



**Task Force Meeting No. 2 Synopsis
December 18, 2019**

Task Force Members Present: Teresa Alvarado, David Pandori, Dev Davis, Pam Foley, Sylvia Arenas, Michelle Yesney, Melanie Griswold, Linda LeZotte, Jessie O'Malley Solis, Luis Arguello, Asn Ndiaye, David Bini, Eddie Truong, Pat Sausedo, Vincent Rocha, Nate LeBlanc, Karl Lee, Michael Van Every, Erik Schoennauer, Harvey Darnell, Juan Estrada, Kiyomi Yamamoto, Jason Su, Kevin Zwick, Leslye Corsiglia, Shiloh Ballard, Andre Luthard, Jim Zito, Sam Ho, Smita Patel, Tamiko Rast, Margie Matthews, Jesus Flores, Shawn Milligan, Ray Bramson, Bonnie Mace, Susan Butler-Graham, and Roberta Moore.

Task Force Members Absent: Pastor Oscar Dace; Trixie Johnson; Don Little
(according to sign-in sheets)

City Staff, Consultants and Other Public Agency Staff Present: Rosalynn Hughey (PBCE), Michael Brilliot (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Kieulan Pham (PBCE), Jennifer Piozet (PBCE), Jessica Setiawan (PBCE), Robert Rivera (PBCE), Daniel Parolek (Presenter/Consultant from Opticos), Adam Mayberry (Presenter/local developer)

Public Present: 25 people (according to sign-in sheets)

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Overview of Agenda

The meeting convened at approximately 6:00 p.m.

2. Follow-Up Discussion on November's Proposed Changes to Urban Villages

Jennifer Piozet, Supervising Planner of the Urban Village (UV) team, provided clarifications on UV implementation and staff's recommendations based on comments from the Task Force and the public.

3. Public Comment & Task Force Recommendation on Urban Villages

Public Comment

Below is an overview of public comments on staff's recommendations on the UV scoping items.

Signature Project Policy

Alex Shoor from CatalyzeSV stated that it makes sense to have objective requirements, but CatalyzeSV wants to address the quality of the community meeting to hear community ideas incorporated into a Signature project. The organization wants to also frame the policy to include

listening to the existing residents for the character and identity of the area as well as develop the project for the people that we (the City) want to bring into the community. One community member expressed the need for better notifications of General Plan designation amendments. Another community member asked for clarifications of the open space requirement, which staff explained is in addition to the existing Parkland Dedication Ordinance and Park Impact Ordinance (PIO/PDO) requirements (e.g., private recreation space and common open space requirements) on a development project.

Task Force Discussion

The Task Force members asked questions, discussed Staff's recommendations, and made motions on multiple Urban Village (UV) scoping items.

Urban Village Boundary Modifications

Staff recommended the following modifications to Urban Villages:

- 1) Eliminate Evergreen Village,
- 2) Eliminate Capitol Ave./Foxdale Urban Village, and
- 3) Remove the Reed & Graham site from the Race Street Urban Village boundary.

Task Force members wanted to understand the overall goal, direction of the General Plan on the topic of job and housing imbalanced. Staff responded that the City is concern with the job and housing imbalance for health issues such as increased greenhouse gas emissions from people commuting long distances and for fiscal impacts. The General Plan has the goal to achieve the jobs to employed residents ratio of 1.1 to one.

The Task Force asked staff to clarify what happens to the existing capacities allocated for development in the Evergreen Village if the UV is eliminated and what would happen to the existing empty lots at Evergreen Village Square. Staff explained that the existing empty lots have entitlements and can develop under those entitlements. With most of the UV being built out, going through a UV plan process would effectively allow for one development project to move forward. Also, currently any new development within the UV would either have to develop under an existing entitlement, under the Signature Project Policy, under an existing underlining General Plan designation that allows for residential, or comply with the City's 100% deed-restricted affordable housing policies. Also, a larger discussion of capacities will be brought forward to the Task Force later on with the Evergreen-East Hills Area Development Policy.

The Task Force also asked staff to clarify the current status of the Reed & Graham site and whether the owner wants to move the business or not. The City's Office of Economic Development reached out to the general manager and the owner of Reed & Graham. They stated that at one time, they were looking to relocate the business due to the residential and park development in the area. A suitable location in the South Bay was not found and the owner decided to reinvest in the site and the business and is committed to staying at the current location.

Task Force member Shawn Milligan made the motion to:

- 1) Eliminate Evergreen Village,
- 2) Eliminate Capitol Ave./Foxdale urban village, and

3) Make no change to the Race Street urban village boundary for the Reed & Graham site.

Task Force members were in favor of this motion, with the exception of Michelle Yesney in opposition. Yesney has expressed in the previous Task Force meeting that the Task Force should understand the long-term consequences of redevelopment of the Reed & Graham site and via email that alternative sites within the City should be identified for Reed & Graham and similar businesses (i.e., “locally unwanted land use”) if the Task Force wants to designate the site to allow for a mixed-use development.

The Task Force brought up a separate discussion on whether to create new urban villages along Story Road/Capitol Avenue and Story Road/White Road. This discussion was deferred until the next Task Force meeting on January 30, 2020, after staff’s presentation on Neighborhood Business Districts (NBDs), which will include the Story Road NBD.

Residential Pool Policy (General Plan Policy IP-2.11)

Staff recommended removing the Residential Pool Policy, General Plan Policy IP-2.11.

Task Force members asked staff to clarify how the City’s residential capacity is affected and how projects would move forward in future horizons or in UVs without an adopted plan if the Residential Pool Policy was eliminated. Staff stated that the policy does not add new residential units into the City. The intent of the policy was to phase the number of residential units in UVs in future horizons and in UVs without an adopted plan. In practice, since the adoption of the Envision 2040 General Plan, the City has not reached the 5,000 units capacity allowed by the Residential Pool Policy. Developments currently are allowed to move forward in UVs without adopted plans by 1) developing a site consistent with the General Plan designation, 2) meeting the Signature Project Policy requirements, or 3) qualifying as a 100% deed-restricted affordable housing project under General Plan Policy IP-5.12. This process will not change with the elimination of the Residential Pool Policy.

Task Force member Jim Zito made the motion to eliminate the Residential Pool Policy (General Plan Policy IP-2.11). The motion was second by Pat Sausedo and third by Councilmember Foley. The motion was unanimously passed.

General Plan Policy IP-5.5 (Urban Village Development)

Staff recommended the following modifications to General Plan Policy IP-5.5:

IP-5.5 Employ the Urban Village Planning process to plan land uses that include adequate capacity for the full amount of planned job and housing growth, including identification of optimal sites for new retail development and careful consideration of appropriate minimum and maximum densities for residential and employment uses to ensure that the Urban Village Area will provide sufficient capacity to support the full amount of planned job growth under this Envision Plan. ~~The Urban Village Plan should be consistent with the following objectives:~~

- ~~1. The Urban Village planning process is not a mechanism to convert employment lands to non-employment uses.~~
- ~~2. Other City policies such as raising revenues, for example which could occur through the conversion of employment lands to non-employment uses shall not take precedent over the jobs first principle.~~
- ~~3. The General Plan's jobs first principles apply to Urban Villages and that residential conversions are not allowed to proceed ahead of the job creation that is necessary to balance the residential elements of the Village Plan. This policy means that jobs and housing can move together on a case by case basis.~~

A Task Force member asked that if these objectives are removed, are there other mechanism or statements in the General Plan to assert that the City does not encourage conversion of employment lands. Staff clarified that there are multiple policies in the General Plan to encourage preservation and enhancement of industrial, commercial and other employment lands. One Task Force member commented that the intent of the original version of the policy (without the three objectives) was to provide new housing opportunities in areas with underutilized retail properties to avoid sprawl and loss of open space. Another Task Force member mentioned that while the City is focused on housing development, other goals of the General Plan should be considered as well, such as reducing vehicles-miles-traveled and environmental effects and location of mixed-use developments. Staff stated that the objectives provided challenges to the development of Urban Village plans by limiting the ability to designate suitable sites as all residential or commercial.

Task Force member Erik Schoennauer made the motion to approve staff's recommendation to remove the three objectives from General Plan Policy IP-5.5. The motion was unanimously passed.

4. Missing Middle Housing: Presentation on an Additional Housing Opportunity for San José

Presentation on missing middle housing by Daniel Parolek from Opticos.

5. Plex Housing: A Developer's Perspective

Presentation on a recent development in San Jose under the missing middle/plex housing principle by Adam Mayberry

6. Discussion and Questions on Missing Middle and Plex Housing

No comments from the Task Force.

7. Task Force Discussion & Public Comment

Task Force Discussion

The Task Force continued the discussion on Urban Village scoping items.

Signature Project Policy (General Plan Policy IP-5.10)

Staff recommended revising the Signature Project Policy to include clear requirements to implement recent State legislations that requires cities to review housing development based on objective standards as described on page six of the [overview memo](#) for the December 18, 2019 Task Force meeting. Establishing clear requirements would provide transparency and predictability to both developers and the community.

Task Force members deliberated the various standards with the majority of the discussion focusing on the enhancement of the community engagement criteria and incentives for development of affordable housing exceeding the City’s current requirements. Staff clarified that community engagement, or outreach, for development proposals are enforced by City Council Policy 6-30 (Public Outreach). A Task Force member also suggested the open space criteria should be evaluated as a percentage of the size of a site, however, it was not included as part of the motion.

With regards to how job-density is calculated for a Signature Project, staff confirmed that the practice has been for a project to provide more than the “fair share” of jobs obligation planned in the Urban Village. The “fair share” of jobs obligation are 1) the replacement of the existing commercial square footage on-site and 2) the percentage of the planned jobs for the entire village that a new development is required to provide based upon the size of the site. Staff also clarified that the General Plan does not establish a minimum commercial requirement for Urban Villages. This level of specificity is reserved for the Urban Village plan planning process.

Task Force member Erik Schoennauer made the motion to approve staff’s recommendation with the following amendments and deferment:

- Reduce the site selection criteria for an interior parcel to be a minimum of 1.5 acres and have a minimum of 100-foot street frontage,
- Provide the planned average job-density in the Urban Village, and
- Refer to staff to provide recommendations on community engagement and affordable housing incentive criteria by the next Task Force meeting.

The motion was unanimously passed.

Other Task Force Comments

Below is a list of questions and comments raised by Task Force members to staff to follow-up to inform the Task Force for decision-making:

- Staff will provide recommendations for community engagement specifications for the Signature Project Policy.
- Staff will provide recommendations for affordable housing incentives for Signature Projects that exceed the current affordable housing requirements, including the City’s

Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO). A potential incentive is to lower the job density requirement.

- For the discussion of Signature Project Policy, provide information about the effects of displacement on existing residents.
- Analyze Story Road/White Road and Story Road/Capitol Avenue as a potential Urban Village.

Task Force members suggested for informational purposes that on the Signature Project Policy, compare staff's recommendations for site selection criteria and the motion passed by the Task Force and provide the number of parcels in UVs that would fit these criteria.

Public Comment

The majority of public comments was focused on housing development considerations for appropriate locations and effects on the existing neighborhoods. Suggestions included concentrating new housing near rail and bus rapid transit lines and consider the effects to existing neighborhoods, including neighborhood business districts.

8. Announcements

Next Task Force meeting will commence on January 30, 2020.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9 p.m.