owners to provide a pseudo park at the boundary between Cloudera and Olive.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

She would like Ventura to be able to get real parks. She also applauded Ms. Summa's idea of giving North Ventura the look and feel of other neighborhoods.

Future Meetings and Agendas:

Ms. Turner advised she would meet with Ms. Dellaporta and Ms. Price to sort the groups out. It would probably be in later June so there was time to figure out when the groups could meet and what their composition would be. She welcomed suggestions from the Group on how the Ad-hoc groups could be set up.

Ms. Price asked if the two scheduled meetings in June were now to be determined.

Ms. Turner replied yes.

Adjournment: 8:06 PM

Note: Copies of meeting materials will be posted on the City's project website:

<https://bit.ly/2OtGFJG>.