

From: [Pham, Kieulan](mailto:Pham,Kieulan)
To: [Pham, Kieulan](mailto:Pham,Kieulan)
Subject: [TF meeting no.1] FW: GP Task Force Follow Up Comments
Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2019 10:18:57 AM

From: Shiloh Ballard <shiloh@bikesiliconvalley.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2019 4:30 PM
To: Marcus, Adam <adam.marcus@sanjoseca.gov>; Brilliot, Michael <Michael.Brilliot@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: GP Task Force Follow Up Comments

[External Email]

Hi Good SJGP Staff!

I wanted to follow up on my comments yesterday since I'm not sure I was totally clear.

On the topic of how we deal with the horizons, I had a couple thoughts that overlap but also stand on their own.

1) In response to the suggestion that horizons (phasing development) be abolished, I stated that we put the horizons in place for a reason. We should understand those reasons and whether/how they relate to our current context.

That said, in general it makes sense to me for a city to send signals to the market on where it wishes to see development occur first. Those reasons could have to do with where infrastructure improvements are set to occur and/or where existing transportation infrastructure stands to withstand additional growth at present.

2) I was heartened to hear staff advocate for the removal of a UV, Foxdale, as an anti-displacement strategy. And it raises a broader issue.

The UV program essentially sends a signal to the development world where we want growth to go. That's good.

What's not so good is it means that we are pro development or by some people's definitions, pro displacement of the existing uses.

If many of the existing uses are tired residential buildings, ones that are ripe of redevelopment, then we are essentially promoting displacement of naturally occurring affordable housing. We are, through a UV strategy promoting the displacement of poor people.

While the hope is that production will alleviate housing shortages (and I believe it will) the reality is that our most vulnerable will, best case, suffer temporarily, and worst case, not be able to withstand the financial costs associated with being displaced.

That's a long way of saying, we've looked at phasing development from a "smart growth" lens but I don't think we've every looked at phasing through an equity lens - perhaps we should as we're deciding how to treat horizons. Let's be thoughtful about phasing development with an eye towards equity.

To state things in a different way, our strategy is focused on urban villages. In UVs, there is a strong likelihood that the areas ripe for redevelopment are also the areas where our most financially vulnerable live. So, as we evaluate how we're doing, especially when it comes to our affordable housing goals, we need very very strong strategies for making sure that as we grow, we don't force out those who are most important in our community, poor people. Production will help, but what happens to families that are displaced? That goes for businesses as well. So, if we're thinking about dropping phasing through horizons, then perhaps we hold off on the UVs with the most vulnerable until we figure out how best to make sure we don't force them out of our community for good. Halting development until we figure that out isn't my preferred scenario but development without displacement should be a goal we strive for.

I've written these comments up hastily without fully thinking them through so feel free to let me know if I've characterized things inaccurately. I look forward to more fun conversations with you all to make the city even better!

--

Shiloh Ballard
Executive Director and President
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition

<http://www.bikesiliconvalley.org/>

96 N. Third Street, #375, San Jose

Follow us on Twitter @bikeSV @ShilohBallard

[If you like bikes, become a supporter of SVBC!](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.