



RECEIVED AT  
COUNCIL MEETING OF:

JAN 15 2019

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
CITY OF BERKELEY

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA MATERIAL

**Meeting Date:** January 15, 2019

**Item Number:** 3

**Item Description:** North Berkeley BART Zoning and Future Development

**Supplemental/Revision Submitted By:** Mayor Arreguin

**“Good of the City” Analysis:**

*The analysis below must demonstrate how accepting this supplement/revision is for the “good of the City” and outweighs the lack of time for citizen review or evaluation by the Council.*

The information in this handout – “Feedback Collected at Visioning Event Held October 13, 2018” - was previously provided as a link in the Mayor’s Report to Council. A printout of the information was requested.

***Consideration of supplemental or revised agenda material is subject to approval by a two-thirds vote of the City Council. (BMC 2.06.070)***

A minimum of **42 copies** must be submitted to the City Clerk for distribution at the Council meeting. This completed cover page must accompany every copy.

Copies of the supplemental/revised agenda material may be delivered to the City Clerk Department by 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Copies that are ready after 12:00 p.m. must be delivered directly to the City Clerk at Council Chambers prior to the start of the meeting.

Supplements or Revisions submitted pursuant to BMC § 2.06.070 may only be revisions of the original report included in the Agenda Packet.

## FEEDBACK COLLECTED AT VISIONING EVENT HELD OCTOBER 13, 2018

### **Visioning Proposal #1**

Support for "step down heights" principle shown

### **Visioning Proposal #2**

Parking at BART does not need to be replaced

2 stories over whole site is restrictive

Don't need to replace all the parking, hills residents can bus downtown

Good architectural style

There needs to be additional parking spaces, *all* low income housing

Not visionary enough

### **Visioning Proposal #7**

Good mix of heights

Too much parking

Taller heights would allow for more amenities and open space

Not appropriate for neighborhood

Good balance between housing production (especially with the tower) and community needs, like access to open spaces

"Iconic restaurant" and tower not appropriate for residential neighborhood

The "transit village" is far too high, too dense, and too ugly

Yes, replace all 800 spots and add 100 more; "tower" suggestion wouldn't work for this neighborhood

Good focus on increasing the amount of housing available in the neighborhood in a realistic way

### **Visioning Proposal #8**

Love that it connects to the greenway

Love that plan creates middle income housing

Focus on missing middle is important, but would be more appropriate for the surrounding blocks, which should be upzoned

Love mixed use and variety of forms

Love the style and scale of the buildings, "missing middle" is a great concept for this site

Should have more units than BART minimum

Appropriate variety of housing types

Could include 7 stories

Too tall

Not dense enough

### **Visioning Proposal #9**

Oxford Plaza is great downtown, but too urban for North Berkeley BART

### **Visioning Proposal #11**

Creative and realistic, we want more neighbors

Gorgeous rendering, but wrong scale for this site

Too tall

Good vision for a lot of housing and very different activities balanced with parking

Absolutely ridiculous

Blocks the view

### **Visioning Proposal #15**

Needs to be great, but looks like status quo

### **Visioning Proposal #16**

Too little housing, too much parking

Excellent scale, nicely shaped buildings, community meeting spot, good if limited to 4 stories,

Like view corridor.

Multi-modal access is important, no surface parking

One is the best designs, very thoughtful about use and emergency contingencies, must be sure to keep the view

Housing is more important than views of Mt. Tam

Focus on parking and open space is misguided, aiming to keep views of Mt. Tam isn't a high priority

### **Visioning Proposal #17**

Most feasible of proposals

Replace parking with homes

### **Visioning Proposal #18**

Interesting to pickup and drop-off

### **Visioning Proposal #19**

Good traffic control

Greening whole site interesting but not sure if feasible

No building facades are a concern

Too much parking

Like the green space, but too tall

Like the idea of 2-3 stories, underground parking, and a path over the buildings

Can we offer housing units to people who don't own cars? Create a carless complex, except for commuters who drive to BART

Like the large park 2 stories up; it's big, but not bulking

### **Visioning Proposal #20**

Too short, new street?

Bikeway connection and access to vehicles from Virginia to Sacramento good idea

Non-starter; too high, huge, boxy, unattractive, no provision for replacing the needed parking it would displace, structurally impractical

Well done connecting Greenway

### **Visioning Proposal #22**

Internal streets should be 15 mph or less, some 7-story height

I like the idea of private courtyards, but not sure they'd work out with the need for Ohlone open space

Fine print of "up to 8 stories" is not okay

No. Housing should be all low income, disabled, senior and not for students

Good focus on housing and good diversity of housing types

### **Visioning Proposal #25**

Student housing poor choice

EVCs are invasive

Open space must be part of site

Too tall at the edges

Amazing idea that combines the life lessons of elders with the next generation responsible for a bright future

Good idea to continue Ohlone Greenway and integrate as much greenspace as possible

Good, thoughtful, students won't need cars, advantage of increased multi-generational community

Love the idea of natural + vegetation and a grove of native plantings

Like that there's only one coffee shop and no other businesses

### **Visioning Proposal #26**

Very thoughtful

Involvement of Ohlone a great idea

Architecture too repetitive