



**Task Force Meeting No. 45 Synopsis  
November 1, 2010**

**Task Force Members Present\*:**

Jackie Adams, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Dave Fadness, Sam Ho, Nancy Ianni, Frank Jesse, Charles Lauer, Sam Liccardo, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Judy Stabile,.

**Task Force Members Absent:**

Teresa Alvarado, Pastor Oscar Dace, Brian Darrow, Enrique Fernandez, Leslee Hamilton, Matt Kamkar, Lisa Jensen, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Pierluigi Oliverio, Erik Schoennauer, Neil Struthers, Alofa Talivaa, Michael Van Every, Jim Zito.

**City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present\***

Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Dipa Chundur (PBCE), Lee Butler (PBCE), Jenny Nusbaum (PBCE), Ru Weerakoon (Mayor's Office)

**Public Present\*:**

David Dickey (481 S. 21<sup>st</sup>), Maria Mustonen (481, S. 21<sup>st</sup>), Terry Christensen (CommUniversity SJSU), , Steve Kline (Burbank Del Monte NAC), Jean Dresden, , Larry Ames (SJ Neighborhood Commission), Davide Vieira (Five Wounds / Brookwood Terrace SNI), Kerri Hamilton (CEEJ)

\*As verified by registering attendance on Sign-In Sheets.

**1. Welcome**

The meeting convened at 6:37 p.m.

**2. Village Planning "Lego Block Charrette" Exercise Overview**

Andrew Crabtree presented an overview of the Charrette exercise. He emphasized that the purpose of the exercise was to test and refine the Envision Village Planning policies by working in groups as if preparing a Village Plan using Lego blocks to represent planned growth capacity for different types of land uses. However, Andrew stressed that it was not important that the groups actually complete a Village Plan, but rather that Task Force members should focus on reviewing the Village Planning policies contained in the Draft Envision General Plan.

Andrew highlighted key guidelines from the Draft Plan, including consideration of changes to the village boundaries; adequacy of infrastructure; appropriate locations for retail, and the addition of new streets as needed to maintain a walkable block size. He explained the rules for the exercise, as detailed in the handout provided. He noted that since the Village Planning policies require that all projected jobs and housing be accommodated within the Village boundaries, all corresponding Lego blocks should be used in this exercise. He also noted that at the end of the exercise each group would report back on the observations made through exercise and recommendations for

additions or modifications to the Draft Plan policies related to Village Planning. Each Task Force member was provided with a “Testing and Refining Village Planning Policies” worksheet to facilitate review of the Draft Plan policies.

Prior to beginning the exercise, one Task Force member requested clarification of the purpose and outcome for the exercise, expressing concern that most of the Village area parcels are likely in private ownership, and asking if the intent of the Village Plans is to remove all existing uses. Staff responded that while most of the parcels are privately-owned, the purpose of the exercise is to help develop recommendations for policies to include in the Draft Plan related to Village Planning and that this could include policies to identify and recommend some specific existing uses to be retained. Staff emphasized that the goal of the exercise was not to develop a village plan but instead to testing the policies of village planning and the concept behind the development of a village plan.

One of the Task Force members reiterated that the intent for the exercise was to test the form of future development and to understand whether the Draft Plan policies need to be edited or changed or if new policies were required.

Due to a high level of expressed interest, staff noted that Game 5 of the World Series between the San Francisco Giants and the Texas Rangers (Giants ahead 3 games to 1) would be shown on one of the large screens during the charrette exercise.

### **3. Charrette Exercise, conducted at Table Groups**

The Task Force members and public were divided into groups to participate in different village planning areas at 5 tables (two for West San Carlos Village; two for Capitol/ McKee; and one for Blossom Hill/Snell). Each group was asked to place the Lego blocks on the base map while discussing the relevance and applicability of the related policies and completing the “Testing and Refining Village Planning Policies” sheet prepared by staff.

The Exercise was occasionally paused while Task Force members, community members and staff watched highlights and applauded (a 3-run homer) and the “bottom of the ninth” conclusion of the San Francisco Giant’s victory in the 2010 Major League Baseball World Series!

### **4. Charrette Table Report-Outs**

Each group was given the opportunity to present their observations and recommendations on the policies. Below is a summary for each group.

#### **Task Force Group 1: Blossom Hill /Snell**

(David Pandori, Jackie Adams, Shiloh Ballard, Gary Chronert, Pat Dando, Dave Fadness, and Charles Lauer)

This Task Force member group identified the following key concerns for the Village Planning process:

- 1) Establish a good interface with existing low density development uses at the Village periphery in order to gain support with adjacent property owners.
- 2) Look for opportunities to connect to regional parks or trails or other amenities in the general area around the Village.

- 3) Identify job and housing capacities for subareas within the Village to ensure that each phase of the Village implementation includes an appropriate mix of uses. Property owners should not be pressured to redevelop ahead of their own schedule.
- 4) The Village Planning process should include a significant number of affected property owners, but not necessarily all of them. Community support is critical.
- 5) Require that a plan and financing mechanism be in place for building connections to light rail before the approval of new development within a Light Rail Village.
- 6) Provide a process for “landmark projects” to be planned and approved ahead of the Village Plan, and provide objective definition or criteria for a landmark project.
- 7) Replace the term “Village” with a term that better reflects a more urban setting.
- 8) Consider developing 3D models of Urban Villages areas as examples for potential developers to better understand the concept.

**Task Force Group 2: Capitol/McKee**

(Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Patricia Sausedo, and Dick Santos)

This Task Force member group identified the following key concerns for the Village Planning process:

- 1) Additional office and high tech job growth could be accommodated within the Village area; the planned amount of job growth seems to be too focused on retail.
- 2) Provide more industrial uses that can accommodate neighborhood services such as public storage in an area compatible with residential uses.
- 3) Include a “Transportation Element” within the Village Plan; Provide more guidance on how to plan new streets and/or paseos for connectivity. The paseos and/or alleyways should be designed such that they connect to other streets or parks and should be accessible to public.
- 4) Encourage shared parking facilities.
- 5) Standardize outreach process for noticing community so it’s the same for all villages.
- 6) The Village Planning process should include coordination with school districts to ensure there is enough capacity.
- 7) Six months is inadequate for the Village Planning Process, and 9 months is a better minimum. Should acknowledge that too long a village planning process could hold up needed development and cost more.

**Task Force Group 3: West San Carlos**

(Sam Liccardo, Harvey Darnell, Frank Jesse, Nanci Ianni, Pat Saucedo, Sam Ho and Judy Stabile)

This Task Force member group identified the following key concerns for the Village Planning process:

- 1) Six months is inadequate for the Village Planning process. Nine months may be realistic.
- 2) The West San Carlos area should be divided up into smaller planning areas, concentrated around nodes that support transit.
- 3) Support urban plazas that can be in lieu of parks.
- 4) Support below grade parking.

**Community Group 1: West San Carlos**

This community member group identified the following key concerns for the Village Planning process:

- 1) The West San Carlos corridor (and other large Village/Corridor areas) should be divided up into smaller planning areas, with density (including incubators) concentrated at nodes along the Corridor.

- 2) Light Industrial uses did not seem to fit within the Planning Area.
- 3) Policies should be clear on how to interface with the highway, low density development and stepping up stories for interface with low density development and at street.
- 4) Prioritize pedestrian/bike access over auto access.
- 5) Promote use of subgrade parking

**Community Group 2: Capitol/ McKee**

This community member group identified the following key concerns for the Village Planning process:

- 1) Support below grade parking.
- 2) Encourage vertical mixed uses, and buffering of high density development.
- 3) Village policies should provide opportunities for assisted living.
- 4) Define and reduce block size and support connectivity to various uses.
- 5) Encourage large park sizes.
- 6) Provide for more industrial uses
- 7) Change financing mechanisms to support implementation of villages

**5. Group Discussion of Draft Plan Implementation Policies for Village Planning**

Councilmember Liccardo noted that staff is working with the Communiversality group to develop the first Village Plan based upon elements of their plan for the Five Wounds/ Brookwood Terrace area. Staff noted that, consistent with earlier discussion about “breaking up” some of the large Village/Corridor areas, staff will modify several Village boundaries to align with the Communiversality concept plan in order to craft Village Plans. Staff commented that many helpful suggestions had resulted from the charrette and would be incorporated into the revised Envision Plan document.

**6. Public Comment**

One community member commented that it was important to have certainty relative to the boundaries for proposed Villages, and that particular care should be taken in narrow spots not to plan each specific parcel, but an overall plan. The speaker also noted that Race Street is the only connection from Interstate 280 to The Alameda, and that the existing street network should be reviewed. One community member highlighted the efforts of the Communiversality group in preparation of the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace and requested that the Task Force and staff consider how to integrate that work into the Envision General Plan Update process.

**7. Announcements and Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at around 8:26 p.m.