

**TO: Envision San José 2040  
Task Force**

**FROM: Andrew Crabtree**

**SUBJECT: May 17, 2010  
TASK FORCE MEETING**

**DATE: May 14, 2010**

---

This memorandum provides information to assist you in preparing for the May 17, 2010 Envision San José 2040 Task Force Meeting. Links to the referenced documents and other resource materials (e.g., reading materials and correspondence) are posted on the Envision website.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Summary of Community Input from May 15<sup>th</sup> Workshop**

Staff will provide the Task Force with a brief summary of the community input gathered at the May 15<sup>th</sup> Workshop.

### **Agenda Item 4 – Envision General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram**

The Task Force will continue their discussion of the proposed Land Use/Transportation Diagram concepts and designations. The primary outcome for this meeting is Task Force review and recommendations regarding a conceptual approach to the land use diagram for the General Plan Update, and a preliminary list of proposed land use designations. Based upon input received at this meeting, staff will finalize a Draft Land Use/Transportation Diagram for final consideration by the Task Force at the June 7<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting. In making a recommendation for the Draft Diagram, Task Force members should also consider the input provided from the Community Workshop and provide comprehensive and final recommendations for any desired additions or modifications so that the Draft Diagram can be completed for the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting will be conducted as a discussion by the entire Task Force and not in smaller table groups.

At the April 26<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting, staff recommended that the General Plan Update Land Use/Transportation Diagram be based upon the following key concepts:

- Use Generalized Land Use Designations
- Add Employment Land Capacity
- Designate Low Growth Areas
- Establish Fixed Urban Growth Boundary
- Renew or Retire Specific Plans

The Task Force generally indicated support for all five concepts; however, along with community members, also provided several recommendations on how best to implement the Preferred Land Use Scenario and reflect the Task Force and community Update goals through the Diagram. As discussed below, staff has prepared a revised version of the Land Use/Transportation Diagram and corresponding designations to address the following recommendations:

1. Add more residential designations with smaller ranges of allowable density, including one(s) to address projects developed within the 8-16 DU/AC or 12-25 DU/AC density ranges.
2. Reconsider the proposed maximum densities for high-density residential land use designations.
3. Reconsider the potential land use impacts of commercial uses within residential areas.
4. Identify appropriate sites for potential hospital development.
5. Identify trails and other transportation features on the Land Use/Transportation Diagram.
6. Identify park sites on the Land Use / Transportation Diagram.
7. Designate the County Fairgrounds site for park, open space or public use.
8. Reduce the allowable density in the University Neighborhoods South Campus area.
9. Include good opportunities for community input and Council consideration of project issues as part of the development review process.

#### 1) Number/Range of Residential Land Use Designations

Task Force members expressed general concern over the reduced number of proposed residential designations, specifically the lack of a Medium Density (8-16 DU/AC) or Medium High Density (12-25 DU/AC) residential designation. Because of their overlap, these two existing designations generally accommodate the same residential product types: duplexes, small-lot single-family units, court homes, and townhouses. The higher end of the Medium High Density (12-25 DU/AC) range also accommodates more dense townhouse and stacked-flat projects. The proposed designation, *Mixed Use Neighborhood (up to 30 DU/AC)*, is intended to be applied to residential areas which are already developed with a mix of product types and do not have a strongly defined neighborhood character based upon a consistent pattern of development. This designation could support all of these forms of development.

In recent years, the housing product types with densities that fall between 8 and 25 dwellings per acre have been used to implement higher-density infill development generally within existing neighborhoods, a strategy that is now counter to the Envision 2040 goals of targetting residential growth to limited areas. Specifically, the small-lot single-family and court home unit types do not generally align with the Envision goals in that they would yield too high a density if inserted into non-Growth Area residential neighborhoods, and result in too low a density if used within the Village and Corridor Growth Areas. Staff is recommending that the General Plan not support continued extensive future use of these product types at these density ranges, although they may be used within areas designated as *Mixed Use Neighborhood*.

Duplexes can be appropriate within a Residential Neighborhood setting, particularly one with an established mix of single-family and duplex development. Staff recommends that the *Residential Neighborhood (8 DU/AC)* designation support duplex development where appropriate. The General Plan text should include guidance as to when new duplexes are appropriate. The Zoning Ordinance can be used to more closely identify which specific properties are appropriate for duplex or single-family development.

Townhouse and stacked flat projects, appropriately designed, are potentially appropriate within Village areas as a transition between adjacent single-family uses and higher-density Village development and are also potentially appropriate within *Mixed Use Neighborhood* areas. In some cases, the *Mixed Use Neighborhood* designation is applied to areas adjacent to Villages and may provide for transitional intensification in support of the Village development. To better accommodate potential townhouse development, staff has revised the lower end “floor” of the density range in *Urban Residential 1 (25-95 DU/AC)* designation to 25 DU/AC.

With these changes and clarifications, the proposed residential designations address potential mid-range density residential forms (e.g., types of housing typically developed between 8 and 25 dwelling units per acre).

#### 2) Maximum Residential Densities

In response to both Task Force and community-expressed concern, staff has revised the proposed Land Use Designations to lower the maximum allowable density “ceiling” in the *Urban Residential 2(50-250 DU/AC)* designation from 350 DU/AC to 250 DU/AC. Also, staff has included an allowable range of building intensity in terms of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that would apply if mixed-use development is proposed, for example, a multi-story office building with a penthouse apartment on top.

#### 3) Commercial Uses within Residential Areas

As proposed, most of the City’s existing residential neighborhoods (non-Growth Areas) will have a low-density *Residential Neighborhood* or *Rural Neighborhood* designation that precludes significant commercial activity. Commercial uses in these areas would be limited to home occupation uses as are currently allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. Within *Mixed Use Residential* and *Mixed Use Commercial* areas, which include some older neighborhoods that already have or historically have had small neighborhood markets and other commercial uses mixed in with residential development, the General Plan will support commercial uses regulated through the Zoning Ordinance. Changes between residential and commercial use will typically require City Council approval of a rezoning request.

#### 4) Potential Hospital Sites

The development of new hospitals is proposed to be appropriate on sites with commercial designations (*Regional Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, Combined Industrial/Commercial*), sites with *Public/Quasi-Public* designations, sites with *Village* or *Corridor overlay* designations, and potentially on sites with residential or *Industrial Park* designations. In combination, these sites provide extensive opportunities for potential hospital development. Hospitals are not considered appropriate on sites with *Light Industrial* or *Heavy Industrial* designations..

#### 5) Trails / Transportation Features

The Task Force packet includes a new Transportation Diagram figure depicting designated trails, Grand Boulevards and Main Streets. This Diagram will be a component of the Land Use/Transportation Diagram, but is provided as a separate figure for enhanced readability.

#### 6) Park Sites

A “*Floating Park*” designation has been added to each of the Village and Corridor Growth Areas that support future residential development. The Task Force should recall that some village and corridor areas will be primarily employment-focused and not necessarily include new parks, although other

public spaces such as plazas may be appropriate. The identification and designation of specific park site acreages and locations would be included within the Village planning process.

#### 7) County Fairgrounds

Following the Task Force discussion, the current General Plan designations for the County Fairgrounds site are proposed to be maintained so that the majority of the site will be designated as *Public Parks, Open Space and Habitat*, while a smaller portion will remain with various employment designations. Recognizing that the site may at some point move from public to private ownership, staff recommends that the General Plan specify that if the site develops in the future, it should be developed with a mix of industrial and commercial employment uses, consistent with the job growth capacity identified for the County Fairgrounds site in the Preferred Land Use Scenario.

#### 8) University Neighborhoods

Following the Task Force discussion, staff has further studied the University Neighborhoods area south of the San Jose State campus in order to establish a more fine-grained set of land use designations with the goal of preserving groups of single-family, often historic homes, while also supporting existing commercial uses. Staff has identified additional sites for which a *Residential Neighborhood (up to 8 DU/AC) designation* would be appropriate. Staff is also recommending commercial or mixed-use designations for the existing commercial/retail uses located along San Salvador, East William and 4<sup>th</sup> Streets.

#### 9) Development Review Process

In response to a staff recommendation that use of the Discretionary Alternate Use Policy (DAUP) and Planned Development (PD) Zoning processes should be strictly limited, Task Force members expressed concern that reduced use of the Planned Development Zoning process would also reduce opportunities for community input. Because the PD Zoning process as used in recent years to create discrete areas of increased density in established residential areas would significantly undermine the potential achievement of Envision goals to carefully target growth, especially near transit, staff recommends that the Task Force explore alternative practices to engage community members in the development review process at an upcoming meeting and also that enhancing community engagement opportunities in the development review process be included within the Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Proposed Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions**

Staff will present proposed Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions for Land Use (Commercial, Industrial, Urban Agriculture, Downtown), Health Care and a first set of policies for Urban Design for discussion and recommendation by the Task Force. Forty-five minutes have been allotted for this discussion with the intent that the Task Force complete their discussion of Land Use and Health Care policies, and provide comments on the initial set of goals and policies for Urban Design. The Land Use and Urban Design policies build on the existing General Plan text to further support the Village and Corridors Growth Area concept and other concepts from the Draft Task Force Land Use/Transportation Guidelines. The drafted policies also more fully address potential mixed-use development and the increased flexibility to develop employment uses incorporated into the Land Use Diagram. The Task Force will be able to continue discussion on remaining Goals, Policies and Actions for Urban Design, including those to support the Downtown, at their June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The Health Care policies have been reviewed through a separate Hospital Stakeholders group and incorporate suggestions provided through that discussion.

### **Agenda Item 6 – Community Input**

Members of the community will be provided with an opportunity to address the Task Force and provide input on the Agenda discussion items.

### **Agenda Item 7 – Task Force Vote on Recommendations**

Following Community Input, the Task Force will be asked to propose and vote on a recommendation regarding the proposed Land Use/Transportation Diagram concepts and preliminary Land Use Designations and on each of the proposed Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions. Based upon these recommendations, additional detail will be developed by staff and brought to the June 7, 2010 Task Force meeting.

### **Reading / Resource Materials**

Reading and Resource materials for the Task Force are available on the Envision website, including:

- Hospital Stakeholders Meeting Synopsis (12-09-09).
- Hospital Stakeholders Meeting Synopsis (2-25-10).

### **Task Force Correspondence**

A letter has been submitted by Task Force member Shiloh Ballard on behalf of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group. The letter and an attached newspaper opinion piece address the Silicon Valley Leadership Group's recent "CEO Business Climate Survey" conclusions that housing availability is a significant impediment to doing business in Silicon Valley. Hard copies are included with the Task Force packet.

### **Public Correspondence**

Four items of public correspondence have been received. All items are posted online. Hard copies of two of the items were previously provided to the Task Force at the April 26, 2010 meeting. Hard copies of the other two are included with the packet materials for this meeting.

- A letter dated April 26, 2010 from the Committee for Green Foothills was received immediately prior to and distributed at the April 26, 2010 Task Force meeting. Because it was received too late to include with the packet materials for that meeting, it has been posted as part of the May 17 meeting packet items.
- Public correspondence from the Coalition for a Downtown Hospital with their recommendations for land use designations that are appropriate for hospital uses (A hard copy of this letter was distributed at the April 26, 2010 Task Force meeting.)

- A letter dated May 14, 2010 from The Health Trust providing comments regarding the Goals and Policies for Health Care, Quality Neighborhoods, Parks and Recreation and Urban Agriculture has been received. It is posted with the packet materials and a hard copy will be distributed.
- A letter from Marc Boyd regarding earthquake liquefaction zones is posted with the packet materials and will be distributed.

Any additional correspondence received before noon on the day of the meeting will be distributed in hard copy to Task Force members and the public.

### **Announcements**

An updated Task Force Work Program has been posted on the Envision website. The Work Program highlights topics scheduled for review by the Task Force in the coming 14 months in order to stay on track for a final presentation of a complete Draft Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update document and Environmental Impact Report to the City Council in June, 2011. To maintain the overall schedule, while allowing a break from Task Force meetings during July and August, an additional Task Force meeting has been scheduled for June 7, 2010.

A survey, similar to the one used a year ago, will be distributed to Task Force members at the meeting to give Task Force members an opportunity to provide feedback on the Envision process and the quality of staff work.

### **Next Meetings**

The next meeting is scheduled for next Monday, May 24, 2010. This meeting will focus on finalizing Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions for Transportation, including a discussion of Transportation Mode Split Goals, and Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions for Economic Development, Fiscal Stability and General Plan Implementation.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Susan Walton. I can be reached by phone at (408) 535-7893 or by email at: [andrew.crabtree@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:andrew.crabtree@sanjoseca.gov). Susan can be reached by phone at (408) 535-7847 or by email at: [susan.walton@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:susan.walton@sanjoseca.gov).

Andrew Crabtree  
Envision San José 2040