



Via E-Mail Only

September 22, 2015

Meeting Summary

Orchard Heritage Park Project

RE: Community Meeting #1

Date of Meeting: Thursday September 17, 2015, 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm, Sunnyvale Community Center

Attendees:

City of Sunnyvale:

Nate Scribner (NS), nscribner@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Jim Stark (JS), jstark@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Callander Associates:

Dave Rubin (DR), drubin@callanderassociates.com

Brian Fletcher (BF), bfletcher@callanderassociates.com

Community:

See Sign In Sheets (attached)

The following information was discussed during the meeting and/or received via comment cards or email correspondence directed to pubworks@sunnyvale.ca.org.

item

Orchard Heritage Park Community Comments

- Gardening advocate asked that team consider including plumbing inside garden shed.
- Numerous community members commented that no orchard trees should be removed to accommodate project improvements (i.e. maintenance building or trash enclosure should not encroach into orchard).
- Consider including playground to appeal to younger families. Play equipment should not be modern looking.
- Consider providing large shade trees and benches around museum.

SAN MATEO
311 Seventh Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94401
T 650.375.1313
F 650.344.3290

SAN JOSE
300 South First Street, Suite 232
San Jose, CA 95113
T 408.275.0565
F 408.275.8047

RANCHO CORDOVA
11180 Sun Center Drive, Suite 104
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
T 916.631.1312
F 916.635.9153

Recreate
Educate
Live+Work
Connect
Sustain
www.callanderassociates.com

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #1**

Date of Meeting: Thursday September 17, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 2 of 4

- Community member requested that the design incorporate large specimen trees for immediate impact. Avoid small container planted trees.
- Design should provide a more welcoming entry to the museum and offer a direct route to access new improvements. Any solution must include shade (preferably a structure). Weddings are very hot. Consider including grapevines on arbor.
- Consider provisions to allow for rotating exhibit space at entry plaza.
- Shade over lunch areas more interesting for kids/schools
- Provide for more kid friendly amenities where possible.
- Consider a design that has benefits to broader community and not just the museum.
- When programming the space, consider limitations on loud music in entry area during events.
- Provide multi-generational appeal in design of space.
- Look at parking lots for opportunities to accommodate program as they're very underutilized. BF noted that expanding project limits also tends to expand project costs.
- Consider how to discourage homeless from using new park amenities.
- Location of future maintenance building should not encroach on existing features to the extent possible.
- It was noted that the parking lot will be used more, if good amenities are available.
- Consider placing maintenance building along entry drive from Manet side of the campus.
- A community member inquired whether the maintenance building be same size. BF responded that the building will have a very similar footprint.
- One community member suggested that the maintenance area be retained where it is, just hide it better.
- Consider maintenance and trash area at curve on Michelangelo side of campus.

Butcher House Community Comments

- It was clarified that the cost to move the Butcher House will be borne by Historical society.
- A number of community members stated that the Butcher house should be saved for future generations.
- Consider using the house as additional museum space.
- One community member inquired 'Why move and save Butcher

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #1**

Date of Meeting: Thursday September 17, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 3 of 4

House?’ Another made the statement that the Butcher House might not on the City’s heritage resource list. Where’s the City’s study saying to keep Butcher House? Consider adding Heritage Preservation Commission to the review process.

- Many participants noted that the Butcher House should only be placed within the confines of Orchard Heritage Park. No removal of orchard trees. If it’s valued by the community, it should not be tucked into the orchard.
- It was suggested that there’s value in showing what hard working class lived like. We should not just save and restore historic homes of the wealthy.
- A few community members expressed that the study issue is too narrowly defined. Another individual thought there should be a “no relocation” option.
- It was suggested that the design team be realistic about quantity of impacted orchard trees.
- It was suggested there may not be enough room to accommodate all programs.
- Butcher House is part of history. It belongs in Orchard Heritage Park.
- Orchard needs to be certain size to be economically viable. Removing trees pushes orchard closer towards not being viable.
- Locate Butcher House where maintenance building is currently located.
- Consider parking lot as location for the Butcher House.
- Can Butcher House go somewhere else in the City? Has that scenario been considered?
- A community member inquired how the Butcher house would be transported to each park location depicted on concepts. Would the act of transporting the house remove trees in certain locations where trees don’t otherwise seem impacted?
- One community member wanted to find out how to voice their concerns over placing the Butcher House at Orchard Heritage Park. BF responded that there will be future meetings including a Council meeting to provide input.
- Question was asked whether the maintenance area foot print can be reduced to save on space.
- Question was asked whether the City benefits from having Butcher House? Consider needs of broader community.
- Consider placing the house at Las Palmas Park for use as a recreation center.
- Butcher House redundant with museum. Have something to honor working class from that era instead.
- A few community members asked to see what the interior of the

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #1**

Date of Meeting: Thursday September 17, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 4 of 4


home looks like.

- Question was asked whether there's time pressure to resolve Butcher House issue.
- Restrooms at multi-purpose building are often vandalized and closed. Consider ways to solve that issue.
- Can maintenance area be broken up? Buildings broken up by use, smaller buildings spread around the site.

-END-

The information above is Callander Associates' understanding of items discussed and decisions reached at the meeting. Callander Associates is proceeding with the project based on this understanding. If you have any questions, additions, or corrections to this memo, please contact this office in writing within three days.

Submitted by:



Dave Rubin, Project Manager, Callander Associates

cc: All attendees

Attachments:

1. Sign-in sheets, dated September 17, four pages
2. Comment cards received at meeting (9/17/15)
3. Email correspondence received at pubworks@sunnyvale.ca.gov between 9/9/15 and 9/24/15



Via E-Mail Only

November 12, 2015

Meeting Summary

Orchard Heritage Park Project

RE: Community Meeting #2

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29th, 2015, 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm, Sunnyvale Community Center

Attendees:

City of Sunnyvale:

Nate Scribner (NS), nscibner@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Jim Stark (JS), jstark@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Callander Associates:

Brian Fletcher (BF), bfletcher@callanderassociates.com

Tristan Williamson (TW), twilliamson@callanderassociates.com

Community:

See Sign In Sheets (attached)

The following information was discussed during the meeting and/or received via comment cards or email correspondence directed to pubworks@sunnyvale.ca.org.

item

Orchard Heritage Park Community Comments

- It was suggested that the maintenance building will be more of a landscape type of project, not a construction project. Examples such as a landscaped screening wall and exterior landscape of the building were given.
- It was inquired about the Butcher House being in a parking lot location.

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 2 of 9

- Community member suggested consulting with the Historical Society on the 3 presented concepts and getting their feedback.
- Community member inquired about the treatment of the driveway in Concept B. Can the orchard be restored?
- Community member inquired about providing access to farm equipment.
- Inquiry on the historical significance of the Butcher House.
- Community member inquired about the number of trees that are to be lost with each concept.
- Community inquired about the possibility of a different location for the Butcher House and whether or not it will be open to the public.
- Community member inquired about alternatives to liquidambar for the Interpretive Pathway, is there another SPP?

- Community member was concerned about ability to voice their preferences and opinions on the project (see comment card).
- Community member inquired about the location of restrooms in the proposed play area.
- Community member suggested alternate location of play area of the Driveway by the Barn.
- Between the three concepts, what is the number of outdoor spaces in each? This is important, especially for accommodating events.
- Community member voiced their goals for the security fence. Must be secure, visually appealing, thematic, and open.
- Community member inquired about the danger of farm equipment on site, especially toward children.
- Community member said that the Gazebo has many benefits and they can foresee ability but can they see an equivalent idea in the other concepts?
- Can the proposed play structure be included in Concept C?
- Community member noted that Concept C contains a visual connection between the two structures. Creates an engagement between different environments.
- Community member asked about the need for a retaining wall. Is it to prevent flooding on site?
- Community member questioned proposed location of Gazebo in Concept C. They asked it be to the left of the fountain.
- How are the two decisions being made related and how will they be made?

- It was noted that the next step would be a parks and recreation

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 3 of 9

meeting.

- Community member noted “big” need for proposed playground but inquired about the hours and the security measures, need for a fence?
- It was noted that the Museum Courtyard is currently used as an informal playground, if this is a continued use there is need for shade and a restroom.
- It was noted that residents and neighbors needs to be ensured and made aware of any drawings that show trash enclosures.
- A suggested alternative location for a trash enclosure would be across from the driveway at Michelangelo Drive.
- A community member inquired about the impacts on the trees from the fence around the Butcher House shown in Concept B.
- A community member asked if there are any restrictions on future site development of orchard land that are tied to the original development of the site.
- What is the budget of entrance and relocation project, how do the 3 concepts compare, and what is the existing budget?
- A community member asked how the 3 concepts stack up in regards to the Butcher House issue.
- It was noted that the 4th Concept’s improvements are free of the Butcher House.
- A community member requested an increased focus of “living heritage” at the site.
- It was noted that the home of the orchard workers is complicated by featuring the ranch home/Butcher House.
- A community member requested that the Butcher House remain at its existing site.
- It was noted by community that concepts A and C feature all desirable elements and are a “win/win” for the site.
- It was noted that in concept B, the Butcher House is hidden behind other existing elements.

BF Comments

- Community likes the idea of a playground.
- Community did not respond to concept B.
- Noted that there is no shade at the amphitheater.
- Noted that there are no restrooms for play area.
- Concept C was also well received.
- Concepts A and C could be accessible.
- Community would like to see a concept without the Butcher House.
- A and C are most viable options.

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 4 of 9

- The Orchard house would complement and highlight how they lived.

Comment Cards:

Are there are any amenities or features from the other two concepts that you would like to see in your preferred concept?

- Would there be room for a gazebo in Concept A.
- Bathroom for play area?
- Gazebo, open entry to museum.
- Walkways to be able to look at farm equipment.
- Playground either here or elsewhere on community center site. No loss of apricot trees, would rather have nice playground and not Butcher House.
- Small gazebo or other back drop for a wedding (other events) pictures.
- Like the Gazebo in C, would also like the play structure but less priority, would also like plum trees near Butcher House, keep lawn in C.
- Playground idea OK in existing location, except that it seems small for the number of children in the area. Perhaps place playground in another part of the Community Center lawn areas.
- Please do not move Butcher House in Orchard Park, it's pretty open space.
- Using the old historic crates somehow, stacking in an aesthetically pleasing way as part of a display is a nice idea. Can this be included in Option 3? Option 3 is the unified layout with a center area. Please camouflage the maintenance and garbage structures.
- Play structure.
- A – like the idea of having the house with some yard visible.
- B – having the house in the back area gives event planners more privacy depending when parties are allowed to start – so will the public still be allowed throughout the rest of the park?
- Play area should be added to C, in the area next to the purple shrubs.
- Like the idea of living exhibit to show and playground. Also shadow walkway is what residents want there, open area for concept C.
- Gazebo and play area in Concept C.
- Playground and Gazebo.
- I would like to see the maintenance building and trash enclosure placed in a landscaped berm. There is a way to design the building and landscape so that these elements are actually pleasant and interesting.

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 5 of 9

- Multiple community members stated preference to have a way to vote against Concept B rather than having to give it a rank at all.
- Multiple community members state that a play area is needed in concept A.
- Preference for Concept B based on the turf area being continuous, not divided up as in other concepts.
- Preference for an option showing to Butcher House rotated 90 degrees clockwise with the front being roughly 20' from the multipurpose building.

Are there are any amenities and features in your preferred concept that you would like not to include?

- Do not remove any trees.
- No play area in concept C.
- Option C is the best use of space, leaving half of the lawn area as open space.
- Not much interest in Butcher House.
- Keep Butcher House on Butcher property down near Wolfe
- Not sold on having a playground at this site. I'd rather see space for school groups, restrooms and lunch area.
- Play area to include present old equipment and restrooms
- Play area may be more of a problem, liability.
- Option B is not preferable: more expensive to move the Butcher House in this option; Butcher House appears "hidden away" behind other buildings.
- Play area not preferable because it does not include (accessible) bathroom facilities and would appear to be outside the fenced area and generally not in a visible area.
- Move proposed play area to near the Community Center, behind the Senior Center, as an alternative to the currently-proposed site.
- No Butcher House
- Vote against including a play area and/or freestanding bathrooms.
- Playground could be fine in proposed location if restrooms can be made available; if not, multiple community members stated preference for moving play area to a location in the Community Center.
- Support for the walkway, as it improves the sight line from the parking area to the museum, but multiple community members stated it is not preferable to create an obstacle to this sight line by locating the Butcher House as shown.

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 6 of 9

- Preference to locate the Butcher House close to the Museum building for a number of reasons: proximity of 2 separate buildings for use in weddings and other events; multiple community members expressed concern over the increased staffing of docents potentially required by locating the Butcher House far from the Museum building.
- Playground not compatible with concepts put forth.

Do you have any other comments?

- Keep the last remaining apricot orchard in the Santa Clara Valley completely intact.
- Apricots are an important part of City and County history. Very important to the preservation of community heritage that the orchard be preserved. Future generations should be able to see the orchard first-hand.
- Orchard maintenance becomes less cost-effective with removal or trees.
- This entire project appears to be an unnecessary expense for the City and its taxpayers.
- Effort is being driven by desire to move maintenance building; if this must happen, proposed location should not affect orchard or operations.
- Potential model for a period-correct park: Mission San Juan Bautista. Unadorned, emphasis on history.
- Potential improvements to maintenance building design:
- Keep current location, but new building could match orchard barn structure so that it adds on to the “current cloistered sanctuary feeling.” Maintenance building could be pulled back more into the parking area, opening up more space for amenities within the existing courtyard.
- Inquiry about organizing to prevent any development on the orchard land.
- Multiple community members recommend adding more parks in Sunnyvale.
- Feelings of sadness in seeing orchards disappear with buildings being put in their place.
- Preference to move the Butcher House to the old Murphy Park on N. Sunnyvale Ave.
- Multiple community members stated they do not want the trash enclosures to be located near the homes, where currently proposed, and one states they should not have to look at the back of trash enclosure and maintenance building from their home on Michelangelo Drive.

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 7 of 9

- Suggested alternative location for trash enclosures: behind theatre or gym.
- Suggested alternative location for maintenance building: west of the Barn (where temporary tents are).
- Support for the Entry Plaza going straight into the museum entrance.
- Proposed open turf area should be moved to in front of the Butcher House, leaving the potential for a larger open turf area in case the Butcher House does not end up on this site.
- Additional benches needed to accommodate group visits to the museum/student field trips.
- The museum should be open more often, or else the potential play and garden areas should be open at all times so that it will be open to students at the community center classes and to the general public.
- A play area should be located close to the community center.
- Multiple community members expressed the desire to remove any intervention that would involve any change to the orchard's current state.
- Preference for the location of the Butcher House in Concept B due to: proximity to Museum buildings, orchard and walkway to Senior Center, effectively telling the "story" of Sunnyvale's history.
- The new entrance will be welcoming to all.
- The loss of "8 to 9" trees will not "destroy" the orchard, and is a sacrifice in order to preserve Sunnyvale history.
- Children's play area is not preferable as it does not tie into presenting history.
- Support for the wide entry through historic gates.
- Support for an exhibit with interpretive panels on the farm machinery.
- There is a need for a covered walkway between the Butcher House and the Museum (as noted by the Historical Society). Potential location: along the multi-use building.
- Suggest recreating the front porch the Butcher House historically had, which was "rounded out in front of the door, and extended to each side of the front of the house."
- Cutting down trees to make way for the Butcher House is unacceptable, as the apricot orchard is the last one left in the South Bay and is too small for proposed reduction.
- Replacement of trees is something that already happens in the orchard, and so the replacement of a swath of trees in the case of the driveway behind the museum building is acceptable. Potential

Meeting Summary**Orchard Heritage Park Project****RE: Community Meeting #2**

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Page 8 of 9

to relocate trees from the proposed Butcher House location (Option B) to areas where farm equipment is currently stored.

- Staff and council ought to go back and look at original proposal.
- Continue to preserve orchard and as much our heritage as possible.
- Preference to leave the Butcher House where it is.
- Preference not to alter the orchard at all, or to buy it and convert it to a park.
- Try to preserve as much open space in front of museum and Butcher House for events.
- The more open space, the better. Need to provide the public with greater amount of time of notice before the date of the community meeting.
- I really love the orchard
- I'm still unconvinced about the value of the Butcher House. If we don't have to keep it, I like the layout of B-less the Butcher House.
- Butcher House's historic value is questionable.
- Disagreement with the removal of trees from the orchard for environmental reasons (mitigating air pollution caused by increased traffic).
- Support for the Museum and orchard the way they are now, no support for the addition of another building that will not add value to the site.
- Agree with the gentleman who implied that the Historical Society somehow has more influence on whether or not the Butcher House is appropriate for this property. There really has been little or no discussion about whether this relocation is not usable. It's sort of "Fait accompli"
- Many people enter the Community Center through Michelangelo from the South(walking). Need to keep a cut through.
- It would be nice to include play area. Shaded trellis and trees also good.
- Great job by the consultant and staff for running a great meeting.
- Put less emphasis on weddings, more on play structures.
- Wherever you put the house, will it have a covered open area for receptions; as I see nothing on the plans on any drawings? Like the Los Altos museum has an outside area ready to have any event out there.
- Great idea to show the farming equipment in a more informative way
- C might make the most sense in both the visual and the information
- Add play yard in concept C. Beside the Butcher House.

Meeting Summary

Orchard Heritage Park Project

RE: Community Meeting #2

Date of Meeting: Thursday October 29, 2015 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm


Page 9 of 9

- Great concepts! Pathway to senior center and community center is needed.
- Has any thought been considered to develop Butcher corner around the theme of the Butcher home?
- A gazebo is a distraction. I don't think this feature is needed.
- Excellent presentation. Listened well from meeting #1
- Did not like the option of not having a fourth option that did not relocate the Butcher House

-END-

The information above is Callander Associates' understanding of items discussed and decisions reached at the meeting. Callander Associates is proceeding with the project based on this understanding. If you have any questions, additions, or corrections to this memo, please contact this office in writing within three days.

Submitted by:









A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Rubin".

Dave Rubin, Project Manager, Callander Associates

cc: All attendees

Attachments:

1. Sign-in sheets, dated October 29, four pages
2. Comment cards received at meeting (10/29/15)

	CONCEPT A	CONCEPT B	CONCEPT C
first place votes			
second place votes			
third place votes			
did not include in rank			
total	56	56	56