



Working Group Meeting #1

NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN

Date + Time October 16, 2018 | 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Location Community Meeting Room, City Hall

Meeting Purpose and Outcomes:

- *WG Orientation and Planning Process Overview*
- *Introduce Project Team*
- *Discuss WG roles, responsibilities and schedule*
- *Build relationships among WG members*

Attendance/Meeting Facilitators:

City staff:

Jonathan Lait – *Interim Planning Director*

Elena Lee – *Senior Planner*

Chitra Moitra – *Planner*

Robin Ellner – *Administrative Associate III*

Nivi Das – *Project Manager (P+W)*

Kristen Hall – *Lead Designer (P+W)*

Rachael Cleveland – *Project Designer (P+W)*

Dave Javid – *Engagement Principal (Plan to Place)*

Consultants:

Geeti Silwal – *Principal (P+W)*

General public: 20- 30



MEETING NOTES

AGENDA

- I. (5:30 pm) WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
- II. (5:45 pm) PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW
- III. (6:15 pm) COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP ORIENTATION
- IV. (6:45 pm) GET TO KNOW YOUR COLLEAGUES
- V. (7:15) PUBLIC COMMENTS
- VI. (7:25) WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS
- VII. (7:30 pm) ADJOURN

WG General Comments

- What are the ramifications of the CAP? Considering all of the parcels are privately owned how will this plan impact future efforts in the area? Are there examples documents that could be shared?
 - *Jonathan explained that it will establish policy and zoning regulations much like a specific plan. Elena noted that we will share specific plan and other resources (eg SOFA) . There was also a request to share a link to example specific plan and precise plan efforts that P+W has completed over the past 5 years.*
- Questions about data and what kind will be available and how it will be collected. Particular note that data should include those that are gathered from residents and others interested in this effort.
- WG asked for confirmation that this planning effort will include collaboration/check in with the city council.
 - *It was noted that four study sessions with City Council and Planning Commission are planned.*
- WG asked for a robust Community engagement effort with adequate marketing of activities to encourage all to attend. It was noted that we will have a project branding and dedicated website and other tools to create a transparent and inclusive process.

WG HOPES (for the Plan and Process)

- Encourage beautiful, artistic, bold and creative and inviting ideas areas that are very Palo Alto. Make the comprehensive plan a model that can be used elsewhere. *(6 members noted something similar)*
- Encourage parks and open space.*(3 members noted something similar)*
- The area encourages a very inviting and diverse community and encourages diversity and inclusion *(3 members noted something similar)*
- Create more housing *(3 members noted something similar)*

- Preserve historic fabric and character of the area and its historic buildings
- Plan is seen as a benefit by the public and is still relevant a 100 years from now
- That the vision is feasible
- The process is timely and efficient
- The plan area includes a balance of services and uses that serve a diverse population
- The plan makes progress on large problems facing the city and the region (e.g., housing needs and impacts of climate change)
- Provide better connections through the area including between Ventura and California Avenue
- Balance the needs of the city as a whole
- Create a transit-oriented area with access for multiple modes

WG FEARS (for the Plan and Process)

- Project exacerbates the parking and traffic problems *(5 members noted something similar)*
- That the plan isn't supported by the community *(4 members noted something similar)*
- That the plan doesn't include the community's concerns *(3 members noted something similar)*
- The plan isn't supported by the nearby Neighbors *(3 members noted something similar)*
- That the area becomes too commercial
- That the plan isn't implemented
- That the plan doesn't encourage an attractive bold and creative environment
- The process drags on and isn't efficient
- There isn't enough data generated to support conclusions
- The plan gets it wrong
- The plan causes displacement in the area
- The plan results in vacancies and blight
- The vision isn't feasible and is unrealistic
- The plan leads to an unbalanced level of services for the area and lacks in diversity

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Consider bike and pedestrian safety
- Daylight the creek
- Consider ecology and sustainable design including rooftop gardens
- Support the idea for pop-up events but ensure they are where neighbors go
- Who are stakeholders meeting with? Who decides who to meet with and how will the meetings be held individually or as groups? Should include local business reps
- Understand the rich history of the site (e.g., asparagus farming)
- Understand the need for diversity and affordable housing and ecological diversity
- Look at previous efforts that had a plan for traffic in a beautiful way (e.g., previous landscape plan)
- Question whether there is enough community engagement planned workshops
- We need to do this plan without causing displacement or additional impacts on traffic and parking
- Plan for housing near transit and services that is affordable

- Understand that traffic is a result of excessive parking supply and consider areas where that are not car-centric and car free or car light
- Plan for bike and ped safety, and sustainable measures
- Consider using FAR as a measure to densify housing and create more open space

General thoughts after the meeting:

- It would be good to have a copy of the PowerPoint printed and available for the Working Group at all the meetings.
- Consider having general public during public comment section of agenda to set the right tone.