

MINUTES
OF THE
JOINT WORKSHOP
OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

September 27, 2005

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Those in attendance were: City Councilmembers Steve Brozosky, Cindy McGovern, Matthew Sullivan, Jerry Thorne, and Mayor Jennifer Hosterman; Planning Commissioners Brian Arkin, Philip Blank, 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; and Janice Stern, Principal Planner.

2. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE ELEMENT

Consideration of a potential land use change areas and other issues to be resolved, and a process for arriving at a Preferred Land Use Plan and Draft Land Use Element (SR 05:268)

Janice Stern presented the staff report.

Ms. Hosterman referred to the list of citywide land use issues to be resolved and asked for comments from the Planning Commissioners.

Philip Blank referred to page 3 of the staff report with regard to assisted living facilities and asked if there was a difference in the amount of fees paid by assisted living developers as compared to other types of development?

Ms. Stern said staff would have to bring that information back at a future meeting. However, she cited an example of the latest assisted living facility where a number of the fees were waived because it was an affordable project. She believed the fees were different on a case-by-case basis.

Mary Roberts asked if these workshops would include the minutes from Planning Commission meetings about two years ago, when it reviewed the entire city and received comments from the public. She did not want those people to be ignored.

Ms. Stern said staff did not intend to start from zero and would prepare packages of material for each area of discussion, including any consensus decisions reached at those previous meetings.

Ms. Roberts referred to the Hansen/Kaiser site, which is 73 acres, and asked about the 35 acres designated as potential high density residential. She asked if that included the 20 acres for the school district.

Mr. Iseron indicated that is the east part of the Hansen property where El Charro would be extended. Staff had reviewed that area and felt there was a possibility for residential development since it was farther away from other impacted uses. He agreed with Ms. Roberts that it was across from Cope Lake.

Trish Maas referred to #44 on the map near the Kaiser Hospital site and indicated the Planning Commission had felt it would be a good location for senior housing. That does not appear to be part of the discussions now and she wondered why.

Ms. Stern said staff had heard that Kaiser was no longer interested in that. Staff is rechecking with all property owners to determine their current interests in development.

Mr. Blank referred to the proposal to get community input at the end of this process. He felt by that time a lot of effort would have been put into creating the plans and the community input could indicated a desired change that would cause the process to start all over again. He preferred that staff insure community out reach for each of the Tuesday sessions so that there can be community input as the process goes along.

Mr. Iseron indicated notices will be put in all the newspapers. He said all the input given at prior meetings would be the basis for the recommendations being presented. As this plan is refined, the community will be part of the process. He clarified that the Hansen site referred to by Ms. Roberts was farther down Stanley and not by Cope Lake. He noted there were four workshops in late 2003 and early 2004 to discuss potential land uses and to provide background information for issues in various parts of town as well as potentials for change. Neighborhood meetings were held in various parts of town to allow the residents to present their comments.

Ann Fox referred to the map and felt it would be helpful for all the roads that are considered for widening to be shown in red. When she looked at some of the land uses that are to be discussed and considered the draft circulation element recently decided upon, she did not see how those came together. For instance, widening Old Santa Rita Road to three lanes from Rosewood to Santa Rita. She did not see how the vacant land left for development and actual proposed use would entail requiring Old Santa Rita Road to be widened to three lanes. She referred to the schedule of proposed workshops and their topics and suggested combining some of the topics into one workshop, such as putting Hacienda Business Park and Staples Ranch together in order to streamline the process. She wanted to review land use in conjunction with the circulation element.

Mr. Iseron acknowledged the traffic piece fitting in with land use is a point well taken. However, staff felt it was better to discuss what is the best land use for a specific area first, then to perform traffic models to see the impacts of the land use. Adjustments could be made at that point. He also noted that staff wanted to streamline the process, but each of the topics

listed for a separate workshop have a fair amount of substance and it was not felt that the process should be rushed without full discussion. The Staples Ranch and Hacienda Business Park topics will include presentations from people outside of city staff. Staff is open to suggestions and if Council and the Commission prefer more streamlining, then some topics could be combined.

Brian Arkin indicated the Commissioners visited most of the elementary schools in the city and gathered information from the community. He did not see how the input had been incorporated in the staff reports. It appeared to him that the process was starting over. He wanted staff to show what a compressed plan would look like in order to see what would be lost, then an informed decision could be made on what process to be followed. It also appeared that there are meetings where applicants would be making presentations of projects. He felt it was better for Council and the Commission to make a decision on where it wants houses or commercial developments, and then hear presentations from applicants.

Mayor Hosterman acknowledged the Planning Commission received a lot of public input a long time ago and staff has indicated that will be integrated in the process. The process is not starting over. She believed Staples Ranch and Hacienda Business Park are two huge pieces of property with a great potential impact on the City of Pleasanton. Just because a decision is made on a certain type of development, if there is no developer who wants to build it, there is nothing to talk about anyway. Because of that, she felt it was important to have the discussion with the County of Alameda regarding the Staples Ranch property and with the Hacienda business owners regarding their ideas for the area.

Mr. Arkin wanted to see if the process could be finished in a year instead of two years.

Mayor Hosterman felt it was more appropriate to talk about that at workshop 4. By then, the basic land uses in town would have been discussed and at that point, a decision could be made on whether to compress future workshops.

Ms. Maas agreed with Mr. Arkin. At the beginning, she believed the Planning Commission was to be the lead agency to start the process. Now, there are just a lot of joint workshops. She was also concerned that by spring of next year there will be changes in the membership of the Planning Commissioners and possibly Councilmembers.

Jennifer Pearce acknowledged she was new to this process but she felt the plan proposed by staff is a good one.

Mr. Arkin said two of the Planning Commissioners will be termed out and there is an election for Council in late 2006. He did not want to have new people coming on board and causing the process to start all over again. He wanted to complete the General Plan Update with the same people who started it.

Ms. Fox also felt it was inappropriate for applicants to make presentations. She wanted to keep this a General Plan review and not to delve into specific areas during the process. That way they are not going into specific details for specific development projects. She

preferred to look at the Circulation Element and start combining the two now. Then look at areas that have not been discussed in detail and focus on them to move forward. It sounded to her that the process started a few years ago was being reinvented.

Matt Sullivan agreed with some of what the Planning Commissioners have said, since he was there when it happened. He wanted to make certain the comments made by the community at that time are not lost. He noted there are new people and new Councilmembers, so it is necessary to go through the process again. He felt it may be possible to combine some of the topics even if it means a little longer meeting. He was concerned that some of the Planning Commissioners who have been involved in this from the beginning will no longer be on the Commission. He supported some kind of compressed schedule. He questioned whether it would take six months to develop the draft EIR. On the list of sites, the last group labeled as "other" is designated as not to be considered. He disagreed and felt he would like to discuss uses on some of them, such as the Kaiser site, St. Augustine Church, etc. He agreed with the list of issues presented by staff for discussion. Regarding eliminating presentations by specific applicants, he agreed in general. For example, presentations have been made regarding the southeast hills area and EIRs are in process, so no further presentation is necessary. However, there are new concepts for Hacienda Business Park and Staples Ranch and he felt a presentation should be given on those topics. He noted the Planning Commission received presentations in the last process and it was helpful.

Ms. Maas wanted a time limit on those presentations.

Jerry Thorne referred to the references in the staff report to memos that are on the website and requested copies of them and their attachments, along with the work of the Planning Commission. He agreed that some of the items listed as "other" should be discussed, such as St. Augustine's. He wanted to have a presentation regarding Hacienda Business Park.

Mr. Iseron said staff would provide copies to all the members when the items come forward for discussion.

Cindy McGovern had a few questions regarding the staff report. There was a property called the Walsh site, which she could not find. She asked if the name changed from something else?

Mr. Iseron said it is a very narrow strip of property along Valley Avenue along the railroad corridor.

Ms. McGovern asked if staff perceived any density changes in any currently approved Specific Plans?

Mr. Iseron said a specific plan would have to be modified in order to change a density. That would be part of this process, but staff was not focusing on specific plan areas, since most of them have been recently approved. One exception would be Staples Ranch. He

noted the Vineyard Corridor and Happy Valley Specific Plans are also new, however a portion of the Happy Valley Specific Plan would come forward for review as part of the Spotorno/Greenbriar application.

Ms. McGovern asked if the density in the downtown area would be part of the review? She referred to a presentation by Charles Huff and Mike O'Callaghan to Council about zoning changes and secondary units in the downtown area.

Mr. Iseron said it was not included because of the recent adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan.

She asked if there were overall land use goals for the vacant property in the city? She wondered if there were certain public and institutional or open space properties that the city wanted to maintain?

Mr. Iseron said those things are to be reviewed. He did not think there had been identified percentages for each, but that is important to the land use discussion to determine if there is enough land for each category.

Ms. McGovern wanted that perspective to be included in the build out plan. She then asked if the economic perspective is considered when reviewing land use changes?

Mr. Iseron said that is part of the consideration and the consultant team includes a member of Bay Area Economics, which is working on an economic and fiscal plan for the city. They are working with the Economic Vitality Committee and staff to assess what would be best for the city in the future in terms of business interests and other economic and fiscal analyses.

Ms. McGovern then referred to the map and noted some properties are not within the city limits. She asked if staff had discussed annexation with these landowners?

Mr. Iseron said yes. He noted the General Plan is based on the city's planning area, which includes areas beyond the city limits, so that if those areas are ever annexed, the city has some input to the County with regard to what it might approve to be built in that location. For planning purposes, the General Plan has always gone beyond the city boundaries.

Ms. Iseron referred to the memo, which discussed possible large issues for Planning Commission contemplation. She asked if there would be a review of definitions and policies surrounding density ranges, mid-point ranges and gross developable acreage?

Mr. Iseron said that was possible if desired.

Ms. McGovern then indicated her interest in inclusionary housing and wanted to make certain that was part of land use.

Mr. Iseron said that was more closely related to the Housing Element.

Ms. McGovern then wondered if the inclusionary housing ordinance would be reviewed as part of land use when considering affordable housing or as part of the Housing Element?

Mr. Iserson said it would be reviewed in terms of condominium conversion issues. The ordinance can be reviewed at any time, but staff did not want to get into the Housing Element, since it was so recently adopted.

Ms. McGovern wanted a review of inclusionary housing because she wanted to see rental and for-sale units brought in line and perhaps increase the number of units. She asked if there was a compilation of all the public comments before the Planning Commission? She wanted to know what the top ten issues were.

Mr. Iserson said there are minutes and notes from all those early meetings.

Mr. Sullivan said there was a published report and a listing of the issues. Wayne Rasmussen prepared it. On August 28, 2003, the Commission had a discussion about what areas to look at in the General Plan update process and what areas not to be reviewed, such as the Housing Element, the Downtown Specific Plan, etc. Those records would be helpful to the Council.

Steve Brozosky expressed concern about how long this process is taking. It seems only small steps are taken at each meeting. He did not want a situation where some people would agree to something just to move on to the next meeting. He felt some of the land use items could be combined. He noted the Council would not be reviewing all environmental impacts for Hacienda or Staples. He wanted to look at land use decisions and implications to the circulation. He wanted a more conceptual review of range of units, orientation, etc. Typically, a General Plan is adopted and then specific plans and planned unit developments are adopted. He felt this process was backwards. He noted a prior comment about changes in Councilmembers or Planning Commissioners and felt it might have been better to have a steering committee, since they don't have terms. This process started in 2003 with an 18-month schedule in order to be complete before the 2004 election. We are now at a point where some Commissioners will be leaving and there is another Council election coming. He suggested that staff put together a binder including prior discussions and the statistical data, so everyone is on the same page. He wanted to know how many units are left before reaching the housing cap, including how many units are approved, what densities are included in specific plans, etc. He also noted the Busch property, which has property set aside for the School District, which he doubted would occur. In 2008 there would be many units designated as medium density residential and those numbers should be counted toward the housing cap. He agreed with others that there should be discussion before certain parcels of property are ruled out of consideration. He believed the Housing Element would have to be amended based on the land use decisions.

Ms. Stern agreed a review would be necessary to show the city is meeting its regional housing needs requirements. The new requirements will be available in 2006.

Mayor Hosterman said one of the issues discussed previously is to have sustainable goals in the General Plan Update. There was discussion of a Sustainability Element to be included in the General Plan, but the preference was to have sustainability woven throughout the General Plan and its elements. She reiterated the concerns mentioned to include discussion regarding the distinction of fees and their impacts between assisted living facilities and other housing types; inclusion of all previous discussions and public input; compressed schedule opportunities; keep all vacant land on the table pending public discussion and staff input; downtown densities; gross developable vs. net developable acres as it relates to density; language of the inclusionary zoning ordinance; number of units remaining to reach housing cap; and finally the issue of losing Councilmembers or Planning Commissioners from this process due to expiration of terms and the possibility of a "steering committee."

3. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Vera Dunder, 5328 Brookside Court, referred to the map and #46 as not having further discussion. She asked that this be discussed. The property is zoned "P" and "A" (Agriculture). The sewer sludge was used on this land. She was afraid that the property could be changed to "C" so it could be sold and developed. She was concerned about the possible contaminants on the property and the dust that could be blown to the adjacent park where children play and where there is commercial development. The Environmental Protection Agency still does not know about the effects of sewage sludge on landfills.

Rick Irby, 3461 Norton Way #2, referred to #47 on the map (3780 Stanley Boulevard), and questioned the acreage designation. He felt 1.5 acres was for one parcel not all three. He noted his mother has lived on the property all her life and he has a long relationship with Brian Swift, who is no longer with the city. The new staff does not keep in touch with him on developments around her property, especially with regard to Nevada Street. There is also question about the sewer line coming down from Vineyard Avenue.

Mr. Iserson said staff would investigate the acreage question. As far as the extension of Nevada Street, he did not know there were issues in terms of discussions with property owners in the area. He would discuss the matter with the Public Works Department.

Vanessa Kawaihau, 871 Sycamore Road, referred to the matrix and indicated Lund Ranch is not in the specific plan area. It abuts the North Sycamore Specific Plan area. She noted there are 154 acres for the Spotorno plan and the matrix only shows 20. The property owner and his developer applied to build 102 homes, which is also not reflected. She felt this gave the impression that the city was only concentrating on the upper PUD areas and moving all his density to the flat area, which would affect the community character element, specifically policy 18, which is to preserve the semi-rural character of the Happy Valley community. Increasing density in the flat area, while preserving the hillside, would decimate the semi-rural community. That is quickly disappearing in the Pleasanton area and very difficult to find in the Greater Bay Area as a whole. She urged this body to work to preserve the Happy Valley community.

Mabel Terra Lester, 11033 Dublin Canyon Road, said she has been trying to develop her property for seven years and would like to move forward with it. This property has been in her family since 1916. Her property was #25 on the map.

Mike Regan, 1363 Hearst Drive, acknowledged the General Plan Update is an overwhelming and sometimes frustrating process for all. As a citizen, he thanked them for the process and it was worthwhile taking the necessary time. There is a housing cap of 29,000 units and there are important decisions to be made. He has learned a lot by participating in this process. He believed the Circulation Element is the prerequisite for anything to be done in this process. That determines options and the quality of life for the residents. Affordable housing and assisted living facilities should be a priority to allow people to continue to live in the community. He wanted a holistic approach to the plan to weigh the impacts of each project on the surrounding area. He agreed with Mr. Brozosky that it would be helpful to have a central compilation of information, so everyone has the same data.

Michael Knuppe, 2899 Vizzolini Court, owner of property #22 on the map expressed his desire that the children, teachers, police, fire personnel, city employees, etc. be able to afford to live in Pleasanton. He referred to page 2 of the staff report, bullet 6, relationship of jobs and housing, and he wanted a survey of city employees, teachers, etc. to see who currently lives here, would like to live here, what they think would be an affordable housing price, etc. All this information should be included in future land planning. It may affect density; perhaps 15 units per acre is too low? Do we want all of our workers to commute into the city? He also wanted to know how many emergency response personnel live in the city. If there is a major earthquake and the city is isolated, can these people get to the city to serve the citizens? He did not want Pleasanton to become known as an elitist community.

Scott Trobbe, 1690 Dell Avenue, Campbell, owner of property designated as #43 on the map (I-680 and Bernal), indicated several discussions have been had about changing the property from commercial to some other use. He supported this process because it gives him an opportunity to be proactive about the use of his property. He indicated he would like to have some kind of retail use, such as a high-end grocer, boutiques, restaurants, etc., at that corner and will commence discussions with city staff.

Becky Dennis, 838 Gray Fox Circle, suggested holding a workshop to prioritize land uses. Some are a higher priority for the city than others and she felt they should be given a right to use existing and planned infrastructure first. She indicated she was an affordable housing advocate and she felt the housing deficit in this area should be a priority for consideration. She acknowledged there is a housing cap, but it could be increased by the voters. She noted affordable housing has the most difficult time in being accepted by the community because it brings no benefit, such as parks, other than as a community investment in work force housing and in housing those with lower income who live here. She hoped the Council would make the kind of sites that can accommodate that missing type of housing a priority. Council should consider land use prioritization that considers housing type and density, the overarching issue of jobs/housing balance, impact on circulation, impact on other infrastructure like schools, sewer capacity, etc. If there is a workshop just to discuss the community's priorities and the management of the community in terms of fair share housing

and jobs/housing balance, there could be developed a structure by which to consider the presentations of individual projects.

James Paxson, 4473 Willow Road, Suite 105, responded to some concerns expressed about the workshop devoted to Hacienda Business Park. The intention of the business owners was not to present a specific plan nor alternatives at this point. Until there is direction from this body on what it envisions for the process and what it wants to see, the owners do not have much to present in terms of actual projects. What they do want to present is a good deal of background information on development alternatives. They have done a lot of background research and they want to present that information to the Council and Commission to help the body make informed decisions and to give direction about the types of projects that are desired in that area.

Kevin Close, 871 Sycamore Road, wanted further definition of certain terms. With regard to the housing cap, he asked what is a housing unit and how many are left? It seems that response from staff will not come before the fourth meeting. He asked what is gross density. Is it all the acreage or density at the site of development? He also wanted circulation kept in mind when considering all these things.

There were no other speakers.

4. NEXT STEPS AND MATTERS INITIATED BY COUNCIL OR COMMISSION

Nelson Fialho suggested that the body reach consensus on the ten or so issues raised before setting further workshops. He also wanted discussion about condensing the schedule of workshops. Even though there are nine workshops, there are really only five after this one. The last three are for staff to present the draft element as a result of the discussions to that point, traffic modeling, and the last workshop would be to determine the preferred draft circulation element. Two of the workshops are for presentations regarding Hacienda and Staples. There are significant economic and residential considerations at a policy level that will directly impact the General Plan and should be reviewed before embarking on discussions of citywide land use issues. He acknowledged it seems overwhelming, but there is a purpose and staff would try to keep presentations and discussions as short as possible.

Mr. Brozosky did not feel direction would be given to staff until all matters had been presented. He asked staff at which workshop would things be prioritized and directions given for them to start working on the draft land use element?

Ms. Stern understood the desire to look at everything first and felt it would be about workshop #6 before directions could be given to staff for preparation of the draft plan.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the need for prioritizing and felt it should be done in a way that least impacts the traffic in the city. He felt there was no problem with more people in the city, but with the congestion and traffic that comes with housing development.

Mr. Sullivan agreed it was a good idea to talk about priorities. He was uncertain at what point that should occur, but should be done before decisions are made. He acknowledged traffic is a major concern, but he believed there were other considerations as well, and decisions should not be made based just on traffic.

Mr. Fialho suggested inserting discussion about priorities after the Hacienda workshop in order to focus subsequent discussions on land use with regard to citywide issues.

Mr. Brozosky felt the priorities discussion should be before the Hacienda and Staples presentations.

Mr. Fialho disagreed because there are significant economic and residential impacts that will directly affect policy decisions that relate to the General Plan. He felt it was important to have that information presented publicly so the community is aware of the issues as Council is making its policy decisions and prioritization.

Ms. McGovern inquired about secondary units and assisted living units. She wanted to know if the number of units meets the regional requirements for affordable housing. She said her decisions would be based on whether she can count those units towards her goals. She asked if there would be notices in the newspapers that encouraged landowners to contact the Planning Director if there are any development proposals, since the Council is reviewing land use.

Mr. Fialho felt staff did a very good job in terms of public notices. There is a very comprehensive notification strategy on the city's website and there will also be information in the city's newsletters.

Ms. McGovern was very concerned that if consideration is being given to rezoning commercial land to residential and there are people who own land that is residential that will be impacted by that, that they be informed. She did not want people coming back to say they have had their land rights taken away. She asked what happens if another developer besides Hacienda and Staples wants to have a workshop?

Mr. Fialho felt the difference is that the Hacienda and Staples properties are being viewed in a different light. These have a major economic component and Staples has a senior housing component that is about 700 units. Hacienda is different because commercial property is being considered for changing to Transit Oriented Development (TOD). That is a dramatic shift from past Council positions. He did not feel these kinds of issues would be apparent in other projects in the city.

Ms. McGovern would like to take the approximate 2,500 units left to reach the housing cap and then decide what are the types of land uses and housing needed to finish this town at build out. That is why she asked about goals. She wanted to meet the goals of different age groups, especially young adults. There are fewer young families and she wanted to make certain there is a diversified community in terms of age. Her last issues involved regional

issues of growth, housing and traffic. When land use is considered, regional impacts should be considered as well.

Mr. Thorne wanted to have the binder of information previously mentioned before the next workshop. He wanted to know exactly what was left to work with in the city and then combine that with the priorities in order to make reasonable decisions on how to allocate what is left.

Mayor Hosterman said the issues have been enumerated and reiterated the fact that a number of parcels had been taken out of considerations, but would now be added back in for discussion. She noted the series of workshops and felt there was consensus on moving forward with the number of workshops as planned. The next workshop is scheduled for October 11, 2005 for Alameda County to make a presentation regarding the Staples Ranch property. She thanked the members of the public for attending the meeting.

Mr. Nelson said there was an unresolved issue about a workshop on citywide priorities. He believed that could be scheduled after the Hacienda Business Park workshop.

Ms. McGovern asked if that could be combined with another workshop.

Mr. Brozosky asked if the binder could be provided before the next workshop as suggested by Mr. Thorne.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the workshop was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Abrahamson
City Clerk