

SANTA CLARA GENERAL PLAN

GENERAL PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Date: December 11, 2008

Location: Santa Clara City Hall

Attendees:

Steering Committee Members Present:

Joe Kornder, Co-Chair
Jamie McLeod, Co-Chair
Dixie Baus
Tom Banholzer
David Delozier
Patricia Finnigan Biocini
Todd Fitch
Ray Hashimoto
Dixie Haus
Joe Head
Jerry Marsalli
Teresa O'Neill
Kevin Park
Alice Pivacek
Ed Richards
Peter Yoon

City Staff:

Kevin Riley
Carol Anne Painter
Helene Leichter
Doug Handerson
Rachel Grossman
Julie Moloney
Gian Paolo Martire

Dyett & Bhatia, Consultants:

Rajeev Bhatia
Martha Miller
Jean Eisberg

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Build upon community input and technical analysis results to brainstorm plan alternatives.
- Provide an opportunity for all Steering Committee members to participate.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Welcome and Announcements (Co-Chair McLeod)

Co-Chair McLeod opened the meeting and described the objective of tonight's meeting: to focus on land use locations. Density and design issues will be discussed at subsequent Steering Committee meetings.

II. Summary of Progress to Date (Rajeev Bhatia)

Mr. Bhatia reviewed the public outreach activities since the last Steering Committee meeting: the Community Survey and the Public Workshop on Alternative Concepts. Technical analysis has also been completed, resulting in two working papers: Existing Conditions (including land use, transportation, public facilities, and environmental issues) and a Market Assessment. Reports are available on the project website: www.santaclaragp.com.

III. Community Input and the Progressive Plan (Kevin Riley)

Public Workshop Input

Mr. Riley described key outcomes from public outreach activities to date. In summary, community members recommended that the City:

- Provide public services & infrastructure with development;
- Protect light & heavy industrial uses;
- Encourage mixed-use near Lawrence Caltrain Station & along major corridors;
- Improve El Camino Real with some new retail & residential uses at key locations;
- Maintain commercial development along Stevens Creek, adding some mixed-use & residential uses; and
- Promote the development of a Downtown.

Explanation of Progressive Plan Concept

Mr. Riley presented an overview of the progressive plan concept for the General Plan. The progressive plan concept consists of land uses applied in three phases—Short-Term Horizon: 2010-2015, Mid-Term Horizon: 2015-2025, and Long-Term Horizon: 2025-2035. The phased land use maps presented at the meeting are conceptual and do not follow property lines. Colored areas of the map are focus or change areas; uncolored portions are areas that are not expected to change.

The progressive plan concept is land use planning based on time horizons and development “prerequisites”. Prerequisites are goals, policies or standards that must be met before land use changes are made. For example, demand and capacity for infrastructure and public facilities would need to be assessed and a plan for any new infrastructure developed before changes in, or intensification of, land uses occur. Later phases of development would be reassessed and restructured as necessary as the General Plan is periodically updated.

Resulting Progressive Plan Maps and Implementation Prerequisite

2010-2015: Short-Term Horizon—manages growth, protects industrial areas, limits new housing locations; and focuses new residential & mixed uses on transit corridors/nodes.

Proposed prerequisites:

- Provide transition and open space criteria to reduce impacts on residential neighborhoods;
- Support secondary units and define development sites to meet RHNA housing allocations;
- Include standards and thresholds for new development to ensure adequate services and infrastructure;
- Provide policy incentives for retail at specific nodes to encourage mixed-use development; and
- Provide alternate locations for places of assembly to protect industrial uses.

2015-2025: Mid-Term Horizon—intensifies employment areas; protects industrial areas; adds new housing locations; and intensifies residential on transit corridors.

Proposed prerequisites:

- Implement programs for alternative transit options to reduce single-occupancy trips;
- Achieve minimum averages for City services, such as parks and emergency response times;
- Require certain infrastructure improvements for recycled water lines and sewer capacity;
- Reassess land use opportunities along transit corridors and adjust General Plan land uses to support mixed uses; and,
- Complete the next required Housing Element.

2025-2035: Long-Term Horizon—intensifies employment areas; adds new housing locations; intensifies residential & mixed-use on transit corridors; and moves Civic Center to Downtown area.

Proposed prerequisites:

- Require the expiration of the Redevelopment Area;
- Achieve minimum fiscal health to balance City revenues with costs for services and operations;
- Require certain infrastructure improvements for alternate energy, regional transportation, support services (i.e. schools, open space);
- Reassess land use opportunities along transit corridors and adjust General Plan land uses to support mixed uses; and,
- Complete the next required Housing Element.

IV. Discussion of Progressive Plan (Committee)

Summary of Committee Discussion

Steering Committee members discussed the concept of a progressive plan and gave feedback on the land use allocations of the proposed alternatives.

General Comments

- Prerequisites would help decision makers to determine if a project is consistent with the General Plan. Decision-makers would need to consider the intent of the prerequisites, as opposed to only the prescriptive nature of the prerequisites themselves.
- If a great idea comes forward in advance of the designated time frame it should be allowed to move forward with a General Plan Amendment.
- The plan should reconsider basic definitions of land uses to focus on performance issues related to development rather than development type (e.g. what will “industrial” mean in 25 years?)

- Redevelopment areas may be more appropriate for commercial uses because of tax revenue potential.
- The City should be mindful of the impacts of residential changes on our neighboring cities . Mixed use neighborhood centers should create local shopping opportunities. Employment uses can be designed to work with residential uses.
- Public and quasi-public uses, such as schools, should be included in all mixed use areas.
- The plan should include standards for green building.

Land Use Location/Map Comments

- New residential development north of Caltrain and Bayshore can help to create a more vibrant neighborhood.
- Consider more residential along Tasman corridor to take advantage of transit access. However, the City will need additional public and retail services here as well.
- More public transportation options should be added along El Camino Real. The corridor should be designated mixed use residential.
- Public transportation should be expanded along north-south routes from the Tasman corridor.
- Housing outside of airport zone (i.e. along De La Cruz, near Rivermark) should be considered.
- Consider mixed use development near Mission College.
- Look at the potential for properties along Kiely Boulevard for more residential development.
- Consider Monroe Street, south of Caltrain, for opportunities for residential intensification.

Consensus on Alternatives

The Steering Committee generally agreed on the concept of a progressive plan . They support the protection of single-family neighborhoods and support residential development north of Bayshore, as long as appropriate infrastructure and public facilities are constructed in advance or concurrently. In addition, several Committee members highlighted the importance of providing additional public transportation options.

V. Public Comments

Co-Chair McLeod invited members of the public to share comments:

- There was a concern expressed about conflicts between residential neighborhoods and businesses along Stevens Creek Boulevard. In particular, traffic calming to avoid auto test drives, regulation of business parking in the neighborhoods, and enforcement of parking, traffic and noise regulations. The Plan should protect existing neighborhoods. The process should keep residents informed of the Plan progress.
- High-density mixed use development was identified as inappropriate along El Camino Real due to interface with adjacent single family homes. Development

should be limited to five stories along this corridor. This development type is more appropriate within ½ mile of rail transit and in the industrial areas.

- The Plan should reflect the changing concept of work and the fact that workers no longer remain at the same job for long periods of time. It is not reasonable to expect that people will live near where they work. The Plan should reflect the needs and desires of the community that is in Santa Clara now.
- VTA should be consulted about future planning for new transit lines. Given transportation funding cuts, changes to routes and frequencies may be more feasible. Private local transportation service may also be feasible.

VI. Conclusion and Next Steps (Carol Anne Painter)

- Ms. Painter announced several upcoming General Plan meetings:
 - General Plan Steering Committee, Housing Element (January 15, 2009, 5:30-7:30pm)
 - Joint City Council/Planning Commission, Alternatives (February 10, 2009, 5:30-7:00pm)
 - Community Workshop, Preferred Plan (March/April)
 - Steering Committee Meeting, Preferred Plan (May)
 - Joint City Council/Planning Commission, Preferred Plan (June/July)

VII. Adjournment

NEXT STEPS

The next Steering Committee Meeting on the Housing Element will be held on Thursday, January 15, 2009, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. in the Santa Clara City Hall Council Chambers.