

**TRANSCRIBED POSTER NOTES
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**

Area 1: 600 Park Avenue

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

600 – Not suitable – R20 max. Only areas surrounded by R1; Need sufficient parking on site. Out of neighborhood; Not walking distance to amenities and stores; RTC may take over Park Ave; Bus service stopped due to low ridership; 2 story [buildings at] perimeter; 3 stories more suitable to interior.

Potentially since very low density. Has some open space but very little park areas in Capitola. Do not remove existing parking.

One of the only true low income housing units. Leave it alone and don't price folks out

Absolutely. One of the only remaining large parcels that can accommodate well-designed and truly high-density multifamily residential development (at least 30 du/ac). Please create some renderings to show people how it can be done in a way that won't scare them.

Within residential neighborhood on both borders not enough parking now.

80 units of low income housing. All low income currently

Area 2 : Rosedale & Hill

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

Potentially if demo existing buildings. Some open area should remain. Not much park area in Capitola. Almost no street parking anywhere. Do not remove existing parking.

Yes. Please increase the density to at least 30 du/acre to align with the rest of the jurisdictions in the county.

Area 3 : Capitola Ave & Hill

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

There is NO extra parking on Capitola Road or Hill Street. None!!! We already live with a freeway on one side of **Turner** Lane. Please don't build high or we lose our privacy as well

If you change 15 du/ac to 30 x 4.3 acres – 129 units. 129 minus existing 72 is 57 more units?! How do you maintain any greenspace, play areas, setbacks?

Ye. Redevelopment may not happen, but our ridiculously low high-density density limit of 20 du/ac should be raised to at least 30 du/ac

I don't see how more units could be added without demo existing units. Do not remove parking.

Concerns: Height, set back, density, parking.

Parking is already inadequate for neighbors on Hill Street and Capitola Avenue. Tall buildings would not allow sun to enter into yards that already get little light.

Yes with qualifications. We need 1) adequate setbacks from adjacent property to make sure multistory don't block light; 2) adequate parking; 3) better public transportation; 4) will only support small increase in density less than or equal to 25%

Against Area 3. Taller buildings pushed against west of **[dense?]** existing neighbors. Impedes privacy and solar access to many existing people.

Area 4 : Clares and 46th

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

Yes, has some open space but unless removed onsite parking would have to demo and increase stories. Do not remove parking.

Not suitable for additional multifamily due to already identified potential for 2561 units in mall/41st Avenue. Consider as well as existing multifamily development throughout this neighborhoods/region of the city.

Yes. This development is old and unsightly. Redevelopment would absolutely be an improvement. Please increase the density to at least 30 du/ac.

Area 5 : Capitola Cove

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

Potentially if demo old building. Do not remove existing parking SF to south side Clares and East side very little open space, very little park area in Capitola

Not suitable to due to already identified potential for 2561 units in the mall/41st Avenue corridor, as well as existing multifamily throughout the neighborhood/region of the city

Yes. If nothing else, please at least make the density accommodate the built density to bring it into compliance with the zoning. 30 du/ac should be preferable.

Area 6 : Capitola Gardens

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

Pros: Underutilized site compared to neighboring mixed-use MU-N. Larger lot size for opportunity to have well design MF. Proximity to transportation and services. Potential for workforce housing. Strong candidate for rezoning vs. 1-5.

Yes only single story development in a parking like setting. There is more open space, could be future multistory. They landed 3 ADUs in the biggest lawn area. No parking required for them. Do not remove parking

YES. One of the last opportunities for a large well-designed, truly high density multifamily residential development in our city...and in close proximity to lots of amenities, the beach, and the 41st avenue commercial corridor. Please raise the density to at least 30 du/ac.

Capitola Gardens is not suitable for additional multifamily. Its already bordered by the new Bluffs development and the multifamily villas at Capitola complex. Plus, Capitola Road corridor is slated for opportunity and the mall area presents plans for expansive housing.

Don't inundate on street parking for existing residents.

Area 7 : Landing at Capitola

Question: Is this area suitable for additional multifamily development? Why or why not?

Comments:

Yes, potentially if demo old building very little open space. Do not remove parking

Pros: Already exceeds the allowed density; proximity to other multifamily housing making it a logical extension; area is already zoned RM-L and an increase in density would not drastically change the character of the neighborhood; strategic location to public transit; potential for mixed-income housing; strong candidate for rezoning vs. #1-5.

Yes. It won't happen (redevelopment) because what is there is relatively dense and well-maintained, but remove the density constraint. Increase the density to at least 20 du/ac to bring it into conformance with the zoning, or make it 30 du/ac to increase their options!

Multifamily Housing Design Posters

Terra Court, Capitola

Its no bad, has a lot of concrete. Glad front porches are on the frontage. Very little open space, no play areas.

Needs more treen canopy. Would prefer a multifamily, multistory, residential building with shared open space

I don't like the height! Colors pitch roofs. No green space.

Best of all the examples for articulation and sense of individual owner.

Dunslee Way, Scotts Valley

Two stories on the perimeter and 3 in the middle with translucent windows on neighbors sides

Great architectural design. I love the front porches with access to the street in a multifamily development. Good siding and color choices

This is a nice design – neighborhood friendly front onto paring or street area. Varied planes and roof line. Thhere is community gathering space behind some of the buildings and in the back. Beautifully landscaped too. I've been there and even the 3 story it has an interesting design.

Great Design.

Way too much

1209 Seabright Avenue, Santa Cruz

These have a very residential look, but do appear like McMansions that are too close to each other.

Much preferred as RMs will be incorporated in and around single-family homes.

This is a great example, very nice materials, lots of details appears as an SFD. Nice to see pitched roof and lots of gables.

Architectural style doesn't fit with Santa Cruz. Density okay. Would prefer multistory, multifamily, residential building.

Design – No. Don't mind the height and closeness. Addresses middle-housing.

Bay Avenue Senior Apartments, Capitola

I like the variations in exterior materials. I'd like to see these several stories higher! I think the design supports that.

We shouldn't have 3 stories surrounded by single level residences. This doesn't keep the feel of Capitola for existing neighborhoods.

I have never see[n] the interior of this site, it has a pedestrian friendly interesting street façade. Looks better from the street side.

Amazing development. We need more of this. Also, increase the density to let them expand!

I like the open space and low profile of the buildings.

Looks very Pacific Northwest. Good use of multi-units.

716 Darwin Street, Santa Cruz

This example has a warm look w/balconies and varying exteriors. It's a good look for 35 du/ac!

This is a warm look

I like this example but it's a little top heavy with balconies on a 3rd story. It has pleasing design with architectural details to break up the somewhat boxy mass.

Front looks dated! Height is fine but I'm curious about parking and if no parking, is it close to transit

Frederick Street, Santa Cruz

While boxy, the roof variations help break it up, as do the balconies. Another good look for 36 du/ac

This looks like a monolith. Very boxy. 3 stories. Should not border residential single level neighborhoods!

This is boxy and lacking in architectural details. Nice it has a usable size balcony for each unit. A lot of paved areas.

This looks the most coastal of the 4 and is consistent with similar multi-family units in the Capitola area in 41st

Other Comment Card

It appears nobody wants any of this. Do what ever you can to comply and at the same time discourage any of it being built. Thank you for all your work. Please protect Capitola