



**Planning Commission
Staff Report**

September 25, 2013
Item 6.b.

- SUBJECT:** P13-1858
- APPLICANT:** City of Pleasanton
- PROPERTY OWNERS:** Zone 7 Water Agency, Lionstone Group, Kiewit Peter Sons Co., Legacy Partners, Pleasanton Garbage Service, City of Pleasanton
- PURPOSE:** Consideration of a Draft Preferred Land Use and Circulation Plan for the purposes of preparing an Environmental Impact Report and a Draft Specific Plan
- GENERAL PLAN:** Water Management, Habitat and Recreation; Community Facilities; High Density Residential; Retail/Highway/Service Commercial, Business and Professional Offices; Business Park; Parks and Open Space; General and Limited Industrial. Future East Pleasanton Specific Plan.
- ZONING:** P (Public and Institutional), I-G-40 (General Industrial, 40,000 s.f. minimum lot)
- LOCATION:** East of Martin Avenue and Valley Avenue, north of Stanley Boulevard, and south of Arroyo Mocho
- EXHIBITS:**
- A. Preferred Plan and Alternatives Report
 - B. Excerpt of May 22 and June 12, 2013 Planning Commission minutes; excerpt of June 18, 2013 City Council minutes.
 - C. Traffic Analysis
 - D. Infrastructure Summary and Cost Estimate prepared by Kier & Wright
 - E. Water Supply Assessment, July 2013, prepared by WJM C&C for Kier & Wright
 - F. EPSP Infrastructure Feasibility Analysis, July 25, 2013, prepared by EPS, Economic and Planning Systems
 - G. EPSP Fiscal Impact Analysis, July 25, 2013, EPS, Economic and Planning Systems
 - H. Tables comparing former options/alternatives with current options/alternatives

I. BACKGROUND

The East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force has met ten times since August 2012 to develop a land use and circulation plan for the East Pleasanton area. The Planning Commission last reviewed progress on the Specific Plan in May and June, 2013 at which time, the Commission provided input regarding four working draft land use alternatives. The alternatives were then forwarded to the City Council for additional comments and direction, and for authorization to proceed with various impact analysis reports, as follows:

- Traffic Analysis dated July 25, 2013 prepared by Fehr & Peers (Exhibit C)
- Infrastructure Summary and Cost Estimate prepared by Kier & Wright (Exhibit D)
- Water Supply Assessment, July 2013, prepared by WJM C&C for Kier & Wright (Exhibit E)
- EPSP Infrastructure Feasibility Analysis, July 25, 2013, prepared by EPS, Economic and Planning Systems (Exhibit F)
- EPSP Fiscal Impact Analysis, July 25, 2013, EPS, Economic and Planning Systems (Exhibit G)

Based on the information in these reports and the feedback from the Planning Commission and City Council, the East Pleasanton Task Force refined the plan options, selected its Preferred Plan and recommended five CEQA alternatives to be addressed in the Specific Plan EIR.

The Planning Commission is now being asked to review these plans and provide input.

II. DISCUSSION

Exhibit A provides text descriptions, maps, and acreages, and quantifies the development in the Preferred Plan and the Alternatives. The plans represent a range of alternatives with residential units ranging from 1,000 units to 2,279 units, and plans representing various proportions of single family and multifamily development. Retail and office development is similar in the preferred plan and all alternatives (at 91,000 square feet and 442,000 square feet, respectively) and industrial development varies from 1.06 million to 2.17 million square feet. A summary of the development program for each alternative is included on the last page of Exhibit A.

Preferred Plan:

The Preferred Plan evolved over several Task Force meetings which focused on the following questions:

- What is the appropriate level of development given a desire to create a financially feasible plan?
- How many residential units should be accommodated and what should be the balance between single family homes and multifamily units?
- Should the multifamily units and other higher density development be focused in a central area to create an “activity center” or should the higher density development be dispersed?

- Should the Operations Services Center (OSC) and/or Pleasanton Garbage Service (PGS) facility be relocated?

The Preferred Plan would result in the following development:

| SF-R 4d/a | SF-R 8d/a | SF-R 11d/a | MF-R 23d/a | MF-R 30d/a | Total Housing |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| 183 units | 664 units | 296 units | 241 units | 375 units | 1,759 units |
| 46 acres | 83 acres | 27 acres | 10 acres | 13 acres | 179 acres |

| Retail | Campus Office | Industrial/ Flex | Destination Use | Public & Institutional |
|---------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 91,000 sq.ft. | 442,000 sq.ft. | 1,057,000 sq.ft. | 3 acres | 17 acres |

A total of 1,759 units would consist of 616 multifamily units and 1,143 single family units, or a split of 35% multifamily units and 65% single family homes. Looked at from acreage used, the multifamily development would account for about 23 acres or about 13 percent of the total acreage in residential development. In this plan, the multifamily locations are dispersed in two locations, one on Busch just east of the OSC and the other at Busch and El Charro Road.

In the Preferred Plan, the OSC remains in its current location, and the PGS site would be relocated further east into an industrially-designated area. An approximately 13 acre park located just south of Lake I is also designated Public School Site and part of the site would be used for an elementary school if it is determined necessary by the Pleasanton Unified School District. Public and private parks cover almost 80 acres of the planning area.

Circulation is provided by an extension of El Charro Road from Stoneridge Drive to Stanley Boulevard, Busch Road connecting from Valley Avenue to El Charro Road, and an extension of Boulder through the southern part of the Specific Plan area to Busch Road. In addition to these and other local streets, “Green spines” provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation throughout the area.

As noted below in the Analysis section, this exact plan was not analyzed by the economic consultant. However, a similar plan with 1,759 residential units and a slightly different split of multifamily and single family units (fewer single family units and more multifamily units) was found to be one of two “most feasible” options, from an economic feasibility perspective.

Impact on City’s Share of the Regional Housing Need: The City Council’s direction on June 18, 2013 was that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan should accommodate at least a proportion of the City’s regional housing need for the next two housing elements (through

2030). The table below provides an estimate of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for that period:

Table 2: Estimate of RHNA to Year 2030 and Acreage Needed to Accommodate Housing Needs

| | 2014-2022 RHNA | Estimated 2014 Inventory | Additional units to be planned for 2014-2022 RHNA | Estimate of 2022-2030 RHNA | Estimate of units to be planned for 2014-2030 | Additional Acreage Needed |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Very Low Income | 1,102 | 991 | 111 | 1,102 | 1,213 | 40 |
| Low Income | | | | | | |
| Moderate Income | 405 | 0 | 405 | 405 | 810 | 35 |
| Above Moderate Income | 551 | 270 | 281 | 551 | 832 | 111 |
| Total | 2,058 | 1,261 | 797 | 2,058 | 2,855 | 186 |

The Preferred Plan (Alternative 5C) would accommodate approximately 62 percent of the total estimated housing need, and about 51 percent of the multifamily housing need over that period.

III. ANALYSIS

The impact analyses listed above were prepared on plans with slightly different development programs than are currently shown in Exhibit A. The tables in Exhibit H provide a comparison between the development assumptions used for the various alternatives analyzed in the impact reports and the current Preferred Plan and Alternatives. Options 1 and 2 are the same as those analyzed in the impact reports. Options 5A, 5B and 5C are similar to Option 7 which was analyzed for financial feasibility but was not analyzed in the traffic report. Former Option 6 and current Option 6 are similar but the current Option 6 has slightly more units and slightly fewer single-family units. Given these relatively minor differences, the impact reports (Exhibits C through G) are still useful to evaluate the impacts of the options.

Traffic Impact Analysis: The analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers provides information regarding the four land use and street network options. The comparison includes daily external vehicles trips, AM and PM peak hour external trips, internal trips, trips by transit and expected levels of walking and biking trips. In addition, roadway segment volumes for El Charro Road and Busch Road are calculated for the four alternatives. A table summarizing these findings is on page 4 of the report. As would be expected, Option 6 with the most residential units and similar amount of retail, office and industrial development to the other options generates the most trips.

The impact of the proposed options is also compared to the analysis prepared for the Housing Element Supplemental EIR. Because the amount of development assumed for the SEIR was greater than any of the options currently being studied for the area, the number of daily trips

and peak hour trips was higher in the Housing Element SEIR analysis. A summary of the intersection level of service at 33 intersections is provided with the assumption that the traffic impacts (and therefore the impact on intersection Level of Service) of any of the alternatives would be less than that of the Housing Element analysis.

The memo also includes a qualitative roadway evaluation (p. 8) and concludes that providing access from Busch Road at Valley as well as Boulder Street is beneficial in that it disperses traffic loads and allows more compact intersection designs. It also notes that curvilinear roadway designs (as compared to a grid system) have disadvantages for pedestrian and bicycle travel by increasing the trip distance and possibly discouraging non-auto trips.

Infrastructure Costs: Exhibit D includes an infrastructure cost estimate for each option. The infrastructure costs for each option are generally very similar and range from \$61.1 million to \$63.3 million. The slight differences in infrastructure needs between the options (e.g. additional traffic signals required for options 5 and 6) are detailed in the summary.

Water Supply Assessment: Exhibit E provides a Water Supply Assessment for the land use options and concludes that the water supply is adequate to support this level of development assuming the implementation of a recycled water system. An agreement is currently in place for a supply of recycled water through the El Charro Transmission Pipeline.

Infrastructure Feasibility Analysis: Exhibit F provides an analysis of the potential development feasibility of five options (this is the only analysis of “Option 7” which is similar to Option 5A, 5B, and 5C in the Exhibit A). The feasibility analysis is based on a cost to value ratio (i.e. infrastructure cost as a percentage of development value) and a tax burden threshold test which calculates the special tax necessary to finance infrastructure costs as a percentage of development value. The consultant’s conclusions were that Option 1 is the least feasible, Options 4 and 5 were marginally feasible, and Options 6 and 7 (corresponding substantially to current Option 6, and current Options 5A, 5B and 5C) were most feasible.

Fiscal Impact Analysis: Exhibit G looks at the fiscal impact of development of each of the alternatives on the City’s general fund. Assumptions are made about development value and property turnover, as well as population, employment and service populations. The costs of various City services are deducted from anticipated revenues from property and sales tax, and other revenues. All four plans analyzed are estimated to have a positive fiscal impact on the City’s finances.

IV. DISCUSSION POINTS

As noted above, the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force focused on several questions as it has refined the draft Preferred Plan. Staff is seeking the Planning Commission’s feedback on these topics for the Preferred Plan:

- What is the appropriate level of development given a desire to create a financially feasible plan?
- How many residential units should be accommodated and what should be the balance between single family homes and multifamily units?

- Should the multifamily units and other higher density development be focused in a central area to create an “activity center” or should the higher density development be dispersed?
- Should the Operations Services Center (OSC) and Pleasanton Garbage Service (PGS) facility be relocated?

In addition, the Planning Commission should provide feedback on the alternatives to be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

V. NEXT STEPS

The City Council will receive the Planning Commission’s feedback and, after providing direction for any changes, will authorize the use of the Preferred Plan and Alternatives in the preparation of the Draft EIR and Draft Specific Plan.

Concurrent with the Draft EIR preparation, the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force will be providing feedback on the contents of the Draft Specific Plan, including design guidelines and development regulations, phasing and a financing plan. A Draft Specific Plan and Draft EIR will be available for public review in early 2014.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Discuss and provide feedback on the Preferred Plan and Alternatives.

Staff Planner: Janice Stern, Planning Manager 925.931.5606 / jsstern@cityofpleasantonca.gov