October 1, 2009

Menlo Park Specific Plan

City of Menlo Park



Perkins+Will
ESA
Fehr Peers
Strategic Economics
BKF

PERKINS
+WILL

Agenda

Schedule

Phase I Vision Plan – Process and Goals

Emerging Plan – Review of Community Meeting #3

Next Steps – Specific Plan and EIR

Comments from the Oversight/Outreach Committee

Schedule

Project Schedule — DRAFT

Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan, EIR and Amendments

17 July 2009

PER +



+ www.perkinswill.com

Next Steps

October 1, 2009

• Oversight/Outreach Committee Meeting	October 1
• Planning Commission Meeting	October 5
• City Council Meeting	October 13
• Draft Specific Plan/Draft EIR Work Commences	Mid-October

Note: Next steps discussed in more detail later in the presentation.

Phase I Vision Plan:

Process and Goals

PERKINS
+ WILL

Phase 1 Vision Plan

- Extensive community visioning exercise conducted in 2007 and 2008
- Included an educational forum, walking tours, three community workshops, one Planning Commission workshop, and two City Council Meetings
- Promoted by five citywide mailings (including two return surveys) sent to all residential and commercial properties, as well as by focused outreach from the project Oversight and Outreach Committee.
- Vision Plan unanimously accepted by City Council; provides foundation for Specific Plan



Phase 1 Vision Goals

1. Vision Plan Area Character: Maintain a **village character** unique to Menlo Park.
2. East-West Connectivity: Provide greater **east-west, town-wide connectivity**.
3. El Camino Real Circulation: **Improve circulation and streetscape conditions** on El Camino Real.
4. Neighborhood Context: Ensure that El Camino Real **development is sensitive** to and compatible with adjacent neighborhoods.
5. Vacant and Underutilized Parcels on El Camino Real: **Revitalize underutilized parcels** and buildings.
6. Train Station Area: **Activate the train station** area.
7. Santa Cruz Avenue Pedestrian Character: Protect and **enhance pedestrian amenities on Santa Cruz** Avenue.
8. Downtown Vibrancy: Expand shopping, dining and neighborhood services to **ensure a vibrant downtown.**
9. Housing: **Provide residential opportunities** in the Vision Plan Area.
10. Open Space: **Provide plaza and park spaces**.
11. Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation: Provide an integrated, safe and well-designed **pedestrian and bicycle network.**
12. Parking: **Develop parking strategies** and facilities that meet the commercial and residential needs of the community.

Emerging Plan:

Review of Community Meeting #3

PERKINS
+ WILL

Community Workshop #3

September 17, 2009

Format

- Doors Open/Preview 6:30 PM
- Presentation 7:00 PM to 7:30 PM
- Open House 7:30 to 8:45 PM
  - Four Identical Stations describing the Emerging Plan
  - Two Facilitators at Each Station
  - Questionnaire to Complete
  - Discussion/Dialog among Attendees
- Public Comment 8:45 to 9:30 PM
- Closing Comments 9:30 to 9:45 PM

Illustrative Plan

Public Space
Downtown Public Space
Public Space
Santa Cruz Avenue Streetscape Concepts

Menlo Park
Specific Plan
City of Menlo Park

Menlo Park
Specific Plan
City of Menlo Park

Menlo Park
Specific Plan
City of Menlo Park

Menlo Park
Specific Plan
City of Menlo Park

Community Workshop #3

September 17, 2009

Workshop Boards

1. Emerging Plan
2. Public Space
3. Building Character
4. Vibrancy/Land Use Economics
5. Connectivity + Traffic



September 17, 2009

Emerging Plan

1

Illustrative Plan



Proposed Land Use Plan



Vibrant Downtown

Connected Places

Walkability

Living Downtown/Station Area

Integrating the Boulevard

Potential Scenario of Development



Public Space

Downtown Public Space



Public Space 2A



Illustration of Key Public Spaces Downtown

Illustration of Station Area

Workshop #3: Public Space (Board 2A)

September 17, 2009

1. Does the Emerging Plan have an adequate diversity of public spaces?

Yes—35

For the most part—36

Not really—7

No—1

Summary: Strong support/affirmation that the Emerging Plan provides an adequate diversity of public space—90% answered 'yes' or 'for the most part.'

Santa Cruz Avenue Streetscape Concepts

Option 1: Moderate Streetscape Improvements (Median Trees Retained)

Plan of Santa Cruz Avenue with major Streetscape Improvements



Section through Santa Cruz Avenue

- New Street Design with Diagonal Parking Removed and Median Trees Retained
- Two Traffic Lanes with Parallel Parking
- One Narrow Sidewalk and One Wide Sidewalk

12' wide sidewalk, Palo Alto, CA

Illustration of 18' wide sidewalk

Existing Santa Cruz Ave.

Option 2: Major Streetscape Improvements (Median Trees Removed)



Plan of Santa Cruz Avenue with major Streetscape Improvements



Section through Santa Cruz Avenue

- New Street Design with Diagonal Parking and Median Trees Removed
- Two Traffic Lanes with Parallel Parking
- Two Extra-Wide Sidewalks

18'-20' Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA

Illustration of 18.5' wide sidewalk

Existing Santa Cruz Ave.

El Camino Real Streetscape Concept



El Camino Real Downtown - Proposed Cross-Section



El Camino Real South - Proposed Cross-Section

Workshop #3: Public Space (Board 2B)

September 17, 2009

2. Regarding Santa Cruz Avenue, do you prefer:

Option 1 (varied/wider sidewalks; retain median trees)—42

Option 2 (widest sidewalks; remove median trees)—31

Summary: This was the closest split of all questions—58% supported Option 1, although submitted comments indicated some significant support for removing median trees to widen sidewalks.

Height + Massing

Potential Scenario of Development



Downtown Village Character

The Emerging Plan supports and enhances Downtown's village character, defined as a pedestrian-oriented district with smaller-scale buildings (2 to 3 stories), individual storefronts, local "authentic" businesses, and informal public spaces.

El Camino Real/Station Area Character

In support of transit and downtown businesses, the El Camino Real Corridor and Station Area fosters a pedestrian-oriented district with a higher intensity of development (3 to 5 stories). Buildings in this area have a mixed-use residential emphasis, with minimal setbacks for ground-floor retail and step-backs on upper stories. The plan proposes a transition in scale to match Downtown's village character and adjacent residential neighborhoods.

El Camino Real North/South Character

As appropriate to the lot size and scale of the El Camino Real corridor, the plan supports higher intensity development, with 3 to 5 stories along the east-side (South El Camino Real) and 2 to 3 stories on the west-side. Buildings should employ varied massing and setbacks, with step-backs along the upper-stories and a gradual transition in scale towards adjacent neighborhoods.

Downtown Village Character

Santa Cruz Avenue at Curtis: 2-3 stories

2-3 stories mixed use: Ground floor retail with residential above

El Camino Real/Station Area Character

Santa Cruz Avenue at El Camino Real: 3-5 stories

3-5 stories mixed use: Ground floor retail with residential above

El Camino Real/Station Area Character

ECR at Ravenswood looking north: 3-5 stories

5 storied mixed use: Ground Floor retail with residential above.
Top story stepped back.

El Camino Real North/South Character

ECR at Partridge looking north: 3-5 stories

3 story residential on east side of ECR

4 story office on east side of ECR

Building Character 3

Existing Building Heights per Menlo Park Zoning Ordinance



Proposed Building Heights, Setbacks + Step backs





Workshop #3: Building Character (Board 3)

September 17, 2009

4. Does the Emerging Plan reflect an appropriate building character and massing for:

A) Downtown?

Yes—30

For the Most Part—30

Not Really—6

No—9

B) El Camino Real?

Yes—30

For the Most Part—26

Not Really—5

No—10

Summary: Strong support/affirmation of the Emerging Plan's appropriateness of building character and massing for both downtown and El Camino Real – 80% answered 'yes' or 'for the most part' for downtown; 79% answered 'yes' or 'for the most part' for El Camino Real.

Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact analysis looks at how potential new development resulting from the Emerging Plan could impact the City's General Fund on an annual basis.

Emerging Plan Land Use Program

Land Uses	Emerging Plan Projects	Proposed and Approved Projects	Grand Total
Residential Units	**680**	130	810
Retail SF (net)	**91,800**	14,800	106,600
Commercial SF (net)	**240,820**	105,725	346,545
Hotel Rooms	**380**	--	380
New Parking Supply (spaces)	**3,670**	969	4,639

The Emerging Plan could add: 1,537 new residents + 929 new jobs

Fiscal impact change over time

The Emerging Plan will have a positive fiscal impact on the City's General Fund

Fiscal Impact over time throughout Development of Emerging Plan (2009-2030)



Source: City of Menlo Park, Strategic Economics, 2009.

Financial Feasibility

The Financial Feasibility Analysis tests how the variables of building heights and parking requirements can affect project financial feasibility and city impact fees (roads, parks, schools) and BMR housing.

Increased Heights and Development Feasibility

Increasing height limit improves project feasibility and makes it more likely that mixed-use development will occur. Taller buildings also provide more space for office workers and residents in the downtown, who support local businesses.

Generic Residential Development





Source: City of Menlo Park, Strategic Economics, Perkins+Will, Fehr and Peers, 2009.

- 200' x 200' Parcel
- 30 Residential Units
- 14,200 SF Retail
- 100 Parking spaces - 1 level above ground + 1 level below ground



- 200' x 200' Parcel
- 68 Residential Units
- 8,000 SF Retail
- 170 Parking spaces - 1 level above ground + 1 level below ground



Financial Feasibility

The Financial Feasibility Analysis tests how the variables of building heights and parking requirements can affect project financial feasibility and city impact fees (roads, parks, schools) and BMR housing.

Generic Office Development



Source: City of Menlo Park, Strategic Economics, Perkins+Will, Fehr and Peers, 2009.

- 200' x 200' Parcel
- 9,000 SF Retail
- 42,000 SF Office
- 200 Parking spaces - 2 levels above ground + 1 level below ground

- 200' x 200' Parcel
- 9,000 SF Retail
- 61,000 SF Office
- 265 Parking spaces - 2 levels above ground + 1 level below ground



Vibrancy + Land Use Economics 4

Increased Heights and Impact Fees

Increasing height limit provides additional impact fees for parks, schools, and roads and opportunities for below market rate (BMR) housing.

City Impact Fees



Source: City of Menlo Park, Strategic Economics, 2009.

Workshop #3: Land Use Economics (Board 4)

September 17, 2009

6. Based on the findings from the fiscal impact and financial feasibility studies, is additional building height on El Camino Real (as shown—up to five stories) an acceptable tradeoff for increased City revenues and vibrancy and a greater likelihood of redevelopment?

Yes—48

No—28

Summary: 62% of respondents stated the tradeoff was acceptable; however, some comments questioned whether the tradeoff would be worth it if the City only realized the currently projected 4% increase in citywide General Fund revenue.

East-West Connectivity

Adding a typical 11-foot sidewalk extension on each side of a crossing of El Camino Real would reduce the pedestrian crossing time by about 25%. At a typical crossing speed of 3.5 feet per second, the crossing time would be reduced from 24 seconds (84-foot crossing) to 18 seconds (62-foot crossing). Specific improvements, such as sidewalk extensions, will be subject to detailed analysis as part of the Draft EIR, and could be removed or modified in response to findings.



Sidewalk Extensions

Class I Bike Path

Class II Bike Path

Class III Bike Path

Connectivity + Traffic

Bike Network



Northbound ECR between Ravenswood and Oak Grove: bulbouts in this area would likely conflict with the potential 1300 ECR mitigation measure of adding a new travel lane.

Transit



Workshop #3: Connectivity/Traffic (Board 5)

September 17, 2009

7. Does the Emerging Plan provide for adequate enhancements to east-west pedestrian and bicycle connectivity?

Yes—17

For the Most Part—39

Not Really—14

No—5

Summary: Affirmation that the Emerging Plan provides adequate enhancements to east-west bike/pedestrian connectivity—75% stated 'yes' or 'for the most part.'

Traffic on El Camino Real

Assuming no roadway changes, traffic generated by the proposed land uses would increase travel time per vehicle on El Camino Real between Middle and Valparaiso by one minute or less during peak travel times

Effects from other potential changes to El Camino Real

- **Removal of Right turn lanes at Oak Grove and Santa Cruz Avenue and installation of sidewalk extensions**
  Increase in average vehicle delay by about 8 to 12% (3 to 4 seconds) during the PM peak hour.
- **Changing lane configuration on El Camino Real to provide 3 through lanes in each direction**
  Reduction in average vehicle delay by about 15% (8 seconds) at both Ravenswood and Valparaiso Avenues. No sidewalk extensions possible.
- **Implementing a pedestrian scramble phase at El Camino Real/Santa Cruz Avenue**
  Increase in vehicle delay by about 88% (23 seconds) and increase in pedestrian wait times. Scramble phase means that all vehicles stop and pedestrians can cross in any direction.

El Camino Real Travel Time During PM Peak Hour (between Middle and Valparaiso)



Source: Fehr and Peers, 2009.

Workshop #3: Connectivity/Traffic (Board 5)

September 17, 2009

8. Based on findings from the traffic study, is the increase in travel time an acceptable tradeoff for increased vibrancy and development of vacant parcels?

Yes—52

No—21

Summary: While the results show strong 71% support for the increased travel time tradeoff, there were multiple comments about the "exponential" effect even a few seconds of travel time would have on ECR traffic; and others also questioned the baseline traffic numbers shared at the meeting.

Connectivity + Traffic

Existing

Total Parking	
City Owned Parking Plazas	1186
Caltrain Parking	158
On-street Parking	138
Project Area Boundary	
Total Public Parking in Downtown	1482

Proposed



Total Parking	
City Owned Parking Plazas	1400
Caltrain Parking	158
On-street Parking	90
Project Area Boundary	
Total Public Parking in Downtown	1648

*Notes:

- The parking garage locations in Plazas 1 and 3 were selected for being the largest and thus most feasible building sites.
- Parking Garage on Lot # 3 accommodates both public parking + parking for residential above and podium level retail.
- 370 spaces, shown in the diagram, represent parking that is publicly accessible

Parking Standards

Recommended Parking Standards

The recommended parking rates account for the mixed use nature of the downtown area and reflect rates recommended by *Parking Generation* and *Shared Parking* manuals, two- industry standard documents.

TABLE 1 PARKING RATES

Land Use	City Requirements		Industry Sources		Recommended Rates	
	Zoning Code	Mixed Use Reduction	ITE1	ULI	Downtown	SP Area outside of Downtown
Multi-Family Residential (R-4)						
Studio (per du)	1	-	1.68	1.85 / 1.85 [2]	1.3	1.85
1 Bedroom (per du)	1.5	-				
2 Bedroom (per du)	2	-				
Other Residential (per du)	2	-				
General Office (per 1,000 sf gfa)	3.3 - 6.0	3.3	3.27	3.8 / 0.38 [2]	3.0	3.8
Retail (per 1,000 sf gfa)	6	5	4.32 / 5.45 [2]	3.6 / 4.0 [2]	2.9	3.6
Restaurants (per 1,000 sf gfa)	6	6	--	--	6	8
Quality High Turnover With Lounge	---	---	17.7 / 19.78 [2] 11.6 / 15.53 [2] 15.3 / 18.75 [2]	18 / 20 [2] 10.5 / 15 [2] 10 / 10 [2]	---	---
Hotel (per room)	-	1.1	1.05	1.25 / 1.18 [2]	1.25	1.25

Notes: du = dwelling unit, sf = square feet, gfa = gross floor area.
1 ITE parking supply rates derived from parking demand rates in Parking Generation, plus a 15% vehicle circulation factor.
2 Weekday/weekend parking rates. Weekend data shown where available.
Sources: City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, Title 16 Zoning, Chapter 16.72. City of Menlo Park Parking Reduction Policy, http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/parkredpolicy.pdf. Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation (3rd Edition, 2004). Urban Land Institute Shared Parking (2nd Edition, 2005).

Workshop #3: Connectivity/Traffic (Board 5)

September 17, 2009

9. Is the change in distribution of parking downtown acceptable?

Yes—30

For the Most Part—26

Not Really—24

No—4

Summary: Support of the Emerging Plan's distribution of parking downtown – 67% stated 'yes' or 'for the most part'. However, this appears to be a hot-button issue, with some strong comments both for and against the parking concepts. A large number of comments were in support of parking structures.

Next Steps:

Specific Plan and EIR

PERKINS
+ WILL

Next Steps

Preparation of **Draft Specific Plan**

EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP)

– 30 Day Comment Period – Winter 2009

Preparation of **Draft EIR**

Draft Specific Plan/Draft EIR **Public Review Period** – Spring 2010

– 45 Day Review Period

– O/OC, Planning Commission, City Council Meetings

Final Specific Plan and EIR Response to Comments

– Planning Commission, City Council **Public Hearings** – Sept/Oct 2010

– City Adoption of Specific Plan and Certification of EIR

Comments from Oversight/ Outreach Committee

Question for Oversight/Outreach Committee

What are the potential big questions and issues for the Planning Commission and City Council as they consider the Emerging Plan?

September 17, 2009

Menlo Park Specific Plan

City of Menlo Park



Perkins+Will
ESA
Fehr Peers
Strategic Economics
BKF

PERKINS
+WILL