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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For six days, from November 13 through the 18 of 2002, a team of 33 multi-disciplinary professionals, graduate students, faculty, and consultants affiliated with the University of Miami School of Architecture’s Knight Program in Community Building worked with dozens of local staff and volunteers and several hundred members of San Jose’s Evergreen-Eastridge area to discuss the challenges, opportunities, and goals for the future growth and development of the area. Based on advanced data collection, three separate pre-charrette visits by team members to meet with local community officials, staff and citizens, and the intensive stakeholder sessions, pinups, and reviews convened during the charrette itself, a master plan, market analysis, and set of strategic actions in areas of policy, design and management were developed and are documented here in this report.

The Evergreen-Eastridge area of San Jose represents a microcosm of the challenges and changes facing large sections of American metropolitan areas built after World War II. Older suburban neighborhoods that were once affluent bedroom communities at the edge of cities now find themselves surrounded by all manner of residential and commercial development, hemmed in by heavily trafficked highways that carry the residents of newer neighborhoods ever further out in a regional pattern that has become characterized as “sprawl” since William H. Whyte first coined the term back in the late 1950s. Suburbs built in the 1950s through the 1980s have “urbanized” with the addition of shopping malls, strip centers, office development, and apartment complexes, but without the benefits of urban amenities such as pedestrian-oriented streets, high quality public space, reliable transit service, civic institutions, mixed-use neighborhood centers and town centers, and distinctive architecture that reflects the local culture and creates a character of place.

Early postwar suburbs like Evergreen-Eastridge have also become increasingly ethnically and racially mixed, and socially, economically, and culturally diverse. The incredible ethnic mix of West Evergreen resembles the immigrant neighborhoods of large metropolitan cities that were the gateways to America throughout much of the 20th century. In contrast to the inner-city urban neighborhoods of cities like New York, Boston, and Chicago in the last century, however, the “melting pot” in cities like San Jose is now a low-density suburb.

In Northeastern and Midwestern cities, many suburbs built during this era have experienced out-migration, declining property values, and are now grappling with the same problems more typically associated with distressed inner-city neighborhoods. West Evergreen shares in some of these challenges, including issues related to school readiness for children, job training, day care, the lack of health care for many families, as well as some crime and drug abuse.

In contrast to declining suburbs in other parts of the nation, the West Evergreen neighborhood of San Jose has been swept up in the rapid growth and economic boom of Silicon Valley. Recent decades have brought a dramatic rise in property values throughout the region, including formerly affordable areas such as the West Evergreen neighborhood. Thus the Evergreen-Eastridge study area is caught in a regional affordable housing crisis, a topic of extreme concern for residents, community officials, and business leaders in San Jose and throughout the Silicon Valley.

The housing crisis is a poignant issue for West Evergreen, as the neighborhood has provided housing for many of the City’s new immigrants, many of whom were forced out of other areas of the City by rising costs and redevelopment pressures and can no longer afford the rising housing costs in the neighborhood. The housing crisis also interconnects with broader issues, including sustainable economic growth in the region and the effect on households and schools as people of low and moderate incomes are continuously forced to move to seek out more affordable housing.

The pattern of development during this era was entirely automobile dependent and this dependency, more than any other factor, has come to dominate the daily life of Evergreen-Eastridge residents as they travel to and from their homes, workplaces, shopping, and social and family activities. The neighborhood was built at a scale for the comfort of automobiles – wide, barren residential streets and even wider commercial streets fronted by deep parking lots that surround and isolate one property from the next, and form a no man’s land of “greyfields.”

Now the community is looking to balance the needs of the car with the qualities of livable communities that are built to a more human scale. It is a balance that can be struck, but one that will require a new approach to planning and policymaking based on livable community design. It will also require a firm commitment on the part of elected officials and regulators in guiding the future development and redevelopment of properties in the neighborhood in keeping with this new approach.
intensive charrette held from November 13-18, 2002. This Plan is organized into eight sections which are grouped as follows.

Sections I - III – Overview, Background, Information and Analysis of Existing Conditions

Section I is the Executive Summary of the Plan document.
Section II provides historical background on the study area, an overview of the charrette process that informed the plan, including goals and objectives drawn from the West Evergreen SNI report.

Section III provides an analysis of existing conditions in the study area, including: the regional context, environmental setting, transportation, the social environment, housing, economic and real estate context, and urban form.

Sections IV - VI – Master Plan, Implementation and Strategic Recommendations

Section IV contains the heart of the Plan document, including a summary of ideas explored in the charrette, a detailed breakdown of the specific strategies and ideas embodied in the master plan, a summary of the market analysis (provided in full as a companion document), and proposals for transportation improvements and building types.

The master plan includes specific strategies for the addition of parks, plazas, athletic fields, and open space throughout the neighborhood, including connections to the regional system of trails, open space, and recreational areas. The plan identifies potential settings for new community facilities (a community center, elementary school, ice skating rink) and transit stations.

Detailed plans are presented for transit-oriented development on the 86-acre site adjacent to the mall; short-term and long-term infill and redevelopment of the Eastridge Mall site; and infill development along the Tully corridor and Lion’s Plaza.

Transportation improvements are presented including: the reconfiguration of multi-modal connections at the Eastridge Mall site; general traffic calming improvements for existing residential and commercial streets throughout the neighborhood to create a pedestrian-friendly setting and improve the attractiveness of the area; new pedestrian- and transit-oriented street designs for development of the TOD site; a cut-and-cover strategy for Tully Road on the approach to the Reid-Hill View Airport; and a roundabout proposal for relieving traffic at the intersection of Tully and the Capitol Expressway. Strategic locations for structured parking are identified to support transit, and provide parking for new and existing residential, retail and office properties while freeing up land for infill development, parks and community facilities.

The plan organizes new development so that commercial and higher intensity residential areas transition to lower-intensity residential areas to provide a smooth transition with the existing neighborhood. New community facilities, and new and expanded parks and gathering places are seamlessly connected to the existing neighborhood to provide safe, attractive means of access for all residents.

The building types identified in this section also convey the quality and character of development that residents would prefer: interconnected development (no enclaves) with a low- to mid-rise scale and architecture that reflects more of the neighborhood’s cultural diversity.

Section V contains general urban design guidelines to be incorporated into regulations that will guide the implementation of the plan.

Section VI identifies strategic actions that can be taken in areas of design, policy and management to help bring about positive changes in the study area consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the West Evergreen SNI Report and the Evergreen-Eastridge Charrette.

Section VII – Companion Documents and Appendices

Section VII identifies the major companion documents included with this report: the summary of the results from the Evergreen-Eastridge Charrette stakeholder meetings, a reference list for the documents and reports.
used in preparation for the charrette, and the full Evergreen-Eastridge Market Analysis.

Moving Forward: The Art of the Possible in Evergreen-Eastridge

The Evergreen-Eastridge Plan cannot provide solutions for all of the complex social and economic issues faced in the study area, but the charrette and this plan serve to continue and extend the community dialog while providing specific proposals, guidelines and strategies for action. Beyond the current economic downturn in the region, future growth, change and redevelopment are inevitable for Evergreen-Eastridge. The time to plan for and choose a future course for development is now. Opportunities abound: the coming of light rail transit; a mall with redevelopment potential; infill opportunities along the full course of Tully Road; an existing system of parks and trails to connect with; property values that make structured parking economically viable; and residents open to mixed-use development, transit, and higher density development so long as it is designed in an attractive, livable character and transitions gradually with the existing neighborhoods.

Some will say “It can’t be done here,” that it will “cost too much,” “take too long,” or departs from the inescapable model of placeless sprawl of isolated apartment blocks, office parks, strip centers, and enclosed malls that cover Santa Clara County, the Bay Area, and much of suburban America from coast to coast. Even the shortest memory, however, can recall how dynamic and rapid change can occur within the region.

To bring about the changes envisioned in this plan does not require one grand sweeping effort completed in a single stroke. The enhancement of Evergreen-Eastridge will come about through an incremental approach in which individual steps taken by public agencies, nonprofit groups, and the private sector will accumulate over time to create the place that citizens dream of: street by street, building by building, each move following a unified vision for a more livable community. Transit investments today, a redeveloped shopping mall tomorrow, the infill of parking lots as the market dictates that the combination of these actions will add up to more than the sum of its parts, and deliver a more livable Evergreen-Eastridge for the benefit of all current and future residents.

The members of the charrette team have worked with the public, private, and nonprofit sectors in communities throughout the United States and can show one example after another of neighborhoods and communities that have accomplished the same types of community building goals and strategies presented in this plan, places with far fewer resources, with shrinking populations and tax bases, places of the old economy and unsophisticated planning regulations and public administration, but places where people knew that if they were to take control of their own fate as a community, they needed to stop emphasizing the reasons why things could not become better and set to work making things happen.

“Success,” as Bobby Unser said, “is where preparation and opportunity meet.” We believe that the people of San Jose who came together for the West Evergreen Strong Neighborhoods Initiative and the Evergreen-Eastridge charrette have the talent, creativity and commitment to continue to move this initiative forward and prepare to take advantage of each opportunity that arises to build a more livable community. With the community behind this initiative, the public officials can feel confident they are responding responsibly to the community’s needs.

Reviewing the design.
II. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview of the Charrette Process

A charrette is a collaborative planning process when citizens, designers, planners, and community officials gather to formulate a vision for future development in an area. A charrette provides input from all participants and provides the design team with immediate feedback on the community’s vision and ideas.

The Evergreen-Eastridge charrette began with a community barbecue and a discussion of the process. The charrette “headquarters” was located in the Eastridge Mall, where the design team set up a full working studio. Residents were encouraged to visit the charrette headquarters, and participate in the community meetings, pin-up, and review sessions held midway through the process. The charrette organizers published a pre-charrette newspaper in three languages (English, Spanish, and Vietnamese) as part of the community outreach effort. The newspaper was widely distributed and there was also an intensive outreach to the media.

The participation of the community ensured that the charrette team had a complete understanding of the issues affecting the Evergreen community. The community meetings were held over a three-day period, with active participation not only by the residents but also by the stakeholders. The topics of the meetings included:

- Transportation and Major Roads
- Transit
- Eastridge Mall Redevelopment
- Land Use Policies and Local Airport
- Parks, Trails, and Community Facilities
- Business Owners/Neighborhood Retail
- Schools, Nonprofits, Churches, and Cultural Groups
- Infrastructure, Utilities, and Neighborhood Street Design
- Housing
- Alternatives for the transit-oriented development (TOD) site (owned by Arcadia at the time of the charrette). ¹

During each meeting, input and ideas from the participants were recorded to help the design team produce drawings. Developers, business owners, government officials and activists had their thoughts recorded and rapidly put into a visual context. The public participants took part in group sessions in which they used markers and maps to record their ideas for the neighborhood, and then presented their drawings and reported on these ideas in a public review session.

Drawing on all of this public input, possible options for land use and urban design decisions were developed by the charrette team and presented at a community pin-up session where residents commented on the preliminary drawings to ensure that the final product reflected the input received. Ultimately, a master plan was completed and presented to the community at a final reception and closing presentation. In the months that followed, all of the drawings produced at the charrette were scanned into a digital format, an extensive market analysis was completed, and specialized sections of the report were completed, assembled and edited by members of the charrette team, and the report was designed graphically. It is hoped that this final charrette report will form the basis for a specific plan that can guide the inevitable growth and redevelopment in the study area and help make the Evergreen-Eastridge area an even better place to live.

Footnotes

¹ Note: the 86-acre site immediately south of the Eastridge Mall has been designated for transit oriented development (TOD). The site was owned by the Arcadia company at the time of the charrette, but it is best to avoid identifying individual parcels by their ownership in a master plan as companies and individuals often hold more than one property and parcels inevitably changes hands over time. Thus the 86-acre Arcadia property in this neighborhood will be referred to as the “TOD site” in this plan.
B. History & Regional Context of the Evergreen-Eastridge Area

From the earliest days of Spanish settlement in Northern California, the San Jose area now known as Evergreen-Eastridge has been an important part of the region's economy—first as a rich agricultural resource, and now as a bedroom community for Silicon Valley.

Captain Juan Bautista de Anza established San Jose as California's first civil community in 1777, so that its rich farmland could supply the Presidios of Monterey and San Francisco. As recently as 1950, San Jose was a farming community of fewer than 100,000 people. San Francisco, population 775,000 at the time, was "The City" for the Bay Area. It remains so today for many because of its beauty and urbanity—but San Jose's population now is about 900,000, while San Francisco's has barely grown in 50 years.

Unlike its smaller neighbor to the north, San Jose grew mainly during the heyday of sprawl in America. In the 1950s, 60s and 70s, the city aggressively built housing tracts for commuters who drove the freeways first to San Francisco jobs and later, once Stanford University had given birth to the semiconductor industry, to Silicon Valley high tech campuses. Eventually those campuses spread into North San Jose, but the bulk of the city's residents live to the south and still brave the freeways northbound every morning.

During San Jose's period of most rapid growth, property taxes also were rising and helped to pay the costs of community services. Since the late 1970s, however, a series of ballot measures starting with Proposition 13 changed California's tax structure and all but eliminated financial incentives for cities to build housing. Industry and, unfortunately, big box retail became the preferred forms of growth. San Jose continued to add new homes as it added jobs, but many nearby cities did not. This is the main reason for the jobs-housing imbalance that has pushed housing costs here among the highest in the nation.

The transition from agriculture to housing in much of the Evergreen-Eastridge area was relatively recent. When the Eastridge Shopping Center opened in 1971, it was surrounded mostly by farmland, with Reid Hillview Airport its closest neighbor. Tracts that soon replaced the farms were settled mainly by Latinos, who later were joined by Vietnamese and other Asian immigrants. Farther south, new Evergreen tracts were known as places where families of any ethnicity could buy homes. For this reason, Evergreen-Eastridge has always been comfortably multicultural.

During the 1980s and 90s, the Bay Area began to make some progress against sprawl. Increased environmental awareness fed efforts to preserve open space, including the hillside area now called San Jose, which now are protected by a voter-approved urban growth boundary. Santa Clara County, where San Jose is located, started to build a light rail system linking major employment centers with residential areas. Much of the cost was covered by a half-cent sales tax approved by voters, as well as direct San Jose and Redevelopment Agency contributions. At the same time, San Jose instituted aggressive planning for higher-density infill housing and transit-oriented development. A ballot measure in 2000 provided a new half-cent sales tax to expand the light rail network and add a high-speed BART connection to San Jose, linking it with the East Bay and San Francisco. The ensuing recession has drastically reduced the revenue expected from that tax, but one light rail expansion that is funded for certain is the Capitol line now being built to the Eastridge mall, headquarters of the Evergreen-Eastridge charrette.

By the early 1990s, the southeast Evergreen area was the only place left in San Jose for major greenfield development (except for the Coyote Valley, which remains undeveloped because planning triggers have not been met). The final orchards fell, and some 3,000 homes have been built. But the pressures of sprawl have become acute in the Evergreen-Eastridge area. Traffic is terrible, leading to what amounts to a moratorium on development of remaining open land. Residents of aging suburbs around the now-struggling Eastridge Mall have organized under the city's Strong Neighborhoods Initiative, and they are clamoring for safer, more affordable neighborhoods and a greater sense of community.

These are some of the challenges and opportunities that set the stage for the Evergreen-Eastridge Charrette.
C. Goals and Objectives

The Evergreen-Eastridge area has some of the amenities of a vibrant metropolitan area, including a variety of housing types, some neighborhood churches and schools, and proximity to public transportation and a diverse array of retail.

The study area residents come from a remarkable diversity of socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds and unique histories. Strong community organizations are emerging that represent these cultural groups.

The area, although considered “affordable” relative to the city of San Jose, has among the highest housing values in the United States. Not surprisingly, housing affordability is a critical concern for most social groups in Evergreen-Eastridge. Per-household density (4.1) is high compared with surrounding areas, with high housing costs necessitating multiple generations to share housing and split housing costs.

Among the concerns that residents share are the amount and speed of traffic on arterial roads affecting pedestrian safety, a perceived lack of parking (exacerbated by overcrowded single-family housing and heavy automobile dependency for mobility), lack of community facilities and gathering places, poor interconnectivity among available facilities including existing parks and trails, concern about the overall appearance of the neighborhood, and needed improvements to commercial areas. Competition for funding for improvements is also a concern.

The City of San Jose’s Strategic Neighborhood Initiative (SNI) outlined six overarching goals in the West Evergreen Neighborhood Improvement Plan (2001).

Goal A: Create a Safe Street Environment
- Construct pedestrian path from Ley Va Middle School along Barberry Lane to King Road
- Improve intersection of King Road and Barberry Lane
- Initiate traffic calming studies for identified intersections
- Complete pedestrian improvements and traffic calming along Aborn Road
- Improvements to right of way along KLOK radio tower
- Pedestrian overpass across Capitol Expressway with LRT

Goal B: Provide Quality Parks and Trail Connections
- Work with the owner(s) of the TOD site to acquire land for expansion
- Build a community center in Meadowfair Park
- Build new sports facilities in Meadowfair Park
- Improve appearance of Lower Silver Creek

Goal C: Improve Community Facilities and Programs
- Construct a 5-6 acre neighborhood park in the southern portion of the community

Goal D: Beautify the Neighborhood
- Increase frequency and capacity of trash pickup
- Encourage the development of vacant and underutilized sites

Goal E: Enhance retail services

Goal F: Encourage ongoing communication
- Improve communication between city and community
III. EXISTING CONDITIONS

A. Regional Context

Any strategy resulting from the Evergreen-Eastridge charrette should acknowledge the unique regional context as well as the specific characteristics of the community. Rapid development in the region has created issues that profoundly affect the City of San Jose, including the Evergreen neighborhood. The regional issues include a jobs-housing imbalance, traffic burdens, challenges to jurisdictional fiscal health and a lack of affordable housing.

The City of San Jose has the largest reserve of vacant land planned for residential development in Santa Clara County. It also provides proportionately more housing for jobs than other cities and has more employed residents than it has jobs. The City of San Jose had about 0.80 jobs per employed resident. In 2000, Santa Clara County had about 1.3 jobs per employed resident. The high demand for housing and the inordinately high cost of land in the region results in housing prices beyond the reach of most residents.

The city has identified opportunities for infill development and for higher densities at present and future transit stops, including mixed-use development for living, working, dining, shopping, and socializing. The Evergreen-Eastridge Plan is designed to provide a vision for infill development and revitalization of the immediate community and to help address the impacts of regional issues. The Evergreen community has unique qualities that will enable it to build a community that honors its past as well as provides an exciting and vibrant future.
B. Environmental Setting

The Evergreen-Eastridge Area is on the east side of the Santa Clara Valley, within the east hills of the Diablo range. The City of San Jose and its neighborhoods experience dry, hot summers and temperate winters with an annual rainfall average of fourteen inches a year. The native vegetation in the area is well adapted to variations in climate, as is the native animal population.

The project area sits at the eastern edge of the West Evergreen neighborhood.

This landscape, formerly agricultural fields, orchards, and a golf course, has been significantly altered over time. Past development practices have relocated and piped streams and drainage ways and eliminated some areas with habitat value for indigenous plants and animals.

The TOD site, located adjacent to Meadowfair Park at the southeastern edge of the charrette study area, is presently undeveloped but was used in the past for agriculture and walnut orchards. Burrowing owls, a California species of concern, have been found on the Meadowfair Park site and it is likely that given the undeveloped, grassland condition of the nearby TOD site, burrowing owls could occupy a portion of that property as well.

The Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood is located within the 206,000-acre Coyote Creek watershed. The City of San Jose’s Urban Services Area makes up 26% of this watershed. An unnamed drainage system identified in the November 2000 Riparian Restoration Action Plan runs through the middle of the TOD site. This tributary of Thompson Creek is a drainage system in the West Evergreen Neighborhood listed as a “moderate priority” for restoration. Restoration opportunities cited in the plan include uncovering the underground drainage pipe and restoring a natural channel complete with adequate floodplains, riparian buffers, and community trails. Thompson Creek, which collects the drainage from this tributary and numerous others to the east, is currently undergoing a large restoration project.

The Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood drains into a storm water canal along Barberry Lane. This is a trapezoidal dirt channel. The channel stays above ground until the intersection of Barberry Lane and Gorda Drive. At that point it enters a pipe and follows a northeast direction under the parking lots of the Eastridge Mall, goes under Capital Expressway and discharges into Thompson Creek.

The 86-acre TOD site is a gently sloping site with a few small walnut trees. The site is currently covered with a variety of shrubs and grasses including Italian thistle, Perennial peppergrass, and Rattlesnake grass. There is a small depression in the center of the TOD site. Historical photographs show that this depression was at one time part of an irrigation pond.

The neighborhood is built out in a relatively low density but very high intensity pattern in terms of the amount of land covered by impervious surfaces: streets, parking lots, buildings, concrete drainage ways, and sidewalks. The charrette study area, excluding the TOD site, consists of approximately 75% impervious surfaces. Areas high in impervious surfaces can lead to storm water flooding during rain in low areas. Historically much of the Evergreen area has experienced flooding problems and flood control improvements were systematically installed including Lake Cunningham, which was developed as a flood retention pond masquerading as a recreational amenity.

The burrowing owl, a native inhabitant of the Eastridge-Eastridge area.

The study area is part of the Thompson Creek watershed, viewed here east of Capitol.

Map of the existing environmental conditions showing the potential to connect the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood with the system of trails, parks, and recreational open spaces. The study area appears near the center of the drawing; civic buildings are shown in red, Thompson Creek and Lake Cunningham are east and northeast of the study area.
C. Transportation

Existing transportation conditions find heavily trafficked streets, low connectivity with very few routes for vehicular movement from one portion of the neighborhood to another, and a hostile environment for pedestrians and cyclists on both commercial and residential corridors.

The charrette team conducted an extensive analysis of existing streets within the neighborhood. Teams photographed and drew street sections of 19 commercial and residential streets within the study area. The teams also collected data on street type, posted speeds, curb type, tree pattern, tree type, bike lane, and other characteristics but it quickly became apparent during this research that the characteristics of the neighborhood’s streets were highly redundant since much of the street network was developed around the same time period.

Specific conditions for streets and sections of the neighborhood are covered in greater detail in Section IV of the plan where street improvement proposals are presented.

The key to realizing the advantages that light rail transit service will bring to the neighborhood are changes to the existing development policy that virtually prohibits any new development within the study area that generates additional vehicular trips. The plan calls for a focused transit oriented development around a light rail stop proposed for the TOD site and additional roadway and trail improvements to support pedestrians, cyclists and transit. Rather than tying future development entirely to trip generation rates, future policy should require development proposals to maximize the pedestrian, transit, and cycling opportunities that the master plan addresses through the location of transit stops, mixed-use development, traffic calming, structured parking, and a high quality pedestrian setting that supports and encourages transit usage and alternatives to driving. The drawing on this page overlays five- and ten-minute walking radii around each station where traditional neighborhood development can reinforce the benefits of light rail transit.

The coming of rail transit requires a rethinking of development policy, but any loosening of this policy should also ensure that new development contributes to the amenities and improvements called for in the West Evergreen SNI report and this master plan.
D. Social Environment

The Evergreen-Eastridge Area is a rapidly growing population center in the process of becoming a community. It is an ethnically diverse area, many of whose residents have been in the community for a generation or less. Most of the 22,500 West Evergreen residents occupy homes built during the past 40 years. The largest ethnic groups are Latino, Asian American, and White, with a small representation of African American and Native American. Estimated 2002 median age is 29.87, with 74% age 16 or older, and 7% age 65 or older. Population estimates from September 2002 show growth rates of nearly 17% over the past decade. In 1999, approximately 28% of the residents of West Evergreen moved during that year compared with a national average of 16%.

Given this level of mobility and the sprawling nature of the built environment, creating a sense of belonging and civic involvement is difficult. However, the charrette attracted a considerable number of participants, a wide range of whom expressed passion and commitment to the welfare of the neighborhood. The Evergreen-Eastridge community expressed pride in the area’s schools. Residents were proud of the area’s agricultural past and the work of native son Cesar Chavez, founder of the movement to organize farm workers.

According to the West Evergreen Strong Neighborhoods Initiative Plans (SNI; 2001), 54% of residents owned their homes. The Eastridge Shopping Mall appears to be used by local residents, but is also considered a regional center. Parks and schools are used by local residents, with the exception of Lake Cunningham, which is a regional park that is little used by the immediate community. Vietnamese community members consider the Lion Plaza shopping center a center of community activity and identity. However, the large local Vietnamese community, which has grown in the last half of the 20th century, has fewer institutions and marketplaces with which it identifies, compared to the older Latino community.

There are many grass roots cultural, educational and civic groups representing San Jose’s ethnic communities. Many of these groups expressed a concern for lack of meeting facilities and a lack of a sense of place—locations where they can go and reliably find symbols of their cultures as well as activities and services they require. Some people see the Eastridge Mall as a community resource, although one that does not reflect the diversity of local cultures and tastes, and the Mall is focused on becoming a more regional market center.

It is the strong recommendation of the charrette team that any additional development that is allowed to occur within the study area as identified in this plan be evaluated in terms of its contribution to the stability of the existing neighborhood. Thus new development and redevelopment should address the needs of the existing neighborhood for public space, trails, community facilities, neighborhood retail, flexible live-work space, affordable housing and transit. As much of the development envisioned in this plan is not allowable under the current regulations, changes in regulations that allow development to proceed in areas such as the TOD site, the Eastridge mall property, or redevelopment of properties that might involve density bonuses or mixed-uses should be contingent on their ability to deliver some of the desirable improvements to the existing neighborhood.
E. Housing

Throughout the Evergreen-Eastridge charrette, residents in the study area and surrounding neighborhoods voiced their concerns about housing, particularly the high cost, overcrowding, and the challenges of keeping up neighborhoods. Residents expressed concern that long-term residents and their children cannot afford to remain in the neighborhood, disrupting families and the community. Affordable housing is also a major public policy concern, one shared by the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group as a key issue tied together with the future economic vitality of the entire region. The Evergreen-Eastridge area is a microcosm of regional housing challenges and presents an opportunity to think through the interweaving of transit, livable density, varied housing types, and renovation and upgrading of older housing.

While homes in the Evergreen area are the most affordable within the City of San Jose, the average home price in the charrette area is $450,000. To be able to buy a home, a family of four (two working parents and two children) would need to earn approximately $180,000 per year. Assuming that a fire fighter and her schoolteacher husband each earn $50,000 per year, they could only afford a house which costs $250,000, well below the 2002 sales price of most homes in the charrette area.

The Evergreen area also has an average household size significantly larger than the rest of San Jose. While San Jose’s average household size is 3.2 persons per household, the West Evergreen SNI area has a per person household of 4.1. The high cost of housing was the primary reason cited, although the presence of extended families was also noted.

The problem affecting housing is regional rather than specific to the Evergreen area. Land prices are the primary challenge. Land costs are three times more in San Jose than in Dallas. Labor costs and developers’ fees for critical infrastructure (schools, parks and roads) also add to the high cost of homes. Finally, profits are also higher: 15% before taxes as compared to 5% in Dallas.

Increasing density and encouraging infill development in neighborhoods was a commonly suggested solution. Residents expressed concern about additional development and density in the study area due to traffic, parking and the existing transit system. However, most seemed to understand that density will be required to achieve more affordability, to provide more housing options for long-term residents and their children to remain in the neighborhood, and to enable the creation of new parks and open space as a trade-off.

The steadily rising cost of housing has also impeded renovation, expansion and redevelopment of older homes to keep up with increasing household sizes. Modest 1200-1500 square foot ranch houses of the 1950s and 1960s are subdivided into large numbers of very small rooms to accommodate large households, rather than take advantage of unused space on lots that afford room to expand houses, or add second stories to existing homes, or completely redevelop new homes. This is a design dilemma as well as a financial one and the charrette team explored both dimensions to try to come up with some options for existing residents to tap the value of their real estate to carry out renovations and expansions to better house their families.

Some of the housing types proposed for the TOD site will also be discussed as potential models for redevelopment and infill in other areas of the existing neighborhood.

Footnotes

1 San Jose Mercury News, August 2001.
F. Economic and Real Estate Context

San Jose, as the capitol of Silicon Valley, is continuing to struggle with the after-effects of the dot-com collapse. After years of virtually full employment in Santa Clara County, the county unemployment rate peaked at 8.8% in January of 2003 and recently declined modestly to 8.3% in April 2003. With unemployment in the City still well above 7%, employment losses of more than 30,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, and office vacancy rates hovering between 30 and 40%, the prospects for new office development at this time, particularly in the Evergreen-Eastridge Study Area, are not encouraging.

The housing market has also recently begun to soften. Although values have not fallen sufficiently to alter asking prices, houses are remaining on the market, on average, for 120 days or more. In contrast, according to local realtors, a house placed on the market just last year would typically have received 12 to 15 offers within the first 30 days on the market. Another sign of the softening market is the 34% increase in foreclosures in Santa Clara County this year. However, realtors are sanguine that households will continue to have compelling reasons to move, and with interest rates at historic lows, there is no expectation of a precipitous drop in housing values.

Housing affordability continues to remain a greater concern. Although the Area Median Family Income is approaching $100,000 ($96,000 in 2002), the average sales price of single-family detached houses currently ranges between $370,000 (zip code 95122) and $793,500 (zip code 95138), or approximately four to eight times median income.

The Evergreen-Eastridge Plan represents a long-term perspective and while the current situation is not ripe for development it provides time to plan and put in place the regulatory mechanisms to ensure that growth and redevelopment follows a more desirable path when the region bounces back. While difficult to contemplate during an economic downturn, it is inevitable that the attractiveness of the city and the region will continue and that development pressures will return.

Based on the timing of market resurgence in residential, retail, and office sectors, the plan will need to allow for flexibility in the phasing of development in the area, but it will be crucial to remain committed to the long-term goal of mixed-uses and mixed housing types in order to achieve a vibrant and diverse neighborhood rather than isolated pods of housing, office, and retail in a sea of parking lots.
G. Urban Form

The generation of a Master Plan for the Evergreen-Eastridge Neighborhood begins with an analysis of existing conditions, reflected here in drawings and diagrams. For example, a comparison of the street network of the study area with that of Downtown San Jose shows just how much the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood is a product of its time. The fine grained, interconnected rectilinear grid of streets and relatively short blocks, so much a part of the traditional planning of 19th century cities of California, shaped and continues to define much of downtown San Jose. The Evergreen-Eastridge study area, in contrast, developed much later and has given way to a more circumstantial structure of curvilinear and discontinuous streets, large blocks, and even larger “pads,” building sites, disconnected from an urban framework—all ingredients of the paradigmatic post-war suburb. Even as much of the neighborhood has been built out over the past three decades the suburban pattern of development and the presence of the large Eastridge Mall and TOD site properties has resulted in very little interconnectivity, hence very few alternative routes, for the movement of vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians within the neighborhood.

The Figure Ground drawing reveals the coarse texture of the urban fabric that characterizes the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood. In this drawing buildings are rendered black and everything else, parks and parking lots alike, are left white. The large vacant area in the center of the drawing, the TOD site, is clearly a hole in the fabric of the neighborhood, while the Eastridge Mall is an aberration in scale, an aircraft carrier surrounded by a sea of parking lots, making harmony out of the discordant scale of the Mall.

Less obvious on this drawing but equally problematic is the degree to which the urban fabric appears to have disintegrated along Tully Road. The effect of the larger footprint buildings and parking fields that dominate this thoroughfare is to create an uninhabitable environment for anyone outside of an automobile. Unlike traditional streets where the buildings line and define the roadway, the figure-ground drawing shows how difficult it is to discern where Tully actually lies. The deep setbacks, wide right-of-way, and haphazard arrangement of unattractive buildings make this a hostile, dangerous and unattractive setting for pedestrians and cyclists that diminishes the character of the neighborhood and creates a barrier that isolates the neighborhoods to the north of Tully from those to the south.

The Map of Existing Environmental Conditions
Conditions reveals another layer of information, the extent of the open space network already in place in the Evergreen-Eastridge/K.O.N.A. neighborhoods and their surroundings. More importantly, it reveals a real opportunity to connect to this system in a manner that links existing and proposed civic buildings and public spaces to a network of trails and green spaces integrated throughout the neighborhoods. Not apparent in the diagram but clearly part of the experience of the Mall to its south and west, are the mature trees that buffer the parking lot from Quimby. This landscaped area represents an underutilized asset that should be preserved and leveraged in any future redevelopment or infill.

Last, but not least in this analysis, is the study of the local airport’s safety zones. The most critical zones are denoted in red. The trapezoidal space just to the north of the Eastridge Mall is thus a “no-build” zone. The most critical red zone impacts the northern portion of the mall parking lot and a section of Tully Road that will be carefully looked at in the Master Plan. The orange zone also illustrates areas of concern on the mall property that will be considered in current and long-term proposals for the mall’s redevelopment. Lastly, the site designated for transit oriented development just south of the mall is impacted by the safety zones much less than originally thought, with only a small corner of the site falling in to the least restrictive yellow safety zone. An acknowledgement of the hazards faced by pilots and people on the ground in this area should lead to a Master Plan that improves safety in this area while providing infill opportunities in less critical areas.
H. Master Plan
1. Lion’s Plaza with infill buildings.
2. Infill Buildings.
3. Indoor Ice Rink.
5. Mixed Use Residential Building.
6. Air Field Extended Safety Zone.
8. Office Development.
9. Roundabout above Capital Expressway.
10. Light Rail and Bus Station.
11. Rail Car Storage.
13. Big Box Retail Buildings.
15. Rail Station.
16. Community Building.
17. Village Square.
18. New Elementary School.
19. Town Homes.
IV. THE MASTER PLAN

A. Ideas Explored During the Charrette Process

During the process of developing a land use plan for the Evergreen-Eastridge area, numerous suggestions for changes in the land use patterns were explored. While one purpose of a charrette is to fully record the input of the community, it is equally important to produce a feasible plan as a final product. The final plan, therefore, does not include all the suggestions and recommendations expressed by participants. This section is a record of the suggestions and recommendations received which were not included in the final land use plan.

The airport was discussed in several community meetings. The team was well aware of the debate that had surrounded the future of the airport, including the suggestion that the entire facility be relocated to another setting. As the public process had already engaged in this discussion prior to the charrette, including an environmental impact review, the team operated under the assumption that the airport would be a reality for the foreseeable future of the area and pursued strategies that could maximize both the potential of the neighborhood and the safety of the pilots and residents.

The first option discussed was moving the existing runways to the west to increase the development potential of the charrette area. This option was discarded because it could result in more impact to neighborhoods located to the north and south.

A second option discussed was eliminating one runway to lessen impacts to the existing neighborhoods and to again increase the potential for development in the charrette area. It was determined that this would reduce the capacity of the Reid-Hillview Airport to below the minimum established and would increase general aviation use at the San Jose International Airport which is currently at or above capacity.

The final option for the Reid-Hillview Airport which was discussed but not included in the final land use plan was the possibility of changing the orientation of the runway to a more east/west approach and landing. This option was not included because it was substantially more expensive than other options; it impacted more neighborhoods than the current configuration and increased the potential safety issues with school facilities.

One ongoing issue discussed was the future location of the light rail system. The proposed location of the light rail line down the median of the Capital Expressway was uniformly disliked for a number of reasons.
by both residents and team members. The isolation of the rail stops in the middle of a heavily traveled roadway would discourage ridership and negate the catalytic potential for transit oriented development. Several options for extending the line to and/or through the TOD site were discussed. One option discarded early in the process was locating the light rail along the eastern edge of the site. This option was not pursued because it would not capture enough riders to result in a positive cost/benefit ratio. In addition, the light rail station would be located beyond the ideal walking distance to capture internal trips from future development.

Another option discussed was the restoration of the natural drainage system on the TOD site by uncovering the underground drainage pipe and constructing a natural channel complete with flood protection, riparian buffers and community trails. This was also in question since the site had previously been used for agriculture, which imposed prior changes to the landscape and drainage. Many residents had indicated that ball fields, parks, trails and active open space were a higher priority and that the costs of maintenance for the restored creek channel might be more reasonably allocated for community uses.

Another idea presented by a community resident was for the development of a major intramural sports facility that would combine adult and youth sports, day care, and after school programs. Other proposals called for most or all of the TOD site to be preserved and landscaped as parkland. Both of these proposals were considered overly ambitious and cost prohibitive given the market value of the 86-acre TOD site. The team was also concerned that both of these proposals would require so much of the TOD site’s acreage that they would push out other development opportunities that could address a wider variety of community needs. Neither of these proposals would take full advantage of the light rail transit line being extended to the site. Thus, the charrette focused on potential locations for sports fields and community facilities within the context of the overall plan rather than dedicating the entire TOD site to one idea or another. However, during the charrette it was determined that the cost of restoration would be, at a minimum, approximately $13-14 million. The restoration would require a 200-foot-wide green corridor with a total acreage of approximately 8 acres, and while the concept of “daylighting the stream” sounded attractive, the reality in San Jose’s semi-arid climate is that this would be a dry creek bed that would only revert to a stream intermittently during the rainy season. The natural character of the landscape was also in question since the site had previously been used for agriculture, which imposed prior changes to the landscape and drainage. Many residents had indicated that ball fields, parks, trails and active open space were a higher priority and that the costs of maintenance for the restored creek channel might be more reasonably allocated for community uses.

Another idea presented by a community resident was for the development of a major intramural sports facility that would combine adult and youth sports, day care, and after school programs. Other proposals called for most or all of the TOD site to be preserved and landscaped as parkland. Both of these proposals were considered overly ambitious and cost prohibitive given the market value of the 86-acre TOD site. The team was also concerned that both of these proposals would require so much of the TOD site’s acreage that they would push out other development opportunities that could address a wider variety of community needs. Neither of these proposals would take full advantage of the light rail transit line being extended to the site. Thus, the charrette focused on potential locations for sports fields and community facilities within the context of the overall plan rather than dedicating the entire TOD site to one idea or another. However, during the charrette it was determined that the cost of restoration would be, at a minimum, approximately $13-14 million. The restoration would require a 200-foot-wide green corridor with a total acreage of approximately 8 acres, and while the concept of “daylighting the stream” sounded attractive, the reality in San Jose’s semi-arid climate is that this would be a dry creek bed that would only revert to a stream intermittently during the rainy season. The natural character of the landscape was also in question since the site had previously been used for agriculture, which imposed prior changes to the landscape and drainage. Many residents had indicated that ball fields, parks, trails and active open space were a higher priority and that the costs of maintenance for the restored creek channel might be more reasonably allocated for community uses.

Another idea presented by a community resident was for the development of a major intramural sports facility that would combine adult and youth sports, day care, and after school programs. Other proposals called for most or all of the TOD site to be preserved and landscaped as parkland. Both of these proposals were considered overly ambitious and cost prohibitive given the market value of the 86-acre TOD site. The team was also concerned that both of these proposals would require so much of the TOD site’s acreage that they would push out other development opportunities that could address a wider variety of community needs. Neither of these proposals would take full advantage of the light rail transit line being extended to the site. Thus, the charrette focused on potential locations for sports fields and community facilities within the context of the overall plan rather than dedicating the entire TOD site to one idea or another. However, during the charrette it was determined that the cost of restoration would be, at a minimum, approximately $13-14 million. The restoration would require a 200-foot-wide green corridor with a total acreage of approximately 8 acres, and while the concept of “daylighting the stream” sounded attractive, the reality in San Jose’s semi-arid climate is that this would be a dry creek bed that would only revert to a stream intermittently during the rainy season. The natural character of the landscape was also in question since the site had previously been used for agriculture, which imposed prior changes to the landscape and drainage. Many residents had indicated that ball fields, parks, trails and active open space were a higher priority and that the costs of maintenance for the restored creek channel might be more reasonably allocated for community uses.
B. Market Analysis

The market analyst on the charrette team, Laurie Volk of Zimmerman Volk Associates, carried out a robust analysis for the Evergreen-Eastridge study area that is covered in a brief synopsis here in the body of the plan. The full Evergreen-Eastridge Market Analysis is a detailed companion report that supplements this plan.

The development program for the Evergreen-Eastridge site assumed a transit-oriented development on the 86-acre site adjacent to the Eastridge Mall to maximize the opportunities produced by the extension of the light rail system south near the current alignment of Capitol Expressway. The market analysis and suggested development plan included 3,000 dwelling residential units, 900,000 square feet of office uses and 105,000 square feet of retail/commercial uses. The mix of housing types includes rental and for sale housing consistent with affordable housing definitions for San Jose’s median income levels, though the precise, up-to-date calculations of these prices and the percentage of affordable housing units to be included will be determined by local policies.

In addition to providing for a desirable range of housing prices, the mix of housing types will expand housing options for a broad range of singles, families, and households of different sizes and compositions, and to avoid the single-use pod approach that has produced large concentrations of identical housing in and around the neighborhood.

As noted above, this is a long-term plan for the potential build-out of the site that would be accomplished in phases over a period of a decade or more as market conditions dictate.

Residential:

From the market and development perspectives, up to 3,000 new dwelling units could be developed on approximately 50 residential acres. Following the proportions of housing types as established by market preferences, and excluding single-family detached housing types, the distribution of 3,000 housing units would be as follows:

**Residential Mix: 3,000 Units**

**West Evergreen Transit-Oriented Development**

*City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, California*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Number of Housing Type Units</th>
<th>Number of Housing Type Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>Multi-family for rent</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>Multi-family for sale</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>Single-family attached for sale</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential market for new housing on the site is likely to include families as well as younger and older singles and couples moving from the adjacent neighborhoods, from San Jose, from elsewhere in the Bay Area, and a small percentage moving from elsewhere in California and the United States. The housing mix will also provide opportunities for existing residents who might want newer housing, or who might be at a stage in life where they are considering selling their home and moving into a smaller, lower maintenance property.

Based on the socio-economic and lifestyle characteristics of these target households, the supply-side context in eastern San Jose, and the residential mix distribution, the optimum market position for new residential development on the TOD site would be as follows: refer to chart.

The proposed housing types include rental apartments in mixed-use buildings, lofts and conventional apartments. Ownership housing units include shophouses (live-work units), a variety of condominium apartments, and townhouses and duplexes.

Net densities within the proposed development range from 30 units per acre for the duplex units up to 80 units per acre for the podium apartment buildings. The average net density for the proposed range of housing types is 57 units per acre. On an 86-acre site, the gross density of the proposed range of 2,990 dwelling units would approach 35 units per acre.

Transit-oriented development is supported by higher densities, and gross residential densities on land adjacent to a transit stop should not fall below 30 units per acre.

Absorption of 2,990 dwelling units within a development of the West Evergreen TOD site could be achieved within 10 years from commencement of marketing, depending on phasing and construction, and barring a significant and persistent downturn in the national, regional and local economies over those 10 years. Pricing and positioning has been designed to accommodate workforce housing with the minimum public subsidy and to achieve sell-out within a reasonable absorption period in a phased development.

By city regulation, at least 20 percent of the total units must be affordable to households with incomes at or below 80 percent of the Area Median Family Income.

### Optimum Market Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Net Density/Lot-Average Size</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Approx. Base Rent/Price</th>
<th>Approx. Unit Size Range</th>
<th>Approx. Rent/Price Per Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Apts. Over Commercial</td>
<td>$700 to $1,700</td>
<td>350 to 900</td>
<td>$1.89 to $2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>65 du</td>
<td>Lofts</td>
<td>$825 to $1,850</td>
<td>400 to 950</td>
<td>$1.95 to $2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>80 du</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$950 to $2,000</td>
<td>450 to 1,200</td>
<td>$1.67 to $2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Family For-Sale 19.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Approx. Rent/Price Per Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>45 du</td>
<td>Four-Plex</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>70 du</td>
<td>3-Story Townhouses (TH over Flat)</td>
<td>$285,000 to $395,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Single-Family Attached For-Sale 22.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Approx. Rent/Price Per Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>56 du</td>
<td>2-Story Townhouses</td>
<td>$275,000 to $350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>45 du</td>
<td>3-Story Shophouses</td>
<td>$315,000 to $495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>35 du</td>
<td>3-Story Townhouses</td>
<td>$750,000 to $675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>30 du</td>
<td>2-Story Duplexes</td>
<td>$450,000 to $650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3,000 dwelling units
or $96,000 for a family of four. Although the majority of prices and rents proposed for the property do not qualify as affordable under the regulations, the gap between the proposed pricing structure and affordable prices and rents is considerably smaller than elsewhere in the San Jose new home marketplace. However, in order to maintain housing values within the community, it is critical that public subsidies be provided to the households requiring assistance, and not towards the reduction of individual unit values to affordable levels.

**Supply-Side Context:**

Current new construction prices in the Evergreen area range between more than $400,000 to nearly $600,000 for attached housing, and between just under $600,000 to well above $1 million for detached houses. Most new properties are achieving sales paces of two or more units per month and a few have been able to sell 10 or more units per month.

Resale home prices in the Evergreen area generally start at just under $200,000 and can exceed $1 million, with an average price ranging between approximately $365,000 and just under $800,000, depending on area.

Citywide, last year over 5,200 new and resale single-family detached houses were sold, at an average price of more than $536,000, and just under 2,000 attached units were sold, at an average price of $330,800.

Contract market-rate rents in the Evergreen neighborhood start at just under $1,000 per month for a one-bedroom apartment and approach $1,900 per month for a three-bedroom apartment. Citywide, in 2001, the average rent for one-bedroom apartments exceeded $1,600 and the average rent for three-bedroom apartments was nearly $2,300.

**Office:**

Given the current weak state of the office market, and the extended period of time that will be required to absorb the vacant Class A office space, the amount of office that could be constructed on the TOD site and/or Eastridge land has been correlated with the number of proposed dwelling units, rather than derived from conventional supply-demand analysis. Based on the assumption that the development should provide one job per dwelling unit, that an average of 300 square feet of office space is required per worker, and a maximum development of 3,000 dwelling units, it is proposed that up to 900,000 square feet of new office space could be developed on the site, both in single-use and mixed use buildings.

Approximately 110,000 square feet of office could be developed in mixed-use buildings consisting of two floors of small office uses over a ground floor of retail uses. The remaining 790,000 square feet could be developed in individual office buildings, either as spec office space or single owner-occupants.

These buildings should be planned and designed in the context of the traditional street, block, and public space fabric of the master plan, and not in the typical office campus-style pattern that eats up land and has been criticized by growth management expert Doug Porter as creating “employment ghettos” that isolate work places from homes, shops, services, and transit. This includes buildings in potential single-use areas, such as the proposed roundabout location at the intersection of Tully and Capitol. The location of office buildings should also take full advantage of the excellent transit access that will soon be established on the eastern edge of the Eastridge Mall site and on the TOD site to reduce parking requirements, take advantage of shared parking opportunities in structured parking, and reduce automobile trips as much as possible.

Some of this considerable space should be planned and phased in as flex space that might be necessary to test the market and to allow space to be converted from one use to another as the neighborhood and the region evolves. Examples of convertible space design can be found in some of Post Properties’ urban village-style apartment projects, the ground floor apartments designed for easy conversion to office space in Celebration, Florida, and the temporary use of second floor office space for self-storage in King Farm’s village center in Gaithersburg, Maryland. Some space could be designated for more flexible shop-office-workshop uses that could...
provide incubator opportunities for local residents and entrepreneurs to move some of the home-based businesses in residential areas of the neighborhood into. These are important sources of income for existing residents coping with extremely high real estate costs. The City, the Redevelopment agency, and non-profits should support this move by subsidizing shop-office-workshop space to support the formation and expansion of small minority and women owned businesses, and to provide alternative locations for uses and activities that might add traffic, noise, and detract from the residential character of existing single-family residential neighborhoods.

Retail:
The presence of Eastridge Mall has long made the Eastridge-Evergreen area of San Jose a retail destination, and the repositioning of the mall property is expected to revive and extend this commercial presence into the future. This means that the potential addition of retail on the TOD site should complement the mix that is planned for Eastridge’s future tenant mix, and should also respond to neighborhood retail needs. Thus a blend of retail opportunities exist for the TOD site, including both big box tenants and neighborhood retail, both of which have the potential to be organized in a town center arrangement. Neighborhood-oriented retail and town center-type businesses could include restaurants, cafes, service businesses, and shops typical of community shopping centers such as drug stores, grocers, video stores, and dry cleaners.

The potential for inclusion of some big box tenants will need to be looked at carefully in the context of parking, traffic impacts, and the phasing of development, but if planned carefully and positioned to allow “park once” access to both the mall and the TOD town center retail, these impacts could be significantly mitigated. The mixing of community shopping center tenants (grocers, drug stores, etc.) with big box retailers such as Barnes & Noble or Borders Bookstores, Bed, Bath & Beyond, Target, and other mainstream tenants is increasingly common and can be found in projects such as Pentagon Row (Washington, DC), City Place (West Palm Beach, FL), and Mashpee Commons (Mashpee, MA). This mix would allow development to take advantage of the site’s excellent expressway frontage and visibility, while providing a buffer and transition moving from the expressway into the high quality pedestrian streets and public spaces envisioned for the town center and residential areas of the site.

If big box tenants are allowed on the TOD site, they should:
- be concentrated near the expressway and the mall edges of the site;
- include tenants that would complement and add to the critical mass of the regional retail of Eastridge Mall;
- be tied to phased construction of structured parking, which could be jointly financed and located to serve both transit and town center commercial tenants;
- be planned and designed to fit within the street, block, and public space network of the master plan.

This will allow these properties to be redeveloped over time and continue to be woven into the traditional neighborhood layout of the plan rather than creating disposable roadside sites and buildings that would become a blight on the neighborhood if they were built as stand alone properties unrelated to the neighborhood.

Leaving the potential for some big box retail as an open question, the amount of retail space has been conservatively correlated with the number of dwelling units proposed for the site rather than derived from conventional void and leakage analysis. Based on an average of 325 square feet of retail space per household (not per person), and 3,000 dwelling units, up to 105,000 square feet of new retail space could be developed in mixed-use buildings. Approximately 50,000 square feet of retail could be developed with two floors of residential uses over a ground floor of retail uses. The remaining 55,000 square feet could be developed with two floors of office uses over a ground floor of retail uses. No freestanding retail has been contemplated for the site, though the plan discusses the potential to incorporate big box retail with structured parking in the context of the streets, blocks, and public spaces in the master plan. This square footage is a conservative figure that reflects local traffic concerns and does not factor in existing households in adjacent neighborhoods, traffic counts on streets and arterials bordering the site (which are considerable), or potential benefits of transit-oriented retail development in the station area of the TOD site.

There is also the potential to establish, in a prominent public space on either the TOD site or a section of the Eastridge Mall property, a flexible, open air structure with booths and kiosks that can be rented at low cost and where residents can sell arts, crafts, produce, plants, etc.
C. Town Plan
The Master Plan for the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood reflects the overriding concerns expressed by the community and property owners for connectivity, civic facilities, public space, pedestrian friendliness, human scale, environmental sensitivity, housing and transportation options as well as safety.

The Eastridge Mall
The Eastridge Mall is an extremely large site that will be a key to the neighborhood’s future growth and development. As the mall management is already looking at short-term redevelopment strategies that will reposition the property to make it more commercially competitive, the time is right to consider both short term and longer term strategies that can be pursued to:

- accommodate the coming of light rail transit to the site;
- better integrate the mall with the surrounding neighborhoods;
- address safety concerns connected with the Reid-Hillview Airport;
- promote win-win redevelopment plans that will leverage the underutilized portions of the property owned by the mall management company and the anchor stores while enhancing the quality of the neighborhood.

The master plan presents alternatives for the Eastridge Mall property in phases, with the first phase recognizing the need to support the short-term repositioning of the mall property while encouraging changes to the physical configuration of the building and the site that support the short-term and long-term strategies noted above. Thus the master plan presents two drawings of the central area of the Eastridge Mall, a short-term plan that incorporates many of the ideas embodied in the mall’s current proposals without changes to the main bulk of the mall building, and a longer-term plan that gradually infills the site and weaves the mall building and property into the neighborhood. It is worth noting that, in the context of retail properties, the long-term perspective ranges from a 7- to 15-year horizon and sometimes less for properties already established and pursuing repositioning.

Projects that have successfully pursued this approach can now be found in every corner of the United States, from the Plaza Pasadena in Pasadena, California, to Mashpee Commons, in the New England climate of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, to Mizner Park and Winter Park Village in Florida, to Orenco Station Town Center in Portland, Oregon. Case studies of these and other projects that are relevant to both the Eastridge Mall evolution as well as older, open air strip centers in the Evergreen-Eastridge study area can be found in Greyfields to Goldfields, by Lee S. Sobel, and Place Making: Developing Town Centers, Main Streets and Urban Villages by Charles C. Bohl, one of the co-authors of this report. The point here is not to advocate a specific blueprint for the mall property’s future, but to identify the range of options available to the mall owners, the anchor stores, and the community in terms of pursuing incremental strategies that can:

- enhance the long-term commercial viability of the property;
- maximize the latent value of large tracts of real estate currently committed to surface parking lots and buffer areas;
- transform the isolated, internally focused mall building and surface lots into an integral part of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Throughout the U.S., older shopping mall properties are undergoing significant repositioning efforts involving both private and public sector efforts to revitalize aging commercial properties in light of increasing competition and metropolitan growth and change. Through proactive planning and commercial real estate market analysis and expertise, shopping malls and strip centers have been undergoing dramatic transformations that move away from large buildings isolated from the community by vast parking lots, in which all shops and services are totally enclosed, toward more open air, mixed-use formats laid out in a more traditional arrangement of blocks and streets, interspersed with public spaces emulating the urban fabric of traditional main streets and town centers. This is not a fad, but a mainstream phenomenon that can be witnessed in the fact that, as retail expert Bob Gibbs has noted, over a third of all new shopping malls presented at the annual ICSC convention now incorporate open-air main street elements.
Any plan for the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood must recognize that the short-term redevelopment and repositioning of the mall is necessary and imminent. The current physical reality of the mall building and property is disconnected and out of scale with the surrounding neighborhoods and creates an unattractive and often dangerous no man’s land of traffic and parking lots adjacent to residential areas. Furthermore, the mall delivers very little in the way of civic benefits to the local community beyond the ice skating rink, which is used primarily by people from outside the immediate neighborhoods and is slated for closure and demolition in the near future. There is a tremendous untapped potential in the property from both a commercial and a community building perspective.

Beginning with the issue of safety, it should be acknowledged that a plan to infill the area of the Eastridge Mall and develop the TOD site must recognize the concerns of airport users and neighbors alike. Recognizing the “red zone” as the critical safety area for the approach to the airport for airplane landings, the plan envisions converting some of the mall parking area to a green space in the area between the Mall building itself and Tully Road. In fact, the plan suggests a continuation of that green over Tully Road, effectively creating an enhanced safety zone for emergency soft landings in the green area that would be unimpeded by parked or moving vehicles when compared to the current condition. The proposal calls for a “cut and cover” of Tully Road, which would be depressed by cutting into the ground and then covering this section of the road with a platform. The cut and cover strategy, while it poses certain expenses, policy, and safety issues, is much less expensive than a tunneling approach, which is unnecessary. At the same time this solution responds to residents’ desire for playing field space for the community, some of which would be located in the green area just to the south of the red zone in front of the Mall.

To both sides of this airport safety zone the Master Plan for the Eastridge Mall property envisions infill of the existing parking areas with streets, blocks, and buildings housing a variety of uses including residences and office space, and shaping community gathering places of small parks, squares, and plazas. This is made possible by the construction of parking garages for mall customers as well as additional garages serving the new uses on site, including transit. For example, in the northwestern quadrant (near Sears), the six blocks that were recovered from the existing parking fields include 4-story apartment buildings with garages (4), a replacement indoor ice rink (3), and a neighborhood green designed in the style of historic plazas of Spanish colonial cities.

On the other side of the safety zone, to the northeast, are sites for three office buildings of 25,000-to-30,000 square feet per floor. This site has previously been identified for potential office development (8) and the plan calls for these buildings to be designed to take advantage of the high visibility afforded the site given its proximity to the proposed traffic circle at the intersection of Tully Road and Capitol Expressway. These structures sit close to the thoroughfares, helping to frame the space of the circle and creating a more distinctive gateway to the neighborhood for those entering from the east, while providing a small campus-like green behind. The office buildings are served by a separate garage, which provides additional parking for the mall on busy weekends and evenings.

To the southeast of the mall structure a large parking structure will absorb much of the mall’s parking requirements and additionally provide some parking for transit commuters. So as not to line the public realm with a large and imposing garage structure, this garage, like others in the plan, is lined with four floors of apartments, a building type which easily “attaches” to parking structures and which will help to address the ongoing housing crunch in the neighborhood and throughout San Jose.

Current redevelopment plans by the Eastridge Mall property owners focus on a new wing extending from the site of the existing ice rink to the southwest. The Master Plan depicted here utilizes this expansion as a point of departure, creating a plaza space between it and the development to the southeast. This plaza,
Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Site

Gazing at the TOD site, it is important to keep in mind how unusual it is to find such a large undeveloped parcel in the Bay area (or most any metropolitan area for that matter), and in such close proximity of a proposed transit extension. Its fallow fields are really an asset in disguise as they offer the hope, the promise really, for the construction of a model Transit Oriented Development for San Jose and for all of California. With a proposed light rail line through its center and a mix of uses, this 86-acre site should be planned to seamlessly connect to its surrounding context while providing new opportunities for San Jose residents to live, work, shop, dine, play, and congregate without getting in a car, or perhaps without the absolute need to own one.

If this were all the site offered it would already be an extraordinary opportunity to take full advantage of the potential for transit oriented development, but the site represents much more than this. In both the SNI planning efforts and the charrette, the existing residents identified a range of quality of life improvements that many hoped the development of the TOD site could address including: providing sites for a community center and other civic buildings; the expansion of neighborhood parks and gathering spaces; and the potential to link the neighborhood to a regional network of trails and green space.

The site is within close proximity to the majority of existing homes and would not require most people to cross any of the busy thoroughfares that act as barriers within the neighborhood. With very little undeveloped space remaining, the TOD site represents the last, best hope for the Evergreen-Eastridge community—will be lined primarily with restaurants and fast food outlets, creating an outdoor “food court” (using the lexicon of the retail industry). It is worth noting that participants in both the earlier SNI effort and the charrette expressed a desire for more fine dining opportunities in the neighborhood and that restaurants with outdoor seating have performed extremely well in the new open air town center formats that mall developers are turning to. The dining establishments assembled by these new retail formats typically include local and regional proprietors that provide a diverse range of cuisines at a variety of price points. While developers in many communities have to struggle to find this type of variety, the Evergreen-Eastridge community is blessed with a diverse population that can provide connections to restauranteurs in the San Jose community, including some located in the neighborhood itself. This would also respond to the very strong recommendation coming out of the charrette that it would be in the mall owner’s best interest to include shops, services and cuisine that better reflected the diversity of the neighborhood residents as a key part of its redevelopment strategy and distinguish the commercial venue from the regional competition.

The Evergreen-Eastridge Master Plan is conceived both for the short range and the long range. The infill of the Mall’s four perimeter quadrants can be accomplished incrementally, over the relative short term, as the market for office, residential and retail space dictates. Greyfield redevelopment is being accomplished in regions throughout the United States—including real estate markets far less robust than that of San Jose’s in recent decades—including sites with shopping centers that are ongoing and profitable concerns.

But the redevelopment vision would be incomplete if it stopped there. The disproportionate scale of the mall in contrast to its neighbors would still be a problem, however much it might ameliorated by the adjacent infill development. Longer term, the Master Plan envisions deconstructing the mall itself, opening it up by “peeling back” its roof and removing some of its edges, bringing streets through, creating a community green in the center and returning the concept of shopping and congregating back into a community-oriented activity in the tradition of market places.
Eastridge neighborhood to address these needs and to create a meaningful center for the community. The development of the TOD site should be carried out in a manner that leverages opportunities for locating civic buildings and public gathering spaces that all of the local residents and new residents could enjoy.

Important to the design of the TOD site as well as the infill potential for the Eastridge Mall is the connection of these two major properties to one another and the surrounding neighborhood fabric. In the master plan, the Mall’s proposed expansion to the southwest (discussed above) is continued visually and experientially across Quimby, into the heart of the TOD site via a transit boulevard (14) along which the highest density residential uses are located, though no building is proposed to be greater than four stories in height. This boulevard, lined with neighborhood-oriented retail uses on the ground floor and residential above (4, 5), terminates in a new elementary school (18), itself sitting at the edge of an expanded Meadowfair Park (20).

Overlaid upon this connecting boulevard is a modified grid network of streets, relieved by the diagonal boulevard and civic buildings, small parks and plazas at strategic locations. The streets are lined primarily by apartments and condominiums (4, 5), with each block designed to enclose private courtyards and to shield above-ground parking structures from view. Housing is also provided along the curvilinear western boundary of the site, but it is proposed to be made up of primarily town homes (19) so as to create a gradual transition in density and scale between the existing single family homes to the west and the apartments and condominiums located in the central and eastern portions of the site.

The townhomes will be serviced from a rear lane, where parking and utilities can be located. If desired, the lane could also provide rear access for residents of the single family homes that currently back up to the TOD site, which would allow parking to move to the rear and open up a variety of options for adding living space and improving the frontages of these homes along the existing streets. The townhomes extend the full length of this western edge of the property, providing a dignified frame for Meadowfair Park and enhanced safety through these “eyes on the park.”

An exception to the residential dominance of the site can be found at the northeast portion of the TOD site, adjacent to the intersection of Quimby with Capitol Expressway. Included in this area is an existing business park. The Master Plan provides three blocks to be used by so-called big box retailers (13) and liner shops along the village green they enclose. Parking for these retailers will be in two rooftop levels. While the conventional design and layout of big box retail is corrosive of neighborhood structure, great strides have been made in finding methods to incorporate these mainstream retail operations within the context of neighborhood retail areas. To avoid an endless cycle of investment and abandonment of retail properties, it is crucial that these operations be worked into the street-and-block fabric of the master plan with liner shops essential for breaking up the long walls of dead space that big boxes inevitably involve.

While conventional big box retailers may balk at such an expense in what is now a “suburban” location, this arrangement will be justified by the increased customer base provided by the housing densities proposed for both the TOD site and the mall site, as well as the proximity of light rail transit. But it will also be in the interest of the neighborhood, the city, and the region to provide public support for structured parking which is essential for concentrating development, supporting transit, and minimizing the deleterious effects of sprawl on land consumption, open space, air and water pollution, and traffic congestion.

The discussion of the site so far has centered on its composition in relation to a network of streets. A second, equally important network is overlaid on the site, indeed over the entire study area, comprising green space. Taking a cue from the Map of Existing Environmental Conditions, the plan...
connects to existing off-site trail and open space systems along Thompson Creek on up to Lake Cunningham, while supplementing this network with additional greenways, each with its own character. The plan’s most distinctive corridors and urban open spaces are along the transit boulevard, and the east-west running avenue that connects Braham Avenue with the proposed transit station, civic plaza and community center building described below.

Complementing these more urbane public spaces, the green space network is at its most picturesque in the parkway created from the mature trees that tower along the edge of western and southern edges of the Eastridge Mall parking lot. In the master plan, this buffer, which represents an underutilized asset, can become the focus of an extraordinary parkway offering a diversity of flora and a scenic route allowing pedestrians from the elementary school and adjacent Welch Park, north of Tully, to access the amenities of the TOD site along this attractive, tree-lined route.

**Light Rail**

The proposed VTA light rail extension as it is currently envisioned by VTA planners is to travel within the Capitol Express right-of-way. The heavy traffic on the expressway, however, would make these station stops very unattractive, undoubtedly dampening ridership and negating the potential catalytic effect of light rail on real estate development. The master plan provides an alternative route aimed at maximizing the attractiveness of the light rail and unleashing the development potential of station areas outside the Expressway’s right-of-way, bringing the rail inboard, just as it passes to the east of the Tully Road Capitol Expressway Roundabout.

Traveling within the proposed street network (on what are now the mall’s parking fields), a transit stop is to be located at the eastern entry of the mall building, at what is now J.C. Penny. This transit stop will allow passengers direct access to the mall, as well as space for modal transfers to buses, cars, and bicycles. An expansion of the mall here with liner shops will break up the mall’s blank walls and help frame the transit station plaza, enlivening it with newsstands, coffee shops, florists, and the like. On the other side of the plaza, the bus waiting area is enhanced by a covered colonnade, providing shelter and completing the enclosure of the plaza. The plaza itself may provide space for an occasional farmer’s market.

Given the phasing strategy of VTA’s light rail extension, a rail car storage yard will be necessary near the Eastridge Mall stop. The Master Plan envisions rail car storage for up to ten carriages just east of the Circuit City store along Capitol Expressway. Parking can be replaced in the proposed garages.

As the light rail continues on its southerly route it rounds the southeast corner of the mall to head west before turning south again to run within the center median of the street connecting the mall with the TOD site. This transit boulevard will allow a second stop within the study area, virtually in the middle of this 86-acre site. This transit stop will be characterized by a brick paved plaza and freestanding arcaded structure. This, in turn, provides a gateway to a civic plaza and a community building large enough to house community services (after school programs, a clinic, continuing education, etc.) and a small variety of shops.

**Rails to Trails**

The proposed VTA light rail extension is currently envisioned by VTA planners to travel within the Capitol Express right-of-way. The heavy traffic on the expressway, however, would make these station stops very unattractive, undoubtedly dampening ridership and negating the potential catalytic effect of light rail on real estate development. The master plan provides an alternative route aimed at maximizing the attractiveness of the light rail and unleashing the development potential of station areas outside the Expressway’s right-of-way, bringing the rail inboard, just as it passes to the east of the Tully Road Capitol Expressway Roundabout.

Traveling within the proposed street network (on what are now the mall’s parking fields), a transit stop is to be located at the eastern entry of the mall building, at what is now J.C. Penny. This transit stop will allow passengers direct access to the mall, as well as space for modal transfers to buses, cars, and bicycles. An expansion of the mall here with liner shops will break up the mall’s blank walls and help frame the transit station plaza, enlivening it with newsstands, coffee shops, florists, and the like. On the other side of the plaza, the bus waiting area is enhanced by a covered colonnade, providing shelter and completing the enclosure of the plaza. The plaza itself may provide space for an occasional farmer’s market.

Given the phasing strategy of VTA’s light rail extension, a rail car storage yard will be necessary near the Eastridge Mall stop. The Master Plan envisions rail car storage for up to ten carriages just east of the Circuit City store along Capitol Expressway. Parking can be replaced in the proposed garages.

As the light rail continues on its southerly route it rounds the southeast corner of the mall to head west before turning south again to run within the center median of the street connecting the mall with the TOD site. This transit boulevard will allow a second stop within the study area, virtually in the middle of this 86-acre site. This transit stop will be characterized by a brick paved plaza and freestanding arcaded structure. This, in turn, provides a gateway to a civic plaza and a community building large enough to house community services (after school programs, a clinic, continuing education, etc.) and a small variety of shops.
And while the community center would provide space for community programs and perhaps a clinic, the community should resist the tendency to create a drab, institutional-looking facility. There are hundreds of places with concrete block clinics in the U.S. and they are typically soulless, placeless facility unloved by residents and passersby alike, and reflect poorly on the property that is supposed to be a center of community life. The “celebration hall” language is meant to suggest a place that celebrates community in a distinctive building that will provide a dignified setting for the community activities it houses and act as a symbol of the community. Every culture has produced such places: plazas, squares, meeting halls, etc. Imagine a place where every bride and groom would want to have their picture taken on their wedding day, a place to celebrate the birth of a child, a place to honor the life’s work and community contribution of a local resident. You can have the facilities associated with a clinic at this same site, as long as it is housed in a building worthy of special significance with gardens, fountains, loggia, and benches to create a special gathering space.

In terms of location, the plan shows the community center towards the center of the TOD site, near the rail station, which will be a natural hub for the comings and goings of new and existing residents, as well as visitors to the neighborhood. The location is also a short walk from the existing neighborhood along the extension of Sibelius Avenue, which widens into an attractive corridor with a greenway leading through the TOD site. The location of the community center was carefully considered, but it is not fixed in stone and if existing residents desire a location closer to the existing homes along Chopin, the building could be shifted to the opposite end of Sibelius where it enters the TOD site. The public space connected with the community center is envisioned as a memorial garden with different sections to honor the various cultural groups residing in the neighborhood.

Parking for any new development that occurs on the TOD site will be accommodated on site through a combination of on-street parking, off-street parking in lower-level garages, and structured parking. A tremendous amount of parking can be accommodated within the street-and-block structure proposed without resorting to the type of surface parking lots that surround the Eastridge Mall, and which would be unwanted neighbors for the existing residents. Note that the TOD...
site is designed as a transit village, and will not be designed to include a “Park & Ride lot” where hundreds of people from outside of the community leave their cars for the day. The transit stop at Eastridge Mall is intended to accommodate park & ride where surface parking already exists in abundance and where it will not have a negative impact on the existing neighborhood or the design of the transit village as a pedestrian-oriented setting. The plan does definitely not assume that San Joseans will be parting with their cars anytime soon, and they do not need to adopt a carless lifestyle to enjoy pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods as envisioned in the plan. The TOD plan, and the overall master plan, simply strive to make walking and biking a viable, safe and attractive alternative to driving within the neighborhood.

Tully Road

The Master Plan for the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood also includes a strategy of gradual infill along Tully Road, creating housing and investment opportunities in conjunction with the redevelopment of the thoroughfare. In keeping with residents’ concerns over the safety and attractiveness of neighborhood corridors, the plan calls for gradually transforming Tully into a vibrant mixed-use environment capable of supporting pedestrian life as well as it now supports the moving vehicle. Important in this regard is the necessity of “framing” the space of the street and its sidewalks with three- and four-story buildings containing ground floor retail with offices or housing above. While several of the blocks along the north side of Tully are quite shallow, the plan illustrates a strategy for “tuck under” and surface parking in the rear of three-story buildings (see Infill Strategy: Tully at Muran). Carriage house flats above parking provide a residential scale to the south side of Clark Street, screening the parking from view of the park to the north. Other opportunities for redevelopment along Tully Road abound. At Lion’s Plaza, for example, a phased strategy allows for the gradual infill of this community asset without affecting day-to-day operations. The plan envisions the construction of a parking garage with space on the ground floor for a supermarket. The garage building will be “wrapped” with housing and ground floor retail activities. Upon completion of this structure, the supermarket currently on site can relocate into this new facility, freeing up the older structure for redevelopment as a second garage. Upon full build-out, the Lion’s Plaza parking lot will have been remade as a three block extension of the urban fabric tied to the existing and well-used plaza at the heart of this property. This example could be repeated on other large commercial parcels along Tully as the market dictates, but with little room for new growth elsewhere and the very high real estate values present, the introduction of structured parking to unlock the development potential of surface parking lots is becoming increasingly feasible and desirable as an infill strategy.

Footnotes

1 According to Lee Sobel, the author of Greyfields Into Goldfields (CNU: 2002), a greyfield property (not limited to malls) is an abandoned or struggling single use, commercial property located in an older suburban or urban setting that contains an abundance of excess parking. The moniker comes from the faded asphalt that dominates these properties in the same way that greenfields are characterized by agricultural land or grassy fields. Brownfields, in contrast, are typically contaminated, industrial infill sites.
D. Transportation

The transportation component of the charrette is somewhat unique as it involves major arterial design, greenfield development, and existing neighborhood traffic calming. This portion of the report begins with the major transportation corridors of Tully and Capitol and continues with the TOD site and an evaluation of the existing neighborhood.

1. The Corridor: Tully and Capitol

a. Existing Conditions

Tully Road exists on the north side of the project site and is a major east-west thoroughfare for the City of San Jose. At the intersection of Capitol, the peak hour volumes are in excess of 6,000 vehicles per day. As major regional traffic corridor, Capitol is operating at Level Of Service (LOS) F. It was stated that the primary peak hour movement is north and south on Capitol.

The Reid-Hillview Airport, north of Tully, is active and contains certain restrictions on land use to the south of Tully through the Eastridge Mall and into the project site. These restrict development from occurring in certain areas and also require building height limits.

Existing transit includes a bus service with regional and local service. Headways, particularly at peak hour, are reasonable. Informal interviews with bus riders indicated that the service makes appropriate connections throughout the city. Currently there are plans being formulated for a transit station and light rail service along the west side of Capitol.

b. Design Recommendations

The design recommendations for Tully and Capitol include a treatment of the intersection of those two streets and multi-modal access improvements.

The intersection of Tully and Capitol is operating deeply into LOS F. This intersection is at the convergence of two primary commuting streams. Delays are excessive. Commonly the charrette team finds that one and two lane roundabouts are one of the most effective means of improving performance and reducing the required number of lanes while significantly reducing accident rates. The peak hour volumes in excess of 6,600 vehicles per hour (vph) lie outside the capacity thresholds of a two lane roundabout. Since there is a significant north-south movement at the intersection, it is proposed that one northbound and one southbound lane be grade separated under a two lane roundabout in a cut-and-cover fashion. This would allow free movement of the north-south traffic, significantly reducing intersection congestion and increasing LOS. Design considerations and assumptions are as follows:

1. Although free flow rates for a single lane may be as high as 1,900 vph, we assumed that the actual rate would be around 1,200 to 1,300 vph.
2. Drivers approaching the proposed roundabout would have adequate sight distance to judge queue lengths and have enough time to choose the at-grade or below-grade path. This self-regulating behavior would help balance the traffic streams.

3. The roundabout was to be two circulating lanes with an attempt to reduce the number of approach lanes. Three lane roundabouts are not often used, but two lane roundabouts have been created often in the United States with great success.

The proposed roundabout was modeled with SIDRA, a commonly used intersection design and research model recommended by FHWA and many others. The model was iterated down from full volume runs to a point where intersection LOS C was achieved. The results are as follows:

It should be noted that this is a preliminary model, but the capacity is significant. In addition, the total required volume in the cut and cover tunnels is about 2,100 vph. This is low and will adequately be conveyed in two lanes, one northbound and the other southbound. An illustration of the intersection is as follows:

If we assume a 60/40 split in volumes the peak hour volume for one lane would be 1,260 vph. This falls within our design thresholds.

This represents a significant reduction of required lanes over a signalized option. It is also safer for non-motorist activity. It is important to state here that final modeling, geometric design and signage must be evaluated for a more accurate view of the design. The preliminary results, however, look very favorable.

As a side note, it would be interesting to provide a formal piece of sculpture or a fountain in the middle of the roundabout. This work should represent the aspirations of the community. Modernist, abstract or...
The street improvements for the Tully-Capitol corridors should include the following:

1. Mid-block neckdowns and median crossings east of King on Tully. There are frequent crossings made by pedestrians from the shopping centers on both sides of the street. These areas should also be striped.

2. Bus shelters should be built at the bus stops. Some of the existing bus stops appear as if they could be uncomfortable and need to provide shelter from the sun and weather. It was observed that there are a good number of people who shop at the local stores and carry heavy bags onto the buses. A comfortable shelter would provide some relief and encourage others to use public transportation. They should also be well lit to enhance safety.

3. Pedestrian crossings to the residential area east of Capitol to the TOD site near the proposed roundabout.

4. Widen the sidewalks and add sidewalks where they do not exist or are in a state of disrepair. A minimum width should be 6 feet, and wider at the commercial areas.

5. Provide a few more trash cans along Tully.

2. The Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Site

Existing conditions for the site find it in an unused, vacant state. There are traces of abandoned drainage swales and native grasses. The property is surrounded by Capitol on the east, a school on the south, residential subdivisions on the west and the Eastridge Mall on the north.

Design Recommendations center around the potential for a TOD type of development. This includes a transit stop for the light rail surrounded by mixed use buildings and then attached and detached residential buildings. The figure on the previous page shows a 5 minute walk for local activity and a 10 minute walk representing a transit catchment area. Much of the existing neighborhoods are included within the 10 minute walk so wide with parking both sides. This is not the same as the currently adopted standards for the City, so acceptance of this reduced standard may be difficult. The reason for doing this is rooted in the underlying philosophy of choosing a vehicle dependant environment or a multi-modal environment. Narrower streets create a walkable public space and wider streets do not. Narrower streets are safer and vehicles drive slower. The type of injury produced moves from fatal (AIS index of 6.0) at 36 mph to minor at 20 mph. There are emergency vehicle access issues, but these are addressed generally by the provision of alleys that meet UFC regulations, generally 4 means of access to a structure fire and red-curbing of intersection corners or mid-block areas for setting up fire apparatus. A parking density study must be done to determine the extent to which the street is open for fire apparatus access and set-up. An example of fire fighting opportunities in a walkable neighborhood is as follows: The access from the alley provides 20 feet clear width as specified in the UFC along with the required 150 feet of access to the structure. The street out front provides additional access opportunities.

Interconnectivity to the adjacent residential neighborhood is essential. This is because the location of the proposed transit stop and retail area is easily within a 10 minute walk of the existing neighborhood. It is important to draw in as much of the existing motorists and non-motorists activity as possible not only for the health of the proposed development, but because it will reduce the impacts on existing streets. The following illustrates the locations suggested for street connectivity. The single cross-hatched area represents a 5 minute walk from the transit/retail center. This leads to a discussion of the
Traffic impact to the adjacent neighborhood outlined below.

Trip generation from the proposed site takes on a very different aspect than conventional development patterns. There is a high internal capture rate. Original work on this subject for TODs shows high percentages of internal and external trip capture rates due to both the proximity of transit and retail. The ITE publishes the Trip Generation Manual and it is commonly used as a source for establishing traffic impacts. An associated volume demonstrates a minimum of 20% and a higher end of 40% capture rates. It is understood that the City has a restriction on adding vehicle trips to adjacent roads. It is suggested, however, that with the significant potential for relieving Tully/Capitol to an upgraded LOS C, that a TOD would be highly desired by the City as an example of a solution to dysfunctional land use patterns and traffic problems. In fact, the proposed TOD will actually reduce the number of trips from the existing subdivision.

### 3. Existing Neighborhood Concerns

The neighborhood adjacent to the west side of the proposed TOD exhibits a typical residential suburban pattern. The streets are fairly wide (up to 36 feet curb face). There were a number of requests by the residents to propose a way to calm traffic on those streets, especially if connection were to be made to the TOD site. An analysis was done on a select number of streets with the following results:

- Crossing times needed to be reduced.
- Vehicular speeds needed to be reduced.
- Emergency access needs should be maintained.

The results of the design revealed the need for several calming techniques. They include neck-downs, bulb-outs, landscaping and red curb designations. The following example illustrates some of the techniques:

### Traffic Calming

The series of images, right, represent two stages of traffic calming. These include narrowing the street, adding sidewalk improvements and adding a rotary (small raised paved circle) to adding street trees. The narrowing will lower vehicle speeds. A mature canopy of trees not only makes a comfortable place for pedestrians, but reduces the heat sink effect and will further slow traffic.

There still remains the question of emergency fire access. An example of a fairly narrow access from streets of smaller width was modeled with Autoturn, a vehicle turning model that resides within AutoCAD (see next page for images). The drawing was established at scale, a fire truck (ladder truck) was selected and the turning movements were described in the intersection with the following results:

This 32' wide street had the corners extended in what is called a bulb-out. This is used instead of street narrowing. The sidewalks were extended and the pedestrian crossing time was reduced from 15.2 seconds to...
about 5 seconds. Trees were added to create a sense of enclosure to indicate to the motorist that a tightly configured street section was present. Finally, Autoturn was run to demonstrate that a ladder truck could make a 90 degree turning movement. Notice that there is no parking at the bulb-outs. This leaves proper room to maneuver a large vehicle. If bulb-outs are not used, then the curbs should be painted red and posted “no parking.” The drawings are dimensioned as a general guideline for construction.

Finally, it is important to understand the impact parking standards have on the community. A walkable design approach, especially near commercial or retail, requires a reduction in conventional parking ratios. On-street parking not only removes some off-street parking spaces, but allows a more direct access to buildings that front the right-of-way. Second, conventional parking requirements are exaggerated and are based on the weekend shopping counts plus a “buffer” of 10 percent or more. This is unnecessary for a mixed use community because there are more people on foot from the nearby residential buildings and retail is healthier with some traffic congestion at peak hour periods. Also, there are shared parking opportunities that don’t exist in conventional suburban development. That is to say, parking lots for offices in the day can be used for restaurants, movie theatres, clubs and other types of activity in the evening. This allows for a significant reduction in parking needs. This is also true for uses that are primarily active during the work week as opposed to activity typically occurring on the weekend. A commercial building next to a church can easily share parking, for example.

In conclusion, it is proposed that the study area be modified to accommodate non-motorist activity through the application of several traffic calming techniques and problem intersections be reconfigured to allow a less congested atmosphere for regional traffic. This approach usually departs from conventional traffic design standards and will require modifications to existing code. It is important to make a decision as to whether an auto dependant or a multi-modal approach is desired by the City. The latter has significant benefit to the social, environmental, and economic health of the City and is advanced in this report for those reasons.

Footnotes

1 Swift, Peter, Dan Painter and Matthew Goldstein, “Residential Street Typology and Injury Accident Frequency,” Longmont, Colorado, 1997. The research indicates a 485% increase in injury accidents between a 24 and 36 foot wide street.


4 The States of Florida, Vermont, California and others are recognizing that LOS D and E are appropriate for mixed use areas. Retail sales increase, more people walk, and accident rates decrease.
E. Building Types

A wide variety of residential building types were studied before and during the charrette that can be linked to the history of Bay Area neighborhood design, especially streetcar neighborhoods. These streetcar neighborhoods provided, and continue to provide, an extremely high quality of life for a wide variety of residents while integrating densities that supported the transit system. These densities were typically achieved with a composition of small lot single family homes, duplexes, four-plexes, and small courtyard apartment buildings, sometimes sharing the same block. Historically, in the region, the architecture of these building types can be attributed to Julia Morgan, Ernest Coxhead, and Bernard Maybeck. Learning from the fine-grain relationship of building types within existing Bay Area neighborhoods, one of the goals of this plan is to provide lifestyle choices for residents, vibrant social networks within the new and existing community, and patterns based on local and regional precedents and household composition, means and culture of local residents, will also respond to local concerns that the TOD site not develop into an enclave of upscale townhomes or lookalike apartment buildings. The mix presented here is intended to provide opportunities for existing residents as well as new residents and to reinforce the physical, social and cultural connections between the new neighborhood and its surroundings.

The diversity of housing is also intended to provide a range of rental and ownership options at prices considered moderate within San Jose. A mix of housing, based on local and regional precedents and household composition, means and culture of local residents, will also respond to local concerns that the TOD site not develop into an enclave of upscale townhomes or lookalike apartment buildings. The mix presented here is intended to provide opportunities for existing residents as well as new residents and to reinforce the physical, social and cultural connections between the new neighborhood and its surroundings.

The proposed streetscape and character of development for the TOD site includes a high-quality pedestrian setting with a mix of uses in low-to-mid rise buildings that reflect the multiple cultural influences of the neighborhood. (Trent and Roxanne Greenan)

The courtyard apartment house, for instance, reintroduces an arrangement capable of accommodating multiple unrelated households as well as extended families. The courtyard space is the type of attractive, semi-private space that is lacking in the neighborhood, particularly in multi-family properties. Courtyard spaces are well suited to the San Jose climate and provide a more intimate, protected alternative to the public space of streets and large parks.
1. Single Family: The single family house can be built on a minimum 40’ wide lot. The type shown here orients the living space to face the street and shares a driveway to access the garage in the rear.

2. Bungalow Court: This housing type can be integrated into new neighborhoods, or as an infill strategy within existing neighborhoods. A series of detached bungalows (as small as 500-square-feet, one bedroom units) are organized around a semi-private courtyard space. The building dimension facing the street is similar to that of a single family house. Typical lot sizes are 65’-70’ wide by 100’-120’ deep. The bungalows are typically one to two stories and the width of the courtyard varies with the height of the buildings.

3. Four-Square Duplex: This type is appropriate to transition from higher densities to the existing single family neighborhoods. From the street these buildings look like large single-family homes, but they provide from two to four units of various sizes. The character of the four-square duplex also lends itself to infill opportunities, as it can maintain the single-family fabric of a street.

4. Townhouse: The townhouse shown here has a private courtyard to provide an additional outdoor room and to encourage natural ventilation that is appropriate with the mild climate in San Jose. Roof terraces, balconies, and other elements also to take advantage of climate and views of surrounding hills. The townhouses are alley loaded to accommodate parking to the rear and in order to provide a pedestrian orientation at the street edge instead of a large garage door. The minimum lot size is 22’x100’.

5. Courtyard Apartment: This type arranges a combination of units ranging from 500 square foot studios, to large two or three bedroom units around a shared courtyard space. Minimum lot size is approximately 65’x100’. All of the units have entrances from the courtyard and each second story unit has a separate and private exterior stairway. Parking is located to the rear of the lot and accessed by a narrow side drive or an alley. Within this two-story configuration up to 40 units per acre can be accommodated with surface parking at the rear of the lot.

6. Live/Work: This is a two-story unit with a flexible space at the street level that can accommodate a small office, workshop or retail space, or can serve as a family room or spare bedroom. This type can serve to incubate a small business and enables a viable mixed-use neighborhood center to evolve in response to the market. This type is useful for its flexibility. It is a low-intensity commercial/residential unit that allows a smooth transition from higher intensity commercial areas to purely residential areas. Live/work units could accommodate the variety of home-based enterprises already present in the study area, particularly along King Street.
V. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Urban Design Guidelines

Building height:
- All buildings shall be a maximum of 5 stories, except where buildings front on a central square or plaza. Buildings on a central square or plaza may have a limited floor plate up to 10 stories subject to approval by the City of San Jose.
- The height of a story is between 8’ and 14’, measured floor to ceiling. The height of ground level floors may be a maximum of 18 feet and, in the case of ground floor retail, shall be a minimum of 12 feet. A mezzanine is defined as a partial story between two stories of a building. A mezzanine may be a maximum of 10 percent of the floor area of a story.

Setbacks:
- The front setback along a street shall be at least 8’ from the right of way for at least 75% of the total length of the building.
- The side setback shall be 0’.
- The rear setback shall be 3’ if the building is accessed by an alley.

Street walls:
- Habitable space minimum 20’ depth for the full height and width of the building.
- Vehicular entry maximum 24’ wide at minimum interval of 60’.

Off-street parking:
- 20’ minimum setback from build-to line.

Building design:
- Building design shall use energy conservation measures including but not limited to self-shading, natural lighting, natural ventilation, outdoor circulation, and reduced dependence on artificial lighting and air conditioning. Porches, balconies, breezeways, pergolas, deep eaves, eyebrows, and other elements promoting natural ventilation and shading are encouraged. Each building shall dedicate a specific location for recycling separation, storage, and access.
- Exterior finish material shall be limited to concrete, stucco, quarried stone, cast stone, decorative concrete block, terra cotta, tile, metal, wood, and glass. Fabric awnings are permitted without back lighting.
- Building streetwall surfaces shall be a minimum 30% glazed. Mirror type glass shall not be allowed. All glazing shall be of a type that permits view of human activities and spaces within. The first floor streetwall shall be a minimum 30% glazed. Glazing shall be clear or very lightly tinted for the first five stories. Colonnade column spacing, windows, and doors shall be composed of elements having a vertical proportion.
- Cantilevers and moldings shall not exceed 3’ in extension beyond the vertical wall surface, unless visibly supported by brackets or other supports.
- Storefronts on the ground floor shall have a transparent clear glazed area of not less than 70% of its facade area. Except for entrance doors, the bottom edge of the glazed areas shall be between 18 and 36 inches above the sidewalk. Security enclosures, if any, shall be of the mesh type that pedestrians can see through and shall be located within the storefront displays. Storefronts shall remain open to view and lit from within at night. Storefront composition consistent with traditional shopfronts are to be favored over flat, strip mall-type window walls (see “Traditional Storefront Composition” diagram).
- Awnings, balconies, roof eaves, signs, porches and stoops, and ramps may encroach into setbacks.
- With the exception of fire hydrants, utilities shall run underground and aboveground projections of utilities shall be placed in alleys.
- Street and garden walls, fences, and hedges may be placed along property lines, at a height not to exceed 96 inches. At street frontages, street and garden walls, fences, and hedges shall be a minimum 50% transparent, and between 36 inches and 72 inches above grade for at least 80% of the length. Pillars and posts shall average no more than 10 feet apart. Chain link fences are not permitted.
- A courtyard garden shall have at least two sides enclosed by building walls. Either fences or garden walls shall enclose the remaining sides, and a minimum 30% of its area shall be landscaped. The street opening to the courtyard garden shall not exceed the width of the street or square that it opens onto.

Landscape:
- Street trees shall be placed at a maximum average spacing of 25 feet on center. Street trees shall have a minimum caliper of 6 inches and shall have a minimum clear trunk of 8 feet at time of planting.
- Trees on plazas and squares and median trees shall have a minimum caliper of 6 inches and shall have a minimum clear trunk of 8 feet at time of planting. Median planting shall provide 100% canopy coverage within two years of installation.
VI. COMMUNITY BUILDING STRATEGIES

Design, policy and management are the three primary tools of successful community building programs. Design actions may include capital improvements in the public realm such as parks, squares, boulevards, streets, and pedestrian access points. Specific policies provide the regulatory basis for the plan’s implementation. These may include policies promulgated by state, county, and local governments, as well as by transit agencies, environmental regulators, and planners. Management actions relate to the ongoing work that must be performed for the continuous improvement and maintenance of the physical environment and the management of activities such as parking (including valet parking), the locations of short-term and longer-term parking meters, garbage collection, deliveries, and the organization of community festivals and events. All three areas - design, policy and management - must work together in an iterative process to ensure a successful program of urban enhancement. The following are future actions that the various stakeholder groups may want to consider:

A. Landscape and Park Design
   • Design landscaping and other public right-of-way elements to clearly establish gateways to the Evergreen-Eastridge area at the intersections of: (1) Tully Road-Highway 101; (2) Tully Road-King Road; (3) Tully Road-Capitol Expressway (City action).
   • Landscaping along King and Tully should adhere to consistent design themes to give the neighborhoods a distinctive sense of place (City action). In Coral Gables, Florida, for example, each street is lined with a specific species of tree that varies from one street to the next.
   • Use native grass, shrubs, and trees as landscaping features to establish consistency at gateways and connectors (City action).
   • Build a distinctive, user-friendly bike/pedestrian overpass at Capitol Expressway to link neighborhoods east of the expressway with the TOD site. Design and landscaping should be consistent with the neighborhood gateways and King and Tully Road enhancements (City-County action).
   • Establish pedestrian and bike paths along the proposed greenways to connect with the city’s current trails plan (City action).
   • Designate safe, dedicated bikeways through the neighborhood that can also accommodate mopeds and scooters for local transport.
   • Provide regional trail connections to promote better neighborhood access to Lake Cunningham (City-County action).
   • Retrofit existing neighborhood streets to make them more pedestrian-friendly, including narrowing lanes, the addition of trees and implementation of traffic-calming strategies (City action).
   • Develop a new park that includes playing fields as well as passive recreation opportunities (City action).
   • Develop a commemorative park site that connects ethnic groups in the Evergreen-Eastridge neighborhood. This park should recognize the contributions of the various ethnic groups, should identify space for public art and should utilize landscaping that recognizes the area’s agricultural heritage (City action).
   • Designate a site for a new elementary school on the TOD site (as shown in the master plan) and work with the school district to design and fund an appropriate building for terminating the vista of the roadway connecting the Eastridge Mall site and the TOD site. (School district, City, Nonprofits)

B. Eastridge Mall Design

Establish a working group of members from the Valley Transportation Authority, the owners of the Eastridge Mall and the City of San Jose staff. The working group would be charged with the following:

   • Develop a long-term vision for the Eastridge Mall that integrates the mall with the existing neighborhood and with a new transit village on the TOD site.
   • Recommend an efficient location for the Eastridge Light Rail station that would tie the mall with adjacent retail fronting at the station site and would promote pedestrian access to shopping.
   • Explore remodeling the Eastridge Mall with a design that gives a Main Street appearance and helps connect the mall with the TOD site.

Proposal for Eastridge Mall by mall owners.

Proposal for Eastridge Mall Transit Center.
• Design direct connections to the mall for pedestrian, light rail, and auto access. This will better integrate the mall into the community.

• Form citizen groups that represent the major ethnic groups in the neighborhood to continue to refine the mix of distinctive architectural influences they would like to see in public and private buildings in the neighborhood, street furnishings (benches, arbors, signage, lampposts), and landscaping, particularly with respect to the proposed community memorial gardens.

C. **Policy**

• Form a committee comprised of the City of San Jose, the County, and VTA to resolve conflicting views relative to the future of Capitol Expressway.

• Form a committee to explore the trade-offs and proposals presented in the master plan regarding development proposals and airport safety issues (all agencies and groups involved in the Reid-Hillview Airport including the Eastridge Mall and TOD site property owners).

• Establish a schedule of implementing traffic-calming strategies on neighborhood streets to discourage commuter cut-through traffic.

• Investigate the relocation of the Alvin Post Office to the TOD or Eastridge Mall site to eliminate a traffic hazard and overcrowding at the current facility (City, USPS).

• Adopt or revise zoning policies that will allow for second units (attached to houses or detached over garages and alleys) so extended families can share properties legally and comfortably without impacts to existing neighborhoods (City action).

D. **Management**

• Synchronize traffic signals on King and Tully to move traffic more smoothly (City action).

• Improve lighting and restroom facilities at existing parks (City action).

• Investigate improving traffic flow at all the schools and encourage the schools to investigate flexible school hours and appropriate day care options (City and School District action).

• Investigate opportunities to make school ball fields and recreational areas an interconnected part of the neighborhood open space network that is open to the public outside of school hours (City and School District action).

• Improve communication about existing transit services (City and VTA action).

• Improve communication about existing neighborhood improvements programs (City, Non-Profits, Neighborhood Organizations action).

• Improve existing bus and transit connections to enhance service (VTA action).
Evergreen/Eastridge Charrette

Stakeholder Meeting Highlights
November 13-18, 2002
San José, CA
**Transportation and Major Roads**

- Enhance school access and kids safety
- Improve traffic movement
- Create pedestrian friendly environment
- Implement transportation demand management
- Coordinate with local and regional transportation solutions

**Vietnamese Community Recommendations**

- Develop area or dedicated street as a cultural center with a distinctly Vietnamese character
- Provide more places for older people to meet and for after school activities
- Provide more opportunities for business networking
- Strengthen information and communication regarding City and business development plans

**Latino Community Recommendations**

- Prevent displacement and assist with home maintenance
- Create affordable housing for young families and seniors
- Use portions of flight path for parks & recreation
- Provide more day care and activities for teens
- Create opportunities for Latino businesses
- Make street crossings safer

**Latino Community Recommendations**

- Prevent displacement and assist with home maintenance
- Create affordable housing for young families and seniors
- Use portions of flight path for parks & recreation
- Provide more day care and activities for teens
- Create opportunities for Latino businesses
- Make street crossings safer
Community Building and Natural Resource Strategies

**Eastridge Mall**
- Recognize mall as community resource
- Create better transit connection for pedestrians
- Add a greater mix of retail and entertainment uses
- Create a main street/town square reflecting cultural diversity
- Retain ice rink
- Create places for art exhibits and performances
- Improve driving and walking approaches, improve signage

**Parks, Trails, and Community Facilities**
- Connect bike and pedestrian pathways to Lake Cunningham, remove access barriers
- Expand indoor and outdoor facilities for recreation, community, and art activities
- Restore piped stream across Arcadia land to natural condition
- Recognize ethnic diversity, local history, and native trees and vegetation in design and public art

**Land Use Policies and Airport**
- Develop more density to support transit and provide affordable housing
- Preserve residential character
- Place design in context of regional plans
- Maximize land use consistent with FAA restrictions
- Plan for commercial and other improvements to airport site
- Reduce traffic congestion with more mixed-use

**Business Owners and Neighborhood Retail**
- Assist with business financing
- Create more attractive signage on Tully Road
- Expand business networking
- Retain independent community businesses
- Create greater political and economic presence for local business
- Enhance accessibility for all cultures and languages
Community Building and Natural Resource Strategies

Schools, Non-Profits, Churches, Cultural Groups
- Increase information to residents
- Improve school facilities as activity hubs
- Provide more teacher housing
- Create better pedestrian access to schools
- Develop public spaces and facilities for community use and multicultural activities
- Improve park and athletic facilities
- Build elementary school next to Ley Va

Housing
- Develop housing and transit closer together
- Create more affordable ownership and rental housing
- Better utilize sources of public and private funding for affordable housing
- Create a range of housing types and open spaces
- Improve pedestrian access and connections

Infrastructure and Street Design
- Improve pedestrian crossing of Capitol Expressway
- Redesign streets to promote safety
- Build greater housing density with alleys and garages at rear
- Retain more storm drainage and runoff from new development
- Improve street lighting

Arcadia Site
- Create pedestrian and auto access through site
- Include green space & athletic fields landscaped to reference the past
- Build a housing mix that includes affordable housing, senior housing and infrastructure for second units
- Build a small hotel/inn
- Provide adequate parking
- Locate LRT station on site
- Provide for views to eastern hills
Appendix B

Materials Collected and Reviewed

SIGNIFICANT REPORTS / DOCUMENTS / REGULATIONS

- City of San Jose: Zoning Ordinance
- Focus on the Future, San Jose, 2020 General Plan
- Downtown East Valley Major Investment Study
- Background Information Working Paper, September 1999
- Downtown East Valley Major Investment Study
- Downtown East Valley Major Investment Study
- Project Summary Report, December 2000
- East Valley/I-80 Communities: Neighborhood Improvement Plan, November 2001
- West Evergreen: Neighborhood Improvement Plan, November 2001

PACKETS

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority packets
Packets containing:
1. Disk with Property Ownership information
2. Knight Charette Area Map
3. Procedures for Addressing Brooming Owls
4. West Evergreen: Neighborhood Improvement Plan (11/01) (Xerox copy)
5. List of Knight Charette CSJ Coordination Team

Packet Containing:
1. Aerial of study area
2. General plan policies re: Transit-Oriented Development Corridors
4. Evergreen Development Policy
5. Excerpts from Land Use Plan for Areas Surrounding Santa Clara County Airports
6. Draft Development proposal for Eastridge Mall Expansion
7. Memo to ALUC evaluating Eastridge Mall Proposal
8. Glossary of SNJ terms
9. West Evergreen SNJ Plan

SPECIFIC PLANS

- City of San Jose: Communications Hill Specific Plan
- City of San Jose: Evergreen Specific Plan
- City of San Jose: Midtown Specific Plan (December 1992)
- City of San Jose: Rancon South Specific Plan (November 1998)

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

- San Jose: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics (2000 US Census Bureau)
- Santa Clara County: General Population and Housing Characteristics (1990 US Census Bureau)
- Santa Clara County: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics (2000 US Census Bureau)

VIETNAMESE TOPICS

- Vietnamese-Americans: A quarter of a century in retrospect
- Vietnamese Urbanism articles with photos (showing the urban settings where many residents lived prior to San Jose)

SHORT REPORTS

- City of San Jose: Annual Report 1999-2000 (with a great sprawl "city of the future" snarl of highways on the cover)
- City of San Jose: Public Works: Inside San Jose (Spring/Summer 2002)
- 1 English, 1 Spanish, 1 Vietnamese
- City of San Jose: Public Works Department: Building a Better San Jose

SMALL PAMPHLETS

- City of San Jose: City Facts
- City of San Jose: Department of Streets and Traffic: Street Trees

MAPS & ONE-PAGERS

- Knight Program in Community Building Charette Overview (September 5, 2002)
- MAP: Knight Charette Area (11" x 17")
- MAP: Strong Neighborhoods Initiative Planning Areas (11" x 17")
- MAP: Tally Road Area (11" x 17")
- MAP: Tally Road Survey Study Area, Location Map plus other info (11" x 17")
- MAP: San Jose 2020 General Plan District 8 (30° x 40"
- MAP: San Jose Touring Map (16" x 20"
- MAP: San Jose: San Francisco Road Map (14" x 20"
- MAP: Avis Road Map of San Francisco and Vicinity (14" x 20"

MISCELLANEOUS

- Newspaper on Columbia Pike: Corridor Revitalization Plan
- Pre-charette reports and photographs by Knight Fellows and Director on San Jose and West Evergreen/Eastridge Area