

## Visitacion Valley / Schlage Advisory Body Meeting #2 Summary

The Advisory Body members for the Schlage site had a second meeting on Tuesday, **March 12, 2013** at the Visitacion Valley Library.

Attendees: 1) reviewed Leland Greenway site changes; 2) provided questions they would like OEWD to address at a future workshop on the economics of the project, and 3) reviewed key urban design provisions that would either change or be added in the Design for Development (D4D) document to ensure height and other changes don't significantly impact the streets, open space, views and the overall neighborhood environment. The key points raised by Advisory Body members at the meeting are summarized below:

### Leland Greenway

- The final programming must ensure it is a successful green space.
  - The amount of required retail frontage vs. residential frontage should be balanced to ensure successful (not empty) retail and an active green area.
  - Consider a pedestrian path around the perimeter that could act as jogging path, etc.
- Whether the extension of Leland is closed to traffic or open to traffic, it must be designed as primarily a pedestrian-street.
- Determine the best configuration for parking in front of blocks 1 & 2 to support Leland as primarily a pedestrian-street:
  - Ensure parking does not contribute to speeding or interfere with the pedestrian use (members feel that diagonal parking tends to encourage faster driving).
  - Use design solutions, hours, flex space to minimize parking interference.
- Ensure Street A provides an engaging, active connection through the entire site, particularly along the east side of block 2 and where Leland Avenue ends.
- Design ground floor frontages as flexible space that can potentially become retail as the project gradually fills in.

### Urban Design Tools Review

The general sentiment is that buildings have to be designed very well and not look "forced" or "fake" in the design treatments they use to break the massing, simulate the topography and vary the roof lines.

- Current tools in the D4D for required commercial and residential street frontages were reviewed as still applicable and appropriate.
- New tools to ensure varied roof lines within and between blocks, and to emphasize the slope of the site, were reviewed and generally agreed upon:
  - Require that upper stories of buildings step back along key frontages (i.e. parks, key pedestrian streets and paths) and throughout site.
  - Enable punctuation of key corners or other locations through a small height exception (i.e. 5-8 feet)
  - The tools that are not changing in the D4D (roof modulations and features such as gables, corner towers, etc.)
- Current requirements in the D4D mandating maximum building lengths, and requiring significant breaks of 20' wide between these buildings, were recognized to impair feasibility, although participants asked to see quantification of that impact (see questions below). Some participants felt that these requirements were not critical to creating good design within the site, and could be replaced with additional tools to further break down building massing. Tools reviewed and generally agreed upon as appropriate included:
  - For frontages greater than 200 feet in length, require change in building massing every 100 feet. This could be accomplished through a significant setback of the massing,

**Visitation Valley / Schlage**  
**Advisory Body Meeting #2 Summary**

- recess, notch, and should combined with changes in fenestration, pattern and/or material.
- Provide more detailed guidelines for varying architectural style within a block, and between blocks.
  - Continue requirements for stoops and individual residential entrances at the ground floor.

**Project Economics Questions**

The following were questions Advisory Body members had for OEWD regarding project economics (to be answered and used to prepare the 4<sup>th</sup> community workshop):

1. How large is the post-Redevelopment funding gap?
2. What is the additional housing units' financial impact on the project?
3. How many of the additional units will be market rate and how many will be affordable?
4. Where on the site are the additional housing units going? How many are accommodated within original building heights (by shrinking unit sizes), and how many are accommodated by adding height on certain parcels?
5. What is the rationale behind having smaller units and/or fewer large units? How do smaller units help with project economics? What types of households are expected to live in the new housing, and how is that reflected in the mix of unit sizes?
6. What is the rationale behind retail space placement and limited retail space?
7. How much public sector subsidy is needed? How quickly can subsidies be obtained?
8. Could adding substantially more density (and reopening the EIR in order to do so) help the project happen more quickly?
9. Could the project ever work without any government subsidy?
10. What is the City's commitment to closing the funding gap and making the project happen?
11. How does the new AutoReturn location impact the project's economics?
12. What are the development cost implications of continuing requirements that blocks be split into multiple buildings?