

Tasman East Focus Area Plan

Community Workshop #1

2 June 2016 6.30 to 8.30pm

Summary report

The first of three community workshops was held on the evening of 2nd June 2016 in one of the vacant office suites on site. The meeting was well attended by approximately 40 local residents, property and/or business owners, developers and agency representatives. An Excel version of the sign-in sheet is attached (note; not all attendees wanted to sign-in)

The format for the meeting was an initial PowerPoint presentation giving an overview of the project and process, followed by an open-house opportunity for attendees to discuss aspects of the project with design team members at five stations around the room, structured around the following topics;

1. Landmarks and Identity
2. Open Space and Public Realm
3. High Density Livable Neighborhoods
4. Sustainability
5. Mobility and Connectivity

Attendees posed several overarching questions during the initial PowerPoint presentation which generated an open discussion about several aspects of the project and process. Each of the five stations included several questions which attendees were encouraged to answer by writing comments directly onto the boards.

A summary of the input received follows. (One attendee also handed out a pre-prepared sheet listing various items of interest, which is also attached).

General group discussion:

- A. Questions regarding the level of support from developers
 - a. One attendee claimed that 70% of owners do not want to sell
 - b. Participants asked what it would mean for those who own property. Do they have to sell? What if they don't want to redevelop? What would it mean if they want to add a story to an existing industrial building? What would the permitting process be?
- B. Questions about process
 - a. Notice was only provided last Friday. That's not enough time for most people.
 - b. Community members felt that the stadium experience was not good and they do not want a repeat of that experience: "meetings behind closed doors, corruption, people resigning, assurances that were not fulfilled".
 - c. Concern about planners not living or being invested in the community i.e. having "flesh in the game", "those who live here get run over by those who plan here"
 - d. One participant expressed suspicion regarding the implications of why the meeting was being held in a building owned by Related. "What does it mean?" What does it say?"
 - e. Concerns that community concerns will be overridden and lack of transparency were addressed by discussing potential to improve outreach for next meetings and meetings with owners.

- C. Discussion about the nature of potential specific plan
 - a. Community member expressed concern about safety and suggested that police and security resources be part of the plan.
 - b. Community member expressed concern about the level of density being suggested for the area i.e. up to 9000 new residents in the area @ 2 people per household.
 - c. Community member expressed concern about mode choice (i.e. ability to drive or use other modes) as well as road capacity and congestion.
 - d. Community members expressed support for maintaining the present (or past) quality of life of the area

Responses to questions posed at the five stations

- 1. Landmarks and Identity
 - o How should the site respond to its context?
 - Small businesses and local district
 - Build taller to preserve open space
 - Look at smaller floor plates
 - Look to Vancouver for building designs
 - Look at higher densities
 - Look into cooperative housing
 - Integrate drop-off and UBER-type facilities
 - Plan for the future of transit
 - Look into micro-housing
 - Lower parking ratios to less than one per unit
 - Provide for high proportion of affordable units; 20 to 30%
- 2. Open Space and Public Realm
 - o What open space and recreation facilities will make this a great place to live and work?
 - Unique character
 - Keep the trail on the west side of the river unpaved (discourages faster cyclists)
 - Provide a better connection to the Ulistac Natural area
 - Connect the new open spaces to the trail system
 - How best to place public open space with respect to property ownerships
 - Provide a unique type of playground
 - Provide a stage
 - Fountains, water features
- 3. High Density Livable Neighborhoods
 - o Where would you like to see taller residential buildings (12 – 25 stories) located on the site?
 - Units with 3+ bedrooms
 - For sale residential units
 - o What amenities do you think will make this residential neighborhood attractive and livable?
 - Independent coffee and breakfast restaurant
 - Community recreation centers (youth, teen, adult and seniors)
 - Tennis and basketball courts
 - Supermarket and drugstore
 - Market with butcher

- Liveliness and nightlife
 - Small local businesses
 - Community focused 'hometown' feel (e.g. Willow Glen, San Jose)
4. Sustainability
- Are there sustainability strategies that you would like more information about?
 - Net-zero buildings
 - Energy and water
5. Mobility and Connectivity
- How can we improve regional connections to other parts of the Bay Area?
 - I have to plan what I am going to do on event days; 40 minutes to drive 2-3 miles
 - They no longer enforce neighborhood parking restrictions on event days (x2)
 - What about resident parking permits?
 - Consider a RPP, with enforcement
 - Include security aspect
 - There are lots of people coming in to the area, heading in the opposite direction with kids; how will the roads handle the increased capacity?
 - It already takes 45 minutes to get to Milpitas on weekday afternoons on SR 237; we have to take surface streets instead of 237 to get around
 - People live here because it is NOT SF
 - Pedestrians and bikers cannot get conveniently from Lafayette to Tasman; that needs to be fixed
 - Cycling on Lafayette does not feel safe; cars and bikes are too close together; other cities have physical separations to improve safety
 - Need more dedicated east-west connections between the two trails
 - Why not have a frontage road South of 237 to get directly to Lafayette
 - Can't expand Lafayette, with all of the City Place development plus Tasman East
 - 9000 people is not realistic; consider a much lower density; quality of life is a huge concern
 - Would be good to connect new park to river trail
 - It is not realistic to think everybody is going to ride a bike or take transit
 - Support local business, not just large chains
 - Businesses close on event days because roads shut down and regular clients can't get to them

Name	Organization	Type of Stakeholder	E-mail
Drew Brown	R+C Brown	property owner	drew@randcbrown.com
Hazel Alabado		resident	hen_alabado@yahoo.com
John Pol	Mikayla's café	business owner	johngpol@yahoo.com
Kirk Vartan			info@win6village.org
Brendan Croom			brendanpcroom@yahoo.com
Suds Jain		planning commissioner	sudsjain@mail2web.com
Yoko Sannomiya			oceanchild99@gmail.com
Esmail Jalayer	Togo's	business owner	ejalayer2@gmail.com
Ricardo Rengifo	Centerline	business owner	ricardo@centerlinep.com
Shawn Milligan	KT Urban	developer	shawn@milliganlandcompany.com
Mark Tersini	KT Urban	developer	mtersini@aol.com
Lynette Dias	Urban Planning Partners	consultant	ldias@up-partners.com
Mike O'Halloran		planning commissioner	mohsclara@gmail.com
Dan Buzatoiu		resident	brebd2000@yahoo.com
Gerald Harriss		resident	gerald@act-rite.com
Dan Loper	Holland Partner Group	developer	dloper@hollandpartnergroup.com
Michal Healy	SCUSD	other agency	mhealy@scusd.net
Gary Wills		property owner	dantoo@sbcglobal.net
Donna Wills		property owner	ravenltd@yahoo.com
Quang Uong	Neo Century	business owner	quanguong@neocentury.com
Rob Swierk	VTA	other agency	robert.swierk@vta.org
Chris McDonald	Siva Power	business owner	chris.mcdonald@sivapower.com
Steve Edwards	ReThink Development	property owner	steve@rethink.com
Mina Doshi		property owner	mdoshi@intatech.com
Tom Doglio	Marcus and Millichap	broker	tdoglio@marcusandmillichap.com
John Bertolotti		property owner	john@berto-bearcat.com
Jay Landis	Big Bear Automation	business owner	jay@bigbearautomation.com
Isabella Tan		property owner	isabella_tan@yao.com

Community member comment

Tasman East Recommendations

- Community Centers / Sports Complex and park
 - 15+ acres dedicated for parks and recreation plus parking
 - New community center center (includes multi-purpose rooms, dance, and theatre)
 - Orchards (e.g. Guadalupe River Park) and gardens (Master Gardeners)
 - Located between the Guadalupe River (river park) and Lick Mill St extension
 - Easy access from Guadalupe trail, schools (including future Agnews campus), and other neighborhoods (Fairway Glen, Rivermark, and existing apartment complex); light rail access for future Great America Pkwy residential developments
 - Link to Ulistac Nature Center
- Retail
 - District reserved for local and small businesses
 - Attract artisan products
 - Populate with existing restaurants (such as Makayla's Cafe, Pho Khang, Bistro Siam, Butter & Zeus)
 - Santa Clara home town feel, e.g. Santa Clara Old Quad, Willow Glen
 - Opportunity for farmers market and festivals
- Housing
 - Lower densities from 100 units to 40 units per acre (see general plan)
 - Higher density buildings located closer to Tasman and light rail
 - 3 stories maximum for building height (like Lafayette/Tasman)
 - Preference for more single family homes/townhomes
 - At least 35% % of dwelling dedicated for teachers and staff, seniors, etc.
 - Sustainable material, (e.g. SCU building)
 - Incubators/sandbox to attract younger workforce and start ups

Contact: Hazel Alabado, hen_alabado@yahoo.com, 408-569-4889