

## Pleasanton Housing Element Workshop – March 24, 2014

### City of Pleasanton Housing Element

#### Community Workshop Summary

#### Introduction

The City of Pleasanton held a Housing Element community workshop to kick off the project on Monday March 24, 2014, from 6:30 to 8pm at the Remillard Conference Center, 3333 Busch Road, Pleasanton, CA. The first Community Meeting was noticed twice in Tri-Valley times, once in the Community Calendar of the Pleasanton Weekly, as well as on the City's website Community Calendar and Housing Element website. In addition, approximately 1,488 notices were mailed out and 175 emails were sent which included all properties within 1000' of the Irby-Kaplan-Zia property, all properties within 1000' of the CM Capital Site, as well as all people requesting special notification on either of those properties or the Housing Element Update. There were approximately 25 participants at the meeting, which started with a brief presentation made by staff and the consultant.

#### Overview

The presentation included a summary of Housing Element state law requirements, identification of new laws affecting this Housing Element update, and a timeline for the process for the 5th round Housing Element update that is due to be adopted by January 31, 2015.

Following the presentation, participants were asked to visit various stations set up throughout the room to discuss the following topics:

- Housing Programs and Services
- Housing Types
- Housing Challenges and Opportunities
- Current Housing Inventory and Potential Changes
  - CM Capital Property
  - Irby-Kaplan-Zia Properties
- Other Comments and Ideas

Following the station activity, the group reconvened and discussed the schedule of upcoming meetings and turned in comment cards, and the meeting was adjourned.



# City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary

## Activity Stations

### Housing Program and Services

At the Housing Program and Services station, participants were asked to identify: (1) which housing programs and services are important to them and/or their friends and family, and (2) which housing programs and services the City should support. The following table summarizes participant responses.

Housing programs and services	This is important to me and/or my friends and family				The City of Pleasanton should support this			
	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	N/A	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	N/A
Age in place resources	10	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
Down payment assistance	1	0	0	3	2	1	0	0
Energy efficiency resources	8	0	0	0	4	0	1	0
Fair housing assistance	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Farmworker housing	0	4	1	2	2	1	1	0
Homeownership education	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Home maintenance and rehabilitation	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Services for persons with physical or developmental disabilities	3	0	0	1	7	0	0	0
Traditional and supportive housing	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0
Emergency shelters and homeless services	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0
Recovery/treatment services	0	0	1	1	6	0	1	0

Participants were invited to provide additional comments regarding housing programs and services in Pleasanton. The following comments were shared:

## **City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary**

### **Age in place resources:**

- Senior housing for middle-class garden homes.
- Senior affordable housing.

### **Farmworker housing:**

- This is a category of workforce housing for lower paid employees that make agriculture in the Tri-Valley sustainable.
- Workforce housing for employees working at the 49.6% of Pleasanton jobs that pay below \$40K/year is needed to support business & lower GHG emissions (community).

### **Services for persons with physical or developmental disabilities:**

- Need housing for special needs individuals.

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary

### Housing Types

At this station, participants were invited to identify which housing type they currently live in (using a red sticky dot) and which housing type the city needs more of (using a blue sticky dot). The following table summarizes participant responses.

<b>Single-family home</b>	<b>Townhouse</b>	<b>Apartment</b>
<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 13  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      3  <b>Comments:</b>                      • More single-story homes</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 3  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      4  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 1  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      2  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>
<b>Mixed-use building</b>	<b>Senior housing/Assisted living</b>	<b>Within walking distance of shops and services</b>
<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 0  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      3  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 0  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      4  <b>Comments:</b>                      • Moderate priced senior housing (not low – not so expensive)                      • Single-story senior housing moderate price</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 0  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      9  <b>Comments:</b>                      • Need more major retailers, shops and restaurants downtown. Also more child-friendly places downtown (Cold Stone Ice Cream)</p>
<b>Energy-efficient home</b>	<b>Affordable housing</b>	<b>Mobile home</b>
<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 2  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      7  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 0  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b>                      6  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>	<p><b>Currently live in:</b> 0  <b>Pleasanton needs more:</b> 1  <b>Comments:</b>                      none</p>

Participants were invited to provide additional comments regarding housing types in Pleasanton. The following comments were shared:

- Special needs housing needed for people with autism or other delays.

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary

### Housing Challenges and Opportunities

At this station, participants were asked to respond to the question: What stands between you or your friends and family and a new or renovated home? Participants provided the following responses to this question:

- More schools, all levels, elementary/middle.
- Nonprofit workforce housing for younger workers (like our children) that work in retail or food services. Below 50%-80% AMI.
- If I could keep my property tax rate.
- Downtown needs to grow.
- Good infill housing.
- More big parks.
- More walkable neighborhoods.
- Affordability.
- Downtown offer more services/shops/restaurants/specialty stores.
- Downtown housing.
- More senior housing (middle) range.
- More single-story homes.



### Current Housing Inventory and Potential Changes

At the Current Housing Inventory station, participants were asked to provide their feedback regarding potential changes to the zoning of the CM Capital property and the Irby-Kaplan-Zia Site. Staff received no comments or feedback on the Irby-Kaplan-Zia Site. Participants provided the following comments and feedback on the CM Capital Site:

- REZONE! CM Properties back to commercial. Pleasanton does NOT need 2 high density projects next to each other!!
- Rezone CM Properties from residential to commercial.
- Do not put trail on this side of arroyo. Put on predominately commercial side. Not Parkside Resident side.
- Want CM Capital properties rezones back to commercial and not high density.
- Want the CM Capital properties site rezoned back to commercial from residential.
- Change CM Capital zoning back to commercial
- Do not open this side of canal.
- Rezone back to commercial no high density.
- Change CM Capital back to commercial.
- Rezone CM property – it was a mistake to RHNA. Zone the entire parcel. Please correct this mistake. REZONE!
- We do not need this housing. Rezone back to commercial.
- Put trail on the other side of arroyo. The trail is 20' from my bedroom window.

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary

- Rezone. Do not open trail on this side of arroyo – there are no police patrol services and it does not go anywhere.

### Other Comments and Ideas

At this station, participants were invited to provide additional comments and ideas for the Housing Element. Participants shared the following:

- Housing for special needs to fulfill SB812.
- Need major stand alone retail shops, more restaurants and child-friendly eateries downtown (i.e. Cold Stone).
- Adult-only eateries or designated hours for such.
- The need for workforce housing is real. Pleasanton must consider partnering with nonprofit housing developers to achieve low income housing.
- As a long-time Pleasanton resident, I'm concerned that our "elected" officials are not always looking out for my quality of life in Pleasanton. All this new pressure for growth is causing a lack of focus on what is important to me.
- More nonprofit work force housing for those earning below 80%-50% AMI.
- Rezone CM Capital to Commercial.
- No high density 30/ac.
- Infill.

### Comment Cards

Participants were provided comment cards to complete with additional questions and feedback. The following comment cards were completed and shared at the end of the workshop.

I understand the RHNA Housing numbers being imposed on us by the State – but Please build these projects in logical locations.

The rezoning of the CM property and the soon to be Summerhill High Density Project being adjacent to each other, with other high density buildings nearby on W. Las Positas, bordering single family homes, across the street from a middle school.

That was VERY poor planning! Who represents Pleasanton citizens? Looks like our city bends their ear to developers, their attorneys and their money.

Suggest explanation of "General Plan"

Explain ABAG acronym & how many areas/counties/jurisdictions get assigned housing rent numbers.

Community workshop good way to inform the residences. Keep it going.

Thank you!

## **City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary**

### **Conclusion**

Several themes and priorities were identified by the residents during this workshop. There was consensus with the residents in attendance that Pleasanton needs more housing within walking distance of shops and services, more energy efficient homes, and more housing for special needs households including housing for persons with developmental disabilities. In terms of priorities for housing services that the City should support, residents felt strongly that the City should partner with developers who provide housing for residents to age in place and energy efficient housing. The City should also support housing rehabilitation programs for existing homeowners and work with advocate groups to support programs for persons with developmental disabilities. Lastly, residents in attendance provided numerous responses to the CM Capital property rezoning and were not in support of maintaining zoning for this property to allow for high density housing.

# Pleasanton Housing Element Workshop – July 16, 2014

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element

### Community Workshop Summary

#### Introduction

The City of Pleasanton held a Housing Element community workshop on Wednesday July 16, 2014, from 6:30 to 8:30 pm at the Remillard Conference Center, 3333 Busch Road, Pleasanton, CA. The Community Meeting was noticed in the Tri-Valley times, the Community Calendar of the Pleasanton Weekly, and the City's Community Calendar and Housing Element website. In addition, approximately 175 emails were sent to people requesting special notification about the Housing Element Update. There were approximately 20 participants at the meeting, which included a presentation and discussion led by staff and the consultant.

#### Overview

The presentation included an initial summary of Housing Element State law requirements, identification of new laws affecting this Housing Element Update, and a timeline for the process for the 5th round Housing Element Update that is due to be adopted by January 31, 2015. After the overview presentation, draft Housing Element goals, policies, and programs were presented by the consultant. The majority of the presentation focused on presenting the proposed goals, policies and programs within the Housing Element Update and obtaining feedback from the community. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the draft goals using a worksheet provided at the beginning of the meeting. In addition, participants discussed the goals and policies and asked questions about the Housing Element Update.

Following the discussion and question and answer session, next steps were summarized and the meeting was adjourned. Comment cards were provided for the submittal of additional comments and questions regarding the Housing Element Update.

#### Goals, Policies, and Programs Worksheet

Following the presentation on the draft goals, policies, and programs, participants completed the following worksheet to provide their comments and suggestions on the draft Housing Element goals.

<b>Goals</b>	<b>Not Very Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Neutral/ No Opinion</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Housing Variety, Type, and Density	1	2	3	4	5	
Housing Tenure	1	2	3	4	5	
Housing Affordability	1	2	3	4	5	
At-Risk Housing Affordable to Low- and Very Low- Income Households	1	2	3	4	5	
City Government Actions	1	2	3	4	5	
Growth Management	1	2	3	4	5	

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element Community Workshop Summary

Existing Housing Conditions	1	2	3	4	5	
Housing Location	1	2	3	4	5	
Housing Discrimination	1	2	3	4	5	
Special Needs Housing	1	2	3	4	5	
Environmental Protection	1	2	3	4	5	
City Resolution 10-390 Non-Discrimination	1	2	3	4	5	
State Bill (SB) 2 Supportive and Transitional Housing	1	2	3	4	5	

### Comment Cards

Participants were also provided comment cards to complete with any additional questions and feedback.

### Conclusion

Several themes/concerns were identified by the residents during this workshop (in verbal and written comments). Following is a summary of these comments:

- Concern about the recent rate of housing construction in the City and a desire for slow/metered growth management;
- Opposition to additional zoning for higher-density residential uses;
- Ensuring the Housing Element, including the wording of goals, policies, and programs, reflects community values and maintains community character;
- The desire for new development to pay for infrastructure, schools, and traffic mitigation;
- The ability of the City's limited water supply to accommodate new growth;
- Concerns about existing overcrowded schools and the ability of the City's school infrastructure to accommodate new growth;
- Support for incentivizing affordable housing, including the construction of second units, and clarifying the requirements/fees for the construction of such housing;
- The importance of workforce housing and the need to encourage partnerships with nonprofit developers to build such housing.

# Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings

## City of Pleasanton Housing Element

Stakeholder Meeting #1 Nonprofit Housing Developers, Local Service Providers, and Community Organizations

April 7, 2014

### Introduction

The City of Pleasanton held a Housing Element stakeholder meeting on Monday April 7, 2014, from 3 to 5pm at the Remillard Conference Center, 3333 Busch Road, Pleasanton, CA. A letter inviting the non-profit housing developers, local service providers and community organizations in the region was sent out. There were approximately 16 participants at the meeting.

### Participants

Representatives from the following groups were in attendance:

- Citizens for a Caring Community
- Sunflower Hill
- Community Resources for Independent Living (CRIL)
- Open Heart Kitchen
- Bay Area Community Services
- Mid Pen Housing
- Community Housing Developments
- One Step Forward
- Housing Consortium of the East Bay (HCEB)
- SAHA Housing
- Neighborhood Solutions

### Overview

The meeting started with introductions and a brief presentation made by staff and the consultant. The presentation included a summary of Housing Element state law requirements, identification of new laws affecting this Housing Element update, and a timeline for the process for the 5th round Housing Element update due to be adopted by January 31, 2015.

Following the presentation, participants were asked a series of question and asked to write responses down on sticky note cards. The note cards were then placed up on the wall and following each set of questions and responses was a group discussion. Below is a listing of the questions asked followed by responses received.

### Question #1: Strengths

- What existing housing and service programs are most successful in the Pleasanton community?
- What factors have contributed to this success?

### Responses:

- Success of City Housing projects such as the Promenade Project, Ridge View Commons Senior Housing, and Kottinger Gardens

## Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings

- Successful senior housing, services for seniors, affordable housing for seniors, and community support for affordable housing for seniors
- Small scale housing for special needs households (permanently affordable housing)
- Affordable Housing Impact Fee
- Great housing services, City staff, housing rehab services, Housing Commission/Committee Staff
- Housing Rehab: Preservation of housing affordable to extremely low- and low-income homeowners/renters.
- BMR Apartments, Section 8 Apartments, Senior Housing
- Senior Housing Complexes
  - WHY: People identify with the need and it affects everyone
  - WHY: Not controversial- no impact on schools and lower impact on roads
- Mixed use- mixed income
  - Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (FNMA and FHLMC)
  - HUD Programs such as 236
  - Senior Housing, Senior Center, Affordable Inclusionary Housing
- City and Community committed to senior housing

### Question #2: Weaknesses/Needs

- Which segments of the population are most underserved by housing-related resources?
- Are new housing-related needs emerging in the community?

### Responses:

- Programs that serve:
  - Workforce housing is underserved
  - Homeless disabled and low-income
  - Persons with disabilities who are on SSI
  - Individuals who require not only affordable but also accessible housing
  - Low-income families (low wage workforce housing)
  - Special needs. Households don't have enough resources SB812 addresses growing need
  - Families with children, single men
  - Autism + special needs-those who need security as well as socialization and independence. There are 700 individuals with special needs living in Pleasanton right now autism wave will increase that number.
  - Local workforce most underserved. This need continues to grow with fewer people who work here able to live here and declining. Retail employees, food service employees, support staff and services, employees most underserved
- Lack of disabled accessible housing
- A larger need for housing for special needs adults is emerging. Housing with a community feel and social opportunities
- Family housing. Sites for multifamily housing zoned at 30+DU/Acre
- New housing needs. Small housing units (up to 1200 sq. ft) for seniors wanting to down scale

## Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings

- Inclusionary (Palmer) 79%-51%
- Federal Section 8

### Question #3: Opportunities

- How can the community improve on and grow existing resources?
- What housing types and services should we be looking to add?
- Are there specific policies or actions that the city should consider including in the Housing Element to improve access and/or opportunities?

### Responses:

- Provide more age in place units/modifications/accessible units
- Look at surplus land the city or county owns and see if it can be donated for special housing uses like we've discussed today.
- Appropriately zoned sites for multifamily housing near transit & other amenities
- Identifying incentives- such as parking requirement reductions- to improve feasibility of affordable housing development
- Analyze City use of affordable housing funds for mixed income family housing or special needs housing
- A stronger commitment to economic integration in housing, continued use of universal design, and increased public transportation which is affordable
- More housing to address the homeless and accessibility needs. Housing Accessible to Public Transportation
- Greater partnerships with city and advocates
- Assess In lieu and impact fees to verify they are correctly set and provide a formula schedule to update regularly
- Provide increased marketing of existing programs
- Encourage more affordability at 50% AMI
- Prioritize funding
- Increase the lower income housing fees to reflect the true cost of providing affordable housing.
- Reset fees and adopt policies to encourage property owners of RHNA rezoned properties to dedicate land in lieu of housing fees (which should be set at a level that makes this advantageous)
- All other development should pay the increased fees.
- Give incentives to property owners to partner with non-profits
- All land zoned 30 Units/acre should be partially (at least 40%) as non profit

### Other Comments and Ideas

Following the questions the group discussed the sense of pride that a number of advocates/stakeholders at the table have in the community of Pleasanton and how they are committed to partnering together to ensure that the current and future needs of the residents in the community are addressed.

## **Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings**

### **Conclusion**

Similar to the community workshop several themes and priorities were echoed by the stakeholders during this meeting. There was consensus that the City has been very successful with senior housing projects throughout the community and now it is time to tackle other housing groups like special needs households including housing for persons with developmental disabilities and the City's current workforce. In terms of opportunities and priorities the City should provide as many incentives as possible to partner with developers who provide housing for residents to age in place as well as housing for persons with developmental disabilities.

## **Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings**

Stakeholder Meeting #2 For-profit Housing Developers and Finance Professionals

April 10, 2014

### **Introduction**

The City of Pleasanton held a second stakeholder meeting on Thursday April 10, 2014, from 3 to 5 pm at the 157 Main Street, Conference Room 3, Pleasanton, CA 94566. The City sent out approximately 120 letters inviting developers and finance professional in the region. There were approximately 13 participants at the meeting.

### **Participants**

Representatives from the following groups were in attendance:

- Citizens for a Caring Community
- Ponderosa Homes
- Sunflower Hill
- Equity Enterprises
- Habitat for Humanity
- ROEM Development
- MAS Real Estate

### **Overview**

The meeting started with introductions and a brief presentation made by staff and the consultant. The presentation included a summary of Housing Element state law requirements, identification of new laws affecting this Housing Element update, and a timeline for the process for the 5th round Housing Element update due to be adopted by January 31, 2015.

Following the presentation, participants were asked a series of question and their responses were written on sticky note cards and placed up on the wall and that lead to a group discussion. Below is a listing of the questions asked followed by responses received.

### **Question #1: Strengths**

- What existing housing programs and service are most successful in the Pleasanton community?
- What factors have contributed to this success?
- What strengths have you experience working with City staff, Pleasanton residents and the community in general while developing housing in Pleasanton?

### **Responses:**

- Access to good school district
- Strong demand for housing
- Great access to the I-680 and I-580 freeways
- People love Pleasanton and want to live here
- Continuously high scores on the annual citizen satisfaction survey
- Hacienda Business Park

## Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings

### Question #2: Weaknesses/Needs

- Which segments of the population are most underserved by housing-related resources?
- Are new housing-related needs emerging in the community?
- What issues have you incurred with developing housing in Pleasanton?

### Responses:

- Harder to borrow money
- High impact and City fees
- 50% of AMI Alameda County (too high of a subsidy for this income group)
- Fees can end up being higher than land values
- Higher impact fees than surrounding areas
- All cash buyers push out typical home buyers in today's market
- PD Zoning and GP zoning creates uncertainty in housing development regulations
- Prevailing wage is required when utilizing government funding
- Lack of perceived support for affordable by design units
- Need concurrent permit processing for PUD's and Tract Maps
- City listens to the few neighborhood objections over greater support.

### Question #3: Opportunities

- How can the community improve on and grow existing resources and work better with the development community?
- What housing types and programs should we be looking to add?
- Are there specific policies or actions that the city should consider including in the Housing Element to improve access and/or opportunities?

### Responses:

- Class A, LEED Certified, Tax Credit for everyone
- Programs to defer fees
- Change in community/ political will
- Greater use of CDBG/ Home funds
- More in-lieu fees to be dedicated to housing
- More affordable rental housing rather than ownership
- Programs for for-profit developers to pay fee/ give land to non-profits
- Ongoing effort at state level for affordable housing
- Add Habitat for Humanity housing type developments
- Know your workforce (what they can afford)
- More ownership affordable

### Conclusion

The stakeholder group at this meeting varied widely from developers who have built housing in Pleasanton, developers who would like to pursue housing projects in the City, interested residents and affordable housing advocates. The consensus from this meeting was that

## **Pleasanton Housing Element Stakeholder Meetings**

Pleasanton's housing market is highly desirable. Some of the for-profit developers in attendance would like to see more development certainty in their projects and a more streamlined review process in terms of concurrent reviews. In terms of opportunities, the City should continue to provide as many incentives as possible to entice affordable housing developers and bank what little funding the City has into housing for the City's workforce through rental and some ownership opportunities.