

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

October 25, 2005

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The joint workshop was called to order by Mayor Jennifer Hosterman at 6:36 p.m.

Those in attendance were as follows: City Councilmembers Steve Brozosky, Cindy McGovern, Matt Sullivan, Jerry Thorne, and Mayor Jennifer Hosterman; Planning Commissioners Brian Arkin, Philip Blank, Jennifer Pearce, and Mary Roberts. Staff members present were: Nelson Fialho, City Manager; Michael Roush, City Attorney; Jerry Iserson, Director of Planning and Community Services; Janice Stern, Principal Planner; William Cody, Fire Chief; and Eric Carlson, Fire Marshall.

Planning Commissioners Trish Maas and Ann Fox were absent.

**2. HACIENDA BUSINESS PARK**

**Presentation on options for a future Transit-oriented Development Specific Plan for Hacienda Business Park, a 570-acre site generally located south of I-580, east of Hopyard Road, and west of Old Santa Rita Road.** (SR 05:304)

Jerry Iserson presented the staff report.

James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park Owners Association, presented the goals of the plan and introduced the consultant design team.

Nick Haskell, EDAW, Inc. 150 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, presented the background of Hacienda Business Park and how the project has evolved with the development of the city and the changing workplace, as well as the proposed future uses in regard to a transit-oriented specific plan.

Mayor Hosterman opened the meeting to questions and comments from the Council, Commission and public. She referred to the mixed land uses near Owens Drive and asked if it were possible to draw a line from the BART station and across Owens Drive to create a pedestrian walkway/mall?

Mr. Haskell said they did not want to constrain traffic on Owens Drive, but rather to improve sidewalks, street trees, etc. to get a better way to walk to the BART station. He liked the idea of a north/south pedestrian connection. Part of the nature of a transit-oriented development is to not to created separate and discrete uses.

Jennifer Pearce asked about the profile of the self-selectors in terms of people who would be living in this area.

Ellen Greenberg, Freedman, Tung & Bottomley, 74 New Montgomery Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, responded the self-selectors would be households seeking urban environments with convenient living without dependence on auto travel for various trips. There would be many seniors in this group, but more likely they will be young working people who see this as convenient to work and who value the amenities of a city like Pleasanton for its parks, recreational opportunities, trails and with a great access via BART to more urban places. She noted the principals of transit-oriented development (TOD) act out differently in every place.

Ms. Pearce referred to Pleasant Hill as an example of TOD and asked for further elaboration.

Richard Lee, of Fehr & Peers, One Walnut Creek Center, 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 600, Walnut Creek, referred to the census data for Pleasanton in 2000 and noted there was no residential development near the BART station in Pleasanton. He then referred to Pleasant Hill where there are residences nearer the BART station.

Mary Roberts said the demographics presented appear to focus on younger people with no families or children, since there is no focus on school issues. It seems to be very different than Pleasanton as a whole. She noted the transportation studies would be dependent on that type of demographic.

Mr. Haskell agreed this is different than Pleasanton and noted those are the self-selectors who would most likely live in that area.

Ms. Roberts commented the Pleasanton staff performed a traffic study of the occupants of the Archstone Apartments and felt it would be interesting to review that. Many people appeared to be traveling south. She felt it would be interesting to see how many people from the apartments actually walked to BART or to work.

Mr. Iserson said staff would locate the information and bring it back to a future meeting.

Philip Blank referred to the information presented on other TOD projects that are under construction and asked if information had been compiled from TOD projects that are actually completed?

Ms. Greenberg said they had tried to find another business park that had undergone this kind of transformation. Instead they found many business parks at a similar point to Hacienda and the surrounding communities were contemplating changes for many of the same reasons present in Pleasanton. The consultants then looked at more traditional urban areas that have some of the transportation and travel characteristics that are of interest for encouragement in Pleasanton. These are places that have managed to grow, add jobs, housing, and activities without having big increases in traffic. The team extracted many lessons and principles from these areas.

Mr. Blank said since no other business park has made this transition, he felt there was a risk factor.

Ms. Greenberg said they had made a list of factors to determine what would be transferable to this location. There are some pieces such as a high quality-walking environment, which can be reproduced in Hacienda. Another piece is regional accessibility. The places that have been most successful without adding development without adding traffic have transit systems that connect to many places in the region. Pleasanton scores poorly in that regard and that is really hard to change.

Mr. Blank asked how to gauge what is transferable and what is not if there is no real world experience in a business park environment?

Ms. Greenberg said it is based on substantial research on travel behavior. For example, if there is great access to BART that only helps people whose business destination is accessible from BART.

Mr. Blank then asked what data was used to create the critical mass numbers shown on the slides?

Ms. Greenberg said there is a considerable body of data that shows for example the "decay factor". Many people will walk a quarter mile, but the numbers drop off substantially for longer distances. There is also quite a bit of quantitative data on the response people have to parking charges. There is much data of interest when discussing the different strategies for the area.

Mr. Haskell said the slide with points about critical mass was an economic study focusing on the definition of a mixed-use building and how it works, whether it is proximate to transit or any other context. Getting a mixed-use building to work is a challenge. The economic consultants did the research on actual retail and market studies. This whole proposal will not work without successful mixed uses. This is based on a retail market study for the community and taking into account the focus desired for the project.

Mr. Sullivan said several retail and transit studies have been done and are on the Hacienda Business Park website. He wanted to clarify something. On one hand he heard nothing has been done like this before and on the other there is a lot of data

about transit-oriented development and how it affects traffic and transportation choices, as well as the economics from both retail and office aspects.

Mr. Haskell referred to the NASA Ames Research Park in Mountain View as an example of development that took strong measures to minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding area. He noted transportation demand management methods.

Ms. Greenberg said there is a lot of data on transit-oriented development and the way specific built environment factors contribute to people's travel choices. She noted the significant experience of the consultant team and their knowledge of the subject nationwide. She noted the unique factors of Hacienda Business Park such as its size, its suburban location, etc.

Mr. Sullivan acknowledged there is a lot of data and experience that supports the concept, but just not many office parks that have actually tried this, so it is unknown if it will be successful. He acknowledged that the TOD philosophy works if there is the right mix of elements. He then referred to the demographics and asked if they had considered older people who are downsizing after the children grew up and moved out?

Ms. Greenberg said research has been done on the aging of the population and the desires to no longer keep up the house and yards, but still want the community benefits.

Mr. Sullivan noted the traffic challenges in Pleasanton and the region. Hacienda already has entitlements to build 1.8 million square feet of office space and that will add a lot of cars to the problem. Part of the issue is trying to get these cars out of the business park and onto the freeway. He asked how the transit-oriented development concept could help this situation and perhaps the traffic the city is currently struggling with.

Mr. Lee said most of the focus on transit-oriented development has been on the residential portion. He noted the four "Ds" – density, diversity of uses, design for pedestrian use and destinations. The key is that people would be at the edge of Pleasanton separated from the city by the business park and this would give many opportunities to work and shop in the area. For anyone headed west, they could use BART. The vehicle trip reduction of the residential units here would be lower than any other location in the valley. He believed it would help with the larger picture as well. He believed there would be more opportunities for transit to the east such as BART and continuation of the ACE train.

Mr. Sullivan felt on a short-term basis there could be some kind of bus going east if there is a critical mass to support it.

Mr. Lee noted he had never seen a BART station surrounded by nothing. There is a great opportunity in this area, not only for Hacienda employees, residents and users, but also for other transit in all directions.

Jerry Thorne asked how many students would be generated from this new development? Were the .34 students per household figure accurate?

Mr. Haskell said that was correct and that figure was provided by the School District.

Mr. Thorne asked if staff had reconciled the Land Use Element and the Housing Element in terms of the use and housing cap with regard to this project?

Mr. Iserson said this project is just one option to pursue in terms of meeting housing needs and the existing policies of the Housing Element in terms of rezoning thirty to forty acres in order to get about 800 more multiple family units. At the same time, one must keep in mind there is a housing cap and consideration must be given to the number of available sites left in the city, the number of units remaining to reach the housing cap and the best way to allocate those units. Discretion will be needed in determining where to locate the units, the type of units in terms of offering affordability and whether they could be placed on land not currently designated for residential uses. A major question will be how Council ultimately decides regarding the Staples Ranch proposal for an assisted living/residential care facility.

Cindy McGovern said she had talked to Mr. Paxson last week and had discussed the current entitlements for Hacienda as well as traffic issues. She asked if the TOD was in lieu of the current entitlements.

Mr. Haskell said no.

Ms. McGovern summarized that there would be an additional 1.8 million square feet of office space, 200,000 square feet of retail, 1,450-1,650 additional residential units on this site, so traffic will not be taken away, it will be increased.

Mr. Haskell said this proposal would most likely be pared down. The consultant team was present in order to answer questions and to see what options are available.

Ms. McGovern asked how many acres of land would have a land use designation change?

Mr. Haskell said there were five key sites, or about 55 acres.

Ms McGovern asked how many of those acres were within one-half mile of the BART station?

Mr. Haskell said that would have to be calculated. That is where the most intensive land use areas will be located.

Ms. McGovern referred to the housing cap and how many units are left. She believed it was 1,683 units.

Mr. Iseron clarified there were an additional 871 units that do not represent any existing plus approved development, but are currently designated on the existing General Plan as residential.

Ms. McGovern felt that what Hacienda was proposing is almost all of the remaining units.

Mr. Haskell said the word “proposing” was premature. The consultants’ assignment was to see what was the optimal transit-oriented development community. The 1,600 units would be ideal for the goals, but that is not the proposal at this stage. That number will definitely change as further review occurs.

Ms. McGovern asked what was the current level of service for the intersection at Owens and Gibraltar at the peak hour?

Mr. Iseron did not know at the moment. He said Owens and Hopyard is a problem intersection at this time, LOS D and projected to go to LOS E.

Ms. McGovern asked if the projection of LOS E included the 1.8 million additional square feet of office space?

Mr. Iseron said yes.

Ms. McGovern asked what the zoning was on the subject 55 acres?

Mr. Iseron said it was zoned business park, which is a broad designation that allows for a variety of office, research and development, and commercial uses. The 55 acres could include commercial uses. The reason a general plan amendment would be necessary would be to introduce the residential component.

Ms. McGovern asked if the construction in Dublin near the BART station was transit-oriented development?

Mr. Iseron said they were more transit-adjacent as opposed to transit-supportive, in that the connections and linkages do not qualify as a strict TOD.

Mr. Haskell concurred with Mr. Iseron.

Ms. Greenberg said throughout the Bay Area and the country there are examples of density without urban amenity. That is a regrettable combination. If the community welcomes density, it should be in such a way to attain amenities that people will enjoy and increase the value of the area. It is not just about quantity by any means. It should stimulate and support activities that people want and will enjoy.

Ms. McGovern did not want to create an island in the Hacienda Business Park. She wanted to see what it would offer to the community as a whole besides the economic stability it brings the community, which is great. She referred to the possibility of open space, green spaces, trails, etc. Any application should include that and possibly other community facilities.

Steve Brozosky indicated he had met with Mr. Paxson as well. He referred to the number of proposed units and asked what number was the critical mass? He noted the housing cap with 1,683 units available and there is Staples Ranch, potential development at the other BART Station, perhaps a couple of other things. If Council says it can only give 600 units, would the project work or not?

Mr. Haskell said that was a good question. To find the answer, other questions need to be asked, such as “is that the best way to create a transit supportive place?” If the unit count is so low, it may not make economic sense to build. The answer will vary depending on the criteria that is offered. The tough question is how does one characterize a minimum scenario and what is it? If it is a mixed-use community there has to be some balance. He referred to a recent TOD presented to the City of San Mateo that was proximate to the Hillsdale station and the Hayward Park station on the Caltrain corridor. It was a large project and will have a lasting impact on the City of San Mateo. The impacts of the Hacienda project are far reaching and this is a serious endeavor. There are regional implications to transit.

Mr. Brozosky asked if more infrastructure was necessary for water and sewer?

Mr. Haskell said the infrastructure already exists.

Mr. Brozosky felt if there is already infrastructure, then the costs of development would be reduced and he believed there were opportunities for fewer units or more inclusionary units and still make it economically feasible.

Mr. Paxson said the costs for infrastructure are still there in the form of bonds on the property. So it is not “free infrastructure”.

Mr. Brozosky believed that was being paid for by the entitlements for commercial, so any more entitlements added to the business park would give a lower cost to each unit.

Mr. Haskell said the number is tied to the value of the land and depended on what sort of tenant moved in with a new use on raw land.

Mr. Brozosky expressed concern about the impact on the schools. Based on the .34 students per household, he calculated there would be 500-600 students being generated from this development. Since there is no school site identified on the

Hacienda Business Park site for those students, does that impact other schools, or require changing boundaries?

Mr. Haskell said they did not know as yet.

Mr. Brozosky asked if there were other sites in the Bay Area that Council could go to in order to see what transit-oriented development really looks like with regard to density and style? It is hard to visualize from a drawing on paper.

Mr. Haskell said he would provide that information.

Mr. Brozosky noted the business owners would participate in this planning process and asked if the existing residents in Hacienda Business Park would have input on the proposed plan?

Mr. Haskell said there has been an effort to meet with property owners to get their input.

Mr. Paxson said the four Signature Properties projects and the Archstone Apartments complex are not formally members of the business park. They were deannexed from the business park, however there is still an affiliation with the Hacienda Business Park Owners Association. They are important neighbors in this process and are part of the outreach for this process.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the amount of retail space necessary and how much can actually be supported by the residential development. He believed there would be customers coming from outside the business park.

Mr. Haskell said that was correct, but a big part of the discussion is the number of employees in the park today.

Mr. Brozosky felt most retail could not be supported from a lunch crowd. He felt most stores needed to be open later and would need to draw customers from outside the park. He then asked how the data was found for the trip generation for the TOD. He felt there could be a survey of existing housing units to find out the commute destinations and numbers of vehicles.

Mr. Lee said most of the data was fairly accurate from the census but acknowledged there could be focused surveys of similar TODs or current residents to get a sense of travel patterns by mode or destination.

Mr. Brozosky referred to a presentation by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission that talked about TOD. The study indicated the maximum observed was 40% of the people used the public transportation near their homes, with the lowest being 5%.

Mr. Lee said the MTC survey was done about every ten years and asks about all trips from about 10,000 households. A new study is due to be out next month of all transit-oriented developments. The study Mr. Brozosky referred to dealt with apartment complexes and all apartments were within one-third mile of the station. It demonstrates in a suburban environment, one can see lower driving rates.

Mr. Brozosky asked if studies had been done to show whether it was better to have high density residential development near a BART station or was it better to have more businesses, so people could commute in and go to jobs?

Mr. Lee said his firm has done many of those studies for BART and other clients in Sacramento. Generally speaking, residential is better in suburban areas. It is different in downtown areas like San Francisco or Oakland. Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill are more transitional. Pleasant Hill has about 20% less drive alone traffic. By and large residential development is better near transit in suburban areas. Employment uses will occur with time as the area becomes more mixed.

Mr. Brozosky believed the major difference between Pleasant Hill and Pleasanton is that in Pleasant Hill people can go in more directions. Most people would go to jobs in San Francisco, while in Pleasanton the next big job center away from the Tri-Valley is in Silicon Valley. It seemed better to him to put high-density residential development by an ACE train station than by BART. He felt most transit-oriented development was not at the end of a line.

Mr. Lee agreed this is a different situation, but it does present an opportunity to enhance transit connections to the east.

Mr. Brozosky asked how much control Pleasanton had over development of the BART parcel?

Mr. Iserson said the city had discretionary approval over a housing development on that site. If it is a BART facility such as a station, parking structure, etc. then the city has no control. For the Stoneridge BART station, the city would have approval of any office or residential component.

Mr. Brozosky believed it would be necessary to build a multi-level parking structure in order to get more density near the station.

Mr. Iserson agreed.

Mr. Brozosky asked if there were demographic studies available of the population of those currently living in the residential areas of the business park, how many children, ages, commute destinations, etc.?

### **3. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

Patricia Belding, 7703 Highland Oaks Drive, Citizens for a Caring Community, thanked Mr. Paxson and Allison Brooks for their leadership on the innovative planning for Hacienda Business Park. She also recognized them for their mindfulness of the needs for affordable housing. She believed the proposal as presented is very interesting and she believed strongly in transit-oriented mixed use centers as the city matures. She noted her group has spoken to the Council about the need for about 800 low and very low-income housing units to meet its regional fair share housing obligations. The city has done well in providing moderate housing, but more focus is needed to provide the low and very low-income units provided in a mixed income setting such as the Promenade development and inclusionary zoning units in other developments. The proposal as presented uses up most of the remaining units in the housing cap. It would have inclusionary zoning but would not provide the necessary 800 low-income housing units and no units left over for planning in other parts of the city. One solution to this problem would be to raise the housing cap to provide for the required affordable housing in various parts of the city, but her group did not support that course of action. It would require an election that would amount to a vote on whether people wanted lower income people to live in Pleasanton. Another possibility is for Council to take action now to zone the 30-40 acres of property necessary for multi-family residential in various parts of the city. That could be done within the cap and the development of Hacienda could be considered later. She believed if the affordable problem were solved now separately from Hacienda's development, future plans for it could be considered more freely. She would be willing to raise the cap to provide work force housing in Hacienda. She thanked the consultants for this innovative proposal.

Howard Neely, 448 Amador, asked if new property were annexed to the city, is it locked into the existing housing cap? The housing cap was set on X amount of land and if the Staples Ranch is annexed, does that affect the housing cap?

Mr. Iseron said any land annexed to the city would be subject to the existing housing cap.

Bob Plemmons, 5721 Belleza Drive, said the residents in the Hacienda Business Park do not have a direct voting right for anything that happens there. However, the homeowners association contributes \$36,000 a year to Hacienda Business Park so he felt the residents should have some input on decisions made for the area. He referred to the proposed 1,450-1,650 residents and asked if they were in the five areas marked as mixed use areas on the map and not in the yellow areas indicated as residential? He noted the zoning has not been changed on those residential areas. He said in other meetings he has attended, it seemed Hacienda Business Park applications were blanket approval or denial, but not in line items as for other parts of the city. He suggested that when the proposal comes to Council for approval that each section is line-itemed so the whole package is not approved if residential is not desired in a particular area.

Mayor Hosterman stated that Mr. Plemmons may not have a voting right in Hacienda, but he certainly did when it came to the City Council.

Mr. Iseron clarified that no application was being approved at this meeting, which is why staff did not present the 115 conditions of approval usually attached to applications.

Judith Geiselman, 2602 Glen Isle Avenue, also appreciated the presentation and the comments of the Planning Commissioners and Councilmembers. If land currently used for BART parking is changed to residential development, it is critical for BART to provide other parking alternatives available before that land use is changed. She has changed her mind about using BART when no parking is available. She referred to Harbor Bay Isle in Alameda, which was a huge business park with residential units. As time went by, the land uses were changed. She noted the homeowners associations did have a good working relationship with the business community and suggested Pleasanton investigate that situation. She was not in favor of raising the housing cap, but did support affordable housing. No matter where construction occurs in Pleasanton, it will add traffic. It will be difficult to determine which will be the best way to increase the traffic the least. She would like to see transit-oriented development and noted she would use the retail businesses if they were of interest to her.

There were no other speakers.

#### **4. NEXT STEPS AND MATTERS INITIATED BY COUNCIL OR COMMISSION**

Brian Arkin noted Hacienda has 1.8 million square feet of entitlement and will be adding 200,000 square feet of retail. He asked if that retail came from the entitlement or was in addition to it? If Wal-Mart came from the entitlements, then other retail should be treated the same way.

Mr. Paxson said that would be reviewed. This is part of the input they wanted from the Commission and Council. They would look at different scenarios.

Mr. Arkin felt this was a great presentation and the project has a lot of potential. He wanted to see the next phase. Traffic is a concern. If houses are moved from other parts of the city to here, then traffic should be reduced in other parts of the city as well. He believed a mixed use was great for the Carr America facility because it is across from existing apartments as well as shopping at the Wal-Mart and other stores. There is housing shown on West Las Positas and he did not see how that would fit in the proposal, since it does not include mixed use. He felt this concept could be expanded to other properties. The PeopleSoft and Oracle campuses have parking lots next to proposed mixed uses, so perhaps there could be a parking structure built and the flat part used for other mixed uses. He noted the comment that there would not be shops that would detract from downtown and was uncertain how that could be controlled. He referred to the mixed use between the BART station and across Owens Drive and said he would like to see a wide pedestrian walkway over Owens that would tie the projects

together. He did not want pedestrians to walk across Owens. With regard to the housing cap, he felt there were actually 2,500 units left. His final concern was with the schools and he wanted the children in the area to go to one elementary school and not split among all the other schools in Pleasanton. This is an interesting project and he felt the consultants had done a great job so far.

Phil Blank said it was a terrific presentation and he was definitely in favor of this kind of transit-oriented development. He needed more data before moving forward. He wanted traffic information and more data on the mix of uses. He was in favor of moving forward conceptually, but it is necessary to be very careful to understand the mix and whether the data is transferable and where the risks are. He was interested in pursuing this and felt this was a great opportunity for the city.

Mary Roberts agreed with Mr. Blank and Mr. Arkin. She supported smart growth like transit-oriented development. She believed this area would be a separate entity from Pleasanton because a different kind of people would live here. Most people who move to Pleasanton do so because it is suburban with good schools and open space. This proposed development is very different. It would be good for Hacienda, but careful consideration needs to be given about how it would integrate with Pleasanton. When people drive children to schools, come downtown to eat, etc. it increases traffic. The circulation of the city is different than people just coming into Hacienda Business Park and then leaving. She said people don't necessarily get on BART and go to San Francisco. They tend to go in different directions through Pleasanton. She also felt consideration had to be given to all the high density mixed use development in Dublin, which would send traffic through Pleasanton. She agreed the proposal was good for further consideration, but wanted to keep in mind how it impacts the residents of Pleasanton and why people would move there.

Jennifer Pearce thought it was a good idea in theory and the presentation was excellent. She had many friends who would like to live in suburbia, but with an urban feel and transit-oriented environment. These people also have children and that would impact the traffic and the feel of a transit-oriented urban environment. She was interested in seeing the lower number of units to sustain the transit-oriented environment.

Mayor Hosterman reminded the public that the General Plan Update has been going on for about two years with most of the work being done by the Planning Commissioners. She thanked them for their efforts.

Steve Brozosky felt this was information gathering to see potential for the business park. There are concepts, but we are not here to make decisions on numbers of units or what is financially viable. There are opportunities for inclusionary housing and for low and very low-income units. He was not ready to talk about numbers at this time. There will be more workshops to talk about how many units are left to the housing cap and where they will go. Traffic would need to be reviewed again with regard to

mixed use and more models need to be run of the different mixes. This was a good presentation and provides much food for thought for the next workshops.

Cindy McGovern felt it was premature for her to discuss numbers of units for Hacienda Business Park. She wanted a meeting with the Planning staff to review the big picture of land use. She wanted to see what land may be annexed, how far the planning area extends, what land is not zoned for residential, etc. She was interested in whether there would be a density transfer from the southeast hills area to the Hacienda area. She needed to know if that would occur before making any decision on Hacienda. For the economic stability of the community, she wanted to leave the business park with as much retail, commercial and office. That would provide more sales tax for the city. She did not want to rush to build out and suggested lengthening the time to reach the building cap by setting aside a certain number of units to be used in the next General Plan Update in five to ten years. That way there would be units to encourage new people to move to Pleasanton as well as economic growth and Council could look at what had happened in the last five to ten years with traffic, operational expenses, economic stability, etc. She wanted a possible residential unit reserve. She also wanted a review of the growth management plan and the number of units approved for construction per year. She wanted to lower that number to stretch out the amount of time to reach build out of the community. She agreed the inclusionary ordinance should be increased to 25%-30%. Finally, she wanted to review the Housing Element and make certain it is in line with what is done in Hacienda or Staples.

Jerry Thorne believed the concept presented was smart planning. He was concerned about the numbers. If 1,650 units were allowed, it was critical whether or not to count the units on Staples Ranch. If they were counted, there would be 2,150 units compared to the 2,554 units left. He would like the plans to come back with less than 1,650 units and more in the middle or whatever is the lowest to make the project viable. He wanted to make certain retail in the park is not set up for failure. He believed if it were just there to service the business park residents, it would be difficult to be successful and would require customers from outside the park and that would impact the rest of the city. The hours of operation would have to be considered as well. He was also concerned about the impact on the schools and felt if children were sent to other schools throughout the city it would create more of a traffic problem than exists today. He also wanted a better understanding of the number of commuters and their destinations out of the business park.

Matt Sullivan said in general he was very supportive and excited about this concept. There are great opportunities for Pleasanton. This is an example of sustainable development and this type of project could help reach affordable housing goals. It is more environmentally responsible development. He noted decisions could not be made now about numbers of units, but needed to be considered over time as the rest of the land uses are reviewed in the city as well as transportation and circulation issues. He suggested two or three scenarios be presented for the TOD and see how it performs and how it affects traffic. He also wanted to review the affordability aspects of the housing. He wanted a better idea of what this development would look like and how

the streets would be laid out, hopefully with more narrow streets. He liked the point about density with amenities. He wanted to evaluate traffic effects and opportunities to help the city with its traffic problems. It is simplistic to say no more houses because they bring traffic. He hoped to see a way to quantify the sustainable or environmental benefits of this as opposed to big houses in the hills. Perhaps it would help understand density transfer. Economic benefit was of concern to him as well as it relates to retail and the synergies of people living near retail and office. School impacts also needed further review. Finally, he wanted to make certain there is community input. He supported development near the BART station and across from Wal-Mart, but there is concern about the development on West Las Positas area. He did not think that could be truly transit-oriented. He noted the Hacienda website included several studies that have been done for this project, including what the retail can support, traffic impacts, Dublin retail impact on this, etc.

Mayor Hosterman reiterated the information available on the website and encouraged members of the community to review that data. She acknowledged there are issues regarding the impact on schools. There are critical mass questions about the number of units necessary to make the project work. She listed other points raised, such as, locations for visiting similar developments, trip generation numbers, walking mall idea, BART parking, traffic issues, future entitlements for retail and office space, analysis of impact of transit-oriented development on the downtown, density transfers, housing element questions, sustainable future regarding housing goals, scenarios of what the project could look like, getting a measure of community acceptance as the project evolves, quantifying environmental benefits with regard to density transfers, understanding economic benefits, and providing opportunity for community input. She asked James Paxson if he understood the direction given at this meeting.

Mr. Paxson said he and the consultants had clear ideas of what was necessary to generate the next level of information. He said the URL for the website mentioned is [TOD@Hacienda.org](mailto:TOD@Hacienda.org) All the studies are posted on that site.

Mayor Hosterman thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and for the information presented.

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion, the joint workshop was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Abrahamson  
City Clerk