



---

## SUMMARY OF MEETING #9

---

### **Summary of East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting #9**

Thursday June 6, 2013, 6:30 PM

Pleasanton Operations Service Center • 3333 Busch Road

#### **Task Force Members in Attendance:**

**John Casey, Housing Commissioner**  
**Joseph Butler, Housing Commissioner (Alternate)**  
**Brad Hottle, Parks and Recreation Commissioner**  
**Colleen Winey, Zone 7 Water Agency**  
**Nancy Allen, Danbury Park**  
**Patrick Costanzo, Kiewit**  
**Kellene Cousins, Mohr/Martin**  
**Steve Dunn, Lionstone Group/Legacy Partners**  
**Jay Galvin, Stoneridge Park**  
**Erin Kvistad, Ironwood**  
**Heidi Massie, Autumn Glen/Heritage Valley**  
**Bob Russman, Village at Ironwood**  
**Mark Emerson, At-Large Representative**  
**Ken Mercer, At-Large Representative**  
**Robert Silva, At-Large Representative**  
**Brock Roby, At-Large Representative**  
**Bob Shapiro, At-Large Representative**

#### **Staff Present:**

Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development  
Janice Stern, Planning Manager  
Mike Tassano, Traffic Engineer  
Pamela Ott, Economic Development Director

#### **Consultants Present:**

Wayne Rasmussen, Rasmussen Planning, Inc.  
Gail Donaldson, Gates + Associates

## **I. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes**

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview – Brian Dolan called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM and welcomed the audience. He also briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.

B. Action Regarding Meeting #8 Summary Notes - The Task Force meeting summary of April 8, 2013 was unanimously approved without changes.

## **II. Meeting Open to the Public**

Don Kahler, Pleasanton Gravel Company, noted that gravel mining activities east of the EPSP area are projected to continue to the year 2058. He also requested that potential school sites not be located in the EPSP Area at all, due to safety reasons related primarily to the lakes and gravel truck traffic.

## **III. Land Use Plan Alternatives**

A. Introduction to Alternative Plan Discussion – Brian Dolan provided an overview of the recent and near-term EPSP planning process. He noted that the April 8 EPSP alternative plan presentations to various City commissions and committees had recently been conducted. He further indicated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was for the Task Force to review the various comments on the alternatives to date, and to suggest any potential additional changes prior to forwarding the alternatives to the City Council for comments at its June 18 meeting.

B. Presentation Regarding Alternative Plans – Wayne Rasmussen reviewed the current residential unit counts and non-residential floor areas projected for each of the four current alternative plans.

Janice Stern indicated that during the month of May, City staff and consultants reviewed the four current EPSP alternative plans with the Housing Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, Economic Vitality Committee, Trails Committee, Planning Commission, and the Pleasanton Unified School District Board. Changes to the current alternatives which staff will integrate into them, unless the Task Force indicates otherwise, include the following:

- Change legend on all alternatives from "Potential School Site" to "Potential Public School/Park Site."
- Relocate potential school site in Alternative 4 to a site west of El Charro Road.
- Identify approximate locations of future private residential recreation areas on all alternatives.
- Add trails, staging areas, and vistas to all alternative plans.
- Identify approximate location of retail overlay zone on northern parcel.
- Correct Alternative 3 legend to show "30 DU/AC" instead of the "40 DU/AC."

Ms. Stern further indicated that the following comments were also provided at the commission and committee meetings that may require policy guidance in the future:

- Developer land dedication for affordable housing should be considered in-lieu of payment of City Affordable Housing Fees.
- Landowners should partner with non-profit housing developers to provide affordable housing.
- The community park site is appropriate for primarily leisure recreational use and the Lake I park site for active use.
- Some suggested uses for the Lake I park site include a 3-4 acre dog park, tennis courts and swimming pool.
- Work force and entry level housing are needed, including 8 to 12 dwellings/acre for young families and teachers, and 23 and 30 dwellings/acre for rental housing.
- Reserve a school site with an option to purchase; site needs to be suitable for school construction; would like to see land for school provided to the District.

C. Task Force Discussion and Input Regarding Alternative Plans – Brian Dolan indicated that prior to proceeding to the City Council on June 18 with the alternative plans, staff will be seeking further input from the Planning Commission on June 12 regarding city-wide RHNA matters.

Bob Silva requested that staff calculate the ratio of single-family housing units to multi-family units projected for Pleasanton at General Plan build-out.

Pat Costanzo discussed his email dated May 30, 2013 (and subsequent tables) regarding RHNA housing numbers. More specifically, the email deals with the percentage of the projected RHNA numbers that should be planned in this area and then, given that percentage, what mix of high density housing vs. all housing is appropriate for the area.

Task Force members then divided into three groups to discuss the four current land use alternative plans and to provide input to staff for refinements. Following the discussion period, each of the three groups presented their comments as follows:

Group I (Brock Roby, presenter):

- No alternative is the winner, although alternatives are good for generating discussion and feedback.
- Need Council direction on:
  - How many units should be planned for EPSP area?
  - Who will pay for infrastructure?

Group III (Bob Silva, presenter):

- Hard to proceed without refined financial numbers
- Housing density balance is important
- Need two more alternative plans using 30/70 MF/SF ratio, and 30-35% of the RHNA allotment
- Need 1,700 to 2,200 units to make the project work
- Less commercial land.

**Group II (Heidi Massie, presenter):**

- Need to know financial feasibility
- Need Council direction on RHNA percentage to be accommodated, and MF/SF ratio
- Could go as high as 35-40% of RHNA, and 40/60 MF/SF
- Too much industrial and commercial land.

Following presentations by the three discussion groups (above), the Task Force provided the following comments for generating Alternative Plans 5 and 6:

- 35% RHNA, 40/60 MF/SF split
- 40% RHNA, 35/65 MF/SF split
- Spread the high density
- Ask Council about minimizing office and industrial land uses
- Need strategic direction from Council
- 7 to 10 dwelling units per acre is real estate "sweet spot" – higher and lower densities produce less value at this time
- OSC as potential school site? Could hold for 10 years, then School District could determine whether they need it.
- Financial feasibility analysis needs to cover full range of possibilities - can always come down from higher numbers.

Steve Dunn indicated that some office and industrial land use acreage could be reduced and replaced with residential.

Coleen Winey noted that the Zone 7 Board will be discussing the EPSP process at its next meeting on June 12.

#### **IV. Task Force and Staff Brief Announcements**

There was no discussion on this item.

## **V. Summary and Next Steps**

Brian Dolan indicated that discussion regarding the dispersion of RHNA housing city-wide is scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting of June 12, 2013. The Task Force's six alternative plans will be referred to the City Council for review at its June 18, 2013 meeting. The next Task Force meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2013.

### **Close**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:50 PM.

For further information call Janice Stern at (925) 931-5606 or [js Stern@cityofpleasantonca.gov](mailto:js Stern@cityofpleasantonca.gov)