Berryessa BART Urban Village Plan
Workshop #2 Summary

On May 2nd, 2019, approximately 80 individuals participated in the second Berryessa BART Urban Village community workshop. The workshop, which turned out to be a well-attended and successful one, was the second in a series of three community outreach meetings geared toward engaging the community in the Berryessa BART Urban Village planning process. Participants included neighborhood residents, property owners, and other individuals interested in gaining insight into the planning process.

The workshop began with a welcome from San José District 4 Councilmember Lan Diep and City of San José Planning Deputy Director Michael Brilliot. The City staff then gave a 15-minute long summary of Workshop 1, followed by the consultant team’s 40-minute presentation of the Berryessa Bart Urban Village concept plans and a 10-minute presentation of the Berryessa Multimodal Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP).

At the end of the presentation, participants engaged in facilitated small group discussions at their respective tables. Within the 10 groups at the workshop, facilitators asked their respective group the following questions to understand attendees’ perceptions of the concept plans:

1) Concept Plan: Land Use, Open Space, & Urban Form
   - How many of you agree with the land use, open space, and urban form concept plan?
   - What do you like about the land use distribution, massing, and open space shown in the concept plan?
   - How can we improve it?

2) Concept Plan: Transportation
   - How many of you agree with the transportation concept plan?
   - What do you like about the transportation concept plan?
   - How can we improve it?

3) Surrounding Transportation: With BART and the urban village coming, what is the single transportation improvement that we should include in the plan to get more people to walk, bike, or ride transit?

The community input gathered at the workshop is summarized below. To view community input by group/table, refer to Table 1.

Urban Form/Land Use

- While four out of ten tables expressed their agreements on density and heights of the proposed buildings, two tables expressed their disagreements. The rest of the tables did not have a clear consensus on heights (for instance, 50% of the participants at table 1 agreed on the urban form, while the rest did not).

- Some of the tables expressed their concerns about the height of proposed residential buildings next to existing residential buildings being too high. People suggested that heights need to be stepped down even further to match the surrounding townhouses, which are usually two or three stories.

- Five out of ten tables expressed their desire for ground floor retail to be extended to most of the site (particularly around the central open space and the BART station).
Six out of ten tables expressed their concerns about safety issues in the neighborhood, which included break-ins, presence of homelessness, and a potential increase in crime/theft in the future after the BART station opens.

Some of the tables expressed their desire to see a good pedestrian connectivity/enhanced pedestrian crossing between the east side and west side of the BART tracks, as well as over Berryessa Road.

Participants generally liked the amenities proposed in the plan. While two tables expressed their concern about the flea market disappearing, two tables liked the idea of a new farmers’ market as an alternative.

**Open Space**

- The majority of tables expressed their agreement on the open space plans, trails, and the protection of the riparian corridors.
- Two tables expressed their desire to see native plant, fish, and vegetation species implemented in the riparian corridors.

**Transportation**

- Five out of ten tables would like to see enhanced pedestrian crossings, particularly over Berryessa Road, but also between the east and west side of the BART tracks.
- The majority of the tables expressed their desire for the new development to be pedestrian friendly.
- Seven out of ten tables expressed their concerns about the traffic in the area. Some were concerned that the existing road network is not equipped to handle the traffic that will be potentially caused by the new development. A particular concern was the King Road bridge over Penitencia Creek not having enough lanes to handle the proposed development.
- Three out of ten tables expressed their concerns about parking (riders for the new development may use surrounding residential areas for parking).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Community Feedback by Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use &amp; Urban Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operation + Maintenance for amenities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about neighborhood safety (Who controls/plans?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Table disagreed on urban form with 50% liking and 50% disliking heights of the proposed buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like the trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would prefer designated and separated streets/networks for the various travel modes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walkability is important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficient roadways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would like improvements to streets outside the village because they are not equipped to handle new traffic from the additional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Urban Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility for future potential changes (Can the plan be adjusted if conditions change after BART opens?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amenities/Restaurants/Retails/Park Infrastructure should be considered and developed early in the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about neighborhood safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to plan for schools with the additional housing; a school inside the boundary would provide a good set up for Safe Routes to School program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like the concept of central park and connection to Coyote Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about the parking facilities (whether they would meet the demand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Urban Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Would prefer taller developments to be placed in the middle of the development for bird safety – bird safety concern if tall buildings are adjacent to the riparian corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development seems to be highly focused on the west side but not on the east side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Would like connectivity between the east side of the BART station and new development (connection to areas outside of the Urban Village Boundary should be considered)

• Enough housing to accommodate the amount of office and commercial proposed on the site

• Concern about connectivity to Penitencia Creek

• Would like the street design elements to extend across Berryessa and would prefer smaller bridges to have less environmental impact (Would like to see an enhanced crossing/greenway over Berryessa Road (for bike/ped))

Open Space
• Like open space plan

• Would prefer to limit trails and impact to habitat within the riparian corridor (one trail only around the riparian corridor).

• Amenities desired:
  o Tennis court
  o “Activities notes” should be close to the riparian corridor
  o Native plants near corridor

Transportation
• Concern about the circulation and traffic of the new residential and commercial development.

• Concern about increased traffic (Existing uses around the area (mostly industrial) traveling to westside/101 – if there’s residential near that it will increase traffic)
  Consider truck routes and adjust routes when there’s construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Urban Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mix of uses is great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More retail along transit corridor and the BART station so that it won’t be empty on weekends when employees won’t be around (add more retail to activate areas that would be “dead” after 5pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree with the high density by the BART station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like amenities - Eastside amphitheater, outside concerts, farmers market, art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Space
• Like to see native fish and vegetation species in riparian corridors

• Like the protecting of the riparian corridors

• Coyote creek: Connections of trails/continuity

• Would like to see more green infrastructure to minimize stormwater runoff to avoid erosion at the creek (rain gardens, green roofs)
- Would like to see more green infrastructure, connecting trails through greenways and along trails for protection

**Transportation**
- Minimize traffic and noise from BART
- Would like to see a safe pedestrian crossing for Berryessa Road
- Needs integrated Bike System along the creek
- Protected bike lanes
- Like the transit hub, pedestrian friendly street, small blocks
- Wide sidewalks
- Focus on safety (lighting, active ground levels)

**Table 5**

**Land Use & Urban Form**
- Infrastructure should be built to accommodate capacity first
- Concerned that the neighborhood character will change from when they first bought into their neighborhood
- Concerns for security (break-ins) and the presence of homelessness (BART may attract homeless)
- Incorporating senior living facilities/homes in high rises would be great since they can utilize the nearby transit
- Would prefer no restrooms at the BART station for security reasons
- Nearby industrial uses produce odors is problematic

**Transportation**
- Enhancing Berryessa Road for vehicles (Mabury and Lundy as well)
- Traffic is a concern because of the high density of the urban village (access to/from area is not adequate)
- Concerns over BART lack of parking – riders may use surrounding residential areas for parking (BART parking not to be reduced)
  
  Would like to see restrooms along trail for people walking/biking and in plazas/public spaces
### Table 6

- 101 interchange needs to be improved
- Don't want development requirement for the timing of commercial and residential development (implementation triggers)
- King Road/Penitencia creek bridge needs to be widened

### Table 7  
**Land Use & Urban Form**

- Balance overall
- King Road/Penitencia creek bridge needs to be fixed
- Towers may overshadow greenspace
- Extend ground floor retail along whole length of central open space corridor (example: Santana Row)
- Should be a place to gather (keep the Flea Market in spirit) A new flea market perhaps? Farmers' market?
- Add more jobs, including in adjacent areas (More office space)
- Add ground floor retail to commercial building at Berryessa Road/BART track
- More bike storage at the BART station and green space + parking garage
- Would like their own “neighborhood feel” from this urban village project
- One participant said other cities in the Bay Area are sacrificing residential homes for office building due to this job growth and San Jose should plan for that
- Transition to surrounding existing neighborhood

**Open Space**
- Like how open space enhances the creek

**Transportation**
- Berryessa interchange should be kept on Berryessa (Mabury is for traffic)
- Speed on Sierra Road should be mitigated
- Sierra Road should not be a cut through
- Add attractive safety barriers between Sierra and Open Space
- Berryessa should be the auto-focused road and Mabury should be transit/bike focused
- Close ramps at Oakland and add ramps at Berryessa
- 101 needs a lot of help
- Local streets should be special with areas to hang out – placemaking

**Office Space Viability**
- Access to freeway
- Parking
- Traffic

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use &amp; Urban Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Road/Penitencia creek bridge needs to be widened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flea Market Disappearing (concern) – Community factor/loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor retail – helpful for pedestrian traffic – restaurants/grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants expressed their desire to see small businesses here, mixed with larger companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security – Possible increase in crime/theft? Proximity to East Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise – Deterioration over the years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about another Gas Station near Sierra Road – Near Coyote Creek – required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian environment to be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density NOT preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step down buildings to allow air flow to residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see a mix of housing in the new development (affordable, market-rate, and senior living.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Space
- Like the open spaces: riparian corridors and the central park
- Would like to see bigger open space in central park area
- Would like to have a farmer’s market in the central park (in a way to maintain the role of the flea market)
- Would like the shared open space/park in Facchino site moved to the edge of the development so that the surrounding community can have better access to it

Transportation
- Reduce the number of cars
- Accommodate commuter buses (particularly along the Berryessa road)
- Clogged traffic on Berryessa Road leading to Comm. St./Freeway access
- BART routes may not attract enough commuters unless linked to San Jose downtown
- Pedestrian access to BART from across street? Foot bridges? Skywalk?

Land Use & Urban Form
- Commercial buildings are too tall and do not want a downtown feeling (tallest building now is four floors)
  - Overwhelming to the area
  - Enclosed feel – no wind tunnel
- Don’t want more gas stations in the area
- Want enough separation between buildings
- Want texture and softness in design (particularly for high-rise buildings)
  - Need to be environmentally friendly
  - Materials and colors are key (similar form and soft color found in mid-rise development near Milpitas BART station)
  - 18 floors of reflective glass – too much

Transportation
- Concerns with BART noise – want to build a wall along BART and existing residences
- Will the community use buffer noise effectively?
- King Rd. bridge over Penitencia Creek (2 lane) – not enough capacity for proposed development (Needs to be part of the project)
- Would like to see a variety of transportation options
- Need transit to connect with BART (will buses go to Lundy or King to connect to BART?) – clarification on VTA’s plan (NEXT Network)
- Need to take a bus to get from light rail to BART
- Traffic will be displaced on Mabury or residential neighborhoods

**Table 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Urban Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 5 of 6 people agree on urban form and land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree with heights (buildings along BART could be higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like the flea market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Like commercial as buffer noise in the flea market part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extending the commercial frontage throughout the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Good food/restaurants as a desired use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have activities (day &amp; night) around BART for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve noise barrier for the Facchino site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about privacy from commercial looking at residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space**

- Like Blooming Creek walk
- Child-friendly open space
- Would like to see habitat interpretive signs along the trail

**Transportation**

- Better Pedestrian connection over Berryessa road, and between east and west of BART
- Connected bike lanes
- Safe biking and storage (bike cages and racks)
- Clear pedestrian and bike paths – safety
- VTA real time signage and apps are desired
- Real-time info on buses
- Connection to Cupertino & Mountain View
Workshop Board Activity:

Approximately 40% of the attendees indicated where they lived on the board provided. In general, of the individuals who indicated where they lived, similar proportions of attendees participated from within the study area, outside the study area, and beyond the extents of the map. Attendees came from a variety of established and new neighborhoods.
Berryessa BART Urban Village Plan
Online Engagement #2 Results

• The purpose of the survey was to gather input on the Concept Plans
• The input collected will help refine the features of the Urban Village
• The survey was open to public responses from April 24, 2019 to May 9, 2019
• The link to the survey was posted on the project website
• 81 people took the survey
  • Out of the 81 respondents, 54 people shared their zip codes
  • Out of 54, 44 people live within 2 miles of the project limits
  • 51 people live within 5 miles of the project limits
  • 3 people live over 5 miles away from the project limits
  • 8 people work in the area
  • 45 people own property in the area
Land Use Concept

![Land Use Concept Map]

- **Strongly Agree**: 46%
- **Agree**: 22%
- **Neutral**: 5%
- **Disagree**: 18%
- **Strongly Disagree**: 9%

Legend:
- Employment/Commercial
- Open Space
- Residential
- Retail/Mixed-Use
Option 1: Maximum Anticipated Capacity Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Commercial(SF)</th>
<th>Residential(Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Market</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundhouse</td>
<td>698,125</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Station Lands</td>
<td>456,618</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa &amp; Lundy</td>
<td>556,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,670,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,825</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing survey results]

- 27% Strongly Agree
- 17% Agree
- 22% Neutral
- 19% Disagree
- 15% Strongly Disagree
Option 2: Balanced Capacity Concept

### Online Engagement #2 Results

#### Balanced Capacity Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Commercial (kft)</th>
<th>Residential (units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South First Market</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASCHO</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Station Lands</td>
<td>707,500</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa &amp; Undley</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,175,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **17%** Strongly Agree
- **14%** Agree
- **15%** Neutral
- **11%** Disagree
- **43%** Strongly Disagree
Open Space Concept

Open Space System

Pie chart showing survey results:
- 30% Strongly Agree
- 41% Agree
- 6% Neutral
- 1% Disagree
- 22% Strongly Disagree
Street Network Concept

Street Network

- Road Network
  - Local Street
  - Connector Street
  - Green Way
  - Pedestrian Priority Street
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Street Network Concept

- 20% Strongly Agree
- 38% Agree
- 28% Neutral
- 10% Disagree
- 4% Strongly Disagree

BERRYESSA BART URBAN VILLAGE
ONLINE ENGAGEMENT #2 RESULTS