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1 Introduction

1.1 Goals and Objectives of Project

El Camino Real is a state highway (Highway 82) and a major north-south transportation corridor serving the Bay Area Peninsula and connecting communities from San Jose to San Francisco. It has developed into an automobile-oriented roadway, with inconsistent facilities for people walking and riding bicycles, and limited transit service. Redwood City is currently in the process of re-examining the policies and standards for the El Camino Real Corridor (Corridor) within its jurisdiction. In particular, Redwood City is looking for opportunities to encourage redevelopment in line with the General Plan goals and the recent efforts of the Grand Boulevard Initiative, as well as the National Association of City Transportation Officials’ Urban Street Design Guide. In addition, Redwood City would like to evaluate and consolidate development standards within the El Camino Real Corridor in order to create a cohesive, comprehensive plan that achieves these objectives for improvement and is well integrated with the adjacent communities.

The ultimate goal for this project is to produce an El Camino Real Corridor Plan to consolidate existing zoning districts, land uses and adopted plans into one cohesive document for the El Camino Real Corridor in Redwood City. Specific objectives are:

- Consolidate recently zoned areas into a cohesive plan.
- Develop strategies to address current development challenges, such as small, narrow, and shallow lots with different ownership.
- Improve the Corridor’s relationship with the transit center (Caltrain station), downtown core (Downtown Precise Plan area), and surrounding neighborhoods.
- Improve the streetscape for a complete street design to promote walking, transit, bicycling, and economic development.
- Incorporate community benefits, such as strategies for affordable housing, transitions from the Corridor to the neighborhoods, and vibrant streetscapes.
- Create a friendlier place for the people who live and work here: parents, kids, commuters, homeowners, and local businesses.
- Provide a comprehensive business retention and development strategy, focusing on small businesses.
- Identify financing mechanism and phasing recommendations to implement public improvements.
1.2 Purpose and Format of Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews are one tool by which the planning team learns from community members about the challenges facing the Corridor and the opportunities for the future. As part of the community outreach effort for the preparation of the Corridor Plan, the planning team interviewed 33 stakeholders on September 20, 2016 and one stakeholder on September 26, 2016. All interviews were conducted at the City Hall of Redwood City. The interviews were conducted in groups of one to five, with one hour allotted for each interview session. Stakeholders included business owners and representatives, property owners, developers, transportation agency representatives, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, and neighborhood activists.

The purpose of the interviews was to learn about stakeholders’ experiences living, working, and owning businesses and property in the Corridor, and to learn from their perspectives about what is working well, and not so well, in the study area. Specifically, interviewees were asked how connections along and across the Corridor could be improved upon. Stakeholders were asked how they would prioritize the accommodation of bike infrastructure, parking, and pedestrian facilities in the El Camino Real roadway. They were also asked what types of development, streetscape improvements, and parking management strategies they would like to see. Business and property owners were asked about the constraints they currently face and how new policies could help mitigate them. In addition to these particular topics, interviewees were given the opportunity to discuss issues of significance to them.

The full list of discussion questions and prompts are included in Appendix A. The list of participants is included in Appendix B. The following summary presents the range of responses organized by topic area, without attributing any remarks to specific individuals.

It is important to recognize that the issues presented in this paper may not necessarily be representative of the community at large, or a comprehensive assessment of opportunities and challenges faced along the Corridor. While the stakeholders represented a diverse spectrum of the community, no sampling techniques were employed in selecting the stakeholders, and consequently, the results cannot be generalized as the sentiments of the community at large. It is also important to recognize that information presented by the stakeholders included perception and opinion. Nonetheless, the valuable insight shared during the interviews greatly informs the planning process for the Corridor Plan.
2 Stakeholder Comments

2.1 Key Themes

During the stakeholder interviews, several themes were identified. Those mentioned by many stakeholders are summarized below for quick reference. The following sections provide the varying individual perspectives on these topics as well as additional issues that were raised.

- The Corridor is over-parked, and existing parking regulations limit development and reinvestment in the Corridor.
- Densities and building heights along the Corridor could be increased.
- Additional housing, particularly affordable housing, is desirable.
- Biking on El Camino Real is considered dangerous. Stakeholders were mixed on whether bike facilities should be added to El Camino Real or to an alternative route (e.g., Arguello).
- Bus transit should be made more attractive and accessible. Consider creative solutions, such as private shuttles and/or a circulator.
- El Camino Real should be safer and easier to cross and more pleasant and attractive to walk along.
- Vehicular traffic and congestion is a significant concern and should be managed in some fashion.
- Address small lot sizes in order to facilitate reinvestment.
- Community benefits provided as part of new development are desirable, but should be structured so that they do not over-burden new development and prevent revitalization.

2.2 Stakeholder Comments

A comprehensive summary of comments made by the stakeholders, organized by topic, follows.

DEVELOPMENT

Stakeholders were asked how they envisioned the Corridor growing and developing in the future, and specifically, what form they would like such development to take in terms of building heights, intensity, and the like. Generally, stakeholders were interested in an urban form that supports walkability and transit. Many stakeholders expressed their support for taller and higher density development, compared to the existing buildings along the Corridor. Several stakeholders noted that traffic improvements would be needed to accompany increases in densities and building
heights. Stakeholders also expressed a desire for setbacks, stepbacks, and transitions to buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods and provide room for streetscape amenities.

Specific comments from stakeholders on development standards are summarized below:

**Supportive of Transit-Oriented Development**

- The biggest challenge is traffic; El Camino Real needs to be pedestrian-friendly so that people are encouraged to walk rather than drive.
- The Plan should support sustainable development strategies.
- A more pedestrian-friendly place and transit-oriented development around Caltrain and the bus corridor is desirable.

**Building Heights**

- Three to four stories of mixed-use (commercial and residential) development along Corridor should be encouraged.
- Mixed-use development of 4-5 stories, with a good buffer for residential neighborhoods, should be encouraged.
- Buildings should be allowed to be taller. What if height limits went up to 95 feet in areas that are not adjacent to single family homes? There is the political will in Redwood City to raise height limits.
- North of Broadway has wider sidewalks, medians, infrastructure, one-story buildings, and low amounts of traffic. That location could develop into a mixed-use area with buildings heights of 3 stories, with traffic control.
- Taller buildings can be used as a street wall to buffer single family neighborhoods.

**Density**

- In order to builders to be able to finance more affordable housing, the City needs to increase the permitted residential density.
- Consider increasing densities and upzoning (i.e., rezoning for more intensive use) to create larger sites to incentivize revitalization along Corridor.
- Currently, the way land is used in the Corridor is inefficient; it is not dense enough to build a sense of place and community, but it is dense enough to generate traffic without mitigations.
- Look at communities and areas that have been successful at being denser and managing the flow of traffic better.
- Use Grand Boulevard Initiative findings to demonstrate that if greater densities are managed, excess revenues could be provided back to the municipality.
Setbacks, Stepbacks, Transitions

- Consider setbacks that allow room for more street trees.
- Encourage development close to the street, with surface parking away from the street.
- Encourage the use of height stepbacks adjacent to neighborhoods to create better transitions.

Urban Design

- The concept of creating smaller blocks and reducing perceived building mass through building articulation is important so that people feel that the corridor is more human-scaled and walkable.
- New development should be more attractive; the aesthetics of projects should be considered. Well-designed buildings with attractive facades and are well designed make dense development more interesting.
- Summerhill Apartments is a good example of project that improved the exterior of existing building.
- Urban design aspects, such as signs and landscaping, make a difference and provide visibility for retail spaces.

Dead-End Streets

- The physical limitations of rail tracks and crossings should be kept in mind. Dead-end streets should be incorporated into development rather than left as dead-end streets.
- The City should think about relinquishing dead-end streets and combining them with parcels.

LAND USES

Stakeholders spoke about the mix of land uses they would like to see along the Corridor. Several stakeholders expressed a desire to see more housing developed along the Corridor, particularly in light of rising housing prices in the area. Some stakeholders also spoke positively of mixed-use development and new retail opportunities.

Specific comments from stakeholders on land uses are summarized below:

Housing

- We need affordable housing at all income levels, which requires infill and densification.
- More housing should be encouraged along El Camino Real and near Caltrain. This would make it easy to get to Downtown and use transit while alleviating car traffic.
- The downside of creating more housing where people work and shop is the increase in traffic.
- There should be more places where people can live close to where they work.
• The rent charged by low-income housing rent should be low enough - $1,000 per month.
• We need to solve housing crisis.
• I support the recent focus on housing development along the Corridor.

Mixed Use
• Encourage mixed use development that incorporates residential, office, and retail, which facilitates walking to the train, and doesn't require parking.
• Encourage more mixed use development so that people are out walking and frequenting businesses.

Commercial
• There should be more retail establishments (e.g., clothing stores, flower shops) along El Camino Real.
• It is not essential to have retail on the ground floor of every parcel.

MOBILITY
Stakeholders spoke about connectivity in the Study Area. In general, stakeholders were interested in making El Camino Real easier to navigate via all modes of transportation. Many stakeholders discussed the advantages and disadvantages to accommodating a bike lane on El Camino Real, as well as the potential of exploring an alternative bike route. Several stakeholders voiced support for improving bus transit along the Corridor, and some expressed an interest in expanding bus service via private shuttles or a circulator. Some stakeholders suggested adding new crosswalks. And, several stakeholders discussed the need to improve vehicular congestion.

Specific comments from stakeholders on mobility are summarized below:

General Comments
• I am seeing dozens of small Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, but it is difficult to ascertain their effectiveness. It may make sense to try to share administrative overhead among program leadership.
• Multimodal mobility and public transit should be encouraged in the Corridor. There needs to be better public transit and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.
• A bike and/or pedestrian boulevard that goes along the railroad tracks would be nice.
• Caltrans supports communities in reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The goal is for more non-auto mode share by 2020; by that time, there should be three times more bicycle use and two times more walking than there is currently.
• There is interest in having a ferry connect to Redwood City; this could help alleviate traffic, especially if the ferry is linked to other public transit providers.
• Some communities are organizing themselves into districts in order to qualify for discounted transit passes.
• It would be beneficial to improve the intersection in front of Sequoia High School so that it is more welcoming to the community during non-school hours.

**Bicycles**

• Adding bike lanes may be an issue for some small businesses, as they would lose parking.
• Bicyclists avoid El Camino Real due to safety concerns.
• A bike lane would be great in theory, but there is concern that adding a bike lane to El Camino Real would increase, rather than ease, traffic.
• Biking seems dangerous on El Camino Real because there are too many cars driving on the road.
• It would be preferable for bike lanes to go around El Camino Real, and for instance be located on Arguello or Fair Oaks. If Arguello became a bike boulevard, people may lose interest in El Camino Real as a bike route.
• Menlo Park is a good example that of a city that has removed on-street parking and installed bike lanes in their place.
• On-street parking should be removed from El Camino Real, and bike lanes should be installed in their place.
• Separated bike lanes should be installed on El Camino Real so bicyclists can travel faster and more safely. I’d be interested in seeing bike lanes separated from vehicles by a curb, like they have in Amsterdam.
• New bike lanes should connect to the existing network of bike facilities. Belmont provides a good example.
• Removing a lanes of vehicle traffic to install a bike lane would be hard in a more congested area.
• If the City installs a bike lanes on El Camino Real, neighboring cities would be encouraged to do the same.
• It would be nice if the lane that goes along the railroad tracks became a bike/pedestrian boulevard.

**Bus**

• It would be ideal if there was a dependable bus system that could be used to travel El Camino Real.
• Google is interested in offering bus rapid transit (BRT).
• There should be BRT along El Camino Real.
• It should be easier and more convenient for pedestrians to access public transit.
• Samtrans does not anticipate dedicating lanes for BRT, but the agency can take some steps toward modified BRT (e.g., signal control).
• Look into Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s 522 rapid bus route concept; it’s a good proposal for incremental improvement.

Pedestrians

• The safety of the pedestrian crossings over railroad tracks should be improved upon; people cut across the railroad tracks to get to Target or liquor store.

• It would be helpful to have a bike/pedestrian bridge over El Camino Real, to connect the adjacent neighborhood to the Safeway and Downtown. There are residents in the area who do not have cars and do not feel safe crossing El Camino Real by foot.

• There should be more crosswalks across El Camino Real. The existing crosswalks along El Camino Real should be safer, with better painting and flashing lights. Longer crosswalks should be mitigated.

• Some pedestrians are forced to take side streets to avoid fumes and traffic.

• California Walks has a helpful toolkit for making pedestrian improvements.

• The north end of El Camino Real should have median islands installed in order to help pedestrians cross six lanes of traffic.

• It’s difficult to access the Caltrain Station from west of El Camino Real.

Rail

• There is concern about at-grade crossing of railroad tracks. Consider moving the railroad tracks underground.

• There should be a charming street car on El Camino Real.

Shuttle

• It might be difficult to incentivize corporations to provide free shuttle service to the public; try to show them that it’s better for the community, particularly in light of housing prices and excessive parking.

• It could be beneficial to talk to the County about expanding their existing shuttle services so that employees of local businesses can take advantage of it.

• The City should encourage more frequent bus or shuttle lines along El Camino Real. Emeryville’s circulator is one model of a free circulator bus line.

• Employees would benefit from free shuttle service.

• Big businesses that currently provide or will provide shuttle service for employees include El Camino Hospital, Kaiser, and Stanford. The City should consider talking to them about expanding services. An employer will be more likely to expand their service if it’s easy for them to do so.
Signal Timing

- Caltrans has re-timed lights along El Camino Real. Despite re-timing them at least three times, they slip into non-synchronized state. It is unclear what the issue is.
- The lights along El Camino Real should be synced. How they are timed contributes to gridlock.

Traffic

- The bottleneck at Chestnut and Roosevelt should be fixed by smoothing out traffic between Oak and Roosevelt.
- Concerns regarding traffic should take priority over any concerns regarding the lack of on-street parking.
- The Corridor cannot be widened, so the City must work on improving Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and other measures to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).
- The Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study is underway. It is looking at improving the local street network, particularly on the west side of the San Francisco Bay. Caltrans can provide information about what it has in mind with respect to Highway 84, if the City finds that it’s a problematic area.
- Other studies currently underway – including to improve carpool lanes on Highway 101 – may lead to improved traffic conditions on Highway 101, and thus on El Camino Real.
- The intersection at Whipple is horrible; better street signs are needed to inform drivers that the right lane is right-turn-only.
- The Highway 84/El Camino Real intersection functions well with regards to traffic, although it is odd to have a clover leaf intersection in the middle of a city.
- The economic recovery in Silicon Valley created traffic without mitigation measures.
- It is exciting that Redwood City is an up-and-coming community, but traffic is concerning.
- There should be a focus on alleviating congestion getting to/from the Dumbarton Bridge.
- Narrowing El Camino Real any further would create more traffic.
- There is a need to address congestion and traffic here.
- The City should address left turn pockets that get backed up; traffic flows into the adjacent neighborhoods.
- Some streets around downtown are underused and don’t need to be streets (i.e. Arguello).

PARKING

Stakeholders were also asked about their opinions on parking availability and on the City’s existing parking requirements. Stakeholders generally expressed that the City’s existing parking regulations have resulted in an oversupply of parking and limited development opportunities. Some stakeholders supported parking structures, assuming additional parking is needed along the
Corridor. Stakeholders expressed a mix of opinions on the desirability of retaining on-street parking. Some indicated that on-street parking is important to their businesses; others indicated that it should be removed to make space for other amenities.

Specific comments from stakeholders on parking are summarized below:

**Parking Requirements**

- Be careful about parking ratios; if on-street parking is taken away, it is good to provide drivers parking pockets/off-street parking options.
- Businesses and developers are not incentivized to construct bigger buildings due to parking requirements; underground parking is too costly to build.
- It is difficult for developers to accomplish wide sidewalks and setbacks with current parking requirements. There is a need to create a shared parking strategy.
- Strategies like lowering the parking requirements, unbundling parking1, and increasing support for other types of transportation can help with housing affordability and sustainable transportation goal.
- There needs to be more parking closer to Downtown.
- Parking requirements are too high; parking is underutilized.
- The amount of parking currently required for residential development is too high; people don’t have two cars per one dwelling unit.
- An inventory of an occupied building can provide very useful data when adjusting parking requirements.
- I support reduced parking.
- There is little incentive for property owners to further develop their property with current parking ratios and density limitations.

**Off-Street Parking**

- Businesses don’t want to be assessed for a public parking lot that isn’t necessary.
- Parking is not an issue as on-street parking on El Camino Real is underutilized; we don’t need an additional parking lot on El Camino Real.
- Surface parking at Sequoia Station is a dead zone and underutilized.
- The surface parking at the library (at Jefferson and Middlefield) is a good location for structured parking.
- Encourage parking structures. Street parking is preferable for older residents, but the majority of people like to walk.

---

1 Parking unbundling is a parking strategy in which parking spaces are rented or sold separately, rather than automatically included with the rent or purchase price of a residential or commercial unit.
If additional parking is needed, I am more supportive of a parking structure than parking lots.

It is hard to say when autonomous vehicles will be mainstream. But it is possible that parking structures won’t have 30-year life. Structured parking should be repurposable.

**On-Street Parking**

- The City needs to retain on-street parking, customers need to be able to park for free. Businesses that do not have their own off-street parking lots rely on the availability of on-street parking on El Camino Real.
- On-street parking is extremely underutilized, look at alternatives.
- A parking permit strategy can be helpful with regards to housing affordability.

**STREETSCAPE**

Stakeholders were asked what streetscape improvements and amenities they would like to see. Some stakeholders suggested improvements to lighting, transit facilities, and the number of street trees. Some stakeholders recommended improving the sidewalks to be more pedestrian-friendly and accessible to people with disabilities. Some also discussed how it would be positive if businesses could provide outdoor seating along El Camino Real.

- There should be more bus shelters along El Camino Real, so transit riders are shielded from the elements.
- Caltrans doesn’t allow vending on sidewalks [which would allow for outdoor store displays and dining], which frustrates people. The City should look into relinquishment of sidewalks, as was done in Emeryville.
- Sidewalks need to be fixed to be more pedestrian friendly and wheelchair accessible.
- Use lighting to activate spaces and make the area safer.
- Insufficient lighting is an issue on Main Street near Safeway; it’s too dark and feels unsafe there.
- There should be additional street trees along El Camino Real. It is important that the sidewalks be wide enough for trees. Also, consider adjusting the street tree list.
- El Camino Real needs to be more vibrant and attractive. More people will be interested in shopping in the area then.
- Different parts of the Corridor have different needs.
- El Camino Real should be treated as an extension of downtown. Perhaps it should be treated as a busier downtown street.
- Sequoia High School is important to the area. It’s located on an important intersection. Can it be more welcoming to the community during non-school hours?
DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

Stakeholders were asked about the obstacles to reinvestment in the Corridor and what the Corridor Plan could do to remove those obstacles and facilitate investment. Several stakeholders discussed the relatively small size of the Corridor’s parcels and the challenge that presents.

Specific comments from stakeholders on development incentives are summarized below:

- The prevalence of small parcels is a challenge. It’s difficult for housing developers to construct new housing on small parcels, because the economics do not make sense. The City should try to set up policies to make parcel assemblages possible. The City should talk to individual property owners regarding what they want in exchange.

- There is currently no mechanism in the City for coordinating a group of property owners could agree on leasing or purchasing. The City should encourage the formation of a viable negotiating block of small property owners that can coordinate on lease terminations, assemblages of properties with long-term leases, and/or the selling of properties. City should also help with showing small property owners the tax consequences of these actions.

- There are small old retail businesses along El Camino Real that need to be upgraded, but so much has to be improved by the property owners that it’s unfeasible. Any improvement to the building triggers the need for additional improvements (for instance, seismic improvements, improvements related to the Americans with Disabilities Act).

- If transfer of development rights (TDR) is allowed, property owners can transfer unused building height to a lot closer to El Camino Real.

- It is important for empty spaces to not stay empty.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Stakeholders were asked what benefits to the community they would like to see the Corridor Plan provide. Several stakeholders expressed an interest in the Plan providing benefits to the community, such as affordable housing, infrastructure improvements, and stability to small, independent businesses. There was also a clear interest in ensuring that any community benefits program did not overburden new development.

Specific comments from stakeholders on community benefits are summarized below:

Affordable Housing

- Consider inclusionary zoning, ² commercial linkage fees, ³ and working with private employers to see how they might add to housing stock and take the burden away from just private developers.

---
² Policy that encourages or requires a certain percentage of new residential development to be affordable to low- or middle-income residents.

³ A Commercial Linkage fee is a per-square foot fee assessed to new, non-residential construction, such as hotel, office space, and retail and restaurants, to address the affordable housing demand from new workers.
• It is not worth it for property owners to develop new buildings if affordable housing must be included; developers want to be able to build more market rate units.

• There is too much red tape for developers to navigate, and it prevents them from building enough affordable housing. Developers are required to conduct a lot of studies and pay development fees. The cost of these studies and fees contributes to the high price of housing. Affordable housing is a problem too difficult for property owners to shoulder alone.

**Miscellaneous**

• Feasibility studies are recommended to make sure fees don't undermine new projects.

• Repairing infrastructure should be the City’s first priority. Funding for this can be raised through new development.

• Can the City leverage the area’s designation as a Priority Development Area?

• The City should target larger lots, in three to four nodes, for urban public spaces. These locations should be amenable to large setbacks.

• Small businesses are concerned about displacement; if anything can support existing businesses, that would be helpful.

• Consider implementing a community benefits districts.

• Encourage the use of a flexible community benefits program so that fees can be changed when recessions hit and costs get too high. Sunnyvale looking at flexible community benefits program that can be ratcheted up and down.

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Several stakeholders also offered their feedback on the importance of engaging the community early and effectively in the process. Specific comments from stakeholders on community engagement are summarized below:

• The County’s 2006 initiative on housing includes good examples of community outreach on density and housing.

• The public should be educated on the need for higher density. Avoid using wonky language when communicating with the community.

• The findings of the Grand Boulevard Initiative should be presented to the public. I recommend collaborating with the other jurisdictions involved in the Grand Boulevard Initiative.

• Stanford in Redwood City is a good case study to review. That project successfully engaged the Fair Oaks neighborhood.

• Continue prepping for conversations with residents of single family neighborhoods. It’s important to communicate that dense development will cause some negative impacts but can be mitigated, and can bring benefits as well.

• A visioning phase is helpful.
• Make sure to communicate to the public that development standards will result in physical changes and projects so local neighborhoods can provide their input before new development happens.

• An outreach activity in which people walk and/or bike the area can be helpful.
3 Next Steps

The findings of this report will be shared with decision-makers and the Redwood City community. The Corridor Plan will be informed by the candid input and insights shared by the stakeholders during these interviews, as well as by the feedback and recommendations provided during community workshops, Citizens Advisory Group meetings, public hearings, and an online survey. As potential standards and street design options are developed, stakeholders may be consulted again to solicit reactions and feedback.

In the near term, the planning team will be sharing the existing conditions reports – prepared for the project on the topics of Land Use and Streetscape, Real Estate Market, and Transportation – with the community. A community workshop will be held on Wednesday, November 16th at 7 p.m. in City Hall. Moving forward, reports will be prepared on preliminary draft development standards and land use policies and regulatory objectives. In addition, conceptual urban design and streetscape options will be sketched, illustrated, and outlined. These products will be presented for public review and refined based on feedback from the community, the Corridor Advisory Group, and decision-makers.
Appendix A: Stakeholders Interview Questions

Challenges and Opportunities
What’s working well on El Camino Real today? What do you think are the greatest challenges facing the Corridor today? What do you feel will be the key challenges the Corridor will face in the next 10 to 20 years?

Mobility
The Corridor Plan will look at ways to improve safety, convenience, and aesthetics along and across El Camino. What improvements are needed to enhance connections to the Caltrain Station, the downtown core, and the surrounding neighborhoods? Think about walking, biking, transit, as well as driving. Also, consider the ability of people of all ages and abilities to get around.

Where are the places where safety improvements are most critical?

El Camino plays two major roles: it is a regional thoroughfare for people passing through town, and it is a local road that serves local shops and residents. How should we try to balance these sometimes competing interests?

There is limited space on the roadway to accommodate different features and modes of travel: sidewalks, bike lanes, parking, car/truck travel lanes, medians, turn lanes, and landscaping. Is the space allocated appropriately now? What changes would you like to see?

Parking
How much do you value on-street parking? Would you be willing to walk a block to your destination after parking in a parking garage or lot that is shared among businesses?

Economic Development
What factors do you think contribute to a business’s success if it is located on El Camino? Think about things like the type of establishment, access, size, signage, façade, design, parking, and other factors.

What actions could the City take to support small businesses along the Corridor? How can the City use the Corridor Plan to facilitate investment?
Urban Design

What type of improvements to the public realm (the streets, sidewalks, and public spaces) would you like to see along the Corridor? Think about things such as lighting, landscaping, the width of sidewalks, street furniture (benches, trash cans, etc.), public art, bus shelters, and similar.

Development Regulations

What developments along El Camino Real do you like the most? Why?

There are currently some vacant sites on the El Camino corridor, and the City is likely to see development proposals come forward for various locations in the coming years. What aspects of new development on El Camino are most important to you? Consider: use (ground floor and upper floors), building height, building design/architecture, parking, and similar.

Talk about how familiar you are with the City’s current zoning regulations, and in what capacity. Based on your experience, what is working well or not working well with regards to the Corridor? With regards the Downtown Precise Plan Area where it overlaps with El Camino?

Thinking about a specific project or projects with which you are familiar, how did the City’s Zoning Regulations affect the outcome?

Are you aware of any particular zoning issues (e.g. use limitations, development requirements, processes) in the existing zoning code that currently affect development in the Corridor and hinder implementation of what’s described for the Corridor in the General Plan?

Are you aware of aspects of the Downtown Precise Plan that are particularly effective at facilitating development there?
## Appendix B: Stakeholders Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adina Levin</td>
<td>Friends of Caltrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Lam</td>
<td>Redwood City Carwash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Warner</td>
<td>Sequoia Station/Regency Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Saxon</td>
<td>Record Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Buckmaster</td>
<td>Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Giovannoni</td>
<td>Woodside Plaza Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Frank</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Kopf</td>
<td>Owns property near El Camino Real &amp; Maple/Beech/Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Royer</td>
<td>Owns business at El Camino Real &amp; Whipple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Affrunti</td>
<td>University Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Kim</td>
<td>Samtrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Breeze</td>
<td>Summerhill (Oakwood Apartments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Shlaes</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Bike Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Kinney</td>
<td>Roosevelt Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Saxon</td>
<td>Record Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gita Dev</td>
<td>Sierra Club – Sustainable Land Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Chu</td>
<td>Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Tarantino</td>
<td>Gelb Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Lam</td>
<td>Redwood City Carwash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Smith</td>
<td>Sares Regis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Sordi</td>
<td>Irvine Company (Franklin St. Apartments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leora Tanjuatco</td>
<td>Housing Leadership Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Hart</td>
<td>Colliers International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massoud Badakhshan</td>
<td>Gelb Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Verdone</td>
<td>Oak Knoll/Edgewood Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Garvey</td>
<td>Grand Boulevard Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ingram</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Van Brunt</td>
<td>Downtown Business Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanne Foust</td>
<td>Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Mateo County Economic Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samie Goodman</td>
<td>Woodside Plaza Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Arton</td>
<td>Owns property at El Camino Real &amp; Hopkins/Whipple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Wagner</td>
<td>Redwood City Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Elliot</td>
<td>Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Ayers</td>
<td>University Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>