PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

April 29, 2020

Meeting Summary
### PTC Comments on February 26th Presented Draft Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Name</th>
<th>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALCHECK, Michael</td>
<td>--Proposals should address housing shortage. --Density is required. --Address SB35 requirements in the proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**
1. WG goals and need should reflect overall City’s need and long-term goals.
2. WG discussions should inform the decision makers
3. Work on changing existing City guidelines to address state regulations and legislative changes.
4. Option with greatest housing density preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Name</th>
<th>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HECHTMAN, Bart</td>
<td>--More dense housing required because of the plan area location and connectivity. --Density &amp; height should be phased over time</td>
<td>--Parking is required now, but should be tethered back in future</td>
<td>--Have a centrally located park as an open space in the middle of the plan area so it’s closer to all residents. --Can reduce some creek side open space to balance this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**
1. Did not have the opportunity to review WG proposed Alts.
2. Proposals should return to WG members for further deliberations
3. Alt 1 –nonstarter Alt 2 & 3 –phased out development plans over next 20-30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Name</th>
<th>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAUING, Ed</td>
<td>--Housing is a priority. --No displacement of existing residents</td>
<td>--No self-parking</td>
<td>--Realistic open spaces must be included, not only patios and balconies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**
1. Full mitigation to all impacts should be studied, no studies has been done to study outcomes.
2. Very aspirational proposals.
3. Conduct more detailed community surveys to gather more public opinion.
4. Eminent Domain should not be used as a tool.
5. Plan should be done right amidst all future uncertainties.
6. Proposals should return to WG members.
### Additional Comments:
1. Plan should have built in flexibility so it can adapt to future needs, especially to cope with economic recession and future uncertainties.
2. Retail and office use in the Plan should be flexible enough to adapt successfully to future changes.
3. Equitable distribution of affordable housing and density throughout the city, should not be unfairly concentrated in Ventura neighborhood only.
4. One with more housing density preferred

### SUMMA, Doria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Name</th>
<th>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMA, Doria</td>
<td>--Improvements to Park Blvd. for bike safety</td>
<td>--Realistic proposals for open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEMPLETON, Carolyn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Name</th>
<th>Housing (Density &amp; Height)</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLETON, Carolyn</td>
<td>--Prefers the comparison of densities between the alts. --Prefers the ground floor retail use locations. --Concerned about infeasibility of rental units and inadequacy of BMR units</td>
<td>--Improvement of ECR and Page Mill Rd intersection required to accommodate higher density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:
1. PTC should see it again, when the plan is more developed
2. Prefers the phasing out approach in the Alts
3. Worried to see the increasing burden of density planned for this neighborhood and not the rest of the city
4. The NVCAP survey should have been more representative of the area residents and should be more well-rounded.
5. Alt 1 not aspirational enough. Alt2 includes creative zoning solutions and maintains the feel of the neighborhood. Alt 3 should attempt to retain the 340 Portage Building’s historic elements, but requires to be renovated for modern workspace
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Becky Sanders     | P+W Alts does not reflect community wishes.  
WG not empowered to take community feedback, give WG chance to finish the process  
Proposals are not alts but gradations of same plans, this doesn’t honor the resident’s wish  
Doesn’t belong in Ventura, site specific plan, existing conditions not considered  
Fry’s site to revert back to housing  
Eminent Domain not to be used, use moratorium for additional development, use zoning to get rid of commercial zo. More housing additional to community retail. Office not mentioned |
| Ken Joye          | Full mitigation of impacts of proposed developments  
What other neighborhoods absorbing the development impacts?  
Alt 3 covers entire study area, others don’t  
Don’t just consider uses that only pencil out for commercial developers  
Do not allow non-confirming use to exist. Enforce RM zone, no more office space |
| Angela Della porta| Additional Alts proposed by WG (5) guided by the vision of neighborhood. Those alts address concerns of the neighborhood  
Concerned about new constructions before new plan decides the use. The neighborhood and city need to decide what goes in there. |
| Winter D          | No parking study, not based on existing zoning, no parkland dedication fees collected, proposals are not reality based, biased poorly designed survey, Alts 3 when developed will be 18 times denser than anything else developed in PA, consider overflow traffic.  
Alt 1—no park, Alt 2 limited open space. Under the park land dedication—the required parkland and how underserved than hood is. Economic racism. |
| Kelsey Banes      | Great location for the plan to create great neighborhood. Housing greatest need add it over course of time. Prioritize affordable housing and that requires higher density.  
Do district parking rather than underground parking.  
Survey result prioritize housing, midrise building supported.  
Reach out to renters more. |
| Kirsten Flynn     | Not an ideal process, wants a more robust process  
Permit freezing for new projects in the plan area  
Include affordable housing, even though density is not decided  
Prioritize Park Blvd. bike safety specially in traffic conflict area of Page Mill and Park. |
| **L. David Barron** | Housing shortage, people pushed out. Dense housing around transit required. Encourage the most housing density plan (even more) for city to consider. More housing required to meet the next RHNA cycle goals. Significant under zoning in SOFA area. Parcels still not yet fully developed. If zoning is not enough for developers to build it will not be built. The vision will not be realized |
| **M. Mollineaux** | Essential to look at conflict of interest, look at renter’s interest. Preserving low density zoning is not enough. City wide comprehensive Parking Allocation study is required. Approve the high density but do the traffic study. |