

August 15, 2011

To: City of San Jose Envision 2040 General Plan EIR Staff

From: John Urban,
Newhall neighborhood

Subject: City of San Jose Envision 2040 General Plan EIR

Hello,

Below are comments related to the City of San Jose Envision 2040 General Plan EIR.

CD-3.9 page 4-13 Quality of Life

Minimize driveway entrances to enhance pedestrian safety and decrease the area of paved surfaces. Encourage shared vehicular access points that serve multiple uses and/or parcels, including shared access for commercial and residential uses. Avoid driveways that break up continuous commercial building frontages. Position vehicular access to minimize negative impacts to aesthetics and to pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Why wasn't the following sentence added: Discourage use of local neighborhood streets as access points to parking lots/garage.???

CD 4.14 page 4-15 Quality of Life

- 1) Will both the Village Plan and "specific regulations and the Urban Design Standards" (CD 4.14 page 4.15 Quality of Life) be required to be complete before development is allowed on\at a Village on a Grand Boulevard??
- 2) When will Grand Boulevard Urban Design Standards begin to be developed?
- 3) Will job creating land uses/development be allowed along Grand Boulevards before Urban Design Standards are complete?
- 4) Will residential land uses/development be allowed along Grand Boulevards before Urban Design Standards are complete?

CD 4.5 page 4-14 Quality of Life

For new development in transition areas between identified growth areas and nongrowth areas, use a combination of building setbacks, building step-backs, materials, building orientation, landscaping, and other design techniques to provide a consistent streetscape that buffers lower-intensity areas from higher-intensity areas and that reduces potential shade, shadow, massing, viewshed, **artificial light trespass, privacy** or other land use compatibility concerns.

Why wasn't "artificial light trespass" specifically called out as a compatibility concern?

Why wasn't "privacy" specifically called out as a compatibility concern?

Transportation and Land Use

The following four points assume coordination of transportation and land use.

1) TR-1.8 page 6-36

Actively coordinate with regional transportation, land use planning, and transit agencies to develop a transportation network with complementary land uses that encourage travel by bicycling, walking and transit, and ensure that regional greenhouse gas emission standards are met.

2) TR-1.9 page 6-36

Give priority to the funding of multimodal projects that provide the most benefit to all users. Evaluate new transportation projects to make the most efficient use of transportation resources and capacity.

3) TR-3.3 page 6-41

As part of the development review process, require that new development along existing and planned transit facilities consist of land use and development types and intensities that contribute toward transit ridership. In addition, require that new development is designed to accommodate and to provide direct access to transit facilities.

4) TR-3.6 Collaborate with Caltrans and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to prioritize transit mobility along the Grand Boulevards identified on the Growth Areas Diagram. Improvements could include installing transit signal priority, queue jump lanes at congested intersections, and/or exclusive bus lanes.

Why are growth areas on The Alameda (CR-30 and VT4) not coordinated with VTA's BRT stops?

Why is the Growth Area CR-30 designated with a Village overlay when a BRT stop is so far away (¾ mile - SCTransit Ctr & 2/3 mile (Naglee/Taylor) ?

Why is the Growth Area CR-30 designated with a Village overlay when a BRT stop will by definition never stop at Newhall St due to the required spacing of BRT stops to create an "express" bus service?

Since the Naglee/Taylor BRT stop will not move due to its interface with BART (Berryessa station) VTA feeder lines, why isn't The Alameda/Naglee/Taylor intersection designated a Village?