



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 19, 2004

To: Planning Commission
cc: City Council

From: Planning Department Staff

Subject: **General Plan Update Memo No. 1: Land Use Overview**

INTRODUCTION

There is no perfect road map for completing a comprehensive General Plan review process. The Planning Commission has taken a key step in completing the issues-gathering, community outreach process. Present-day issues have been identified. The existing, built, and operating land uses provide the foundation for what is here. Past City Councils have established a future vision reflected in the goals and policies of the existing General Plan. But the comprehensive review requires establishing a new vision and developing the goals, policies, and programs to achieve it.

The existing Pleasanton General Plan includes all the goals established with its adoption in the mid-1990's. The City Council has directed staff to undertake a General Plan "update." Pleasanton is approaching build-out of its residential areas (only three percent of total units remain unapproved). Significant commercial/office/industrial ("C/O/I") development remains, but only about 17 percent of that designation is unapproved. Absent wholesale changes in City goals, much of the City's direction, thus, has been fixed for the short- and mid-term future. Although the Council has left all of the General Plan open to review, the focus of the review is most likely to be on the remaining undeveloped areas. Because the Land Use Element is where all of the key goals find expression, it is typically the focus of any comprehensive general plan review.

A general plan is required to have internal consistency. This means that all of the policies of all of the elements of the general plan can be achieved at build-out of the plan. If achievement of one policy would preclude achievement of another, there is no internal consistency. The land use element is the key document where the full range of policies from throughout the general plan find expression, and it is here that the balancing of various policies is most visible.

When updating the Pleasanton General Plan, the Land Use Element – particularly the Land Use Map which allocates sites for the physical development of the community – is frequently adjusted in an iterative process to test the results for a wide array of policies. This process is driven by certain high-priority goals or policies which are first established; then other changes are made in reaction to them. The overall result is then reviewed and frequently adjusted again by either modifying the high-priority goals or other policies. There is no standard path for this process, and each General Plan update evolves its own path. However, the process requires a vision of the future end state where, in aggregate, the key, major goals are achieved. And it requires these priority goals be established early in the process.

Pleasanton exists as part of a large metropolitan area – the fourth largest in the country. While it is tempting to develop a parochial plan, isolated from the region, it is not feasible. Regional forces exert pressure on Pleasanton in many forms: economic, social, political, environmental. The region forms a backdrop for Pleasanton’s Plan, and the Pleasanton Plan should be viewed in this context. Demographic and social changes will come to Pleasanton. The economic engine of the region will impact the type, rate, and quality of new development as well as the uses of existing development. Having a realistic plan means recognizing regional, statewide, and nationwide trends. Having a successful plan means translating the future reality into innovative, guiding policies which bring the realities of growth and change in line with the vision of a future which accords with the City’s desires.

This memo touches on the present and future land use mix as established in the existing Plan, the external forces which will affect Pleasanton’s future, constraints affecting new development, and the specific land use issues raised during the public outreach process. It then provides an overview of the larger General Plan “building blocks,” focusing on the land use standards and policies which form the basis of the Land Use Element. This information is best used as background information for reviewing the more specific issues in the upcoming land use workshops. Because developing a new General Plan – even an update – is an iterative process with likely many policies vying for supremacy in establishing the basis for the ultimate plan, the information in this memo is unlikely to establish any initial direction. Rather, it is intended to provide a basis for reviewing the pieces as they are studied in future workshops and, ultimately, in providing direction toward creating the desired plan.

PLEASANTON LAND USE OVERVIEW

Existing Land Uses

The attached tables provide information on the existing mix of land uses. This present mix is the reality one experiences in all facets of the present life in Pleasanton. The mix of housing type determines, in part, the types of households here and their demographics, which, in turn, drives many social/political issues. Commercial/office/industrial uses determine not only the services available to and the economic vitality of the community, but they also are key drivers of traffic and associated issues. Existing parks determine in part whether a child’s team can practice this weekend, and other land uses have similar impacts. Together, they form the physical development basis for the quality of life currently experienced in Pleasanton and against which future scenarios can be compared.

Of particular note:

- The ratio of Single-Family to Multiple-Family units is 67:33, a relatively stable ratio over the past ten years. The percentage of multiple-family units reached a high of 36 percent in 1994 and is slowly receding as almost all multiple-family land is developed.
- While almost every type of housing is present in Pleasanton, medium density, detached, single-family homes predominate.
- Office uses are the largest constituent of commercial/office/industrial uses.
- Local jobs exceed resident workers, with Pleasanton being a net importer of workers (as was anticipated in the current General Plan).
- Both regional and local retail centers exist and serve most shopping needs. Lacking are some amusement-related businesses (theaters, bowling, skating, “night life” activities, and others), and some service/retail areas are lightly represented (home appliance, paint, boutique shopping, etc.).
- Heavy industry is almost gone from Pleasanton. The Hanson quarry is closed, industrial warehouse uses along Sunol Boulevard are changing, as are uses in Commerce Circle. Light industrial office-flex uses are still seeking space.
- The garbage transfer station needs more space.
- Parks have kept pace with growth generally, but usage has climbed with a demographic change toward more children and a social change to more organized sports at younger ages.
- Churches have difficulty finding suitable undeveloped sites at affordable prices; most small churches lease space in industrial areas.
- Other quasi-public/institutional uses (day care, health clinic, etc.) lack specific sites where they do not have to compete for land with other uses capable of paying more for land.
- While strides have been made toward permanently securing open space outside the Urban Growth Boundary Line, most designated open space is “unprotected,” privately-owned land.
- Trails have been opened along some arroyos, but most of the City’s Trails Master Plan is unbuilt.

Under Construction and Approved Land Uses

Tables I.a. and II.a. and Figures F-I and F-II show the currently approved land uses. These include projects with final City discretionary approval and/or projects with development agreements. They represent land uses which cannot be modified without the property owners' approval. These uses, together with the existing land uses, represent the starting point for looking at vacant and/or undeveloped land. The striking picture is that little land within the Urban Growth Boundary Line remains "undeveloped." With approved uses, the Single-Family : Multiple-Family ratio skews slightly in favor of single-family (to 68:32), office uses continue to predominate, and other uses remain stable.

Build-Out Land Uses

The figures shown in Tables II.b. and II.c. assume build-out of vacant land at General Plan-designated uses and mid-point intensities. The "final state" cumulative totals for land uses can be compared with the various existing policies in the General Plan to see where the City stands in relationship to its goals. Of special note:

- Only 871 housing units remain, almost all likely to be single-family units in low-density and rural-density areas. High-density-designated areas are limited to a few very small vacant in-fill sites. Table I.b. shows the sites with no entitlements; only ten sites have a potential project greater than 20 units at mid-point densities.
- The total housing stock reaches about 27,300 units, about 1,700 units below the 29,000-unit housing cap and well below the number called for in the Housing Element to achieve Pleasanton's regional housing need allocation (about 28,800 units).
- The current General Plan does not show locations for the approximately 30-40 acres of new High Density land specified in the Housing Element.
- At build-out, the mix of Single-Family : Multiple-Family would be 68:32.
- Within the Multiple-Family category, about 62 percent would be rental (counting the North Pleasanton condominiums which have always been rented as apartments).
- Significant new office/light industrial development is planned, with over 5.5 million square feet of planned future uses, beyond those existing and approved.
- The jobs-employed residents ratio would grow to about 2:1.
- Only sand and gravel-related uses are shown for a portion of the now-closed Hanson quarry facility.
- Neighborhood and community parkland shown in the General Plan when added to the net Bernal Property City lands would grow to 8.058 acres per 1,000 population due to the decrease in population and increase in park acreage.

- The only undeveloped Public & Institutional-designated land is near the civic center; quasi-public uses will have to locate on lands designated for other uses.
- No site is designated for a third high school facility, should the Pleasanton Unified School District (PUSD) add it to its master plan.
- The Urban Growth Boundary is unchanged. Is the time ripe for addressing the quarry lands, or parts of them?

FACTORS INFLUENCING LAND USE DECISIONS

The factors which influence ultimate land use decisions are many, complex, and intertwined. This section highlights some of the factors which may play large or small roles in affecting final land use decisions. Whether any of these factors has a key role or none at all is a function of the decision-makers' determination of the relative importance of that factor in light of all other factors influencing the direction of the General Plan.

Demographic Trends

Table III and Figures IV-V and VII-XII show general demographic facts and trends in Pleasanton. These include the following:

- Pleasanton continues to house primarily households headed by those in the 30-55 age bracket.
- School-age children have grown as a percentage of total population (from 21.3 percent to 23.2 percent), reflecting both the passing of the "baby bust" era and the baby boom "echo" of the early 1990's.
- PUSD demographic projections indicate a stabilizing elementary school-age enrollment even with growth while middle- and high school-age enrollments grow; the demographer anticipates high housing costs to cause a return to the pre-Silicon Valley boom era when such housing is available to move-up households, not young families.
- The elderly (over 64 years) population is creeping up both in numbers and as a percentage of total population (from 5.3 percent of the population in 1990 to 7.7 percent in 2000); however, the baby boom generation is still farther away from "elderly" status than the timeframe of this General Plan Update, and a dramatic increase is not anticipated during this period.
- Pleasanton continues to house relatively few young adults, and housing cost, relative unattractiveness of suburbia to this age group, and the absence of low-end for sale housing will likely continue this trend.

- Pleasanton is becoming more diverse ethnically, largely due to the representation of Asians within the population. (Asians grew from 5.6 percent of the population in 1990 to 11.7 percent in 2000.) This trend is likely continuing, and perhaps accelerating. Pleasanton has not seen a significant increase in Latinos, unlike the statewide trend.
- Household incomes are relatively high; disposable incomes are likely to remain high despite high housing and other costs of the Bay Area.
- Housing costs are relatively high as a percentage of household income. About 30 percent of owners pay more than 30 percent of household income for housing; 34 percent of renters pay over 30 percent of household income for housing.
- The number of poverty-level households as a percentage of total households was about 13 percent in 1999.
- Mobility is high and is likely to remain so; about 50 percent of Pleasanton’s population lived here less than five years at the time of the census. This fact accentuates demographic trends, as changes can happen relatively quickly. What happens at the State or national level may also not be reflected locally (e.g., while nationwide the population is aging, Pleasanton may not reflect this trend if large home equities entice the “young elderly” to relocate to lower-cost areas and the City’s attractiveness to younger families (excellent schools and youth programs) and a housing stock comprised primarily of three- to four-bedroom single-family detached units replace them with the “typical” household demographic.

Job/Economic Trends

The Bay Area economy (of which Pleasanton is a part) lost thousands of jobs in the early years of this new century, and Alameda County and Pleasanton, though not as hard-hit as some areas, lost jobs as well. Vacancies in the office, office/flex, and light industrial sectors reached ten percent in Pleasanton in 2002. Some new buildings have never been occupied. But Pleasanton has a diversified economy with many job sectors represented, and it has fared better than most cities.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) makes periodic projections of the growth in jobs within the Bay Area. (See the attached excerpts from its “Projections 2003”.) Its latest projections indicate a resumption of job growth throughout the region. It projects Pleasanton growing by 18,500 jobs through 2020. This job growth would absorb about 77 percent of the total employment which could be generated at build-out of all C/O/I lands.

Sub-Regional Changes

The Tri-Valley is quickly becoming a different place than it was when the last General Plan Update occurred. One tenet of the Land Use Element was that the location of Pleasanton’s business parks at the intersection of I-580 and I-680 was a prime advantage and that other Tri-Valley communities with less advantageous business locations would provide a significant

portion of the total housing needed for Pleasanton-based businesses. But other cities have established their own business parks and have planned for even more. Every Tri-Valley jurisdiction has an “excess” of jobs in its most recent plan. This fact has potentially significant effects for build-out of Pleasanton’s planned Commercial/Office/Industrial (C/O/I) expansion. It also has significant traffic impacts, although these impacts are complex in their relationship to Pleasanton traffic (e.g., if regional “gateways” are not expanded and all cities add net surplus jobs, the fixed amount of traffic coming through the gateways to fill these jobs will not grow but, rather, will be reduced at the downstream – Pleasanton – end as some exit the freeways to fill new jobs in adjoining cities.

Will the surplus of jobs lead to new traffic solutions to allow “imported” workers to the Tri-Valley to fill these jobs? Or will the surplus of land designated for these uses be prone to redesignation requests for market-driven uses in the short-term? Pleasanton’s existing plan proposes adding over nine million square feet of new C/O/I space on top of filling the vacancies in existing space. A key question for this review is whether the areas designated for these additional C/O/I uses are sufficiently well-located and economically situated to be developed while much of the Tri-Valley’s designated C/O/I lands in the aggregate will probably remain vacant for a long period of time.

Sand and gravel resources are of statewide concern. While the Hanson quarries have been exhausted, those of Vulcan and RMC LoneStar remain and have many years of life left. Most of the sand and gravel-related businesses which depend on a ready supply of raw materials are located in Pleasanton and relied heavily on the Hanson facility. Will these uses (Utility Vault, Kiewit, Pleasanton Ready Mix, asphalt batch plants, concrete recyclers, etc.) relocate? Are there sites available for relocation? It is in the best economic interest of the entire Bay Area to foster the quarries and their related businesses as they provide a key resource necessary for the continued health of the entire Bay Area economy. Nonetheless, these are basically resource extractive industries and are not sustainable. Are land use policies in place not only to protect and foster this resource, but also to use it wisely?

The Livermore airport sits along the northeast edge of the Pleasanton Planning Area. Although a “protection area” has been designated by the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission around the airport, there are continued noise complaints and safety concerns expressed by those affected by the airport’s flight paths. The airport is an increasingly valuable facility in attracting and keeping major businesses to the Tri-Valley. Yet, it continues to impact its neighbors negatively. Although regulation of the airport is not in Pleasanton’s purview, what happens at the airport is important for the possible uses within the East Pleasanton Area.

Open space and agriculture are of increased importance after the passage of Measure D established large-lot agriculture as the land use for most of the County-regulated lands surrounding Pleasanton on its westerly and southerly flanks. Studies are on-going for a number of activities as a result of this measure: water needed for high value agriculture, appropriate minimum lot sizes and uses, permanent open space acquisition opportunities. How these and others are handled directly affects those areas within Pleasanton’s Planning Area and indirectly affects the quality of life for all Tri-Valley residents. Pleasanton also is a part of the Altamont Landfill Open Space Committee which is charged with acquiring open space in fee or easement.

Careful attention to coordinating the General Plan open space policies to the new regulatory framework and funding opportunities will be necessary to ensure an integrated, functional program of open space retention.

Constraints to New Development

Future growth relies on the availability of infrastructure to support it; it also creates impacts which can have negative effects on the quality of life. This section briefly notes the constraints which should either be removed to accommodate growth or mitigated to allow new development to satisfactorily co-exist with the environment. Each of the “constraints” will be addressed later when their relevant General Plan policies are reviewed. This section is intended only to provide a “big picture” overview of the issues which are likely to come into play in reviewing land use alternatives at the macro-level.

Traffic

Regional traffic is a major issue as existing freeways are operating at unacceptable levels of service and are projected to become more congested. How new development of all types affect this issue will be a key part of the “Traffic/Circulation” portion of the General Plan Update. The direct correlation between new growth and traffic, however, makes this a key constraint when looking at land use alternatives. The existing General Plan, with its extensive planned C/O/I growth coupled with relatively few new residential units, relies on regional traffic systems for its future viability.

Local traffic is a major issue as well; it has local quality-of-life implications along major arterials as well as on local collector streets. Future land uses and the local street network selected to provide access to such uses are again directly linked. The “Traffic/Circulation” portion of the Update will be directly addressing these issues. Existing traffic has some congested areas, and the initial build-out model runs indicate it is not possible to achieve full land use build-out without significant new street network improvements. At the same time, concerns over the characteristics of traffic – speeds, unsafe maneuvers at signalized intersections, driver inattentiveness – have increased concerns over safety even in stable neighborhoods with stable traffic volumes. The concerns may translate into new policies which will affect future development patterns and intensities in an effort to achieve adequate quality of life in new areas as well as preserve or improve it in existing ones.

Complicating traffic issues is the interplay of the failing regional transportation systems on the local street infrastructure, generally expressed as cut-through traffic. As Pleasanton sits at the intersection of two major freeways, both of which are projected to suffer severe congestion, the option of using local streets for regional travel is prevalent. The options to stop such cut-through traffic also generally stop or impede local trips as well. Options to keep regional traffic on regional systems by improving flows are preferable but complicated and/or expensive. This issue is to be addressed fully in the “Traffic/Circulation” component of the Update, but it is important in reviewing land use to recognize its potential.

Water

Zone 7 has aggressively sought to expand its water entitlements for its service area, of which Pleasanton is a part. The future potable water supply is probably not a constraint in reaching build-out given current understandings of how the State Water Project (the source of most of Zone 7's supplies) will operate. However, there is currently insufficient water for both new urban growth and irrigated agriculture. Alternatives for using recycled water for far more uses than the present limited landscape irrigation are being studied. Water availability is likely to impact some of the options for the designated agriculture/open space areas on Pleasanton's southern and southeastern flanks. Options for recycling and/or storage impact the future use of the old quarries and the "Chain of Lakes" concept long planned for them. These quarries lie within Pleasanton's Planning Area and Sphere-of-Influence, and more detailed attention to their future use opportunities is timely.

Zone 7 plans include an aggressive improvement of water treatment facilities and extraction wells for drought and/or back-up emergency supplies. Many of these facilities will be located in Pleasanton and will have minor land use implications.

Sewer

With the completion of the expanded export pipeline and treatment plant expansions, sewage treatment is no longer an issue for Pleasanton. Possible recycling opportunities, including use of the Reverse Osmosis facility, will continue to dominate sewer discussions.

The present sludge treatment area off of Johnson Drive may be ripe for alternative land use review. Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD) has been studying options for its handling of sewage sludge, and options exist which could make this 119-acre site surplus. Alternative land uses could then be reviewed for it.

Energy

The recent energy crisis in California pointed out many of the vulnerabilities of the existing system. PG&E's emersion from bankruptcy and its completion of the 230KV transmission line to its Pleasanton substation have lessened this constraint, but long-term issues of provision of power on a timely basis and the sustainability of supplies remain. The Pleasanton Energy Committee is charged with drafting an Energy Element to the General Plan. In addressing land use alternatives, power does not appear to be a constraint per se; however, when reviewing land uses, attention should be given to the planned location of future overhead transmission lines and potential sites for locally-generated power.

Airport Protection Area

A small portion of the Planning Area in its northeast corner is subject to the land use regulations adopted by the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission. The basic restraint is to disallow any residential uses within that area. While not prohibited, the development of uses within this area which attract large numbers of people to a small area (major retail centers, sports parks) have been of concern to airport spokespeople. These restrictions and "concerns" should be considered when addressing future land uses in this undeveloped area.

Air Quality

As the Tri-Valley grows, it will be more difficult to meet the State and Federal ozone standards. While air quality is very much improved over that existing 30-35 years ago, the Tri-Valley is still the most difficult area in the Bay Area to achieve satisfactory air quality. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is required to adopt plans showing future compliance. Its plans so far do not include land use restrictions. However, it has urged “smart growth” land use policies which would reduce future growth in traffic (or reverse it) and reduce congestion.

Schools

The PUSD Master Plan is based on the present land use plan, topping out at around 27,500 population. The District’s Plan includes one new elementary school. It is studying options to house the projected high school enrollment which will exceed its Master Plan capacity limits for its two high schools. The District has an option on a 20-acre parcel of land on the former Busch Property which does not have a “Schools” General Plan designation.

Future residential land uses can differ in their impacts on school enrollment, varying from a low of zero for senior housing projects to as high as one student per unit for medium- and large-lot subdivisions. Apartments/condominiums can vary in their student generation rates based on the demographics of tenants the builder intends to attract. (While it is illegal in California to discriminate against children in housing, the design of a project – its amenities, bedroom mix, design, rent, and location in the community – can have a significant effect on the actual number of households with children who occupy it.) Commercial/Office/Industrial development has a lesser impact: current rules allow those who work here to enroll their children when space is available. The large worker population and the popularity of the PUSD makes it likely that schools will remain “full.”

The present demographic projections show all levels of schools to be close to “capacity” throughout the timeframe of this General Plan Update. Adding student-generating uses will have impacts on the District’s plans and should be closely coordinated.

Flooding

Recent projections of the potential 100-year flood event indicate that much more of Pleasanton could be at risk of flood damage. Zone 7 is actively studying options to minimize flood effects. Solutions could impact the quarry areas (for peak event detention/storage) or the Bernal Property’s Arroyo de la Laguna (widening to lower upstream surface water levels).

New development areas can easily be kept above future flood levels. Small and infill developments, however, are difficult to design to avoid incremental increases to peak flood flows due to runoff. This is a new regional mandate and will require creative solutions in those areas of Pleasanton slated for future development. Intensities of development may be impacted if on-site detention is required.

Growth Rate and Provision of Necessary Infrastructure

Pleasanton has long used its Growth Management Program and project-related conditions of approval to ensure that new development has had all the necessary infrastructure in place to ensure adverse impacts were avoided. Recently, both the school and traffic mitigations have not

operated as expected. There have been delays in building new elementary schools, the third middle school, and now finding a high school solution. The regional traffic and growth in Dublin on our northern border have impacted local streets/intersections in a manner not anticipated, and Pleasanton has not moved forward with street network improvements conditioned at the time of project approval for numerous reasons (West Las Positas Boulevard interchange: questions of desirability and cost increases; NPID-related intersection modifications at certain major street intersections: compromises to expand capacity lead to loss of street medians, may cause “downstream” impacts; Bernal bridges: delays in securing environmental permits; etc.) The extent to which new growth will pay for its impacts (present policy) and the extent to which physical solutions to some issues are desirable are key issues for future planning.

Fiscal Impacts

The existing General Plan was carefully reviewed for its fiscal sustainability: balancing expected long-term revenues with future costs to provide services with no reduction in the then-present service levels. City revenues are subject to influences beyond local growth and development as the State can modify the funding “rules.” And changes in anticipated City facilities impact future costs. The General Plan Update will include a new fiscal review as part of the overall process. In beginning to look at land use, however, it is helpful to recognize items which bring new costs as well as those with new revenues.

Since the last General Plan adoption, the City has added the large Bernal Property, with unknown future improvements to maintain and restored creeks to maintain as well. The current State fiscal crisis appears headed towards reducing City revenues, and there is much discussion about a “permanent” local government finance formula which may have other impacts on City revenues. The issue of future fiscal sustainability at current service levels is timely.

Although the details of fiscal “solutions” are unknown, the general characteristics of land uses on fiscal affairs is likely to remain fairly stable. Residential uses at the higher economic end of the spectrum and most commercial, office, and industrial uses contribute net surplus revenues over costs. Residential uses which bring service requirements (e.g., senior housing) are likely to be costly. New developments of all kinds have stronger surpluses than older projects (the Proposition 13 effect of lagging re-assessments), so new growth of all kinds tends to be “good” fiscally. Sales tax-generating uses (by today’s formulas) are beneficial; this includes business-to-business sales and sales of building components (sand and gravel-related businesses) as well as the more well-known retail sellers. Developments which “turn over” by resale are generally more beneficial than those that do not (speculative developments rather than owner-occupied buildings, for-sale housing rather than rentals). All of the above, however, must be viewed as tentative since the fiscal “rules” can change quickly. Pleasanton has never consciously applied “fiscal zoning” to its land use decisions, and, due to the uncertainties involved, it is not clear that a better fiscal end would result if it did. Instead, Pleasanton has planned its community based on what it has felt would be the most beneficial to the community as a whole. It has addressed special fiscal issues on a project-by-project basis (e.g., requiring private infrastructure where costs/risks have been high; requiring developer-provided services such as busing in senior projects; etc.). This method has worked well to date and is recommended by staff. However, knowing the components going into fiscal sustainability is helpful in developing initial land use

alternatives, recognizing that a complete fiscal analysis will accompany the formal General Plan review.

COMMUNITY-RAISED ISSUES

The community outreach process has been summarized in the “General Plan Update Issues Report” and the “General Plan Update Community Meetings Summary Report.” The major land use issues identified concern the housing cap and housing types, future quarry land uses, jobs-housing issues, and open space protection. Less often noted were ridgelands development issues, future evolution of North Pleasanton business parks, neighborhood protection against inappropriate new land uses, and garbage facility expansion. However, every land use issue should be viewed against the most commonly raised issue: traffic and circulation.

“LARGE” ISSUES FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CONTEMPLATION

Staff has identified the following issues which should ultimately be addressed. They are identified here to help the Planning Commission focus on the components of the current Land Use Element. The Commission, in reviewing the Land Use Element text and policies, should be asking whether these are still relevant and adequate, whether new concepts need to be addressed and included, and whether the land use alternatives it wishes to review fit within the existing policy framework or require significant modifications.

Staff anticipates the Commission will discuss at its first workshop not only the “big issues” it sees as needing to be addressed, but also trends it sees as leading to an ultimate land use solution. The following breakdown of the existing Land Use Element is an excellent way to begin this discussion.

1. Residential Land Uses

- a. Existing land designations will not allow the City to reach its 29,00-unit cap. Will additional land be designated for residential development to allow the 29,000-unit cap to be approached? If so, where?
[This will be the subject of its own workshop.]
- b. Are the definitions and policies surrounding density ranges, mid-points or ranges, and gross developable areas still viable?
[Discussion in the past included creating a very high density category with a “floor” and modifying the Medium Density mid-point downward. This has not been identified as an issue, and the limited remaining acreage to develop does not appear to warrant wholesale changes.]

2. Commercial/Office/Industrial Land Uses

- a. Prior projections of 28 million square feet are now 32 million square feet, with employees projected at 86,000 instead of 68,000. Are the undeveloped areas designated still viable?
[The East Side will be the subject of its own workshop.]
- b. Are the density ranges and mid-point satisfactory?
[The North Pleasanton intensification concept will likely require modifications here. This will be the subject of its own workshop.]

3. Community Facilities

- a. Given changing demographics and societal trends, are proposed City community facilities sufficient?
- b. Are school facilities adequately addressed?
[Query a third high school facility?]
- c. Are sites available for churches, day care facilities, health clinics, and other quasi-public/institutional uses?
[Query whether additional use-specific sites should be created?]
- d. Should an expanded or new location be sought for the garbage transfer station?
- e. Should specific site(s) be found for a cemetery?

4. Open Space

- a. Given changing demographics and societal trends, are proposed parks sufficient to meet future demands?
[Given the acquisition of the Bernal Property, are other designated sites still desired? For their original purposes?]
- b. Are all designated open space and agricultural lands still desired to be retained as open space? With acquisition of entitlements? Are additional areas desired to be accorded open space protection?
- c. What use(s) should be made of the “Sand and Gravel Harvesting” portion of the former Hanson quarry?

5. Urban Growth Boundary

- a. Are the boundaries still satisfactory?
[No requests have been made for adjustment. Note that a small portion of the Hanson quarry area lies outside the boundary and should be dealt with as part of an East Side plan.]

6. Areas of Special Interest

- a. Measure F continues to regulate the Ridgeland. Are any changes desired?
[Note that undeveloped areas westerly of Foothill Road are scheduled to be discussed at a future workshop.]
- b. The Happy Valley, Vineyard Avenue Corridor, Downtown, and Busch Property have all been comprehensively planned with adopted Specific Plans and/or PUDs. Are adjustments desired?
- c. Is the direction for future use of the quarry areas still desirable?
[Note that the East Side Area will be the subject of a future workshop.]

7. Specific Land Use Element Policy Issues

- a. Have sufficient lands been designated for commercial uses (Policies 4 and 5)?
 - Is there a need for an east side neighborhood shopping center, and should it be relocated from the failed, vacant site on Vineyard Avenue?
 - Should the General Plan address “big box” stores specifically? Only “big box” grocery stores?
[Note that build-out residential population can probably support one more neighborhood shopping center, unless full grocery service is added to WalMart. Also note that at least three existing neighborhood centers are considerably undersized by today’s standards in their anchor supermarkets, placing them in a potentially vulnerable spot.]
 - Are additional service commercial areas needed or desired?
- b. Should a mixed-use plan for the BART station area move forward (Policy 7), and, if so, at what intensity?
[Note: This will be the subject of its own workshop.]
- c. Should transit-oriented development be fostered near BART stations, along the ACE train corridor, or other areas (Policy 13)? Should other land use/transportation integration policies be strengthened in light of traffic issues?

8. Miscellaneous Element Policies with Land use Implications

- a. What combination of street circulation network and transportation policies can accommodate planned growth while maintaining acceptable levels of service given projected regional and local traffic volumes (Circulation Element – Policy 1).
[This is the subject of the “Traffic/Transportation” workshops and will be a continuing, integral aspect of land use planning.]

- b. Should the Rose Avenue extension continue to be planned for? (Circulation Element – Program 4.7)
[Without it, vacant lands at the end of Rose Avenue require the lowest allowable density for its range; with it, higher densities are feasible.]
- c. Query whether planned residential collector street volumes of 2,000 - 3,000 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) are too high, with densities to be reduced in order to achieve lower volumes? (Circulation Element – Program 6.5, Table III-1)
[Note that many collector streets have been designed in a manner which assumed higher volumes (e.g., Sycamore Creek Way: larger setbacks, extra-wide separated sidewalk areas, driveway turn-around capability; West Las Positas: parkway design; etc.). Should new or different standards apply equally to all such streets?]
- d. Query if, and where, the City should designate 30-40 acres of High Density Residential land to allow Regional Fair-Share Needs for total and affordable housing to be reached? (Housing Element – Program 19.1)
[Note that this will be the topic of the next workshop.]
- e. Query whether a second golf course open to the public remains a desirable land use? (Public Facilities Element – Program 14.1)

NEXT STEPS

This initial land use workshop is designed to raise issues of importance to the ultimate development of a new Land Use Element. It affords the Commissioners the early opportunity to raise and share their concerns and priorities with one another, with staff, and the community. No action is required or expected at this time.

The questions raised and the information presented in this report form a comprehensive backdrop for the upcoming workshops which address more specific topics. The second workshop is proposed to address options for additional housing as specified in the Housing Element, with other workshops to follow addressing other specific land use topics. Ultimately, the “big issues” outlined in this report will be resolved in the final consensus land use plan. Reaching that goal will require the Commissioners’ careful review of this and future workshop material, the sharing of issues and priorities with one another and the community, the exploration of alternative land use scenarios, and the balancing of multiple goals into one comprehensive plan.

Attachments:

1. Table I.a. – Approved Residential Projects in Pleasanton and Within Planning Area Boundary
2. Table I.b. – Residentially-Designated Parcels on 1996 Pleasanton General Plan Map With No Entitlements
3. Table I.c. – Summary of Commercial/Office/Industrial Building Area and Jobs
4. Table I.d. – Existing Dwelling Units by Type and Geographical Location Within the 1996 General Plan Planning Area
5. Table II.a. – Under Construction, Development Plan Approval, and Development Agreement Entitlements for Commercial/Office/Industrial Projects in Pleasanton
6. Table II.b. – Commercial/Office/Industrial-Designated Parcels on the 1996 Pleasanton General Plan Map With No Entitlements
7. Table II.c. – Summary of Commercial/Office/Industrial Building Area and Jobs
8. Table II .d. – Existing and Projected Ratios for Jobs/Housing and Jobs/Resident Workers
9. Figure I-A – Residential Developable Lot Map
10. Figure I-B – COI Developable Lot Map
11. Figure I-C – Composite of Residential and COI Developable Lot Map
12. Table III – Demographic Characteristics, 2000 Census
13. Figure II – Pleasanton – Age of Population, Census 1990 and 2000
14. Figure III – Pleasanton – Age as a Percentage of Population, Census 1990 and 2000
15. Figure IV – United States – Age as a Percentage of Population, Census 1990 and 2000
16. Figure V – Average Household Size, Pleasanton, 1980, 1990, and 2000
17. Figure VI – Pleasanton – Number of Hispanic People, Census 1990 and 2000
18. Figure VII –Pleasanton – Number of Hispanic People, Census 1980, 1990, and 2000
19. Figure VIII – Pleasanton – Population, Census 1980, 1990, and 2000
20. Figure IX –Pleasanton – Race, 1980, 1990, and 2000
21. Figure X – Pleasanton, Race as a Percentage of Total Population, Census 1990 and 2000
22. Table IV – PUSD-Generated Future Student Enrollments
23. Table V – Student Generation Rates
24. Excerpts from ABAG, Projections 2003: “Projections 2003: A Smart Growth Forecast” and Alameda County Subregional Study Area Forecasts