The Working Group Meeting #9b packet contains the following items:

1. Working Group #9b Meeting Agenda
2. Staff Memo for Working Group Meeting #9b
3. Draft Plan Alternatives Discussion Materials
4. Working Group Palo Alto Multifamily Housing Tour Guide
Call to Order: 5:30 PM

Welcome and Housekeeping: 5:30 PM - 5:35 PM

Oral Communications: 5:35 PM - 5:45 PM

Discussion Items: 5:45 PM – 8:15 PM*

Planning Alternatives Discussion—Elements of the Plan

Oral Communications: 8:15 – 8:25 PM

Wrap Up & Adjournment: 8:30 PM

Future Meeting/Workshops:

*Listed times are estimates.
The purpose of this meeting is to discuss draft plan alternatives, by focusing on:

1. Reviewing the “homework” that Working Group members performed;
2. Discussing the priorities of Working Group members for the plan alternatives;
3. Reviewing, discussing, and providing feedback on the plan alternatives, with an emphasis on building typologies and their locations; and
4. If time permits, discussing the trade-offs between elements of the draft plan alternatives.

As a reminder, this meeting builds on the draft plan alternatives discussed on December 5, 2019. To find the draft plans presented\(^1\), as well as the minutes\(^2\) and notes summarizing Working Group and public comments\(^3\), please see links in the footnotes. The summarizing notes of Working Group comments will allow participants to hear the feedback provided by others during the break-out groups.

**“Homework”**
On Thursday January 9, 2020, Working Group members were sent an activity to perform in advance of the meeting.

The City, through its consultants Perkins and Will, have listed some examples of Palo Alto’s multifamily housings built over the years. Please try to visit as many of the multifamily residential projects referred in the attachment and included in the interactive map. Physically visiting these sites will help Working Group members define their preferences on the type of density, design, and architecture envisioned for the plan area. This experience will facilitate the discussion during the January 21, 2020 meeting.

---

\(^1\) Meeting Packet: [https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=74258&t=62615.68](https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=74258&t=62615.68);


\(^3\) Notes Summarizing Working Group Comments: [https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=77855.95&BlobID=74865](https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=77855.95&BlobID=74865)
The detailed instructions and project locations are attached. An interactive map of locations is available online at: https://tinyurl.com/qrowg98.

Priorities of Working Group Members for Plan Alternatives

Chair Angela Dellaporta will lead a short exercise allowing Working Group members to indicate their highest priorities and vision for the plan area.

Housing Typologies
The presentation provided by Perkins + Will (attached) presents 5 financially feasible housing types that could be built in Palo Alto. Please carefully review the descriptions of each typology. The typologies are then distributed across the plan area in 3 different plan alternatives. Each plan alternative provides a different number of homes, accommodates a different number of new residents, new workers, and retail opportunities.

The presentation includes an analysis of the amount of retail demand that could be generated in the plan area under various assumptions. This analysis helps the Working Group, the City, and the consultants make informed comments about the amount of retail space that should be required in the plan area. The expert from Strategic Economics will be present to provide more detailed information and to answer questions as they arise.

The presentation reflects the distribution of open space throughout the site, including publicly owned open space, publicly accessible but privately-owned open space, and private open space dedicated for the use of residents of multifamily buildings.

The presentation also revives the community metrics discussed at a prior Working Group meeting. These metrics, including population density, job density, retail, and intersection density, are metrics reflected in some of the favorite places identified by Working Group members. As the NVCAP pursues vibrancy present at dynamic places, understanding how the draft plans compare to these favorite places can provide a means of assessing achievement of the dynamism admired elsewhere.

During the updated presentation on Tuesday January 21, 2020, the consultants will include an additional slide showing how each plan alternative performs on these metrics.

Trade Offs
Both the iteration of the plans presented on December 5 and the draft plans presented on January 21 include a number of trade-offs. For example, as the number of dwelling units increases, the need for parking spaces increases; more parking spaces could increase the number of cars parking and driving on the roadways and thus the potential for increasing traffic arises. Yet, sustaining retail may require more residents and more foot traffic. The Working Group may want to achieve a balance of these elements; and different members may have differing visions and place greater value on some priorities above others.
The Working Group will have an opportunity to discuss some of the tradeoffs, as well as where each member may stand in regard to these trade-offs.

**Additional Information**
The Planning and Development Services Department has prepared and submitted to the Palo Alto City Council an update to the Housing Work Plan. This staff report can be reviewed online. It includes a section regarding the NVCAP process, as this plan relates significantly to addressing the housing needs of the city. The report also addresses a number of additional housing related projects the department is pursuing.


The presentation to City Council on this topic will occur on January 21, 2020; a date and time which regrettably conflicts directly with the Working Group meeting.

**Contact Information**
If you have any questions or comments, please send via email to NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org or contact Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services, by phone at (650) 329-2167.
What We Heard

Circulation

Ground Floor Use & Program

Housing Typologies

District Character & Open Space
What We Heard

For All Alternatives
- Add Cloudera site
- Incorporate Palo Alto multi-family residential examples
- Include memorable open spaces (green roofs, plazas etc)
- Consider senior housing

Leading with Legacy
- Retention of 340 Portage building is not necessarily in opposition to new housing
- Parking requirements limit redevelopment opportunities on 340 Portage site
- Add development sites at Lambert and Park

Adaptive Core
- Add housing on 340 Portage site adjacent to historic monitor roof
- Maintain historic character in building design

Designed Diversity
- Design for a variety of housing types within one parcel
- Increase housing units to accommodate family sizes and incomes
Building Typologies
Building Typologies

- “Building blocks” of housing that could be arranged in a variety of ways throughout the NVCAP Plan Area
- All typologies are considered “feasible” to construct given current Palo Alto development conditions

Townhomes
- 3-stories, attached units
- Typical Density = 33 du/acre
- 1 parking space / unit
- For-sale model
- Individual unit entries with front stoops
- Ground floor parking, accessed via rear alley

+ Neighborhood Serving Commercial
- 5* stories with central open space
- Typical Density = 147 du/acre*
*More units required to make the ground floor commercial viable
Neighborhood-serving commercial uses could include: restaurants, coffee shops, pharmacies, local merchants, or specialty foods

Low-Rise Greenway
- 4-stories, with linear open space
- Typical Density = 107 du/acre
- For-sale or rental models
- 1 parking space / unit
- Individual ground floor unit entries with front stoops
- Underground parking

Mid-Rise Block
- Up to 8 stories, with central open space
- Stepbacks above 6 stories
- Typical Density = 159 du/acre
- Rental model
- 1 parking space / unit
- Individual ground floor unit entries with front stoops
- Underground parking

Low-Rise Block
- 4-stories with central open space
- Typical Density = 124 du/acre
- For-sale or rental models
- 1 parking space / unit
- Individual ground floor unit entries with front stoops
- Underground parking

Mid-Rise Block
- Up to 8 stories, with central open space
- Stepbacks above 6 stories
- Typical Density = 159 du/acre
- Rental model
- 1 parking space / unit
- Individual ground floor unit entries with front stoops
- Underground parking
Building Typologies

Townhomes

Massing and Articulation

1. Varied roof lines and facade planes
   Individually articulated units with a scale and rhythm that evokes the surrounding single-family residential character

2. Individually articulated units with a scale and rhythm that evokes the surrounding single-family residential character

Frontage Zone

3. Unit entries along street

4. Planting strip for screening and urban greening

5. Upper level balconies for increased street life

Usable Open Space

6. Individual front gardens for each unit

7. Shared alley provides open space and more pedestrian porosity through the neighborhood

Emeryville, California

Issaquah, Washington
Building Typologies

Townhomes

Typical Prototype Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Height</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Floor Height</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Size</td>
<td>1,500 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>33 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>18 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1 space/du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minimum Width = 120’*
Building Typologies
Low-Rise Greenway

Massing and Articulation

1. Varied facade planes
   Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

2. Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

Usable Open Space

6. Individual front gardens for each unit

7. Linear greenway offers publicly accessible open space

Frontage Zone

3. Unit entries along street and public open space

4. Individual ground level terraces provide screening and urban greening

5. Upper level balconies for increased street life

Union City, California
Hammarby, Stockholm
Hammarby, Stockholm
Building Typologies

Low-Rise Greenway

Typical Prototype Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Height</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Floor Height</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height</td>
<td>45 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Unit Size*</td>
<td>700 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>107 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>50 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1 space/du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*700 sf = typical 1 bedroom rental unit
Typology assumes a mix of studios, 1- and 2-bedroom units

*Minimum Width = 120’
Building Typologies

Low-Rise Block

Massing and Articulation

1. Varied facade planes
   Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

2. Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

Frontage Zone

3. Unit entries along street and public open space
4. Individual ground level terraces provide screening and urban greening
5. Upper level balconies for increased street life

Usable Open Space

6. Individual front gardens for each unit
7. Internal courtyard offers publicly accessible open space
Building Typologies

Low-Rise Block

![Diagram of Low-Rise Block](image)

**Typical Prototype Metrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Height</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Floor Height</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height</td>
<td>45 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Size*</td>
<td>700 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>124 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>156 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1 space/du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*700 sf = typical 1 bedroom rental unit
Typology assumes a mix of studios, 1- and 2-bedroom units

*Minimum Width = 250’
Building Typologies
Low-Rise Block + Neighborhood
Serving Commercial

Massing and Articulation
1. Varied facade planes
   Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

Usable Open Space
6. Linear spill-out social space activated by ground floor commercial use
7. Individual front gardens for each unit
8. Internal courtyard offers publicly accessible open space

Frontage Zone
3. Unit entries along street and public open space
4. Individual ground level terraces provide screening and urban greening
5. Upper level balconies for increased street life

San Francisco, California
Seattle, WA
Building Typologies

Low-Rise Block + Neighborhood Serving Commercial

Typical Prototype Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1.3 acres (55,000 s.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>35,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Height</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Floor Height</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height</td>
<td>60 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Size*</td>
<td>700 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>147 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>185 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1 space/du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minimum Width = 250’

*700 sf = typical 1 bedroom rental unit
Typology assumes a mix of studios, 1- and 2-bedroom units
Building Typologies

Mid-Rise Block

Massing and Articulation

1. Varied facade planes and stepbacks above 6 stories
2. Change in material, color, and massing to break building’s volume down into a more human scale

Frontage Zone

3. Unit entries along street and public open space
4. Individual ground level terraces provide screening and urban greening
5. Upper level balconies for increased street life

Usable Open Space

6. Individual front gardens for each unit
7. Internal courtyard offers publicly accessible open space
8. Accessible green roofs

Union City, California
Houston, TX
Building Typologies

Mid-Rise Block

Typical Prototype Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1.3 acres (55,000 s.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
<td>35,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Height</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Floor Height</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Height</td>
<td>85 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit Size*</td>
<td>1,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>159 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>201 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1 space/du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1,000 sf average assumes a mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units

*Minimum Width = 250'
Building Typology Trade-offs

- All typologies work for a variety of architectural styles
- All typologies can incorporate stoops, balconies, varied rooflines, and setbacks that contribute to the public realm

**Townhomes**
- 3-story, attached units
- Does not support ground floor retail
- For-sale product ($1.4 Million/ 2-3 bdr)
- Individual front gardens; shared open space between rows that increases site circulation

**Low-Rise Block**
- 4-stories
- For sale and rental product ($1.15 Million; $3,850/month)
- Individual front gardens; publicly accessible internal courtyard
- Examples found throughout Palo Alto

**Low-Rise Greenway**
- 4-stories
- For sale and rental product ($1.15 Million; $4,290/month)
- Individual front gardens; publicly accessible internal courtyard
- By reducing average unit size, increases open space opportunity
- Can act as a buffer between single-family homes and taller typologies and can fit on smaller parcels (less than one acre)

**Mid-Rise Block**
- Up to 8 stories
- Does not support ground floor retail
- Rental product ($4,675/month)
- Publicly accessible internal courtyard
- Denser typology allows for larger average unit sizes and a greater mix of unit types

**Low-Rise Greenway + Neighborhood Serving Commercial**
- 5 stories
- Supports retail on the ground floor
- Rental product ($3,850/month)
- Spill-out space; publicly accessible internal courtyard
- Best suited to sites along main streets (Portage) or Plan Area edges to ensure visibility
Vibrancy & Community Benefits
## Retail Demand Analysis

### Draft Retail Demand Analysis

NVCP
12/27/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident-Serving Categories of Retail</th>
<th>Spending per Palo Alto Household</th>
<th>Estimated Sales per SF</th>
<th>Demand Estimate (SF of Retail per Household)</th>
<th>Share of Total Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groceries (food at home)</td>
<td>$11,321</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants (food away from home)</td>
<td>$8,420</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugstores (nonprescription drugs, prescription drugs, housekeeping supplies, and personal care)</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>$1,414</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys, Games, Crafts and Hobbies</td>
<td>$273</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Products and Services (shoe repair, laundry/dry cleaning, etc.)</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Retail Goods and Services Expenditures, ESRI, 2018; Strategic Economics, 2019.

Supportable retail at NVCP, assuming some expenditures and demand are captured at Cal Avenue and other retail shopping districts

- NVCP captures 25% of total sales
  - 15 square feet per household
  - 25%

- NVCP captures 50% of total sales
  - 30 square feet per household
  - 50%

- NVCP captures 75% of total sales
  - 45 square feet per household
  - 75%
Open Space

Goals and Assumptions
- Comprehensive Plan Open Space goals (2 acres / 1000 people)
- Parkland Dedication Ordinance requires 366 sq. ft/ unit
- Creek Easement is 1.4 acres and is not included in open space calculation

NVCAP Categories

CENTRALIZED
GREENWAYS
COURTYARDS/ GREEN ROOFS
Open Space

Alternative 1: Leading with Legacy

- 6.7 acres
- *2.9 acres of centralized open space only

Alternative 2: Adaptive Core

- 12.3 acres
- *3.5 acres of centralized open space only

Alternative 3: Designed Diversity

- 12.8 acres
- *3.3 acres of centralized open space only

Centralized Greenways

Greenways

Courtyards/Green Roofs
### Complete Community Metrics

**Population Density**
What population density will support a vibrant and diverse community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Density (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>6.5 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>7.9 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>9.1 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>9.1 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>11.8 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>13.2 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>32.9 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jobs**
What is the right mix of jobs to support a thriving, diverse, and equitable economy for NVCP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Jobs (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>2.3 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>5.5 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>11.4 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>16.4 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>17.5 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>21.6 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>36.8 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail & Services**
What services and retail might be needed to support NVCP’s residents, commuters, employees, and visitors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Retail (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Density**

- A_NVCP/Cal Ave: 35
- B_The Yards: 36
- C_Emeryville: 30
- D_University Ave: 30
- E_Oak Park: 30
- F_Pearl District: 40
- G_Central Sq: 60

**Population Density / sq.mi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Density / sq.mi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>6.5 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>7.9 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>9.9 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>9.1 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>11.8 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>13.2 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>32.9 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jobs / sq.mi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Jobs / sq.mi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>2.3 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>5.5 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>11.4 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>16.4 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>17.5 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>21.6 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>36.8 K/sq.mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail & Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Retail &amp; Services / sq.mi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_NVCP/Cal Ave</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_The Yards</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_Emeryville</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_University Ave</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Oak Park</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_Pearl District</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Central Sq</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Density / sq.mi**

- A_NVCP/Cal Ave: 35
- B_The Yards: 36
- C_Emeryville: 30
- D_University Ave: 30
- E_Oak Park: 30
- F_Pearl District: 40
- G_Central Sq: 60
Complete Community Metrics

- Vibrant neighborhoods require a density of residents, jobs, retail and services, and street intersections.
- Using local precedents and favorite places cited by the Working Group as a “vibrancy” baseline, we see how the NVCAP Plan Area compares and where there might be opportunities for improvement.
Comparison Summary

Plan Area Existing Conditions

- 128 Housing Units
- 560k gsf Class A Office
- 150k gsf Retail
- 2,441 Parking Spaces

For All Alternatives

- Additional proposed office square footage subsidizes community benefits (housing, retail, open space, and community space)
- Existing retail is not right-sized for the population, so alternatives show a net reduction in retail
- New jobs calculation is based on proposed office and retail program
- Location of housing typologies considers both proximity to transit and sensitive surrounding uses
- Alternatives' open space calculation includes all categories of open space (centralized, greenways, courtyards/green roofs)
- All new construction is self-parked
- District parking garage required to replace existing surface parking at 340 Portage and accommodate increased commercial and retail program
Alternative 1A: Leading with Legacy

Existing Fry’s building and Cloudera site to remain
- Fry’s building remains and current use is redistributed to 30k retail and 210k office (formerly 77k retail, 163k office)
- 100 new housing units on 340 Portage Parcel
- 6K former office building on Ash given to community use

Proposed Program
Final Buildout

- **Housing**
  - 952 units
  - 1,080 total

- **Office**
  - 47k sf
  - 546K total

- **Retail***
  - 23k sf
  - 83k total**

- **Open Space***
  - 6.7 acres

* Assuming 25% capture
** Total retail reflects a 70k reduction from the existing condition
*** Does not include Boulware Park or 3350 Birch site; includes all other categories of open space

- Height concentrated along ECR
- 2.4 acres of consolidated open space at 340 Portage parcel
- Net office for Plan Area reduced by 32k sf
- New jobs to housing ratio for final buildout = 2.2
  (Existing NVCAP Plan Area = 9.5)
Alternative 1a: Leading with Legacy

Existing Fry’s building and Cloudera site to remain: Trade-Offs

- Retaining the Fry’s building limits overall housing yield
- Increasing office sf at 340 Portage and permitting housing to develop at a higher density (100du/acre) incentivizes developer to provide open space and community use at Ash office building

Proposed Program Details

- **Single-Family Units**
  - (111k gross sf)
  - **74 townhomes**
- **Multi-Family Units**
  - (614k gross sf)
  - **878 apartments**
- **Residents***
  - **2.3k people**
- **Jobs**
  - **234**
- **Required Parking**
  - **1.4k spaces**
- **Open Space/1k Residents**
  - **6.1 acres**
  - (City Target = 2 acres)
- **Community Space**
  - **6,100 sf**

* Assumes average household size of 2.4
**Assumes ratio of 1 job per 250 sf of office space and 1 job per 500 sf of retail space; jobs figure reflects only the proposed program, not final buildout.
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Alternative 1b: Leading with Legacy

**Proposed Program**
*Final Buildout*

- **Housing**
  - 1,581 units
  - 1,709 total

- **Office**
  - 107K sf
  - 606K total

- **Retail***
  - 23k sf
  - 83k total**

- **Open Space***
  - 10.1 acres

* Assuming 25% capture
** Total retail reflects a 70k reduction from the existing condition
*** Does not include Boulware Park or 3350 Birch site; includes all other categories of open space

**Existing Fry’s building and Cloudera site to remain**
- Fry’s building remains and current use is redistributed to 30k retail and 210k office (formerly 77k retail, 163k office)
- 100 new housing units on 340 Portage Parcel
- 6K former office building on Ash given to community use
- Height concentrated along ECR
- 2.4 acres of consolidated open space at 340 Portage parcel

**Proposed Program**
*Final Buildout*

- Net office for Plan Area reduced by 32k sf
- 628 new multi-family units on Cloudera parcel
- One Type III building on Cloudera near Caltrain
- 60k new office at Cloudera
- Half acre of centralized open space at Cloudera
- New jobs to housing ratio for final buildout = 1.5 (Existing NVCAP Plan Area = 9.5)
Alternative 1b: Leading with Legacy

Existing Fry’s building to remain and Cloudera site to develop: Trade-offs
- Additional office sf at Cloudera is maintained within existing footprint and provides developer with incentivize to develop housing and provide open space
- Permitting housing to develop at a higher density (100 du/acre) encourages redevelopment
- Type III building increases the potential for a greater mix of unit types

Proposed Program Details

- Single-Family Units
  - (111k gross sf)
  - 74 townhomes
- Multi-Family Units
  - (1 million gross sf)
  - 1,507 apartments
- Residents*
  - 3.8k people
- Jobs**
  - 474
- Required Parking
  - 2.8k spaces
- Open Space/1k Residents
  - 5.6 acres
  - (City Target = 2 acres)
- Community Space
  - 6,100 sf

* Assumes average household size of 2.4
** Assumes ratio of 1 job per 250 sf of office space and 1 job per 500 sf of retail space; jobs figure reflects only the proposed program, not final buildout.
Alternative 2: Adaptive Core

Proposed Program
Final Buildout

- **Housing**: 1,674 units, 1,802 total
- **Office**: 167k sf, 666K total
- **Retail***: 32k sf, 90k total
- **Open Space****: 12.3 acres

* Assuming 25% capture
** Does not include Boulware Park or 3350 Birch site; includes all other categories of open space

Modify Fry's building and Cloudera site to develop
- Fry's building is partially removed
- 60k new office at 340 Portage parcel
- Monitor roof section is maintained and becomes an experiential retail center
- 584 new multi-family units on Cloudera parcel
- 60k new office at Cloudera
- Half acre of consolidated open space at Cloudera
- 2.4 acres of consolidated open space at 340 Portage parcel
- New jobs to housing ratio for final buildout = 1.6
  (Existing NVCAP Plan Area = 9.5)
Modify Fry's building and Cloudera site to develop: Trade-offs

- Additional office sf at Cloudera is maintained within existing footprint and provides developer with incentivize to develop housing and provide open space.

- Permitting housing to develop at a higher density (100 du/acre) encourages redevelopment.

- Additional office sf at 340 Portage incentivizes developer to take down part of Fry's building and adaptively reuse the monitor roof section of the building as an experiential retail center.

- Partial removal of Fry's increases site access and circulation.

Proposed Program Details

- Single-Family Units (286k gross sf)
  - 191 townhomes

- Multi-Family Units (1.1 million gross sf)
  - 1,483 apartments

- Residents*
  - 4k people

- Jobs**
  - 733

- Required Parking
  - 4k spaces

- Open Space/1k Residents
  - 6.8 acres
  - (City Target = 2 acres)

- Community Space
  - 6,100 sf

* Assumes average household size of 2.4.

** Assumes ratio of 1 job per 250 sf of office space and 1 job per 500 sf of retail space; jobs figure reflects only the proposed program, not final buildout.
**Alternative 3: Designed Diversity**

**Proposed Program**

**Final Buildout**

- **Housing**
  - 2,646 units
  - 2,765 total
- **Office**
  - 208k sf
  - 706K total
- **Retail***
  - 85k sf
  - 126k total
- **Open Space**
  - 12.8 acres

---

**Maximize Housing for Inclusivity and Diversity**

- Fry’s building is taken down to increase housing and site porosity
- 567 new housing units on 340 Portage Parcel
- 100k sf increase in office at 340 Portage
- Office building on Ash renovated to provide 12k community use
- Existing ECR ground floor retail maintained with housing above

- 628 new multi-family units on Cloudera parcel
- One Type III building on Cloudera near Caltrain
- 60k new office at Cloudera
- Half acre of consolidated open space at Cloudera
- 2.4 acres of consolidated open space at 340 Portage parcel
- New jobs to housing ratio for final buildout = 1.1
  (Existing NVCAP Plan Area = 9.5)
Maximize Housing for Inclusivity and Diversity: Trade-offs

- Additional office sf at Cloudera is maintained within existing footprint
- Increasing office at Cloudera and 340 Portage incentivizes developer to create housing and provide open space
- Permitting housing to develop at a higher density (100 du/acre) encourages redevelopment
- Type III building increases the potential for a greater mix of unit types

Proposed Program Details

- **Single-Family Units**
  - (371k gross sf)
  - 247 townhomes

- **Multi-Family Units**
  - (1.7 million gross sf)
  - 2,399 apartments

- **Residents**
  - 6.3k people

- **Jobs**
  - 1k

- **Required Parking**
  - 5.7k spaces

- **Open Space/1k Residents**
  - 4.6 acres
    - (City Target = 2 acres)

- **Community Space**
  - 12,100 sf

* Assumes average household size of 2.4
**Assumes ratio of 1 job per 250 sf of office space and 1 job per 500 sf of retail space; jobs figure reflects only the proposed program, not final buildout.
Multi-Family Housing in Palo Alto

In preparation for our January 21, 2020 please visit as many of the multi-family residential projects in Palo Alto listed below and located on this interactive map:

https://tinyurl.com/qrowg98

These projects exhibit multi-family character and may serve as a precedent for the NVCAP Plan Area. Take note of your preferences and be prepared to discuss during the January 21, 2020 Working Group Meeting.

Please consider the following during your evaluation of the projects:

1. Note your preferences about the building (ground floor, architectural style, materials, height, windows and balconies, etc.)
2. Note your preferences about the street and landscape surrounding the building (sidewalk width, planting, outdoor furniture, paving, etc.)
3. Select 3 architectural and/or landscape features that make this project appropriate for the NVCAP Plan Area.
4. Select 3 architectural and/or landscape features that could be improved upon.
5. Note how the project is situated in the surrounding neighborhood. Consider height, materials, and relationship between buildings.
Multi-Family Housing in Palo Alto

In preparation for our January 21, 2020 please visit as many of the multi-family residential projects in Palo Alto listed below and located on this interactive map: [https://tinyurl.com/qrowg98](https://tinyurl.com/qrowg98).

These projects exhibit multi-family character and may serve as a precedent for the NVCAP Plan Area. Take note of your preferences and be prepared to discuss during the January 21, 2020 Working Group Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILT PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Hamilton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Byron Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **707 Bryant Street** | **The Weatherly** |
| 19 Units | 130 Units |
| 28 du/acre | 37 du/acre |
| 3 Stories | 4 Stories |
| Condo | Condo |
| Constructed 1977 | Constructed 2004 |

| **Woodmark** | **Oak Court** |
| 325 Channing Ave | 845 Ramona Street |
| 36 Units | 53 Units |
| 31 du/acre | 43 du/acre |
| 4 Stories | 3 Stories |
| Condo | Rental |
| Constructed 2005 | Constructed 2005 |

| **801 Alma Street** | **800 High Street** |
| 50 Units | 60 Units |
| 89 du/acre | 62 du/acre |
| 4 Stories | 4 Stories |
| Condo | Constructed 1999 |
| Constructed 1999 | Constructed 2006 |

| **California Park** | **Mayfield Place** |
| 2301 Park Blvd. | 2500 El Camino |
| 45 Units | Real |
| 26 du/acre | 70 Units |
| 3 Stories | 40 du/acre |
| Constructed 1989 | 4 Stories |
| | Constructed 2017 |
PROPOSED OR APPROVED PROJECTS

1. 901 High Street
   - 11 Units
   - 34 du/acre
   - 3 Stories
   - Proposed 2016
2. 2585 El Camino Real
   - 13 Units
   - 14 du/acre
   - 3 Stories
   - Under Construction
3. 2755 El Camino Real
   - 57 Units
   - 127 du/acre
   - 4 Stories
   - Rental
   - Approved 2018
4. 441 Page Mill Road
   - 16 Units
   - 26 du/acre
   - 3 Stories
   - Under Construction
3225 El Camino Real
8 Units
11 du/acre
4 Stories
Approved 2019

Wilton Court
3705-3709 El Camino Real
59 Units
128 du/acre
4 Stories
Approved 2019

3877 El Camino Real
17 Units
14 du/acre
3 Stories
Approved 2017

788 San Antonio Road
102 Units
104 du/Acre
4 Stories
Proposed 2019

PROJECT LOCATIONS
Interactive map available here: https://tinyurl.com/qrowg98