Presentations from the March 11, 2019 City Council Meeting
Review of the NCS Survey Data Relevant to Area 4 (Ventura Neighborhood)

Ventura Town Hall

March 11, 2019
# Retirement and Quality of Life

## Table 7: Question 1 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to live</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your neighborhood as a place to live</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to raise children</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to work</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to visit</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to retire</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of life in Palo Alto</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Question 1 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to live</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your neighborhood as a place to live</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to raise children</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to work</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to visit</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto as a place to retire</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of life in Palo Alto</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Walking and Connectivity

Table 27: Question 5 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major streets</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of public parking</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel by car in Palo Alto</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel by public transportation in Palo Alto</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel by bicycle in Palo Alto</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of walking in Palo Alto</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of paths and walking trails</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of housing options</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable quality housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable quality mental health care</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ease of travel by bicycle in Palo Alto**: 72%
- **Ease of walking in Palo Alto**: 74%
- **Availability of paths and walking trails**: 65%
- **Variety of housing options**: 11%
- **Availability of affordable quality housing**: 5%
- **Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)**: 69%
- **Recreational opportunities**: 69%
- **Availability of affordable quality mental health care**: 35%

City of Palo Alto
Quality of New Development

Table 32: Question 6 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>North/South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of new development in Palo Alto</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in social events and activities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in community matters</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn about City services through social media websites such as Twitter and Facebook</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shopping opportunities: 77%

Cost of living in Palo Alto: 8%

Vibrant downtown/commercial areas: 71%

Overall quality of new development in Palo Alto: 38%
Connectivity and Neighborliness

Table 40: Question 8 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used Palo Alto recreation centers or their services</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a neighborhood park or City park</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Palo Alto public libraries or their services</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Palo Alto</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a City-sponsored event</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used bus, rail or other public transportation instead of driving</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled with other adults or children instead of driving alone</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked or biked instead of driving</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Palo Alto</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a club</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done a favor for a neighbor</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the City’s website to conduct business or pay bills</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the Utilities website to conduct business or pay bills</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rating of the City

### Table 54: Question 11 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Government</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 54: Question 11 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Government</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Palo Alto Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The value of services for the taxes paid to Palo Alto</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall direction that Palo Alto is taking</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job Palo Alto government does at welcoming citizen involvement</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall confidence in Palo Alto government</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally acting in the best interest of the community</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being honest</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating all residents fairly</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Connectivity

### Table 76: Question 17 - Geographic Subgroup Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent rating &quot;very&quot; or &quot;somewhat&quot; convenient</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
<th>Area 5</th>
<th>Area 6</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free shuttle</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uber/Lyft or similar rideshare service</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooling</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PALO ALTO
North Ventura
COORDINATED AREA PLAN

JOINT SESSION: CITY COUNCIL & WORKING GROUP
March 11, 2019
Comprehensive Plan Policy 1.7

• Use coordinated area plan to guide development

Comprehensive Plan (Program L-4.10.1)

• Prepare a coordinated area plan for the North Ventura area and surrounding California Avenue area.
On November 6, 2017 the City Council adopted a Resolution expressing local support and commitment

On March 5, 2018 the City Council approved:
• Goals and Objectives, Schedule milestones and Plan boundaries
• and authorized formation of a working group (Appointed in April 2018)

On October 17, 2018, the first Working Group meeting was held. There have been three meetings so far.

On February 5, 2019, the first Community Workshop was held.
Procedures provided in Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Section 19.10.

PAMC Section 19.10.010(a) states that the intent is to create enhanced opportunities for building a sense of community through public involvement, with meaningful opportunities to help shape the physical components of their neighborhoods and community.
General Process

• City Council initiates the CAP process and establishes goals and objectives

• Working Group appointed to advise staff, the Planning & Transportation Commission and City Council in preparation of the CAP.

• Process includes regular public meetings, including a community meeting.

• Planning & Transportation Commission hearing on draft CAP and environmental review

• Final City Council hearing
CAP Components
1. Distribution, location and extent of land uses
2. Distribution, location, and extent and intensity of public infrastructure
3. Program of implementation measures (development regulations, public works projects, and financing).
4. Design and development standards
5. Determination of economic and fiscal feasibility
6. Associated environmental review
NVCAp Consultant Team Members

Perkins+Will - Lead

ARUP - Transportation
Strategic Economics – Economic Analysis
Plan to Place - Outreach
BKF Engineers - Infrastructure
David Powers - Environmental
NVCAP Presentation Overview

1. Schedule and Work to Date
2. Project Background and Context
3. Working Group Meetings
4. Community Workshop
5. Key Themes
6. Next Steps
We Are Here
March 11

2018

EXISTING CONDITIONS

WG #1 Orientation & Process
WG #2 Existing Conditions

2019

DEVELOP PLAN OPTIONS

WG #3 Visioning
WG #5 Plan Alternatives Development
WG #6 Plan Alternatives Refinement

Community Meeting #1 Visioning
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Existing Parking

- 2400 off-street parking spaces (20.6 acres of surface parking)
- At peak hours off-street parking is utilized at 41% capacity and off-street parking is at 63% capacity (85% is considered optimal)
Existing Parkland

- City policy states that parks should be within a half mile walk of all housing, with a quarter mile walk preferred.

- Currently, Boulware Park, Sarah Wallis Park and Stanford Palo-Alto Playing Fields are within a half mile distance.

- Community members have indicated that more park space is needed.

* Source: Palo Alto Parks, Trails, Natural Open Space, and Recreation Master Plan. Distance measured as a radius from the park center.
Pedestrian Connectivity

- Page Mill is a barrier to California Avenue and Caltrain
- Limited north-south connectivity through site
- Heavy volume at El Camino Real and Page Mill presents discontinuity for walking and cycling connections to the site

Legend

Walk
Time
- 5 min
- 10 min
- 15 min

Regional Public Transit
- Caltrain
- Caltrain Station & Existing Crossing
- Bus Stops
- Site Boundary

Origin Point of walking distances
Key Intersection Volume - Biking

- High volumes along Park Blvd., making use of the designated Bike Boulevard
Local Transit and Bikeways

• Transit concentrated along El Camino and California Ave
• Transit stops generally well served by bike lanes/routes to offer first and last mile connections
Key Intersection Volume - Motorized Vehicles

- Heavy volume between El Camino Real and Page Mill Road
- Intersection of El Camino Real and Page Mill Road extremely busy
- Evidence of cut-through traffic from El Camino Real to Oregon Expressway, via Olive Avenue and Ash Street

Counts collected during AM Peak Hour (8:00-9:00am)
Recent Development Activity

1. 195 Page Mill Road (Completed)
2. 3045 Park Boulevard
3. 3265 El Camino Real
4. 3225 El Camino Real
5. 3001 El Camino Real
6. 470 Olive Avenue
7. 441 Page Mill Road
Parcel Ownership

- Color Fill Indicates Contiguous or Common Ownership
- Recently Developed or Entitled Parcels
- Fry's Parcel
- California Avenue Train Station
- Underpass Grading
- Site Boundary
By the end of 2018 Palo Alto was about 22 percent of the way toward meeting its 2015 to 2023 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) overall.

- Palo Alto is on track to meet its allocation in the Above Moderate income category.
- Progress toward meeting RHNA goals in the lower income categories lags behind.

Source: City of Palo Alto Housing Element, 2015 to 2023; Annual Housing Element Progress Report, 2017.
Potential Uses for NVCAP

- Current residential zoning for the Fry’s site is RM-30
  - 30 dwelling units per acre
  - This can be equivalent to 35 feet of height
  - Potential for density in RM-30 to increase with Housing Work Plan

- The areas of the site that could most likely to be redeveloped into housing are currently occupied by commercial uses
Our economic consultant estimates that new 100% affordable projects require a density of 120 units per acre (about 5 stories) to be viable in Palo Alto.

Affordable housing is very difficult to fund.

In January 2019, the City Council approved the first 100% affordable housing project in seven years.

The City requires that at least 15% of all units built for sale are offered as affordable units.
• Palo Alto is at the top of the market for office and R&D space
• Office space is very valuable in this area; the annual cap (equal to ~50,000 sf) has increased the premium office space demands
• Currently the NVCAP site is occupied by mostly small to medium businesses
• $8-9 per square foot for office in the plan area; $5-7 per square foot for R&D in plan area (rental housing pays about $5 per square foot)
Fry’s lease is up at the end of 2019
The nature of retail is changing
Our economic consultant says that big box retailers are unlikely to locate in North Ventura, making an uncertain future for the Fry’s space
Additional retail in the plan area will rely on more people living and working in this area for support
Potential Uses for NVCAP

- In the pipeline: new public safety building near California Avenue, park improvements consistent with the Parks Master plan, and the Cubberly Center Master Plan
- Improvements to Matadero Creek
- Are there opportunities for community-supporting uses, such as artist studios or maker spaces?
- What are other creative uses that would enhance the quality of life here?
WHAT IS A COORDINATED AREA PLAN (CAP)?
The process for implementing a coordinated area plan is set forth in Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Title 19, Chapter 19.10. Coordinated Area Plans (CAPs) are similar to “precise plans” or “specific plans” (terminology used in other jurisdictions and State law) and provide both policy and regulations for development within a specific area. Consistent with PAMC requirements, the key deliverables expected as part of the CAP process include the following components:

- Plan Objectives and Plan Goals
- Site Context and Policies
- Development Standards and Criteria
- Architectural and Site Design Objectives and Standards
- Transportation Connections and Improvements
- Capital Improvements and Implementation Measures

A financial feasibility analysis of site alternatives will be an important part of the planning process, as will an economic study, urban design studies, and community engagement strategy.

EXISTING CAP
The South of Forest Area (SOF) CAP is the City’s only existing CAP. This plan was completed in two parts. The first phase was completed in March 2000 and addressed the redevelopment potential of approximately 50 acres adjacent to downtown Palo Alto. Redevelopment opportunities in this area were triggered in large part by the relocation of the Palo Alto Medical Foundation from the SOF to El Camino Real.

The second phase of the SOF CAP focused on nine blocks (approximately 19 acres) within the area that were experiencing significant redevelopment in the early 2000s. Adopted in 2003, the SOF CAP took three years to complete and the outcome is viewed favorably.

NORTH VENTURA CAP
In 2008, the City designated a Priority Development Area (PDA) as part of a program established by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to prioritize areas for transportation funding throughout the region. The Palo Alto PDA contains approximately 95 acres and is located roughly between El Camino Real andAlma Street, and College Avenue and Lambert Avenue.

The California Avenue/North Ventura area was selected as a PDA based on excellent access to transit, the proximity of the existing California Avenue Business District, and the availability of underutilized parcels of land.

Palo Alto’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan, adopted in November 2017, calls for the preparation of a CAP for the North Ventura area within this PDA. This area includes the large site currently occupied by Fry’s Electronics and a portion of the Matadero Creek. Together with the surrounding parcels, this site holds great potential for a walkable neighborhood with multi-family housing, ground-floor retail, a public park, creek improvements, and an interconnected street grid. It should guide the development of the California Avenue area as a well-designed mixed-use district with diverse land uses and a network of pedestrian-oriented streets.

FUNDING
The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has awarded Priority Development Area (PDA) grant funding in the amount of $638,000 to the City of Palo Alto for preparation of a CAP for the northern part of the Ventura neighborhood. In compliance with the grant requirements, the 11.47% local funding match requirement will be met with $112,000 in private funds provided by the Sobrato Organization. The Sobrato Organization has also agreed to provide an additional $138,000 to fund the environmental review process.
FEBRUARY 5, 2019
EXISTING CONDITIONS & VISIONING

- Most attendees were over age 50
- Most attendees were Ventura residents
- Questions and anonymous polling
- Big-group discussion with volunteers explaining selections
- Focus-group discussion
- Plan sketching and visioning
Community Workshop

* Note: All percentages are based on the opinions of workshop attendees; they do not reflect the opinion of the Ventura Community as a whole.

**Question 1**

It is the City’s goal for the plan area to be a “walkable neighborhood with multi-family housing, ground floor retail, a public park, creek improvements and an interconnected street grid.” Do you agree with this goal?

*please select one*

A. Strongly Agree
B. Somewhat Agree
C. Disagree
D. I’m not sure

**FOCUS-GROUP DISCUSSION REVEALED**

- Ambivalence about “an interconnected street grid”
- Opposition to displacing single family residents
- Strong opposition to increasing vehicular access through the site

48%  41%  4%  7%
Community Workshop

Question 2

With the understanding that housing is a City priority for the project area, in what type of housing are you most interested? For your reference, $125,400 is the average median income for a family of 4 in Santa Clara County.

Please select one

A. Affordable housing
   (80% or less than average county income – equal to $94,450)

B. Workforce Housing
   (120% of average county income – equal to $150,250)

C. Market-Rate Housing
   (not income-restricted)

D. Other

Focus-group discussion revealed

- Support a mix of all three types of housing
**Question 3**

Which one of the following statements best describes your feelings about increasing residential height limits in the plan area?  
*please select one*

A. **I support** increasing height limits if it would encourage multifamily housing. This site is an opportunity for Palo Alto to add much-needed housing.

B. **I support** increasing height limits, as housing is important to me, but I am worried about the character of buildings over 3 stories in height.

C. **I do NOT support** increasing height limits above 3 stories, even if it means that the existing commercial properties may not redevelop into housing.

D. I’m not sure / Other

---

**FOCUS-GROUP DISCUSSION REVEALED**

Support for more than 50-foot building heights with the following criteria:

- Inclusion of affordable housing.
- High-quality architecture.
- Set back upper floors, especially when adjacent to existing single-family homes and to reduce a “canyon” effect.
- Allow for generous public and active outdoor spaces at the street.
Community Workshop

**Question 4**

What kinds of amenities, if any, would you like to see in the plan area, given that more funding and/or development may be needed in order to get the amenity?

*Please select up to 2, or you may choose the “do not support” option:*

A. A neighborhood park
B. A community center
C. Improved bike facilities
D. The revitalization of Matadero Creek
E. Some other amenity
F. I do not support more development or additional funding to get more amenities in the plan area

**FOCUS-GROUP DISCUSSION REVEALED**

Other amenities:
- Places for teens to gather.
- Creek-side walkway/bike path.
- Creek improvement could be the start of a larger effort to improve entire creek.
- Park that treats stormwater.
**Question 5**

More people living and working in the plan area might increase the need for additional neighborhood uses, such as retail and services. What types of retail and services, if any, would you like to see?

*Please select up to 2, or you may choose the “do not support” option:*

A. Neighborhood-serving retail
B. Restaurants and Cafes
C. Boutique Hotel (a small, stylish hotel)
D. Artist and Maker Spaces (or other community services where people gather to create, invent, and learn)
E. Something else
F. None of these/I do not want any additional retail and services and in the plan area.

**FOCUS-GROUP DISCUSSION REVEALED**

- Childcare
- Pub/Wine bar
- Services for the homeless
Question 6
What type of open space, if any, would you like to see in the plan area?

*Please select one answer or you may choose the “none of these” option.*

A. A recreational park with a playground and picnic tables
B. A linear park along the creek with a walking path
C. A town square with a café and outdoor performance space
D. Smaller, pocket parks scattered throughout, with benches and planting
E. Something else
F. None of these, I do not want any additional open space in the plan area.

Focus-group discussion revealed:
Other amenities:
• Support for community gardens
Question 7

Which of the following connectivity improvements, if any, should be a priority in the plan area?

*Please select one of the following:*

A. More streets through the plan area that will create more connections for pedestrians, bikes, and cars

B. More paths through the plan area that will create more connections for pedestrians, and bikes, but not cars

C. Something else

D. None of these; I do not want any additional connections through the plan area

**FOCUS-GROUP DISCUSSION REVEALED**

- Overwhelming support for more connectivity for bikes and pedestrians, but not for cars.
- Concerns about cut-through traffic and increased vehicle trips on ECR and PM.
Key Themes

1. Create a mix of housing with an emphasis on inclusivity and affordability.

2. Explore additional height as a way to add housing, and increase the offer of affordable housing.

3. An increase in housing must also plan for better walking/biking connections and mitigate car traffic.

4. Build on the existing, inclusive neighborhood character with high-quality design and creative neighborhood amenities.

5. Look for opportunities to enhance Matadero Creek with an open space alongside.
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*Intent is to hold periodic check-ins with City Council. There will be up to two more sessions scheduled before the Plan is adopted.
Questions?

Project Website
www.paloaltonvcap.org