



**DRAFT**

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES REPORT**

**The City of Pleasanton  
Department of Planning and Community Development**

**August 28, 2003**





## **DRAFT GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES REPORT**

### **BACKGROUND**

The City of Pleasanton recently initiated a comprehensive General Plan Update process. The first step of the process started with the identification of community issues to be addressed. This is the first of a five-step effort to update the 1996 General Plan. The purpose of the following report is to present a composite list of the issues that were identified during Step I. This list will be the basis for proceeding with the resolution of issues and policy development steps of the planning process.

The following report is divided into four sections for the purpose of presenting the issues identified during Step I:

- Update Process
- Issues Identification Methodology
- Issues Questionnaire
- Update Issues List.

### **UPDATE PROCESS**

On April 15, 2003, the City Council directed staff to undertake a comprehensive update of the 1996 Pleasanton General Plan. The Council also adopted a Council/Planning Commission-based process for undertaking this important task. This process is intended to bring both historical perspective and expertise to all aspects of the General Plan. Existing City commissions and committees will be used to utilize the community-based structure already in existence. The Council and Planning Commission are charged with guiding the Update with collaborative input from the Economic Vitality Committee, along with the Housing, Parks and Recreation, Civic Arts, Human Services, Youth, and Library Commissions in their respective areas of responsibility. In addition, the recently formed Energy Committee will be developing a draft energy element for future integration into the updated General Plan.

The Council/Planning Commission-based process allows Council and Commission participation early in the planning process. A series of joint workshops between the two at key points are anticipated to provide a constructive feedback loop for narrowing alternatives and facilitating consensus solutions.

To achieve the high level of community-wide participation that has been characteristic of Pleasanton in the past, the Planning Commission will also incorporate a series of community meetings as a way of reaching out to the public. These are intended to engage the full spectrum of participants.

## **ISSUES IDENTIFICATION METHODOLOGY**

The identification of issues was initiated by staff through the preparation of a questionnaire to assist individual Councilmembers, commissioners, and committee members in identifying the issues to be preliminarily addressed during the Update process. Since most commissioners and committee members have been involved in community activities for a number of years, comments were requested on all elements of the Plan, not only for elements within the area of responsibility of the respective commission/committee members. The results relating specifically to each of these groups were then compiled and presented to each group at public meetings for discussion and additional input. The results of the Questionnaire, commission/committee meetings, and staff input were then compiled into the following report for final adoption by the Council.

## **ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Issues Questionnaire (Appendix) identified the eleven existing General Plan “elements” (Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Public Safety, Public Facilities, Conservation and Open Space, Noise, Air Quality, Community Character, Economic and Fiscal, and Subregional Planning) and the proposed Energy Element, along with a brief summary of topics that are covered in each. The objective of this format was to provide the participants with a comprehensive overview of the General Plan contents to trigger their thoughts regarding potential issues that they may wish to raise for future consideration. Not every issue is expected to be determined during this first step. As the Update process moves forward, there will be additional opportunities for new issues to be presented. The value of this first step, however, is to focus on the future work and then, as the process unfolds, to ensure that no issues are overlooked.

## UPDATE ISSUES LIST

The following is the list of community issues to be addressed during the upcoming General Plan Update. It represents a compilation of input received from the Issues Questionnaire, commission/committee public meetings, staff, and Planning Commission and City Council public meetings. Since input was received from a variety of sources, the various categories of sources are identified within the list as follows:

- Issues identified through the Questionnaire process are shown in standard font.
- Issues identified at the commission/committee meetings are shown in **bold standard font** with the name of the commission/committee that requested them shown in parenthesis. Inclusion of these items does not necessarily imply support from the group that identified them.
- Issues identified by staff are shown in *italicized font*.

## ISSUES

### Land Use Element

1. Re-evaluate the jobs/housing relationship in Pleasanton?
2. **Seek a job/housing relationship that improves the balance of jobs to housing? (Planning Commission)**
3. Re-evaluate the General Plan housing cap limit (now 29,000 dwellings)?
4. **Reserve capacity within the constraints of the Housing Cap to assure that Pleasanton's General Plan and State-mandated goals for the provision of very-low-income housing units can be attained before voter approval to exceed the Housing Cap is required? (Planning Commission)**
5. **Zone sufficient land for high-density residential use at densities adequate to meet Pleasanton's General Plan goals and the State mandate for very-low-income housing by June 2004? (Planning Commission)**
6. Increase residential build-out to the 1986 General Plan level?
7. Pull the Urban Growth Boundary line in to protect all undeveloped land west of Foothill Road and in southeast Pleasanton?
8. Address the residential growth and traffic commute patterns resulting from the City's Urban Growth Boundary, housing cap limits, and zoning of low-density housing?
9. Update Growth Management Program policy guidance?
10. Allow more annual housing in the Growth Management Program to meet the requirements of the updated Housing Element?
11. Better protect ridglands from housing development?
12. Complete an East Side Land Use Study (e.g., Staples Ranch, Hanson property, possible relocation of the Transfer Station, quarry site, Stoneridge Drive)?
13. Update policy guidance and land use designations for the Hacienda Business Park?

14. Add housing in Hacienda Business Park?
15. Re-develop portions Hacienda Business Park with mixed-use, transit-oriented uses?
16. Permit residential uses at various industrial and commercial sites?
17. Convert old office buildings to loft-like apartments?
18. Encourage housing re-use opportunities?
19. Permit higher residential densities along Stanley Boulevard and Old Stanley Boulevard?
20. Eliminate all future development west of Foothill Road/south of I-580?
21. Prohibit new land uses that would have adverse impacts on existing residential neighborhoods?
22. Implement public educational programs regarding “big picture” housing problems?
23. Locate housing near BART?
24. Provide greater protection against commercial and industrial encroachment into residential neighborhoods (i.e., communication towers)?
25. Re-consider the appropriateness of the Lund Ranch residential designation?
26. Establish open space preservation ratios for future development around the perimeter of the City?
27. Prohibit any expansion of existing land use intensities?
28. Reduce the parking number and size requirements for business parks?
29. Prohibit commercial development south of Bernal Avenue?
30. Update policy guidance for the West Pleasanton BART Station?
31. Expand upon the West Foothill Road Overlay District Design Guidelines?

32. Require that future General Plan updates, Specific Plans, and other major planning efforts are conducted by citizens' committees to ensure a "bottoms up" approach?
33. Blend all infill housing development with adjacent existing housing?
34. *Regulate large house size more carefully?*
35. *Review the land use designation of the land located between Pleasanton-Sunol Road and I-680 south of Happy Valley Road?*
36. *Update the Vineyard Corridor area land use designations to match the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan Map?*
37. *Undertake a land use study for all of the quarry lands area for implementation following the completion of quarry operations?*
38. *Undertake a land use study for the Lund Ranch II/Kottinger Hills area?*
39. *Work with the School District to determine if a site needs to be designated on the General Plan Map for a third high school?*
40. **Designate a new 20-acre site on the Hansen Aggregates property for relocation of the Pleasanton Garbage Service facility, with compatible neighboring land uses? (Planning Commission)**

## Circulation Element

1. Involve more community input regarding traffic pattern changes?
2. Better define and mitigate cut-through traffic?
3. Better mitigate freeway traffic impacts?
4. Reduce First Street traffic congestion?
5. Minimize the speed of traffic going through the Downtown?
6. Allow lower level-of-service standards for specific locations at specific times?
7. Include San Joaquin County (including Mountain House) traffic counts in the City Traffic Model?
8. Improve traffic safety around schools?
9. Delete the planned Stoneridge Drive extension?
10. Delete the planned West Las Positas/I-680 interchange?
11. Delete the planned El Charro Road extension to Stanley Boulevard?
12. Delete the planned Rose Avenue extension to Valley Avenue?
13. Expedite construction of the Happy Valley Bypass Road?
14. Connect Stoneridge Drive easterly and then southerly to Stanley Boulevard?
15. Place a higher priority on completing the planned arterial streets?
16. Encourage more freeway interchanges?
17. Better time the local traffic signals?
18. Increase green-light signal phases at traffic signals on streets leading to schools?
19. Increase traffic signal green-light phases in general?
20. Synchronize more traffic signals on arterial streets?

21. Better time traffic signals near schools during commute hours?
22. Re-evaluate the need for potential future traffic signal additions?
23. Reduce the unintended negative consequences of traffic metering?
24. Use off-freeway traffic metering to reduce cut-through traffic?
25. Encourage the expanded use of BART?
26. Encourage more parking at the BART station?
27. Expand the Transportation Systems Management Program?
28. Add more Wheels bus routes to schools?
29. Provide more youth education regarding the use of mass transit?
30. Re-evaluate the need for a Park-and-Ride lot at the Bernal Property?
31. Evaluate the potential for light rail and other transit along the Iron Horse Trail?
32. Explore the potential for a transit concept for the East Side area in conjunction with ACE and for light rail transit on the Iron Horse Trail?
33. Make early completion of the Iron Horse Trail a higher priority?
34. Add more pedestrian and bike trails leading to schools?
35. Encourage Zone 7 to pave its trails?
36. Improve bikeway and pedestrian safety?
37. Encourage more school carpooling?
38. Encourage bike-commuting opportunities and provide additional facilities to BART, business parks, Stoneridge Mall, Downtown, etc.?
39. Prohibit automobile sales on public streets?
40. Increase Downtown parking?

41. **Place a high priority on widening Highway 84 as soon as possible? (Economic Vitality Committee)**
42. *Modify on- and off-ramp configurations at the I-680/Bernal Avenue interchange?*
43. *Review the standards for acceptable traffic volumes on various classes of City streets?*
44. **Extend street access to serve the proposed Pleasanton Garbage Service site on the Hansen Aggregates property? (Planning Commission)**
45. **Provide superior access for very-low-income residents to transit, trails, community services, and retail areas in order to minimize traffic impacts and lower resident transportation costs? (Planning Commission)**

## Housing Element

1. **Do not update the Housing Element again at this time? (Housing Commission)**
2. **Update other elements of the General Plan consistent with the recently updated Housing Element? (Housing Commission)**
3. **Encourage Happy Valley residents who annex to develop second units as the local method of contributing to meeting the City's housing goals while preserving the semi-rural character of the area? (Planning Commission)**
4. Create more special-needs housing (including the developmentally and physically disabled)?
5. Minimize affordable housing?
6. Identify the range of affordable housing in other cities for comparison purposes?
7. Is smaller "start-up" housing needed?
8. Provide more small-lot/small-home development?
9. Promote "second units" by relaxing City design standards?
10. Spread affordable housing throughout the City?
11. Add more low-income senior housing?
12. Base future housing types on an income-to-affordability basis, with the remainder of housing units within the cap to consist of multi-family units and small-family homes on small lots?
13. **Give priority to the development of rental units for families of all incomes to minimize per-unit student generation impact on schools until the housing limit is attained? (Planning Commission)**
14. Is there adequate availability of land for housing needs at all income levels?
15. Provide more housing in various price ranges?
16. Provide more housing for young families and essential public service employees?

17. Ensure 15-percent low- and very-low-income housing at General Plan build-out?
18. Match housing affordability with income distribution in the City?
19. Provide more multi-family housing?
20. Rezone to create more housing opportunities?
21. **Meet the adopted Housing Element goals for very-low-income housing units in mixed-income developments through a variety of approaches, including the renovation of Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens, and zoning sufficient land for high-density residential development by June 2004? (Planning Commission)**
22. Target the remaining housing development specifically to meet the community needs, not the developer needs?
23. Include City-sponsored affordable housing in market-rate senior-housing developments?
24. Encourage affordable housing design techniques?
25. Encourage a wider variety of housing types?
26. Re-study the remaining infill housing sites?
27. Re-develop older homes in the City?
28. Work with the City of Dublin to plan affordable housing around the BART station?
29. Create more special-needs housing (including the developmentally and physically disabled)?
30. Is there adequate availability of land for housing needs at all income levels?
31. **Provide housing opportunities for at least 75 percent of Pleasanton's workforce earning 50 percent of the median income or below? (Planning Commission)**
32. **Provide at least 50 percent of Pleasanton's remaining housing units for all income levels in a high-density multi-family format that incorporates solar and other energy-efficient technology. (Planning Commission)**

## Public Safety Element

1. Provide more information about where hazardous materials are located?
2. Provide more direction about where to dispose of hazardous materials?
3. Update the General Plan hazardous materials storage policy guidance in regard to the current disaster-preparedness plan?
4. Provide greater public safety information outreach to the community?
5. Better clarify the five-minute emergency response time expectations?
6. Re-evaluate the potential for future housing development within the vicinity of earthquake fault lines and landslide areas?
7. Clarify Pleasanton's relationship to Homeland Security?
8. Further study and resolve flood control issues?
9. Police high school parking lots?
10. *Codify standards/assumptions for geotechnical studies?*
11. **Implement community policing programs designed specifically for mixed-income neighborhoods that include very-low-income housing units and accommodate the needs of seniors, families, and singles as appropriate? (Planning Commission)**

## Public Facilities Element

1. Determine if the types and locations of parks and recreation facilities are adequately identified?
2. Determine if any parks will no longer be needed now that the City owns the Bernal Property?
3. Expand the shared use of park and recreation facilities with the School District?
4. More carefully plan long-range funding options for park and recreation facilities?
5. Address long-range maintenance needs associated with open space conservation areas?
6. Update the Community Facilities Program in conjunction with the General Plan Update?
7. Integrate golf course policy guidance into the General Plan?
8. Determine if more multi-purpose parks are actually needed?
9. Develop a teen center as a highest priority?
- 10. Develop a second dog park? (Parks and Recreation Commission)**
11. Develop lacrosse fields beyond those currently planned?
12. Develop a BMX park?
13. Develop new in-line skate parks beyond those currently planned?
14. Develop a paint ball field? **(The Parks and Recreation Commission recommends the deletion of this item.)**
15. Add more restrooms in City parks?
16. Better accommodate youth recreational needs?
17. Place greater emphasis on implementing the Youth Master Plan?
- 18. Determine if sufficient arts facilities (performing arts, studios, galleries) exist in Pleasanton? (Civic Arts Commission)**

19. **Determine if sufficient arts programs (instructional, performing) exist in Pleasanton? (Civic Arts Commission)**
20. More clearly identify the types and locations of arts facilities?
21. **Determine if sufficient art works exist in the Downtown? (Civic Arts Commission)**
22. Determine if the City can expand the sharing of art facilities more with the School District?
23. More carefully plan long-range funding options for civic arts?
24. **Raise money for funding arts facilities and programs through donations received for naming facilities in honor of the donor? (Civic Arts Commission)**
25. **Update the Arts Facilities Study at this time? (Civic Arts Commission)**
26. **Bring all age groups together through art? (Civic Arts Commission)**
27. **Improve Library services for teens? (Library Commission)**
28. **Improve Library-related foreign language services for the community? (Library Commission)**
29. Place greater emphasis on implementing the Youth Master Plan?
30. Determine if Pleasanton actually needs a “landmark” civic center?
31. **Identify locations and support land use developments for human services resources? (Human Services Commission)**
32. Place greater emphasis on meeting the needs identified in the City’s Human Needs Assessment?
33. Develop long-range funding options and service alternatives to address human service needs?
34. **Eliminate barriers to encourage human services providers and special needs services? (Human Services Commission)**
35. Expand library facilities to meet the growing needs of the community?

36. More fully develop long-range Library funding options?
37. **Expand alternatives for Library services? (Library Commission)**
38. **Expand the Library to facilitate more support for and to be better utilized by the School District? (Library Commission)**
39. **Physically expand the Library in terms of floor area to accommodate improved community services? (Library Commission)**
40. **Improve public information communications with regard to the Library and other City services? (Library Commission)**
41. Determine if reverse-osmosis water for irrigation can be efficiently used?
42. Determine if the statewide water shortage affects Pleasanton?
43. Conserve more water in street medians?
44. Use recycled water for agricultural use?
45. Prohibit recycled water injection?
46. Improve the taste of Pleasanton water?
47. Improve Pleasanton water quality?
48. Work closely with Zone 7 to ensure that year-round water is kept flowing in the Arroyo del Valle?
49. **Provide more public information outreach, particularly through the schools, to encourage waste recycling? (Planning Commission)**
50. Improve planning for long-term school facility needs?
51. Tie school capital needs more closely to development?
52. Make the maximum school size and phasing objectives more stringent?
53. Size future public infrastructure to be as large as feasible?

### Conservation and Open Space Element

1. Ensure that future parks have a more natural character?
2. Develop more nature trails?
3. Develop a “river walk” trail from Main Street to Valley Avenue?
4. Add the Bernal Property open space concept to the General Plan?
5. Place greater emphasis on preserving the natural character of open space?
6. Preserve substantial acreage of non-park open space?
7. Preserve all ridgeline areas that surround Pleasanton?
8. Place greater emphasis on restoring and enhancing creeks?
9. Place greater emphasis on enhancing the Arroyo del Valle area north of the Fairgrounds?
10. Update the Sand and Gravel Harvesting provisions of the General Plan?
11. Place greater emphasis on historic preservation?
12. Place greater emphasis on adopting the historic preservation ordinance?
13. Encourage the reclamation of historically significant agricultural land?
14. Prohibit large areas of lawn in street medians, and commercial and residential developments?

## Noise Element

1. Support the development of sound barriers around the BART platform in order to reduce the impact of freeway noise on passengers?
2. Limit cumulative noise levels in all residential neighborhoods to 60 dBa Ldn?
3. Aggressively enforce noise emission standards for all vehicles?
4. Require rubberized asphalt street surfaces in all noise-impacted neighborhoods?
5. Undertake a comprehensive re-evaluation and update of General Plan noise policy guidance and implementation standards?
6. Support greater Livermore Airport noise mitigation?
7. Support greater freeway noise mitigation?
8. Support greater arterial street noise mitigation?
9. Reduce noise standards to permit more outdoor community and youth events?
10. Ensure that existing noise levels do not get any higher?

## Air Quality

1. Undertake a reduced pollen-producing plant species informational outreach program?
2. Strive to meet the most restrictive State and Federal air quality standards?
3. Better integrate the policy guidance of General Plan Land Use, Circulation, and Energy Elements with the Air Quality Element?
4. Develop local climate change strategies and programs?
5. Attempt to ensure that existing air quality conditions do not deteriorate below the current levels?

## Community Character Element

1. Develop a public thoroughfare landscape hierarchy concept?
2. Expand the City's efforts to replace street trees as they decline with age?
3. Expand City street tree programs?
4. Add a landscaped street tree median on St. Mary Street?
5. Add significant architectural features and landscaping to the Downtown street entries and entries to the City as a near-term priority?
6. Encourage street trees and other landscaping only to the extent that water and energy are available to serve them?
7. Place a greater emphasis on encouraging the use of native plant species?
8. Develop a program that addresses long-term character maintenance needs?
9. Add the community character policy provisions of the Bernal Property to the General Plan?
10. Temporarily landscape the Bernal Property?
11. Make greater efforts to retain the small-town historical character of Pleasanton?
12. Prohibit future land uses that are not consistent with the character of Pleasanton?
13. Strive to maintain a youth-friendly community through decisions relating to physical character?
14. Prohibit tall multi-story buildings in the future?
15. Develop a program for restoring and decorating bus stops?
16. Reduce the strict nature of the Heritage Tree Ordinance?
17. Expand Community Character Element Program 15.2 to recognize and preserve special design character neighborhoods?
18. **Encourage high-density housing that enhances the attractiveness of the streetscape and other publicly accessible areas through architectural detail, neighborhood and public gathering areas, gardens, and public art?  
(Planning Commission)**

## Economic and Fiscal Element

1. Encourage more businesses to come to Pleasanton and expand local employment and increase the tax base?
2. Promote local-serving employment, especially for the youth?
3. Establish a program of becoming fiscally self-reliant?
4. Re-evaluate the current status and effectiveness of development impact fees?
5. Limit the City debt ratio to five percent?
6. Develop a long-range plan to size City government to match the community needs at City build-out?
7. Specify a maximum percentage of the overall City budget to be allowed for City retirement plans?
8. Increase funding for youth projects?
9. **Ensure that the Economic Strategic Plan is consistent with the General Plan? (Economic Vitality Committee)**

### Subregional Planning Element

1. Expand the preservation of open space?
2. Expand the protection of scenic views?
3. Improve access to the north and south ends of the Pleasanton Ridglands Regional Park?
4. Stress the importance of developing trails as a transportation alternative?
5. Place more effort on reducing regional traffic congestion?
6. Pursue more regional traffic and transportation solutions?
7. Discontinue Congestion Management?
8. Request Pleasanton representation on the Livermore Airport Board?
9. Pursue better subregional public transportation systems?
10. Expand subregional efforts to ensure the provision of long-term water, sewer, and other infrastructure?
11. Place greater emphasis on developing regional affordable housing?
12. Increase City involvement in regional planning matters?
13. **Address the service gaps and shortcomings of the human services delivery system as identified in the Tri-Valley Human Services Needs Assessment? (Human Services Commission)**
14. **Work with the neighboring Tri-Valley communities to establish a Tri-Valley Planning Council to coordinate the planning of subregional planning matters? (Planning Commission)**

## Energy Element

1. Emphasize the conservation of electrical energy?
2. Emphasize renewable energy use by public and private entities?
3. Emphasize energy self-reliance?
4. Ensure that energy conservation is market-driven?
5. Limit energy conservation to site-specific regulations?
6. Better promote the “Green Building” program?
7. Provide energy conservation education?
8. Encourage the reduction of energy demand?
9. Develop citywide energy conservation policy guidance?
10. Utilize energy program funding options?
11. Create subregional energy conservation alliances?
12. Treat the conservation of all energy sources equally?
13. Ensure that citizens have the option of changing energy providers at their own discretion?
14. Develop the new Energy Element based upon the best practices and examples from other cities?
15. Incorporate generator-siting policy guidance into the new Energy Element?
16. Adopt LEED guidelines for residential development?
17. Establish a program of purchasing solar panels in bulk and passing the reduced costs on to the citizens?
18. **Develop a mechanical drive engine ordinance to establish noise limitations?  
(Planning Commission)**

Other

1. Develop new General Plan water and sustainability elements?
2. Better implement the “Patriot Act?”
3. Undertake the General Plan Update under the framework of environmental, economic, and social sustainability?

**APPENDIX**

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE**

## GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE

City staff has prepared the following questionnaire to help facilitate the identification of issues that the community would like to be addressed during the upcoming General Plan Update. The questionnaire references the eleven existing General Plan "elements" and the proposed Energy Element, along with a brief summary of topics that are typically covered in each. This format is intended to provide you with a comprehensive overview of General Plan matters to trigger your memory as to potential issues that you may wish to raise for consideration.

Please help us kick-off the Update process by completing the following questionnaire and returning it to me no later than May 15, 2003 in order to have the results included in a summary of issues report to be assembled by staff by the end of May. You can mail your completed questionnaire to:

Wayne Rasmussen, Principal Planner  
P.O. Box 520  
Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802

If you would like to complete this exercise on your computer, please email a request to do so to Maria L. Hoey of the Planning Department at [mhoey@ci.pleasanton.ca.us](mailto:mhoey@ci.pleasanton.ca.us), and she will forward the questionnaire electronically to you. In the event that you do not have a copy of the current General Plan and would like one, you may obtain a copy, free of charge, at the Planning Department located at 200 Old Bernal Avenue, or just contact Maria and she will mail one to you. If you should have any questions, please feel free to give me a call at:

Phone: (925) 931-5606  
Fax: (925) 931-5483  
Email: [wasmussen@ci.pleasanton.ca.us](mailto:wasmussen@ci.pleasanton.ca.us)

To complete the questionnaire, please identify any potential issues (concerns, problem areas, etc.) under the following General Plan subject headings that you feel should be addressed during the upcoming General Plan Update. For any other related issues that do not seem to fit under any of the twelve headings, please include your comments at the end of the questionnaire under "Other." If you need more writing space, just attach an additional sheet of paper(s).


1. Land Use (commercial, industrial, residential, and institutional development; jobs/housing balance; residential growth management; land use intensity; potential Land Use Map changes, neighborhoods and other land areas of special interest, citizen input on planning matters)
  
2. Circulation (local traffic, regional traffic, traffic management such as signals and intersections, traffic calming, cut-through traffic, BART, Park and Ride, Wheels bus service, transportation systems management, parking, trails)
  
3. Housing (type, density, size, condition, affordability, regional needs, special needs, vacant sites, constraints, opportunities)
  
4. Public Safety (geologic hazards, seismic hazards, flooding, hazardous materials, fire safety, police safety, emergency operations)
  
5. Public Facilities (water, waste water, solid waste, schools, library facilities, other community facilities, human services, recreation, arts)
  
6. Conservation and Open Space (wildlife, plant life, soils, ground water, sand and gravel, agriculture, open space, historic resources)
  
7. Noise (vehicular traffic, trains, BART, Livermore Airport, commercial activities, residential activities)

- 8. Air Quality (pollutant sources, sensitive receptors, specific pollutants)
  
- 9. Community Character (architecture, landscaping, street trees, City entries, sound walls, public buildings and grounds)
  
- 10. Economic and Fiscal (community economic condition, City fiscal condition, City financing at general Plan buildout, balanced budget)
  
- 11. Sub-Regional Planning in the Tri-Valley Area (transportation, water, waste water, water quality, open space, agriculture, visual resources, air quality, economic development)
  
- 12. Energy (gas; electric and solar energy; environmental impacts; public education on technology and programs; renewable energy; regulations)
  
- 13. Other

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Designation/Title: \_\_\_\_\_





## Planning Commission Staff Report

August 13, 2003  
Item 6.d.

- SUBJECT:** Preliminary Draft General Plan Update Issues Report
- PURPOSE:** To provide Planning Commission input regarding issues to be addressed during the General Plan Update process.
- ATTACHMENT:**
1. Update Planning Process Timeline
  2. Preliminary Draft General Plan Update Issues Report
  3. E-mail from Patricia Belding, dated August 3, 2003

---

### BACKGROUND

The purpose of the following report is to present the Preliminary Draft General Plan Update Issues Report and provide an additional opportunity for Commissioners to give input on potential issues to be addressed during the Update process. Not every issue is expected to be identified at this time, but, hopefully, a substantial overview of matters of importance to the community will evolve. As the Update process moves forward, there will also be further opportunities for new issues to be presented. The value of this first step, however, is to focus on the future work and then, as the process unfolds, to ensure that no issues are overlooked.

The Council/Planning Commission-based planning process for updating the General Plan calls for the identification issues to first be identified. This first step was initiated through the "General Plan Update Issues Questionnaire" last May. The Questionnaire was prepared by the Planning staff and distributed to the Council, various City commissions and committee members, and other staff members. The Questionnaire lists all of the General Plan elements along with a brief summary of each. Since most of the Questionnaire participants have been involved in community activities for a number of years, comments were requested on all elements of the Plan, not only for the individual areas of group responsibilities.

The Questionnaire was forwarded to all members of the:

- City Council
- Planning Commission
- Housing Commission
- Parks and Recreation Commission
- Civic Arts Commission
- Human Services Commission
- Youth Commission
- Library Commission
- Economic Vitality Committee
- Energy Committee

A good overall response to the Questionnaire was received. Individual meetings were then held by most of the above groups in June and July (except for meetings to be conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council) to converse and provide additional input relevant to the area of responsibility of each group. All input received through the Questionnaire and commission/committee meeting process are compiled in the Preliminary Draft General Plan Update Issues Report. Similar meetings have also been held by the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce and the Pleasanton Downtown Association (PDA). Response letters from the Chamber and PDA are expected in time for presentation at the August 28, 2003 City Council/Planning Commission workshop.

The next steps in the planning process call for the Planning Commission and City Council to finalize the Update Issues Report this month. This is scheduled to be followed by a series of neighborhood meetings in September and October and a town meeting(s) to receive public input on the community desires for resolving some of the issues. The Update Planning Process Timeline is attached for your information.

## **COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

In addition to suggesting issues to be addressed during the General Plan Update, several of the commissions/committees also had recommendations relating to the Update process that they wanted to pass along to the City Council and Planning Commission. These consisted of the following:

Economic Vitality Committee – The Committee recommended that the City utilize Internet systems to involve the community in the Update process and educate the community regarding the purpose of general plans by developing a web page on the City's web site (this has since been completed by staff).

Civic Arts Commission – The Commission recommended that the City utilize broad geographical areas of the City for conducting the upcoming neighborhood meetings, similar to those used for the 1996 General Plan Update (this idea is discussed later in this staff report).

Parks and Recreation Commission – Same as the Civic Arts Commission.

Housing Commission – The Commission recommended that the General Plan Update not include the recently adopted Housing Element. However, if any significant changes to the Element are to be considered, then the Commission would like to be included in the discussion.

## **PRELIMINARY DRAFT GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES REPORT**

The Preliminary Draft General Plan Update Issues Report (Attachment 2) presents all of the Update issues raised to date by the various City groups and staff. Each is listed under the title of the General Plan element to which it relates. Comments are coded so as to distinguish between those received by way of the: (1) Questionnaire, (2) commission/committee meetings, and (3) staff. As noted above, the list of issues to be addressed is expected to be flexible and remain open throughout the Update process. However, the combination of issues contained in the Preliminary Draft Report will make a solid base from which to begin the issues resolution phase (Step 2).

The Planning Commission is encouraged to carefully review and discuss the Preliminary Draft Report and add any additional issues that may have been overlooked. Staff will then include those in the Draft Report for the Commission and Council to review at the August 28, 2003 joint workshop. Following further discussion and potential modification at the workshop, the Council can adopt the formal Issues Report.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS**

While reviewing the various issues contained in the Preliminary Draft Issues Report, it would also be helpful for Commission members to be thinking about the upcoming General Plan neighborhood meetings and how to determine which areas to include. Two options for doing this were raised at the recent Council, commission, and committee meetings.

Option 1 calls for study areas to be defined as those neighborhoods of the City where the most substantial combination of unresolved planning issues are found to exist through the Questionnaire process, and/or areas where significant undeveloped land exists. Upon review of the various issues identified to date, staff feels that this option might consist of the following

areas: west of Foothill Road, north Pleasanton business park area, East Side area, and the Kottinger Hills/Lund Ranch II/Happy Valley area.

Option 2 is to create more geographically balanced and sized study areas similar to the approach taken during the 1996 General Plan Update. For example:

South Study Area – East of I-680, south of Bernal Avenue, and south of Vineyard Avenue.

West Study Area – West of I-680.

North Study Area – (clockwise) East of I-680, south of I-580, west of Santa Rita Road, north of West Las Positas Boulevard, east of Hopyard Road, and north of Stoneridge Drive.

East Study Area – North of the South Study Area, east of the West Study Area, and south of the North Study Area.

The primary difference between Options 1 and 2 is that Option 1 generally focuses on the details of planning for existing undeveloped sites, whereas Option 2 takes a broader-brush, comprehensive overview of planning impacts throughout much larger areas.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission take public comment on the Preliminary Draft Issues Report, discuss the various issues and add any further potential issues of importance.



**PRELIMINARY DRAFT GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ISSUES REPORT**

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Pleasanton recently initiated a comprehensive General Plan Update process. The first phase of the process started with the identification of community issues to be addressed. This is the first of a five-phase effort to update the 1996 Plan. The purpose of the following report is to present a composite list of the issues that were identified during Phase I. This list will be the basis for proceeding with the resolution of issues and policy development phases of the planning process.

The following report is divided into the four sections for the purpose of presenting the issues identified during Phase I:

- Update Process
- Issues Identification Methodology
- Issues Questionnaire
- Update Issues List.

**UPDATE PROCESS**

On April 15, 2003, the City Council directed staff to undertake a comprehensive update of the Pleasanton General Plan. The Council also adopted a Council/Planning Commission-based process for undertaking this important effort. This process is intended to bring both historical perspective and expertise to all aspects of the General Plan. Existing City commissions and committees will be used to utilize the community-based structure already in existence. The Council and Planning Commission are charged with guiding the Update with collaborative input from the Economic Vitality Committee, along with Parks and Recreation, Housing, Civic Arts, Human Services, Library, and Youth Commissions in their respective areas of responsibility. In addition, the recently formed Energy Committee will be developing a draft energy element for future integration into the updated General Plan.

The Council/Planning Commission-based process allows Council and Commission participation early in the review process. A series of joint workshops between the two at key points are anticipated to provide a constructive feedback loop for narrowing alternatives and facilitating consensus solutions.

To achieve the high level of community-wide participation that has been characteristic of Pleasanton in the past, the Planning Commission will incorporate citywide town meetings and neighborhood workshops as a way of reaching out to the public. These are intended to focus on particular issue areas and to engage the full spectrum of participants.

## ISSUES IDENTIFICATION METHODOLOGY

The identification of issues was initiated by staff with the preparation of the attached questionnaire to assist individual Councilmembers, commissioners, and committee members in identifying the kinds of issues to preliminarily be addressed during the Update process. Since most commissioners and committee members have been involved in community activities for a number of years, comments were requested on all elements of the Plan, not only for elements within the area of responsibility of the respective commission/committee members. The results relating specifically to each of these groups were then compiled and presented to each group at public meetings for discussion and additional input. The results of the Questionnaire, commission/committee meetings, and staff input were then compiled into the following report for final adoption by the Council.

## ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE

The Issues Questionnaire identified the eleven existing General Plan “elements” (Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Public Safety, Public Facilities, Conservation and Open Space, Noise, Air Quality, Community Character, Economic and Fiscal, and Subregional Planning) and the proposed Energy Element, along with a brief summary of topics that are covered in each. The objective of this format was to provide the participants with a comprehensive overview of the General Plan to trigger their thoughts regarding potential issues that they may wish to raise for consideration. Not every issue is expected to be determined during this first phase. As the Update process moves forward, there will be additional opportunities for new issues to be presented. The value of this first phase, however, is to focus on the future work and then, as the process unfolds, to ensure that no issues are overlooked.

## UPDATE ISSUES LIST

The following is the list of community issues to be addressed during the upcoming General Plan Update. It represents a compilation of input received from the Issues Questionnaire, commission/committee public meetings, staff, and Planning Commission and City Council public meetings. Since input was received from a variety of sources, the various categories of sources are identified within the list as follows:

- Issues identified through the Questionnaire process are shown in standard font.
- Issues identified at the commission/committee meetings are shown in **bold standard font** with the name of the group that requested them shown in parenthesis
- Issues identified by staff are shown in italicized font.

## ISSUES

### Land Use Element

1. Re-evaluate the jobs/housing relationship in Pleasanton?
2. Re-evaluate the General Plan housing cap limit (now 29,000 dwellings)?
3. Increase residential build-out to the 1986 General Plan level?
4. Pull the Urban Growth Boundary line in to protect all undeveloped land west of Foothill Road and in southeast Pleasanton?
5. Address the residential growth and traffic commute patterns resulting from the City's Urban Growth Boundary, housing cap limits, and zoning of low-density housing?
6. Update Growth Management Program policy guidance?
7. Allow more annual housing in the Growth Management Program to meet the requirements of the updated Housing Element?
8. Better protect ridgelines from housing development?
9. Complete an East Side Land Use Study (e.g., Staples Ranch, Hanson property, possible relocation of the Transfer Station, quarry site, Stoneridge Drive)?
10. Update policy guidance and land use designations for the Hacienda Business Park?
11. Add housing in Hacienda Business Park?
12. Re-develop portions Hacienda Business Park with mixed-use, transit-oriented uses?
13. Permit residential uses at various industrial and commercial sites?
14. Convert old office buildings to loft-like apartments?
15. Encourage housing re-use opportunities?
16. Permit higher residential densities along Stanley Boulevard and Old Stanley Boulevard?
17. Eliminate all future development west of Foothill Road/south of I-580?
18. Prohibit new land uses that would have adverse impacts on existing residential neighborhoods?

19. Implement public educational programs regarding “big picture” housing problems?
20. Locate housing near BART?
21. Provide greater protection against commercial and industrial encroachment into residential neighborhoods (i.e., communication towers)?
22. Re-consider the appropriateness of the Lund Ranch residential designation?
23. Establish open space preservation ratios for future development around the perimeter of the City?
24. Prohibit any expansion of existing land use intensities?
25. Reduce the parking number and size requirements for business parks?
26. Prohibit commercial development south of Bernal Avenue?
27. Update policy guidance for the West Pleasanton BART Station?
28. Expand upon the West Foothill Road Overlay District Design Guidelines?
29. Require that future General Plan updates, Specific Plans, and other major planning efforts are conducted by citizens’ committees to ensure a “bottoms up” approach?
30. Blend all infill housing development with adjacent existing housing?
31. *Regulate large house size more carefully?*
32. *Review the land use designation of the land located between Pleasanton-Sunol Road and I-680 south of Happy Valley Road?*
33. *Update the Vineyard Corridor area land use designations to match the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan Map?*
34. *Undertake a land use study for all of the quarry lands area for implementation following the completion of quarry operations?*
35. *Undertake a land use study for the Lund Ranch II/Kottinger Hills area?*
36. *Work with the School District to determine if a site needs to be designated on the General Plan Map for a third high school?*

## Circulation Element

1. Involve more community input regarding traffic pattern changes?
2. Better define and mitigate cut-through traffic?
3. Better mitigate freeway traffic impacts?
4. Reduce First Street traffic congestion?
5. Minimize the speed of traffic going through the Downtown?
6. Allow lower level-of-service standards for specific locations at specific times?
7. Include San Joaquin County (including Mountain House) traffic counts in the City Traffic Model?
8. Improve traffic safety around schools?
9. Delete the planned Stoneridge Drive extension?
10. Delete the planned West Las Positas/I-680 interchange?
11. Delete the planned El Charro Road extension to Stanley Boulevard?
12. Delete the planned Rose Avenue extension to Valley Avenue?
13. Expedite construction of the Happy Valley Bypass Road?
14. Connect Stoneridge Drive easterly and then southerly to Stanley Boulevard?
15. Place a higher priority on completing the planned arterial streets?
16. Encourage more freeway interchanges?
17. Better time the local traffic signals?
18. Increase green-light signal phases at traffic signals on streets leading to schools?
19. Increase traffic signal green-light phases in general?
20. Synchronize more traffic signals on arterial streets?
21. Better time traffic signals near schools during commute hours?
22. Re-evaluate the need for potential future traffic signal additions?

23. Reduce the unintended negative consequences of traffic metering?
24. Use off-freeway traffic metering to reduce cut-through traffic?
25. Encourage the expanded use of BART?
26. Encourage more parking at the BART station?
27. Expand the Transportation Systems Management Program?
28. Add more Wheels bus routes to schools?
29. Provide more youth education regarding the use of mass transit?
30. Re-evaluate the need for a Park-and-Ride lot at the Bernal Property?
31. Evaluate the potential for light rail and other transit along the Iron Horse Trail?
32. Explore the potential for a transit concept for the East Side area in conjunction with ACE and for light rail transit on the Iron Horse Trail?
33. Make early completion of the Iron Horse Trail a higher priority?
34. Add more pedestrian and bike trails leading to schools?
35. Encourage Zone 7 to pave its trails?
36. Improve bikeway and pedestrian safety?
37. Encourage more school carpooling?
38. Encourage bike-commuting opportunities and provide additional facilities to BART, business parks, Stoneridge Mall, Downtown, etc.?
39. Prohibit automobile sales on public streets?
40. Increase Downtown parking?
41. **Place a high priority on widening Highway 84 as soon as possible? (Economic Vitality Committee)**
42. *Modify on- and off-ramp configurations at the I-680/Bernal Avenue interchange?*
43. *Review the standards for acceptable traffic volumes on various classes of City streets?*

## Housing Element

1. **Do not update the Housing Element again at this time? (Housing Commission)**
2. **Update other elements of the General Plan consistent with the recently updated Housing Element? (Housing Commission)**
3. Create more special-needs housing (including the developmentally and physically disabled)?
4. Minimize affordable housing?
5. Identify the range of affordable housing in other cities for comparison purposes?
6. Is smaller “start-up” housing needed?
7. Provide more small-lot/small-home development?
8. Promote “second units” by relaxing City design standards?
9. Spread affordable housing throughout the City?
10. Add more low-income senior housing?
11. Base future housing types on an income-to-affordability basis, with the remainder of housing units within the cap to consist of multi-family units and small-family homes on small lots ?
12. Is there adequate availability of land for housing needs at all income levels?
13. Provide more housing in various price ranges?
14. Provide more housing for young families and essential public service employees?
15. Ensure 15-percent low- and very-low-income housing at General Plan build-out?
16. Match housing affordability with income distribution in the City?
17. Provide more multi-family housing?
18. Rezone to create more housing opportunities?
19. Target the remaining housing development specifically to meet the community needs, not the developer needs?

20. Include City-sponsored affordable housing in market-rate senior-housing developments?
21. Encourage affordable housing design techniques?
22. Encourage a wider variety of housing types?
23. Re-study the remaining infill housing sites?
24. Re-develop older homes in the City?
25. Work with the City of Dublin to plan affordable housing around the BART station?
26. Create more special-needs housing (including the developmentally and physically disabled)?
27. Is there adequate availability of land for housing needs at all income levels?

## Public Safety Element

1. Provide more information about where hazardous materials are located?
2. Provide more direction about where to dispose of hazardous materials?
3. Update the General Plan hazardous materials storage policy guidance in regard to the current disaster-preparedness plan?
4. Provide greater public safety information outreach to the community?
5. Better clarify the five-minute emergency response time expectations?
6. Re-evaluate the potential for future housing development within the vicinity of earthquake fault lines and landslide areas?
7. Clarify Pleasanton's relationship to Homeland Security?
8. Further study and resolve flood control issues?
9. Police high school parking lots?
10. *Codify standards/assumptions for geotechnical studies?*

## Public Facilities Element

1. Determine if the types and locations of parks and recreation facilities are adequately identified?
2. Determine if any parks will no longer be needed now that the City owns the Bernal Property?
3. Expand the shared use of park and recreation facilities with the School District?
4. More carefully plan long-range funding options for park and recreation facilities?
5. Address long-range maintenance needs associated with open space conservation areas?
6. Update the Community Facilities Program in conjunction with the General Plan Update?
7. Integrate golf course policy guidance into the General Plan?
8. Determine if more multi-purpose parks are actually needed?
9. Develop a teen center as a highest priority?
10. **Develop a second dog park? (Parks and Recreation Commission)**
11. Develop lacrosse fields beyond those currently planned?
12. Develop a BMX park?
13. Develop new in-line skate parks beyond those currently planned?
14. Develop a paint ball field? **(The Parks and Recreation Commission recommends the deletion of this item.)**
15. Add more restrooms in City parks?
16. Better accommodate youth recreational needs?
17. Place greater emphasis on implementing the Youth Master Plan?
18. **Determine if sufficient arts facilities (performing arts, studios, galleries) exist in Pleasanton? (Civic Arts Commission)**
19. **Determine if sufficient arts programs (instructional, performing) exist in Pleasanton? (Civic Arts Commission)**

20. More clearly identify the types and locations of arts facilities?
21. **Determine if sufficient art works exist in the Downtown? (Civic Arts Commission)**
22. Determine if the City can expand the sharing of art facilities more with the School District?
23. More carefully plan long-range funding options for civic arts?
24. **Raise money for funding arts facilities and programs through donations received for naming facilities in honor of the donor? (Civic Arts Commission)**
25. **Update the Arts Facilities Study at this time? (Civic Arts Commission)**
26. **Bring all age groups together through art? (Civic Arts Commission)**
27. **Improve Library services for teens? (Library Commission)**
28. **Improve Library-related foreign language services for the community? (Library Commission)**
29. Place greater emphasis on implementing the Youth Master Plan?
30. Determine if Pleasanton actually needs a "landmark" civic center?
31. **Identify locations and support land use developments for human services resources? (Human Services Commission)**
32. Place greater emphasis on meeting the needs identified in the City's Human Needs Assessment?
33. Develop long-range funding options and service alternatives to address human service needs?
34. **Eliminate barriers to encourage human services providers and special needs services? (Human Services Commission)**
35. Expand library facilities to meet the growing needs of the community?
36. More fully develop long-range Library funding options?
37. **Expand alternatives for Library services? (Library Commission)**
38. **Expand the Library to facilitate more support for and to be better utilized by the School District? (Library Commission)**

39. **Physically expand the Library in terms of floor area to accommodate improved community services? (Library Commission)**
40. **Improve public information communications with regard to the Library and other City services? (Library Commission)**
41. Determine if reverse-osmosis water for irrigation can be efficiently used?
42. Determine if the statewide water shortage affects Pleasanton?
43. Conserve more water in street medians?
44. Use recycled water for agricultural use?
45. Prohibit recycled water injection?
46. Improve the taste of Pleasanton water?
47. Improve Pleasanton water quality?
48. Work closely with Zone 7 to ensure that year-round water is kept flowing in the Arroyo del Valle?
49. Improve planning for long-term school facility needs?
50. Tie school capital needs more closely to development?
51. Make the maximum school size and phasing objectives more stringent?
52. Size future public infrastructure to be as large as feasible?

## Conservation and Open Space Element

1. Ensure that future parks have a more natural character?
2. Develop more nature trails?
3. Develop a "river walk" trail from Main Street to Valley Avenue?
4. Add the Bernal Property open space concept to the General Plan?
5. Place greater emphasis on preserving the natural character of open space?
6. Preserve substantial acreage of non-park open space?
7. Preserve all ridgeline areas that surround Pleasanton?
8. Place greater emphasis on restoring and enhancing creeks?
9. Place greater emphasis on enhancing the Arroyo del Valle area north of the Fairgrounds?
10. Update the Sand and Gravel Harvesting provisions of the General Plan?
11. Place greater emphasis on historic preservation?
12. Place greater emphasis on adopting the historic preservation ordinance?
13. Encourage the reclamation of historically significant agricultural land?
14. Prohibit large areas of lawn in street medians, and commercial and residential developments?

## Noise Element

1. Support the development of sound barriers around the BART platform in order to reduce the impact of freeway noise on passengers?
2. Limit cumulative noise levels in all residential neighborhoods to 60 dBa Ldn?
3. Aggressively enforce noise emission standards for all vehicles?
4. Require rubberized asphalt street surfaces in all noise-impacted neighborhoods?
5. Undertake a comprehensive re-evaluation and update of General Plan noise policy guidance and implementation standards?
6. Develop a mechanical drive engine ordinance to establish noise limitations?
7. Support greater Livermore Airport noise mitigation?
8. Support greater freeway noise mitigation?
9. Support greater arterial street noise mitigation?
10. Reduce noise standards to permit more outdoor community and youth events?
11. Ensure that existing noise levels do not get any higher?

## Air Quality

1. Undertake a reduced pollen-producing plant species informational outreach program?
2. Strive to meet the most restrictive State and Federal air quality standards?
3. Better integrate the policy guidance of General Plan Land Use, Circulation, and Energy Elements with the Air Quality Element?
4. Develop local climate change strategies and programs?
5. Attempt to ensure that existing air quality conditions do not deteriorate below the current levels?

## Community Character Element

1. Develop a public thoroughfare landscape hierarchy concept?
2. Expand the City's efforts to replace street trees as they decline with age?
3. Expand City street tree programs?
4. Add a landscaped street tree median on St. Mary Street?
5. Add significant architectural features and landscaping to the Downtown street entries and entries to the City as a near-term priority?
6. Encourage street trees and other landscaping only to the extent that water and energy are available to serve them?
7. Place a greater emphasis on encouraging the use of native plant species?
8. Develop a program that addresses long-term character maintenance needs?
9. Add the community character policy provisions of the Bernal Property to the General Plan?
10. Temporarily landscape the Bernal Property?
11. Make greater efforts to retain the small-town historical character of Pleasanton?
12. Prohibit future land uses that are not consistent with the character of Pleasanton?
13. Strive to maintain a youth-friendly community through decisions relating to physical character?
14. Prohibit tall multi-story buildings in the future?
15. Develop a program for restoring and decorating bus stops?
16. Reduce the strict nature of the Heritage Tree Ordinance?
17. Expand Community Character Element Program 15.2 to recognize and preserve special design character neighborhoods?

## Economic and Fiscal Element

1. Encourage more businesses to come to Pleasanton and expand local employment and increase the tax base?
2. Promote local-serving employment, especially for the youth?
3. Establish a program of becoming fiscally self-reliant?
4. Re-evaluate the current status and effectiveness of development impact fees?
5. Limit the City debt ratio to five percent?
6. Develop a long-range plan to size City government to match the community needs at City build-out?
7. Specify a maximum percentage of the overall City budget to be allowed for City retirement plans?
8. Increase funding for youth projects?
9. **Ensure that the Economic Strategic Plan is consistent with the General Plan?  
(Economic Vitality Committee)**

## Subregional Planning Element

1. Expand the preservation of open space?
2. Expand the protection of scenic views?
3. Improve access to the north and south ends of the Pleasanton Ridgeland Regional Park?
4. Stress the importance of developing trails as a transportation alternative?
5. Place more effort on reducing regional traffic congestion?
6. Pursue more regional traffic and transportation solutions?
7. Discontinue Congestion Management?
8. Request Pleasanton representation on the Livermore Airport Board?
9. Pursue better subregional public transportation systems?
10. Expand subregional efforts to ensure the provision of long-term water, sewer, and other infrastructure?
11. Place greater emphasis on developing regional affordable housing?
12. Increase City involvement in regional planning matters?
13. **Address the service gaps and shortcomings of the human services delivery system as identified in the Tri-Valley Human Services Needs Assessment? (Human Services Commission)**

## Energy Element

1. Emphasize the conservation of electrical energy?
2. Emphasize renewable energy use by public and private entities?
3. Emphasize energy self-reliance?
4. Ensure that energy conservation is market-driven?
5. Limit energy conservation to site-specific regulations?
6. Better promote the "Green Building" program?
7. Provide energy conservation education?
8. Encourage the reduction of energy demand?
9. Develop citywide energy conservation policy guidance?
10. Utilize energy program funding options?
11. Create subregional energy conservation alliances?
12. Treat the conservation of all energy sources equally?
13. Ensure that citizens have the option of changing energy providers at their own discretion?
14. Develop the new Energy Element based upon the best practices and examples from other cities?
15. Incorporate generator-siting policy guidance into the new Energy Element?
16. Adopt LEED guidelines for residential development?
17. Establish a program of purchasing solar panels in bulk and passing the reduced costs on to the citizens?

## Other

1. Develop new General Plan water and sustainability elements?
2. Better implement the "Patriot Act?"
3. Undertake the General Plan Update under the framework of environmental, economic, and social sustainability?



**ATTACHMENT - 3****Wayne Rasmussen**

---

**From:** Patricia Belding [pbelding1@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 03, 2003 9:33 PM  
**To:** Wayne Rasmussen  
**Cc:** James Paxson; Maurine Behrend; Don Thomas  
**Subject:** Citizens For A Caring Community Response To General Plan Questionaire

Dear Wayne:

Attached is Citizens For A Caring Community's response to the City's questionnaire on various General Plan issues, including housing. The questionnaire, as I understand it, is a key part of the process of updating the General Plan and involving the community. Our responses make clear the priority we think should be set on affordable housing for the low and very low income residents of Pleasanton, which will most likely be mixed income apartments.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this material. We hope the General Plan process will focus new attention on the importance of the need for this housing. Many thanks for all your work.

Patricia Belding  
Chairperson  
Citizens For A Caring Community

Patricia M. Belding  
7703 Highland Oaks Drive  
Pleasanton Ca 94588  
(925) 462-2152

CC: Kurt Wiest

## PLEASANTON GENERAL PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE

1. **Land Use (commercial, industrial, residential, and institutional development; jobs/housing balance; residential growth management; land use intensity; potential Land Use Map changes, neighborhoods and other land areas of special interest; citizen input on planning matters.**

**Generally:** Ensure that the Land Use Element is consistent with the goals of the Housing Element, and does not create barriers to the attainment of those goals. **Jobs/housing balance:** Seek a jobs/housing balance that improves the jobs/housing match through meeting Housing Element goals that remedy Pleasanton's identified and chronic deficit of very low income housing units. **Residential growth management:** Reserve capacity within the constraints of the Housing Cap to assure that Pleasanton's General Plan and State mandated goals for the provision of very low income housing units can be attained BEFORE voter approval to exceed the Housing Cap is required. **Land use intensity and potential Land Use Map changes:** Zone sufficient land for high density residential use at densities adequate to meet Pleasanton's General Plan goals and the State mandate for very low income housing by June, 2004.

2. **Circulation (local traffic, regional traffic, traffic management such as signals and intersections, traffic calming, cut-through traffic, BART, Park and Ride, Wheels bus service, transportation systems management, parking, trails)**

Housing for Pleasanton's very low income residents should provide superior access to transit, trails, community services, and retail in order to minimize traffic impacts and lower resident transportation costs.

3. **Housing (type, density, size, condition, affordability, regional needs, special needs, vacant sites, constraints, opportunities)**

Meet adopted Housing Element goals for very low income housing units in mixed income developments through a variety of approaches, including the renovation of Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens, and zoning sufficient land for high density residential development by June 2004. Achieving zoning goals will remove a significant barrier to the providing very low income housing units within mixed income developments, and will encourage the participation of non-profit housing providers.

4. **Public Safety (geologic hazards, seismic hazards, flooding, hazardous materials, fire safety, police safety, emergency operations)**

Implement community policing programs designed specifically for mixed income neighborhoods that include very low income housing units that accommodate the needs of seniors, families, and singles as appropriate. Encourage participation in neighborhood watch, neighborhood directories, block parties, and community/social services referrals.

5. **Public Facilities (water, waste water, solid waste, schools, library facilities, other community facilities, human services, recreation, arts)**

Give priority to the development of rental units for families of all incomes to minimize per unit student generation impact on schools until the housing limit is attained. Generally give priority to multi-family, residential development providing new, or located near existing community facilities to lower the per person impact on water and costs of providing community services.

**6. Conservation and Open Space (wildlife, plant life, soils, ground water, sand and gravel, agriculture, open space, historic resources)**

Of the housing units remaining under Pleasanton's Housing Cap, increase the percentage of high density housing units for all income levels provided in order to prevent sprawl and preserve the legal validity of Pleasanton's adopted housing limit.

**7. Noise (vehicular traffic, trains, BART, Livermore Airport, commercial activities, residential activities)**

See response to #2. Further encourage to provision of multifamily housing in order to minimize the per unit noise associated with landscape maintenance, air conditioning, and recreational activity.

Design high density housing to provide maximum privacy, and to minimize unit to unit noise impacts.

**8. Air Quality (pollutant sources, sensitive receptors, specific pollutants)**

See comments for #2.

**9. Community Character (architecture, landscaping, street trees, City entries, sound walls, public buildings and grounds)**

Encourage high density housing that enhances the attractiveness of the streetscape and other publicly accessible areas through architectural detail, neighborhood and public gathering areas, gardens, and public art.

**10. Economic and Fiscal (community economic condition, City fiscal condition, City financing at General Plan buildout, balanced budget)**

Provide housing opportunities for at least 75% of Pleasanton's workforce earning 50% of the median income or below.

**11. Sub-Regional Planning in the Tri-Valley Area (transportation, water, waste water, water quality, open space, agriculture, visual resources, air quality, economic development)**

**12. Energy (gas, electric and solar energy, environmental impacts, public education on technology and programs, renewable energy, regulations)**

Provide at least 50% of Pleasanton's remaining housing units for all income levels in a high density, multifamily format that incorporates solar, and other energy efficient technology.

**13. Other**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Designation/Title: \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHMENT - 4

**Michael Oliver and Associates**

local government consulting

August 7, 2003

Wayne Rasmussen  
City of Pleasanton Planning Department  
P. O. Box 520  
Pleasanton, CA 84566

Dear Mr. Rasmussen,

It was a pleasure to meet with you last week to discuss the City's revisions to the Pleasanton General Plan. As we reviewed, Pleasanton Garbage Service is currently located on approximately 7 acres on the south side of Busch Road east of the Kewitt property and west of the Hanson property. The activities currently conducted on the site include:

- A solid waste transfer station
- A recycling facility which processes residential and commercial solid waste
- A recycling buy-back center
- Associated storage for equipment, vehicles and related activities
- An office building which provides administrative support for the solid waste activities
- A truck repair and maintenance facility
- A tire sales and repair shop
- A portable sanitary services storage area

The activities on the existing 7 acre site have evolved over approximately 30 years and now require additional space to be conducted efficiently and to provide state of the art solid waste and recycling services to the City of Pleasanton. Pleasanton Garbage Service is currently in negotiations with the Hanson Aggregates property owners to acquire approximately 20 acres of that site located on the south easterly portion of the property—identified in the attached map as 'Area C' which is approximately 76.4 acres.

Although PGS recently added upgraded recycling equipment to the existing sort line and expanded the transfer station significantly, additional space will be required to achieve optimal, modern and cost-effective solid waste recycling, handling and transportation in the future. Pleasanton Garbage service plans to relocate all the activities listed above to

760 Tunbridge Road • Danville, CA 94526

tel 510-553-0535  
fax 510-635-8752  
e-mail OliverAssc@aol.com


the new site and has identified the following issues for the City to address as part of its General Plan process:

- Designation of approved activities in the Land Use Element for a solid waste transfer, recycling, buy-back and processing facility in the area indicated in the attached drawing.
- Designation of adequate traffic access for vehicles using the Site for solid waste transport, including truck route designations, geometry and access to both Busch Road and El Charro without restriction.
- Provision of adequate infrastructure for water, sewer, storm drainage as well as standard gas and electric utilities in the area of the Site.
- Provision of compatible land uses adjacent to the proposed site--and within a 'buffer' area restricted to uses not sensitive to noise, operations extending into the late night and early morning hours and the other impacts associated with the current activities on Busch Road.

Pleasanton Garbage Service looks forward to participating in the General Plan Process as it affects our current and future activities in the City of Pleasanton.

Additionally, PGS would appreciate your placing us on your Planning Commission Agenda mailing list at the above address or by e-mail at [OliverAsse@aol.com](mailto:OliverAsse@aol.com). Thank you for your assistance and feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Michael Oliver

Cc: Robert Molinaro, Pleasanton Garbage Service  
Nelson Fiahlo, Deputy City Manager

