



Housing Commission Minutes [SUBJECT TO APPROVAL]

June 23, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

This meeting was conducted in accordance with Governor Newsom's Executive Orders N-20-20 and N-35-20 and COVID-19 pandemic protocols

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Galvin called a [teleconference](#) meeting of the Housing Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was recited.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Sharon Chillinsky, Karline Fischer, Vivek Mohan, Tony Soby, and Chairperson Jay Galvin.

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Neil Kripalani

Staff Present: Steve Hernandez, Housing Manager; Ellen Clark, Community Development Director; Megan Campbell, Associate Planner; Schweta Bonn, Senior Planner; and Edith Caponigro, Recording Secretary

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

4. REVIEW AND PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE 6TH CYCLE (2023-2031) DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT

Mr. Hernandez introduced staff members and advised they would be reviewing information for the 6th cycle of the 2023-2031 Draft Housing Element with the commission.

Ms. Campbell reviewed with commissioners a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Housing Element Update noting that this is a required element of a City's General Plan, are updated in 8-year cycles, and are reviewed for compliance with State laws by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Commissioners were advised that the process for the 2023-2031 Housing Element began in March 2021 and has included Introductory and Preliminary Report meetings, Stakeholder Group Meetings, Site Inventory Methodology & Selection Meetings, Policy/Program meetings, EIR Preparation/Scoping/Review, Draft Housing Element Meetings, HCD Revisions, and Public Hearings.

The presentation included information pertaining to community engagement, public review of the draft, components of the Housing Element, an overview of RHNA, an inventory list of sites, the goals, policies, and programs. Ms. Campbell discussed the goals which included:

Goal 1: Meet RHNA – rezoning program, BART station transit-oriented development, assist in development of low-income housing, facilitate developments at the Kiewit and Stoneridge Mall properties, and facilitate accessory dwelling unit (ADU) production.

Goal 2: Housing Diversity – improve inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, housing mitigation for commercial development, review and adjust Lower-Income Housing Fee, housing education programs and information, support access to rental housing and study enhanced local rental assistance program and explore partnerships with major employers to develop workforce housing.

Goal 3: Conserve Housing – allow manufactured homes, continue to work to stabilize rents for mobile home parks, maintain code enforcement and refer to rehabilitation programs, and rehabilitate substandard housing.

Goal 4: Reduce Governmental Constraints – adopt Objective Design Standards, suspend Growth Management Program, and address infrastructure deficiencies.

Goal 5: Meet Special Housing Need – county “Home Together 2026 Implementation Plan” and local/Tri-Valley homeless strategic framework, enhanced multi-family accessibility requirements and Universal Design Ordinance, allocate a portion of Lower Income Housing Fund to special needs groups, and amend Municipal Code for special needs housing (single room occupancy, emergency shelters, etc.)

Goal 6: Effectively Plan for Housing – objective design standards for high density sites, implement Climate Action Plan 2.0, seek funding for low-interest energy efficiency upgrade loans for lower income housing, implement Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and promote transit, and implement Downtown Specific Plan.

Goal 7: Affirmatively Further Fair Housing – support anti-discrimination law enforcement, develop neighborhood revitalization programs to support affordable housing opportunities, publicize fair housing information and refer complaints, and partner with community organizations to reach traditionally underserved populations.

Ms. Campbell reviewed in detail each of the goals and discussed the key programs outlined for each of the goals.

Ms. Campbell advised commissioners that staff was seeking feedback from them on the Draft Housing Element and a future opportunity for public comment will be available at the July 19, 2022 City Council meeting.

Ms. Clark noted that several important steps still remaining in the Housing Element update process include: HCD review of the Draft Housing Element (Aug-Nov, 2022), release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and EIR Comment period (Oct-Nov, 2022), Commissions/Council/Public Meetings review of Revised Draft Housing Element (Nov 2022 – Jan 2023), Resubmittal of the Housing Element to HCD (Jan-Mar, 2023), and Adoption Hearings (Mar-May 2023).

Commissioner Soby questioned the method that was used for the Needs Assessment, and Ms. Clark commented on sections of the Housing Element that are mandated by the State and discussed the fact that approved data was provided to every jurisdiction of the Bay Area which meant all were working on a level playing fields with the same baseline data. She commented on the Housing Element process and the Needs Assessment breaking down details into distinct categories.

Commissioner Soby discussed remarks in the report provided by Mr. Paxton regarding businesses in the area and furthering the city’s objectives. He questioned the possibility of partnerships evolving with businesses. Ms. Clark noted that in the past the city has not engaged in partnerships but with large corporations being established in the city the opportunity is in place to look at potentially getting others to relocate to Pleasanton.

Commissioner Fischer asked what staff’s biggest concern was in getting this Housing Element approved. Ms. Clark felt the City of Pleasanton was in an advantageous position since many other jurisdictions do not have a Housing Element in place; however, additional levels of housing is causing

some issues, and the pandemic has not helped.

Chairperson Galvin indicated he had reviewed the recent comments received from Becky Dennis and had questions pertaining to the comment regarding factors of the fund to be used for affordable housing and her reference to what the other 45% would be used for. Ms. Clark advised this would be used for programs and was not a mandated part of the policy. Mr. Hernandez commented on programs that [preserve-utilizes](#) the Lower Income Housing Fund which is something that the commission does review. Ms. Clark noted that tenant and landlord programs also need to be considered.

Commissioner Fischer asked about the Housing Fund and the use of 40% for programs, [and](#) she also questioned what portion of those funds came from the state. Mr. Hernandez provided information about the approximately \$10M in the Lower Income Housing Funds and the commissions allocation of about \$200,000 from this fund during the recent fund allocation cycle.

Commissioner Fischer asked if the goal was to have twenty percent of homes built to be affordable, for example, if a builder were to build one hundred homes, then twenty of those homes would need to be affordable homes. Ms. Clark commented on the city not showing or having funds to build homes or having available staff to do necessary research for such. Commissioners felt it was a frustrating situation for staff because there was no reasonable amount of funds available to resolve the housing problem, but that Pleasanton was in a much better position than other cities because it did have the Lower Income Housing Fund. Chairperson Galvin commented on the numerous budget decisions that City Council must make each year.

Chairperson Galvin commented on fees, the lack of information about the budget, and information about the commitment of funds. Ms. Clark noted the LIHF funds were not a reasonable amount that would resolve the housing issue, and City Council has numerous decisions to make each year about what to do with the funds and always need to look at supplementing.

Chairperson Galvin further discussed commitment and being able to get other people involved who perhaps could assist Mr. Hernandez since her was a lone person with responsibility for many things involved with housing matters. Ms. Clark agreed that Pleasanton needed more help in matters relating to housing and felt providing additional staffing resources could be a recommendation from the Housing Commission as something missing from the Housing Element document. Chairperson Galvin felt the city was committed to doing a lot of things over the next few years, which included housing, but [was-is in](#) need of more staff to do them.

Commissioner Chillinisky questioned whether prioritizing of project sites was something the commission was expected to do since it seemed like there was limited power to cause a project to actually take place and typically it is the market that drives projects. Ms. Clark agreed that projects are typically driven by the local market, however, the city can engage in planning for sites such as the BART [one-site](#) and determining where focus should be placed. She noted that [the City has established work plan items a work plan has not been established, and the City is looking staff planning effort in advancing a particular program. was something together with staffing that will be considered.](#)

Commissioner Mohan complimented staff on the report, noting it contained a tsunami of data and agreed with focus being placed on the market end of areas that have demand, which did not necessarily mean focusing on the homeless situation first. He commented on affordable housing still being unaffordable in many areas and felt conversations needed to be held with the county and state. Commissioner Mohan volunteered [to](#) represent the City of Pleasanton and begin conversing with the county and state as he felt this was a strategy piece missing from the document.

Chairperson Galvin suggested Commissioner Mohan put a proposal together with his recommendation and share it with Mr. Hernandez.

Commissioner Mohan had further questions pertaining to the \$10M in the Lower Income Housing Fund, and Chairperson Galvin had questions on why areas within the East Pleasanton Specific Plan were not being considered in the Housing Element but other areas such as the Steelwave and [Raymond-Remen Tract](#) properties were included. Ms. Clark advised that unincorporated areas were not being considered, partly because they were lacking in infrastructure, and the others are areas that have already been accepted by City Council. She also discussed the need for sites to meet required state mandates.

Commissioner Soby commented on the issue of getting people who want to build on recognized sites and the importance of focusing on how to get builders and funds to do this. He commented on recent state and count mandates and noted that before the COVID pandemic Ponderosa Homes had been ready to move forward on a project but now these requirement changes ~~that~~ are requiring further thinking about strategies.

Commissioner Fischer noted that anything built in Pleasanton is not necessarily going to be affordable for many people wanting to live in Pleasanton. She wondered if something could be done collectively with other cities to help battle this at both the local and state levels. Commissioner Mohan indicated he was impressed by the cost numbers provided by staff but felt it would be helpful to look at any ways to achieve this and agreed with Commissioner Fischer that having many voices involved would be helpful.

Chairperson Galvin was informed by Ms. Clark that the abbreviated term JADU was being used for a Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit that is intended to be integrated into a main home. She also provided information about SRO which is for a studio unit.

Commissioner Mohan commented on data in the report talking about people living in the city and working out of the city. Ms. Clark provided information about policies that relate to this and being able to provide housing that would allow people to work in the city and also live in the city. Commissioner Soby questioned if a study had been conducted to determine that the Pleasanton workforce wants to live in Pleasanton. Mr. Clark felt that people would make the decision, but the city needs to provide every opportunity and have heard from employers that this is something desired.

Further discussions took place regarding the number of commuter buses that are leaving the fairgrounds daily.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m. by unanimous consent.