

North 1st Street Local Transit Village Plan

Third Workshop Summaries

Dates: Monday, August 16, 2021 and Saturday, August 21, 2021

Advertised times: 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Actual times: 6:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m. and 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Location: Held virtually on Zoom



*Planning, Building and
Code Enforcement*

Workshop Overview

On Monday, August 16th, 2021, approximately 65 participants (40 community members, 19 staff members, 4 consultants, and 2 interpreters) participated in the first virtual community meeting for the Third Workshop series. The third workshop series is the last workshop series for the Village effort. Participants included neighborhood residents, property owners, and interested parties.

A second community meeting was held on Saturday, August 21, 2021. Approximately 31 participants (20 community members, 9 staff members, and 2 interpreters) participated in the virtual community meeting. Participants included neighborhood residents, property owners, and interested parties.

The purpose of the third workshop series was to present the draft village concepts, such as land use, maximum heights, urban design, parks and open space, and circulation and streetscape, and obtain feedback. These concepts were discussed at both community meetings.

The workshop began with a presentation by staff which provided an overview of the village concept, the first and second workshops and the results of those workshops, what a village plan does and does not do, the village concepts, and rezonings under Senate Bill 1333.

After the presentation, participants and staff members were invited to participate in a small group discussion where the draft Village concepts were presented with discussion questions. The purpose of the small group discussions was to obtain feedback on the draft concepts. The following feedback was provided for each topic area:

Village boundary:

- Question: why doesn't the village boundary extend south to Julian Street?
 - Answer: The current village boundary extends to Julian Street but the proposed village boundary extends mid-block between Empire Street and Hensley Street. Properties were removed from the village boundary if they are historically sensitive or were not going to be redeveloped.
- Why is Lot E not part of the village boundary?
 - Answer: Because the City wants to use Lot E for city uses
- Why is the County properties excluded from the village boundary?
 - Answer: The County wants to build on their properties to further their mission statement, so there is no need to have land use rules over these properties as the County would not be required to obtain city permits for projects that further their mission statement.

- Surprised to see so many properties removed from the Village boundary, especially towards downtown. This creates a strange 4-block disconnect, and there seems to be many sites that could help connect the residential/commercial intent of the area
- Question: Why are historic properties being excluded from the boundary?
- Answer: We want to keep our historic properties and placing them in the village would risk them being redeveloped
- Question: Is the historic house at 560 North 1st Street part of the village boundary?
 - Answer: No, this property has been removed from the village boundary.
- Question: The original village boundary included more single-family residential on Fox Avenue, Ryland Park, etc.; why was this changed?
 - Answer: These properties were removed if they were historically sensitive, and/or if they were single-family dwellings (generally low likelihood of redevelopment).

Land use:

- Concerns related to max building height at 200 feet for the block between Hedding and Mission Streets and whether the middle school would be shaded/in the shadow. County building is very high at 160 feet. Concerns that the height is too tall near the middle school.
- Proposed height between Hedding and Mission Streets on the west side of North 1st Street seems intrusive to the neighborhood. Wish to have height restrictions here, even at 150 feet. The height applies to the majority of the city block.
- The 4 to 5 houses on Mission and 2nd Street would be dwarfed, height should be reevaluated.
- The 200 max height from Hedding and Mission is not appropriate; unacceptable.
- Height belongs on the west side of North 1st Street. County parking lot can be developed with more height.
- The max height of 135 feet between Hedding and Burton Ave will seem like a wall of buildings.
- Density would naturally occur on the west side of North 1st Street.
- Appreciation that the taller heights are on the west side of North 1st Street.
- Concerns related to shadows, but also has desire for high density developments.
- Consider Residential Neighborhood land use designation on Hedding Street and Mission Street for lower density.
- Land use diagram reflects what neighbors stated at previous workshop—taller buildings concentrated at Taylor/Mission area.
- Question related to the density for the light yellow color (Residential Neighborhood land use designation).
- If there isn't an opportunity for residential on the east side of North 1st St between Jackson Street and Mission Street, it will stay like it is for a long time.

- Building footprint needs more land. Can developers acquire more land for projects to get built?
 - Answer: It is possible through land acquisition and willingness of property owners to sell.
- This area is a food desert so having a grocery store or a weekly farmers market would be great. Small market tried to locate on 1st Street but was not successful likely due to lack of density. An example that could be considered is Jackson Square in New Orleans.
- Why aren't there more sites for residential or mixed-use and so many sites for Neighborhood/Community Commercial?
 - Answer: the market study and lot size, along with other components do not lend itself for more growth. Also, do not want to place residential next to freeways. Furthermore, through past community workshops, the community stated that the intensity should be placed in the central part of the village, therefore, the land use map is reflective of that. Cannot realistically get larger development along the northern and southern NCC sites because of small lot sizes. Central sites have larger parcels. Parcel aggregation potential can feed into feasibility of redevelopment.
- Question: How will the potential bicycle and pedestrian paseo be built? Will there a fee be established?
 - Answer: No fee established. This will need to be studied more. The potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo is in the village plan to identify it as a priority so the city could do a nexus study or pay for it as part of a city Capital Improvement Project (CIP) project.
- Intensity of development seems to be focused on the center of the village. The big 'elephant in the room' is that the County controls a huge swathe of land in this area—is there any understanding of what they are doing to plan their properties?
 - Answer: They do have a Master Plan for all their land in the area along the northern portion of the village. The City has been coordinating with the County to understand their intent and interest.
- Would be nice to see a map showing North 1st Street and the County's master plan.
- Would be nice to have a grocery store nearby so that there are options to not drive.
- Question: what is the delineation between transit residential and urban residential?
 - Answer: Transit Residential is higher density at 30 to 250 dwelling units per acre and a 1.0 to 12.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR).
- Question: Can we clarify what is the south-mixed use character area? Could the first floor for buildings in this area be commercial?
 - Answer: Existing buildings are more residential in nature, so more mixed-use and smaller scale than anything north of this subarea. Yes, there is a red line on the land use map which indicates that ground floor commercial is required. We want to make sure to specifically ask for ground floor commercial.

- Question: Are there any guidelines, controls, etc. regarding the type of commercial uses? For example—can we prevent a strip mall type of environment or alcohol licenses?
 - Answer: The type of commercial uses are controlled by the Zoning Ordinance and not the village plan. The village plan and urban design guidelines would not support a strip mall type of development. Alcohol licenses are issued by the Alcoholic Beverage Control (State of California agency) though the city retains local control of where licenses can be obtained.
- Question: is there any consideration in this village plan to take over a property to establish a parking garage or similar?
 - Answer: Generally, these village plans are not supportive of auto-uses, but we don't see people building standalone parking garages. We may see this as part of a private development. The redevelopment agency tried to build parking in other parts of the city, but they were never able to generate enough money for it to make sense. But private development generally provides parking as part of their development.
- Question: What is the impact to the overall traffic to within the plan area as well as surrounding areas? Are we going to be seeing more impact to traffic and street parking?
 - Answer: While there will be overall more traffic in the bay area, the goals of the General Plan is to provide opportunities and to develop communities or villages that allow people other opportunities to get around so that it's not as reliant on the car. The environment is more of a mixed-use urban fabric that is bike, pedestrian, and transit-oriented to provide alternatives to people driving a car. We are looking at the city's parking standards and eliminating parking minimums and letting the market decide what is the 'right size' amount of parking is needed. This would be in companion with Transportation Demand Management measures which means the development would need to do a selection of items like providing bike share, car share, clipper cards, other things that allow people to get around using other modes.
- Most of the properties along North 1st Street are of historic nature, and over the years, there are a few commercial properties that have replaced these structures. Do not like the commercial tenants as they alter the historic nature and are actively using barbed wire.
- Concerns related to the Kelsey project. Living on Fox Avenue, learning that it was 115 units with only 18 parking spots, was a scary precedent knowing that the public transit is not very great/utilized. What is the timeline for the UV, and within that timeline is there intentions to do any improvements to public transit (light rail, buses, etc.)? I tried living 6 months without a car and it did not work. There will be more FedEx, UPS, and Amazon trucks delivering packages and coming through these streets.

- Answer: This is a plan and not a project and is anticipated to go to the City Council early 2022. In terms of VTA, there are longer term plans of how they can speed up light rail. DOT is working with plans to filter transit into this area over the next 5-20 years. We don't have control over VTA, but we have certain levers to ask VTA to concentrate on certain areas to drive certain improvements to certain areas –N. 1st street being one of them. Fixing light rail on 1st street is one of the top priorities of the Plan Bay Area. Also Department of Transportation (DOT) is looking more at 'urban freight' such as Amazon, UPS, etc. as part of the mobility work.
- Question: In the presentation you used words like 'most likely' and 'I don't anticipate'. Doesn't this plan allow you to be more specific? I.e. limit things to specific heights, uses, etc.
 - Answer: SJ is a 'bedroom community' - only large city where this is true. We have a lot more trouble getting people to build commercial instead of housing; therefore, we are developing areas where people could do commercial uses if they wanted to, while also allowing them to do housing which is what they would prefer. That's why residential uses often allow commercial, but not vice versa. While the specific types of commercial are not discussed in this village plan, this village plan states where the general commercial and residential uses can be placed. The zoning code further details what kind of commercial can be located where (i.e. retail, dentist office, acupuncture, etc.).
- Concern related to signing of a lease at 840 North 1st Street, what are the impacts.
 - Answer: What is existing may remain, the village plan applies when properties are being redeveloped.
- Question: Why was the bank (515 N. 1st Street) removed from the village boundary?
 - Answer: We found that the bank is a great example of New Formalism architecture and is a candidate city landmark and we don't want the historic properties to be redeveloped, and therefore, it was removed.
- Question: Are the larger sidewalks a part of the increased density that's intended?
 - Answer: We want to have enough area for people to walk side-by-side and talk to each other, but also about a public area that does not feel so cramped with the buildings, and makes it harder to grow large-canopy trees, locate benches, etc.
- Concern related to tent-based community occupying the widened sidewalks. As an example, the segment of North 5th Street (north of City Hall) is occupied by houseless people and isn't being utilized as intended.

Maximum height, urban design and placemaking:

- Regarding the gateway elements:
 - Use of landscaping and signs are nice but needs to be reviewed

- No neon signs. Signs that are eco-friendly to animals to sleep at night, too close to river for light
- Use landscaping identifiable to the area
- Gateway locations are good
- Consider soft landscape lighting like the Highline in New York
- Connect the village through landscaping and lighting
- Great existing architecture along North 1st Street and at 3rd Street and Jackson Street
- Dislike building architecture for new buildings near Milpitas and Berryessa BART stations
- Spanish style, Vendome hotel, and craftsman are unique architectural styles to this area
- Heights should be gradual. Increase heights mean less sun in the afternoon and can shade the middle school, less dust from the highway and less sun onto those houses.
- Height on the east side of North 1st Street is acceptable and can block the view of the jail.
- Desire to gain an understanding of what realistic heights will be for redeveloped buildings, factoring in stepbacks, setbacks, etc.
- Concerns related to maximum heights, shade, and loss of sunlight
- Desire to see public art (e.g. sculptures) in the public open spaces
- There will be concerns related to height from Hyde Park neighborhood
- How would you feel if someone proposed a 20-story building next to your house?
- Appreciate the varied architecture in village
- Important to keep the historic structures
- Spanish colonial revival architectural style in northern section of the village fits well
- Taller building heights are a concern when located adjacent to single-family homes
- Proposed maximum height at Younger Ave and Hedding Street at 135 feet is too tall. Blocks the sun. Can the maximum height be a maximum of 50 feet instead?
- There is a decrease in height proposed in the village plan compared to what is allowed today.
- Would be helpful to understand the transition from North 1st Street and North 2nd Street (cross section).
- Curious as to why adjacent isolated building across from I-880 is only 50 feet. Should be taller than 50 feet (at least 120 feet). Should be taller near the freeway.
 - Answer: The proposed height diagrams were developed with the land use designation in mind. The site has a land use designation of Neighborhood/Community Commercial, which is not an intense commercial designation and therefore, the proposed height is reflective of that.
- What is the likely building height given the parameters?
 - Answer: it is difficult to answer as this depends on other factors, such as parking, public/private open spaces, etc.
- Good that gateway location is at North 1st Street and Hedding Street because of proximity to light rail.

- Question related to why the publicly-accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces are in the middle of the village?
 - Answer: the middle of the village is planned to be the “heart” of the village where the most activity will occur.
- Gateway element should be added at Jackson and North 1st Street to channel people into Japantown—should be culturally distinctive
- Victorian style architecture should be added since many buildings along North 1st Street are Victorian style
- Each block has 1 or 2 buildings that are fourplexes that were built in the early 1900s. That would be nice to show if they can keep the style if they want to build low-rise density example—good way to show high density.
- The proposed height of 200 feet adjacent to the public school. Was the school contacted for any input or are schools exempt from feedback?
 - Answer: The City didn’t meet with the school, however, they were sent notices of the community workshops and can provide feedback if so desired
- Concerns regarding proposed heights adjacent to single-family houses
- Why aren’t there any gateway elements at North 1st Street and Empire Street? Coming from downtown, seems like this intersection is a natural gateway into the village
- Question: Can shadow studies be conducted?
 - Only if shadow studies can be requested of private development. Shadows are not considered an impact unless it is over a public park. Stepbacks and setbacks will assist with providing more sunlight.
- High-rise projects do not happen often—seems unlikely that 200 feet height maximum will be built out with consistency
- What are the reasons for lowering some of the required heights?
 - Answer: where you have an established neighborhood adjacent to the property, those heights were lowered. Additionally, many lots are not large enough to support the heights that were proposed. The land use designation and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is not as intense.
- If I lived on 2nd Street, I would not like a 135-foot building staring down at me. From Hedding Street to almost Burton Avenue, you can see that height permitted. While you say it probably will not happen, it could happen. It would be better to have heights adjacent to San Francisco neighborhoods be much less. If opportunity housing is coming, then the reduced height would be very important to reduce massing in the surrounding area.
- High heights next to train station is a really good idea—happy to see that.
- Gateways are good opportunities for public displays of art, and developers would want to use these or support these efforts for their own developments. Perhaps they could be kept consistent in a given area to tie them together?

- Referencing architectural styles in new development would be very good, but accountability will be low.
- The buildings should be oriented towards people with children, in terms of size, play areas, etc. There are many existing families in this area.
- Craftsman architecture in the area is beautiful.
- The potential park in the northern portion of the village is a great location because it is right off of 1st Street so there will be a lot of people walking around so they will want to rest and hang out.
- Question: The southern mixed-use character area could be 200-feet tall?
 - Answer: the proposed heights max out at 120-feet.
- Question: What is the driver to change heights?
 - Answer: because of the boundary and land use changes, we need to also consider the height diagram as well to align the land use and height.
- Question: Why is there tall heights in the southern area where there is a lot of existing residential? Why would you have more height here looming over these residents?
 - Answer: The height is reflective of the land use designation. In the southern area of the village, the proposed land use designations are Transit Residential and Urban Residential, which are more dense residential land use designations. Because of the density, the height needs to be aligned with and reflective of the density.
- Question: Are there massing examples for the entire corridor?
 - Answer: No. The massing examples are only provided as examples and may not necessarily be reflective of any potential new development.
- Concerns related to 120-foot height across from the Vendome neighborhood. 120-foot heights would block the sunlight and be very imposing for the area.
- Question: how hard is it to get the height changed from what is being proposed? How hard is it to change this now?
 - Answer: The proposed heights are still a work in progress so there is an opportunity. However, there are state laws that we need to consider. For example, if we decrease the density and height here, we would need to place it somewhere else. Staff will consider all community feedback.
 - It is unlikely that the height of the building on North 1st Street across from the Vendome neighborhood will be at the proposed maximum 120 feet in height, as there are requirements that the portion of the building fronting a street would either need to the maximum width of the public right-of-way, or the height of the property across the street. This is covered in the Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines document, which is a City Council approved document and can be found here:
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/69148/637520903552430000>

- Concern from residents in Vendome is the reverberation from airport/aircraft sounds against taller buildings and affecting the noise in the neighborhood and within existing residences
- Question: What is the difference between primary and secondary gateways?
 - Answer: Primary gateways are intended to be more grand/visually eye catching than secondary gateways.
- The corner of North 1st Street and Jackson Street would be a good place for a gateway element due to the proximity to Japantown commercial corridor. It is a natural entry point to Japantown, seems like an intuitive marker to let people know there is a great historical commercial district a few steps away.
- Question: What are the architectural style of the homes on Fox Avenue?
 - Answer: there are many architectural styles on Fox Avenue but seems to be a mix of Victorian and Craftsman style homes.
- The temple in Japantown should be represented as an architectural style and at the entry point into the area. Temple should be represented since it is the heart of Japantown.
- Question: Do any state laws for housing waive the requirements for setbacks/setbacks?
 - Answer: There are some state laws that do—the most obvious of which is Density Bonus Law.
- Question: If the village plan has certain maximum heights that aren't anticipated to be built to—why not make the heights lower?
 - Answer: The market could change in the future. But staff will be taking another look into the heights.
- Perhaps can place a gateway element on Burton Ave instead, as the proposed gateway element at 880 and North 1st St would be blocked due to the elevated freeway.
- Hensley has various things that are aesthetically cohesive, to let you know you're entering the historic district. These would be good examples to look at when planning gateways for this UV, and the gateways could even be integrated with those in Hensley to let you know you're going from one place to the next.
- Regarding gateways: Two vibrant neighborhoods here – Vendome neighborhood and the Hensley district. They are separated by the railroad - if there's a new designated area then you could connect 3 designated areas (Hensley, Vendome, 1st Street UV) together
- Ayer would be a good name for the district/area for gateways.
- There should be something about Vendome – e.g., “You are now leaving Hensley to enter the Vendome district.” Related to gateways
- Why aren't there any gateways at the southern end? Would make sense to have some gateway element there to encompass the whole plan area.

- The Santana Row population is a lot different than the population in this corridor so the planning should be different. The POPOs may have houseless that want to utilize this space; how has that been considered?
 - Answer: the POPOs would be located on private property so the property owner would have to say about who could be removed.
- Concern related to houseless people using POPOs as a base to commit crimes, similar to what is happening in the neighborhood now
- Appreciate all the thought that went into considering the existing architecture.

Parks and open space:

- Concerns related to placing a floating park symbol in the plan that may not happen.
- Incorporating a public park may not be feasible here because of high price of land
- If a park is not feasible, desire to have a publicly-accessible but privately maintained and owned open spaces in northern section of Village.
- Taylor Street has direct access across 87 to Columbus Park (to be redeveloped with new softball fields) and Guadalupe River, Heritage Rose Garden, Rotary Garden
- Cannery Park on Mission and 10th Street is great. Good work between 2 developers. Park is sophisticated and helps build community.
- Question regarding the draw to Miller and Asbury potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo. What is bringing people here?
- Publicly accessible but privately-maintained and owned open spaces and the potential bicycle and pedestrian paseo needs more landscaping, too much concrete. Potential bicycle and pedestrian paseo looks like a back alley way and does not make people want to sit down. Does not have the feeling of good streetscape. Too utilitarian looking. Uses benches, lampposts as artwork, bring artwork here. Desire to have things children can interact with.
- Good example of parks is the Salesforce Park in San Francisco, or Highline in New York. Good parks have small, but simple water features where adults and children can interact with it. Use water, wood, and stone elements so everything is usable and interchanged. Another good example is the Denver South Plat/Rhino District where there are residential townhomes and apartments, breweries, and bike shops. Little pieces of artwork. Having a brewery in this area will bring people here.
- Support for the potential bicycle and pedestrian paseo. Likes the idea of a plaza for people to be outside.
- Explore the possibility of creating a bicycle/pedestrian bridge from Mission Street to Guadalupe River Park.
- Concerns related to homeless individuals in the paseo after dark.
- Difficult to connect Taylor Street to Guadalupe park for pedestrians.
- Potential paseo would be great; should include opportunity to outdoor dine.
- Mom and pop restaurants would be great along the potential paseo.

- Question regarding where the publicly-accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces are located.
- Amenities for open spaces should include shade—trees/landscaping.
- If murals and trees could be incorporated onto/nearby Hedding Street, it would make a better connection to Guadalupe River Park.
- Including open areas, small pavilions for bands or entertainment in potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo would help attract people, but a menagerie of commercial businesses is key.
- Free events, music, or exercise (yoga/tai chi) would be great for activation of the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo. Needs to have a draw to the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo.
- Question: What is the likelihood that the City buys property for a park? What is the likelihood of a park being developed?
- Include more publicly-accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces on the east side of North 1st Street especially with the unlikelihood of a public park being developed. If there is not going to be a public park, then more publicly accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces please.
- Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo sounds fine in concept but need a significant commercial element in and around it to create a draw. People do not like going to a place where nothing is happening.
- Need kid friendly programming, such as sidewalk chalk to draw, chess/checkers and other outdoor games.
- Question: What is a POPO?
 - Privately-owned public open spaces (POPOs). These spaces are on private property and are privately owned and maintained. These spaces may be eligible for private recreation credit which is managed through the department of Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services.
- Concerns related to emergency interim housing site and the interface with the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo and residential uses. Supportive of emergency interim housing on Lot E but potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo would lead directly onto Lot E. Concerns related to safety.
- Concerns related to activation of potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo. How do you manufacture the draw to use the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo when there are park spaces. Downtown is already over retail so what can be successful here? How do you manufacture here on this scale to generate enough foot traffic you need for full activation so the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo will not be abandoned?
- Water fountains are difficult to maintain (such as the one in Cesar Chavez) and with the drought, they are not a good use. Amenities for kids get used, small pocket playgrounds. Spaces where people can eat and watch their kids.
- Consider a dog park to attract people to the area.

- Attract a morning, lunch, and evening crowd that will walk around to get out of the office or the house. Include seating for lunch in potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo.
- There is already a big lunch crowd due to nearby county buildings, and the new residents in the new residential buildings will need an escape. Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo is not big enough for entertainment but can be used to escape cars.
- Include a park on the two finger parcels facing North 2nd Street (between Younger Ave and Hedding, and Younger Ave and Burton Ave) or a community garden.
- There are family rich neighborhoods here.
- Need solution to the homeless situation. Vendome area has homeless issue. Columbus park has become a campground and should not be allowed. Homeless situation must be rectified, and it is a burden for neighborhoods.
- Question: Who polices the publicly accessible but privately-owned and maintained open spaces?
 - Answer: the property owner will be responsible for maintenance and policing. There are some resources through the Housing Department: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments/housing/ending-homelessness/homeless-encampments>
- How are the publicly accessible but privately-owned and maintained open spaces maintained?
 - Answer: Code enforcement division. The city is party to the public access easement.
- Consider placing a publicly accessible but privately owned and maintained open space on the corner of Asbury and Miller Street, however there is an existing building with only a 5-foot setback (south corner).
- Appreciates the idea of publicly accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces because they give people in the neighborhood a spot to walk to and sit by a near café or greenspace. It is a nice relief from the urban hardness of the city and if they're not too excessive they can be very nice.
- How will the publicly accessible but privately maintained and owned open space kept from being turned into tent city?
 - Answer: Through coordination with property owners, code enforcement, and the housing department
- Likes the publicly accessible but privately owned and maintained open spaces at Market Street and St. John Street. They just opened a seafood chowder house. It was very nice.
- The corner of North 1st Street and Taylor Street would be a great place for ground-floor commercial, as well as a publicly accessible but privately owned and maintained open space.
- In places like Europe, parks will have vendors and other commercial/food uses that can support family trips, meetups, etc.

- The success of this whole village is based on Guadalupe River Park being cleaned up and used as a resource for the community.
- No shade for pedestrians at any corners—especially as things get hotter. This is really important for making it nicer to walk.
- Unaware that the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo is in this village effort. Very excited. Having a pedestrian oriented commercial space and having something to walk to would be awesome. Plus plus over here.
- The concept of the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo is great, however, there are concerns related to transients and homeless people
- The type of development envisioned near the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo would place more eyes on the street and would push these people away.
- Question: Is there any connection of existing trails to this area?
 - Answer: There are not any currently proposed.
- Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo should be lined with family friendly restaurants. Wants family friendly activation like Santana Row
- Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo would be a popular lunch spot. Would like to see it more than a daytime lunch spot and would like to have something people can gather in the evening.
- Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo is a lovely concept however, there are concerns related to unhoused people incorporating into these spaces. I think of the Market Street closure in San Francisco where they had major issues with homeless encampments. The city ended up spending a lot of money to build it, then more money to tear it out.
- Concerned about tent-dwellers occupying the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo, given the existing population there.

Transportation:

- Concerns about cycling on Taylor Street because of Highway 87 ramps, prefer to cycle on Hedding Street instead.
- Bikelink lockers need to be installed at destinations so cyclists do not have to worry about stolen bike parts.
- Potential transportation improvement of removing right turn lane at Taylor to North San Pedro is supported by certain residents in Vendome neighborhood. Vendome neighborhood has limited access during commute hours.
- People are reluctant to use bike lanes because of speeders.
 - City response: The City has adopted Vision Zero. Speeding is the #1 factor for traffic deaths. Need more infrastructure to narrow the roadways to reduce speed.
- Question related to whether cyclists need to yield or full stop at red light/stop sign.
- Question related to the proposed infrastructure on Hawthorne Way. Hawthorne Way already has a park strip/island and is a narrow street already.

- City response: Hawthorne Way is proposed as a bike boulevard, per the Bike Plan 2025. Bike boulevards are supposed to be calm and relaxing with future traffic calming measures like speed bumps.
- Concerns related to increased traffic.
- Transportation improvements are needed at I-880 and North 1st Street.
- Additional bike lanes are needed in and out of the area.
- Comment related to enough landing space for flying cars.
- Hedding Street should be enhanced so homeless can relocate to 10th street and use a nice bike lane to get there.
- There is cut through traffic through Hyde Park on 2nd Street and Burton Avenue, between I-880 ramp and 4th Street, and at the corner of North 1st Street and Hedding. People drive on North 2nd Street and likely Younger Avenue to get to the freeway.
- Concerns about speeding to and from the freeway.
- Concerns related to additional traffic, additional cars, and parking.
- Cars park on North 1st Street which is a concern.
- Question: What can be done about traffic calming around Hyde Park?
 - Answer from Department of Transportation: the thresholds were not met to study for cut-through traffic for Hyde Park.
- Question: Is the Civic Center redevelopment moving forward?
 - More information regarding the County's civic center can be found at the following links: <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/faf/capital-projects/cc/pages/ccmp.aspx> and <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/faf/capital-projects/Pages/fmr-city-hall.aspx>
- Concerns related to where driveways for properties front North 1st Street are going to be placed as cars are not encouraged to take North 1st Street because of the transit corridor.
- Burton Ave is being used for cut through traffic and vehicles speed through because Hedding Street is a busy street. Unsafe to cross at intersections because of people speeding through the roundabouts and corners.
- Younger Avenue is also used as a cut through—drivers hit trees and parked cars.
- Question related to widening of sidewalks along North 1st Street, would the sidewalk encroach into private property or the street?
 - Answer: The widened sidewalks will encroach into private property when property redevelops.
- Would be nice for LED light conversions for street lights along North 1st Street—many street lights are either burnt out or are high pressure sodium (yellow color). It would be more comfortable for people to walk with LED street lights.
- 20-foot sidewalks along North 1st Street is excessive. North 1st Street already has a nice scale, and most sidewalks in downtown are not 20-feet so may not be necessary and will reduce development capacity. 15 feet sidewalks are adequate on North 1st Street

(inclusive of 5-foot tree well and 10-foot sidewalk). Properties on the west side are too shallow for redevelopment, so a 20-foot sidewalk and stepdown will significantly diminish the development potential. No one would redevelop the properties on the east side of North 1st Street. The sidewalk width from Taylor Street to Julian Street has a fairly distinct pattern of a 15 to 20-foot setbacks of front landscaping. Although this pattern is not urban, it is the historical pattern of the neighborhood. 5 to 10-foot setback from sidewalk for amenities/usable space not necessarily on a sidewalk. A mandatory narrower sidewalk and a design standards that buildings should be setback for landscape/softening would be more consistent with the historical patterns than 20-foot concrete.

- Where are the bike routes and how do the bike routes connect to the bike network?
 - Answer: The Better Bike Plan 2025 illustrates the bike routes and can be found here: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/walking-and-biking/better-bike-plan-2025>. There is an interactive map available here: <https://csj.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f5f8d005271c4300ba3f99cb90abb246>
- Question: How do we widen the sidewalks on North 1st Street?
 - Answer: it is taken from private property and does not narrow the existing street.
- Question: Are there any plans to widen Taylor Street? Maybe East Taylor Street? Lots of traffic jams
 - Answer: There are no current plans to widen this segment of Taylor Street
- Taylor and North 1st Street needs to be looked at carefully. There is currently an unprotected left turn from Taylor Street onto North 1st Street and it is impossible to turn left. Very traffic heavy intersection. North 1st Street goes from 2 lanes down to 1 lane.
- Light rail alters the traffic signals because light rail takes priority. Prefers to take North San Pedro to avoid it
- Hedding and North 1st Street intersection with light rail blocks traffic for a few cycles, which is frustrating. Forces people to use 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Street to get around it. Speeding issues on North 2nd Street.
- Mission Street gets impacted with traffic because of Hedding/North 1st Street, and Taylor/North 1st Street intersections
- Burton Ave is impacted with traffic and roundabouts have not helped to slow down traffic
- Appreciate the bike lanes on Hedding but narrowed the vehicular travel lanes, which angers people
- Crossing Hedding Street to get to the public school on North 2nd Street is dangerous because drivers are upset having to wait. Even with flashing lights and crosswalks,

drivers do not slow down because they are trying to race to get through the light at Hedding and North 1st Street

- On San Pedro Street in the Vendome neighborhood, drivers are running through the stop signs and the medians do not help. It was the wrong approach.
- Open spaces are desired to get out of houses, but there are issues with traffic and speeding. It's unsafe. Department of Transportation or City Council should be talking to police department about the issues. Department of Transportation should be talking to Police Department about speeding on North San Pedro.
- New traffic signal at 4th Street and Hedding works really well.
- Department of Transportation has a safe routes to school program which can potentially work here. Safe routes to school program looks to teach kids to cross safely and what improvements keep them safe. Department of Transportation can reach out to the schools about joining the program.
- Potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo, will it prohibit automobiles?
 - Answer: It could but details are still being worked out
- Love the idea of something more pedestrian-oriented and the only access is from Miller so it would be complicated for that building.
- Overall, like the notion of pedestrian orientation and landscaping in that area. Do not like the idea of locking a property in, but otherwise the idea is liked.
- Mission Street and North 1st Street should have protected left turns.
- Bicyclists should not be on the sidewalks.
- Regarding the future action item of removing the north-bound and south-bound left turns from North 1st Street to Hedding Street, this will change 2nd and 3rd Streets from a quiet street to busy streets. This future action item will push traffic in an uncomfortable way for those neighborhoods. Traffic will be diverted to those areas in order to get onto I-880. Traffic patterns and spillover efforts of these future action items will really need to be studied.
- Will the 20-foot sidewalks on North 1st Street be implemented all at once or only on a project-by-project basis? May have alternating sidewalk depths for several decades.
 - Answer: It would be as properties redevelop. These sidewalks will still help serve the purpose of increasing the pedestrian area.
- Do we want to keep all street trees? Some trees hang into the light rail lines. Trimming seems to harm the health of the trees; some of the trees are not going to be sustainable in the long-term.
 - Answer: Yes to keeping street trees. Will need to make sure the right species are selected that can be compatible with light rail.
- VTA Civic Center station can only be approached from Mission, not Hedding. This is very inconvenient for VTA riders—you have to overshoot the station to get to the platform. This is especially inconvenient for people who are in a wheelchair or otherwise struggle with moving, but challenging for others as well.

- Bikelanes share the same space as buses and this is scary.
- When a light rail train is approaching a station, can we put a period where all crosswalks are on so that all people can catch the train without having to run across the street?
- Guadalupe park trail could be a bicyclist paradise if it was better developed and cleaned up to encourage cyclists to really use the park as much as possible. Cyclists would be way more comfortable if they could use this—this would be amazing. Hedding would be much nicer if it could be cleaned up.
- Improving connections would be really useful in the north-south direction but not very useful in the east-west direction
- It is not possible to obtain the density envisioned in this village plan without providing parking
- It does seem like most developers are calculating more parking than required because they need the spaces for the economics to be feasible
- Does not seem feasible for people to really walk or otherwise to reduce their need to park their cars. There is no parking nearby—where will people park if there is no parking?
- Concerned that we will be building too much parking in San Jose, and greenhouse gases will continue to burn up our planet and create more congestion. We need to utilize other ways to get around the city. I trust that a non-profit developer has an understanding of the clients they serve and their needs for parking. They also provide transit passes to offset the need for driving. Increased density is important to help finance things like grocery stores.
- Because of the light rail on North 1st Street, there are segments of North 1st Street that are a single vehicle lane, so you are just kind of trapped on North 1st Street due to the traffic. Traffic through this area can be really problematic because of the single lane and not being able to turn left.
- Comment regarding future action item for the City to explore disallowing left-turn lanes onto Hedding Street from North 1st Street: This area is such a major section, so the concern is that people would break the law and turn left anyways because it is such a high flow corridor and intersection
- People generally follow the traffic rules, except stop signs. People run stop signs.
- Information from the Department of Transportation: the restricted turn and other diverters to help with cut through traffic. Cut through traffic is something we have more and more of as the city grows. We cannot widen the roads to accommodate them all so we have different methods. This is just one of the tools in the toolbox that DOT is exploring. Acknowledge that the City does not have enough enforcement for traffic law breaking so that's why doing something physically on the ground like diverters.
- Question: Is there any plans on connecting the potential pedestrian and bicycle paseo to the Guadalupe River and some of the other parks across the way because it would be a good transition and improve the use of the site.

- Answer: there is the Better Bike Plan 2025 that the City Council approved that looks at connector streets. The paths that are off the public streets and on park land are within Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services department jurisdiction. Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) also does county-wide bicycle improvements as well. VTA is currently proposing a “bike super highway”.
- Note: More information on VTA’s bike super highway can be found here: <https://www.vta.org/projects/central-bikeway-study>
- What is the reason behind the future action item of removing the right-turn lane from Taylor to San Pedro?
 - Answer: This is a planning recommendation. DOT would need to do an analysis of the right-turn restrictions. San Pedro Street is a neighborhood street but people may be using it as a connector to Taylor Street.
 - Follow up question: With the new proposed land use designations, this restriction may not be needed?
 - Answer: DOT would need to do a full analysis before any turn restrictions are implemented. When new development comes in, we would need to look at where the driveways are located. We want to provide multimodal options, although we recognize not everyone can travel without a car. We want to keep North San Pedro Street as a calm street as it is proposed to be a bike boulevard in the Better Bike Plan 2025
- Question: What about parking? Or a parking structure? What is the vision for some high density parking?
 - Answer: DOT does not handle parking when it is related to a private development project, however, there are efforts to eliminate parking minimums. Parking is not usually discussed as part of the village planning process. Depends on the private development application/proposal. Parking is not typically discussed as a separate chapter or as part of the Circulation chapter in the village plan. However, DOT is looking at relaunching residential neighborhood parking program so be on the lookout.
 - Follow up concern: Brought it up because do not want the Vendome neighborhood to be the parking area for the neighborhood. It’s already pretty full. If there is not enough parking, George Street/Hobston/ and the Vendome area will be the parking lot.
 - Parking is a big concern. We have a lot of folks parking all the way down the street so please mark parking as a bid concern.
- Question: What is pedestrian fencing? What does it look like? Is it literally a fence?
 - Generally the fencing is about as tall as your hip and is see through with some decorative elements. Purpose is to prevent people from walking where the train is going. Intended to be placed next to the elevated platform and not adjacent to sidewalks within the North 1st St village area.

- Follow up concern: Do not want this fencing to look distasteful.
- Hoping that there will be continued discussion about impacts to traffic in this UV as well as the areas that are bordering the UV. What changes here could have negative impact should be looked at? For example on Julian Street.
 - The Downtown Transportation Plan is currently underway that is looking at a downtown holistically, including Julian Street. We don't want to have a piecemeal approach to traffic changes. You can find more information about this on the Downtown Transportation Plan: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/planning-policies/downtown-transportation-plan>

General questions/comments/concerns:

- The navigation center or tiny homes on Lot E: will it continue to operate? Could hurt perspective real estate
- Question about plans for affordable housing
- Issues with homeless individuals trying to break into homes.
- City departments do not talk to each other to solve issues. It's sad that they can't communicate or get anything done.
- Police department keeps stating that they are understaffed and cannot help with the homeless issue.
- How are historic resources going to be kept from redevelopment?
 - Answer: Historic resources were excluded from the village boundary and will be added to the Historic Resources Inventory. There are a few candidate city landmarks that may eventually be designated as city landmarks
- How does historic properties play with state law and ministerial actions?
- San Jose's processes are unclear on everything. No departments communicate.
- If you want to keep the area nice, need to deal with homeless issue. Property owners need to secure their properties. Not all individuals are homeless, they are mentally ill and we are not providing resources for them, which is sad.
- Question: How were the candidate landmarks get that designation? Is that something the city chooses to do or the property owner needs to apply for? How does that designation come about?
 - Answer: The candidate landmark in and of itself is not a designation, but rather saying that a property has the potential (i.e. meeting certain criteria) to be a city landmark. There is a separate process for formally designating a property as a city landmark, which requires staff review (including the city's Historic Preservation Officer), Historic Landmarks Commission, and the City Council.
- Question: What were the specific criteria that the bank building located at George and North 1st Street met?

- Answer: The Sumitomo Bank of California located at 515 North 1st Street is an embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen. The building is an excellent example of New Formalism-style building. It embodies many elements of the style including, most notably, the original stone cladding and expressed steel structural system which spans the height of the building and encompasses all but the west elevation.
- Have attended village meetings in the past and can see that our feedback is incorporated and is being considered. Want to thank staff and hope staff will continue to take concerns into consideration.
- Property owners of 568 North 1st Street do not want their property to be redeveloped. Concerns about sidewalk widening as trees and landscaping planted on the property is somewhat historic in nature and concerned about how the sidewalk widening would impact the property
 - Response to concern: We want to preserve the historic building/character of the area; this building is one of the most eclectic mixes of architecture and we want to preserve that. Sidewalk widening would only be required of new development and existing properties that are not proposed for redevelopment would not be required to do this. Additionally, 568 North 1st Street has been removed from the village boundary.
- Question: What are the setbacks for this area?
 - Answer: Setbacks depends on the zoning district the property is located in. There is no proposal to change setbacks as part of the village planning process. Affordable housing is a little different and is allowed by state law to play by different rules.
- Pretty happy with everything being proposed. Reasonable height limits and the information about the required setback and stepbacks is actually really encouraging to hear.
- Question: What is the timeline for development to begin and conclude? What do we do about blight or properties that don't develop anything after they've been approved? I am concerned about abandoned properties and how that would allow more criminal activity or vagrancy.
 - Answer: We do not anticipate immediate development of this area. Typically cannot allow demolition of an existing building until something new is proposed and developed, which might incentivize continued operation of a building. The market controls what private development is pursued on which sites and when these proposals will be submitted to the city for review.
- City seems to have an aggressive affordable/supportive housing plan in place. By default it seems to be centered in downtown. While I'm not against some of this, an overconcentration would be detrimental. Is there a guideline about where this can/should be?

- Answer: No, the City's Housing Department Siting Policy is just about funding, not allowed locations for affordable/supportive housing:
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/housing/developers/affordable-housing-plans-policies/affordable-housing-siting-policy>
- Will the slide deck or a version of the slide deck be available?
 - Yes, the meeting recordings, notes, and slide decks will be posted on the city's website.