



City of Santa Clara **General Plan Update**

REPORT ON STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

City of Santa Clara
General Plan and Zoning Code Update

REPORT ON STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

City of Santa Clara | July 2008

Prepared by Dyett & Bhatia

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING UPDATE PROJECT	1
	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM.....	2
	STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS.....	3
	REPORT ORGANIZATION	3
2	MAJOR FINDINGS.....	3
3	ISSUE DISCUSSION.....	4
	LAND USE AND MIX	4
	CITY CHARACTER AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION	5
	NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITY.....	6
	RESIDENTIAL GROWTH (INCLUDING DENSITY).....	6
	DOWNTOWN AND STATION AREAS (INCLUDING UNIVERSITY).....	7
	COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR (INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT).....	8
	TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC	8
	ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY.....	9
	PARKS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES.....	9
	GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS.....	10
4	NEXT STEPS	10
	APPENDIX A: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED	11
	APPENDIX B: NOTES FROM STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS.....	12

I INTRODUCTION

This report describes stakeholder interviews undertaken in May and June 2008 with members of the Santa Clara community. Findings from these interviews will be used to inform the opportunities and challenges assessment phase of the General Plan and Zoning update project. This introductory chapter provides an overview of the project.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING UPDATE PROJECT

One of the oldest communities in the Bay Area, the City of Santa Clara is imbued with a history that both defines the City and sets the standard for a high quality of life. Since the preparation of the last comprehensive General Plan in 1992, Santa Clara has continued to evolve dynamically, aided by its location in the heart of Silicon Valley. Today, Santa Clara is home to major global corporations, regional entertainment and convention facilities, multiple recreation facilities, excellent schools, and a well-connected transportation system. Santa Clara is also home to over 115,000 residents, a 21 percent increase in population since 1992.

Many of the objectives of Santa Clara's 1992 General Plan have been met, and many new opportunities, challenges, and approaches have emerged. In addition, market conditions, local demographics, and the larger metropolitan context surrounding the City have changed. These are all good reasons to take a fresh look at the vision for the future. In 2007, the City Council initiated a comprehensive update of the General Plan and Zoning Code, and the project was kicked off in early 2008. A Steering Committee was appointed in June 2008 to shepherd the process.

General Plan

The community is undertaking a comprehensive update of Santa Clara's General Plan to revisit its policies and frame a sustainable land use, urban design, and transportation vision for the next 25 years. Topics that the General Plan will address include:

- Land Use
- Community Design and Historic Preservation
- Sustainability
- Transportation
- Parks and Recreation
- Conservation/Environmental Quality
- Housing
- Safety
- Noise
- Public Facilities and Services

Zoning Code

The General Plan Update will be accompanied by a comprehensive rewrite of the Zoning Code. The new Zoning Code will allow land use policies to be translated directly into development standards, regulations, and procedures that implement the goals and objectives of the Plan on a daily basis. The goal is to create a clear, accessible, and easily administered Zoning Code that incorporates community input and can be understood by all.

Environmental Impact Report

A comprehensive Environmental Impact Report will also be prepared along with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance updates, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Environmental Impact Report will evaluate impacts that the new Plan will have on the environment. It will be prepared in parallel with the General Plan so that any necessary mitigation can be folded into Plan policies.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

In order to create an inclusive and cohesive vision for the City, the public participation program will include a multi-faceted approach over a two-year period. The goal is to engage a broad constituency of the City's population and interests.

- **Community workshops** will cover various General Plan, Zoning and EIR related topics to synthesize issues, visions, and policies from the community at large.
- A **citywide mail-in survey** will be administered through a newsletter mailing to solicit ideas and feedbacks for alternative planning scenarios.
- **Key group outreach and neighborhood briefings** will be held to provide information, discussion forums and presentations to community groups and organizations.
- **General Plan Steering Committee meetings** will guide policy development and direction of the General Plan, building on ideas that emerged through the rest of the public participation process;
- **City Council/Planning Commission meetings and joint study sessions** will serve to “check-in” on progress at key stages of the project.
- **Stakeholder meetings** (described in this report) provide opportunities for individual/small group candid discussions about key issues. Additional stakeholder meetings will be held on housing and zoning topics.
- **Newsletters** are proposed at four key points in the General Plan Update for distribution to residents and businesses throughout the City.
- A project **website** (www.SantaClaraGP.com) provides access to information. Throughout the planning process, materials and information—including project descriptions, meeting announcements, and draft products—will be posted on the website.
- **Press and media releases** will also be prepared and distributed to local media at key benchmarks in the planning process.

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Meetings with a cross-section of Santa Clara community members and decision-makers were conducted in May and June 2008, to help assess opportunities and challenges that will inform future development of the City. The interview participants included residents, local businesses and employers, institutions, developers, bicycle advocates, affordable housing advocates, historic concerns, and City staff and officials. These individuals shared their perspectives on long-range planning issues and trends as well as future opportunities and challenges for Santa Clara. These stakeholder interviews are one component of the public participation program for the General Plan, and will be complemented with workshops, a survey, and other outreach that involves the entire community.

The interviews were conducted individually or in groups of two or three people, organized by areas of interest and/or experience. A total of 34 individuals participated in these meetings, which lasted between 30 minutes and an hour. Planning consultants and City Planning Department staff facilitated the meetings. The format was relatively free-form. Stakeholders were asked general questions about Santa Clara's character and future outlook, and specific questions on topics germane to their background. Participants also had opportunities to discuss issues of importance to them.

It is important to recognize that the issues presented in this report are not necessarily fully representative of the community at large, or a comprehensive assessment of opportunities and challenges. Because of the small group of people interviewed, the results cannot be generalized as the sentiments of the population at large. It is also important to recognize that information presented by the stakeholders reflects their perceptions. However, the valuable insight shared by the stakeholders still greatly informs the planning process for the General Plan.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report provides a summary of the issues and ideas that arose during stakeholder interviews. Chapter 2 summarizes major findings identified by a wide range of stakeholders. Chapter 3 contains an expanded discussion of issues, by topic area, and Chapter 4 concludes with information about how this input will be used during the next steps of the planning process. A complete list of stakeholders is reported in Appendix A. A complete summary of comments, organized by topic area, is reported in Appendix B.

2 MAJOR FINDINGS

These major findings represent perspectives and desires repeated by multiple participants. A more detailed discussion of these findings as well as topics that did not have consensus may be found in Chapter 3.

Most stakeholders agreed that the General Plan should include provisions to:

- Revitalize the historic Downtown area, with retail, housing and other uses that will energize the area and attract the community, while ensuring that development is sensitive to homes in the historic Old Quad neighborhood.

- Revitalize El Camino Real with mixed-use development, with amenities for adjacent neighborhoods. Differing suggestions for maximum building heights were offered, with most ranging between four and six stories. The need to ensure that new development is compatible with and sensitive to the scale and character of adjacent residential uses, was also emphasized.
- Target higher-density housing around the Caltrain/future BART station (Santa Clara Station Area), where transit is accessible.
- Preserve existing neighborhoods, as well as historic homes and other structures in the Old Quad and other neighborhoods, which exemplify the City’s history as the Mission City.
- Enhance residents walking access to stores, parks, and other amenities that contribute to livability.
- Retain, support, and allow expansion of auto dealers along Stevens Creek Boulevard.
- Maintain a diverse range of industrial and business uses in the corridor between the Caltrain tracks and Highway 101. Do not allow any residential development in this area (with the exception of the Station Area).
- Allow intensification of employment uses, and tall buildings to enable business expansion in the area north of Highway 101.
- Improve traffic congestion and circulation networks. Enhance alternative transportation options, including the bus network and reliability, bicycle paths and sidewalks for pedestrians. Explore possibilities for smaller size vans and buses that can serve neighborhoods and the elderly.
- Ensure a high level of public services and amenities (e.g. public safety, schools, and parks) as the City grows.
- Explore ways to enhance sustainability in the City.

3 ISSUE DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an expanded discussion of the issues raised by the stakeholders. Each issue area draws out themes repeated and ideas offered in the stakeholder interviews. Reflecting their diverse backgrounds and experience, stakeholders’ perspectives on issues do conflict in some instances. Thus, the following discussion outlines points of agreement and of conflict as well. Appendix B should be consulted for a comprehensive summary of interview responses.

LAND USE AND MIX

In general, stakeholders expressed a desire to maintain the City’s broad organization of land uses, where residential and neighborhood commercial uses are separated from the office and industrial area. At the same time, stakeholders were supportive of the idea of mixed-use developments (residential and retail), particularly along El Camino Real and through transit-oriented development around the Station Area and Downtown. El Camino Real is perceived as being ripe for redevelopment, new sign regulations, new retail businesses, and landscaping. Some felt that Santa Clara’s portion of the thoroughfare was the worst section out of any city in

the region. Still, redevelopment proponents recognized that this effort would require assistance from the City to assemble parcels, and collaboration with the community to determine appropriate heights, densities, and designs.

Upon being prompted for examples of good development, several people mentioned Santana Row in San José, except that the stores were seen as too high-end. Rivermark was also generally well regarded as a mixed-use community. The Walgreens/residential mixed-use project at El Camino Real and Flora Vista received mixed reviews. Some felt that it appeared too dark or that the building should have been sited closer to the street, with the parking behind. Others used it as an example of appropriately sized and scaled mixed-use development for El Camino Real.

Some stakeholders expressed hesitation about the practicality of mixed-use development. They questioned whether the market could support vertical mixed-use buildings and whether developers could finance and obtain tenants—especially larger sized—for such projects. Vertical mixed-use development tended to be more popular than a horizontal mix of uses, where adjacent properties provide different services. In addition, stakeholders would like to avoid conflicts between incompatible land uses. Stevens Creek Boulevard was also mentioned as a potential corridor for mixed-use development. Many recognized the importance of the existing auto dealers to the City’s General Fund and wanted to avoid any conflict that additional adjacent residential uses could cause. Similar conflicts between land uses were cited in the City’s office and industrial corridor which has experienced encroachment from religious and education institutions. Businesses with R&D labs and manufacturing processes are concerned about such adjacencies and would prefer neighbors with more similar use patterns.

Particular suggestions of land uses, services, and amenities are described in the specific topics below (e.g. residential, business, retail, parks, etc.)

CITY CHARACTER AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Stakeholders appreciated that the City has been able to retain its “small town” feel, while at the same time providing a climate for jobs and major public and private services. There is some tension between the balance between being a city—with tall buildings, and increasing numbers of residents and workers—and retaining a sense of the City’s traditional character as a suburban community with small-lot single-family homes, with yards. Residents acknowledged that there is a divide between the residential communities north of Bayshore (Highway 101) and south of the railroad tracks, with the office and industrial corridor bisecting through.

Most stakeholders described the importance of preserving the Old Quad, historic homes and other structures, which exemplify the City’s history as the Mission City. Stakeholders agreed that the Mills Act has been effective in helping to preserve these historic buildings. Others remarked that there should be some more flexibility in what private property can rehabilitate and restore in their historic homes. At the same time, many interviewees expressed a willingness to embrace contemporariness and build on the technology present in the City to create a unique City identity. Although they recognized the importance of the City’s past experiences and structures, they want to see the City continue to evolve and keep up with the changing world.

The City's regulations and staff can also set the tone for perceptions on growth and development. Stakeholders gave high marks to the professionalism of staff and clarity of and assistance in the development process. The City government is perceived as being supportive of business and development, which is expressed as both a benefit and a drawback. While developers found the City helpful and encouraging through the development process, some residents felt left out and unheard in the development process. In general, stakeholders were accepting of the City's perceived support of business and industrial uses, particularly because of the jobs and revenues created, but also had a sense of pride in the high-profile companies and technologies located within the community.

NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITY

Residents expressed a lot of pride in their neighborhoods, in terms of the housing stock of single-family homes, safety, and access to parks and schools. Stakeholders who do not live in Santa Clara, but worked in it, felt that they would like to live in the City if housing was more affordable and available. However, even satisfied homeowners lamented the lack of small neighborhood commercial developments, such as delis and coffee shops that they could walk to.

Public safety was a key issue discussed by residents and business owners. Complaints were mostly about graffiti, vandalism, drug activity and small crimes. Vehicle and pedestrian accidents on/near major thoroughfares are also a problem to be addressed. Although stakeholders had confidence in police and fire personnel, some commented that the City would need to consider hiring more public safety personnel, as the City's population grows. Independent of new growth, some stakeholders felt that police personnel should have a greater presence in the community—through cops on bikes programs, or enabling more of them to live in Santa Clara, in addition to just working there.

RESIDENTIAL GROWTH (INCLUDING DENSITY)

The regional government projects that the City will add over 11,000 households (a 24 percent increase) during the General Plan planning period (2010-2035). Stakeholders focused on many of the same locations for where the housing units that could accommodate this projected household growth could go. Namely, along El Camino Real, in the Station Area (as part of a transit-oriented development) and in the Downtown Area (see "Downtown and Station Area" section below). El Camino Real was described as a prime location for retail, mixed-use, and (for most respondents) residential development. Other potential sites recommended by one or more stakeholders included: Stevens Creek Boulevard, the Agnews area, Lawrence Expressway (near transit), and along Kiely Boulevard. Although some interviewees suggested looking at infill opportunities for residential development along Stevens Creek Boulevard, the majority of respondents felt that this corridor should remain a commercial thoroughfare that continues to cater to automobile sales. Stakeholders generally agreed that residential development should not impede on the office and industry sectors' locations.

Stakeholders had mixed feelings about the impact of new development. Some were appreciative of new development replacing old buildings and vacant sites, providing housing for new families, and creating more retail and other services for the City as a whole. Some stakeholders did not have a problem with second or accessory units built on single-family home lots or about two or three single-family homes replacing one, on a single lot, while others were vehemently

opposed to this practice. However, stakeholders did worry about the quality of high-density new construction, questioning whether families will be happy in small spaces with limited open space. In addition, many expressed concern about the effect that new development will have on existing neighborhoods in terms of traffic, existing services and infrastructure, and property values. Likewise, they recognized that with several large residential projects proposed near the borders of adjacent cities, the effects could spill over onto neighboring communities. Moreover, some stakeholders suggested that the City challenge the housing unit projections and requirements stated by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

In all of the potential areas suggested for new housing, stakeholders offered differing opinions on appropriate densities. While some respondents could imagine mixed-use retail, office, and residential towers reaching 20 stories in height north of Bayshore, others felt that heights on El Camino Real should not go above three stories. On average, four to six stories seemed to be the maximum height that stakeholders were comfortable with on El Camino Real.

Stakeholders also see convincing existing residents and neighboring property owners that higher-density development is appropriate in their neighborhoods as a major challenge. Design standards would be essential to ensure that new construction integrates well with existing development, and has appropriate open space and amenities for its residents. Some stakeholders were resistant to the City building more affordable housing. Others disagreed, saying that affordable housing needs to be high quality and prioritized, when feasible.

DOWNTOWN AND STATION AREAS (INCLUDING UNIVERSITY)

Stakeholders were overwhelmingly supportive of the idea of developing the Station Area as a transit-oriented mixed-use development, and of revitalizing Downtown with retail and mixed-use development. Heights in these areas could be slightly higher than along El Camino, according to some stakeholders, at roughly seven to eight stories or even taller for buildings north of the tracks.

Several stakeholders pointed to Mountain View as a model downtown. They want to see more variety in retail and entertainment options that would appeal to the college students at Santa Clara University and to the City's general population. This could include a hotel, restaurants, a bookstore, movie theater, music store, boutiques, and art galleries. Most stakeholders do not currently visit Downtown; they travel to other cities to do their shopping and enjoy entertainment. They would like to see Downtown become more pedestrian-friendly, with streets that connect through for pedestrians, if not cars. A few stakeholders are concerned that political pressures and physical constraints are too challenging to allow a revitalization plan to move forward. They were unsure how to arrange enough parking and accessibility to transit to avoid major traffic problems in the area. Finally, although stakeholders like the Santa Clara University as a community partner and amenity, some expressed about the University buying up property Downtown and potentially expanding in the area. On the other hand, others were supportive the University expanding its boundaries in this area.

The Station Area presents an opportunity for a substantial amount of housing, in addition to retail and commercial development. Stakeholders saw much of the same retail potential in Downtown, with restaurants and shops. However, given the number of housing units that

could be accommodated, some suggested that the area may warrant an additional school. The development would need to be well-integrated into the City's street network, such that pedestrians could easily and safely cross the railroad tracks, and so the Station Area is directly connected to Downtown.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR (INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT)

Stakeholders overwhelmingly appreciated the contribution of the City's major businesses and industries to the identity of Santa Clara as a major player in Silicon Valley as well as to the City's tax revenues. The City government is perceived as being supportive to businesses and stakeholders thought that it should actively pursue high-tech firms and new jobs.

Stakeholders agreed that the business and industrial corridor that bisects the City and the area north of Bayshore around Great America Parkway should be preserved solely for business and industrial uses. In fact, they acknowledged and agreed that densities and building heights could and would increase in these areas, as employment density and land values increase. Only a handful of stakeholders suggested that other large retail or housing would also be appropriate in these areas. Likewise, most agreed that religious institutions and non-profit organizations seeking cheaper rents are better suited elsewhere in the City.

Stakeholders also almost uniformly expressed a desire to retain a diverse range of industrial establishments in the area between Highway 101 and the railroad tracks, rather than have the entire area convert to higher intensity office uses. As for tertiary uses (e.g. auto-oriented businesses and machine shops) along El Camino Real and close to the airport, interviewees were supportive of keeping those uses within Santa Clara, though not necessarily in such prominent locations. Instead, there may be side streets that are more appropriate.

In general, stakeholders felt that Santa Clara did not have the retail business supply and mix appropriate for a City of its size and diversity. Many stakeholders said they tended to shop elsewhere in the region. The Mercado near Mission College is inaccessible for residents south of the railroad tracks and does not have enough parking. El Camino Real and Downtown were identified as areas that should take on more retail development. In addition, residents expressed a desire for neighborhood retail services that they could walk to in their individual neighborhoods. On a larger scale, some stakeholders felt that the 49ers stadium could be a catalyst for creating a true entertainment destination, filling hotels near the Convention Center on the weekend and adding more entertainment services in the area.

Stakeholders also realized that the City does have an imbalance, with many more jobs than employed residents, but were not necessarily enthusiastic about building more housing in the community.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Overall, stakeholders expressed concern for increasing traffic congestion on the City's streets and corridors, as well as a desire for more alternative transportation options, including reliable frequent bus routes, safe well-connected bike routes, and convenient walking paths. Many stakeholders suggested that building more walkable communities could help alleviate some of the vehicle traffic. Even in Downtown, they would like to see the street grid extended to con-

nect dead end streets. Despite the interest in public transit, stakeholders did not have confidence that people, including themselves, will actually use the bus—even if the service and coverage improved. They felt that smaller local shuttles that entered neighborhoods might be a more appropriate service. In addition, stakeholders remarked that employers may be able to implement some transportation demand management techniques to reduce traffic and increase alternative transportation use in the business and industrial corridors.

Stakeholders wanted to build on the San Tomas/Saratoga Creek Trail already completed and under construction to create new non-motorized connections between activity points in the City. Likewise, stakeholders advocated for improved sidewalks, bike storage/racks, and other safe crossings for pedestrians across the City’s busy streets.

Parking presents a challenge in the minds of many of the residents and developers, in terms of wanting to provide enough parking to accommodate reasonable need, but not creating too much that it ruins the pedestrian experience. Residents worried that an increase in residential and employment density will put a strain on existing parking facilities at job sites and shopping centers. With SCU recently requiring paid permit parking on its campus, adjacent residents are worried about spillover into their neighborhoods.

As several large new developments are proposed along the border of the City, stakeholders acknowledged that the spillover impacts of traffic onto adjacent cities would need to be addressed. Likewise, improving transit systems requires regional coordination with the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability encompasses many issues already addressed in the other sections of this report, but stakeholders described several key ideas that are relevant here, including: energy and energy efficiency, green building, water supply/conservation, and green technology as an economic development strategy. Stakeholders expressed great support for the City’s public utility, Silicon Valley Power, in terms of its customer service, low prices and efforts to purchase renewable energy. Stakeholders would like to see more green building and energy efficiency in new construction in the City and incentives to make that happen. There was some concern expressed about being able to provide for basic water needs, as new development is added, without a major shift in infrastructure (e.g. recycled or desalinated water). Lastly, given the City’s current success in high-tech and innovative businesses, stakeholders expressed a desire to see investment in green technology companies and certifications for existing and new businesses. Without taking a step forward in embracing green policies, interviewees felt that the City would be left behind in the sustainability movement.

PARKS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Stakeholders were generally satisfied with existing parks and public facilities, but wanted to make sure that a high level of service is maintained as new residents enter the City.

Central Park was seen as the only large park in the City; residents would like to see additional large parks, as opposed to smaller parks scattered throughout the neighborhoods. Residents were appreciative of the many open spaces and facilities provided, such as the Senior Center.

Additional suggestions for park and recreation amenities included: a petting zoo, parks targeted to teenagers, and community gardens. Employees working in the office and industrial corridor between Highway 101 and the Bayshore described an unmet need for small parks or plazas in which to enjoy their lunch. Stakeholders agreed that the City should continue to work with developers to locate parks within new development, but to make sure that they are useable and large enough to be enjoyed. In addition, the City should seek out opportunities, as they arise, to acquire properties appropriate for open space.

In terms of public facilities, stakeholders wanted to ensure that the City maintains adequate staffing and facilities to meet public safety and education needs. Fire and police services should be strategically added in key areas as development intensifies. Stakeholders were more concerned about schools, which they explained, did not always meet the needs of a changing student population and require some infrastructure upgrades.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

Overall, stakeholders would like to see the General Plan Update process be inclusive and informative. Extensive outreach should be completed to ensure that everyone knows of and understands the process; any technical terms or planning terminology should be explained clearly. As some residents have criticized the process of discussing and approving individual projects, they would like to see the General Plan engage in a more inclusive debate. Stakeholders suggested that participants determine “what’s sacred” and put aside differences and economic challenges to plan for a better future.

4 NEXT STEPS

The input gathered during the stakeholder interviews will inform the subsequent phases of the General Plan Update process. Stakeholders’ first-hand knowledge and experiences will be invaluable in creating a new Plan that reflects the community’s collective goals and visions.

Based on the direction from the stakeholders, as well as public input from community workshops, and other participation activities, the Steering Committee will review an opportunities and challenges assessment prepared by the Planning Team. Once accepted by the Steering Committee, the Opportunities and Challenges Report will provide the technical pluses and minuses associated with the community’s collective goals and visions. This, then, serves as a foundation for development of land use and transportation alternatives for community review and input. The Steering Committee will consider the alternatives and ultimately forward them to the Planning Commission and City Council.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization/Affiliation</i>
Dee Bailey	Habitat for Humanity
Tom Banholzer	Applied Materials
Oscar Bazarro	Resident
Allan Bushnell	Business & Property Owner
Salvatore Caruso	Property Owner
Dominic Caserta	City of Santa Clara City Council
Josh Davidson	Applied Materials
J. Byron Fleck	Resident & Former Commissioner
Robert Freiri	Habitat for Humanity
Ron Garratt	Assistant City Manager, City of Santa Clara
Karen Hardy	Resident & Former Commissioner
Deke Hunter	Hunter Properties
Will Kennedy	City of Santa Clara City Council
Bruce S. Klafter	Applied Materials
Pat Kolstad	City of Santa Clara City Council
Joe Kornder	City of Santa Clara City Council
Brian Lowery	Citizens Advisory Committee
Patricia Mahan	Mayor, City of Santa Clara City Council
Lou Mariani Jr.	Business & Property Owner
Mary Ann Marinshaw	City of Santa Clara Historical & Landmarks Commission
Jamie McLeod	City of Santa Clara City Council
Kevin Moore	City of Santa Clara City Council
Keith Morgan	Frontier Ford
Bill Palley	Applied Materials
Kevin Park	Resident
Fred Raia	Real Estate Agent
John Reagan	Resident
Jennifer Sparacino	City Manager, City of Santa Clara
Tim Steele	Sobrato Development
Joe Sugg	Santa Clara University
John Sullivan	Bicycle Advisory Committee
Eric T. Tan	Applied Materials
Roy Truitt	Hilton
John Vidovich	De Anza Properties

APPENDIX B: NOTES FROM STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Issues raised during the meetings have been categorized below according to topic area. It is important to note that the topics are interrelated, and consideration of the comments in totality is needed for a comprehensive understanding of the stakeholders' discussions.

LAND USE AND MIX

- Strange situation with Sunnyvale around Central Expressway. They have mobile home parks/residential along our western border of office/R&D uses.
- Dealing with places of assembly—community centers, places of worship—how to incorporate these uses into city?
- Interested in buffer areas. How do you buffer new development that is higher density with existing single family neighborhoods. Need to deal with this on large projects—Kaiser, BAREC (would be good example of how to do it). We are seeing pushback on the Kohl site on El Camino Real. How do you buffer the industrial sites?
- The City is pretty built out. Do not want to impinge on open space or industrial base. We have to protect single-family residential as well. Keep the density away from single-family neighborhoods. That leaves corridors. If we can deal with traffic, these places can be vibrant—with nightlife, restaurants, etc. Challenge will be how to get people in and out.
- Problem in jobs/housing balance according to ABAG. No reason why these office/industrial campuses can't co-exist with residential. Liberty Towers at Franklin Mall for just senior housing works very well. There will be more office and R&D. There is still enough land. Need to reduce parking requirements. Increase the pain threshold to get people to change their habits. Or residential on top of parking garage. We don't have a lot of restrictions like we do on the south side of the City.
- Sometimes hard to predict where opportunities are, such as Kaiser. Industrial zone: intensification. Need to protect the diverse industrial uses. With the Irvine project, there was pressure to convert to residential. If you have a strong plan and a plan that's been working, it can forestall political pressure.
- Angry over land use conflict between churches and R&D/manufacturing facilities.
- Could be more development along Central Expressway—there are already some homes along there. Six stories within El Camino Real, Central Expressway, the Station Area, and San Tomas Expressway, as long as there is enough open space.
- Old Kaiser property is on the table. I think they could have done something with the existing building, try to use what's there first. Would like to see businesses and residences on that property, so that there are some services on site (such as coffee, deli). No more cars going on to the property than under the hospital use, but traffic will be an issue—particularly for those who live nearby. They should have pocket parks; not enough open space or sidewalks.
- Also need to look at schools and the parks. Rivermark is successful, but not enough parking. How to expand the Rivermark retail/restaurant/housing mix?
- Two precious corridors are Stevens Creek and El Camino Real. City should give a density credit for quality of construction materials and encourage heights. Wood projects are to-

tally different than concrete projects. Land is very precious; you're seeing higher density go to north, where there is less political objection. Better areas are seeing less density, because that's where people live. This City has a large affordable housing base; would try to stay away from affordable housing. It's difficult to do and starts driving projects.

- Hard to do mixed-use retail and residential. Fruitvale (Oakland) and project near light rail station (San José) have had trouble. Showplace Square in San Francisco—burdened with parking. Some of the spaces are getting smaller.
- Lafayette Street: Sad mix of old industrial uses (between Central and El Camino). Good corridor for allowing some industrial conversion to mixed-use (like El Camino Real with 4-5 story residential). Walnut lofts pretty successful. Lot of apartments are still Section 8 housing.
- We should integrate housing and retail. So people can walk.
- Mixed use doesn't always work well everywhere. Santana Row is probably not financially feasible anymore; very difficult. People aren't actually shopping. 15,000 SF retail on De Anza Blvd. Trader Joes' passed up in favor of more traditional space. Difficult, given litigious neighbors. Focus on transportation hubs, segmented uses.
- Whatever mixed-use development is brought into the City, it should enhance and not distract from the community, and should be aesthetically pleasing. Ensure risk analysis—if lowered density, would that still meet their cost/benefit analysis? Trying to create a consensus like that on every project. If a development is playing by the rules—need to ensure that aesthetics, green, open space, infrastructure, police and fire, and in event of disaster that the project not create a bigger hazard, but be self-sustaining.
- On Stevens Creek Boulevard, ground floor retail, residences on top. Other projects have commercial in the front and residential in the back. Look at Menlo Park, Ventura Boulevard in Los Angeles—higher heights, retail square footage.
- The big box uses are easy to do mixed use—to have a larger pad to do residential above. Better to build on top—built on top of a Walgreens (on El Camino)—parking on grade for retail and underground for residents. If you can get a critical mass, can build completely retail.
- Horizontal mixed use—would rather see mixed use on one property
- Mixed use: minimum standards for commercial, like 15-18 percent
- Have minimum standards for mixed use development; could be different from the rest of the City.
- Sees mixed use areas being used for purely residential or purely commercial. Distorts the map at the General Plan perspective. Mixed use is a danger; should only use it with requirements.
- Don't island residential developments; need to give them access to retail and neighborhood commercial uses—grocery stores, coffee shops, restaurants, etc.
- Unfortunately, Kaiser is all residential, and should be mixed use, and there is no sales tax revenue to buttress the fall of the loss of property tax—need a balance.
- Santana Row is nice, but if you're looking to sell the property down the road, harder to sell when it's mixed use. Requires a more sophisticated buyer. Not sure rental vs. ownership;

would have to decide with co-owners. Have to design it for the ultimate buyer—better off with a single-use.

- Important to not have residential not wander into industrial area. Not healthy to have people living near manufacturing.
- Single-family homes must remain. I prefer seeing churches in residential neighborhoods or small strip malls, but not in business parks/industrial areas.
- Church went into Scott/Bowers (business/industrial area). Couldn't stop it. But, where else could it go, with such high parking needs? It makes sense in this area.
- Religious Land Use Protection Act. If the City can clarify where it would like to accommodate those uses, that would help.

El Camino Real

- Mixed use development—retail and housing primarily.
- Mixed-use as shopping centers are falling apart. As people acclimate to that style of shopping and homes, let's see how that shakes out.
- I would like to see El Camino Real change. High-rise up to six stories and residential above retail is appropriate.
- Could be a good place for more housing, but would be better as mixed use, for more walkable uses. Need to coordinate with neighboring cities on aesthetics
- Mixed use only between retail and residential and only along El Camino. One guy cares that there's a Starbucks in the lobby, the next tenant doesn't want it there—wants more security. For residential, it can work. Can have shared parking, need to be aware of odor, access. Restaurant, coffee, dry cleaning.
- Residential and mixed use. Some could be retail, jobs, dry cleaners.
- Another major commercial area, connect to this transit corridor.
- El Camino Real has been in the process of redeveloped over the years. Transit corridor, makes sense to have high-density, but sometimes have neighbors have problems with density.
- Needs to be more pedestrian friendly. Buildings closer to the street (like the Gateway project), so walking is more friendly.
- Some level of infill ok, if done appropriately.
- Six or seven stories ok. 80-100' is as much as the politics would allow. Can get more open space, better construction. City has plenty of parks, great neighborhoods. Need some ownership housing.
- Both at Stevens Creek and El Camino Real housing should not be at ground floor. City should preserve its shopping strips (sales taxes and convenience). Flora Vista (no homes on the ground floor. Vertical mixed-use.). Difficult to build basement parking for retail. Santana Row parking structures, instead.
- Wants to see transit oriented development, mixed-use (retail with residential above). Be respectful of single-family housing that's right there. If we can't deal with traffic, that'll be

the limiting factor. Steven's Creek gets jammed up, hopefully, El Camino Real does not turn out to be like that. Really have to look carefully at density and corridor wide impacts—then decide on what the solution should be. People pay lip service to bus (#22).

- Redevelopment of the properties needs to be done in a more cohesive way. Impossible for a developer to come and consolidate properties. City may be able to do that.
- Mixed use, some housing. Potential for developing certain kind of a housing product, that will appeal to some. We have been single-family oriented and that's changing. There are more single people, and couples, and people are looking for townhomes and condos. How tall depends on the neighborhood. Near Mervyns: 4-6 stories, where the lots have depth.
- Small property owners. Just making rent, not interested in long-range development and planning. Doesn't like how Walgreen is all darkened up—doesn't help with the community.
- Heights on El Camino Real, Scott and bank building about 30-40" feet. That height is appropriate. On the front of the property only. Ask to put the parking behind. ECR is a six lane highway. It's not very walking friendly.
- Problem crossing tracks in emergency situation; not accessible. Would have to be serviced by San José or Milpitas.
- There are things that the City could do to have advertising on El Camino Real. Sign ordinance is very restrictive. Code enforcement doesn't even enforce it, because it's so restrictive.
- Inappropriate businesses along El Camino Real—how many is too much? How is that tied into dealing with existing locations with liquor stores? Gaming, etc. could be an issue—Garden City in Saratoga.
- City has done a good job with adding apartments and retail spaces along El Camino Real.
- Demand for retail on El Camino Real and Stevens Creek Boulevard; as you add more residential density, drive that demand up.
- Doesn't see office as being a primary use on El Camino Real or Stevens Creek Boulevard—plenty of employment land elsewhere. Office there would be service-oriented (doctor, etc.) because these are the streets oriented to the public.
- On Stevens Creek Boulevard and El Camino Real, should be a push to keep a percentage of commercial; housing to be above ground floor. City needs to preserve its shopping strips—both from sales tax revenue stand point and convenience of residents
- Kohl/Santa Clara Square invigorates the whole area.
- Compared to Palo Alto and El Camino Real to the north, Santa Clara looks like the armpit of the corridor. Put in high-density housing, retail on first floor, like parts of Van Ness and 19th Avenue in San Francisco. Get rid of strip mall characters.
- It's a pit. We're coming from the left and the right (near Sunnyvale and San José). Don't know how the adult bookstore got in there. Don't need any more tattoo parlors either. There are parts near Lafayette. Lots are small, so you need to consolidate, which is hard to do. El Camino has great projects: Kohl and Mervyn sites: if done right, will move us in the right direction.

- Need better landscaping along El Camino Real. Don't know if cruising problem still exists.
- No more than five or six stories tall.
- A lot of run down buildings. Geared toward a couple particular communities. Would love to see this area revitalized. Integrated in with the University, residential uses. More retail. Walgreens mixed-use project is a little crowded, but no objections. El Camino Real is ripe for that. But, not at nine stories
- Parking should be in the back—for both shopping and residences. Walgreens mixed-use project is successful, but parking is in the front. In San Francisco and Palo Alto where you have parking problems, the businesses are thriving.
- El Camino Real and Stevens Creek Boulevard corridors—should have a density credit for quality. Quality to be measured by type of construction, material (i.e., concrete). Encourage height more as a mix with higher-quality material. There should be consideration for those types of materials. The land in those corridors is precious—higher densities are going to the north, with higher quality materials. In the voter base, to the south, only real opportunities are on El Camino Real and Stevens Creek Boulevard. Same as in Sunnyvale, because that's where the voters live.
- El Camino Real is a major arterial; could use a new life—is it mixed use, mixture of mixed use of large block commercial uses to maintain a balance for tax revenues
- It's an intercity street—should be intercity development. Would like to see really good restaurants—smaller mom and pop stores should be on Homestead. Should be more things like Target, bigger chains, steakhouses on El Camino Real—especially at Kiely and El Camino Real—restaurants turn over; not good quality.
- Would like there to be a reason for people to travel the road. Need places to go—goes to Savemart and sometimes the bookstore for eating, shopping, etc. Definitely not a Santana Row experience; it's cheap. Instead of small places to go that are targeted to specific ethnic customers—would be better to have a complex that has a multicultural feel and people go to it for an experience.
- Common sense not ruling over politics—bar near Monroe was an eyesore for neighborhood and City. Crime was bad. Put senior housing over there in place of it. Developer would like to build senior housing, but there is no City funding.
- Important to have the auto services gone. More mixed use and residential/retail uses and restaurants. This is another way to get more housing. Also need to consider going higher on the buildings there. Not realistic for the future to keep heights under 3 stories. Need to emphasize bus access ability, and consider 6-7 story buildings.
- The corridor is really funky. When you get to Sunnyvale, they have done a good job. Ours is spotty. Mervyn's: There is going to be mixed-use out there. Whole Foods, Constantina, or high end grocery store. If I'd to do it, I would just keep it commercial. Mixed-use is not my cup of tea, but if it helped the neighborhood and the developer, I would support it. When they built Moonlight Shopping Center, it was upscale for Santa Clara.
- That area seems to be the worst in Santa Clara.
- Look into the possibility of buying the Wells Fargo site.

- Bank of Santa Clara is 45 feet; has subterranean parking. Another bank 30'). Wouldn't build anything much higher than 45 feet).
- Don't know if anyone has solved the El Camino Real problem: density/transportation (unless you go to NYC). You do need the density to promote transit.
- Was hoping that similar thing would happen from Benton on and up to El Camino Real—the Gateway project—have downtown start at Benton, west from El Camino Real. Need greenery and park space. City hall is very attractive because there is open space. People identify general office buildings and City buildings off of El Camino Real with open space and accessibility.
- El Camino Real to be a hybrid version—dirtier uses to take a back seat
- Enormous parcels of land along the El Camino Real—10-15 acre pieces; for instance the Mervyn's site; wherever you have large parcels of land; which are available along El Camino Real. Going to be cheapest buys—land is underutilized, undervalued; easier to redevelopment. Have to have mixed use, in order to maintain the tax base. Could have mixed use and then only retail. Concentrate the mixed use areas.
- Supportive of the Grand Boulevard concept. Not a narrow street. Greater need to move traffic than to make it pedestrian friendly. Our section of El Camino Real with the median is comfortable. From a historical and traffic perspective, we could succeed in making it a grand boulevard. Maintain attractive business climate. Any residential development has to consider possibility of mixed-use.
- El Camino Real is older—people aren't going to do much to upgrade their buildings. Disadvantage of large retail spaces; bring people in at high rates, and sell the property—quality of center deteriorates over time. When the City builds commercial areas in the City, need to look at the economics. If there is too much, people can't afford the rents nor pay employees well. Too many strip centers—the owners can't make enough rent or the leasers can't afford to maintain the higher rents.
- Put palm trees along the street—make it a very nice place to be—focus on beautifying the street. Nothing to convince people to shop along there—they'll go to Valley Fair, Santana Row, Westgate—everything outside of Santa Clara. (Goes to Santana Row all the time, lots of restaurants).
- El Camino Real should be the downtown area. Should have housing along El Camino Real in a way that is attractive, along with the commercial, retail on the ground floor or both horizontal and vertical mixed use. Provide street parking, and have some areas that are angled parking; provide median, sidewalk eating (but well setback). Mervyn's plaza is an important area—could get a movie theater to get foot traffic into the area. Need a centerpiece to attract people to come there.
- Couldn't really see office uses on El Camino Real.
- Like to see more remedial auto uses not as prominent along El Camino Real. These could be located in an industrial area. Not the best face for the City. Other uses—professional offices, grocery stores—are fine.

CITY CHARACTER & HISTORIC PRESERVATION

- Haven't noticed that much of change. Perhaps the City is more diverse. North of Bayshore has developed.
- Santa Clara has been a sleepy little tree-lined City—keep that flavor.
- Likes living in the City. Lives in Old Quad, adjacent to downtown. Loves the old houses, texture, fabric, architecture of the neighborhood. Things like old hitching posts. Mix of things.
- Santa Clara is not San Francisco; it's not high density. New townhomes are so cramped. There is no open space. Most people live in homes with backyards. They put roots here. But, not at 45 units per acre. Loses the value of what we have. It changes the character.
- There are cities that are supposed to be cities and there are cities that are meant to be suburbs. This is a suburb, and we like being in a suburb: people will beat us if we try hitting high densities.
- Cell phone towers should be well placed or designed.
- Overall vision of the City—have defined areas of commercial, industrial, mixed use.
- City is small enough that it's accessible. But, it's good to be near San José, because of its big City amenities.
- Still has some small town feel to it, despite large businesses.
- A lot of residential high density units are 1-bedroom transient/stepping stone housing. How can you retain people in the City?
- There are a lot of changes being made in the City—older people who are complaining, and a lot of baby boomers putting up their houses for sale; a lot of younger people are coming in and not focusing on the same issues like backyards.
- Santa Clara is not about the apartment complex capital of Silicon Valley—it's a mission City, so what does that mean? Saratoga has a clear identity. Santa Clara gets the flavor of the year
- Expensive place to live
- Santa Clara is a very small walkable city. Would define it as south of Caltrain.
- We should provide for everybody to live here—poor, wealthy alike, a good mix. It's mostly middle class. We have a lot of ethnic diversity here. Don't like to see ethnic groups taking over certain areas. Want to mix well together, but not change names of neighborhoods.

Historic Preservation

- The Old Quad can't be the platform for our model going forward. We're so captured by the past, that it stunts our ideas about what we can do in the future. Along Franklin or Benton next to the University, you'll never have a good revitalization program, nor ridership on BART with all those little houses along the way.
- City Council has ideas about design guidelines for Old Quad—there are still some historic homes, but generally a lot of homes have been taken out and replaced by multi-family housing. Old Quad is now a jigsaw puzzle.

- More progressive architecture is always sent back to the drawing board. Why not do something innovative in the stadium area if you build higher density housing there. Makes sense to be complementary in historic areas. The Gateway area is locked—everything has to be retro and more historic; there is more to Santa Clara than just that.
- No more house museums. Too much effort from volunteers to maintain another well.
- Santa Clara was the Mission City. You can keep some of that, but we should be thinking of more creative, earth-friendly design and development. New generations, new technology, this place is for the next generation.
- Have done pretty well with historic preservation. We have a system set up to preserve our buildings.
- Pushback on the historic district when the City proposed it. We could do more. We now have plan: more of a review process than an “ordinance”: have been doing it, but have not gotten the final one back for approval. Don’t see the houses torn down anymore.
- Where I Live in the Old Quad things have worked well. Mills Act has done a good job.
- Historical and Landmarks Commission (HLC) preserves things that needs to be preserved; tries to use what we already have. But, things are different now and should reflect the new identity. Cisco is a beautiful building and design.
- HLC names some of the streets, which brings in some of the historical aspects.
- Connecting with the other cities along El Camino came in front of the HLC; neighboring cities need to be connected.
- Corner of Sherman and El Camino has become an archeological dig site. One house, dirt basement, can see bones. Benefit of the University is that there is that you’re only dealing with one entity/property owner. But, the University doesn’t have the propensity to keep up an old home.
- Good historic preservation regulations and resources: Mills Act property tax relief, oldest train depot. City grew out from that core area like a fan.
- Historic preservation needs to be handled more sanely. Planning and zoning administration needs to be reexamined. Small additions and amendments shouldn’t have to go through various boards and commissions. The City is doing well to maintain the character of the historic quad, but there should be some freedoms for privately-owned properties.

City Staff & Development Process

- City has been extremely cooperative to work with.
- Very impressed with the planning department, but the building department needs to improve. It’s complicated and confusing for developers and what to expect; needs to be more consistency through the process.
- Santa Clara is small enough that the City government is responsive to citizen concerns.
- Financially, the City is run very well. This is the only City that didn’t cut back on major services, in order to preserve the tax base.

- Santa Clara is one of my preferred places to develop. It's approachable and has relatively clear paths and channels for developers to understand. It has been sensitive to businesses and trying to keep them in Santa Clara.
- The City is very business friendly, honest, good to work with—similar to San Francisco.
- Politically, good to work with.
- City Government is world-renowned. City Manager named best in the world. Great staff.
- Development is getting pricey because of cost of materials and red tape
- A lot of retired people in the City; it would be good to keep people on as consultants to tap into their knowledge.
- City government has a great ability to engage the community. Festivals, community celebrations, service groups within the community, supports big dumpster day to get rid of junk. City really thinks things through about what could go wrong. People want to move here.
- We like partnering with the City because there's a genuine interest in meeting the needs of residents here. Developers feel like they're in partnership with the City. Accessible and approachable, especially when we need assistance on our first project.
- City has been supportive of our projects and advocates for us.
- Has taken advantage of some of the City's housing programs. City could help by leveraging funding opportunities, via corporations and services.
- Planning Counter and staff are great—by far our favorite staff to work with. Challenges everywhere, there are mandates, but the staff collaborate vs. administrative. They have a better attitude, willing to collaborate to work through the issues. There are not too many staff/layers which works to our benefit. Competitive in terms of fees, compared with San José which are much higher.

NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITY

- Bothered by densification of Santa Clara. Common pattern of single-family residential lots that developers want to turn into higher density. Happening throughout the City.
- Lives in the best neighborhood. So quiet. A lot empty nesters are moving out, but young couples with children moving in. So, neighborhood's getting some zip.
- City is full of isolated communities.
- As redevelopment happens things will get denser. If you go back to 1945, City/developers had a Plan and built ranch style home. Streets were designed to accommodate a certain number of homes. And now it's changing. Streets can't handle the traffic. Maybe it's good if you're one of the young people, but not if you've lived here all your life.
- Would like to have lived in Santa Clara, but not many houses for sale when my family was looking.
- Likes living in the City and in the neighborhood. Mostly chose this location because it is close to work. Likes the fact that home is close to parks. Residential, quiet. If he had his druthers, would be a block or two away from El Camino Real, closer to some of the parks.

- Challenges: in all cities, large costs increases and home values have dropped.
- Aren't any block parties anymore.
- Neighborhood he lives in: likes the longevity of owners, they keep up their properties. Is in the old quad and has been there a long time. Would be nice if the City could initiate block parties, or to encourage them. Close the streets and meet up.
- Residential areas around Rivermark are well connected.
- Rivermark had a lot of open space and money to work with. But, not happy about the density and parking is a problem. The idea must be good, because people do go there.
- Liberty Towers could be enhanced. Artists could do murals. It looks like an Eastern Europe WWII building.
- BAREC designed to make it walkable, with the grocery store across the street.
- The City has plenty of parks and great neighborhoods—single family resource will be a driver for having thoughtful stakeholders in the City.
- Would love to see new development, getting rid of old junky houses and people improving their properties.
- The housing typology that is being built—if you tried selling the same houses to children, they would not be as excited as their parents. Need more opportunities for children to go outside. Santa Clara does not have enough of a mix for different lifestyles. People are coming to Santa Clara because they can afford the houses, not because that's where they want to live.
- What to do when we lose apartments to condo conversions? What happens to the people who are there? Do they get first right of refusal? Do they get to be a part of the affordable housing equation?
- Housing programs and services. We refer people who call to the City's website which has a long list of resources. Seems to be working; people are getting services to fulfill their needs.
- There are single family homes in his neighborhood that are very nice but they're surrounded by apartment complexes, which brings the quality of the neighborhood down.
- New homes improved the neighborhood (e.g. on Market Street)
- Sunnyvale has a lot of mobile home parks—especially neighborhood the northeast portion of the City.

Model Development Projects in the City

- Rivermark commercial area is not big enough for the people who go there—not enough parking. Not just people from Santa Clara, other surrounding city residents go there too.
- Rivermark shopping core turned out to be nice—brought a lot of new families into it. Little bit tighter, and buildings closer together than he would personally like.
- Gateway on El Camino is a very nice project.
- Flora Vista and Warburton Village, near Lawrence and El Camino are both good projects. So is Buckingham on Stevens Creek Boulevard.

- Likes results of every development Santa Clara has done. Rivermark is highly successful—balancing green space, residential products, and getting commercial in the first phase.
- BAREC will be a good project.
- Not the development on Lafayette (so called green design). Projects north of Bayshore could be models. If we create nice landscaping, we can build nice little transitions.
- Rivermark, Agnew development at Hope Drive and Lafayette are good examples for residential.
- Rivermark was ideal for ten years ago.
- Rivermark has some promise—very close to employment areas—one way to deal with transportation problem is to get people living closer to where they work.
- BAREC: plan for mixed use, senior housing, new park, and sports complex that includes a bowling green. Basically creating a community center with commercial use—gets sales and property tax revenue together. Tie in amenities that will benefit the community. Same concept for Kaiser.
- I approved of BAREC site plan, with park, different housing types. It was good.
- 1000 El Camino Real is 100 u/a senior housing project—should be able to do that in other areas.
- Santana Row is a good example. Rivermark is a great model, but needs to be more vertical.
- Santana Row for retail. Rivermark is good—nice to have the walkability and close community and access to everything. Good to have parks within neighborhoods, anytime that a neighborhood is developed. Churches are important as well.
- Likes Habitat for Humanity projects in the City.

Model Projects & Character from Other Communities

- DeAnza
- San Francisco, Sunnyvale, LA, Cupertino, Visalia. Office in Sunnyvale.
- Likes Mountain View downtown. It's very walkable. Ours wouldn't be nearly as big.
- Paso Robles: Old Fox Theater. Cater to the need of variety of different groups.
- Cupertino required too much parking at Vallco. Effort in Rivermark to achieve the right amount of parking, but not too much. Other development around there should use the same principle.
- Sierra Madre down in Los Angeles—very walkable; City buys land and redevelops the area.
- Mountain View downtown is very vibrant, packed with people on sidewalks. One of the things that attract people to Mountain View is that there are a number of good restaurants, and other businesses benefit. Plus the high density of employment around the area. Their office buildings that have good tenants.

Safety

- City has a lot more crime and graffiti, especially in his neighborhood, more break-ins.

- Emphasize safety in General Plan. Love to have somebody check the problem intersections, safe entrances, etc.
- Poverty band growing in the City.
- Crime, graffiti—indicator of urban unrest—indicator of no places to go for people. In Los Angeles, they see that, so they open a center. Looking at the area in Santa Clara, can see why there isn't much for people.
- Occasional crime issues. Once in awhile someone will steal a car. If we have an issue, the police are there in five minutes. Haven't had a need for the Fire Department. Feel safe in the City. Not a lot of homeless.
- Possibly more police stations with more growth. Police could be more visible instead of just in their cars. Future of old police station on City Hall property?
- Fire house he works with (other city) has 14 people right off the bat—should have same kind of effort in Santa Clara.
- Santa Clara has 10 fire houses—on duty, maybe just 30 firefighters.
- Mutual aid agreement in the county for help from San José.
- Every neighborhood in the City wants to have crime and fire prevention. City of San José—big blow to the mayor there, San José was downgraded for safe city status. So mayor hired police officers. Same thing with Santa Clara—crime prevention is very important.
- At the last City Council meeting, police said they'd done a lot of arrests. I wouldn't mind seeing a few police out of their cars—on bikes, walking the beat.
- Police have been helpful with transients and graffiti. City services are great, best run City he's ever dealt with.
- Police follow-through, clear up of graffiti.
- City is constantly trying to upgrade infrastructure and keep things clean. Fire Department does five-year inspections. City is supportive and open to ideas. Strong restrictions which are good: permits, planning, inspection—very efficient and up to date. High standards.
- City has a good police dept and good services—likes the fact that the City owns its own utility.
- Would like to see more service personnel living in the City, so that they have more of a stake in the City (thinks that 13% of police and fire personnel actually live in the City).
- There are a lot of trashy homes in the triangle north of El Camino Real and east of Monroe. There are a lot of people hanging out. Probably drug activity in the area.
- Not very pretty, development has been kind of haphazard. Has the highest rate of car/bike collisions because there are lots of driveways and parking alongside most of the street. Have lowered the speed limit to 35. Lot of traffic because it's an arterial road. Intersections, especially at those with the expressways, are very difficult to cross because of width especially.
- San Tomas Expressway cut the neighborhood north of El Camino Real in half. El Camino Real has more places to cross, but they are very dicey—crosswalks without a light; especially dangerous at night. Have been a lot of car/pedestrian collision and bike/collisions between Kiely and San Tomas—near Saratoga Street.

- Crime effect from the kids—needles, vandalism, graffiti; Lawrence Expressway, along creek with brush, it's where the kids go and do their drug transactions/drugs. Stevens Creek Boulevard and Lawrence project—one of the most prominent areas for that.

RESIDENTIAL GROWTH (& DENSITY)

- Meeting the population and housing needs is the greatest challenge and opportunity. Population is aging. BAREC will have senior housing. Will need to do in clumps, rather than looking at small residential lots in the middle of neighborhoods.
- Many units along El Camino Real; that's the future. It's not in the neighborhoods. Even along El Camino Real, the impacts on neighborhood have to be monitored. Santa Clara Square—proposed eight stories is a real stretch. It's a gateway to the northern end of the City—abrupt transition coming in from Sunnyvale. Six stories maybe a maximum in pockets along, if planned well, set back from the residences on the back side.
- Where we are headed is density—that's good. Better to plan for it, build a density corridor. We are filling up every nook and cranny with development.
- Biggest challenge is managing growth. Where I live now, my grandmother would've thought this is dense and crowded, although Old Quad is not considered dense by many. Our children will be living in even more dense places.
- Smart Growth and infill opportunities. Challenges: NIMBYS.
- Room for development in Agnews area. Lot of land there. Many of the young engineers moving to the area. Close to the major industrial and job areas.
- Population will continue to grow. More strains on existing infrastructure and facilities. Tendency to look at the General Plan with respect to revenue generating opportunities. If we have higher-density at much higher heights, must find some way to find services for those people—retail, restaurants, etc.
- Developers aren't going to build at these densities until it makes sense—doesn't matter what the City says.
- How to get away from liquidating single family neighborhoods, in an effort to try to capture the mandate of the ABAG numbers.
- ABAG housing numbers—what happens when you run out of land? The City uses existing parcels that have commercial property on them now. How does the General Plan address the issue of using the land with the anticipation of vacancies or to build for high density housing? What happens if the property owner doesn't want to do that? What if they want to stay low density commercial? Higher maintenance costs, other issues, not enough parking.
- Fight back on the amount of housing required—ABAG looks at cities as uniform; cities have distinct personalities.
- The City has a large affordable housing base and the affordable housing requirements can downgrade the quality of the project. The City should focus on market-rate housing.
- Not just what is affordable, but quality of the project and how it integrates with the existing neighborhood.
- One of the major concerns on infill is making sure it's compatible. People choose areas within the City where they desire to live: ranch style neighborhoods with barbeques, Old

Quad, or new like Rivermark—we should work with what’s already there. There should be articulation, phasing, or buffers—not just density for the sake of density. Need to look at the character.

- Doesn’t mind infill on large roads on large site. Not in favor of taking out one house and replace with five homes. Would like to see projects along El Camino. Higher densities fine. Would like to see desirable architecture. Vesuvio’s: critical piece of land; should remain there.
- Homestead Road north side of the curb used to be farming: developer holding up signs. That was a good use for the infill parcel for housing. Has to be developer driven.
- The City has been proactive on infill development. But, it doesn’t have the capability to make much of a contribution to affordable housing opportunities. The addition of granny units provides an invaluable opportunity for affordable housing. Senior component of Rivermark was not affordable!
- City has started to do infill around Rivermark. It has the best school in the City. Ideal to have residential areas that people can walk to neighborhood services
- City needs more ownership housing with good square footage, built to attract same people as in single family neighborhoods. Politics better in the north because of fewer neighborhoods.
- Every new project requires new infrastructure, labor and police/fire labor. What other means will the General Plan look into to handle new development? Recycling, nonpotable water for landscaping, and other infrastructure?
- Supports residential that is being built over at Valley Fair, but how does it tie into the grid of the City?
- Neighborhoods that are deteriorating—go to zero-lot line building. Do you take the old City mall area and rebuild a Santana row type of community, with parking underground, commercial on ground floor, and residential above? Slightly higher-density redevelopment appropriate in deteriorating residential areas.
- Challenges are housing pressures and where we put the higher density.
- Balance available land vs. what is appropriate being developed. Put development in an area that already has services and transit. Especially along El Camino Real and Lawrence.
- If more access to Lawrence and Caltrain station, build out those areas. Light rail should go up and down the expressways like San Tomas. If Homestead is going to be a major thoroughfare, should design it as such. Right now, currently walkable, but has lots of apartments along the street—really a perfect place for community/neighborhood-oriented commercial. Like sidewalk cafes, restaurants, small stores, would be a good thing, since it’s near the Central Park.
- Worried about affordability—affordable housing is important. Would like to see affordable housing but that is not trashed.
- Every inspector has a different idea—would be good to have them all on the same page—to help smaller developers, especially.

- El Camino Real, San Tomas, Saratoga, Kiely, and Scott are appropriate for residential. They are big corridors, but there is opportunity, because they go through single-family neighborhoods.
- Some residential opportunities on Stevens Creek Boulevard (know it's most commercial; to the extent there is opportunity, but we want to keep car dealers as well).
- There is an opportunity for some housing by the golf course, with shopping and views to the Bay. There is a fire station and a school right there. Would love to see senior housing out there.
- Housing would be good near low-grade industrial area.
- No housing north of Caltrain tracks. Perhaps only along Golf Course. Maybe teacher housing in Mission College.
- Potential housing near Bible College/De La Cruz by the dog park, near existing housing.
- Get rid of the terrible housing near Wilcox: build some high rise out there.
- School district owns a big property on Lawrence. Could move offices to a school sites and build housing.
- Residential on El Camino Real, old Kaiser site, or Downtown.
- Build up and not out. Most environmentally responsibility. Potential north of Bayshore, area occupied by Great America, which likely won't be there forever. Fewer political constraints and neighbors. Envisions a series of towers, with vertical mix of uses (retail, office and residential). Constrained to 20 stories by the airport; willing to go higher. Imagines diversity of incomes and unit types within. All the properties north of Bayshore are on ground lease from City; can pass those savings onto the tenants or owners. Must be well-designed, not like McCarthy Ranch in East Bay or San José north of 1st Street.
- Old Kaiser site should have Franklin Mall-type development. No sense for high-density development because access roads are really bad; instead develop an internal walkable community. Wouldn't mind if Summer Hill and Fairfield developments (BAREC and Old Kaiser) shape the experience.
- Concerned about nine-story building (Santa Clara Square), completely out of place, not compatible with two-story adjacent. Seeing a move among the Council toward high density right on the edge of the City (shared burden with Sunnyvale and other adjacent communities). Not an integrated plan. Asked council to do a traffic impact analysis for the Marina Playa project (Granada and Lawrence) and they said no. Concerned about the future. Important to get the word out in local newspapers, like Inside Santa Clara. What is this doing to the community?
- Area by Rivermark has a lot of land, may be an area the City wishes to develop. People live in the South, travel north/south on Lawrence and San Tomas in the AM/PM. Planning Commission has stated publicly that there's a master vision for Lawrence and El Camino for 6,000(?) units. Can't put 2,700 living units plus parking—doesn't make sense.
- Nine-story buildings don't belong anywhere in Santa Clara. In favor of revitalizing the area. (Lots of graffiti.) OK with four stories. Can step back the buildings a bit. Several meetings on this now; literally hundreds of people oppose it. No one is for it, but the City keeps pushing on.

- The general plan should accommodate higher densities in the future. New residential areas are much higher density, more and more traffic problems just getting out of the neighborhood.
- Everything is pushing up in height.
- We have quite a bit of single-family residential, but there is some encroachment of higher density. Some people put together three lots, as PD. It was well done, but need to be very aware of neighborhood reaction when abutting residential neighborhoods. We looked at new residential's access to retail, schools, open space. Commercial can change over to church, but once it's housing, it's housing! Be careful about putting housing in industrial/commercial areas, adding retail. Protecting single-family residential is important. Downtown there are more pockets of retail. You'll see houses going to commercial and then back to housing, but this is the only place; mostly because of the proximity to the university.
- Woodsborough—18 du/acre; Live Oak—6 du/acre; Kaiser—26 du/ac and up.
- Greater setbacks for the higher density uses. 20-foot setbacks now with greater heights—are a concern in communities.
- Build as tall as the politics will allow—6/7 stories. 80/90/100-foot level.
- Higher density helps justify higher quality materials it: better project, lasts longer, looks different, can achieve more open space going up in height, better livability, and more suitable buildings for an urban environment.
- Height is an issue—not many opportunities in developed areas—north part of the City, Stevens Creek Boulevard, El Camino Real, and near university.
- Identify target areas for higher-density residential uses.
- Good development can benefit the City, but have to look at the surroundings—doesn't make sense to put high density in an area that has no commercial or retail space, or parking in that area or transit.
- Doesn't mind higher density and more people coming in. But, mixed-use development without transit, additional services (like post office), no parks, etc. is a problem.
- People need to realize that they are not the only fish in the sea—life changes and other people want to share in the nice weather. The City needs to get denser.
- Comfortable with higher densities.
- Sunnyvale has some high density residential next to Lawrence Expressway, which seems to be doing well. Could also see industrial areas transitioning into residential as well in the low-density office and light industrial areas closer to Sunnyvale. Densities would have to be a mix—advantage of higher density residential mix is that it's more affordable
- Doesn't see a problem with taller buildings, already are some in the downtown area.
- Building heights need to go up along major roads: Stevens Creek, Kiely, and El Camino Real. Heights could be 5-7 stories on a site like Mervyns that are big. Would have it step down to the residential neighborhood. Downtown heights should increase as well—can sustain greater heights—exist already, like the old Bank of America building—7/8 stories

- New residential across the railroad tracks? No. (1) Lose tax base. Need so much industrial in relation to residential. (2) There is no end to it. You start and it can keep taking up more and more land. We need boundaries. Maybe single-family homes will be a luxury to have—maybe more people will live in condos and townhomes.
- It's now more expensive to live here. Not a lot of home building going on. Not a lot of space and mostly multi-family. Would want something with yard, more space. Need to keep schools top-notch; that's the key.
- Spent 2-3 hours driving around once to look for housing here and nothing was available. People like living in Santa Clara, housing prices are semi-reasonable, older population, decent schools. Small town qualities that people like. Just not much turnover.
- Don't want to hear that the government says they have to provide low-income housing. Everyone else has to pay for those units. Program for first-time buyers is great.
- City could put together development plan to upgrade duplexes into higher intensity condos. The form would be there, when the owner is primed for it.
- When I look at the General Plan related to residential, seems like a knee-jerk reaction to promote high density (55 units/acre). Extremely difficult to build well. Don't necessarily agree that that's a perfect formula for every property. More appropriate to take advantage of certain corridors, existing infrastructure.
- Affordability—more efficient to do an in-lieu fee, but there is a social benefit to integrate and build it on site.
- City will need to be intentional and visionary in providing housing and affordable. Existing neighbors say, wait a minute!
- Santa Clara has too many apartments—need to emphasize ownership housing
- Walkable neighborhood, pockets parks, basic facilities near commercial uses, and other community facilities. Transit oriented/mixed use projects.
- Move beyond the single family detached; clustered development allows for more open space—communal space is important for developments and neighborhoods. May be issues with HOAs
- Along 101, there are air quality issues, not sure whether to encourage residential along major highways.
- With residential, clustered allows for more open space—get away from single-family homes
- Affordable housing: crucial to maintain base, would like to see commitment with the Redevelopment Agency.
- Developers need to phase in amenities first—like advertising that a gym and pool, etc., will be available for them in advance to not have an effect on the surrounding area services.
- Smaller homes in high density housing means that people won't stay long; less commitment and involvement in the City.
- City is going largely residential.

- Need more secondary units—City of San José pilot program to build attached or detached units on lots over 6,000sf. Allowed for in-law units to help with assisted living for parents. Has been very successful, and is now going to be approved for the General Plan
- There are a lot of senior citizens in Santa Clara, since they are on a fixed income, would benefit from an additional unit, tapping into the equity in their home. Could rent out unit or house to a college student.
- Would increase the size of units allowed in Santa Clara, so that in lots over 7,000sf, can qualify for a secondary unit.
- Permit fees for the City would be \$6,000/unit + \$1,500/unit for school board fees. Allowed 640sf currently is the maximum secondary unit size in Santa Clara
- Would do a step-up 6,000sf lot: 550sf additional unit; 7,000sf lot: 600sf additional unit; 8,000sf lot: 650 additional unit; over 8,000sf lot: 700sf additional unit.
- Reduced fees for all owner-occupied properties, since they may be using it for family members. For rental secondary units, would charge normal fees.
- A lot of the homes with 6,000sf lots; difficult to create a driveway on a lot of the units with attached garages to get to the extra unit. City should work with these owners to allow for access.
- Be careful of where housing is being located—hence secondary units in residential.
- New housing: more stacked housing and smaller lots. Development on Market Street with three houses on 9,400sf lot—individual lots, no HOA. Providing people with small yards and parks nearby. Will also see more secondary units. Look at increasing density on larger R1 properties and in single family neighborhoods. Higher-density residential on commercial or industrial properties near existing residential neighborhoods.
- City has enough housing—need the commercial/activity centers. Fears that unless they get back to walkable commercial areas/communities, will end up like a Los Gatos.
- Is there a way to look at where housing would expand and wouldn't expand?
- Type of housing is going to have to change—South Bay is married to single-family home with big backyard. Santana Row illustrates that people can do very well in well-designed multi-family in an upscale community.
- If buffered from single-family residential, residential densities could go up to 75, 85 or 100 du/ac, if there is the right situation. Something like up on the Tasman transit corridor
- Changing single-family to triplex? Property owners can do what they want within the allotted code; City shouldn't allow variances though. Accessory units good to allow multi-generations to live near each other. Apartment complex within a single-family neighborhood is fine if it's designed well. That's part of getting along.
- Wood construction economics better than steel construction. 20%+ premium for steel. Four-story natural balance for one-story of parking, wood construction possible, high parking efficiency.
- Look for higher heights on El Camino Real and Stevens Creek Boulevard

- In western industrial area, need teacher housing—townhouses more than condos. Support workers to the high-tech businesses, need homes as well. Townhomes are a step up, more affordable than single-family.
- Definitions of residential uses need to be clearly defined—other cities in the area—the definitions are not uniform, so there is confusion.
- Residential development is going to be tough, because the City is predominately built out. Very defined by railroad tracks and freeway, so encroachment of residential isn't as pandemic as it is San José, where's there's no bright line.
- Prefer to locate housing development near transit, shopping services, open spaces and community services. Infill projects in residential neighborhoods. Possible to take advantage of a non-residential development, such as a hotel, where you provide services, rental, ownership within the same complex. Have done rehabilitation projects of older buildings.
- Affordable units make it more difficult to finance the project, despite the fact that more density is more affordable. May make more sense to do a two-story condo project. Long-term developer can get more out of lower density. If the market permitted it, willing to go higher.
- High density to be where the jobs are, where the transportation exists, or to be walkable.
- Give people more opportunities to live where they work.
- Really focus on walkable neighborhoods.
- Some empty buildings along San Tomas corridor could transition into housing units. Has to be along that corridor in the northern area. Light rail could be above ground as in Milpitas.
- Tasman: would like to see the transit corridor reevaluated. If it works, high-density residential would be a good buy in that area.
- Our neighbors are utilizing the transportation corridor—joint effort with Sunnyvale for TOD. Sunnyvale is doing some mixed use and rezoning for the industrial area at the west end of the industrial area.
- Promote density of jobs along the transit corridor. If you can locate along the Caltrain line, you're in good shape. The land needs to be accessible.
- Streets capital improvements: Homestead to Kiely from Lawrence should have beautification, similar to Saratoga, which has landscaping, (gateway sign, a median). Provides traffic calming and nice aesthetic and distinction for the City. Pergola along Saratoga is nice. Rivermark, there are no overhead wires, all utilities are underground.
- Depending on whether we get BART or not, will drive what goes into that area. No elementary schools within walking distance. High density not really for families. Even 1.5 acres of park doesn't allow much for programming.
- Build where people have access to transit and open space. Integrate uses, need density and mixed-use.
- Want development to be linked to infrastructure (roads, etc.)
- Thinks the population and job increase is a good thing. Those new folks will want more amenities. People will be willing to use alternative transit.

- Old Quad, near old Bank of America, close to transit and the University appropriate for more development, train station, along El Camino, Coleman Ave for non-residential. Need to be aware that on El Camino you have single-family residential right behind.
- Fairfield development for Kaiser site, is working with community to underground utilities. Also adding a retaining wall to a few homes; pedestrian facilities along the creek way—provides recreation amenity.
- Balance maintaining some of the historical City with new TOD.
- Basic services within walking distance.
- Location of new development to be along major transportation corridors, but preserving industrial uses. Rivermark-like development in industrial area is possible, but would have to minimize impact to industrial viability.
- Would like walkable communities, not requiring transportation like cars.

DOWNTOWN AND STATION AREAS

- Also, challenge, recreating a downtown.
- Transit planning at the SAP area is good.
- Major walkable areas in the City: near Franklin mall.
- Traffic court is a disaster—bringing in element of drunk drivers, speeders.
- TOD. Diversification of housing types, shared parking facilities. On BAE, made it clear that we want to do TOD. FMC site, same. Appropriate applications for density.
- Franklin Mall: like what we did there, but there are benches and badly painted job: little things like that. Low rent. Take down maybe the first property. Housing is OK. Disappointed that the courthouse will be traffic court.
- What can be done to connect the Franklin mall area to the new development area; for revitalizing the downtown area?
- How tall depends on the neighborhood. Near the Old Quad lots are not that deep: it'll be odd to have tall buildings.
- Actually create a new City center at the current City Hall—tear down old police station and make this more City center—do a high rise City hall. Or better yet, make current civic area residential and move City Hall to the downtown area.
- Downtown filtering down to transit would be nice. The superblock needs to be sensitive to the surrounding residents. Do see the Downtown energy expanding from the core, especially to the transit corridors.
- Franklin Mall is a disaster. It's ugly, doesn't bring anyone in. It doesn't look like a downtown or feel like a downtown. We ought to knock the whole thing down. It's maybe problematic to have a somewhat separated downtown, but there is a lot of opportunity there. Put in a bunch of rows of brick or Victorian stores.
- Should connect to depot to energize the area. We have to get some cooperation with the University (closing Franklin and swapping land) Lincoln to Depot (between Benton and Homestead): some high rise housing along the corridor.

- Needs to be redone. Tragic that it was torn down.
- Mini Santana Row: something that people want to go to. Currently Togo to Carmelite: if you can open roads, that'll be great.
- City should've let University Plaza development. Don't see things beyond the superblock, unless someone wants to assemble parcels. Sunnyvale is subsidizing the heck out of it.
- Full of possibilities because of the University. Very convenient area with professors, students. Take advantage of the transit. Want hotels, places to walk. Restaurants, record stores. Look at UC Davis—integrated in with the university. If I could hop on the bus, I would. Not really anywhere to eat. I buy my running shoes there. Lot of historic homes, others would be nice to see them redevelop. Like model of 2-3 stories over retail.
- Makes a lot of sense because of transit, university, appropriate place for density. Questions whether neighbors will support it. University may have more success, developers just get pummeled. Does not visit Downtown. Must create the density, housing first. Movie theater, restaurants, boutiques, art galleries would be nice. Surrounding small cities have the same constraints; cities, yet suburban. People are concerned about parking, don't want high-rise development, traffic, but we do want a downtown. Station Area seems more likely to work out.
- Housing should be located within a ¼ mile corridor of the train tracks and around station area. Retail and residential good. Hotels, office, residential. Station Area would need a school.
- Synergy between City building those amenities, and students using those amenities, getting others to come to sporting and theater events at the City. Not sure that the City has taken a broad enough view of where the Downtown could be. Traffic is terrible. Recommends a bookstore (like a Barnes & Nobles, not just a campus bookstore)—books and social environment, performing arts theater (300-400 seats) like Post Theater in SF. Not concerned about building up in height.
- Historic Victorians and original small neighborhoods. Need to be careful of what you do there. Even keep the facades; you could have something similar to Castro Street in Mountain View or Murphy Square. Plan assumes that you can use Lafayette as access point. Too much traffic, it's not going to work. Only big deterrent to tearing it down is the post office (federal). Not certain there's enough parking there. Neighborhoods have a lot of spillover.
- Vision, similar to Downtown Sunnyvale; Castro Street, has choke points with traffic, lowered to such a point—10 to 15 miles per hour. Have a cultural arts center, park, library, mixed use. At the Station Area you could have a true transit and traffic corridor, with housing.
- Look at Santana Row footprint for an example, or Livermore and Los Gatos. Santana Row is more of a downtown than San José's actual downtown. Retail lifestyle has been very successful. Parking would have to go underground, tie it into surrounding area. Currently, Santa Clara's downtown seems dangerous and unfriendly. Make walking easier, park setting, more visibility.
- Define downtown as walkable, mixed use neighborhoods, and use of light rail or monorail.
- Downtown area that extends from the train station to the Carmelite—historic downtown.
- Should there be a historic core in Downtown area?

- To better utilize public transportation, would like to see the downtown extend to train station.
- Makes sense to squeeze cars in downtown area, but that would create a bottleneck.
- Concerns about traffic flow around Downtown. Large Mervyn's Plaza could lend itself to a Santana Row type development, but scaled down to middle class. Sense of loss for the community losing the downtown. Concerned about whether it will be accessible and usable by most of the folks in the City. More of a Rivermark community center is more of what people identify with.
- Did like the walkability of the downtown area; would like to see more of that.
- Used to have neighborhood services; town is well saturated with fast food establishments. A lot of seniors in the City. If they build a retail area Downtown, there will be high demand—is constantly contacted regarding his lease space. Sees no problem with bringing in smaller commercial uses—Costco would be a disaster. Walgreens kill the small mom and pops. There are a lot of grocery and drug stores to the west and south.
- The Downtown plan area—needs to be geared toward the university crowd, but could also blend it in with the seniors. Should be nice restaurants—not rowdy but more upscale for parents. Something like Meggiano's. Need some housing to make it work—could include low income housing—but would need to ensure that property is not trashed. Also, a smaller art movie theater.
- Downtown used to have a movie theater, dry cleaners; and then City had nothing to replace it. Franklin mall was never fully successful.
- No clear defined area; Jack London Square has foot traffic. Santa Clara has no place to hang out at. Not important to define an area for all of Santa Clara; more important to define several shopping areas/community center area in each neighborhood.
- Women have to like it and be attracted to it. Need to provide centers and create jobs.
- Not clear where Downtown is—City without a focal heart. How do you reactivate that area and regenerate the downtown core?
- Station Area needs a connection from El Camino Real to Coleman. Could create a Mello-Roos district to finance it.
- Another opportunity for housing is by the University. Politics for that is really difficult.
- Station Area seems like a more likely and appropriate place for high-density development.
- Area near transit station and Old Quad makes sense to add density because of transit access.
- Vertical mixed-use retail, live/work on top in Downtown area.

Santa Clara University (SCU)

- What facilities are available for housing, recreation uses, commercial uses—problem is that University elements extend into single family neighborhood.
- University and the surrounding area will play a prominent role in the future of the City. New development there is good and good for the City.

- Not aware of any planning activities near the university (downtown area). Look at heights in this area, and see this as politically challenging.
- Another opportunity for housing is near the University.
- Concerns about student housing—would like to see Planning Department dealing with noise and parking, and overflow housing. Some overlay zone.
- I don't like SCU buying up all the property. They already own a lot of homes that they don't pay taxes on.
- SCU is the only employer who charges employees for parking, therefore some spillover into the neighborhoods, which the neighbors aren't happy about.
- SCU has a master plan, updating it end of summer. Likely will replace more buildings, re-develop going forward. Less expansion, except for increase in student beds by about 1,000. Enrollment of 4,500 undergraduate students will remain the same. 75% of students live within four blocks of campus. 2,500 (about half) live in university housing. Grad students commute and commute during peak hours. Faculty and staff commute from all over.
- Hope plan would include as much green space as possible around the campus.
- Healthy relationship between SCU and the City. Interact with City on building permits, inspections, etc. Generally have strong support for the community, lots of interaction also through students groups who are doing community service.
- Neighborhood University Relations Council (NURC) made up of student life, campus safety, my office, City departments, mayor/council meet a couple times a year with the neighbors. Just to check in, have a forum for any discussion. Usually about 5-6 people that show up continuously. Typical complaints: too many students living in the same house, too many cars, too much noise at 2am. The University is technically not responsible for students off campus. It can provide more housing and programming on campus. But, students don't want to be on campus all the time.
- Not a closed university. People come and walk around campus. Athletic fields and sports facilities are used by other schools and groups—goes through scheduling office.
- UC Santa Cruz wants to be THE university of Silicon Valley. New strategic plan says the University should develop a set of goals that foster the engagement with Silicon Valley (cities, industries, and people).
- Campus Safety patrol has no weapons, not much jurisdiction. Can detain until SCPD arrives.
- Downtown business meets with University planning—they are very cooperative. Shares his parking with the City. City provided for a crossing to his site.
- Growth has been controlled well. University has assimilated sites around it; its presence has improved the area.
- Cooperation between City and University seems to be great.
- Wishes University was more open to the public.
- In neighborhoods surrounding the university, what are the impacts of student housing?

COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL SECTOR (INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT)

- City should actively pursue high-tech business. But, jobs/housing ratio is out of whack.
- Zoning and adjacent uses must be compatible with industrial uses. Residential, churches and day cares are not appropriate. We can avoid conflict, by limiting diversity and just allow the manufacturing and R&D to happen. Adjacent cities ought to align with one another about how to treat these; what should the radius be between these types of uses. City should consider to what extent they want to keep and attract these types of businesses.
- Likes the fact that Santa Clara has a balance of industrial, commercial, and housing development. A lot of the larger office facilities have closed and converted to residential. Not sure what good industrial and commercial development is replacing anything else. Concerned about losing the commercial/industrial base.
- North of Bayshore: lot of non-residential and in downtown. If Stadium come there it could be great for commercial/office uses.
- General Plan should be focused on bringing the jobs in.
- Jobs appropriate in the area where industrial/commercial development has happened. No residential beyond the TOD area. Better that San José bringing the huge area from the north.
- Would like to see industrial uses market driven. If there is a need of sheet metal, let it continue. Would hate to see our interest in higher-density drive out older industrial uses. There is something good about the diversity of industrial uses. Not supportive of maximizing every site.
- Maintain a balanced land use approach; not necessarily a numerical balance of jobs/housing.
- Campuses planned in the industrial areas—don't have a problem with heights. City's been welcoming to the businesses.
- Industrial uses. In favor of retaining low-tech uses. Think of them as tax base for us—and we're going to need that if we are going to have 30,000 more people. Think of them as the golden egg we can't lose. Don't know what the relative contribution is: high tech vs. low tech. As long as these businesses are bringing in tax base, we should keep them.
- Challenge in keeping the industrial zone and not doing a lot conversions.
- Retain industrial uses.
- B and C class buildings from the 1960s and 70s are not getting rented. Knock them down and build Class A.
- Don't mess with the industrial areas. Pays for this City.
- Sees heavy industry becoming light industry (North Grinding Wheels, Pittsburg De Moines Steel have all disappeared).
- Likes that City has a lot of industry. I don't go to the industrial part of the City very often. Apartments would be ok, near where people work. Not single-family though.
- Lawson Lane: 5 and 6 story buildings with parking structures. Floor plate high 30,000-40,000sf. Parking ratios 2.3 – 3.5 per 1,000 SF. Overdesigned to allow for future parking.

Environmental review would need to be redone. San José Airport at 10 stories, 40,000 sf with central core that would allow 20,000sf to split the building. Parking 3.5/1,000 sf.

- On a spec basis, it's ideal to do six stories or less. Premium once you get over 70 feet. Near Great America is an appropriate place, since there are similar buildings there. The City seems to be encouraging density there.
- Don't want the City to change in the future, in terms of building trends. Some cities like to dictate what will be built. R&D is core to Santa Clara, good corporate tenants and developers. Willing to listen to how demands are changing.
- Redeveloping what we already own, increasing intensification (e.g. teardown 1.5 story manufacturing for six stories, add parking garages).
- Old industrial area should mostly stay how it is. Not everything needs to be a glass high rise. Don't overwork trying to change the current zoning. Menlo Park tried to downzone; it was disastrous. Leave a range in the zoning that invites flexibility. Only so much small floor plate retail we can take (coffee, dry cleaning, etc).
- Thinks the City should preserve all the industrial lands as possible, good for tax generation, keeps taxes down for residents. San José has that problem, now has not enough businesses
- Santa Clara is very business friendly. Straight up and honest. Very good to work with.
- General Plan should look at what are the general trends, and what is happening in the City. Is there some type of manufacturing or industry that the City wants to target?
- Target certain areas for industrial development. Sees the potential for research, headquarter facility for high-tech, solar facilities. Would lend itself to more open space—even opportunities for community centers.
- What are the economics of running the City—making sure that land use decisions to allow for certain type of development—i.e., a minimum lot size.
- City should have a scheme of how to distribute industrial vs. residential uses. (Sunnyvale has it right, redeveloping industrial to residential and moving industry to a better area). Sunnyvale provides incentives for companies to move to other areas.
- Doesn't think that manufacturing going away and replacing with housing is a good idea. Need to have jobs.
- Central industrial area: looks like they are starting to change the zoning in the central industrial area. (Sobrato site off of central expressway)
- Currently, Sobrato high rise office buildings going into industrial area; could see that continuing to some extent.
- These economic periods are cyclical. Bay Area is still the center of high-tech. People all over the world want to come here. Good climate.
- Applied Materials still has development with the City (for 30 acres).
- Many companies have moved out—manufacturing has moved out; losing sales tax revenue. In the future, City will need to maintain that that revenue in order to maintain the high quality of infrastructure

- General Plan: City's policy is really good on retaining the industrial lands. Santa Clara has a very clear industrial zone delineation. Preserved by large blocks.
- Industrial area: could accommodate office and commercial uses that bring in tax dollars. Something like Intel—expand the role of the area, but preserve or enhance the tax base. Transition zone would be nice—single family, tracks, industrial uses—offices could be that transition.
- Office uses: Doesn't see office as a primary use along El Camino Real or Stevens Creek. Maybe some service offices. There are other places in the City for office buildings.
- High tech: All that is single story mostly. At some point they'll start going up. They occupy a sizable chunk in the City, and can easily go up.
- Besides just the tech industry, like biotech and nanotechnology, large employers in the area need to keep coming.
- Limits on commercial growth (height, etc.). Don't see a problem with going up in the industrial areas. Up until now land has been cheap, but that's changing/changed. Along El Camino Real: we need to go up, but eight stories there would be wow!
- High rises in employment areas (SE side of Montague some pushback from residents against higher rise residential development that is close to existing homes). The single story office uses will have to intensify in the longer term.
- Height and density in employment areas: Crank it up.
- Hope the City keeps a pro-business environment. I don't think they want to push out large sales tax contributors. City Government is hands off, which is fine. As long as they don't increase fire permits, business license fees, etc.
- I would like to see the businesses take more of an interest in the City, in terms of relationships with the community. We see it with non-profits at the wine festival and at the 4th of July.
- AMD, Cisco, Intel, SunCity, BoA, AT&T interact with University students: members of the board, internship opportunities for students, alumni relationship.
- You get your retail sales tax. When Applied Materials sells product to Intel, etc, City gets that sales tax. Areas right off Central, Lafayette, De La Cruz, San Tomas, Great America, Montague—places that have a lot of access. There's still room for all those industrial areas along the side streets. A lot of people work in this area and then drive away. We miss out on capturing this market.
- Campus like office spaces more along Central expressway, might want to come up with a minimum campus size, and areas appropriate for Class A, B, C. Want to have opportunities for small business development.
- Technology changes, will see more things going toward energy and solar. Keep the business areas business, and keep the jobs in the City.
- Need to provide jobs for the people who live here.
- Need to attract the brand name businesses as well with adjacent uses.
- Have to build vertically to make it pencil out here now. Would build higher if they could. Need ceiling heights of 30 feet for some manufacturing. Then some office on top.

- Avoid the bedroom community result—make the City a place where businesses want to be.
- Protected core like the industrial area; can go even higher.
- We have a significant real estate footprint. The trend is towards higher employment and office density—more persons per square footage.
- Marriott is ten stories. Regency Towers (was going to be four towers; only built one tower). Intel. McCandles towers: 12 stories with a helipad. That’s as high as they should go.
- There are a lot of office campus areas north of 101. Create a more business-friendly environment. Look at Nvidia, great example—more efficient use of the land. Lots of vacancy over by San José Airport, lots of opportunity for businesses appropriate to the airport
- Commercial and industry uses have served the City well—should work to maintain areas that allow for preservation of sources of revenue.

Retail

- I don’t really go north of Bayshore. Sometimes a shop on Lafayette, maybe a party on Lick Mill with friends, and have been to Mercado (but, tries not to go there, parking is bad). Goes to Saratoga for services, instead.
- Sales tax revenue is 2:1 over property tax, but Santa Clara has no shopping.
- We don’t have a lot of restaurants, lunch places in the office/industrial corridor. Convenience commercial is allowed in the General Plan. Campus at Central and Scott has little restaurants across the street, but there’s a phobia of crossing the street, despite the crosswalk. Would need an underpass or overpass.
- People want a Trader Joe’s. Should be one down in Kaiser property—name brand stores that will attract people and supply jobs. Fears that the City is focusing on just doing housing
- Low income workers are the ones who have trouble because they have to commute. Think about what types of businesses are coming in, and what salaries can they get.
- If women want to shop there, they will come there and provide foot traffic. Women will go to a multi-use area where they can shop for multiple things—bed bath and beyond, coffee shop, etc.
- Design things like an outdoor mall. There are some newspaper facilities on ground floor better suited for office areas.
- Neighborhood-oriented commercial preferred. More walkable.
- If school district land was to free up, this would be a good place for neighborhood commercial uses, but would need to be market supported.
- Next to residential neighborhood (used to be Office Depot). We have enough traffic on Stevens Creek, don’t need more traffic or more residential. When they built Santana Row, increased the traffic. Hurts our business, especially around the holidays. Kind of a disaster.
- Fewer car dealers all the time. Weak economy, high gas prices. Buick dealer near Kiely closed. Auto dealers work best when clustered. Eighty percent of customers come from Santa Clara County.

- New movie theater, maybe along El Camino. If BART comes, you would have more ridership, people, and businesses. You would have the amount of people you need to support a theater, restaurants, and businesses. Nothing brings me Downtown. Those are the reasons I went to Santana Row this weekend. Good people watching.
- We have many examples of retail abutting residential and it works well.
- Would like to see something other than a football stadium. Not much of an attraction for 7 months of the year, and Great America is closed all winter and then moves to weekends, and is only open 7 days a week in the summer. Retail businesses would need customers year-round.
- Stevens Creek Blvd back up to neighborhoods. Big ticket items, cars. They've been good about putting the processing and repairs up front, and parking in the back where it's not going to impact residences.
- More construction-type retail (e.g. hardware, furniture) along commercial corridor (Lafayette, along train tracks). It doesn't take away from the existing commercial, but it gives an added value to the land some options. Big box stores would help draw in regional customers.
- Tourism does bring revenues into the City's General Fund. Growing the convention center, stadium—having a more entertainment mixed use area with restaurants, etc. similar to the Giants stadium in San Francisco.
- SCU provides buses to take students to malls, San José arena, events. Not a lot for students to do in Santa Clara. Students need an array of things, not just 2 or 3 venues.
- Hopefully we'll have a downtown. In St. Paul Minnesota, there are a lot of corner stores: here they are strip malls. Would like to see corner stores, as opposed to all clustered in one area.
- Eats lunch every day in the Stevens Creek vicinity. Could always be more choice. Some old blighted areas. Usually drive no more five miles to get to lunch. At least one colleague walks back to the office. Doesn't use other services in the City.
- Hotels should be driven by the developer. Doesn't see government role in driving specific land uses. The only time the City should do it when there is an identified need by the community. At the time the Downtown plan was done, the community asked for it.
- Where do auto uses go? Could become the same kind of congregating nature. Those uses shouldn't be the face of your city. Right out here in front of City Hall. Would like get rid of tattoo parlors; seems like they're already fading.
- Signs need to be better.
- What will the next major economic industrial movement?
- There will always be neighborhood commercial opportunities, but controversy over big box. Look at expanding entertainment to the north.
- There are a lot of auto services that would be displaced on El Camino with new development. There is a need for the services, but where are you going to move them? Will be pressure to have these services and facilities in the City. Make space for that in the City.
- Community needs the shopping centers. Safeway has another 22 years on the lease.

- Neighborhood resources—day care centers, halfway house, deal with a slight increase in homelessness, senior population is going up. Is a fan of BAREC concept.
- How do you protect what is there in neighborhood centers and not let it turn to all residential?
- Checks around the area to see what is going on, to see what stores people need. Brought in stores that maintain themselves—gardeners, sweepers come every day.
- Very strict on drive-ins and gas stations. Santa Clara is nothing like San José.
- There is demand for retail at El Camino Real and Stevens Creek. Walgreens built housing on top. You don't have to necessarily mix the residential (if you can get a critical mass, you can build complete retail).
- Not happy with grocery stores in this town. Roseville model (larger supermarkets, with events like wine tasting, etc.). Rivermark somewhat does that. Supermarkets are downscale or are closing. They have long-term leases at low prices.
- Stevens Creek should remain as is.
- Stevens Creek should change—has had a better life than El Camino Real. The uses have been a little denser (El Camino Real looks a little ghostly). Stevens Creek has some vitality, but not enough. There's a wooden six-foot fence separating someone's back yard. Opportunity for development in that area.
- North of Bayshore: would love to see something that'll keep money here. 7,000 seat theater. There will be some point that it'll tip and restaurants would want to be there. There is not much going on there right now. Don't know what our policy is regarding signs for: some are 40 years old with paint crumbling. Code enforcement needs to happen.
- Likes Santana Row. Just wishes it were tied to Valley Fair better.
- Would be great to have a Santana Row type of development.
- Need better mixed of uses, more retail services.
- Missing the neighborhood retail. Plan needs to take into account cost of housing and that two parents will have to work. Need to have reasonable mix of employment and family-oriented community.
- More likely to go to downtown San José or Mountain View Shoreline for shopping, arts, culture, etc. Restaurants are sparse on the north side.
- Clear line set up between residential and commercial. One thing we haven't done well with is retail. Tried to promote mixed use (retail) and higher density along El Camino—where the bus route is somewhat reliable. City should ensure that the zoning and policies are there, so that individual property owners can readily redevelop—as opposed to a targeted redevelopment effort. Sunnyvale has done a better job.
- Korean businesses wanted to create a Korean-town feel on El Camino Real with a cultural center.
- Homestead and Wolfe road—Asian shopping center, cultural experience
- What does the City view as establishing these types of diversity/cultural uses/markers?

- People don't go to Santa Clara for fine dining or shopping, and people actually have to go to neighboring cities. Difficult to get to Rivermark.
- Not much control over Stevens Creek. The City badly needs the sales taxes—encourage the car dealers (got to be careful about the back side—some residents have been complaining).

Entertainment (Great America, 49ers)

- Regional recreation concept: Great America, entertainment, convention center, 49ers are all great.
- Neighbors talk about an entertainment center around Great America (and instead of 49ers stadium). It's already got the convention center. But, theater went in at Mercado instead. We don't want to negatively impact Great America. City owns the land. Could see commercial going forward
- City gets \$6 million a year from Great America without lifting a finger. Don't spend much time thinking more about this. Great America does not need supplemental venues/uses—it's a destination. 49ers is a whole different ballgame. The idea that the entertainment zone needs to be "filled in" doesn't click. It's mostly about revenue. There could be other things we can put in there, that may be fine. Don't feel a compelling need the same way as he does about need for a downtown.
- Need to stay true to the vision of the Bayshore North Entertainment Area. Stadium would really enhance what's out there. Otherwise our hotels will just become business hotels (weekends—nothing happens out in the restaurants). Need something that'll emphasize the tourism, entertainment area.
- Don't see a 180-acre amusement park for the next 50 years. Stadium or City walk—some project that is exciting.
- Fremont's having some problems with the baseball stadium. Maybe that's a possibility as well.
- If it were in Santa Clara I might consider buying season tickets. Might be a good revenue source for the City. I heard woes about budget in the City. I could probably take the bus to the stadium. Things that are great about new stadiums are new industries/retail pop up around them. Don't think I'd be impacted by the traffic, which would come to 101. I would be sympathetic to the concerns of people in the north. Light rail is nearby which will help.
- Earthquakes team would like to see it built as well, because four international soccer tournaments could fill the stadium.
- Would be good for the City for revenues and taxes and other businesses.
- 49ers would add a great deal to the economy for the long term—would provide a lot of jobs for low income people, plus attract a lot of income into the area.
- 49ers stadium is necessary because it will work in the entertainment area and will attract business. Larger businesses may want to be here. Problem is financing the stadium. Stadium needs a shopping area with restaurants and hotels that attracts more visitors. Otherwise, just a structure that will only be active ten days out of the year.
- 49ers is an exciting prospect for the overall economic health of the City. It's an economic magnet/attraction. People using it as a destination, opportunity to bring money from out-

side. Do you look at uses currently adjacent that are office—is there an opportunity to create focused retail and tax dollar revenues? Why not allow higher end retail in an overlay? Not uncommon to have restaurants and hotel uses around a major sports facility.

- There is a need for more entertainment-type business; park gives great entertainment value for certain months of the year, something to fill that in for the rest of the year—value for the residents.
- For the new stadium, noise issue—what are they going to do about existing development?
- 49ers can build their stadium, but not if they want to use public City money. Retail land prices around it would go up. Poor use of land. Only used a few times a year. Neighbors around it are not happy with the idea.

TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC

- Challenge is to not become a traffic nightmare. Traffic is already significant. How do we take care of that, without subways/rapid transit? People will still be driving everywhere in the City. We're not much of a bus society.
- Get rid of separation of uses; instead New Urbanist approach that emphasizes walking, biking.
- Ton of high density housing that makes Lawrence backed up in all lanes.
- Like University to take over a couple of roads (Market): as many as possible, and put landscaping on it.
- Look at Santana Row—a lot of underground parking, ton of people walking around, not a problem with traffic inside, but bad outside. Continue to look at developments with enough parking or mass transportation connection
- Lafayette hard to find from 880. Sign says Baskim, WA, to Lafayette. Need to rename at 880 with San José's cooperation, so downtown will be easy to find off from freeway. "Downtown Santa Clara Parkway". Would be confusing to call it University Ave (confusion with Palo Alto). In Hawaii they have restaurant row. Have Washington Street start at Homestead and go through the superblock as it did.
- Safety concerns (Traffic/site planning): Starbucks by the bank/Carls Jr. Walk out of the bank—you're right into the traffic.
- No connection between northern and southern neighborhoods. Nothing that would connect southern people to go to the north. GA or the convention center the only reason.
- Street names continue, but dead end streets. Either extend the streets through or change the street names.
- Evaluate General Plan; for instance how has Lafayette changed—major collector to Los Gatos and up north; has a major significance in the county—is single family along that road still making sense?
- Lawrence, San Tomas, or near El Camino Real, or central expressway—defining these as transit area—only method of transportation is a car. There is no BART and the bus system may not be frequent enough. Plus, how does the project tie into other imp surface streets

- Key issues: Transportation. Traffic problems when people come. We also need to take care of our needs—keep VMT low, aging population. Buildings should be close to transportation.
- Supersize the bike plan. Make it more significant.
- Density Corridors: Working from the assumption that this will be built out. Instead of looking at project by project, look at corridor as a whole and see if traffic can support that.
- Downtown's got to get some strong pedestrian corridor. Has to be pedestrian friendly (Station to all the way through to superblock).
- Stevens Creek doesn't have much room to grow. Freeway access needs to be improved around 880 and around Saratoga and 280. Not that much parking when we have two dealerships next to each other and residential development.
- Finally got cities to put in left-hand turn lane into the dealership. Difficult to get San José and Santa Clara to coordinate. City has done a nice job of streetscape improvements on Saratoga.
- Benton should go through. Have transit across the street, but can't get there.
- We have good north-south flow, but not good east-west connections. Suggest left lagging lights/yield (Tucson has done this). Let thru traffic go first.
- Will the General Plan address traffic calming in the neighborhoods?
- Development impacts: how will the General Plan address traffic issues that extend to other cities, as well as impact of other developments on existing uses. Make sure that traffic study data is reliable, current, and verifiable.
- How do we get people to get to the train station.
- TOD is appealing as people are focused on sustainability and the carbon footprint. If not mass transit, the other limitation is parking. Caltrain isn't feasible for many employees, nor is light rail. Company had a shared shuttle, but got too expensive and unworkable. TDM is not going to be sufficient.
- Services around transit, such as car sharing. Portland bike sharing. Used to ride bikes, worried about bike safety. Would like to see more sidewalks in the City. No sidewalks between Lawrence and old campus, on Kiefer.
- For employees living in Santa Clara, offices are often too far to walk to work, but too short for transit.
- Other part of the transportation question is how this addresses kids getting out of school, picking up children, going to practice, etc.
- Can walk to things in older parts of Santa Clara. Hard to walk to things in the new neighborhoods. Stores out of business, low connectivity.
- Trying to build enough transit to serve housing, from environmental standpoint and economic, given gas prices. Tend to be mobile within Santa Clara County. People would take advantage of transit if it was convenient and driving became inconvenient.
- City's version of transit oriented development—less parking, but no alternative to not use a car! Has tried taking transit, and it's very inefficient—very difficult.

- Existing streets—Homestead, El Camino Real, Palamino, Calabazas, expressways—difficult and precarious to ride a bike; alternate routes through the City would be better.
- Challenge to get residents to come north of 101; would be good to have mass transit connection for them to make it easier.
- Transportation and corridors, moving to more public transportation.
- Access to light rail, high-tech companies, system of bike trails and pedestrian walkways possible—something like esplanade between LA and Orange County or existing San Tomas Trail is a good template. Synergy with Rivermark.
- Support transportation, which will be increasing issue. VTA is supportive of developing along transportation corridors. The Tasman, not much retail to support the transit.
- Emphasize the increase in use of and attractiveness of transportation. Need to get some people out of their cars. Would like to see the City to look into mini-bus (Mountain View has it). 15-passenger buses that run like taxicabs and circulate within the City. Some bus routes have been cut. For aging population. Something that runs from downtown to senior center (or to the golf course!).
- VTA gives us the bus routes they give us, so not sure what can be done about that.
- Vehicles vs. Transit as a philosophy: There is a chicken and egg problem. We don't have the higher levels of transit that are there in other places. From the developers perspective—they may still want to build more parking over City requirements. Not opposed to the philosophy, but don't know if there is an alternative to cars right now. It takes a lot of density to support vibrant public transportation—we are quite a ways from there.
- Smaller shuttle like buses going into the neighborhoods (VTA may be on the right track with that).
- Likes the portion of what San Mateo/Burlingame did. Lifted the train up.
- Encourage development around transit/Caltrain. VTA is a failure. We need intracity transit. We need smaller buses (meeting people from neighborhood to bus stop or to light rail). We don't have rapid transit. If we are going to develop anything denser, then mass transit almost required. He likes driving, and is not going to change.
- Public transportation needs to be improved. Right now, it's non-functional. Took a survey one morning to address City's assertion that people will take a bus. No one who owned a home take a bus. Presumably because it's inconvenient. There's only one bus that goes to my office. It's at 5:30am. Public transportation infrastructure will need to be revamped if you expect these new residents to use it.
- Suburban model. Transit doesn't really work. With the exception of the light rail users going to work. Santa Clara is not a destination. Who wants to ride the bus? Not a very attractive alternative. Bikes and walking seem more doable.
- Would like to see a better bus system. Routes changed and now a friend has to take three buses. Seldom take the bus. I don't know if it runs well. Now some express buses, but look like more routes in San José as opposed to Santa Clara.
- I would like to see the BART come into Santa Clara. Should be the ultra-modern version. And a people mover to airport.

- Would like to see less car use and less need to have to use a car.
- City needs a really good transportation network. Roads not the answer. Not enough ways to get people around. In Portland, you arrive by plane, free light rail to City, some 16 miles that you can ride along the light rail route. Quick and easy. City needs better transit, bike lanes, pedestrian experience. Right now, bike routes are not safe.
- Mass transit will be important going forward. Mass transit must be supported by feeder service. A bus system needs to be developed.
- Hard to put transit in, since we have low density development. Take advantage of what we have. Electric vehicles, HOV lanes. Incentives, not penalties. Train station is no brainer—have to be able to access the transit though. Make that investment worthwhile, before just building new.
- High-tech workers want to live in SOMA in San Francisco. Our tenants love the train and the bus. Coleman area has not improved as much as other parts of Santa Clara; access to Caltrain prohibited. That's where a city can use their force to make unmovable entities to make this change. Negotiate with Union Pacific.
- Take TDM initiatives: ride sharing, etc.
- Shortcoming of light rail is that when it travels through downtown San José, it goes slower. VTA light rail goes all the way to Los Gatos and back to San José as a hub. Just wondering if better transit access would be possible.
- El Camino Real is a well traveled road—increase frequency of transit, and reliability. Week-ends and holidays, it's really bad. Express trains/buses on an hourly basis. Like Caltrain's express trains. Bicycles could also be a designated train/bus ride time.
- Connect the light rail through the rest of Santa Clara.
- Just about any city can provide mass transportation to a stadium, but not Santa Clara.
- Sends a lot of customers to Mountain View for eating and Milpitas for the mall on the light rail. Light rail from a convention center connection, to Valley Fair. Less traffic.
- Encourage bicycle use.
- Alternative transportation design. Encourage more public transportation and bike use.
- Move away from HOV on the highway.
- El Camino Real between Homestead is very isolated transportation wise. Everything has to be caught at the train station. Really would like to see improved transit with buses, more frequency, especially to the Lawrence light rail.
- Does bike for transportation—worried about it getting stolen; there aren't a lot of places to leave the bike. Not a lot of recreational cyclists in the City.
- Transportation: great to have BART come close, along with caltrain. Airport noise is kept down, even though they are expanding.
- BART will drive property values higher down the road.
- Automobile traffic is expedited, but has had impacts on non motorized transportation.

- The four lanes on Homestead at Liberty have trouble with people speeding to pass, right next to a school. Reduced that to add bike lanes and thus slowed the traffic down.
- Freeways and road infrastructure has created barriers. For instance, 101 used to have grade level intersections and more crossing opportunities. Same thing happened with 17/880—Newhall Street was closed off, as well as Brokaw Road, which used to go straight through to Milpitas. Plus the airport chopped more area off.
- Would like to see development along transportation corridors, which should be along light rail and Caltrain/BART area.
- Making it easier for pedestrians, which improves access to transit. There are still a lot of barriers—the county roads and highways are willing to make the expressways more pedestrian friendly, which are under the City’s jurisdiction. VTA has come up with some money to provide pedestrian improvements.
- Pedestrian crossing is precarious throughout the City.
- Bicycle committee has been looking at the San Tomas/Aquino creek trail. Expected to go as far as 237 to Cabrillo. Getting across El Camino Real is difficult; would need an easement from a property owner.
- Wants to see light rail along San Tomas expressway to connect the north to the south, south to Great America and serve jobs would be along the San Tomas/Montague corridors.

Parking

- Need below-grade parking. Prometheus goes down two levels (70 units per acre). BRE, one level below grade, and one higher.
- Cars vs. transit. If you look at areas where there has been natural evolution of land use—Old Quad/University area: houses designed with one car. Now 10 students live in one house, spilling out into the neighborhood. Reality is people own cars and will drive. How can you force people to give up a car? We need to realistic and make sure that development has adequate parking.
- In large shopping centers. Parking spaces will not shrink and cars will not shrink. In Franklin Mall, some of the stalls are too tight.
- New apartments are mostly four-story over podium parking, high water table. Now wrapping a unit. Fighting to meet parking requirement. City staff want to reduce it, residents want it.
- More density = problems for parking.
- Street parking shouldn’t be constrained. Thinks SCU students should have a permit. Otherwise, the street is a public place and parking should be allowed. Downtown may need more parking. Hoping that Main Street would connect through (no dead ends).
- We need a lot of parking (peak time is noon), but don’t need as much in the evenings. In the last ten years, we’ve added 1,000 new parking spaces, so parking is not much of a problem anymore.
- Pressure is for more parking, not because we want more people to drive, but because employment density is increasing. 1.85 parking/units is not competitive. Renters will move on \$50. You hear a lot about “hoteling,” but there’s still times when all the employees are

there. Pressure from Planning staff to reduce parking. We build on spec, many different tenants over its life. How the building is used over 30 years evolves. 4 spaces/1,000SF allows flexibility. Risky for us to spend the money to overdesign and hope there's no change to the code. Long-term flexibility is paramount.

- Parking will always be a challenge. Any new development causes parking issues. We're trying to house families, not cars. Especially to be sensitive in established neighborhoods. We build special needs units, which means extra spaces.
- Parking permitting not popular. Rely on the neighborhoods themselves to call the police. Limited usefulness. We have used it near Stevens Creek where you have residential next to the commercial. Neighbors will admit that it's a wash.
- Basement parking—Los Altos has basement parking; could see that happening in the future, but difficult to build for retail—so auto-oriented. Valley Fair and Santana Row, structured, but not basement. Basement works for office or residential uses.
- Question of whether to reduce parking to encourage public transportation.
- Parking will be a challenge.
- Look at recent trend of variances; try to avoid variances for zoning. For instance, variance for reduced parking or just change the parking code?
- Biggest problem is parking—strip malls are not good investments. When tough times come, the strip malls get killed.

ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY

- Beginning to dabble into requirements of green building. Need a regional approach—similar to Mountain View and Sunnyvale. SVP is visionary in providing service. We went for 12 years without power increase. They are developing a diversity of sources of energy.
- General interest and growing reality of sustainability.
- Buildings can get better and better. Greener and greener. We're just beginning to get into the green movement. More efficiency.
- Opportunity for green development and green design, in alternative transportation and construction.
- Green building is ok. Everybody's jumped on the bandwagon. Higher gas prices have been for the better.
- Incentivize a program for green development, similar to affordable housing.
- Would like to see builders go green. Open space, design, public spaces. BAREC site is a great development example.
- Proud of Santa Clara for its green power program, even though not a participant. It will be a leader in the future.
- Infrastructure to support non-fossil fuel alternatives for energy. City should be looking to be carbon neutral. If you take those as core values, then we say we need a different electrical system. Need to have distributed generation. Need infrastructure for plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Need green infrastructure and permitting process.

- Sustainability beyond just energy, but economically viable and socially responsible. Transportation network helps poor and older people, for example. Whether you're going to leave something the same or change it—need to address this responsibility. Not in our culture right now, but if we're planning 20 years ahead. Don't get left behind. San José wants to become the greenest city in the country.
- Objective is to reduce our energy consumption through efficiency projects. Depends on what happens with our business and what we do with the facilities. SVP has been a great partner, pleased with the service. Don't expect great increase in energy use or water use. We have a lot of pressure from our customers to increase efficiency, recycle.
- Berkeley was trying to move forward with helping to finance solar panels. Santa Clara has a jump on San José in terms of costs of providing power through SVP. Anything the City can do to have a competitive advantage to have affordable available power, is worthwhile, in addition to providing green power. Data centers require intense power capacity.
- Green building is pretty common—energy efficiency pays off.
- Green building, sustainability—very important. LEED is weak on water conservation.
- Santa Clara is going to be more a lot more in to green technology
- Incorporate green as a policy and benefit. First platinum rated multi-family housing project in the City at Lafayette and El Camino Real.
- How can the City take a leadership role in promoting green development? Sunnyvale gives you greater FAR for at least certified green—20% more building in exchange for green certification.
- Promote energy efficiency.
- Continue to look at the infrastructure on water and power. California is the number one demand user for power and least amount of infrastructure. Santa Clara must ensure growth of infrastructure (for water, power, and sewer) with residential growth.
- Major challenges—infrastructure for the future—power, sewer, roads, water that can handle future growth. Especially power demands are growing. Difficult for his building to draw more power capacity.
- Water is going to be huge—rely on 50% of groundwater. North San José had a good project—heavy usage of brown water. Nearby residential using the City's facilities, could have more commercial development in the east side to draw people.
- Water is another issue—desalination may be the future trend.

PARKS, OPEN SPACE & PUBLIC FACILITIES

- I like that I can walk from my home to a school with a wide open park. Run in my neighborhood at night.
- Would be nice for more areas for community garden—used to be one over at Wilson school.
- North of Montague Expressway, designated park areas along Lick Mill and a foot bridge over the Guadalupe Creek. Montague doesn't have a designated sidewalk. Concern is that Central Park is the biggest green area—other areas are broken up and co-located with a

school. Some neighborhoods have higher density and reconverted owner-occupied affordable rentals.

- Kaiser site slated for 800 units. Very high density. Our open space is precious. Library and swim center intrude onto Central Park. City could do a land swap and keep the mature trees, along creek, on Kaiser site, allowing development elsewhere. You can always build on parks, but you can't tear down housing.
- BAREC site—would like Summer Hill to increase the density of their houses to get more open space—clustering development to get the open space.
- Senior center is terrific, and is available to people over 50—swimming pool and gym. Needs to be more publicizing of the Senior Center. Would be nice to have a shuttle service to and from.
- City is really good about demanding parks in new development.
- Football, baseball, concert venues: we are not creating the entertainment areas that needs to happen. We've done a great job with the creek trail. Fantastic, with the artwork. Would like to open retention pond and make it part of the open space. Combine parcels to make it happen.
- For a City of 19 square miles, we have a lot of fire stations, libraries—two and one more underway—police station. We have more acres of park per capita than any other City. Also a great diversity of recreation activities. We have amenities covered, and that's why we can't touch the industrial area. We just upgraded the theater at Central Park. We can't have everything. We have an International Swim Center and someone wants to do a new one.
- Concern about lack of parks. Instead of cramming units on Lawrence which is loud, suggests park, with barbeque pits.
- There are a lot of parks in Santa Clara, but not a lot of big parks. Good sports facilities and Park & Rec Department. But there are no animals—would like a little petting zoo. Central Park is wonderful. I walk with my grandchildren to the park, once a week. Not heavily used. This weekend it was closed! Why? I would have liked to have been informed.
- Need something for children. In Milpitas, there's a skateboard park. Programming, outlet for kids. International Swim Center is pursuing some sort of Hall of Fame; that's great. Most schools have playing fields which is good. The San Tomas bike/walk trail is good.
- No one has even approached the University about formally sharing open space. Probably a good idea.
- Need Parks & Rec element for workers in the employment areas. Doesn't have to be that commercial/industrial neighborhoods are devoid of parks. Right now, I'd have to go to one of the neighborhood parks. Not for active recreation, but an oasis. Quality of life for business workers.
- Standards for park acreage per resident AND worker. In lieu fees should allow for new parks, not just existing.
- Would allow Central Park to expand.
- Open space possible at nursery site that just closed on El Camino Real, it's along the creek. Marselli is probably our least used park. That could be one to swap.

- Need to show where there are more parks/green space. A lot of the public sites are actually parks and used primarily for that.
- Good amount of parks and open space—bike trails along creeks are important to building a livable community—connection between living and working areas of the City.
- We have a lot of parks in the City. Natural reserve—we have some of that. There will always be continued pressure to impinge on those, but we need to keep these as open space.
- City has great parks.
- Santa Clara has 37 parks, international swim center, senior center, youth activity center, own utility, central park—infrastructure has been in process for last 30 years; very self contained.
- Farmers market near post office at Franklin, have it every Saturday year round.
- Dog park-has been very successful—popular and include as part of recreation open space.
- At parks, would be nice to have a place to go get a drink or something to eat so you don't have to turn around and go home.
- Does not like removing open space and replacing with commercial or residential.
- In Central Park, there is a lot of open space—programming is inadequate—pools, swings, libraries, and parking areas are full. People have trouble getting parking to the library—doesn't encourage people to stay at the library

Bike / Pedestrian Trails

- The trail structure in Santa Clara has been quite a bit of work. That's a nice feature. Would like to see more trails. Use of creeks to get pedestrian and bike paths through the City. Would be important to retain the park area (near old landfill, at the northern edge of the City, as open space.
- I have to drive to get to the Los Gatos Creek trail to find trails at least 12 miles each way (for running), with bathroom stops.
- A lot of cracked sidewalks, and trees growing too low and shrubs impeding on sidewalk space. It's difficult by wheelchair. People should be keeping their yards nicer and shrubbery off of sidewalks.
- Sidewalks are very important throughout the whole City—need to be much wider. Walking my grandchildren to school is infeasible—they're too narrow, undulating driveways, over-planting on curbs. Not good for old people, wheelchairs, strollers.
- When building up, you can leave room for common open space. Open space trails around Bayshore, flat, accessible, could be a great path. Promenades allow more access, more trail entrances. Good for seniors. Hopefully, there would be a library, access to services, etc.
- Need to make it possible to commute by bicycle. The more bike lanes the better. To the extent we can find corridors (and it's difficult, because we have looked everywhere.) A lot of people who work in Santa Clara don't live here, so it's a challenge to get people to bike. However, we can try linking bikeways to Caltrain. You can individualize the route with bikes, unlike transit. Biker wants non-stop trail away from car. We should be looking at creek ways and easements.

Schools & Public Facilities

- Fire stations have mixed use surroundings, very tight; need adequate parking, and having parks nearby for neighborhood uses.
- Police substation at Rivermark. Are we looking at having another substation on the west side? They provide visibility, and the location is approachable. If you take homestead to Lawrence, the commercial corners—Marianis, with new Kaiser hospital across the street. Would like to see Kaiser place a park on their property.
- Look at educational demands on education, improve Mission College structurally and programmatically, as well as SCU.
- Supportive of expansion of Mission College—needs to have much more of a physical presence, and more attractive. Also supportive of SCU expansion—although private, it is doing many wonderful things.
- Was a teacher for 40 years. All of our schools will be refurbished in the near future.
- City has a huge problem with the schools. Large group of parents not equipped to deal with kids. Adults who are coming into the City are having a hard time. Kids need more guidance. The City needs to invest in schools. Have a lot of parents that are overextended. Against the law to work the kids—a little more discipline and a little more work opportunities.
- No children, but heard concerns about overcrowding in schools.
- Would need more schools with projected population growth. Important that K-3 maintain 20 students per classroom.
- City has a huge problem with the schools—failing children, adults not supporting/giving guidance. Partially due to demographic shifts and too many apartments.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

- Everybody needs to be a part of the General Plan and know the vision.
- Concerned about development process. Developer hires and pays for the EIR. Sees omissions and lies. The developer should instead pay someone in the City to go hire the EIR consultant.
- General Plan should focus on next 5-10 years, not so far out as 25. People are not pleased with the City Council. We learn about development projects in the *San José Business Times*, as opposed to at community meetings. Difficult to communicate the importance of these issues in a newsletter. Needs to be clear that the City may do things that will impact your neighborhood.
- Important for all stakeholders to put aside the economic problems/challenges of what the City is today and look to the future for how the City will be develop, what it will face in the future.
- City needs to notify residents of projects and plans. I don't use the internet and email. Just a friendly phone call would be great. I think *Inside Santa Clara* is good. Sending info through utility bill is not helpful.

- Concerns about outreach. Having a study session before developments are produced. Outreach for the General Plan and other projects moving forward.
- Explain terms, make planning terminology understandable.
- Steering Committee: should represent the City geographically. Rivermark is a new voice—hope they are able to secure representation.
- Discussed Steering Committee meetings. Looking forward to it. Grand Boulevard project and partnership with Sunnyvale will be critical. Concerned about what San José does to us.
- Public participation process, that works for developers and residents
- For the General Plan, figure out what's sacred and what's not and follow through.

PREPARED BY

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners