

Addendum and Responses to Comments
DRAFT - April 2, 2009 (with item 1a added 9/18/09)
for the
North San Jose Urban Design Guidelines
Draft #4 - 9/19/08

ADDENDUM

1.	Introduction p. 7	<p><i>Add paragraph:</i></p> <p><u>The North San Jose Urban Design Guidelines shall be reviewed periodically to insure that they continue to work with tenant requirements and the real estate market.</u></p>
1a.	Introduction p. 7	<p><i>Add section:</i></p> <p><u>How to Interpret the Language of These Guidelines</u></p> <p><u>Meaning of "should," "encouraged" and "discouraged" and of verbs in the imperative mood:</u></p> <p><u>Guidelines that employ the word "should" or that are phrased in the imperative mood are intended to be applied as stated. An alternative measure may be considered, however, if it meets or exceeds the objective of the guidelines.</u></p> <p><u>Guidelines using the words "encouraged or "discouraged" are desirable but not mandatory.</u></p>
2.	Urban Design Guidelines p. 17	<p><i>Add paragraph:</i></p> <p><u>The guidelines describe the design of developments at full build-out, but each phase of development should build towards that end state. A master plan for each site can demonstrate ultimate compliance with the guidelines and show how the project could be phased.</u></p>
3.	Block Size and Layout p. 23 Also, pp. 28-31 p. 34 pp. 104-105	<p><i>Add language to clarify the four ways to divide large blocks, where required by the guidelines:</i></p> <p><u>Grid Streets are mandatory in the Core Area, but their alignment may vary when indicated on the North San Jose Grid System Master Plan. They shall be open to the public.</u></p> <p><u>Other streets used to divide large blocks shall meet the requirements of the <i>Guidelines for the Streetscape</i> chapter. They shall be open to the public.</u></p> <p><u>Paseos may be used to divide residential blocks and shall satisfy the</u></p>

		<p>guidelines on pp. 104-105. They shall be open to the public. <u>Mid-Block Connections or Pathways</u> (the terms are used interchangeably) may be used to divide non-residential blocks and shall satisfy the guidelines on pp. 28-31. Access may be limited to tenants and visitors, but the pathways should provide convenient and direct access from the site to transit and amenities.</p>
4.	Block Size and Layout p.23	<p><i>Add 6th bullet under "Guidelines":</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>This guideline does not apply to portions of the site boundary where connections cannot be made because of physical obstacles, such as existing buildings, water bodies and wetlands, railroad and utility rights-of-way, limited access roads, parks and dedicated open space and extreme topography.</u>
5.	Site Access and Circulation p. 27	<p><i>Delete the 12th bullet:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking garages should not face onto primary streets unless wrapped with active uses or retail (also see Guidelines for Parking.) <p><i>Delete the 14th bullet:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a parking garage is placed within 200 feet of North First Street, for example along a grid street that intersects with North First Street, then it must include active uses along the street edge (also see Guidelines for Parking: Structured Parking).
6.	Mid-Block Connections p. 29	<p><i>Amend 10th bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop creative solutions to address security while maintaining walkability; for example, provide access during daytime hours only <u>or limit access to tenants and residents.</u>
6a.	Building Heights p. 38 Also, p. 12 p. 32 pp. 62-63	<p><i>Insert new 2nd bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New buildings facing North First Street in the Core Area should be at least 4 stories in height and preferably taller.</u>
7.	Street Frontages: Guidelines pp. 44-45 Also,	<p><i>Amend 2nd bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build-to lines are established along the following streets (also see <i>Guidelines for the Streetscape: Street Hierarchies and</i>

	<p>p. 32 p. 48 p. 91 p. 92 p. 93 p. 100</p>	<p><i>Typologies</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North First Street <u>within the Core Area</u>; ○ Parkways, within one block of North First Street; ○ Core Area streets, within one block of North First Street; ○ New Mixed-Use Retail streets; and ○ New Residential streets. <p><i>On drawing:</i></p> <p>North First Street in the Core Area to remain solid ("Streets with required build-to lines"). Change all other solid lines to dashed ("Streets where building to the setback line is encouraged").</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Street Frontages p. 48</p>	<p><i>Amend 1st bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Building should be placed parallel to the street. <u>Small parking lots for visitors may be located between the street and building entrance, but large surface parking areas should be located behind the building or along the sides.</u> <p><i>Amend 4th bullet to read:</i></p> <p>Buildings must be built to the build-to lines where applicable, such as areas along North First Street (see diagram earlier in this section). On streets without build-to lines <u>Where shown in the diagram, buildings are encouraged to should</u> be built to the setback line.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Street Frontages p.50</p>	<p><i>Amend 2nd bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vehicular access should be placed on side streets to reduce curb cuts. <u>Small parking lots for visitors may be located between the street and building entrance, but large surface parking areas should be located behind the building or along the sides.</u>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Building Massing p. 63 Also, p. 12 p. 32 pp. 38-39 pp. 62-63</p>	<p><i>Amend Guidelines to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Slender towers are encouraged to create an interesting and varied skyline. This can be achieved by designing the lower floors of a building with larger floor plates, and smaller floor plates above to form a tower. ● Minimum spacing between residential towers should be 80 feet. ● Place taller portions of a building at the building corners.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a building is in the sun path of a public open space, place the tower to minimize shading of that space. • For taller buildings, encourage smaller floor plates and stepbacks on upper floors in combination with building articulation to ensure that sunlight reaches the street level and public spaces. • Buildings along North First Street <u>in the Core Area</u> should form a continuous street wall composed of buildings of similar heights. Accent towers should be placed at major intersections (also see <i>Building Heights</i>, this section). <u>Interruptions in the street wall should take the form of publicly-accessible parks or plazas (also see <i>Site Layout: Private Pocket Parks and Plazas</i> and <i>Street Frontages</i>, this section).</u> • The apparent bulk of buildings should be broken up into smaller masses that reflect a building’s internal functions. <p><i>Change caption on top photo to read:</i> Slender towers are encouraged to minimize shading and to reduce the bulk of the building. <u>Articulate building massing and elevations for a more interesting and attractive skyline.</u></p>
11.	Building Design and Materials p. 69	<p><i>Delete the 2nd bullet:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage smaller floor plates in office buildings to achieve a finer grained urban fabric and pedestrian friendly scale, as well as naturally lit working spaces.
12.	Surface Parking p. 81 Also, p. 48 p. 50	<p><i>Amend the 2nd bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not place <u>large</u> surface parking lots along North First Street <u>in the Core Area</u>, but permit a limited amount of <u>short-term surface visitor parking between the street and building entrance.</u>
13.	Parking Structures p. 82	<p><i>Delete the 4th and 5th bullets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured parking adjacent to a primary street in the Core Area should include either ground floor retail space if the site meets the Retail Site Criteria (see <i>Guidelines for Site Planning: Retail</i>); or multi-story office space; or a combination of both. • These non-parking uses should extend along the entire length of the parking structure where it is adjacent to the primary street.

14.	Parking Structures p. 82	<p><i>Amend the 6th and 7th bullets to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Where provided</u>, retail space that faces onto a primary street should meet the 45-foot minimum depth requirement and 15-foot floor-to-floor minimum height requirement specified in <i>Guidelines for Buildings: Building Design and Materials</i>. Deeper and taller dimensions, such as 60-foot depths or 18-foot floor-to-floor heights, are encouraged. • <u>Where provided</u>, leased spaces along a parking structure edge which are not on a primary street, should be at least 30 feet deep, and are anticipated to be service or office space rather than primary retail space.
15.	Parking Structures p. 83	<p><i>Amend the 1st full bullet to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not wrapped with habitable space, then at least 50% of the structured parking garage floor should be placed <u>no less than 4 feet below the grade of the adjacent sidewalk</u>, and the above-grade portion should be well-screened by architectural elements such as stoops, entryways, planters, or other features that are integrated into the overall building design.
16.	Street Hierarchy and Typologies p. 89	<p><i>Under "Cross-sections are shown for the following streets," amend the 9th line to read:</i></p> <p>Industrial/Grid Streets —with and without build to lines</p>
17.	Street Hierarchy and Typologies: Typical Street Sections p. 100	<p><i>Delete this page ("4a Industrial/Grid Street")</i></p>

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER NOVEMBER 13, 2008, CHARETTE

2008 North San José Charette Feedback

General observations

~~*“I thought the Charette was a wonderful idea and your execution was even better. The tone of the program produced a thoughtful exchange more typical of an Urban Land Institute (ULI) meeting.”*~~

“This was a great session, truly. Having been through the process a couple of times, it was very refreshing to have City Officials and Developers/Users in the same room to understand goals and constraints. I think we can collectively create a context that will satisfy all for future growth in San José.”

“It was a great turnout today and I had a lot of fun. All participants seemed eager to help. It’s a testament to the respect you and the Mayor have in the community. We are willing to help anytime you need us”

“It is comforting to see the administration reaching out to the private sector to get real time input.”

“It was enlightening and productive.”

“Your strong and consistently inclusionary style of policy formulation and leadership has brought a markedly higher level of governmental responsiveness and relevance of the outcomes of City Policy.”

Letter 1

1. What were your perceptions on how the Charette was conducted?

The Charette was a success, a healthy discussion of the issues that are driving/impeding development in NSJ. I think that no matter that the outcome, getting this group together to discuss issues, with City officials present, is very important. As a “trial” run, I think it was conducted very well.

A. Any strengths you’d like to comment on:

The strongest part of the exercise was the break-out session done with smaller groups. The environment was more conducive to getting to the point quickly and challenging each other in issues. A group of 8-10 people is probably ideal.

B. Any areas for improvement?

I do not think it was necessary or helpful to bring in architects that in our case were less familiar with the guidelines and area than many of the developers. It would have been more productive to start with a couple of existing or planned projects and ask the question: Does this work? What do you change here? Why? I think we eventually got there but the valuable time was spent dreaming up concepts to fit the guidelines that don’t make sense or would never be economically feasible.

The group was large. It is always harder (I think) to solicit candid comments and feedback with a large group. Perhaps a few smaller sessions would be more fruitful.

2. Please share three ideas that you have (which were either articulated this morning or ideas that you have had since our meeting) that you would want us to consider incorporating in the next draft of the design guidelines.

- 1.1 1. The Center – establish or define the center of the core area through the capture and use of property by the City to create a “there-there”. Allow and encourage development to expand outwards from this point. (I realize this is much easier in theory).
- 1.2 2. Phasing flexibility – allow developers to build short term solutions that may not meet the intent of the UDG but that work in today’s environment, so long as there is an end-state vision the developer will be held to. For example, allow surface parking until the area is denser.
- 1.3 3. Incentives: provide fee or processing incentives for meeting certain aspects of the urban design guidelines. (Have not thought this one through... but brainstorming)

Letter 1

- 1.1 The document contains guidelines for a Central Urban Park/Plaza (pp. 126-127), possibly in conjunction with a neighborhood retail center (pp. 52-55). The Guidelines assume that such a "center" would be initiated by the private sector.
- 1.2 See Addendum item 2.
- 1.3 The North San Jose Area Development Policy (p. 25) allocates industrial development capacity (above base floor-area ratios) to projects that conform to the policy's Core Area Design Criteria and that "incorporate exceptional and/or innovative architecture design treatment, transit-oriented site design elements and programs to encourage alternative modes of transportation, including transportation demand management measures."

Letter 2

1. What were your perceptions on how the Charette was conducted?

A. Any strength you'd like to comment on?

I applaud the City for this effort. It is the right way to prove out the guidelines prior to approving them.

B. Any areas for improvement?

- i. Provide more time (above 75 minutes) to properly analyze the issues. In my experience, these are usually all day events.
- ii. Make sure everyone has read the guidelines and understands them or provide a clear summary of the "rules"
- iii. Even out the types of professionals on each team (i.e. we had 10 developers and 1 architect. Perhaps add a civil and/or landscape/land planning consultant).
- iv. The site we received in the residential group was not a realistic representation of properties available to NSJ. To our combined recollection, only Moitozo and Agnews could produce a site that large. The majority of property available falls in the 3-10 acre size which provides for different challenges.

2. Please share three ideas that you have (which were either articulated this morning or ideas that you have had since our meeting) that you would want us to consider incorporating in the next draft of the design guidelines.

2.1

A. A main item of concern is the use of secondary streets and paseo. The site configuration will have a lot to do with the appropriateness of adding further site subdivisions. (Is it pie shaped or rectangle-and does it border another property where a paseo or street would dead end? How does the product type fit on the specific parcel?) Somehow the language in the guidelines needs to address this so that the City cannot simply apply a guideline or formula to create subdivisions that may cause economic hardship to the developer.

B. No other comments.

Letter 2

2.1 See Addendum item 4.

Letter 3

1. What were your perceptions on how the Charette was conducted?

A. Any strengths you'd like to comment on?

The City and the Redevelopment agency staff have conducted numerous charettes on a variety of topics from planning exercises, inputs for the San José Envision Master Planning, to obtaining input for the Downtown Arts program. As I have participated several times in events like this, I am always highly impressed with the excellent pre-work the staff has done to create definable outcomes and appropriate methodologies to encourage, record and provide feedback on the citizen inputs. In addition, the staff is very effective in being supportive and strong facilitators in these efforts.

B. Please share three ideas that you have (which were either articulated this morning or ideas that you have had since our meeting) that you would want us to consider incorporating in the next draft of the design guidelines.

- 3.1 1. While there is a need to tie entitlements added to land parcels to reasonably foreseeable timeframes of implementation so the City can accrue in a reasonable timeframe positive economic benefits from its actions, there does appear to be a need to create consistent triggers that developers and owners can use to formulate some level of confidence that the FAR increases, etc. will actually be achievable and therefore can enable the project to be financed favorably.
- 3.2 2. The new IBC building code has further underscored the divergence between low-rise versus high-rise costs of construction, particularly in life safety systems conformance. We will want to take this into account as we structure incentives for taller structures in urban cores and nodes. We certainly heard many such comments during our breakout group.
- 3.3 3. As an architect, I often see well intended rules effectively become ingredients for inhibiting reactive and evolutionary design ideas. We need to keep the guidelines indeed as "guidelines", providing some means for seeing variances where proven offsetting positives justify the exception. Administratively, this can be difficult to achieve but such "devices" like Planned Unit Developments have historically provided such zoning and design relief.

Letter 3

- 3.1 The North San Jose Area Development Policy describes the process for allocation of development capacity.
- 3.2 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) taller buildings and more intense development on North First Street, in the Core Area, on corners, etc.
- 3.3 See Addendum item 2.

Letter 4

1. What were your perceptions on how the Charette was conducted?

a. any strengths you'd like to comment on?

- Very well organized and focused on the goal of testing the effectiveness of the Guidelines.
- It was important to have the Mayor and members of City Council in attendance (rather than only Planning staff) so they can also understand the benefits, issues, and limitations of the Guidelines and get a sense for the reaction from the development community who will ultimately be putting them into practice.
- The inclusion of such a large number of leaders from a wide range of industries was helpful to get a good sample size and better feedback.

b. any areas for improvement?

- It was difficult to truly gauge the effectiveness of the Guidelines, and determine what works and what doesn't within the time allotted. It may be helpful to distribute the problem or parameters of the discussion in advance of the charette so that we can hit the ground running in the break-out sessions. With the mock site parameters being distributed at the beginning of the meeting, most of the discussion was on macro site layout issues as opposed to digging into the Guidelines more specifically and implementing them into the design.
- It would be helpful to use more real world situations/parameters for the break-out sessions to get better feedback. There aren't many developable 28 acre, square sites, without neighbors in San Jose. Real world sites are much smaller (3-7 acres), are uniquely shaped, and will have some adjacent use to be considered.

2. Please share three ideas that you have (which were either articulated this morning or ideas that you have had since our meeting) that you would want us to consider incorporating in the next draft of the design guidelines.

- 4.1 1. Definition. How will these guidelines be interpreted? Are they guidelines, or will they be treated as requirements in certain instances? Language needs to be included in the Guidelines to define clearly for developers as well as planning staff, planning commission, and city council that they are meant to guide, not dictate developments in North San Jose.
- 4.2 2. Flexibility. Goes hand-in-hand with the prior statement. Each development encounters its own unique set of challenges, and it is important that developers and planning staff have the flexibility to work around guidelines that create significant problems for a project without jeopardizing its ability to gain necessary approvals.
- 4.3 3. Adaptability. What the market wants from residential, office, and retail developers today, it may not want 5 years from now. There should be mechanisms included that ensure the Guidelines don't become so restrictive that they hinder new development. The Guidelines need to be able to react at the speed of the market.

Letter 4

4.1 See Addendum item 2.

4.2 See Addendum item 2.

4.3 See Addendum item 1.

From: Darin Schoolmeester [dschool@mve-architects.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2008 5:44 PM
To: Rask, Walter
Subject: Charrette Notes
Walter,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Charrette this morning. It was a great experience to interact with the developers as a group and listen to the discussion regarding the current trends and future outlook for office and residential development. Per your request, I have summarized our group discussion below.

- 5.1 1. **Parcel Size:** It was agreed that the hypothetical parcel as drawn was not very useful from the standpoint exercising the guidelines because there are no future development opportunities in the NSJ area of this size. It was also discussed that a single owner developing a single product and building type on a parcel this large would be highly unlikely in the future. The group decided to break up the parcel into smaller, more realistic size areas to test the residential guidelines.
- 5.2 2. **Product/Construction Type:** With the constraints of construction cost (for high rise buildings) and the goal of higher densities, it was agreed that there were two primary product/building types that would be the most likely to occur in the NSJ area. The first is the podium product, which is composed of 4 stories of Type V wood frame residential over 1 story of Type I subterranean garage (only one due to a high water table in the area). This product type could achieve between 60-70 du/ac (net) depending on a series of variables including rental v. for-sale, mix, unit size, and parking ratios. The second product type is the "Wrap" building. This building type is defined by an above-grade Type I parking structure (4 stories) with Type V residential (4 stories) wrapping around the parking structure. This product type generally achieves a density of 45-55 du/ac (net) depending on the same variables. For the density it can achieve, it was agreed that the 4 story podium building is the most likely product type for NSJ.
- 5.3 3. **Block Size:** Smaller block areas were created during the Charrette exercise. A 15 acre parcel was created adjacent to the largest perimeter road. After allowing for 2.5-3 acres for a public/private park and streets, this parcel broke up into 2-6.5 to 7 acre sites yielding a maximum of 800 units as podium buildings. It was agreed that the podium building was the most flexible in terms of parcel size and creating efficiency. The remaining parcels were well suited for the wrap building type at approximately 4.5 acres each. These parcels could yield as many as 250 units. It was agreed that the parcels became less efficient for this building type if they were less than 3.5 acres or greater than 5 acres.
- 5.4 The most significant point of discussion centered on the guideline encouraging the inclusion of a public street or paseo through a parcel that contained more than 1,600 linear feet at the perimeter. This would be the equivalent of an approximately 3.6 acre site. Due to the nature of the wrap product, and how it is planned and sited, the addition of a paseo or street through the site would cause it to be very inefficient. The recommendation was to create some flexibility and alternative ways to satisfy the goal of the paseo without requirement to puncture through the site.
- 5.5 4. **Parking Ratios:** While the zoning/guidelines allow for as little as 1.63 stalls per unit (based on the provided mix), it was agreed that unless the parcels are immediately adjacent to transit the ratios designed into these communities would be much greater from practical and marketing standpoint. Apartment projects would likely be designed with a minimum ratio of 1.8 and condominium developments would be designed with a minimum ratio of 2.0. With the limitations of construction type and water table, the densities for

these building types are limited primarily by the amount of parking that can be provided economically. Achieving a density of 65 du/ac may be difficult depending on the type of residential development.

- 5.6**
5. **Parks:** The inclusion of public parks into projects (less than 15 acres) was discussed. For efficiency and maintenance considerations, developers have not been encouraged to create smaller parks by the Parks and Recreation Department. The recommendation from the group was that perhaps a strategy/policy could be created which allows for alternatives in the size, ownership, and maintenance of parks that could be accessed by the public.

Please let me know if you need anything else or have any questions about the notes.
Thank you.

Darin Schoolmeester, AIA, LEED AP

Principal

MVE & Partners, Inc. | Architecture + Planning + Interiors
Irvine + Oakland + Honolulu

1900 Main Street, Suite 800 | Irvine, California 92614-7318 | T 949.809.3388 F 949.809.3546 |
www.mve-architects.com

Darin Schoolmeester, McLarand Vasquez Emsiek Architects, November 13, 2008
(Note: Mr. Schoolmeester facilitated the November 13, 2008, charette on Residential Development.)

- 5.1 The comment pertains to the format of the charette and does not affect the Guidelines.
- 5.2 The "wrap" building type has not been proposed in North San Jose. Also, at 45 to 55 units per net acre, the building type will generally not meet the minimum density requirement of 55 or 90 units per acre, except in combination with higher density buildings. Therefore, no change to the Guidelines is indicated.
- 5.3 The charette instructions required a neighborhood park of at least 5 acres. Development of the remaining buildable land would have to be in higher density building types than the "wrap" product in order to achieve minimum densities. See also response to comment 5.2.
- 5.4 See responses to comments 5.2 and 5.3.
- 5.5 The 1.63 spaces per unit parking ratio is a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. There is no parking maximum.
- 5.6 The Guidelines assume that the City will continue to maintain public parks and that the minimum acreages will still apply.



November 21, 2008

Walter S. Rask, AIA AICP
Principal Architect
San Jose Redevelopment Agency
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 14th floor
San Jose, CA 95113-1905

Re: North San Jose Guidelines
City - Developer Charette

Dear Walter,

Per your request, I have attached a summary of the recent City-Developer Charette regarding the North San Jose Urban Design Guidelines.

Overall, this was an impressive effort by the City of San Jose and I believe it clearly showed to the developer and business community the thought and care you are giving to create a flexible and viable new development area as it transitions to a new more urban, transit-oriented and sustainable vision.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in the Charette. It was a fascinating exercise and illuminated the dynamic tension of the intent of the NSJ Guidelines and the range of perceptions of the developer participants. I remain available to further discussions with the City, as needed should you desire. Congratulations on a successful event!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Crystal Barriscale". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Crystal Barriscale AIA AICP LEED® AP
Director of Planning + Landscape Architecture

Encl. NJS Inner Core Work Session - Summary of Findings



North San Jose Urban Design Guidelines

City - Developer Charette Summary of Findings

Office Development Inside the Core

Program:	1.9 million gross square feet	1.6 FAR
	5,700 structured parking stalls	3 per 1,000 GSF
	31,250 sf minimum floor plate	125' x 250'

Developer's Design Parameters:

The group agreed to the following general design standards:

35,000 gsf typical floor plate
27,500 gsf for spec. office (110 x 250')
6-7 story office building (per one developer: 12 story maximum)

14'-13.5' floor to floor height for Office use
15' floor to floor height for Retail use
6 levels maximum of Structured Parking

No podium parking, absolutely.
Little-to-no interest in Retail

Developers Comments to previously compiled List of Concerns:

Small Floor Plates

- 6.1 Guideline references (p. 63/69) on slender towers and setbacks were deemed not feasible or appropriate for office buildings.

Underground Parking

- 6.2 No real comments on providing ½ level below grade. Screening the façade was seen as not economically viable so internal block garages were suggested to avoid the cost.

Building Height and Density

- 6.3 While taller buildings were encouraged in the guidelines, no one was interested in this- perceived as not market for this? Also, if a tower were built to the maximum allowable 250' bldg ht. (17 story, 31,250 gsf/flr – 531,250gsf) the building would be too large for the market; increased risk for the developer. There was no developer interest or belief this was a viable program. Alternately, consider a *minimum* building height on North First Street to reinforce the streetwall intent.

A building this size would mean 1/3 of the FAR would be accommodated in this one building, coupled with the Build-to-Lines, the end result would be a concentration of office along North First Street and virtually all parking on the remaining side and rear parts of the block, not a good distribution of program or response to the intended pedestrian, urban street environment.

The density was fine but was barely enough to accommodate street frontage around the entire block. The issue was the parking program, creating multiple large garage structures: 6-7 large separate structures (240'x225') so approximately a 1/3 of the block is parking garage footprint.



6.4 Grid Streets
There were differences of opinion on whether the street grids were disruptive to laying out an efficient site plan. One developer noted that they did not see it as an issue given that you would need to put in a roadway anyway for circulation/access to the parking garages. This brings up the point that these mid-block 'grid streets' will likely be more service/access roadways, not a pedestrian-scaled, active street frontage.

6.5 Build-to- Lines
Our site problem included not only Build-to-Lines along North First Street but also returning on the side streets for 500 linear feet. To meet this requirement, a concentration of office buildings would be 'lined-up' in a U-shape configuration. If windows are desired on the end facades, a 60' separation is required (new bldg code); 3- 250' facades + 2-60' separation = 870 linear feet or 82% of the frontage, easily meeting the 75% minimum required street frontage.

The issue regarding Build-to- Lines lies in the requirement to continue the build-to-line on the side street for such a long distance (500' in the exercise). It places too great a restriction on how the FAR is distributed. Similar to the comments under Density.

6.6 Parking Locations
Surface Parking: No issues offered.
Parking Structures: The developers in our group did not want to incur the costs to 'provide a high-quality façade' and therefore preferred to place the parking structures on the interior of the block. Some said they would only go six stories max. height. Refer to notes above in the Underground Parking section.

Developers Comments and Group Observations to Overall Design Guidelines and City intent:

6.7 Retail
Providing street retail seemed risky as it is:
- Unknown impact to marketing the office development and creating its own identity
- Too many variables with context of neighboring blocks and development.
- Unknown market demand of types and quantity.
Suggestion was to create a node (or nodes) of concentrated retail areas along North First Street to bring a focus and more intense vitality; to create a sense of place. Not a market to build/absorb retail for the entire length of North First Street.

6.8 North First Street Corridor
Related to the above, consider creating an open space/plaza that defines and gives focus to the long street corridor. This could be done by adjusting the bldg setback width if it could not be done within the public ROW.

General Observations:

6.9 Each developer approached the problem through their particular lens of their typical more suburban office campus development. As such, the change in paradigm begged the issue of:
- How to create a campus identity/internal open space of a campus setting. (difficult to achieve with current high parking ratio)?
- Is there a market for this type of urban development? and if so, how can it be phased over the long-term to accommodate changing market/tenant demands on space types within the block?
- How can it be phased to create a viable unplanned private sector initiative?

Crystal Barriscale, HOK Architecture, November 21, 2008

(Note: Ms. Barriscale facilitated the November 13, 2008, charette on Office Development Inside the Core.)

- 6.1 See Addendum items 10 and 11.
- 6.2 The half-level parking requirement applies primarily to residential development. See Addendum item 15 for revised language. The Guidelines require mitigation of the visual impact of parking garages by screening the façade, wrapping the garage with other uses or locating the garage in the interior of the site.
- 6.3 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) taller buildings and more intense development on North First Street, in the Core Area, on corners, etc. See Addendum item 7.
- 6.4 The grid streets are a requirement of the North San Jose Area Development Policy ("Supporting Street System -- Grid Streets," page 22). See Addendum item 3.
- 6.5 See response to comment 6.3.
- 6.6 See response to comment 6.2.
- 6.7 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) four types of retail in viable locations and configurations. The document contains guidelines for a Central Urban Park/Plaza (pp. 126-127), possibly in conjunction with a neighborhood retail center (pp. 52-55). The Guidelines assume that such a "center" would be initiated by the private sector. Also, see Addendum items 5 and 14.
- 6.8 With reference to a Central Urban Park/Plaza, see response to comment 6.7. With reference to smaller parks and plazas, the Guidelines (*Site Layout: Private Pocket Parks and Plazas*, pp. 42-43) provide guidance on the treatment of sidewalks, setback areas and private property.
- 6.9 At the November 13, 2008, charette and in other venues, local developers indicated little or no demand for single-tenant, tightly integrated campuses like eBay, Yahoo!, Google or Apple. The reason is largely due to the difficulty of phasing such developments and of severing a campus for multiple tenants. Instead, such projects as Brocade in the @First development or Tishman Speyer's First and Component proposal utilize a looser site plan in which a single tenant can occupy one, several or all buildings but still have an individual identity. Campus-type developments may be more suitable outside of the Core Area where the urban design guidelines are less stringent.

Meeting Notes

November 24, 2008

Walter S. Rask - AIA, AICP
Principal Architect
San Jose Redevelopment Agency
200 East Santa Clara Street, 14th Floor
San Jose, California 95113-1905

Planning
Landscape Architecture
Urban Design



1045 Sansome St.
Studio 321
San Francisco
California
94111

415.956.4472 TEL
415.956.4522 FAX

www.kenkaysf.com

Regarding: North San Jose Charrette
Review of San Jose Urban Design Guidelines

Date: November 13, 2008. 9:30 am – 12:00 pm

Meeting Location: San Jose City Hall

Originator: Ken Kay, FASLA - Representing Connie Martinez of 1st ACT

Overview of the Charrette by Mayor Reed, Sam Liccardo, Paul Krutko, Walter Rask & Joe Horwedel

Purpose

General purpose of the North San Jose Charrette was to get opinions and suggestions from property owners, corporate executives, and the development community on the redevelopment of North San Jose as illustrated in the "Draft #4 North San Jose Urban Design Guidelines (September 19, 2008)" Produced by the City's Staff and Field Paoli, Architects.

A Charrette exercise was conducted by three groups of "teams" for one hour and fifteen minutes, and the results of that discussion was reported back to the overall group before closing statements by Mayor Reed was made at noon.

Overview

The General Assembly before the Charrette Exercise Discussion Included:

Walter Rask RDA outlined the intent of the anticipated changes to North San Jose as envisioned in the vision 2030 development policy objectives and form/intent illustrated in the draft urban design guidelines before the Charrette teams assembled for their exercise.

- 5 years of planning work to date

- Wanting more dense building form
- Workforce Housing
- 28 million SF jobs/ 32k residential units
- Environmental clearance/transportation improvements
- Legal clearance
- Schools in the area
- Taller/Denser/more vibrant place
- Key is the core area – highest density, not creating a new downtown, creating a new urban form

Mayor Reed requested general comments from the group of corporate executives and development community before the Charette exercise:

People	Remarks
Hunter-Storm Properties Ed Storm Curtis Leigh	Connectivity key elements 7 to 10 stories 35k footprint 3 to 4 year horizon
Legacy Partners Gregg Hall Jesse Couch	Transition/access to site Additional amenities like hotels are key 16 story max. 33SF footprint
Tesla Frank Jesse	His project: 600,000SF Growing in phases 3 stairwells No "sea of parking" (Tesla's) Multi-use building Better urban design approach
Novellus Randy McFarland	People want lifestyle Good mix of living space, Parks in urban environment Increase FAR Include ground floor labs 6 stories and 30k floor plates
<i>North San Jose Charette – S.J. City Hall November 13, 2008</i>	<i>2 of 5</i>

People	Remarks
Sobrato Development Companies Tim Steele	More parking Structure 3.3 per 1000, Need 5 per 1000 "Flexibility" Power generation issue Santa Clara has advantage
Morley Brothers Eric Morley	Employee densification more intensification of density & nodal mixed use "operating on patience while they are living"
Boston Properties Bob Pester Scott Lindsittel	Financial markets closed down Lehman Brothers 24-36 month Recovery They have 3 billion in development Their site 25 Acres, 490,000SF
Essex Property Trust John Eudy	Flexibility a must Caution with Guidelines

Charrette Exercise portion of meeting:

Team Verte
 Office R&D developers
 Exercise: Core-area
 Lead planner/architect: Crystal Barriscale, HoK

Observations from Charrette:

Site planning exercise by Crystal Barriscale

7.1 I was impressed with Crystal's quick and thoughtful translation of the proposed guidelines onto the site block we were given. The vision or should I say outcome of pushing the buildings to the street and parking 5,000 cars+/- in six story garages in the center of the block would apparently result in a poor outcome. Now in all fairness this exercise was short in time, but long enough to detect a number of significant potential problems.

To be fair to all the work to date, it's a very complex and complicated problem that needs more discussion, refinement and buy-in on the private and public side.

Feedback from Developers:

- 7.2 • Grid Issue – “Non Starter” – “Don’t Like the Approach.”
- 7.3 • Parking structures should be limited to six levels
- 7.4 • Podium parking a problem – meaning no mixed-use of structured parking with office/lab/retail. Too Expensive.
- 7.5 • General heights of buildings in the Core Area will most likely be 6 to 7 stories with the highest ones possibly 12 stories.
- 7.6 • Phasing within the designed grid will create flexibility issues.

Some of My Observations & Recommendations are:

1. The Core Area that engages the light rail line creates a very linear development pattern:
 - 7.7 • The core should have a “Center”, which I feel should be an open space in appropriate scale and interest to give the whole North San Jose a point of identity and sense of place. Significant public art would add to the identity factor.
 - 7.8 • Higher density and nodal retail should be planned where the light rail stations now occur and in the desire lines of pedestrian walking and bicycle access. In our meeting, buildings may range from 6 to 12 stories, which seemed realistic to the developers. Use highest buildings around and close to transit stations.
 - 7.9 • The grip pattern is important for many reasons. Solar orientation, linking the creek & river and providing a needed sense of orientation with the wide safe pedestrian and bicycle network system should become positive outcomes of this needed change. Keep grid flexible, which will also make it more interesting.
 - 7.10 • The width of the paved roadways may be reduced as more people use alternatives to the auto. This space could be a bonus addition to the adjacent property owners’ and as public realm amenities.
- 7.11 2. There was little or no discussion on sustainability in regards to orientation, sun, wind, materials or anything. I was told when asked about this that “all that stuff is in another document.” I feel strongly that the shape and intent of this whole place needs to grow out of the sustainable green movement in everyway.

- 7.12 3. It's not just transit. Transit is one of the links in the chain of human movement and a complete system should be laid out and not just as roadways.
- 7.13 4. The landscape and open space framework needs to move from a tiny thumbnail diagram with no North arrow to a realistic overlay of what exists and how to link and connect it all in a meaningful way.

Summary

In summary I feel the meeting in general was productive, informative, and interesting.

North San Jose has no sense of place in so many ways, which grows out of high growth times with little attention to the whole area's outcome overtime. 1st generation single-use business parks are outdated and need to transform themselves under the clear direction of the City and in keeping with the needs of the private sector. Transformation of existing infrastructure and property ownership is clearly the biggest hurdle and challenge.

I hope these notes and observations are useful and if you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Ken Kay, FASLA
Principal

Recipients:	<input type="checkbox"/> Connie Martinez, 1 st ACT	<input type="checkbox"/> Ruani Weerakoon, SJRDA
	<input type="checkbox"/> Kim Welsh, SJEDA	<input type="checkbox"/> Dennis Korbiak, SJRDA
	<input type="checkbox"/> Joe Horwedel, DD Planning -SJ	<input type="checkbox"/>

End of Meeting Notes

If there are any comments or corrections, please contact KenKay Associates within five (5) days of receipt of these meeting notes.

**North San Jose Charette – S.J. City Hall
November 13, 2008**

5 of 5

Ken Kay, KenKay Associates, November 24, 2008

(Note: Mr. Kay participated in the charette on Office Development Inside the Core as the representative of 1stACT.)

- 7.1 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) taller buildings and more intense development on North First Street, in the Core Area, on corners, etc. Also, the Guidelines encourage (but do not require) taller buildings and more intense development on North First Street, in the Core Area, on corners, etc. See Addendum item 7.
- 7.2 The grid streets are a requirement of the North San Jose Area Development Policy ("Supporting Street System -- Grid Streets," page 22). See Addendum item 3.
- 7.3 The Guidelines do not contain minimum or maximum heights for parking structures. The comment does not explain why the height should be limited to 6 stories.
- 7.4 The Guidelines anticipate podium parking for residential development only, and the half-level parking requirement applies primarily to residential development. See Addendum item 15 for revised language. The Guidelines require mitigation of the visual impact of parking garages by screening the façade, wrapping the garage with other uses or locating the garage in the interior of the site.
- 7.5 See response to comment 7.1
- 7.6 See Addendum item 2.
- 7.7 The document contains guidelines for a Central Urban Park/Plaza (pp. 126-127), possibly in conjunction with a neighborhood retail center (pp. 52-55). The Guidelines assume that such a "center" would be initiated by the private sector.
- 7.8 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) the pattern of development described in the comment.
- 7.9 The term "grid streets" refers to a set of streets in the Core Area prescribed by the North San Jose Area Development Policy. See Addendum item 3. Others streets, paseos and mid-block connectors (or "pathways") are intended to provide the connectivity described in the comment.
- 7.10 The Guidelines prescribe street typologies that are no bigger than official minimums to support walkability and non-motorized transportation.
- 7.11 The North San Jose Area Development Policy contains a section entitled "Sustainable Building Criteria" intended to "reduce energy use, promote water conservation and otherwise reduce environmental impacts" (page 27). These criteria apply to all development in North San Jose, as do the policies and ordinances implementing Mayor Reed's Green Vision for San José. To avoid confusion and inconsistencies, the Guidelines do not repeat these policies and ordinances.

- 7.12 The *Guidelines for the Streetscape* (pp. 87-113) provide for all forms of transportation -- vehicular, transit, bicycle and pedestrian.
- 7.13 The primary means of implementing the open space guidelines is through the Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PDO) and the Park Impact Ordinance (PIO). Financing and the location, size and configuration of neighborhood parks are handled on a project-by-project basis and cannot, therefore, be shown on a detailed plan.

2 Harrison Street
Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94105
USA

Tel 415.433.3700
Fax 415.836.4599

Gensler

November 17th, 2008

Mr Dennis Korabiak
City of San Jose, Redevelopment Agency
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 14th Floor
San José, California, 95113-1905

Subject: **North San José Urban Design Guidelines**
Developer Charrette - Thursday 13th November

Dear Dennis:

Thank you for including us in the charrette for the North San José Urban Design Guidelines last Thursday. It proved a very interesting session, and must have been very rewarding for City staff in the spirit open collaboration that the development community brought to the charrette.

As requested, following is our write up of the session.

Exercise:

Non-Core Area

Development Community Attendees:

The following attendees were named in the charrette agenda. Additional attendees included City of San José Council members and staff who cycled in and out of the Mayors Conference Room.

Bob Wingo (Altera), Frank Jesse (Tesla), Larry Burnett (Cisco), Michael Bangs (Adobe), Randy McFarland (Novellus), Eric Morley (Morley Brothers), Leatha deWitt (Morley Brothers), Rick Campbell (RBC Architects), Tom Armstrong (HMH Inc.), Ed Storm (Hunter-Storm Properties).

Process:

The process was informal, with the overall aim of identifying key issues that the development community saw as obstacles to the implementation of the North San José Urban Design Guidelines.

Discussion (25 minutes)	Overview discussion of the Guidelines, the problem statement, site constraints that would affect any project in the non-core area.
Key Issues (15 minutes)	Discussion of key issues and general concurrence over key assumptions.
Test Fit Exercise (30 minutes)	Two teams were given test fit puzzle pieces and developed indicative schemes that met the developer modified program.
Wrap-up (5 minutes)	General wrap-up of the process.

Discussion:

Discussion generally centered on the financial viability of any project of the scale included in the problem statement and the decision making process that would guide site planning and design. These issues were noted as they were raised, and the resultant flip-charts left with City staff.

Project Address: Where is the front door (or doors) for the site?

North José Urban Design Guidelines: Non-Core Charrette
 Mr. Dennis Korabiak
 City of San Jose Redevelopment Agency
 November 17, 2008
 Page 2

	Proximity to Transit:	How close to transit is the project?
	Infrastructure:	Does the site have sufficient infrastructure to support full build out to the 1.2 FAR?
	Traffic & Access:	Where can curb cuts and turn pockets be accommodated without adding cost of signalization?
8.1	Security:	R&D and product development requires varied levels of corporate security. The ability to secure the site, particularly in a vehicular sense, was seen as a critical component of any site plan (this is something that the guidelines should address).
8.2	Existing Building Stock:	What is the construction type and effectiveness of existing buildings on site? <i>Note: Development strategies and timing would be different depending upon the existing building stock. i.e. According to some developers, a concrete structure would likely include an interim development scenario or repurposing existing buildings, whereas, steel frame or tilt-up would probably seek a full replacement strategy.</i>
8.3	Parking:	Spec-built office space typically requires surface parking immediately adjacent the front door for visitors. Developers saw the desire to move parking away from the front door as an issue that required creative site planning. They also anticipated increased rather than decreased parking demands as space allocations per employee are reduced, resulting in more employees (flexible parking, shared parking zones, or timed build-out of parking structures may address these concerns in the guidelines). The developers do not seem to fully grasp the benefit of being in close proximity to a LRT station and opportunities to reduce parking supply.
8.4	Tenant Profile:	Some discussion of the tenant profile followed. As tenants change, and the market re-establishes itself, the key to developers concerns here was the ability to attract a large single tenant, or multiple smaller tenants that might evolve and grow with the development. Ultimately, the concern here is the desire to "Partner for Growth" with tenants. Here, flexibility of floor plates, and ability to phase the site as demand changes was seen as critical.
8.5	Public Street:	Discussion of the 'public' nature of the street bisecting the site by the Design Guidelines ensued. General consensus was that this would eliminate flexibility of the site to accommodate single-use tenants, and would impinge upon the flexibility and security of the site.
8.6	Retail / Amenity:	Discussion of the amount and quality of the retail and amenity spaces, and the ability of the developer to cost-effectively include these uses in tenanted buildings. Generally, the developers felt it a better scenario to separate retail / Food + Beverage / Fitness / Hotels and Conferencing from the major real

North José Urban Design Guidelines: Non-Core Charrette
Mr. Dennis Korabiak
City of San Jose Redevelopment Agency
November 17, 2008
Page 3

estate venture. Those familiar with vertical teaming environments (Adobe / Tesla) suggested incorporation is a benefit in more urban environments. (For horizontal development, incorporation of a retail portion on site is a benefit to the users, and one that the market will grow as residential and jobs population increases in North San José. Ability to phase this program portion would be beneficial to the development community.)

8.7

Site Phasing:

The discussion centered on the ability to phase infill development of a site. The key concern here resided in the idea that a large parcel would require multiple phases to reach build-out, and that interim phases may not meet the intent of the Urban Design Guidelines until full build-out is achieved. (The Guidelines may need to include some language on implementation strategies for individual sites.)

Key Issues:

Key issues revolved around 4 primary decision making criteria:

8.8

Lifespan / Fiscal Security:

For developer, financier, tenant and other stakeholders. The need to "Partner" with tenants and help them as they grow and mature / change. In terms of the site plan, a modular approach was desired with consistent floorplates, that could be added incrementally as demand necessitated.

8.9

Flexibility:

Maintaining the physical plan ability to attract and maintain tenants as partners, and be able to accommodate their various initial needs, and anticipate their growth and/or contraction.

8.10

Severability:

Is it possible to sever the site to accommodate multiple name-brand tenants. General concurrence was that site permeability could be established, but it is desirable for vehicular penetration into the site to be controlled. There was a high resistance to making any streets and/or roads public.

8.11

Land-Banking:

All developers felt it desirable to secure a master plan that established the maximum build-out at 1.2 FAR. The group desired a 'bank' of land for future development, and, deferral of costs of parking and tie these to build-out of office / R&D space.

Test-Fit Scenarios:

8.12

Each developer team used programmatic puzzle pieces to develop site plan scenarios. Both teams developed site plans based on their understanding of the market, and their traditional means of doing business. Both teams sought a 1.2 FAR, and then described a 650,000 sf development as a phase 1, banking additional developable parcels for future build out.

Scheme 1 identified a central green and amenity space, with modest retail space at the perimeter corners.

North José Urban Design Guidelines: Non-Core Charrette
Mr. Dennis Korabiak
City of San Jose Redevelopment Agency
November 17, 2008
Page 4

8.13

Scheme 2 subdivided the site with a road, concentrating phase 1 on one parcel, and surface parking the resulting second parcel with the intention of developing this later.

Commentary:

The development community tempered much of their discussion with their understanding of current financial market issues, and experience of the PUD entitlement process necessary to establish development capacity and gain City Approvals. Without saying so, many made the assumption that the entitlement process (and development culture) would be 'business-as-usual'.

Considerable discussion also centered on the 'end-state' desire of the guidelines; and, how to get there in a reasonable fashion that is financially viable. Underlying this is concern that developers may encumber themselves with an aging asset that, in the interim, is not compliant with the Guidelines if they are applied universally. The key to realizing the urban design intent of the Guidelines will be in reiterating their flexibility, and, partnering with the development community to establish implementation and phasing strategies for each site.

The Guidelines present a significant vision for North San José. We understand they are intended as a flexible guiding document that aims to produce a long-term vision that is realistic. Reiterating the benefit of the guidelines for the long-term stability and financial health of San José is important.

With future need to do more with less, trends toward more collaborative business practices, smaller individual work-spaces, more flexible work spaces and increased opportunity for remote work practices, the success of redevelopment in North San José will ultimately depend upon flexibility of the Guidelines. The Guidelines need to be seen as a partner in workplace and home flexibility. Inherent flexibility will;

- Promote a wide range of development options, including single and multiple tenant sites,
- Reduce parking requirements on site,
- Increase ability to develop mixed-use projects when the market is ready,
- Increase the ability to densify specific sites to support transit, and,
- Will lead to a more dense, walkable, and diverse urban environment.

Beyond this, however, establishing North San José as one of the primary opportunity areas within the City is vital. Most developers implied a preference for the development ease of green-field sites. Future opportunity will be more urban, and will center on redevelopment. The upside for developers is the potential of greater returns in more urban locations like North San José. At risk is greater up-front cost and more complex projects than many are unfamiliar with. As North San José matures and densifies, it may be necessary for the City to actively partner with the developer community in their own growth and maturation. Similar to downtown, it may be necessary to stimulate redevelopment / regeneration through innovation in public-private partnership strategies.



North José Urban Design Guidelines: Non-Core Charrette
Mr. Dennis Korabiak
City of San Jose Redevelopment Agency
November 17, 2008
Page 5

Again, thank you for including us in the process, and we look forward to watching and helping North San José evolve over the coming years into a vibrant residential and business center supportive of downtown and the broader community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Knight". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "L" and a stylized "K".

Lewis Knight
Senior Urban Designer

Lewis Knight, Gensler Architecture, November 17, 2009

(Note: Mr. Knight facilitated the November 13, 2008, charette on Office Development Outside the Core.)

- 8.1 Grid streets, other streets and paseos that are employed to meet block-size guidelines are meant to be public to achieve the connectivity objective. On the other hand, Mid-Block Connectors (also known as Pathways), may be private. See Addendum items 3 and 6.
- 8.2 See Addendum item 2.
- 8.3 See Addendum items 8, 9 and 12.
- 8.4 See Addendum item 2.
- 8.5 Maximum block sizes are intended to support the connectivity objective. Outside the Core Area, the maximum block size is 1,000 by 1,000 feet or 23 acres. During the charette, several developers commented that the 27-acre study site was far bigger than any prospective development sites in North San Jose. Therefore, the 1,000-foot-square block should not be a constraint.
- 8.6 The Guidelines encourage (but do not require) four types of retail in viable locations and configurations. Also, see Addendum items 5 and 14.
- 8.7 See Addendum item 2.
- 8.8 See Addendum item 2.
- 8.9 See Addendum item 2.
- 8.10 See response to comment 8.1.
- 8.11 The 1.2 FAR is the calculated average build-out of the Core Area under the North San Jose Area Development Policy, not a minimum or maximum. The policy's *Implementation* section (pp. 23-25) sets forth the entitlement process.
- 8.12 Four office developments proposed for North San Jose range from 1.32 to 1.89 FAR.
- 8.13 See Addendum item 2.