

July 27, 2009 Task Force Meeting

Summary of March 9, 2009 Task Force Discussion on Parks and Open Space



At the March 9, 2009 Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update Task Force meeting, Task Force members and participants from the public discussed various questions related to San Jose's future. Provided below is a synopsis of the responses received from each discussion group for the last question. These items were considered in the development of the proposed Goals, Policies, & Implementation Strategies for the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update, and they are being provided to assist Task Force members in the discussion at their July 27, 2009 meeting.

Q4 – Neighborhood Services – Parks & Open Space

What ideas, concepts or goals would you like the Task Force to consider as we further discuss how to provide Parks and Open Space for current and future residents?

Table 1 (facilitated by Joe Horwedel)

- A major regional park should be included in each corner of the City. No more pocket parks should be pursued.

Table 2 (facilitated by Nanci Klein)

- The group felt strongly that we should move away from the 3.5 standard. Group members understand that the 3.5 is a state specified ratio, but everyone in the group felt frustrated by the standard for a variety of reasons. The group believes the 3.5 acres / 1000 population is much too suburban in nature.
- The group wanted to adopt a new standard related to both proximity and function. They wanted to be able to propose say a) a tot lot within 1,000 feet of every home, a soccer field within every 2-4 miles of each residential area, an aquatics center in every district or every other district.
- The proximity and function measure made a great deal more sense to the group than the current standard in place. The group wants to promote a realistic approach to parks and density. For example, a member of the group thought District 3 has great parks, they may not be large enough, but felt there are "6 options" close by that provide different venues. Because of the 3.5 standard, District 3 is seen as "under parked".
- The group was not enamored with a large amount of passive open space. The group was much more interested in tot lots, soccer fields, baseball fields, and other potential amenities.

- The group felt regional parkland adjacent to neighborhood areas should be counted as parkland.
- The group was very interested in trail connections – particularly for bike and pedestrian pathways.
- The group wanted office/non-residential uses to help in providing parks/trails.

Table 3 (facilitated by Andrew Crabtree)

- Focus on trails
- Rooftop parks?

Table 4 (facilitated by Laurel Prevetti)

- Different measures for different areas, recognizing the local needs
- Accessibility and walkability
- Trails and connectivity is key
- Increase community centers: they are more important as gathering places, especially for aging population
- Count regional parks, schools, San José State University, etc.

Table 5 (facilitated by Hans Larsen)

- No discussion.

Table 6 (facilitated by Stan Ketchum)

- Private open space credits do not equal public open space
- Build public park for each development – not defer to offsite
- Trails to neighborhoods
- Trails planning with specific plans (Diridon)
- Strengthen City-School play area use/support

Table 8 (facilitated by Lee Butler)

- Trend has been smaller parks – some activities demand greater square footage – sports facilities needed (baseball, soccer, etc.)
- Review Greenprint
- Parks Department and School District partnerships – joint use facilities
 - Locate parks in SCVWD lands, PG&E power line easements, etc.
- Consider Pleasant Hills Golf Course and County Fairgrounds
- Consider global warming and Green Vision in all parts of General Plan Update
 - Native vegetation not turf in parks
- Increase Construction & Conveyance tax to support parks