



# APPENDIX A

---

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **Advisory Committee Direction**

July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2012

### **LAND USE**

- Allow SF residential to MF Residential
- Provide Transit opportunities (link to transit)

## **Community Input Received by Advisory Committee Members**

July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2012

1. Economic study - Validity of market demand for a larger grocery store in question
2. Traffic concerns
3. Effects on neighboring commercial properties
4. Benefit to neighborhood
5. Gas station - concerns with one being allowed in SP
6. Pedestrian/Bike Safety - crossing Ygnacio Valley Road
7. Want more open space
8. Existing zoning – keep
9. Need to address concerns of residents
10. Tree preservation

## **Public Input**

July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2012

1. Air quality
2. Distribution of burden
3. Question the benefits to city and residents
4. Want a good neighborhood fit
5. Could survey of Shadelands Business Park employees (would employees live on site)
6. Investigate expanding Safeway where it is
7. Site access - from Oak Grove and Ygnacio Valley Road
8. Impacts (traffic) to adjacent neighborhoods
9. Character of development
10. Historic nature of existing lot (policy needed)
11. Economic viability of neighboring centers

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

RRM Design Group  
3765 S. Higuera St., Ste. 102  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401  
P: (805) 543-1794  
F: (805) 543-4609  
www.rrmdesign.com

December 8, 2011

## **Shadelands Gateway Specific Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #1**

On December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2011 the Shadelands Advisory Committee (AC) conducted their first meeting. This meeting was held in a workshop format allowing members of the public to participate along with the AC members in a brainstorming and prioritizing exercise. The purpose of this meeting was to kick off the Shadelands Specific Plan effort and to gather input on key issues.

The agenda included:

- Introductions and purpose
- Project area
- Specific Plan purpose
- Work plan and process
- Role of the Advisory Committee
- Issues and ideas exercise

The issues and ideas exercise was a productive brainstorming session focusing on six key topics related to the Shadelands Specific Plan area. The key topics included:

- The essence of Walnut Creek
- Land Use
- Architecture
- Public Spaces
- Traffic/Circulation (cars, bikes, pedestrians and transit)
- Miscellaneous ideas and issues

The AC and members of the public voiced their ideas, issues, and concerns regarding these six topics. Their comments were recorded on large posters. Upon completion of the brainstorming exercise, each participant was given twelve green sticker dots and three red sticker dots. They were then asked to use their dots as a voting mechanism and place them on high priority items that they were in agreement with (green) or in disagreement with (red). The categories that received the most attention were Public Spaces with a total of 50 dots, followed by Traffic/Circulation and Land Use with a total of 41 and 40 dots. The items that received the highest support include:

- no big box retail,
- preservation and enhancement of the family friendly essence of the community,
- provision for a pedestrian/bike bridge over Ygnacio Valley Road,
- incorporation of a gateway element,
- a land use distribution that incorporates a blend of retail stores,

- provision for a safe pedestrian/bike crossing on Ygnacio Valley Road,
- incorporation of an active plaza/gathering place (3+3 votes),
- provision for an events area,
- provision of a water feature,
- use of 4-sided architecture,
- careful attention to scale and massing,
- no provision for drive-thrus,
- inclusion of a white tablecloth restaurant,
- provision for LEED buildings,
- preservation and enhancement of the first class essence of the community,
- creation of intimate spaces,
- provision for senior housing

The items that received the least support include no vehicle access on Ygnacio Valley Road (6-no votes, 1-yes vote) and no access off Oak Grove Road (3-no votes, 2-yes votes).



A tally of the input received is attached.

# Shadelands Advisory Committee Meeting #1

## DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

December 8, 2011

### DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

CATEGORIES	GREEN DOTS	RED DOTS
	Agree 	Disagree 
<b>Essence of Walnut Creek</b>		
Family friendly (see also Public Spaces)	6	0
First class community	4	0
Balance of land uses	3	0
Pedestrian friendly	3	0
Strong sense of identity	3	0
Small town with strong commercial	2	0
Fountains/public art	2	0
Pet friendly	2	0
Sense of history	2	0
Open space/greenery	1	0
Strong neighborhoods	1	0
Safe	1	0
Ease of access	1	0
Public amenities	1	0
Great shopping	1	0
Environmentally friendly	1	0
Oak trees	1	0
Sports oriented	1	0
Good blend of people	0	0
Good schools	0	0
Envied by others	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Land Use</b>		
Blend of retail	6	0
White tablecloth restaurant	5	0
Senior housing	4	0
No big box (See also Architecture)	4	0
Consider existing zoning/business park	3	3
Neighborhood community	3	0
Open space/green trees	3	0
Gathering place (Aee also Public Spaces/Active Plaza)	3	0
Preserve natural character	3	0
No gas stations	2	0
Vertical mixed-use	1	1
Integrated uses	1	0
Ease of access	1	0
View protection	1	0
Centralized uses	0	0
Passive park	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>



CITY OF WALNUT CREEK  
 Shadelands Gateways Specific Plan

# Shadelands Advisory Committee Meeting #1

## DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

December 8, 2011

### DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

CATEGORIES	GREEN DOTS	RED DOTS
	Agree 	Disagree 
<b>Architecture</b>		
No big box retail (See also Essence of Walnut Creek)	6	1
4-sided architecture	5	0
Careful scale and massing	5	0
LEED buildings	4	0
No shopping center facing Ygnacio Valley Rd./Oak Grove Rd.	2	1
Authenticity	2	0
Rural	1	1
Not too high	1	0
No blind boxes/need daylighting	1	0
Gateway feature (See also Public Spaces)	1	0
Covered walkways	1	0
Avoid parking fields along Ygnacio Valley Rd./Oak Grove Rd.	1	0
Consider underground parking	0	0
Minimize reflective glass	0	0
Eclectic mix	0	1
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Public Spaces</b>		
Gateway element (See also Architecture)	6	0
Events area/public comment	5	1
Water feature	5	0
Spaces with intimacy	4	0
Small ampitheater	3	2
Well-lit at night	3	1
Active plaza (See also Land Use/Gathering Place)	3	0
Variety of spaces	3	0
Pedestrian master plan	2	0
Family friendly (See also Essence of Walnut Creek)	2	0
Large natural area	2	0
Teen friendly	0	2
Swimming pool	1	2
Shade	1	0
Ecological landscaping/paving	1	0
Bike friendly	1	0
Landmark space	0	0
Small garden	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>8</b>



CITY OF WALNUT CREEK  
 Shadelands Gateways Specific Plan

# Shadelands Advisory Committee Meeting #1

## DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

December 8, 2011

### DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

CATEGORIES	GREEN DOTS	RED DOTS
	Agree 	Disagree 
<b>Traffic/Circulation (cars, bikes, pedestrians and transit)</b>		
Pedestrian/bike bridge over Ygnacio Valley Road	8	0
Safe pedestrian crossing on Ygnacio Valley Road/bikes too	6	0
No vehicle access on Ygnacio Valley Road	1	6
Well-designed parking/cueing	4	0
Improve public transit	3	0
No access off Oak Grove Road	2	3
Multi-use paths	2	0
Downtown shuttle	2	0
Less traffic on Ygnacio Valley Road and Oak Grove Road	1	0
Better traffic signs	1	0
No more traffic lights	1	0
Dedicated service drives	1	0
Eliminate "pork chop" islands at intersections	0	0
Keep "pork chops" islands at intersections	0	0
Accessible from Shadelands	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Ideas and Issues</b>		
No drive-thrus	5	0
Replacement tenants for other markets	3	0
Impact on Shadelands Business Park	3	0
Spur better use of Shadelands Business Park	3	0
Loss of supermarket competition	2	0
Impact on other centers	2	0
Precedent pressuring more rezoning	2	0
Consider partial development	1	3
Impact on downtown	1	0
Guidelines vs. regulations	1	0
Emergency phones	0	0
Lessons learned from 680 communities	0	0
Off-site traffic solutions/character	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>

CITY OF WALNUT CREEK  
Shadelands Gateways Specific Plan

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## APPENDIX B

---

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table  
 Project: Shadelands Gateway Specific Plan  
 Description: Option A - Gym/Fitness Center

4/24/2013

SHARED PARKING DEMAND SUMMARY

PEAK MONTH: DECEMBER -- PEAK PERIOD: 5 PM, WEEKEND

Land Use	Project Data Quantity Unit		Weekday					Weekend					Weekday			Weekend		
			Base Rate	Mode Adj	Non-Captive Ratio	Project Rate	Unit	Base Rate	Mode Adj	Non-Captive Ratio	Project Rate	Unit	Peak Hr Adj	Peak Mo Adj	Estimated Parking Demand	Peak Hr Adj	Peak Mo Adj	Estimated Parking Demand
													4 PM	December		5 PM	December	
Community Shopping Center (<400 ksf) Employee	180,000	sf GLA	2.90 0.70	1.00 1.00	0.85 0.85	2.47 0.60	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	3.20 0.80	1.00 1.00	0.85 0.85	2.72 0.68	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	0.95 1.00	1.00 1.00	422 107	0.90 0.95	1.00 1.00	441 116
Health Club Employee	45,000	sf GLA	6.60 0.40	1.00 1.00	0.85 0.85	5.61 0.34	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	5.50 0.25	1.00 1.00	0.85 0.85	4.68 0.21	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	0.80 0.75	0.90 1.00	182 11	1.00 1.00	0.90 1.00	190 9
												Customer		604	Customer		631	
												Employee		118	Employee		125	
												Reserved		0	Reserved		0	
												Total		722	Total		756	

Table  
 Project: Shadelands Gateway Specific Plan  
 Description: Option B - Medical Office

4/24/2013

SHARED PARKING DEMAND SUMMARY

PEAK MONTH: DECEMBER -- PEAK PERIOD: 2 PM, WEEKDAY

Land Use	Project Data Quantity Unit		Weekday					Weekend					Weekday			Weekend		
			Base Rate	Mode Adj	Non-Captive Ratio	Project Rate	Unit	Base Rate	Mode Adj	Non-Captive Ratio	Project Rate	Unit	Peak Hr Adj	Peak Mo Adj	Estimated Parking Demand	Peak Hr Adj	Peak Mo Adj	Estimated Parking Demand
													2 PM	December		11 AM	December	
Community Shopping Center (<400 ksf) Employee	180,000	sf GLA	2.90 0.70	1.00 1.00	0.80 0.80	2.32 0.56	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	3.20 0.80	1.00 1.00	0.80 0.80	2.56 0.64	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	418 101	0.70 0.95	1.00 1.00	323 109
Medical/Dental Office Employee	45,000	sf GLA	3.00 1.50	1.00 1.00	0.80 0.80	2.40 1.20	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	3.00 1.50	1.00 1.00	0.80 0.80	2.40 1.20	/ksf GLA /ksf GLA	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	108 54	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	108 54
												Customer		526	Customer		431	
												Employee		155	Employee		163	
												Reserved		0	Reserved		0	
												Total		681	Total		594	

Use	Size	City Parking Required	City Parking Rates	Estimated Peak Parking (1)	
				Weekday	Weekend
<b>Option A</b>					
<b>Retail</b>					
Grocery Store (2)	55 ksf	220	1 per 250 sq. ft. RFA	529	557
Shopping Center (3)	125 ksf	500	1 per 250 sq. ft. RFA		
Health Club	45 ksf	180	1 per 250 sq. ft. RFA	193	199
<b>Total</b>		<b>900</b>		<b>722</b>	<b>756</b>
<i>Potential Reduction from Zoning Code</i>				<i>20%</i>	<i>16%</i>
Proposed Parking Supply (4)		807		807	807
Parking Surplus/deficit		-93		85	51

<b>Option B</b>					
<b>Retail</b>					
Grocery Store (2)	55 ksf	220	1 per 250 sq. ft. RFA	529	557
Shopping Center (3)	125 ksf	500	1 per 250 sq. ft. RFA		
<b>Office</b>					
Medical Office (4)	45 ksf	225	1 per 200 sq. ft. of RFA	162	162
<b>Total</b>		<b>945</b>		<b>691</b>	<b>719</b>
<i>Potential Reduction from Zoning Code</i>				<i>27%</i>	<i>24%</i>
Proposed Parking Supply (4)		807		807	807
Parking Surplus/deficit		-138		116	88

**Notes:**

(1) Source: Urban Land Institute - Shared Parking, 2006. Calculations completed April 2013.

(2) Municipal Code Land Use Category: Food and Beverage Sales

(3) Municipal Code Land Use Category: Retail Sales/Rentals

(4) Proposed parking supply from site plan dated December 20, 2012