

**North Bayshore Precise Plan
Meeting/Workshop Summaries
April 14, 2015 to March 1, 2016**

March 1, 2016 City Council Meeting Comments

Residential Incentives and Bonus FAR

- Do not disincentivize residential at higher FARs.
- Need more economic information to better assess what level of FARs are needed to make development projects feasible.
- For expedited review, perhaps Master Plans can go first to the City Council for review, and then go through and expedited review process following Council direction; additional information requested on expedited review.
- Support for Office FAR Transfer concepts.
- Incentives should be structured to result in as many affordable housing units as possible.
- Developers should not be able to “double dip” between any local Bonus FAR program and State Density Bonus Law.

February 3, 2016 EPC Meeting Comments

Residential Incentives and Bonus Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

- Expedited review process is not recommended. More public input is needed on new projects.
- Support for Bonus FAR and transfer of office FAR ideas to incentivize more housing.
- More information is needed from other cities on what the FARs and heights mean in terms of their look and feel (images, pictures, etc.).
- Heights – should not be higher than 110', which is allowed by the existing Plan.
- Be creative with State Density Bonus Law and Bonus FAR tiers to achieve a desired City outcome.
- Remove green building measures from the list; these should be givens now.
- Expand/require more habitat enhancements and measures.
- Concern over impacts to mobile home residents.
- Increase affordable housing requirements to 20 percent to 30 percent for Tiers I and II.
- Give housing priority to North Bayshore employees and those without cars.
- Support for affordable housing for the developmentally disabled.

City Council – November 10, 2015

#1: Land use scenarios & land use regulations

- **Scenario #1** preferred

- Flexible land use approach
- #2: Urban design
- Stepbacks, articulation important
 - Support urban feel
 - Parking important; need areas for rideshare, etc.
 - Concern over canyon effect
 - No street parking
- #3 Building heights & intensities
- Varied building heights preferred
- #4 Unit mix
- Use EPC recommendation: Micro-unit/studio-40%; 1 bed-30%; 2 bed-20%; 3 bed-10%
- #5 Retail
- Majority support plaza concept
- #6 Open space
- Continue to explore central open space strategy preferred, but still consider dispersed open space
- #7 Additional study area
- Study VTA site for residential use
- #8 Nasa-Ames connection
- Study connection between NASA-Ames and North Bayshore

Environmental Planning Commission – November 4, 2015

- #1: Land use scenarios & land use regulations
- **Scenario #2 preferred**, with removal of the blocks/areas closest to the HOZ area near the Charleston Retention Basin
 - **Flexible** land use approach, with a **minimum core area** to ensure some residential units are built; others supported a flexible approach with strong encouragement for residential uses. EPC also supported policy ideas to incentivize residential development.
- #2: Urban design
- Cars should be underground or in structures, not on street;
 - Innovative transit system should be part of the neighborhood design;
 - No on street parking where office or residential; put on street parking where retail or mixed use proposed;
 - More bike lanes;
 - Pedestrians sitting near buildings is preferred over out towards street;
 - Prefer number of lanes that is safest;
 - Minimize parking;
 - Variation in residential building types preferred;
 - Streetlevel urban design elements are most important.

#3 Building heights & intensities

- Varied building heights preferred

#4 Unit mix

- Micro-unit/studio-40%; 1 bed-30%; 2 bed-20%; 3 bed-10%

#5 Retail

- **Main street** strategy preferred

#6 Open space

- **Central open space** strategy preferred
- Placemaking and programming important to create and activate vibrant public areas
- Open space should still be considered or dispersed in other areas

#7 Additional study area

- Study VTA site for residential use; Two EPC members supported the study of office

#8 Nasa-Ames connection

- Study connection between NASA-Ames and North Bayshore

October 22, 2015 Community Workshop #2

Based on the broad input received from Workshop #1, the North Bayshore team created four land use scenarios. These scenarios differed in terms of the size of the geographic area for new residential uses, the height and intensity of buildings, the mix of housing types, and the number of potential units.

These scenarios and other related topics were presented to the community at an October 22 workshop. Approximately 40 people attended this meeting.

The following are key summary points from this meeting:

- Most preferred a larger geographic area for new residential uses;
- Most preferred allowing a flexible mix of land uses – residential and office – in the residential study area;
- The new neighborhood should be designed so it is comfortable and safe for pedestrians and bicyclists, with buildings that support active streets;
- Taller building heights are acceptable in areas with a lot of activity;
- Most preferred a housing unit mix that favored smaller units;
- Retail should be focused along a “main street” environment;
- Most supported locating central public open space in the area west of Shoreline Boulevard and north of Plymouth Street;
- Central open space should include diverse, flexible activities; ideas include small play areas, farmer’s market, public art, water features, giant chessboard.

Participants were also given a questionnaire to complete following the presentation and group discussion. The questionnaire included similar questions to those in this Study Session memo.

July 25, 2015 Community Workshop #1

This workshop included a panel of leading urban planners to discuss ideas for the future of North Bayshore. The workshop also included small group exercises where participants described their desired outcomes for this Precise Plan process; described their preferences in terms of development types, building types, and other community amenities; discussed ideas for alternatives for new mixed-use development, housing, services, civic uses, parks, and open space; and identified opportunities and challenges with transforming the area. The workshop was attended by approximately 90 participants.

Overall, workshop participants wanted to see a vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood with a variety of land uses, housing types, public spaces, and destinations within North Bayshore.

April 14, 2015 City Council Meeting

At this meeting, the City Council provided direction on potential North Bayshore new residential locations for further evaluation.

The Council also provided direction on the July workshop format and indicated a preference to further study more urban, high-density residential uses during the Precise Plan process.