



**Task Force Meeting No. 47 Synopsis
December 13, 2010**

Task Force Members Present*:

Jackie Adams, Teresa Alvarado, Shiloh Ballard, Michele Beasley, Judy Chirco, Gary Chronert, Pastor Oscar Dace, Pat Dando, Harvey Darnell, Brian Darrow, Dave Fadness, Leslee Hamilton, Lisa Jensen, Frank Jesse, Charles Lauer, Karl Lee, Linda LeZotte, Shirley Lewis, Sam Liccardo, Pierluigi Oliverio, David Pandori, Dick Santos, Patricia Sausedo, Erik Schoennauer, Alofa Talivaa,

Task Force Members Absent:

Enrique Fernandez, Sam Ho, Nancy Ianni, Matt Kamkar, Judy Stabile, Neil Struthers, Michael Van Every, Jim Zito.

City Staff and Other Public Agency Staff Present*

Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Susan Walton (PBCE), Andrew Crabtree (PBCE), John Baty (PBCE), Dipa Chundur (PBCE), Wayne Chen (Housing).

Public Present*:

Ulitafa Mariner Mamea (Sierra Neighborhood Associations), Terry Christensen (Comm. University SJSU), Peter Rothschild (Rothschild & Associates), Roland Lebrun (Manila Dr), Martin Delson (save our trails), Richard Zappelli (Willow Glen Neighborhood Association), Adara Beamesdefer (San Jose State University), Larry Ames (SJ Neighborhood Associations), Leah Toeniskoetter (resident), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Kerry Hamilton (CEEJ), M. Cescis (Newhall Neighborhood resident), Steve Kline (Burbank DelMonte NAC), Susan Marshland (District 4), Thomas Clarel (Newhall Neighborhood), Juliette Eichler (Newhall Neighborhood), John Urban (Newhall Neighborhood), Monica Gallyot (Olinder Neighborhood Association.), Davide Vieira (Five Wounds / Brookwood Terrace NAC), Jean Dresden, Tim Ledds (Rosevelt Park Neighborhood Association), Jack Nadeau (Save our Trails)

*As verified by registering attendance on Sign-In Sheets.

1. Welcome

The meeting was convened at 6:36 p.m.

2. Review and approval of November 15, 2010 synopsis

The Revised November 15th synopsis was approved.

3. Envision Task Force Ambassador Program Update

Staff and Task Force members provided an update on recent outreach activities. Staff encouraged the Task Force to help identify community stakeholder groups and leaders to engage in the Envision process and also to lead or take part in presentations to those community groups.

4. Draft Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan

The discussion in this section is based on the proposed Task Force edits on Riparian Setbacks, Residential Neighborhood Infill and Landmark Projects; Community input on Historic Preservation and Residential Neighborhood Interface and the related Staff Recommendation on each.

Riparian Corridor: Andrew Crabtree presented the edits to the Riparian Corridor setback text first. He mentioned that the Task Force recommended a minimum 50-foot setback and that Staff is still recommending that the text for a minimum 100-foot setback be retained but that additional detail be provided in this Draft. Staff commented that by keeping the 100-foot setback as the minimum, there would be less conflict with the draft Habitat Conservation Plan.

Some of the Task Force members expressed the need to strengthen the language further. It was suggested to include an action item to discuss the issue at a later time. One of the Task Force members responded that the Planning Commission has set up a subcommittee to discuss the Riparian Corridor Policy Study and to subsequently recommend that it be approved as a policy. Several of the Task Force members expressed that the Task Force should not focus on setting timelines or crafting specific riparian related policy.

Following public comment (see Agenda item 6) and a brief discussion, the Task Force voted unanimously to accept Staff's recommended riparian policy language.

Residential Infill projects: Andrew Crabtree mentioned that in response to the request by the Task Force, language was now incorporated to clarify that properties can redevelop at the existing density in the Residential Neighborhood areas. He explained the text by providing examples of possible redevelopment scenarios.

Following public comment (see Agenda item 6) and a brief discussion, the Task Force voted unanimously to accept Staff's recommended policy language for residential neighborhood infill.

Landmark Projects: Andrew Crabtree asked the Task Force to refer to the new updated page on the proposed edits instead of the one included in the packet. He then explained the purpose and criteria for "Landmark Projects," and clarified that these projects would typically be mixed-use projects. One of the Task Force members suggested that the word 'Landmark' should be reserved for referencing historic structures and that staff should consider an alternative word (e.g., catalyst or signature). Another member commented that the text regarding non-residential uses is still not clear and asked that staff continue to try to provide a clear distinction. Another member asked staff to clarify what the criterion of "extraordinary" means and suggested a point system could be used to make a determination.

One Task Force member wanted language to be incorporated in Policy 5.10 to protect privately maintained, but publicly accessible areas. Another member agreed with this idea in that it might be a good way to protect public access to private parks/tot lots for the future. In response, Joe Horwedel mentioned that if such facilities were part of a parkland dedication then they should be maintained as per the parkland agreement and that it is not within the scope of this General Plan to include such requirements. Instead, he recommended that language similar to that in the riparian policy could be added.

A Task Force member expressed concern that non-residential projects would be able to develop in a village area but not meet the average job density for the village. Joe Horwedel responded that the City does not want to be in the position to say no to jobs. Andrew Crabtree added that once built, residential developments tend to be fairly permanent, whereas lower intensity jobs/non-residential development is more likely to redevelop over time.

Following public comment (Agenda item 6) and additional discussion, the Task Force voted unanimously to accept staff's recommended language on 'Landmark' projects.

5. Environmental Review for the General Plan Update

Darryl Boyd gave a presentation on environmental review for the General Plan Update. The presentation focused on three desired outcomes: 1) Understand the purpose and process of the 2040 General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR); 2) Review the required contents of the EIR; and 3) Learn tips on how to review the Envision EIR.

The following are questions from the Task Force and the staff responses:

Q. When will the Draft EIR be released? A. *Sometime after the first of the year.*

Q. Where will copies of the Draft EIR be made available? A. *On-line and in all libraries. Task Force members can request a hard copy (in addition to the copy on CD).*

Q. Why is there no discussion of Environmental Justice? A. *Unlike environmental review for federal projects, CEQA does not require direct discussion of environmental justice.*

6. Public Comment

Thirteen members of the public provided comments. Five members of the public advocated for the Five Wounds Plan, with four suggesting that the VTA-owned abandoned railroad right-of-way be re-designated as Open Space, Parklands and Habitat and that the existing Light Industrial area be re-designated to allow a mix of residential and commercial uses.

One speaker commented on the riparian corridor policy section of the draft Plan and wanted the exceptions to be revised. The Task Force was encouraged to consider policy language that would require a transition zone between villages and existing neighborhoods (e.g., 1-foot of setback for every 1-foot of height). Another speaker mentioned that it's important to have a village plan approved first and the distinction should be made between residential and commercial from the resident's view point. Another speaker wanted discussion on social equity to be included in the General Plan as it will affect a lot of people. A member of the public announced the effort to bring the 2020 World Expo to Silicon Valley.

7. Announcements

Susan Walton provided an update on the pending San Jose 2020 General Plan Amendments and Requests for Alternative Draft Envision 2040 Land Use Designations. The Evergreen*East Hills Vision Strategy (EEHVS) General Plan Amendments and the Request for Alternative Draft Envision 2040 Land Use Designation on one of the Campus Industrial sites were Denied/Rejected at the December 7, 2010 City Council hearing. The South Almaden Valley Urban Reserve (SAVUR) Request for Alternative Draft Envision 2040 Land Use Designation was withdrawn by the Requestor.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.