

## **Winchester Corridor Advisory Group Meeting 8**

**Location Cypress Community Center**

**Time: 6:30-8:30 pm**

---

**This meeting had 2 parts:**

### **PART 1:**

- VTA release of Request for Proposal for I-280 / Winchester Boulevard Improvements
- City of San Jose Transportation Development Policies

### **PART 2:**

- Case Study Sites to Test Development Typologies
- Current General Plan 2040 4-year review recommendation on jobs/housing allocations

### **PART 1:**

---

#### **Q1: What is the relationship between I-280/Winchester and Urban Village planning?**

A1: It is too early to discuss specifics because a VTA study of 280/Winchester is underway, and we won't know specific proposals for 280/Winchester improvements until VTA's study identifies them. The scope of potential improvements that may be identified by VTA's 280/Winchester study include improvements to the 280/Winchester interchange, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, and local streets. Tentatively, VTA's 280/Winchester study is expected to be completed by around 2020, and the City is developing a transportation development policy (TDP) to capture value from near-term development to be applied to I-280/Winchester improvements identified by VTA's study.

#### **Q2: How is traffic expected to change if an off-ramp to access Winchester Boulevard from I-280 northbound is constructed?**

A2: If an off-ramp to access Winchester Boulevard from I-280 northbound was constructed in existing conditions (i.e., current land use and transportation configurations) we expect that traffic on Winchester Boulevard north of I-280 would increase significantly, traffic on Stevens Creek Boulevard west of I-880 would decrease significantly, and traffic south of I-280 would be similar to current conditions (with no off-ramp) because more traffic tends to travel to more popular destinations, and region-serving commercial centers (i.e., Santana Row and Valley Fair Mall) are north of I-280. It is possible that an I-280 northbound off-ramp to Winchester Boulevard could create routes that would allow some drivers to achieve shorter travel-times through City neighborhoods, and it is important to keep in-mind that roadway network design influences route and travel-time options.

**Q3: Is the City pursuing technology solutions to collect more robust traffic data? Will data collected through these methods be available for the West San Jose Tri-Urban-Village planning processes?**

A3: The City is pursuing all types of technology solutions; as a current example, the City is one of 77 cities to apply for the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Smart City Challenge that “seeks to create an innovative, fully integrated model city that uses data, technology and creativity to shape how people and goods move in the future.”

(<https://www.transportation.gov/briefing-room/overwhelming-response-cities-across-country-us-department-transportation-smart-city>)

However, data collected through more traditional methods will probably be what is available for use during current Urban Village planning processes.

**Q4: How do we get projects we want on the City’s “radar”?**

A4: Be involved in planning processes and propose and advocate for projects and programs to be included in, or covered by, City Council adopted Plans and Policies; the City focuses on implementing projects and programs in, and/or supported by, Plans and Policies adopted by the City Council.

**PART 1: Discussion**

---

- There are lots of neighborhoods and people who will use Winchester as a through corridor
- Coordination with City of Campbell is needed as well
- There are major projects involved in Winchester Boulevard
- VTA: look at north bound off-ramp looking at traffic going to the south
- Improved bike-pedestrian
- Are you doing old-fashioned transportation data?
- What is the relationship between City and off-ramp? Caltrans wanted it or the City wanted it?
- Seed money: Caltrans are very protective of the freeway system. Freight services/commercial services
- Caltrans has requirements about the location of off ramps in distance to interchange. We are working with Caltrans, we are not a suburban environment, and we should decrease accessibility to the regional highway system
- 880 Coleman
- Primarily there are lots of facilities that are outdated; Caltrans is a major stakeholder. Representative of City & VTA – work with them to develop a solution
- How these changes are going to affect the surrounding neighborhoods. It has to be a key regarding the impact on neighborhoods.
- San Thomas is a failed intersection. One of the biggest problems is the long back on 280
- We had to stay focused on our improvement. Given of our horizon year that we are going to see more back up on the new interchange. That is why 280/Winchester came into place
- One of them was 280/San Thomas Expressway
- VTA is planning a VTA Corridor study to improve operations.
- Explore to see how feasible they are

- What is the timeline on 280/corridor study? 12-15 month study next year
- Are people in the neighborhood surveyed in the study? Yes
- What are the problems that you see on the road? There would be a variety
- 2 community meetings a span to the scope
- Crowd sourcing apps that allows the community to respond to the questions. We will do the same thing
- We can come to any meeting and give updates on what we are doing. It will feed into a co-planning process
- It still looks fuzzy. Who is the consultant? Who is doing the transportation study?
- The TDP needs environmental clearance. We need to capture funds into the policy
- Why does this mean that our urban villages will be done but the bike/ped improvements not?
- 2024 is an estimate; it can be longer than that
- Improve the visibility on some bike/ped that can be done in near future to decrease the concerns
- Off-ramp – is it going to take both lanes? It is TBD. It is not going over Winchester, but it will be going to Winchester. If you are going N Bound 17, we have to look at alternatives
- Community: Does the planning consider the flexibility? What is the fix that you want? Can I phase it?
- If 880 to Winchester is not that much on demand, maybe 280 to Winchester is a more priority
- 280 to Stevens Creek Project. Take the capture the Prop B boundary to complete these improvements. A matter of being prepared to take benefit from development projects
- A lot of times it looks like a plan, not a discussion. What it takes to be on the City's radar? Seed funding to get on radar?
- Where is VTA and DOT on autonomous vehicle? And how do you factor it in your decision?
- Concept of vision and not just concept of smaller parcels
- How this area will look like 20 years from now
- We do not know what will happen in the future
- It is ok to have visionary plans
- Park on top of freeway came from the Burbank neighborhood
- The city is going to adopt an Urban Village Plan
- We are trying to get input from the community before all the developments come in to play
- As time passes, things change
- Alternative transportation options – generally Cypress on one side of 280 and Monroe on the other side
- 3 generation of community plans

## **PART 2: Case Study Site Options**

---

- 1) Small Site
- 2) Small Site
- 3) Large Site; Office Complex
- 4) Existing Office Development
- 5) Former Safeway Site

- I like to see one of these sites back up residential. Number 3 does that. Connectivity between sites. Connect 3 & 5 together. What recommendations come to this
- Old Safeway Site, number 5 is critical, number 3 is very well spread out office complex
- Looking for vote: 3,4,5
- Is there a reason Toys R Us is not there?
- Look close to activities closer to Santana Row
- Voted 3,4,5 -> Sites 2,3,5
- 5 -> problems with neighborhood should be addressed
- 1) Aggregate parcels
- 2) Piano store surface parking
- 3) & 4) already mixed neighborhood if somebody was to aggregate those
  - Number 3 – why not cookie cutter, 2 not choose the whole block, why is 3 being cut in half

## Four-Year Review

---

- City had planned growth for 3 times more than ABAG had predicted for San Jose
- There was so much growth predicted
- Hired strategic consultant and other consultants to assess job growth
- Reduce jobs citywide, reduce the city jobs throughout the city
- Also, how to move employment growth
- Capacity to go on
- Proposed job reductions in urban villages will go to Council in early Fall
- What are existing jobs? The big change for Winchester is decreasing job numbers
- There is not enough infrastructure for all the density that is proposed. Growing in a balanced way of getting more jobs still intact.
- We don't want to lose small businesses
- Displacement Plan for businesses. Mayor said something about move to somewhere else where people from existing businesses can go
- Small business owners; force these guys to move that doesn't give them justice
- They cannot afford to go to community
- It is happening all over in Bay Area. Don't lose small businesses. We have to pay attention.
- Whose vision is it going to be?
- Why don't you chose number 3?
- Those are challenges and we are not dictating what size it will be. This is just capacity.
- Number 3 we can do one for the entire site as one option
- There will not be "we." What do we want to say when fire development is close to residential
- Opposed to number 4
- A single parcel for number 3
- From practical standpoint, less likely. What if you got 3? It is a more likely scenario
- Santana Row 1, 3, 4 for case studies ->protected intersection on Monroe St.