



NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN WORKING GROUP MEETING

AGENDA

for

**Thursday, June 25, and
Tuesday, June 30, 2020**

**Virtual Meeting
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM**

Instructions for Virtual Meeting Participation

AGENDA

******BY VIRTUAL TELECONFERENCE ONLY******

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, issued on March 17, 2020, to prevent the spread of Covid-19, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. The meeting will be broadcast live on Cable TV Channel 26 and Midpen Media Center at <https://midpenmedia.org/local-tv/watch-now/>. Members of the public may comment by sending an email to NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org or by attending the Zoom virtual meeting to give live comments. Instructions for the Zoom meeting can be found on the last page of this agenda.

Call to Order: 5:30 PM

- Welcome and Housekeeping: 5:30 PM -5:35 PM
- Oral Communications: 5:35 PM-5:50 PM

Discussion Items: 5:50 PM – 8:15 PM*

- Discussion of topics in NVCAP Handbook –Staff and Co-Chairs

Oral Communications: 8:15 – 8:30 PM

Adjournment 8:30 pm

Future Meeting/Workshops: To be determined

*Listed times are estimates.

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.

Members of the Public may provide public comments to teleconference meetings via email, or by teleconference.

- 1. Written public comments on North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan** may be submitted by email to NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org
- 2. Spoken public comments using a computer** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Working Group members, click on the link below for the appropriate meeting to access a Zoom-based meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully.
 - A. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in-browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
 - B. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
 - C. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on “raise hand”. The moderator will activate and unmute attendees in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak. The Zoom application will prompt you to unmute your microphone when it is your turn to speak.
 - D. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.
 - E. A timer will be shown on the computer to help keep track of your comments.
- 3. Spoken public comments using a smart phone** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Council, download the Zoom application onto your phone from the Apple App Store or Google Play Store and enter the Meeting ID below. Please follow instructions B-E above.
- 4. Spoken public comments using a phone** use the telephone number listed below. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit *9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak. You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Board. You will be advised how long you have to speak. When called please limit your remarks to the agenda item and time limit allotted.

<https://zoom.us/join>

Meeting ID: 98260890913

[https://zoom.us/j/ 98260890913](https://zoom.us/j/98260890913)

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.



**NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN
WORKING GROUP MEETING #12a and 12b
STAFF MEMO
June 25 and 30, 2020**

Finding common ground is the goal of this meeting. The following are difficult issues on which we have divergent opinions, so this will be a tough meeting.

We must make some decisions on these issues by **August 2020**, so that we can develop the alternatives to bring to the Planning & Transportation Commission first and then the City Council in the fall 2020. Once brought to City Council and Council selects a preferred alternative, that alternative will be studied more thoroughly.

We should not shy away from honest, civil, disagreement, but we should try to find common ground. If we cannot, city staff will have to make decisions about the NVCAP.

To prepare for the meeting: Be ready to state your opinion on each issue in a 1-minute persuasive speech OR, even better, after looking at the options, prepare to propose a solution that is likely to be attractive to most people.

Discussion Format: Questions will be discussed one at a time. Some questions will be deferred for later discussion.

1. **Chair will read through the options.** The bullet points under each option are various arguments made by Working Group members. Their accuracy has not been checked.
2. **Each WG member will have up to one minute to state their opinion**, explaining their reasons. If you would like to propose a **combination** of options, or a **completely new solution** to the question, this is a good time.
3. **Discussion.** There will be a short period for WG members to **ask questions** or to **propose more New Solution**. The goal will be agreement.
4. **Vote, if necessary.** If we cannot agree on an answer, combination of answers, or create a new solution, then the Working Group members will take a vote on preferred option(s). Working Group members can vote for all options they support, including newly created options.

Please review the document below before the meeting, so that you can be ready to state your opinion. Underlining is for readability of the document, not emphasis.

- *Practice example:*
- **Question 1. Which flavor ice cream should we have at the next meeting?**
- **A. Vanilla**
- ** Everyone is ok with vanilla*
- **B. Chocolate**
- ** The caffeine will help us stay alert*
- **C. Strawberry**
- ** It's the best*

North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan Handbook

***Question 2. Which office space policy option do you support?**

A. Retain the same amount of office space that currently exists (approximately 578,000 sf).

- Office workers contribute to local small businesses all day long.¹
- Current office space is not excessive.
- Office space helps subsidize low- and middle-income housing

B. Only allow new offices that are each smaller than 10,000 sf (professional service offices: doctor, lawyer, architect, etc.)

- No new offices. Only include commercial space that will provide services to the people who live and work in Palo Alto.
- Small offices make a community walkable and reduce car trips
- Small offices help residents feel connected to the neighborhood; they vitalize the neighborhood and make it feel like a small town. Large offices that are not used by residents do the opposite.
- They add to foot traffic more than corporate offices do, because appointments are short — thus they help support retail.

C. Enough office space to subsidize 20% affordable on-site housing units.

- More affordable housing is desirable, though more than 20% would be better.

D. Projects proposing additional office square footage must create the number of housing units to support the number of jobs created.

- There are too many office jobs in Palo Alto already, and there is not enough housing. We should reduce the Office/housing imbalance.
- Reducing that imbalance would reduce the carbon emissions created by commuting workers.
- We should not be designing to maximize profit for builders.
- We should not be designing to maximize the tax basis for the city.

E. Include 100K - 130K sqft of office space. This will put jobs near transit. It will also help support local retail and subsidize more low- and middle-income housing.

F. No new offices. Only include **commercial space that will provide services to the people** who live and work in Palo Alto.

G. Current office space should be converted to housing. The jobs housing imbalance in Palo Alto must be reversed.

H. New Solution

¹ All bullet points following the options in the document are a combination of the expressed opinions of the Working Group members who decided to present their opinions.

***Question 3. Location of Office Space**

A. Cloudera Site

- Walking distance to train station and busses.
- Tall building buffers the interior of the neighborhood from noise
- Inexpensive to keep things as they are

B. 340 Portage

- Offices at 340 Portage would provide an economic incentive to bring the Cannery Building up to code while preserving the history and placemaking charm.

C. El Camino Real and Page Mill

- Neighborhood serving offices here would reduce driving through the NVCAP
- Close to public transit.

D. Park Boulevard

E. Lambert Avenue

F. New Solution

Comments

- Transition requirements should be strictly enforced to prevent negative impact on adjacent low-density residential uses.

***Question 4. Where should the tallest buildings in the NVCAP be located?**

A. Along El Camino Real

- Tallest buildings will feel most appropriate on the widest, busiest, streets.
- Already an urban feel, so will not be out of place.
- Tallest buildings belong near commercial zones, as in the rest of Palo Alto.
- Tall buildings here will take advantage of the view
- Tall buildings here will minimize shading and privacy concerns for adjacent lower-density streets.
- Tall buildings can reduce noise for internal neighborhood streets
- Easy access to transportation (bus) will reduce driving through NVCAP.

B. Along Page Mill Road

- Tallest buildings will feel most appropriate on the widest and busiest streets
- Already tall buildings here; will not ruin the character of the street.
- Tall buildings here will minimize shading and privacy concerns for internal streets.
- Tall buildings can reduce noise for internal neighborhood streets.
- Easy access to transportation (train and bus) and Cal Ave
- Taller buildings along the periphery will allow for shorter buildings internally, while still creating plenty of housing

C. Along Park Blvd.

- Easy access to transportation and Cal Ave

D. In the center of the plan, along Portage and/or on the 340 Portage site

- Putting tall buildings at 340 Portage will reduce the possible impacts on existing residences along Lambert, Park, Olive, and others.
- It would allow for more flexibility and freedom to build something that meets most people's expectations.

E. Throughout the NVCAP plan area

F. Combination of A and B, since the supporting arguments for each are very similar.

G. New Solution

Comments

- Tall buildings in the NVCAP area should comply with existing laws and development standards. An emphasis on avoiding negative impacts on adjacent zones should be maintained.

***Question 5. Maximum height for tallest buildings in NVCAP?**

A. 3 stories

- Appropriate for most of NVCAP, except along El Camino and Page Mill (where taller buildings are ok).

B. 4 stories

- Appropriate along El Camino and Page Mill
- Anything taller is out of character with the rest of Palo Alto.

C. 6 stories

- One neighborhood (NVCAP) with traffic barriers (railroad track and ECR/Page Mill intersection) should not bear the brunt of traffic congestion caused by too-high density. Mobility issues in NVCAP are a barrier to growth.
- Taller buildings allow for more green space. (If more green space is not provided, then 6 stories is too high.)
- Taller than 6 stories would be incongruous with surrounding neighborhoods. Most buildings in the NVCAP should be 2, 3, or 4 stories in order to foster a suburban ambiance, like most of Palo Alto. This will provide plenty of housing.
- The average height should be about 4 stories or so, with only one or two buildings at 6 stories. We don't want to create an incongruous, big-city development right next to single-family-home neighborhoods.

D. 8 stories

- 6-8 stories or more will allow for variety and meet our needs for residential, community and office/commercial. Well-designed architectural elements and building materials can support change while still honoring community history.

E. 10 or more stories

F. 5 stories. Four stories of wood construction on top of 1 story of concrete. The top story can be effectively hidden from view. 7-10 story buildings, made of concrete or steel, are more expensive to build per square foot.

G. New Solution

***Question 6. Density by “areas of inspiration”** (This density would support neighborhood-serving businesses, without competing with Cal Ave.

A. ~ 1.4K/square mile, as recommended by Palo Alto’s comp plan

- One neighborhood should not look wildly different from the rest of Palo Alto,
- One neighborhood should not bear the brunt of traffic congestion caused by overcrowding.

B. ~ 9K-11K/sq mile, as in Emeryville, Downtown Palo Alto and Oak Park, Chicago

- This density would support neighborhood-serving businesses, without competing with Cal Ave.
- I enjoy the feeling of University Ave/Downtown Palo Alto
- We should select a density that is proportional to the expectations and realities of our own city.
- The future density of NVCAP will likely be related to evolving densities along California Avenue and El Camino/Page Mill. I believe this area should be at least comparable to University Avenue/Downtown

C. ~13K -17K/ square mile (~ 10 du/acre) as in Pearl District and Cambridge Mass.

- I am comfortable in a neighborhood of this density.
- Would allow us to meet our residential needs in the coming years — housing shortage.
- Would create a new, vibrant, neighborhood in Palo Alto.
- I like the feel of the Pearl District, but it would be a significant change.

D. New Solution

Comments

- The NVCAP is not comparable to downtown Palo Alto— because it has vibrant retail nearby, at Cal Ave. It should be dense enough, however, to provide a few local businesses that serve residents, such as a cafe, etc.
- Of the options noted, each reflect the history of a site and many of the examples are related to earlier industrial and manufacturing sector near or in large cities, ports, and hubs. NVCAP has many of those features.
- I like the look and feel of the Pearl District, but it would be a significant change

***Question 7. Overall housing density, by units/acre**

A. <20 du/acre

B. 21-40 du/acre

- 30 du/acre overall is the current density maximum for 340 Portage.
- 30 du/acre overall would allow for denser housing (> 40 du/acre) in some areas, while leaving other areas (such as Olive and Pepper) less dense.
- This is not a contest to maximize the number of units; it is a contest to make the best neighborhood
- 30 du/acre is denser than most of Palo Alto, but would not create a jarringly incongruous area.
- High density (up to 65 du/acre) in some areas, combined with low density in others, would average out to a comfortable range of 20-30 du/acre

C. 41-75 du/acre

- Given the study area proximity to transportation corridors and commercial uses, I believe this mid-range density would be appropriate (41-75 du/acre)

D. 76-100 du/acre

E. >100 du/acre

F. Should be consistent with other mixed-use areas in Palo Alto

G. New Solution

Comments

- I recommend The Death and Life of Great American Cities by Jane Jacobs. Chapter 11: The Need for Concentration.

***Q8. Building typologies (and densities)**

A. Townhomes (33 du/acre)

- Saddling just one area (NVCAP) of the city with high housing densities is discriminatory and unfair. Higher density and more BMR units can be achieved by adding housing throughout Palo Alto, not just in this area.
- Higher density than this would create even worse traffic problems than we have now.
- Taller buildings are only appropriate along ECR and Page Mill. This is a contest to create the best neighborhood, not to maximize the number of units.
- Blocks do not allow for enough light in the units.

B. Low-Rise Greenway (107 du/acre)

- Including some higher-density buildings 4 stories or less will allow us to leave lower-density areas (such as Olive) as they are.
- Including some higher-density buildings of 4 stories or less will allow us to have more open, green, park space.
- Blocks do not allow for enough light in the units.

C. Low-Rise Block (124 du/acre)

- Blocks do not allow for enough light in the units.

D. Low Rise with Retail (147 du/acre)

- As long as they are 4 stories or less in total (including the retail), then these can add to the vitality and walkability of the neighborhood.
- Useful retail reduces car trips made by residents.
- Including some higher-density buildings 4 stories or less (in total, including the retail) will allow us to leave lower-density areas (such as Olive) as they are.
- Including some higher-density buildings of 4 stories or less will allow us to have more open, green, park space.

E. Mid-Rise Block (159 du/acre)

- Low rise will not capture the overall site potential
- Would create the amount of residential units needed
- Can be attractive and compatible with adjacent properties, if designed imaginatively, creatively

F. All of the above in appropriate locations

- A, B, D (no Block Buildings). Density is the only way we will achieve affordable housing with current land prices. A vibrant diverse city depends on affordable housing, so that a chef, a young person, a teacher, a creative entrepreneur, a senior, an employee of a nonprofit can all live in our town. A low carbon city also depends on affordable housing, so that commutes for employees of entry level jobs do not continue increasing.

G. New Solution

***Q9. Housing height limits at Cloudera site (assuming zoning change and appropriate retail)**

A. No additional housing

- Because Pepper and Olive are surrounded by new construction, the Cloudera parking lot provides the only nearby open space for residents to walk. Therefore, some of the parking lot should be turned into a park for nearby residents.

B. With 3-story limit

- Building housing with a 3- story limit will provide density without destroying the suburban ambiance of Pepper and Olive

C. With 5-story limit

- Close proximity to train station would keep car trips low.
- Entire site converted to housing would reduce Palo Alto's jobs/housing imbalance
- A 5-6 story bldg on Page Mill would not shade homes on Pepper or Olive and would create a noise buffer.
- Mostly 3-4 stories, with one 5-6 story bldg, would create plenty of housing density. Park (.6 acre) that extends along berm on Pepper should be retained and possibly expanded.
- Easy access for cars from Page Mill

D. More than 5 stories

- People are already used to the large Cloudera building, so getting approval for a tall building would not be difficult.
- Buildings on the Cloudera site would not shade nearby existing homes on Pepper or Olive
- A tall building along Page Mill would provide a noise buffer for the rest of the NVCAP
- Lower cost per unit — more low- and mid-income housing to address housing shortage
- Mixed use at Cloudera to make affordable housing more likely
- Gail: The Cloudera

E. New Solution

Comments

- A range of heights would be best. 5 or more stories near Page Mill, 3-4 stories near Olive and Pepper.

***Q10. Should any properties be considered "unavailable for development"? (Assume no residents would be forced out of their homes.)**

A. 340 Portage

- Charm, history and a sense of place are easy to erase, and hard to create. We already have those things in the 340 Portage building.
- 340 Portage could be adapted into housing.
- Property owner not interested in developing site

B. Cloudera

- Could detract from character of nearby single-family-home streets.

C. Single-family homes on Olive

- We don't want to evict people.
- The single-family homes on Olive are some of the most affordable in Palo Alto. We should not eliminate affordable housing.
- We need more low-income neighborhoods like this, not fewer.
- Most diverse neighborhood in Palo Alto.

D. Recently built or approved-for-building properties

- It would be ecologically harmful, and financially irrational, to re-build recently renovated (in the past five years or so) or newly built properties. Recent permits for construction are unlikely to be revoked. Anything else should be carefully considered for development, but not necessarily developed. No current residents should be required to leave, but natural attrition will eventually make some properties available for future development. .

E. Office buildings not mentioned above

F. Residences not mentioned above

G. No properties should be considered unavailable for development

- Many of the NVCAP properties can be developed at a higher density but retain the current neighborhood character.
- 340 Portage can be developed with recognition of its historical significance through adaptive re-use.
- 340 Portage can be made into residences.
- Housing shortage must be addressed aggressively. We need a significant increase in residential units of various types.

H. New Solution

Comments

- Many laws are currently being pushed through at the state level to undermine local zoning controls and development standards and that might affect what we envision for the NVCAP.

***Q11. What type of housing should be considered for Olive?** (Assume that no current residents will be required to leave for any of the options below. Natural, voluntary, attrition only.)

A. Keep as is (ADUs allowed)

- Up zoning would inevitably displace residents.

B. Encourage/allow 2-story cottage courts on contiguously owned properties

- Cottage courts, which could include more than 5 units on two single family lots, are a great way to gradually allow greater affordable density, without destroying the fabric or street feel of a neighborhood. They also allow smaller, entrepreneurial developers to access projects, as construction on these projects are wood framed.
- Increase density without changing the low-density character of the street.
- As long as no one is displaced involuntarily, the property owners should be permitted to evolve their property.
- Only if all owners are willing to allow.

C. Encourage/allow multi-family buildings on contiguously owned properties

- Could be built to fit with the character of the street.
- The economics of housing development will likely favor multi-family units especially in areas, like NVCAP, close to transit, retail, office, and jobs.

D. Allow redevelopment of single-family homes into 4-unit buildings

- Increase density without changing the low-density character of the street.
- Many lovely old homes in downtown Palo Alto have been converted to 4-unit buildings and retain a residential feel. New homes could be built to allow conversion.

E. Combination of B, C, D, and E

- Current municipal code and pending legislation will likely make the development of currently single-family parcels much more flexible including ADUs, duplex, trip-flex and quad-flex options depending upon the parcel size.
- Natural attrition will occur;
- The economics of housing development will likely favor multi-family units especially in areas, like NVCAP, close to transit, retail, office, and jobs.

F. New Solution

Q12. How do you envision use of the existing railroad spur? *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. Park or open space

- Will not preclude future connectivity
- Buffer between Olive and 340 Portage
- Connects bike lanes to transit nodes and job centers.
- Easy to convert
- Gail. I support

B. Parking for cars

- No need for change. Inexpensive option.
- We will need some areas for parking, deliveries and emergency access — the railroad spur is a better place for cars than the area next to the creek.
- Will not preclude future connectivity
- Buffer between Olive and 340 Portage

C. Housing

D. Other

- No need to preserve the spur, so can be used for any use.
- **A and C** I support park or open space, housing or a greenway and multi-use path connection to the remainder of the site. Whatever use is planned should also have a commemorative plaque documenting the use of the spur to serve the former cannery.
- There are current examples in the Bay Area of parking structures being designed to be converted to residential units in the future.

E. New Solution

Q13. The Strategic Economics retail study from earlier this year showed the above requirements (see page 18 of this report). **How much retail would you support including in the plan area?** *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. 15 sf per household

- I think it is practical to assume that this much of the local residents' shopping might be diverted to local vendors, and we want whatever retail is designed into the zoning to be successful
- We also do not want to kill retail on California Ave
- It depends on how much housing we add.

B. 30 sf per household

- We want to create a vital, walkable neighborhood in which residents' needs can be met without a car trip.
- We need to be conservative about what to expect regarding retail demand considering our changing world.
- Some offices should be convertible to retail if the prevailing economics make it desirable, but NOT the other way around. Retail should NOT be converted to offices.
- Retail continues to be in a state of flux due to the pandemic and the evolving retail habits and disposable income of customers. Customers are increasingly using on-line options.

C. 45 sf per household

D. Comments

- The city must enforce its rules about maintaining retail and not allowing office space in retail areas.
- Walkable neighborhoods mean walkable retail and neighborhood-serving commercial.
- I suspect that the locations on ECR will be most popular
- Some resident-serving retail (such as a neighborhood cafe) would improve the neighborhood feel.
- Include as much retail as the neighborhood can support.
- The city should have an economic development professional to work at attracting and retaining truly neighborhood-serving retail/eating establishments.
- Small, non-chain, establishments should be encouraged or even subsidized.
- Shopping centers, in particular, are facing serious transformations; many traditional shopping centers are re-inventing themselves with retail, housing and hotels (as one of many models).
- It is likely that between 5 and 20 years from now the number of community members, employees and their office needs, and retail choices will evolve, too. NVCAP may illustrate these changes.

E. New Solution

Q14. The City of Palo Alto's Comprehensive Plan uses standards set forth by the National Recreation and Park Association for locating and developing new parks. **How much park land should the plan area have?** Based on the Alternatives presented to us in January (and adding also the new Research Park proposal of 187 apartments on Hansen), the total new residents to the area will be between 700 - 6500. Palo Alto requires 4 acres of park land per 1000 new residents; thus, the new park land required by the city would be between 3 acres and 26 acres, depending on the actual density of the NVCAP. *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. As much as required by Comprehensive Plan

- Outside space is very important if we are to become a dense population area in Palo Alto, since apartments do not have back yards.
- We desperately need the basic required park space.
- The residents of this neighborhood should have the same access to parks and libraries as other neighborhoods.

B. More than required by Comprehensive Plan

- Huge increase in housing in this area in the coming years, in NVCAP and in Research Park. We should use NVCAP's excellent options for flat contiguous land to prepare for the future housing development in south Palo Alto.
- People love having more open space!

C. New Solution

Q15. What types of parks and open space would you support in the plan *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. Privately-owned parkland, accessible to the public

- Inexpensive

B. Publicly owned parkland

- We have seen a lot of projects that incorporate public space in design, that ultimately is de facto private space. I feel the only high-quality public space we can count on is that that the city owns.
- Privately-owned parks are rarely in the public's best interest.

C. Combination of both

D. New Solution

Comments.

- The city requirement for Park land cannot be met through private courtyards, setbacks, rooftops etc...
- Open space and Park land are totally separate land uses in our muni code and comp plan. There is zero opportunity for open space (as defined by local Law) in the NVCAP

***Q 16. What configuration of park land do you support?**

A. Large, contiguous green space with bike and pedestrian paths

- Postage stamp" parks (like Sarah Wallis) are nice, but not useful for any activities.
- Parks need to be large enough to support park activities. Small pocket parks are a nice neighborhood feature, they do not replace the need for large parks.
- Large parks provide more versatility and neighborhood cohesion.
- A large park is an oasis of peace and quiet away from cars, businesses, concrete, etc. Small "parks" do not provide the peace and refreshment of large parks.
- Large parks create habitat for flora and fauna, welcome birds, and let children run. Small parks provide none of this.
- Handicapped access is available for large parks.
- A big parkland can be accessed by everyone in the NVCAP and will have higher popularity.

B. Small, "pocket" parks scattered throughout, with car access

C. Large contiguous green space + plaza

- I support a **neighborhood park/plaza, tiny public plazas, and Greenways**, parks that are functional as open green areas, and have a **transportation function**.
- An open plaza is not a park, but provides a **gathering place for community** events, eating establishments, hanging out with friends. It should not take the place of a green park but should complement a large park.

D. A pocket park at grade in the middle of the site (as in South Park in San Francisco)

- would provide a central meeting place at a crossroads, which is fundamental in creating a social place.

E. New Solution

Comments

- Park land must be dedicated and protected for the public by law and we should respect that and create parkland that is usable as is standard under existing law for different size parks in the city.

*** Q17. If we have a large, contiguous green space with bike and pedestrian paths, where would it best be placed?**

A. Along Park

- A park on Park would be easily accessible to all who live nearby
- Perfect location for retail and eating (adjacent to park) because it's visible along a busy bike corridor (even better if we make Park Blvd attractive to pedestrians), though at least some of the retail should be located overlooking the creek

B. Along Matadero Creek (not just in the current creek bed, but alongside the creek, in the current Fry's parking lot.)

- Evolve Lambert/Park triangle and the Fry's Parking lot into a District Park to serve the huge number of new residents in North Ventura and in the Research Park properties across El Camino.
- A park alongside/next to Matadero creek would provide space for a bike lane connecting Boulware Park to the bike boulevard on Park.
- If the creek is naturalized, a park next to it would provide an ideal space for picnicking, and for outdoor cafe seating, as in Ashland, Oregon.
- A park next to a naturalized creek is the perfect place for children and families to relax without worries about cars (as at the very popular Bol Park, in the Barron Park neighborhood)
- City could purchase the Fry's site and convert the excess parking (not needed) to park space along the Creek. Park could run from Lambert to Park.
- Away from streets, a park here could be used for various events, even a soccer game.

C. In the center of the plan area

D. Cloudera parking lot

E. A and B: A Park that is adjacent to Park Blvd and then runs alongside Matadero Creek at grade could make a great center to the neighborhood, and create good connectivity between Boulware Park, and Park Blvd.

F. A plaza on Park Blvd that connects easily to a large park alongside Matadero Creek, at grade,

- This would provide an area for vibrant retail on Park Blvd AND the large green park that would provide quiet relaxation and nature away from the busy streets.
- Would provide connectivity between Boulware Park and Park Blvd.

G. New Solution

Q 18. To what extent should the City pursue naturalizing the Creek? *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

Assume high concrete flood walls in all options.

A. Within the 60-foot easement (30 feet from Creek centerline)

- Although naturalizing the creek provides a nice public benefit, it is an expensive option. It probably is only feasible if we can get funding from the Water District or other external source.
- If we want the creek to be naturalized at all, the least expensive option is the most likely to be considered by the city. We would not want to preclude any naturalization by asking for something so expensive that it is unlikely to be adopted.
- Naturalizing the creek is all well and good, but it would be more for walking and exploring. A wider creek open space would probably preclude a pocket park at grade in the middle of the site, which is what I'd like to see.

B. Extending beyond the easement and into the 340 Portage parking lot (80 feet wide)

- Ventura neighborhood, has always suffered from a fractured neighborhood design, chaotic zoning, and lack of access to amenities, including natural amenities. This option would allow resident children access to the natural world without crossing El Camino, the railroad tracks, or other busy roads.

C. Extending beyond the easement and into the 340 Portage parking lot (100 feet wide)

D. Not at all

Comments

- 2 Naturalizing the creek is a wonderful idea (I support it) -- however, the costs/benefits of doing it need to be weighed against a surface-level park that runs along the Creek itself. We may have to choose between the two options.

***Q19. How should Portage Ave., from Ash to Park Blvd., be designed?**

A. For all vehicles, including cars, with traffic calming measures

B. To include cars only on a very limited basis (i.e. early morning deliveries)

- Open only to cars of residents who live/work at the 340 Portage site. Residents could drive through to Ash or Park.
- Since this road will be surrounded by housing, the best design is a small road that allows vehicles but has very little traffic. Cut-through traffic would detract from the neighborhood feel and safety, so

C. For bikes and pedestrians only (with car access for emergencies; deliveries can be made from the railroad spur area)

- Portage should have bollards near Park that allow bike/ped access to Park but don't permit vehicle access.
- I recommend Building the Cycling City by Melissa Bruntlett. It's not about the bike, but about making attractive streets for people instead of automobile dominated development.
- No cars will make the area adjacent to the creek safe and peaceful for families, bikes, pedestrians.
- Cars are not necessary on Portage between Ash and Park if emergencies and deliveries can be handled via the railroad spur.
- Retail will benefit from a more people-friendly, walkable environment — as demonstrated by pedestrian-only shopping streets all over the world.

D. New Solution

Q20. How should Park Blvd. be designed?

A. Keep as is, with parking on both sides and narrow sidewalks

B. Prioritize for bikes and pedestrians: widen sidewalks, eliminate street parking, add trees, widen bike lanes, add safety measures

- Park Blvd., between Oregon Expressway and Lambert, should be street parking "free".
- At the very least we should be considering removing parallel parking on Park Blvd, as the office uses there are required to self-park
- Wider sidewalks would attract pedestrians, reduce car trips, increase retail visibility, reduce carbon emissions.
- Adding trees will mitigate carbon emissions, increase pedestrian use, and raise the value of the neighborhood.
- Eliminating street parking will allow for wider, safer, bike lanes.
- Safety for bikes/peds should be prioritized. Park Blvd is an important and heavily used North-South bike corridor.

C. Add retail along Park Blvd., where feasible, to encourage pedestrian use

- More retail will encourage pedestrians; and more pedestrians will support more retail. Pedestrians and retail are mutually supportive.

D. Other

- Park, between Oregon and Cal Avenue should continue to have street parking, essential for those who live along Park -- as I do -- and with the businesses close to the Cal Avenue business district

E. New Solution

Q2. Should Olive be connected to 340 Portage Avenue? *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. Via a road for cars

- A new road parallel to Park and El Camino will reduce traffic on those roads.

B. Via a path for pedestrians and bikes only

- A bike/ped path would be desirable to connect the neighborhood, provided it is constructed as part of voluntary reconfiguration of lots.
- Assuming the city can purchase a portion of an appropriate property, a ped- bike connection could be good; however, we need to consider any residential displacement.
- Would be advantageous for retail and for residents on both sides of Olive
- A “community assessment” could purchase a portion of a piece of property from a willing property owner.

C. Not at all

- This should not happen if it affects residents on Olive -- existing homes should not be destroyed.
- It's not that much walk or bike or drive to use Park Blvd or El Camino.
- If it's not connected may reduce cut thru traffic from El Camino.

D. Other

E. New Solution

Q22. How much parking should be required for each housing unit? *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. None

B. 1 space per unit or less

- Some zones in San Francisco have a maximum **.5 or .75 parking/unit**. Less parking = less traffic (if transit is a viable option). Sometimes, a car share (Zipcar) is provided on site. Utrecht was able to implement a .5 parking/unit by having a contingency plan (paving over planting areas and using parking at a stadium).

C. 1.25 spaces per unit

- Fewer parking spaces discourages car trips and reduces traffic. Teenagers without cars must ride their bikes. Adults will be more likely to use local, walkable retail.

D. 2 spaces per unit (current 2-bedroom requirement)

- Don't underestimate the need for parking. Because of the cost of housing, it is certain you will have multiple people -- with cars -- living together.
- There is no local study to support reducing parking requirements for residential use nor a decrease in vehicle use in Palo Alto.
- State law (ADUS etc.) have increased the demand for parking spaces.
- Ineffective public transit in the Bay Area. Studies show, even pre-covid, a steady annual decline in public transportation in this county, a reduction in BUS service, particularly in the north county by the VTA.
- Unless the builders can propose specific and effective mitigation, North Ventura should follow the standard parking requirements.
- Under parked developments simply move parking to the surrounding neighborhoods, effectively privatizing public streets, making it difficult for the City to optimize traffic flow and safety.
- One parking space for each bedroom, capped at 2 spaces per unit.

E. Other

F. New Solution

Q23. How should parking for retail, office, and visitors be designed? *(Discussion on this question can be deferred to another date)*

A. Underground parking garage

- This option creates more area for parks and open space.
- This option is the most attractive of all the options. Parking lots do not add to the beauty of an area.

B. Above-ground parking structure

- Better than street-level parking because allows for more housing and green space.

C. Surface parking at street level

- Inexpensive

D. At-grade podium parking

E. Other

- All of the above, depending on what the ARB supports
- Residential parking on top of the 1st floor (retail and garage). As on Santana Row
- One large garage below multiple mixed-use building (as in The Dean in Mtn View)
- At-grade parking for retail, in the back while residential is underground (Verve in Mtn View)
- Reserve street parking for residents,

F. New Solution