

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS
October 14, 2020 MEETING

Item 5.1 – Presentation from Mountain View Whisman School District

1. How integrated has the City been with the school district in establishing the current fencing proposals?

Staff was asked to review and provide input on the proposed fencing last spring. At that time, the District had not provided City staff with any timeline or specific next steps. City staff anticipated additional coordination/meetings prior to the plans being shared with the public.

2. What are the jurisdictional roles of the organizations (MVWSD, City, PRC) as they specifically relate to resolving this particular fencing issue?

Mountain View Whisman School District owns the property identified for proposed fencing. In some cases, they are proposing to keep specific park elements outside the fencing for public use, even though those elements are on MVWSD property. Through a series of master agreements and supplemental agreements, the School District provides public access to their open space during after school hours, on weekends, holidays, and school breaks. In turn, the City provides ongoing maintenance of those areas. MVWSD intends to provide ongoing public access through proposed gates that are timed to allow the public to enter outside of school hours.

The PRC is being provided a presentation by MVWSD to provide an opportunity for further input from the community related to the proposed fencing project. PRC may provide input as well.

City Council is scheduled to receive a presentation from both MVWSD and Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District on Tuesday, October 27. The purpose is to discuss next steps for schools and possible re-opening plans. As part of the MVWSD presentation, District staff will provide an update related to the fencing project. Both the public and City Council may provide input on the presentation.

Following the Council meeting, MVWSD staff will prepare a new fencing proposal taking into account public input received. As the MVWSD staff prepare for next steps, both City and District will further review the existing agreements and discuss appropriate next steps.

Item 6.1 – Park Land Dedication Ordinance Second Review of Modifications

1. Topic 2A, Modification #1 includes the following verbiage: "...staff proposes to establish service objectives or, in some cases, prescriptive objectives, for each element to establish clear expectations of function and purpose." Could you provide an example or two to illustrate what that might look like?

Under the minimum requirements in Table 2: New Proposed Elements, staff is recommending to establish minimum service levels rather than minimum sizes. An example of a service objective is requiring the Picnic Area to seat 15 people and have one BBQ for every two tables. This objective can be achieved in various forms, including by smaller two-person tables and multiple Barbeques or by two large communal tables able to seat 10 with one barbeque. The different sets of tables would require different spatial dimensions. Staff believes serving 15 individuals is the important requirement rather than the specific size requirements, which could result in repetitive picnic layouts for all Picnic Area spaces. An example of a prescriptive objective is requiring Open, Usable Field element to be a minimum of 0.3 acres in size. Staff believes having a size requirement for Open, Usable Field and a Dog Park is the most effective way to implement these elements rather than using a service objective such as number of dogs or individuals that can use the space.

2. What are "minimum service requirements?"

See response to question 1.

3. Table 2 (New Proposal Elements) appears to have eliminated a hydration station as a requirement for Game Courts. Was that intentional? Is there some mechanism to ensure some kind of hydration option is available within any > 0.4 acre space that includes active exercise elements? (playgrounds, game courts, etc) Is hydration ever "assigned" to the park overall, as opposed to a specific element? *Staff removed the hydration station requirement from individual elements because it will be an overall requirement for the open space in order for it to be comparable to a City park. The City will want hydration stations at these open spaces and tying that requirement to specific elements, rather than the overall open space, may cause confusion on what is expected. Therefore, hydration stations will be required under other qualifying criteria for the open space credit.*

4. With the New Proposal Elements, in theory, could the full POPA requirement for a development be satisfied by a Class 1 trail (with no other elements)?

In theory, an applicant could propose that a single element fill the 0.4 acre minimum POPA size to qualify for the open space credit, assuming the element meets the minimum requirements and service objectives. Through the review process and utilizing the analyses of the areas demographics and park elements, staff would review the proposed element to ensure it complies with all requirements. For a trail to be included in a POPA, it would need to include a 100' x 100' open space area to meet the minimum dimensions of the POPA credit, resulting in the need to include additional elements to fill the larger area of open space in combination with a proposed trail. Overall, staff believes it would be

challenging for any single element to meet all of the requirements without being substantial in length or size, such as a U-12 youth soccer field. However, the City could benefit from having that as an option even though it is only one element.

5. How would a POPA achieve an additional 25% for Alternative Proposals? Is it just by virtue of being 1 acre+?

Correct. Any open space that is over 1 acre in size would qualify for credit under the Alternate Proposal section and be eligible for up to an additional 25% credit of the value of the land due to the size of the space being provided.

6. Do Parkland Dedication fees fluctuate much more than other fees imposed on developments by the City?

Yes, the Parkland fee fluctuates more than other City development fees. Other development fees, such as the Citywide Transportation Impact Fee or Utility Capacity fees, are based on an original nexus study to establish the fee, which can only increase by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) each year or by the City conducting an updated nexus study. The Parkland fee, on the other hand, is based on land value, which is constantly adjusting based on the sale of land; and does not adjust consistently across the City, but fluctuates more in areas where greatest development opportunities are located.

7. Could the "Landscaped, Parklike Quiet Area" be better defined so it does not end up covering small pockets of leftover space? Can more requirements be built in (seating, canopy, etc.)?

PRC can provide that direction as part of their input at the meeting. Staff will make a note to bring this up when reviewing the list of elements as part of staff's presentation.

8. Under "Modifications/Additional Direction" - can you explain: "Above and beyond the minimum zoning requirement."

Each property is located in a zoning district, which has an established set of development standards for new development, such as maximum building heights, building setbacks and, for residential development, minimum common and private open space requirements per residential unit.

Specifically, the phrase "above and beyond the minimum zoning requirement" is referencing that any consideration for Parkland credit needs to be on open space that exceeds the required (common and private) open space of the zoning district for that development. This is the City's current practice and establishes an important distinction to ensure that the proposed development is not reliant on the parkland credit area to meet basic zoning requirements and vice versa.

9. Under Option 1, what if a developer chose to have a POPA at the frontage and private space inside? How would fees be calculated under this option?

Developers will only be allowed to apply for one open space credit per residential development. In this scenario, they would only be able to apply for either the POPA

credit for the publicly accessible space or for the private open space credit for the internal private open space area.

10. Do I understand correctly that the difference between Options 1 and 3 is that Option 1 would grant no credit for private open space and Option 3 would grant 25% for private space versus possibly 100% for a POPA? And staff thinks Option 2 is not likely to be used due to its size requirements?

Option 1 removes the credit for private open space from the ordinance so only publicly accessible open space can receive a credit from the City.

Option 2 requires one contiguous acre of open space at a credit of up to 25% of the value of the land. One contiguous acre is the same minimum size requirement as the current private open space credit. The City has only received a few applications for the private open space credit in the last five years. Staff anticipates continuing to receive a low volume of applications if Option 2 is recommended due to the minimum size requirement of 1 acre.

Option 3 lowers the minimum size requirement to 0.4 acres to match the minimum size requirement currently proposed for the POPA credit. The level of credit for this option is proposed at up to 25% the value of the land for open space between 0.4–1.0 acres in size. For private open space greater than one acre, the private open space could qualify for an additional 25% credit under the Alternate Proposal, like the proposed POPA credit. Therefore, Option 3 would allow private open space greater than 1 acre to receive a level of credit up to 50% of the value of the land. By lowering the minimum size and adjusting the credit percentage, there may be a greater volume of applications for private open space credits, but the private open spaces have decreased value (less credit percentage) versus publically accessible open spaces. Option 3 differs from Option 2 which dictates the level of credit will be 25% the value of the land (with no additional 25% credit option) for the 1-acre minimum open space.

All credit options discussed in the Staff Report are summarized in the below table.

Summary of Credit Options in Staff Report

Credit Options	Minimum Size	Level of Credit	Level of Credit if greater than 1 acre (Alternate Proposal)
Private Open Space Credit			
Option 1	N/A	0%	0%
Option 2	1.0+ contiguous acre	Up to 25% value of the land	Up to 25% value of the land
Option 3	0.4–1.0 contiguous acre	Up to 25% value of the land	Up to 50% value of the land
Privately Owned Publically Accessible Open Space Credit			
POPA Credit	0.4–1.0 contiguous acre	Up to 75% value of the land	Up to 100% value of the land