

MINUTES
OF THE
LAND USE JOINT WORKSHOP NO. 7
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

April 25, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

The joint workshop was called to order by Mayor Jennifer Hosterman at 6:34 p.m.

Those in attendance were as follows: City Councilmembers Steve Brozosky, Cindy McGovern, Matt Sullivan, Jerry Thorne and Mayor Hosterman; Planning Commissioners Brian Arkin, Ann Fox, Trish Maas, Mary Roberts and Jennifer Pearce. Staff members present were: Nelson Fialho, City Manager; Michael Roush, City Attorney; Jerry Iserson, Director of Planning and Community Services; Janice Stern, Principal Planner; and Steve Bocian, Assistant City Manager.

Planning Commissioner Phil Blank was absent.

2. GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT WORKSHOP NO. 7

Discussion of land use issues, including: land use options for future development; land designated Public and Institutional on the General Plan, and Senior Continuing Care Units. (SR 06:102)

Jerry Iserson presented the opening remarks.

Janice Stern presented staff report.

Mayor Hosterman summarized that the goal of this meeting was to develop a realistic model for land use in order to return to the traffic issues.

3. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Mayor Hosterman opened the meeting to the public.

Patricia Belding, 7703 Highland Oaks Drive, speaking for Citizens for a Caring Community, complimented staff on its imaginative approach in outlining choices for future development. Her group supported land use Option B, the concentrated residential transit-oriented development, mixed use residential with lower reserve and no Staples Ranch units counted. However, she said if 240 units are counted for Staples Ranch there is nothing for Kottinger Pleasanton Gardens, which needs 100 units. She believed the city could easily get very low-income units from the Kottinger project. Hacienda should get the most units because the more units there are the more affordable they will be and the more resources for infrastructure, such as a school. She supported 50-100 in-fill units downtown and the units earmarked for the West Dublin BART station could be given to Hacienda and this site could be

seen as an overflow from Hacienda. She felt these building blocks were important steps toward the goal of zoning some land for high density residential, which could house some of those who work in Pleasanton.

Mabel Lester, 11033 Dublin Canyon Road, believed the portion of her property designated Public Health and Safety should be reconsidered. It is flat land and would be a good site for housing. She and her family would like to move ahead with development of the site.

J. P. Mobasher, 4111 Mission Boulevard, Fremont, indicated he was the applicant for development of the Westbrook property. He referred to the previous application for the site and indicated he had developed a new project, which has been reviewed by staff, which felt it was a good project. He noted there is 1,000 acres of hillside, which can be used as a buffer for the city. He asked for Council to reconsider this site and his proposal. It would preserve trees and an existing farmhouse and would also include a water feature for the gateway to the city. He asked for approval for medium density for this project.

Autumn McGrath, 3648 Virgin Islands Court, asked to retain the Public and Institutional designation in the Valley Trails area. She would be impacted by any additional housing on the church property along with the noise and congestion. She suggested daycare on the property or some kind of community center.

James Haygood, 3547 Wind Cave Court, also wanted the church property to remain Public and Institutional. He objected to additional housing and felt that would reduce the value of his neighborhood.

Thomas Gaffey, 5959 Bryce Canyon Court, resident of Valley Trails and member of the Evangelical Free Church. The Church has nine acres of land, six of which is vacant. He felt the vacant land was an eyesore and should be developed. The congregation is smaller and cannot afford to develop it alone. He disagreed that additional residential units would devalue the existing neighborhood. The plan is to build a new, smaller church. He commented about traffic in Valley Trails and did not think 20-30 units would impact traffic that much. He urged Council to consider the Church's plan and indicated it was willing to work with Council and the Planning Commission.

Jeremiah R. Blasi, 118 Neal Street, Associate Pastor of Lighthouse Baptist Church and Administrator of Lighthouse Baptist School, which currently meets in the Evangelical Free Church facility, noted the opportunities for service to the community from the Evangelical Free Church proposal. The sale of the vacant property would provide cash flow to help the church to continue its service to the community and would provided necessary housing for the city.

Richard Martinetti, 3640 Hawaii Court South, indicated the church land has been vacant for 29 years and many people have complained about weeds. However, they don't want housing either. He felt housing would upgrade the area, not downgrade it, and urged Council to approve rezoning to allow housing. He believed many residents of Valley Trails do not know what is going on with this property and people should not claim that all of Valley Trails oppose the plan.

Edwin Bogert, 4170 Angela Place, said he has been a member of the Evangelical Free Church for 14 years. For all that time, the church has been trying to deal with the vacant property. He said the church can no longer keep this property and it needed to be developed. If the property stays Public and Institutional, that nine acres could be used for a large church,

synagogue or mosque and that would have a major traffic impact. Any other public use such as a school, hospital, etc. would be bad for the neighborhood. He believed the plan for 25-30 homes was the best for the neighborhood. There would be minimum traffic impact. The church would receive money for improvements to the church, and the city would get a new tax base from the homes. He could not imagine why Valley Trails residents feel their homes would lose value.

James Sievers III, 7599 Ironwood Drive, Dublin, member of the Evangelical Free Church, speaking on behalf of the youth who use the church, described the various activities for youth. Selling the property would provide funds to help the church expand and provide more programs for the youth group.

Pastor Bob Slack, 6900 Valley Trails, asked Council to reserve 25-30 units from the housing cap for the church property. He commented that the property is zoned R-1-6500, but the General Plan designation is Public and Institutional. He believed that if the designation were changed, it would allow the church to remain at the site and to replace the worn out facility with a new one. The church has never promised a community park or center because that is not within the church's ability to provide. He noted the church has planned a get together for all the Valley Trails residents to meet the developer and architect to work out an acceptable plan of benefit for the community. He also noted in the last four years no public institutional entity has offered a real plan for the property. He urged anyone interested to attend this meeting.

Dan Skinner, 2916 Yorkshire Court, believed that Ponderosa Homes could bring the community and church together to get a mutually agreeable plan for the vacant land. He asked for Council support.

Dan Lacy, 7241 South Valley Trails Drive, said he has been talking to his neighbors and agreed many don't show up at the meetings, however they are aware of the situation. He believed that a large percentage of the residents do not want housing developed on that church property.

Becky Dennis, 838 Gray Fox Circle, spoke as an affordable housing advocate and supported any zoning that would allow the city to meet its needs. She did not think it made sense to reserve 200 units for a future Council to use and felt they should be used now, since the city is already falling short of meeting its needs. She liked the transit-oriented model, but would like to know how the city could get more low-income and very low-income housing. She referred to Column 1 in the dispersed element and said that was the only one of the non-high density elements her group would look at. She felt 136 units are enough to bring infrastructure to the east side where there is no existing infrastructure. She believed that number of units could be assigned to Hacienda Business Park. She wanted 100 units from Column 1 of the transit-oriented developed to be assigned to Pleasanton Gardens and Kottinger Place. She also wanted to take the 350 units from West Dublin BART and give them to Hacienda to improve the potential to provide affordability to the community. Column 2 is not acceptable because it does not meet long term goals for affordable housing. However, she did like the way development impacts were calculated for Staples Ranch. Counting any units in Staples Ranch is problematic as long as one is working under the housing cap. But in the future, if development over the housing cap is considered, that is a good way of approaching a remodeling of the city's fee structure and determining a way to get new infrastructure that would meet a new generation of development beyond the housing cap. In Column 3, she would distribute the reserve units to Hacienda. She felt it needed 1,200 units to proceed and believed it could do an awful lot. She believed that if this Council wanted to do future Councils a favor, it

should consider where any units over the housing cap could be placed. She believed most emphasis should be on transit-oriented development in Hacienda.

Sean Lemoine, 4574 River Rock Hill Road, referred to his family's property on the west side of Foothill Road and asked how the General Plan Update would affect it. It has zoning for 26 units even though they don't plan to max out to that. But they want to build homes for their families and again asked how the General Plan Updated would affect that.

Mayor Hosterman said that would be discussed in the future. No action at this meeting would shackle any potential future development proposal the Lemoine family may have for its property. Even if the 25% slope rule is approved, there is still opportunity for Council to use its discretion.

Mr. Lemoine asked if staff has done a fiscal analysis of the impacts of reduced development on the west side of Foothill Road?

David Pastor, 3615 Hawaii Court South, believed that the impact from the church property development would not be from a house or two in a 40-year old neighborhood. This would be a group of new homes that would impact up to six courts in Valley Trails which would end within 50 yards of the new development. He felt the biggest problem of a new neighborhood is from the elevation above the old neighborhood. The surrounding neighborhood will be looking up at whatever is developed and he did not think Ponderosa Homes would build 1,400 to 1,600 sq. ft. homes there, which is what comprises most of the neighborhood. He believed there would be bigger homes at a high elevation in the center of the old community and he felt it would be like a castle on the rock. Further, he believed the housing would limit the view of the park and church. He asked if there was something in the church bylaws about selling the property for profit?

Joe Seto, Zone 7 Water Agency, indicated Zone 7 was interested in the development of the Staples Ranch area. The stream management master plan, which looks at the future of flood control in the Valley recommends regional storage in the quarry pits instead of a channelization approach, which means moving the water as quickly as possible out of the Valley. The area in Staples Ranch has been identified as a critical area for flood control. Zone 7 is looking forward to talking to regional agencies for partnering on this regional flood control approach.

Kevin Close, 871 Sycamore Road, commented the staff report mentions this would be the last land use workshop and asked if there was to be a land use workshop regarding the southeast hills and south Pleasanton. He asked if the number of units discussed for that area were part of the Housing Element? Were the health and safety and geological issues on the west side of Happy Valley to be a regional decision or would it be citywide in the General Plan? Will the number of units in the southeast hills be revisited to reflect changes?

Vanessa Kawaihau, 871 Sycamore Road, indicated last April the City Council adopted as a priority the south Pleasanton open space preservation. Since that time, it was indicated there would be a committee formed among the three property owners, the developers and the community surrounding the three developments of about 350 homes. Staff reports and Council comments indicate the discussions involve only one developer and one community, which is to be a prototype for the other two developments. In a previous land use workshop, it was stated that 150 homes from these three future developments in the southeast Pleasanton hills could be transferred, but it was not stated where they would be transferred or from which development.

She asked if they were from Oak Grove-Kottinger Ranch, Lund Ranch or from Spotorno Ranch? She also noted that in a report for the School District/Council joint meeting, that the density in the unincorporated part of Happy Valley had been reduced. She asked if people who might be considering subdividing their lots lose that right because of transferring density from the southeast hills?

Mayor Hosterman indicated while there are many discussions regarding the southeast hills, no decisions have been made as yet.

Marty Greist Joel, 25 Tehan Canyon Road, stated for public record that she is concerned that as the City continues to put restrictions on how she can use her property that it increases the potential for misinterpretation of the restrictions by other government agencies that can directly impact how she uses her property. She has lived on the property for 25 years and never intended to develop it. She used to graze cattle and now has a horse boarding facility. As development occurred closer to her property concerns were raised about her cattle guard and fencing, so she had to cease grazing. The East Bay Regional Park District insisted she remove her barbed wire fencing because it impeded movement of wild animal crossings. She has had water problems and asked to be annexed in order to get city water, but the neighbors objected because they thought she wanted to develop it. She is now concerned because the East Bay Regional Park District is purchasing the adjacent Frank Lane property, which includes an easement across her property. She is worried the Park District will restrict use of her own property for the horse boarding facility. As more restrictions are applied, she is worried that eventually her property will be condemned and the Park District use is as their headquarters.

Patricia Ratto, 3661 Gettysburg Court, commended Council for its great job over the years. She noted she is in real estate and is familiar with a prior proposal for 35 homes in the Del Prado area five years ago. She believed it was a great improvement for the area. She noted Valley Trails lacks streetlights. She was glad there would still be a church in Valley Trails. She believed Ponderosa was a very good developer and she would like the vacant land improved. She believed the proposal was a very good one and would increase the property values in the area. She said there was a comment the Homeowners Association was against the project. There are over 500 residents in the area and only about 16 members of the Homeowners Association. She attended one meeting where there were only six people present. She asked how many people actually belong to the Association and what is the percentage of members who oppose the development of the church property? She was happy there was a meeting planned with the Church, Ponderosa and the neighborhood to inform people of the plan.

Nick Haskell, 150 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, planner with the firm called EDAW, which is a member of the Hacienda Specific Plan preparation team, indicated they are strong advocates for creating a transit integrated mixed use district. He felt their project would offer something special for the community. They are working with the entire vision for the business park and there are opportunities for in-fill development. He described the various transit features for the area. They are interested in making this a desirable place to live. There has been an intensive planning effort and they will present a variety of alternatives for consideration. There is an interim model in order to understand traffic and to protect the greater community. He urged Council to pursue a higher residential unit scenario for the site for a variety of reasons from the vitality of the project to the overall feasibility of the proposal.

Charlene Sigman, 11700 Dublin Boulevard, Dublin, indicated she and her husband provide therapy programs for kids with special needs in a homelike environment. She started

as a daycare facility on Valley Trails and moved to Dublin but would like to move back to Pleasanton since most of the families they serve live here. She requested that property be set aside for Public and Institutional use. If land is zoned residential and is large enough to fit the needs of a school, it would cost millions to buy and millions in taxes. If land is zoned Public and Institutional, it would cost less and there would be lower taxes. She believed there was a huge need for Public and Institutional land in Pleasanton.

Carl Pretzel, 3633 Glacier Court North, said he had received a letter from the Evangelical Free Church, which indicated it had entered into an agreement with Ponderosa Homes for sale of its property and that it wanted to keep the neighborhood involved throughout the planning process. About ten years ago, the Pastor of the church came to a homeowners meeting and indicated it had an offer to sell some of the land to a synagogue. The problem with the property could have been solved years ago if the church had realized the land designated Public and Institutional would remain Public and Institutional and if they sold it then, there would not have been maintenance problems that have existed for many years. The only improvement has been when the Lighthouse Baptist Church applied to operate a daycare center. A condition was placed by the city to maintain the frontage of the property. He felt that until the city says once and for all that this property should be Public and Institutional that the church will continue to try to make a windfall profit from this land. Fifteen years ago, a petition with 540 names on it was presented to Council. Two weeks ago there was a homeowners association meeting with fifty people and only one person was in favor of the residential proposal. There is also the elevation issue as well as the concern about property values falling. Hacienda is now requesting to build more housing. He is not opposed to that on principle, however several years ago he supported a sports park on a Hacienda site and was told that it was supposed to be a business park. Since that time additional homes have been built, but the amenities like parks and schools are less than what is provided for the rest of the city. He wanted to make certain that if more homes are built in that area that they have the same amenities as are available for homes in the rest of the city.

Diane Kratz, 3633 Virgin Island Court, said she could see the back of the church and field of weeds. Years ago, the neighborhood went through this process and it was clear that homes were not wanted in that area. She was surprised the Church thinks anything has changed. She was told there are about 80 members in the congregation and there are about 500+ families that live there 24 hours a day, not just in the evenings or at church services. Last August the area got out of the flood zone. Most have foundation issues that have cost thousands of dollars to fix. She did not think the church cared about the neighborhood or it would not have let the weeds get out of control, or left a lawn chair on the roof for two years. She also did not think Ponderosa Homes had concerns about their home values or the impact on current drainage issues. It is not a win/win situation when the 40-year old homes try to compete with brand new homes. She hoped Council would protect their investments.

John Donahoe, Kiewit Construction, 8055 Camino Arroyo, Gilroy, indicated the Kiewit property on the east side has a unique opportunity because of the transition of the area from industrial uses at the same time as the General Plan Update process. There are minimal environmental impacts because the site is being reused as opposed to being virgin land. He believed a mixed-use development was appropriate for the site and would counterbalance some other activities being proposed in Pleasanton. At the January workshop when a transit-oriented proposal was presented, comments were made about whether Kiewit had talked to other agencies. He noted that they had since contacted the ACE rail people. ACE is interested in relocating the current station and is willing to talk about other locations. He also noted a traffic consultant would be involved in the planning for the site. He asked Council to consider the

possibility of a transit-oriented development in the east side property area. It is not BART, but the ACE rail serves a different need for the South Bay. There are also other uses available, such as a large campus or low density residential. He asked about how the Specific Plan would relate to the reserve of residential units. Is there the possibility that the specific plan could include some of the remaining residential units?

Margaret Tracy, 1262 Madison Avenue, Livermore, speaking for Preserve Area Ridgeland Committee, indicated it is important to return to the General Plan policies in place before passage of Measure F. These policies did not allow development on hillsides of 25% slope or greater. These slopes were excluded in density calculations. In the past months there have been many articles regarding the 100th anniversary of the action on the San Andreas Fault. Land slipped up to 21 feet along the fault line. Knowing that similar action is expected on the Hayward fault within the next thirty years and anticipating similar action possible on the Calaveras fault west of Foothill Road, it seems wise to exclude development in that area to lessen the liability to the city. General Plan land use decisions made on a case-by-case basis for such a major area of the City, visually important to all residents, seems unwise. Case-by-case decisions lead to unreasonable speculation on land. PARC urges Council to go back to the previous General Plan designation, which does not allow development on slopes of 25% or greater and excludes these slopes from calculation.

Brad Griggs, BRE Properties, 525 Market Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco, indicated it is purchasing a portion of the Shaklee property in the Hacienda Business Park and wanted to move forward to receive approval for constructing apartments on the property. He supported reviewing Hacienda Business Park as an area for building housing. As Council reviews the plan options presented by EDAW, he requested careful review of the viability of development for each parcel. The Shaklee property is within a half mile of the BART station and is a good candidate for transit-oriented development. The eight-acre site is undeveloped. Originally it was allocated .5 FAR for office use or about 177,000 sq. ft. of office buildings on those parcels. Assuming the current traffic conversion rates from office to residential, the property could hold 384 units. He emphasized that his project would not add to the traffic situation in Pleasanton. In fact, there is a 25% traffic reduction for properties located within a half mile of the BART station. He noted that the Hacienda Business Park Owners Association has already approved converting the Shaklee property from business to residential development. He stated that the project is to be a high-density residential project with 47 units per acre. Preserving high density was critical to BRE in order to provide to the city a viable economic project that will contribute 58 units of affordable housing. He explained that 50% of the 58 units will be very low income and 50% will be low-income units. Finally, he mentioned that EDAW had stated there was a minimum of 259 units, but he believed that should be 384 units for that property.

Peter MacDonald, 400 Main Street, Suite 210, indicated with regard to Hacienda Business Park that there has not been a parcel-by-parcel review and he cautioned Council not to assign numbers of units at this meeting. He felt consideration should be given to whether a parcel had traffic capacity. The BRE site for example under the Hacienda Development Agreement was allocated the equivalent of 384 apartment units. It is a parcel that has an approved amendment to the CC&Rs to allow residential development and is close to BART. He summarized the terms of the Development Agreement regarding traffic. He believed the traffic from Hacienda was actually less than expected and felt the impacts would be less on the rest of the city. He felt this was one of the best places to make traffic work when the 29,000 units are reached at build out. This is an opportunity for market rate affordable units for the average family earning about \$50,000. Regarding the Eliason property, he indicated that when Mr. Eliason bought the 183-acre property, 25-30 acres were designated rural density residential,

which meant he could get five residential units. If the General Plan is changed to say that slopes greater than 25% are not counted, then Mr. Eliason can only build two units. That is unnecessary, because there is a seven-acre flat at the end of Blessing Drive, where five units could be built, and it would be a change from what the General Plan has ever read.

Joseph Cunningham 3599 Carlsbad Court, thanked Council and Planning Commission for their many hours of work. He presented a letter for the record from Connie Cox to the City Manager. She thanked him for meeting with the Vice President of the Valley Trails Homeowners Association and noted that neighbors do not want homes put on the Evangelical Church property. She noted the Homeowners Association is a voluntary organization and did not have the staff or time to continued to fight the proposals of the church. This battle was fought eight years ago and it seems like they are starting all over again. She asked Council to reject the proposal from the church and Ponderosa Homes and fix the contradictory zoning, so this issue does not come up again. There is clearly a church on the property and it should have been zoned public and institutional thirty years ago, when it moved in. Mr. Cunningham echoed her comments.

Brian Myers, Hanson Aggregates, 3000 Busch Road, indicated Hanson was a large property owner on the east side of Pleasanton. It ceased its operations at the site in 2003 and since that time has been removing equipment and reclaiming the site. It also dedicated a significant portion of the site to Zone 7 for the lakes. In 2003, Hanson submitted concept plans for the site for various land uses that are largely industrial and commercial office uses. He asked that the General Plan address those land uses specifically rather than address the site as a future specific plan area. When Hanson submitted its application in 2003, it was told it should go along with the General Plan process to see what the community had to say about land uses for the property. He asked that Council give specific direction about what to do with the property and noted that a letter had been submitted requesting industrial and commercial land uses for the site.

John Rennels, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1631, Oakland, indicated he was pleased to announce that BART had closed on the private development component of the future West Pleasanton/Dublin Station, which guaranteed a permanent parking structure in Pleasanton for the station, if it is built. He acknowledged the work of staff on the staff report, which presented scenarios for an attractive mixed-use residential development at the future station. He was concerned that options A3, A4, and B1 do not take advantage of the adjacency to transit, but he looked forward to the private development partner to create a first class development that everyone would be proud of and be an attractive gateway to the community.

Eric Heffner, Windstar Communities, 11149 No. Torrey Pines Road, #250, La Jolla, California, indicated his company is in a long-term ground lease with BART for the site and proposes to build rental apartments in a mixed-use transit-oriented development. There will be retail uses, including convenience stores. He noted BRE is an outstanding firm and is well aware of transit-oriented development. He felt Pleasanton was in an outstanding position because it will have two BART stations in the community and should do its best to maximize both developments. He believed his site had an advantage because it was on the ring road at Stoneridge Mall. The residents could get off the train, go home and then to the mall for entertainment or the restaurants. The traffic impacts are reduced from what would normally occur from an office building. An office building traffic generation equates to 450 units and his company only wants 350 units. That is the minimum to make the project successful and he noted there would also meet the affordable housing requirements the city is requesting.

Keith Beatts, 3636 Virgin Islands Court, spoke in opposition to the residential proposal in the Valley Trails area. He stated the residents are against the housing and the new homes would be out of context with the existing homes. He felt there were alternatives for housing in Pleasanton that were better for the city and affected people less than what is proposed for Valley Trails. He asked Council to consider the opinions of the residents because they are the ones who will have to deal with the project for years to come.

There were no other speakers.

Mayor Hosterman indicated this workshop was the last meeting for two of the Planning Commissioners, Trish Maas and Mary Roberts, who have served the city for a number of years. She thanked them for their service.

There was a break at 8:55 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 9:08 p.m.

Mayor Hosterman summarized that discussions would be focused on public and institution zoning and on land use options. This is an opportunity to develop a model for allocation of unit numbers to be used by staff in generating meaningful numbers regarding land use as it relates to traffic circulation in the city. As numbers are discussed and moved here and there, she asked people not to overreact because it is an opportunity to get solid data for future decisions. Commissioners and Council will ask questions or make comments on these two issues (1-whether to change any current public and institutional zoning/2-consider Table 2 land use options and allocation of numbers) and if necessary a special meeting will be held for necessary votes.

Trish Maas asked staff to review items 6 and 7 for Kottinger and the downtown.

Janice Stern replied that there is a project before the Housing Commission to consider intensifying the Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens developments and to add up to 100 units there. The other idea is for additional housing downtown over and above those units already identified in the Specific Plan. The concept is to make some commercial development more financially viable in order to provide additional amenities downtown, whether open space plaza, parking structure, etc.

Ms. Maas asked if apartments were counted towards the housing cap?

Ms. Stern said apartments and senior apartments are counted. The only units not counted are assisted living developments.

Ann Fox referred to the West Dublin BART station development and whether or not there would be a grocery store on site. She felt that impacted whether or not it was a true mixed use if people had to drive across down to make certain recurring purchases.

Ms. Stern did not know the exact nature of the proposal when it comes before the Planning staff, but there was discussion that there should be some commercial, convenience as part of the development. It is included in the TOD, mixed use residential development.

Ms. Fox inquired about the Zone 7 building and whether it could be used for anything other than a Zone 7 office building for the next twenty years.

Mr. Iserson said the way the restriction is worded is that it must be health related uses. That runs for ten years and after than the property could be used for other uses.

Ms. Fox referred to the discussions about the East Bay Regional Park District and restrictions on property, especially Ms. Joel's comments on fencing. She asked if that property could be annexed to Pleasanton and her issues resolved?

Mr. Iserson said this is the first time he has heard of these issues and said staff could talk to the Park District to try and resolve those issues.

Ms. Fox wanted to make certain that existing cattle grazing uses could continue on the ridge.

Jennifer Pearce referred to the downtown in-fill numbers and asked for specific numbers in specific areas.

Ms. Stern said no particular site has been identified. There is a range of units that could be used.

Brian Arkin referred to the 113 units reserved for the Busch property school site, and asked if Council had voted to fix that number?

Ms. Stern replied that was discussed as part of the original PUD on the Busch property. That is the mid-point for the 22.7 acres. There is no project approval, but that is what has been set aside for that site.

Mr. Arkin indicated he was comfortable with the public and institutional designations as they currently stand. Regarding where to put the homes in the community, he felt it was obvious there are only so many units left and the opportunities for housing exceeds what the voters approved with the housing cap. Regarding east side development, he felt Valley Avenue is crowded now and putting more housing there would make the problem worse. Regarding Staples Ranch, he liked the option that had 65 of the attached units to be counted. He again asked for a copy of the initiative that went before the voters regarding the housing cap. He felt Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens were great places for seniors and supported adding 100 units there. He agreed with allocating 50 units for downtown in-fill. He felt a reserve of 300 units for future development was appropriate. If the problems on Valley Avenue could be solved, some of those 300 reserved units could be allocated in that area. For the remaining units, he would like to see them allocated to development at the two BART stations, or 1,058 units spread between the two. He was enthusiastic about transit-oriented development and felt it protects open space, has the lowest impact to existing residents and provides the greatest opportunity for affordable housing in the community.

Mary Roberts also believed public and institutional designations should remain as they are, but she had a question about the Valley Trails property. The church on that location is a floundering public institution right now. It has an existing day care and she believed if the remainder of the property were used for a community center, she believed all the neighbors would complain considerably. At the expansion of St. Clare's, the neighbors complained. She was certain the land would not remain an open field, but if there were a good institutional use to

come forward, she was convinced it would create problems for traffic in the neighborhood far more than a small housing development. She believed the neighbors were concerned the new houses would be higher than their homes. She has learned over the years how much a bulldozer can change the land entirely. She wanted to get rid of rural density zoning, because it assumes the land is flat. One house per five acres means you can clump a hundred houses on five hundred acres. It gives people a false notion on what can be done with their property. She believed there should be a hillside residential designation for use in planned unit developments. In the hilly areas, there are places where homes can be located, but someone has to go and look at the property, not just look at a map. She felt the reserve of units should be as high as possible because of the east side, since that is where future homes may be in the specific plan area. If Council approved all the units wanted for the BART station and Hacienda projects, the housing cap is already exceeded and there is no room for anything else. If Hacienda is to get all the units it wants, units must be moved from somewhere else in the city. She definitely wanted to leave 136 units for the east side along with the 113 for the Busch property. She also agreed with adding 100 units to Kottinger Place. She continued saying if you reserve 300 units, use 100 units for the West Dublin BART station, 700 for Hacienda and 65 for Staples Ranch, and perhaps 50 units for downtown, that gives about 1,273 units. She was undecided about the Valley Trails area.

Ann Fox agreed there should be an east side specific plan and felt there should be 500 units reserved for the future. Even though only a small portion would be on the east side because of the airport protection area and the lakes, she felt a condominium complex like Danbury Park would be a good addition to that area. She believed there was not enough public and institutional land in the community. She did not think there was a place for a childcare and preschool facility. When a large family childcare home is located in residential areas, there is neighborhood opposition for 12-14 children. She wanted to see public and institutional land set aside, similar to how the Hacienda School in the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan was set aside to be public and institutional. She did not agree with rezoning the Valley Trails property and allowing residential development. The neighborhood has made it clear it does not support that and they should not have to revisit this over and over again. She believed the city should work with the church to find appropriate uses for that land. Regarding the 113 units reserved for the school site on the Busch property, she felt if the School District does not use the site, then a portion of it should remain public and institutional for some other use in that part of town, with houses on the remaining land. Referring to the Staples Ranch, she thought the housing numbers should be based on the impacts to the city. She liked the staff recommendation for 240 units. She supported Option B2 with its concentrated residential development. It sets aside 500 units for the future, but she wanted some consideration given to the units for Kottinger Place/Pleasanton Gardens. She also wanted units for downtown, perhaps 50. Option B2 clearly delineates what part of the city will have higher density residential development and is a good break down of how she would like to see the units allocated.

Jennifer Pearce thanked Janice Stern for narrowing down a seemingly unlimited number of options. The chart was extremely helpful. She believed more public and institutional land was needed in the city for a variety of uses. She wanted to leave the Valley Trails property as public and institutional. They neighbors don't want houses and she was uncertain if that was the best location for additional houses in the city. Regarding the Table, she was very much in favor of Option B. It seems to accomplish a number of city objectives, smart growth, green growth, more affordable housing, alleviation of traffic and a lot of issues recently discussed. She was not ready to discuss specific numbers because she did not understand the basis for several of the allocations. For instance, she was interested in downtown in-fill as a concept in terms of traffic alleviation and making downtown more vibrant, but could not comment on

numbers. Similarly, she supported a lot housing at Hacienda, but did not know if it could be done successfully for less than 1,200 units. She wanted more units for Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens. That is a very valuable area of low-income housing for seniors. In terms of Staples Ranch and what should be counted as units, she supported 65 units as well, but would also like more information about the housing cap initiative and what should be counted. She wanted a higher reserve of units, especially with regard to the east side. If a specific plan is to be developed, it would be helpful to have more units to accommodate infrastructure and to make it a vibrant area.

Trish Maas indicated she was familiar with the Valley Trails area as she used to live there. She believed that was what is defined as in-fill and thought that developing on that parcel could be a win/win for everyone involved, especially when working with Ponderosa Homes. Putting in the right kind of housing could blend with the existing neighborhood and make the older homes appreciate. She favored allocating 25 units to Valley Trails and rezoning the property. In the Staples area, she supported the staff recommendation of 240 units. If senior apartments and other apartments are already being counted towards the cap, it is only fair to do it on Staples Ranch. She supported housing near transit, but did not want to over do it, such as what occurred across I-580. She supported 1,273 units with a reserve of 300 units. She read from her chart #1-300, #2-343, Staples-240, east side-240, Valley Trails-25, Kottinger-100, downtown in-fill at 25. She was willing to adjust some of the numbers.

Mayor Hosterman invited the Councilmembers to ask questions or give comments.

Matt Sullivan asked what the agreement is for the West Dublin BART station regarding commercial, residential, parking garage, etc.

Nelson Fialho indicated there is no land use agreement as it pertains to residential. There is a financing agreement that allows for a public/private partnership for the construction of the BART station. In that agreement, it assumes a certain level of public parking amenity, whether it is a parking garage, or interim parking lot to accommodate the needs of the BART riders. It also contemplates a commercial development of 170,000 sq. ft. There is no mention of residential. That arose as a way to create an incentive for the property owner to build more quickly and to build a parking garage.

Mr. Sullivan asked what was the trigger that causes the parking garage to be built or not?

Mr. Fialho indicated that since office development is slow, then the developer would defer construction of the parking garage until the office market had rebounded. That provides the financing to building the garage. The idea of creating value on the property so that the parking garage could be built sooner was to create a mixed-use development.

Mr. Sullivan summarized that there is nothing in the agreement that says when the parking garage must be built; it is up to the developer based on the economic value of whatever is finally constructed.

Mr. Fialho said in order to get that amenity for Pleasanton riders an incentive was offered in the form of dual zoning (commercial and residential) and the market would drive what ultimately gets built.

Mr. Sullivan asked for clarification of the conflicting zoning and General Plan designation on the Valley Trails site.

Mr. Iserson did not know why this had occurred, but it has been there for a long time. Generally land is zoned to be consistent with the General Plan. There are a handful of properties throughout the city that are not consistent. He believed the land was zoned residential and when the church wanted to build there, the General Plan was amended to allow it, but the zoning was not changed. It will be a priority of staff once the new General Plan is adopted, to make certain there is consistency.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there would be an economic or fiscal analysis of whatever level of development is determined appropriate by the General Plan Update. Once land use, number of units and locations are determined, he understood there would be a fiscal analysis that talks about revenues and how the city will keep on going.

Mr. Iserson said that was correct. That is why staff wants a preferred land use option, so it can proceed to develop a scenario for testing, not only traffic, but also for fiscal analysis. That is done on a project basis as well.

Jerry Thorne referred to the 113 units reserved for the Busch property and asked if they have to be used somewhere else if not used on the Busch property?

Mr. Iserson said those units would go into a reserve if not used on the Busch property.

Mr. Thorne indicated the numbers being reviewed at this meeting do not include what was set forth in the 1996 General Plan, including the Lemoine, Merritt and other properties not listed in the chart.

Mr. Iserson said that was correct. Those three properties (Lemoine, Lester and Merritt) do have residential designation and are accounted for within the existing General Plan and would not lose that. The properties listed in the staff report are those that can be redesignated and would take 1,650-80 units that would be available between the current build out and the housing cap. With respect to the Lemoine property, the family would have to present a PUD and go through the normal process.

Mr. Thorne referred to a comment about an ACE station on the Kiewit property and asked if staff had looked at that?

Mr. Iserson said it had not. Staff was waiting to see how this process plays out and since there is a desire to do an east side specific plan and if there is a proposal to put the ACE station there, it would be reviewed at that time.

Cindy McGovern asked how many units had been approved and not yet built in the city? She also asked if the fairgrounds was counted as public and institutional property in Pleasanton?

Mr. Iserson said the fairgrounds is in the city limits and is public and institutional. The number of units approved and not built is 559 as of January 2005.

Ms. McGovern asked if Lemoine was approved for 26 units, with 13 that could still be built?

Mr. Iseron said the maximum under the density the property has now could accommodate 26 units, however the midpoint is 14 units. They have developed 13 units, so potentially they have 13 units under the existing residential designation that they may or may not get approval for.

Ms. McGovern asked if staff had seen any plan for development on the Westbrook property?

Mr. Iseron replied that a preliminary conceptual drawing had been submitted for 21 units. The midpoint for that property is four units.

Ms. McGovern was concerned about the Joel property and asked if it was designated as agricultural and grazing?

Mr. Iseron answered that it was Rural Density Residential and agriculture.

Ms. McGovern did not think anyone should be able to tell Ms. Joel that she cannot have cattle grazing on her property. She wanted to keep land for grazing where possible and she asked staff to do whatever it could to help Ms. Joel. She referred to comments by Mr. Close about the southeast hills and the south Pleasanton plan and asked if there were any plans for development other than the Spotorno and Oak Ridge properties?

Mr. Iseron said there were no plans at the present time for the Foley property and it is not in the city.

Ms. McGovern clarified that there are no units in reserve for that area.

Mr. Iseron replied that staff assumes the existing General Plan will remain the same there.

Mr. Fialho indicated there are four properties: Foley, Spotorno, Oak Grove and Lund. All of them have land use designations in the existing 1996 General Plan. There is a triangular piece of the Foley property that is inside the urban growth boundary that has designation for 15 units.

Ms. McGovern asked if the density is decreased for any of those three properties, could it be held for the Foley's property?

Mr. Fialho said in theory, if the density is reduced from the current land use designation, it would have to be moved somewhere. Any of these properties are receiver points for those units, which then allows a transfer of more units into the reserve.

Ms. McGovern asked about the number of square feet of office space that Hacienda is approved to build and thought it was about 2.5 million sq. ft.

Mr. Iseron said that is about right and acknowledged there is an entitlement under the Development Agreement that has not yet been built.

Ms. McGovern asked if that square footage was included when any traffic models were run?

Mr. Iserson replied that it depends on how Hacienda proposes to use the square footage. In some cases, they are considering relinquishing some or all of that square footage and in other cases they would retain that and build houses. It all depends on the proposal that is presented to the city in terms of how that is structured.

Ms. McGovern hoped the traffic studies included all that office space since Council has seen nothing to indicate they will not build that. She then referred to the expansion of Stoneridge Mall and asked if the infrastructure around the Mall was adequate to serve residential units to the West Dublin BART station?

Mr. Iserson said it was. The BART station has always been contemplated along with other development. It would only be a matter of changing the office to residential and the infrastructure could handle that.

Ms. McGovern asked if the residential would generate less traffic than the office use?

Mr. Iserson answered that it could depending on the assumptions for a transit-oriented development. Staff would consider that carefully in the traffic study.

Ms. McGovern referred to a presentation by the Metropolitan Transit Commission at a LAVTA meeting about transit-oriented development. The savings in traffic can be as low as 5%, so she was not certain how the city can say 25% will be saved. She asked how staff calculated that?

Mr. Iserson indicated staff had urged Hacienda to be conservative in the assumptions and to make sure in their case studies and analysis of similar projects that they use areas similar to Pleasanton and not take cases completely different and try to apply to this community.

Steve Brozosky clarified that the study MTC presented was for the Pleasant Hill BART station, which is pretty close to Pleasanton. He then referred to the Valley Trails property, which is owned by a single owner, and asked if there was any regulation that would prevent them from subdividing public and institutional property to have multiple owners?

Mr. Iserson said there was no regulation against subdividing the lot. The application would have to go through the parcel map procedure and there would be minimum lot size requirements.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the southeast hills area and indicated the city is not in negotiations with the owners of the Oak Grove Hills. There is a mediation process between the neighborhood and developer to determine an acceptable number of units that would be realistic for the property owner and acceptable to the neighborhood.

Mr. Fialho clarified that it was a facilitated process and city staff is assisting that process.

Mr. Brozosky further clarified that whatever is decided upon in that process will be presented to the city, but the city is not obligated to accept any solution presented. He also noted there were four properties in the area, but the city staff has not talked to the other property owners as yet.

Mr. Fialho commented that the Oak Grove project was farther along in the process, which is why staff devoted more attention to it. It was felt that could be a template for the other properties.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the Hacienda project and asked if staff had seen any proposals it could use to develop traffic models?

Mr. Iserson said staff had only been working with the developer in terms of land use assumptions for the properties and buildings in the area so they can take existing land uses and plug them into the model.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the reserve concept and asked about the process for dipping into the reserve in the future? Would it be used for a project with great amenities or would it just be set aside until another General Plan update?

Mr. Iserson said staff had not gotten to that point yet. The reserve is a concept suggested by Council as an option when allocating housing units during this process. The concept will be fine tuned as the update process goes along and various policies will have to be adopted in the Land Use Element.

Mr. Brozosky asked if a certain number of units are assigned to a parcel and fewer than that are actually built, do the remainder units have to be assigned somewhere else in the city?

Mr. Iserson said yes if they are identified in the Housing Element. In the normal approach in dealing with residential property, the designation has a range. As long as a development falls within that range, that is acceptable. Staff is using the midpoint of a range for planning purposes, so if the development is below the midpoint, then the units must be transferred somewhere else.

Mr. Brozosky asked if the Hacienda development was allocated 800 units and the approved plan has only 600 units, then 200 units have to be transferred somewhere else?

Mr. Iserson replied that needed a little more thought. The Hacienda property in question is not listed in the Housing Element. Staff would have to compare to see how the units in the existing parcels relate to what is approved in the specific plan and determine whether there is an excess that has to be transferred.

Mr. Brozosky commented the General Plan has to be consistent among all the elements and asked if some adjustment to the Housing Element would be necessary after updating the Land Use and Circulation Elements, or would that be done some time in the future?

Mr. Iserson commented that staff was hoping that at the conclusion of this update process that the General Plan would be totally consistent, including the Housing Element recently approved. The city would be adopting another Housing Element within a few years and that process has already started with the ABAG numbers. It is staff's goal to make certain the current General Plan update is consistent with the Housing Element recently adopted.

Mr. Brozosky asked if it would make more sense to have a bigger reserve and not designate all the units. Perhaps assign a lower number of units to the BART station and Hacienda areas, but give the developers incentive that if they provide more affordable housing that they could have a higher number of units.

Mr. Iserson said that is one approach to use, but he hesitated making the reserve too large because it becomes such a large percentage of the housing units left and there could be problems in terms of the EIR analysis for the General Plan, since the units are not allocated to any particular area.

Mr. Fialho indicated if Council decided to allocate zero units to the Hacienda Business Park, for EIR purposes, staff would model what it is currently zoned for, which is commercial/office and some limited industrial and residential. Staff would put into the reserve whatever numbers of units are related to expansion, such as for transit-oriented residential. As the specific plan comes forward and is refined and looks like something Council would want to consider, then traffic analysis would be done and the results would be layered on top of the adopted General Plan.

Mr. Thorne asked if all units in the Hacienda Business Park are used for residential development, what would be used in the future for commercial uses?

Mr. Iserson said it depended on how Hacienda structures its proposal, whether it requested to retain all or some of its commercial units and adds residential units to that or replaced commercial with residential. He believed discussions would start with keeping some or all of existing entitlements for commercial/office/industrial units. Since there are a large number of jobs in the community relative to housing, he did not think it would be necessary to find another place for any lost commercial development in Hacienda.

Mayor Hosterman summarized that the task at this meeting was to create a model that gives some idea of the spread of unit numbers, so staff can generate traffic circulation figures. She asked Council to state their opinions regarding public and institutional zoning and dispersal of units.

Mr. Brozosky did not want to change any public and institutional zoning. There is a need for daycare centers and other things. Even though the impact of another church or institutional use in Valley Trails would be more than housing, the neighborhood has strongly indicated it does not want housing on that vacant property. He encouraged the church to do work on its landscaping. He believed the 113 units reserved for the school site on the Busch property must be kept. If a school is not built, the land is designated for medium density senior housing. He stated that if the School District does not exercise its rights to the property, the city does not automatically get the property. The District would pay 80% of the fair market value at the time it exercised its option. He did not think the city would buy the property for parkland, considering the amount of undeveloped parkland it already has. He favored a reserve of 500 units for future use. This could be used as an incentive for future development. If a development were approved at the midpoint and anything over the midpoint was 50% below market or low income, then the units could come from the reserve to get a better development. He suggested 250 units for the West Dublin BART station project. This is a good place for the units and would provide a good amenity to the city in the form of a parking garage for the BART station. He approved mixed use in the area, but did not want a grocery store. Another advantage of the site is that it is on the I-680 corridor and would allow residents to get on the freeway without going through city streets and increasing traffic impacts. He suggested 240 units for Staples Ranch. Senior apartments are counted in other parts of town, so they should be counted here. He asked for a comparison of the impacts of the Staples Ranch apartments with the Ironwood senior apartments on Busch. He felt that would be more similar than multi-family residential units in the Hacienda Business Park. He suggested 250 units for the east side. He could see

condominiums near the chain of lakes. If a study indicates that won't work because of traffic, then the units could be moved elsewhere or put into a reserve. He also noted ACE has talked about a station in that area and there could be transit-oriented development in the area. He did not want any housing units in Valley Trails. Kottinger Place should get 100 units. He wanted 100 units downtown but was uncertain how to accomplish downtown in-fill. There are several private parking lots downtown and he would like to have them designated public parking or have a garage constructed. The city could allocated density above it, either residential or more intense commercial, which would provided needed parking and bring more vitality to downtown. He noted the arts theater would soon open and would expand downtown usage. He preferred to see a more vibrant downtown than a more vibrant business park. Regarding Hacienda Business Park, he preferred increased commercial use instead of residential. He commented many businesses locate there because it is close to BART for their employees.

Cindy McGovern believed the staff report suggested additional locations in the public and institutional areas for schools and she agreed. She liked the dispersed land use option because it was less of an impact on schools, traffic, etc. She wanted as many units in the reserve as possible. The community has not seen the impact of the 559 units that are approved but not built. She wanted to check the infrastructure before continuing to build more and more units and having a good reserve will allow the city to see the impacts before deciding where to build additional units. She suggested 600 units for the reserve. Regarding the West Dublin BART station, she wanted 250 multi-family rental units. The city needs the parking garage and it will add to the vitality of Stoneridge Mall. She agreed with Mr. Brozosky that Hacienda should increase its commercial use. There is interest in start-up operations and she favored business condominiums and emphasis on research and development. She wanted Pleasanton to be at the forefront of that type of development in the Valley. She agreed with 240 units for Staples Ranch, but she is not agreeing to 820 units for the development. She commented there has been talk about an east side study for more then ten years. It is time to do a land planning for this vital area of Pleasanton and she allocated 250 units to begin that specific plan. She did not allocate any units for Valley Trails nor approve rezoning. However, she would like the church and community to try to find a plan that would work there. There could be additional acreage to the park, another type of daycare, etc. Kottinger Place should definitely have 100 units. She approved 100 units for downtown in-fill. There are areas that need to be revitalized. There are some old apartment houses that need upgrading. She wanted a downtown that is more than one street and allows people to have a walkable community.

Jerry Thorne appreciated the helpful input from the public. Regarding the Busch property, if the School District does not use the site, the 113 units should be put into the reserve. He believed the reserve should start at 200 units because he felt it would be increased from a variety of sources over time and could eventually reach 500 units. He approved the 350 units for the West Dublin BART station. That will be a vital area and will be perfect for transit-oriented development. He approved 240 units for Staples Ranch. He felt the original intent of the housing cap was due to impacts on traffic, schools, etc. He suggested a range of 130-150 for the east side specific plan to get discussions going on what might be developed there. He would not change zoning for the Valley Trails property and would not allocate any units. He agreed with the 100 units for Kottinger Place/Pleasanton Gardens. He agreed with 50-100 units for downtown. Regarding Hacienda Business Park, he felt there needed to be a discussion on how many units would make the project viable. He needed that number before assigning units to the area. Whatever number of units is left should be placed in Hacienda. He was concerned, however, about the loss of commercial space there. As the city builds out there will be a need for more commercial tax revenues.

Matt Sullivan did not want to reduce any public and institutional zoning. Valley Trails should not change and he allocated zero units to that site. He was concerned about additional development west of Foothill Road and impacts on the environment and visibility. He was in favor of any policies to deal with that. He supported the suggested hillside residential zoning or some kind of form-based code. Regarding the Lemoine property, he did not want to prevent the family from building homes for their children, but if they go from 13 to 26 units, there are a lot of people in that family. He commented there has been a lot of discussion on the General Plan and it is time to start narrowing the focus in order to proceed with the traffic models. However, in another sense, he did not think there was enough information to allocate specific units to sites. Hacienda Business Park is an example because there have not been detailed proposals or traffic models to show if there is a beneficial impact from transit-oriented development. He believed there should be two models: one along the lines of the dispersed residential model and one on the true transit-oriented development model. He felt there was a benefit to TOD because infrastructure is in place and there would be traffic and transportation improvements since it is next to public transit. It would be a walkable community for shopping or employment destinations. He noted that neither option was cast in stone and would still have considerable discussion, but he wanted the additional data before making any decisions. His comments on the units would be flexible depending on which scenario was being considered. If dispersed land use is being discussed, the unit numbers may be higher. If TOD is being discussed, then the units have to come from elsewhere in the city. The reserve should start at 200 units and could be increased later. He had concerns that the West Dublin BART station proposal would be a truly viable transit-oriented development. He felt there was a critical number of units necessary to make it work and there needed to be mixed-use commercial amenities otherwise people would just get in their cars and drive some place. He would like to look at both BART stations to see how transit-oriented development would work. Regarding Staples Ranch, he suggested some number of units between 65 and 240. The staff analysis was good, but he felt there could be more assisted living units than estimated. The number he gave for allocation was 175 units. He agreed a specific plan is needed for the east side and the quarries. However, he did not believe housing in that area made sense. There are already major traffic problems in the area and he felt light industrial, commercial, or office was a better fit. That could be a great high tech business park combined with some kind of educational branch from a college. That could help stimulate more economic development in that realm. He agreed with adding units to Kottinger Place/Pleasanton Gardens, but felt 100 units might be too much. He was concerned about how to do it and what to do with the residents during construction. He would reserve 50-100 for that location. Regarding downtown, he supported more residential or mixed-use development. There is discussion about redoing the civic center or expanding the library using the vacant property next door. He suggested a public/private partnership to provide residential units near the ACE station. He could accept 200 units for downtown residential. As discussion continues on the General Plan, there make be units made available from other places, such as the southeast hills, that could be put in the reserve and reallocated later. In general, he wanted two scenarios: one for the TOD in north Pleasanton and one using a more dispersed model.

Mayor Hosterman favored no changes to the public and institutional zoning. The Valley Trails neighborhood fought a change years ago and should not have to do it over and over again. Her favorite Option was B3 on Attachment 2. At some point there will be discussion about a reserve of units for a future Council to consider, but right now it is necessary to create a model with a dispersal of units that will provide an opportunity to prepare a model of what the traffic will look like. She wanted to spread out the units as far as possible to get a snapshot of traffic. More discussions can then be held to refine the numbers. She noted there is a potential for 1,686 residential units with no idea where they will be placed and she did not want anyone to

feel that allocating them in order to create a model in any way provided entitlement. For instance, regarding Hacienda Business Park, she believed transit-oriented development is truly smart growth and should be considered. She also appreciated concerns about maintaining a mix and having enough space for future commercial development. She believed there was room for both and encouraged Hacienda to continue to develop a project to present to the community. She summarized that there was not too much deviation from a reserve for the Busch property school site. She favored a future reserve of 200 units, but also supported assigning those units to various areas in order to get a good picture of traffic. Option B3 allocated 350 units for the West Dublin BART station and she was uncertain if that was realistic, but felt it was important to understand what the traffic would be for that model. Hacienda specific plan is allocated 808, but she could see potential for adding a substantial number of units. She did not believe Staples Ranch was a residential project. It was a medical facility and the number of units is undetermined as yet because the discussions have been with the County, not the city. She supported allocating zero units for this site. She might agree to 65 units, but strongly believed this was a medical facility and should be counted as an assisted living project and not counted towards the housing cap. She did not see any opportunities for housing in the east side of Pleasanton in the near future. She agreed the area needs a specific plan, but believed some mix of commercial/office/light industrial use was best for the area. There could also be some institutional uses in the future. Kottinger Place should have 100 units for the sake of the model to determine what the traffic circulation would be at the intersection of Vineyard and First. She had grave concerns about how the expansion could work. She was very interested in downtown in-fill and could accept anything from 25-100 units. All these scenarios will satisfy the requirement to rezone for an additional 871 high-density multi-family units as contemplated in the Housing Element. There has been a lot of talk about the regional housing numbers allocation set forth by the State of California, but that is an unfunded mandate and she is not interested in trying to comply with it. The numbers are way too high and do not make sense. She felt every community in California would be totally unbalanced if they tried to comply with these mandates. She asked staff if it had been able to coalesce these numbers and could help reach a consensus on how to move forward.

Mr. Fialho said there is a range of possibilities, but in order to prepare a model, it is necessary to get some consensus in terms of some specific numbers. He summarized there appears to be consensus on downtown, Kottinger, and Valley Trails. For the southeast side specific plan, the maximum he heard was 250 units and he felt that was an appropriate number for modeling purposes knowing that Council has full discretion to go below that number through the specific plan process. For modeling, he believed the worst-case scenario should be used. That also applies to Staples Ranch. Council is struggling with how to count the units, but that discussion would occur at a subsequent meeting. He wanted a straw poll on the West Dublin BART station project. He had heard a range of 250-350 units.

Mr. Brozosky said he had suggested 250 but could agree to 350 for modeling.

Mr. Fialho then referred to the reserve, which had been discussed at 200-500, although the majority of Councilmembers had suggested 200 units. Whatever number of units is left would go to the Hacienda Business Park. He believed Mr. Sullivan had asked if staff could identify two extreme cases of dispersed units and transit-oriented development. The identified consensus is not extreme in either direction. He thought Council should look at the analysis and pick an extreme dispersed and an extreme TOD for further analysis in the EIR process. He felt he had identified a preferred land use plan, but staff still needed additional options to review and consider in the EIR process. For example, Option A3 would be a good one to model for

dispersed purposes because it is a variation of the consensus. Option B1 or B3 could be good for modeling the extreme option for TOD land use (excluding the units for Valley Trails).

Mr. Sullivan indicated Hacienda has been working on its proposal for years and has been told by the Planning Commission and Council to prepare a specific plan. They need an opportunity to present something so Council can make informed decisions. If a model can be done as part of an EIR alternative, he was satisfied.

Mr. Fialho said something must be modeled for EIR purposes beyond the preferred land use element. If staff is doing that, it might as well use the extreme case. The planning staff suggested Option B1 as being closer to a TOD plan. He reiterated the preference is B1 and said there should be two alternatives and suggested A3 (with zero for Valley Trails).

Mr. Brozosky asked what was the purpose of using B1, was it just to show impacts? He did not know what could be gained from that. He could never accept Option B1.

Mr. Fialho indicated for environmental impact review analysis, there must be a no project alternative, the 1996 General Plan, the preferred land use plan, and two other options for measuring environmental impacts of things like traffic. In order to measure traffic appropriately, the extreme cases ought to be used, one of which would be TOD and the other a dispersed model.

Ms. McGovern felt if extremes are used, there should be a model that shows a reserve of 500 units.

Mayor Hosterman indicated that if the General Plan update is to be completed in a timely manner, staff needs to have something to prepare a model with realistic numbers for Council to use. She was concerned that requiring too many models would delay the process.

Mr. Iseron explained that the two alternatives are being selected for EIR study purposes and in those cases the reserve loses some of its importance. If one wants to use worst-case scenarios, it might be best to allocate all of the reserve units into the two alternatives that we know are being used only for an EIR exercise. Certainly the preferred land use alternative will include a reserve.

Mr. Sullivan reiterated that even with the alternatives for the EIR, that is not the final decision. Council can still move things in and out of reserves or to other locations.

Mr. Iseron stated these are just working drafts to keep the process rolling and to prepare the EIR analysis. After all the analysis is done, Council will make its final decisions.

Mr. Fialho summarized there is a compromise plan and staff is asking for identification of two additional land use option, one in the dispersed and one in the concentrated residential development tables. He suggested for transit-oriented development that Option B1 is used. For the dispersed model, he suggested A2 or A3 for an exercise for environmental impact purposes.

Mr. Brozosky clarified that this was for the traffic model and these numbers could be reduced later and placed into a reserve after seeing the impacts. Council is not committed to anything.

4. NEXT STEPS AND MATTERS INITIATED BY COUNCIL OR COMMISSION

A special meeting was called to select the options for modeling.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the joint workshop was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen D. Gonzales
Deputy City Clerk