



**Task Force Meeting No. 48 Synopsis
February 28, 2011**

Task Force Members Present*:

Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Brian Darrow, Dave Fadness, Leslee Hamilton, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Matt Kamkar, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Shirley Lewis, Linda LeZotte, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Judy Stabile, Alofa Talivaa, Jim Zito.

Task Force Members Absent:

Jackie Adams, Harvey Darnell, Enrique Fernandez, Sam Ho, Nancy Ianni, Neil Struthers, Michael Van Every.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Dipa Chundur (PBCE), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Wayne Chen (Housing).

Public Present*:

Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Wendy Lao (De Anza WCT), Julie Philips (De Anza College), Trixie Johnson (LWV/SJ-SC), Alexis Shields (SJSU), Joyce Benavides (De Anza College Environmental Studies), Larry Ames (SJ Neighborhood Commission), Terry Christensen (Comm. University SJSU), Roz Dean (Coalition for a Downtown Hospital), Nasim Bolandpaivez, Maria Arnold (NCDZ, LWVSJSC), John Urban (Newhall Neighborhood), Helen Chapman (SHPNA), Steve Kline (Burbank DelMonte NAC), Pat Colombe, Jean Dresden, Mathew Bright (Newhall NA), Susan Marsland (District 1, SJSU Grad Student), Neela Srinivasan (Wildlife Corridor Technician Team, De Anza College).

*As verified by registering attendance on Sign-In Sheets.

1. Welcome

The meeting was convened at 6:34 p.m.

2. Review and approval of December 13, 2010 synopsis

The December 13th synopsis was approved.

3. Report on Council Actions to Define Scope of Envision General Plan Update

Andrew Crabtree summarized the recent Council actions and mentioned that the list of all the pending Envision Requests and General Plan Amendments were provided in the December 2010 Task Force packet. He explained that the changes to the Envision project description were represented as Scenario 7 (revised from Scenario 6) and that these changes were based on input received from the Task Force charrette exercise in November 2010 that additional job capacity should be included in villages, and the need to balance overall job capacity currently allocated in the Alviso area (with no changes to the land use diagram). He further explained the redistribution of land use on specific sites such as i-Star, Rancho Del Pueblo, and Alum Rock Area for the environmental analysis. He mentioned that out of the 14 requests for different Envision land use designations, the Council has provided direction on six, and that the remaining 8 will be taken for Council consideration likely in April.

One of the Task Force members expressed that it would be very difficult to replace the Rancho Del Pueblo Golf Course if it were to be sold, especially when there is a need for such large open spaces for the community. The member expressed concern regarding how the City preserves open spaces. The co-chair clarified that the City Council has not changed the land use designation for the Rancho Del Pueblo Golf Course from Private Open Space, and has not determined that the property should be sold, but has only directed staff to include it in the Envision environmental analysis.

Another member asked staff if these changes were in line with the Five Wounds community plans and pointed out that this community has limited available open space. Staff responded that the Envision Village boundaries on the Draft Envision land use/transporation diagram were modified to align with the Five Wounds concept plan and that the concept plan would be brought back as a Village example for Task Force discussion. Several of the Task Force members expressed the need to retain Rancho Del Pueblo golf course as open space for the community. A Task Force member expressed concern about even studying the possible conversion of Rancho Del Pueblo to housing that would potentially take away potential unit capacity from along the Alum Rock BRT corridor and around the future Five Wounds BART station.

One of the Task Force members raised concern that an increase in jobs on Village VR10 might preclude land from being available for an improved freeway interchange at Hwy 87 and Capitol Expressway. Joe Horwedel stated that Planning staff would review the village boundary with Department of Transportation staff to make sure it does not conflict with development of future interchange improvements.

4. Uses and Development Intensities on Open Hillside Lands

John Baty explained the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), the existing 2020 land use designations, and how these various designations outside the UGB were consolidated in the Draft Envision Plan. He mentioned that following the City Council direction, the Task Force now has an opportunity to discuss the proposed land use designations outside the UGB and consider any modifications. Also he mentioned that the Council had directed staff to look into the County's general plan land use designations on the hillsides. He further explained the *Agriculture* and *Open Hillside* designations proposed for the Draft Envision Diagram and mentioned that the *Open Hillside* designation will replace the 9 existing designations outside the City's UGB with language that will cover a range of uses. Andrew Crabtree clarified that the proposed *Open Hillside* designation could include a cemetery.

John Baty mentioned that the proposed *Open Hillside* designation is based on the County's and the City's General Plan goals and he concluded by asking the Task Force to focus the *Open Hillside* designation discussion on topics/issues such as definition, character, landscape elements, and style.

One of the members suggested that 90% of a site should be retained as open space with development clustered on the remaining area. Another member asked if these regulations can control development. Staff responded that the regulations have generally been effective so far and explained that first, it is important to consider the proposed square footage of the use; second, the amount of proposed urbanization; and third, how much wildlife and habitat would be affected through grading and site preparation.

One of the Task Force members mentioned that golf courses can change landscape, percolation, and other site aspects, and that these uses are already located within the UGB, so not sure why we want to locate them outside the UGB. The member continued by stating that if we do want to allow these types of uses, then they should make up a very small percentage of the area outside the UGB and should not affect creeks, streams, and wildlife.

Some of the members expressed that this topic is pretty significant and that it's important to first understand what the extent of the impact would be. Other members wanted clarification on what particular aspects the Task Force should be discussing.

Another member mentioned that it is important to establish the thresholds or guidelines upfront, and to fill in the blank 'xxx' in the draft policies such as on Pages 3 and 5, and suggested 160 acres in the first and 50% open space in the second. One member mentioned that vineyards could be an appropriate use since they are typically open space, but that there should be specific rules such as requiring very large parcel size.

Another Task Force member mentioned that the Council has already given direction on these issues on January 25, so the Task Force should just review and comment on the topic. The member also mentioned that only a limited number of uses should be allowed outside the UGB and that the types of use that we are looking at are more urban and long range. Another member responded that if the UGB is permanent, then the goal of the UGB is to define a growth limit. Another member asked if these issues can be resolved with including low numbers and or percentages for amount of development. Staff responded that it is critical to have limitations on the FAR, and to have a clear definition of what it means to be an "open space."

There were several suggestions from members, such as: using the term 'employment uses' since it is not in the Council memo; that ancillary surfaces should have a percentage-of-site limit, that the percentage limit on page 3 should be higher than 50%, and for policy 17.3 (e) a rate of between 3 - 7 %; residential development; that resort should be deleted from the draft policy as a possible use; and that discussion on the 15 % slope line should be included here. Staff responded that this designation of *Open Hillside* will be applied above the 15 % slope line. To staff's comment, one member was concerned that these uses would be highly visible since they are above the 15% slope line. Another member responded that it is important to give some value to the lands that people own, even those outside the UGB.

5. Growth Phasing Alternatives

Joe Horwedel explained the proposed policies regarding villages, and their phasing/horizons in relation to where growth would occur according to the Draft Envision plan. He explained how long a horizon might take to be activated and asked the Task Force to consider if there should be flexibility built into allowing development contained in these horizons, given that there are 5 horizons and it might take a long time to get to the last one.

A few Task Force members asked under what circumstances projects could be stopped; and if exceptions can be applied for non-residential projects since they pay taxes, and if there are any laws prohibiting such triggers. Staff responded that we have to have a Plan that can meet the RHNA allocation numbers..

One of the members suggested that the number of residential units should be tied to the jobs provided; and expressed concern that the Envision job goal could be too high to achieve. Another

member asked if there were plans to prioritize development areas so that we can prevent conversions of commercial areas to residential as has occurred in Evergreen.

One Task Force member expressed that the spotlight had shifted away from the downtown because of Valley Fair and Santana Row, so with this Envision Plan it is important to keep the horizons, but possibly include one option to use timeframes instead of numbers of units and locations to help phase the growth. One member expressed that restricting development in main development areas can be a deterrent to investments. Another member responded that there are people who want to invest but they are not really part of this discussion. The member also mentioned that the rules are not clear especially for transferring units from one village area to another.

One of the members responded that while jobs can be built anywhere anytime, it's the residential component that has constraints. The member suggested that one option would be to identify areas within Horizon 1 and then provide alternatives to allow development in other areas using criteria. Another member mentioned that according to the fiscal study the housing should be near retail sites, so the location is important to create a fiscally-sustainable city.

One Task Force member suggested that the horizons/phases should be reduced to three because it is unlikely that we can really build out all this housing and we would not get to horizon 5. The member stated it's important just to plan, meaning just to direct growth in an orderly fashion, keeping it simple and straightforward. The member further emphasized that the list has to be refined (e.g., keep the northern light rail corridors). The member also mentioned that Horizon 3 could be changed into Horizon 2 without getting into the details and that it's important to just convey the priority areas for development. Also the member reminded the group that there is a 4-year review cycle for the City Council, during which there is an opportunity to review how well the housing and jobs are progressing. One member mentioned that the challenge is actually to figure out what to remove from a Horizon to keep them balanced. Another member responded that perhaps there should be lower numbers for North San Jose and allow earlier Horizons to include more corridors citywide.

Several members agreed to an earlier suggestion of having three phases over three decades; and also to target BART and light rail areas where there is opportunity for Federal aid. Another member pointed out that there is phasing built into the North San Jose plan, so we just need options and flexibility for Villages. One member responded that it's important to provide a General Plan that Council can follow and not narrow down the potential of a village outside the existing horizon.

Another member mentioned that land use planning based on just fiscal stability is not good planning, because there is no clear indication on what each administration will do. They commented that it's important to plan where people can work, live, play. The member also commented that people want affordable housing in the community.

6. Public Comment

Eight members of the public provided comments. One speaker mentioned that we have not supported VTA's light rail system very well; BRT has not started and has no exclusive lanes, so it's important to take advantage of the existing light rail system and focus density around light rail stops. All light rail villages should be in the first phase. Another speaker spoke on behalf of the coalition for a downtown hospital and mentioned that some of their concerns were met, but wanted to highlight the need for an illustrative map showing where hospitals can be built, possibly showing North San José and Downtown in different colors. Another speaker spoke on behalf of the wildlife corridors and provided a comment letter to the Task Force.

One of the speakers spoke in support of the preservation of wildlife and the letter that had been distributed. Another speaker suggested that a key issue is the current difference between the City's daytime and nighttime population and that it is critical to maintain the goal of 1.3 jobs per employed resident in order for the City to achieve balance. Another speaker suggested including low impact educational opportunities as allowed uses outside the UGB. These areas provide good opportunities for people to study wildlife and wildlife corridors. Another speaker suggested that any buildings developed outside the UGB should be the top-of-the-line in Green Building techniques.

7. Task Force Recommendations

The Task Force approved a motion for staff to return with a recommendation for allowed uses (with examples), form, and intensity of development on lands designated *Open Hillside*.

The Task Force also requested that staff respond to the letter about wildlife issues from the De Anza students and bring discussion of the Water Pollution Control Plant Master Plan for Task Force consideration.

8. Announcements

Andrew Crabtree announced March 21, 2011 as the next meeting date. Task Force member Oliverio announced movie night in the City Council chambers. Task Force member Beasley handed out a "save the dates" flyer for a Committee for Green Foothills and Greenbelt Alliance investigative series on issues facing south Santa Clara County.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.