

# M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

*Meeting:* Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #11

*Date:* April 28, 2004

---

The eleventh meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on April 28, 2004 in Cougar Hall in the Eastridge Mall Community Room at 7:00 PM.

**Task Force Attendees:** Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Creek), Chris Corpus (Charrette participant, KONA), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Garth Cummings (Charrette participant), Gordon Lund (Groesbeck), Homing Yip (EHRAG), Ike White (Mt. Pleasant), Khanh Nguyen (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Lillian Jones (Charrette participant), Lou Kvitek (SCVCO), Maria Lopez (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Mark Milioto (Evergreen Little League), Mike Alvarado (Charrette participant), Paul Pereira (Boggini), Steve Tedesco (Charrette participant, Boys & Girls Club), Sylvia Alvarez (Charrette participant, EESD Trustee), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Vikki Lang (Evergreen Little League – alternate)

**Members of the Public:** Tian Zhang, Marie Sinatra, Katja Irvin

**Development Community:** Joe Sordi, Mike Keaney, Mark Day, Bo Radanovich, Tom Armstrong, Mike Hill, Jim Eller, Bonnie Moss, Jessica Heinzelman

**Staff:** Laurel Prevetti (PBCE Deputy Director), Julie Amato (RDA Development Specialist), Rabia Chaudhry (Council Office), Britta Buys (PBCE Senior Planner), Jane Light (SJPL Director), Richard Desmond (SJPL Deputy Director), Manuel Pineda (DOT Senior Civil Engineer), Hans Larsen (DOT Deputy Director)

## I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and asked them to introduce themselves.

## II. PRESENT LAND USE CONCEPTS & ALTERNATIVES FOR EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE

Laurel Prevetti explained that the two schematics being distributed were the result of comments from the 4/14/04 EVP Meeting. She said that these designs were more detailed than the typical first run designs for the other opportunity sites because in this case we have an existing campus around which to build. Eventually this level of detail will be applied to all of the opportunity sites. She then asked Mark Day to present each version in detail.

Day explained that the totally acreage of the land in question is 28 acres.

Scheme A shows a retail site at West Campus Drive (new) and San Felipe Road, a total of seven acres. The site contains a grocery store (approximately 55,000SF) and about 20,000SF in other office buildings. This retail center would be visible along the frontage of

---

San Felipe Road. The second component of this scheme is office space in the southeast corner, occupying roughly 75,000SF (three story building). The third component is residential, consisting mainly of townhomes, studios and various bedroom apartments. Parking is located beneath the buildings. The final component is the location of the southeast branch library along the eastern edge of the property, near Yerba Buena Road. Scheme B shows a retail component on Yerba Buena Road, perhaps an extension of what is already at the corner of San Felipe and Yerba Buena Roads. The office component is adjacent and there are possible locations for the southeast branch library. Day explained that with either concept, the college drive could become a proper street and perhaps connect with Yerba Buena Road.

Task force member Vikki Lang commented that she would like to see ballfields in the design, perhaps at one of the unused library locations

Task force member Mike Alvarado asked how to integrate the Falls Creek neighborhood. He also asked what the capacity for amenities was on either of these designs. Meaning, from an economic standpoint, how much does each project generate/contribute towards our amenity/infrastructure list? Cortese responded that this was a good question and that he too would like to see this information now versus later. Alvarado added that he was pleased to see the community gathering spots and was curious to know how many people could be accommodated in them.

Task force member Sylvia Alvarez commented that she prefers scheme A because it better integrates with the surrounding environment. She did express concern about the creation of an interior campus street and asked if we really want people having to cross the street to get to a campus. Day responded that this was a good point and worth the Task Force's consideration.

Task force member Mark Milioto asked where the police training facility would go in either design. Day responded that it would not remain. EVC Vice Chancellor Mike Hill added that it is a college district decision as to whether or not they could still house the police training facility. Milioto also asked about locating a grocery store on this property, considering that nowadays they are not doing well. Day responded that he could have also depicted a Trader Joe's size business versus a Safeway size business and that Milioto is right, we need to have the market study done to determine if indeed a grocery store is viable here. Prevetti added that we are looking to hire a market economist to examine this.

Task force member Lou Kvittek commented that we should not shy from forcing a business out (by adding more of those businesses) just because it was there first. For example, with both Cosentino's and Lunardi's, he personally does not shop there because they are too expensive. Member of the public Marie Sinatra volunteered that she shops there exclusively because of the high quality products.

Task force member Sherry Gilmore commented that with all the new housing units proposed to come in, she'd like to see the police academy stay. Hill responded that the college district is trying to work on this. Day added that we could also explore locating a police storefront.

---

Task force member Homing Yip asked where the four-acre park is on either of these schemes, given that by PDO/PIO regulations, green space would have to be offered up. He also said that he felt there was too much of a push towards high density as the numbers seem to indicate 100 units per acre. Day responded that the numbers on both schemes are more like forty units per acre. Yip followed by asking how the transportation system would support these new units. He expressed concern at the college's apparent shift towards revenue generation, irrespective of community need. Hill responded that the college has multiple goals in developing their site: revenue for the school, housing for staff, support for the creation of amenities and amplification of the college itself as an amenity.

Task force member Tom Andrade added that scheme B seems to include a small park as well as play areas along the street. He recommended the latter be relocated to more within the property since we do not want kids near busy streets.

Task force member Gordon Lund asked if the college has ample parking to take care of its projected growth. Hill responded that currently there is enough but we'll need to increase the number of available spaces as the masterplan continues to be built out.

Task force member Chris Corpus commented that he didn't recall seeing a grocery store on our amenity list. He would like to see located here a restaurant and a gathering spot (like a banquet facility).

Task force member Bill Kozlovsky commented that given the high densities being suggested here, we need to see the amenities and transportation improvements pay off soon.

Task force member Paul Pereira commented that at the 4/14/04 meeting people were talking about housing as a possibility but now it seems like the group is shying away from it. Corpus volunteered that he likes housing, but would also like to see the two amenities he mentioned happen, too.

San Jose Public Library Director Jane Light as well Deputy Director Richard Desmond shared the library's perspective on the two versions for Evergreen Valley College. Light explained that libraries are just like any other real estate - location is key. She gave the example of Seven Trees Library. It's not visible, not expandable and there is no parking. Evergreen Library is ideally located. Light said she likes scheme B's placement of the library along San Felipe Road, which is highly visible. It's important that the southeast branch library be placed on a site that allows for expansion because 12,000SF is too small. The other option in scheme B places the library on Yerba Buena Road near the existing retail, and this isn't a bad option either. She did express concern with the library placement in scheme A, feeling that there were few benefits in locating the southeast branch library and the EVC library close together. Cortese asked Light to explain parking as it relates to the library. Light said that libraries have significant in and out travel. 88% of library goers come for less than one hour. Light also stated that having the library within a shopping center would be a good alternative so that it would benefit from captured trips to the center.

Lang asked for clarification of Evergreen Valley College's land wishes. Hill responded that the college wishes to retain land ownership but let someone else own the building.

---

Cortese offered that if capacity at the southeast branch library is an issue, let's deal with it now via EVP. Lang asked if the library could be built as a two-story. Light responded that a library under 30,000SF really should be one story, it just isn't efficient to have multistory. Cortese summarized the discussion on the EVC site and reminded everyone that each of these land use opportunities will be compared against the group's guiding principles to ensure consistency.

### **III. PRESENT LAND USE CONCEPTS AND ALTERNATIVES FOR PLEASANT HILLS GOLF COURSE**

Prevetti opened by explaining that in response to a question at the previous meeting as to why this property can't be turned into a county park, Prevetti spoke with county officials and their goal is to link large county parks together and create a perimeter around the county. This park is too small to be a county park, plus there is little money in the budget to purchase and develop it.

Task force member Steve Tedesco asked for the city's perspective on developing PHGC as a park. Prevetti said that the city typically gains land either by dedication or PDO. She doesn't know if what is generated via EVP would be enough to buy the entire course. Once this evening's meeting is completed, the task force will have previewed all of the opportunity sites. We can then survey them together and determine how much park land we should be receiving and what amenities will go where.

Task force member Alan Covington asked when the task force would hear about traffic. Prevetti said the task force would hear a little bit today and more information at the 5/22/04 meeting.

Lund asked what would happen if PHGC is pulled out of the properties for negotiation for EVP. Prevetti said we would have to reassess the overall numbers. The more acres we are dealing with, the more financing that is available. If the task force decides PHGC is an amenity then we will recalculate.

Cortese commented that people contact him all the time about the poor condition of the Highway 101/Yerba Buena/Capitol Expressway interchange. There is no money at the city, state or federal levels for improvements. The EVP process started as a way to remedy some of the conditions in Evergreen that would otherwise go unmitigated, such as the major freeway interchanges.

Prevetti commented that the goal here is not to squelch the value of open space. The two proposed concepts for PHGC are purposefully in bubble diagrams to allow the task force to shape what appears here and gain a comfort level. She then asked Day to present the two concepts in question. Day explained that the two versions were drawn by a land planner for KB Homes who was unable to join the meeting today.

#### Scheme A

This is a lower density plan. There are single family homes throughout most of the site, similar to what is at Rivermark. Higher density single family homes can be found towards the middle of the property. The totally number of homes on this property is about 900. There is a park in the southwest corner of the property for water retention and another one in the center. There is also a small retail component.

---

Task force member Ike White requested to see how traffic will be resolved. He also said that Fernish Park and Lake Cunningham Regional Park are both close by. He wonders at the amount of park space being proposed given the city's ability to police these properties. Day agreed and said that we'll also want to look at the connectivity of these sites. We may want a street to go through as well.

#### Scheme B

This version shows about a 40% dedication of park space with the balance of the property being used towards single family homes, townhomes and flats. There is a small retail component on the western edge of the property.

Alvarez requested to see detail on the proposed retail. Day responded that it is a corner retail opportunity, not a shopping center. Prevetti said that if we really want retail at this property then we have to study this closely because stand-alone retail traditionally does not do well.

Kvitek asked if it is necessary that the southwest corner of the property be left for water retention. Day responded yes.

Tedesco commented that he felt there was too much park acreage in version B. Cortese responded that when he envisioned 40% green space, he saw it more in the form of a greenbelt, for connectivity, especially east-west, connecting the regional park with other neighborhoods to the east of PHGC. Whatever development occurs on this property should occur either along the perimeter or around the greenbelt.

Corpus commented that he would hate to see the golf course leave. He also feels that development along the top right hand side of the property needs to be lower density to transition with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Yip said he feels we're attempting to place too high densities on this property. Evergreen already suffers from traffic and now we're adding even more homes. Cortese responded that we will be giving a traffic presentation shortly that will address many of these concerns.

Cortese concluded by stating that this discussion is tabled until the next meeting so as to allow time to discuss traffic and economic issues. He reiterated that the developers and staff need to come back with presentations that are structured around the guiding principles and the many densities needed to achieve traffic mitigation and amenities.

#### **IV. INTRODUCE PRIORITY TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS, BOTH LOCAL & REGIONAL**

Hans Larsen gave a brief transportation overview, explaining that the city's vision is to provide a safe and efficient transportation system that contributes to the livability and economic health of the city. He went on to explain some of the major access elements (freeways, capitol expressway, arterials and transit) in Evergreen. He touched on the city's system of bicycle and pedestrian pathways, operational improvements (traffic signals, intelligent transportation systems) and livability enhancements. He concluded by stating that the next step is to complete a traffic analysis based on the planned development for

---

the land use opportunity sites, at which point staff can devise a scope, cost and suggested priorities.

Cortese explained that we would continue the traffic discussion at the 5/22/04 Task Force Meeting.

**V. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 9:05PM.