

**TO: Envision San José 2040
4-Year Review Task Force**

FROM: Michael Brilliot

**SUBJECT: FEBRUARY 25, 2016
ENVISION SAN JOSÉ 2040
4-YEAR REVIEW
TASK FORCE MEETING**

DATE: February 18, 2016

This memo provides information to assist you in preparing for the February 25, 2016 Envision San José 2040 Task Force meeting. Links to the referenced documents and other resource materials (e.g. reading materials and correspondence) are posted on the Envision San José 2040 4-Year Review website (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/GeneralPlanReview>).

The following is a summary of agenda items for the February 25, 2016 Task Force meeting:

Agenda Item 3 – Presentation and Discussion on Urban Village Policy Modifications

Overview of Urban Village Planning

The Envision San José 2040 General Plan promotes the development of Urban Villages to provide active, walkable, bicycle-friendly, transit-oriented, mixed-use urban settings for new housing and job growth. There are 68 designated Urban Villages in the Envision 2040 General Plan (see Attachment A: Growth Areas and Urban Villages Horizon Map). Urban Villages are intended to be attractive to an innovative and economically diverse workforce, enhance established neighborhoods, and be consistent with the Plan's environmental goals. Development of vibrant, walkable, mixed-use Urban Villages at strategic locations throughout the City is key to achieving planned jobs and housing growth in a form consistent with the vision of the General Plan.

All 68 Urban Villages have been allocated planned jobs and housing growth based on their location, local development patterns, and other factors. The distribution of planned jobs and housing growth in Urban Villages and all other designated Growth Areas is detailed in Appendix 5 of the General Plan (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7541>). The development of planned jobs and housing growth in each Urban Village is implemented through the Urban Village Planning process, as established by implementation policies in Chapter 7 (IP-5.1 – IP-5.9) and Appendix 6 (Urban Village Planning Guidelines) of the General Plan.

The General Plan requires the preparation of comprehensive Urban Village plans that support the full amounts of planned job and housing growth capacity before issuance of entitlements for residential development within any of the Urban Villages. Absent an approved Urban Village Plan, only non-residential development may proceed within Urban Villages, with the exception of: 1) properties

within Urban Villages with a currently underlying residential land use designation¹; and 2) City Council approval of a “Signature Project”.

Consistent with the Community Based Planning Major Strategy, the preparation of Urban Village Plans provides for continued community involvement in the implementation of the General Plan and for land use and urban design issues to be addressed at a finer level of detail. Community meetings are convened by the Planning Division during Urban Village Plan development, with regular participation from the Department of Transportation; Office of Economic Development; Housing; Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services; and the Office of Cultural Affairs/Public Art. Policy IP-5.2 of the General Plan establishes a goal of nine months to develop an Urban Village Plan.

Presently, the City Council has approved six Urban Village Plans including Roosevelt Park, Little Portugal, Alum Rock Avenue, 24th and William Street, Five Wounds, and the Diridon Station Area Plan. These plans incorporate a form-based planning approach and provide more detailed information related to allowable uses, density, and FAR that are permitted within each Urban Village.

In addition to the six approved Urban Village Plans, the following eight Urban Villages are in various stages of the planning process to develop Urban Village Plans.

Urban Village Plan Schedule

Urban Village Plan	Anticipated Completion
The Alameda (Horizon 1)	Spring 2016
West San Carlos (Horizon 1)	Fall 2016
South Bascom (Horizon 2)	Fall 2016
East Santa Clara (Horizon 1)	Fall 2016
Stevens Creek (Horizon 3)	Fall 2016
Santana Row/Valley Fair (Horizon 3)	Fall 2016
Winchester Boulevard (Horizon 3)	Fall 2016
Blossom Hill/Snell (Horizon 2)	Fall 2017

Urban Village Plan Horizons

Major Strategy #12, Plan Horizons and Periodic Major Review, establishes a framework to monitor achievement of key General Plan goals and the use of Plan Horizons to phase implementation of the Plan over time. Specifically, the General Plan provides a tool for phasing residential development within Urban Villages in order to carefully manage San José’s expected housing growth. Plan Horizons establish clear priorities for locations, type and amount of new development in the Growth Areas; support efficient use of the City’s land resources and delivery of City services; and minimize potential environmental impacts.

The Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update Task Force identified Planning Horizon objectives that identified economic development, fiscal sustainability, and environmental leadership as the key

¹ Most sites within Horizon 2 and Horizon 3 Urban Villages have a Neighborhood/Community Commercial or other non-residential designation, so that new residential development is planned only to occur when the City commences the identified Plan Horizon for that Urban Village area.

goals for land use planning; and indicated that new growth capacity should be planned to strongly support transit use and to create walkable, Urban Village areas which incorporate retail and other commercial uses, public services and adequate infrastructure, including parks and public open spaces.

Because the key elements of the vision for the General Plan are to achieve fiscal sustainability and to improve Jobs-to-Housing balance, proposals for commercial and other combinations of non-residential development can be pursued at any time, consistent with existing land use designations. However, to provide for residential development, the General Plan includes each Urban Village in a series of three incremental growth Horizons so that the amount of new housing and the City’s need to provide services for those new residents are increased gradually over the timeframe of the Plan.

Currently, the City is in Horizon 1. As specified in General Plan Policy IP-2.9 (Chapter 7, page 9), priority is given for new residential growth to occur in areas proximate to Downtown, with access to existing and planned transit facilities, and adequate infrastructure to support intensification, and proximate to other Growth Areas. The table below shows which Growth Areas are included within each Plan Horizon. Each Plan Horizon would open additional geographic areas to the possibility of residential development (See Attachment B: Urban Village Categories Map).

Base: Capacity for new housing development not regulated by Plan Horizons	Downtown, Specific Plan areas, North San José, vacant / underutilized lands, residential neighborhoods, and existing entitlements
Horizon 1	Downtown Urban Village Corridors (E. Santa Clara Street, Alum Rock Avenue, W. San Carlos Street, and The Alameda)
Horizon 2	BART Station, Light Rail Station, and Light Rail Corridor Urban Villages
Horizon 3	Planned Local Rail Stations and Corridors, Commercial Centers, and Neighborhood Urban Villages

The General Plan’s Horizon policies include flexibility to allow the implementation of Urban Villages to be responsive to market conditions, while meeting overall Plan objectives by providing policies to move Urban Villages to the next Horizon. The three mechanisms to move Urban Villages to the next Horizon include: the General Plan 4-Year Review, the Annual Performance Review, or construction of a Signature Project.

General Plan 4-Year Review

As part of the General Plan 4-Year Review process, and detailed in implementation Policy IP-2.5, the City Council considers whether the jobs/housing balance, fiscal sustainability, and infrastructure are sufficiently strong to move all Urban Villages in a future Horizon (Horizon 2 or Horizon 3) into the current Plan Horizon.

IP-2.5 During each Major Review of the Envision General Plan evaluate input provided by the reconvened Task Force and achievement of the following key General Plan goals to inform the City Council’s decision, regarding needed changes, to begin the next General Plan Horizon, or to increase the number of residential units available for non-specific Urban Village areas:

1. Jobs/Housing Balance – Demonstrate improvement of the City’s jobs to employed resident ratio (J/ER) consistent with achievement of 1.3 jobs per employed resident by the year 2040.
2. Fiscal Sustainability – Demonstrate sustainable improvement above 2010 levels in the level of service for City services provided to the San José community.
3. Housing Supply – Verify that the current Planning Horizon contains adequate capacity to meet San José’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the upcoming 4-year term.
4. Infrastructure – Confirm that adequate infrastructure and service facilities, especially transit, exist or that a secure plan for them is in place to support the planned jobs and housing capacity in the current and contemplated Horizon.

Based on data from the current General Plan 4-Year Review, the J/ER ratio has remained relatively unchanged since adoption of Envision San José 2040, and City service levels are generally below 2010 levels. Planned housing capacity in Horizon 1 is adequate to meet the City’s current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)², and Horizon 1 Urban Villages are located in established transit corridors and station areas, in close proximity to the Downtown.

General Plan Annual Review

As specified in General Plan Policy IP-3.5 below, the City Council, as part of the General Plan Annual Review, may consider modifying the identified Plan Horizon for individual Urban Villages.

IP-3.5 Annual Review may include consideration of required General Plan Amendments for proposals to modify identified Urban Village Growth Areas, including creation of new Urban Villages, removal of existing Urban Villages or modification of a Growth Area’s boundaries, or to modify the identified Plan Horizon for an Urban Village...

Construction of Signature Projects

Following construction of a Signature Project, Policy IP-2.10 of the General Plan, requires the subject Urban Village be moved into the current Planning Horizon. The Signature Project process is described below.

Signature Projects

A Signature Project is a development proposal within an Urban Village area that clearly advances and can serve as a catalyst for the full implementation of the General Plan Urban Village strategy. For this reason, a residential, mixed-use Signature Project may also proceed ahead of preparation of a Village Plan. A Signature Project may be developed within an Urban Village designated as part of the current Plan Horizon, or in a future Horizon Urban Village area by making use of the residential Pool capacity (see page 6).

² The California Department of Housing and Community Development and California Department of Finance (DOF) calculate statewide housing needs based upon population projections and regional population forecasts. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) then assigns the region’s housing allocation to each jurisdiction, known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA.

Residential, mixed-use Signature projects must meet the following requirements to proceed within Urban Village areas in advance of the preparation of an Urban Village Plan:

1. Conforms to the Land Use / Transportation Diagram. Within the Urban Village areas, Signature projects are appropriate on sites with an Urban Village, residential, or commercial Land Use / Transportation Diagram designation.
2. Incorporates job growth capacity above the average density of jobs/acre planned for the developable portions of the entire Village Planning area and, for portions of a Signature project that include housing, those portions incorporate housing density at or above the average density of dwelling units per acre planned for the entire Village Planning area.
3. Is located at a visible, prominent location within the Village so that it can be an example for, but not impose obstacles to, subsequent other development within the Village area.
4. Includes public parklands and/or privately maintained, publicly-accessible plazas or open space areas.
5. Achieves the pedestrian friendly design guideline objectives identified within this General Plan.
6. Is planned and designed through a process that provided a substantive opportunity for input by interested community members.
7. Demonstrates high-quality architectural, landscape and site design features.
8. Is consistent with the recommendations of the City's Architectural Review Committee or equivalent recommending body if the project is subject to review by such body.

To date, the City has received four development permit applications for Signature Projects. One of the Signature Project applications, Santana Row West, removed the residential component from the proposal and it is no longer a Signature Project. The three other Signature Projects are currently being evaluated by Planning staff and are located in the East Santa Clara Street Urban Village, North Capitol Avenue/McKee Road Urban Village, and Stevens Creek Boulevard Urban Village (see following link for recent San Jose Mercury News article on Stevens Creek Boulevard Urban Village Signature Project proposal: http://www.mercurynews.com/business/ci_29533121/offices-homes-retail-may-turn-garden-city-site). Staff is evaluating the proposed Signature Projects consistent with Policy IP-5.10, and all other applicable guidelines and regulations.

Residential Pool Capacity

The residential Pool capacity may be allocated to allow entitlement of residential projects within Urban Village Areas not included within the current Plan Horizon. This pool is initially established as 5,000 units. The primary function of the residential Pool is to allow residential mixed-use projects in Horizon 2 and 3 Urban Villages to be considered for approval in those Villages with an adopted Urban Village Plan. Signature Projects in Horizon 2 and 3 Urban Villages must also utilize the residential Pool. The residential Pool may be replenished as part of a General Plan 4-Year Review. No Signature

Projects or residential mixed-use projects in Horizon 2 or 3 Urban Villages with completed plans have been approved since adoption of Envision San Jose 2040. Therefore, the residential Pool is currently at 5,000 units.

Staff Recommendations on Plan Horizons and Residential Pool Capacity

Staff is not recommending moving to Horizon 2 during the current General Plan 4-Year Review, consistent with direction provided by the City Council and Policy IP-2.5, which includes furthering key economic and fiscal goals prior to opening up the next Plan Horizon. The City is still in the early implementation stages of the Envision San José 2040 General Plan, and should phase residential development consistent with the Planning Horizon vision and goals of the General Plan. Additionally, based on staff experience developing Urban Village Plans in different Horizons, community support for growth and intensification has been stronger in Horizon 1 Urban Villages, which are located in more urban areas of the City.

Staff is also not recommending adjustments to the residential Pool policy or its current 5000 unit capacity. The Pool has not been since its establishment by the Envision San José 2040 General Plan; however, with the completion and Council approval of the Horizon III Urban Village plans currently in process, and with the proposed modifications to the distribution of job growth, it is anticipated that there will be development proposals seeking to use the Pool policy in the coming four years.

Staff Recommended Updates to Urban Village Policies

Staff is recommending minor modifications to Urban Village policies that focus on Signature Projects. As part of staff's recommendation to adjust the General Plan's planned job capacity, approximately 35,000 planned jobs were removed from Urban Village Growth Areas. Adjustments to planned job capacity in Urban Villages impact Signature Project policies by lowering the employment threshold, specifically Policy IP-5.10, which requires Signature Projects to incorporate job growth capacity above the average density of jobs/acre planned for the developable portions of the Urban Village. For example, a Signature Project on an approximately half-acre site in the Branham Lane/Meridian Avenue Neighborhood Urban Village, with approximately 3,400 square feet of existing commercial uses, would currently need to provide 0.40 Floor Area Ratio (FAR)³, or approximately 9,100 square feet of commercial uses. Under the new planned job capacity for the Branham Lane/Meridian Avenue Urban Village, the same site would only need to provide 0.18 FAR, or approximately 4,000 square feet of commercial uses.

Staff is recommending to update General Plan Policy IP-5.10 to require *Neighborhood Urban Villages* to integrate commercial square footage that equates to above the average density of jobs/acre for the given Urban Village or provide the amount of commercial space that is equivalent to a FAR of 0.35, whichever is higher. Staff is also recommending that Signature Projects demonstrate that they will have a net positive fiscal impact to the City over a 30 year period.

³ Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the total square feet of a building divided by the total square feet of the lot upon which the building is located.

The recommendation to require a minimum of 0.35 FAR of commercial uses for Signature Projects would only apply to Neighborhood Urban Villages. Neighborhood Urban Villages do not currently have significant planned job growth, and adjustments to planned job capacities leave many Neighborhood Village Signature Projects with only incidental, or token retail, which does not meet the goals of Signature Projects. Existing suburban shopping centers typically have a 0.20 to 0.30 FAR for retail uses, which is most likely to fill commercial spaces in Neighborhood Urban Villages. The 0.35 FAR commercial use minimum would not apply to Regional and Local Transit Urban Villages or Commercial Center and Corridor Villages because staff found that the planned job capacity adjustments were not as impactful as in Neighborhood Urban Villages, and adjustments were not necessary. To summarize, staff's intended outcomes of the recommended modifications to Policy IP-5.10 are as follows:

- Consistent with the intent of Signature Projects to advance the General Plan Urban Village strategy, the jobs threshold should remain high enough that residential mixed use projects include more than incidental commercial uses.
- Urban Villages with anticipated market demand for employment growth would maintain existing or have a higher jobs threshold for Signature Projects (e.g., Regional Transit Urban Villages and Commercial Center Villages and Corridors).
- Urban Villages with low anticipated employment growth and not on major transit, would, however, have a slightly reduced jobs threshold for Signature Projects (e.g., Local Transit Urban Villages).

Staff is also recommending removing General Plan Policy IP-2.10, which reads:

IP-2.10 To facilitate the development of complete Urban Village areas, following construction of a Signature Project within a future Horizon Urban Village, move the subject Urban Village into the current Planning Horizon.

Staff is recommending removing IP-2.10 because this Policy would automatically shift, without any consideration, an Urban Village to the current Planning Horizon following construction of a Signature Project. There are many factors that should be considered before moving an Urban Village into the current Planning Horizon, such as existing infrastructure, location to transit, and community sentiment. The General Plan already allows the City Council to consider moving Urban Villages during both the Annual Review and 4-Year Review. Staff believes there should be an opportunity for City Council to have discretion before automatically moving Urban Villages into the current Planning Horizon following construction of a Signature Project. Eliminating this Policy will allow City Council, following construction of a Signature Project, to consider moving the Urban Village into the current Planning Horizon during the proceeding Annual or 4-Year Review.

Lastly, staff is recommending updating Policy IP-5.2, which sets a goal of nine months to complete an Urban Village Plan. Based on preparation of the first six Urban Village Plans, nine months is not a realistic timeframe. More community engagement has been needed than originally anticipated when this Policy was developed. The need for community engagement has also varied between Urban Villages. Urban Villages in suburban areas typically require more engagement than areas that are

more urbanized. For example, the Santana Row and Winchester Urban Villages planning process includes monthly stakeholder advisory group meetings. If Urban Village Plans were prepared in nine months, the level of community engagement would need to be significantly reduced, which would be inconsistent with the first Major Strategy of the General Plan (Community Based Planning). For these reasons, staff is recommending removing the nine month time frame from Policy IP-5.2.

See Attachment C for a complete strikeout/underline version of staff’s recommended text changes to General Plan Policies IP-2.10, IP-5.2, and IP-5.10.

Agenda Item 4 – Presentation and Discussion on Actions to Facilitate Affordable Housing

As part of the scope of the 4-Year Review process, the City is required to evaluate the availability and affordability of housing supply within San José (*Envision San José 2040 General Plan*, Policy IP-2.4). Additionally, City Council directed staff to explore opportunities as part of the 4-Year Review to facilitate the production of affordable housing through the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan.

Availability of Housing Supply

The evaluation of housing capacity for the first Plan Horizon was evaluated in the recently certified Housing Element. The Housing Element is one of seven State-required components of local general plans (State of California, Government Code Section 65302). Typically updated every five to eight years, cities and counties develop their Housing Element to plan for their “fair share” of the regional housing across income levels and needs. The City’s Housing Element was adopted by the City Council in January 2015 and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development in April 2015. The full Housing Element is available at <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/43759>.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development and California Department of Finance (DOF) calculate statewide housing needs based upon population projections and regional population forecasts. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) then assigns the region’s housing allocation to each jurisdiction, known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation or RHNA. San José has been assigned 35,080 new housing units over the current eight year cycle (2014 - 2023).

Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for San Jose (2014-2022)

Income Category*	2007-2014 RHNA	2014-2022 RHNA	Percent Change
Very Low	7,751	9,233	19.1%
Low	5,322	5,428	2.0%
Moderate	6,198	6,188	-0.2%
Above Moderate	15,450	14,231	-7.9%
Totals	34,721	35,080	1.0%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), *Regional Housing Need Plan*

*Note: Very Low= up to 50% of Area Median Income (AMI); Low= 51% to 80% of AMI; Moderate= 81% to 120% of AMI; Above Moderate= above 120% of AMI

The income categories in the table above are based on a percentage of the area median income (AMI) as set by the State and are then adjusted by household size: smaller households have lower income qualification thresholds, while larger households have higher thresholds. The table below provides a summary of the incomes adjusted by household size that would qualify for affordable housing in the various categories:

Income Category	Household Size			
	1	2	3	4
Extremely Low (0-30% AMI)	\$22,350	\$25,550	\$28,750	\$31,900
Very Low (30-50% AMI)	\$37,250	\$42,550	\$47,850	\$53,150
Low (50-80% AMI)	\$59,400	\$67,900	\$76,400	\$84,900
Median (AMI)	\$74,400	\$85,050	\$95,650	\$106,300
Moderate (80-120% AMI)	\$89,300	\$102,050	\$114,800	\$127,550

Source: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/housing-policy-development/housing-resource-center/reports/state/inc2k15.pdf>

Envision San José 2040 General Plan Policy IP-2.5 requires the City to verify that the current Planning Horizon contains adequate capacity to meet San José’s RHNA for the upcoming 8-year term. While the Planning Horizons for Urban Villages may limit the speed at which residential development may occur, analysis completed as part of the Housing Element update adequate sites inventory determined that the City has the capacity to meet its RHNA targets in the current Planning Horizon through capacity achieved in other ways – such as in Downtown, in Planned Communities, and through previously entitled projects.

The Housing Element determined that 2,666 dwelling units could be developed in Horizon 1 Urban Villages within the current RHNA cycle (2014 – 2023). This number is conservatively based on the allocated units for the Urban Villages that were anticipated to have an Urban Village Financing Plan in place by 2023. The ‘Already Entitled’, ‘Downtown’, and ‘Planning Communities’ categories yield approximately 80 percent of the current RHNA allocation.

Affordability of Housing Supply

As mentioned above, San José has been assigned 35,080 new housing units over the current eight year RHNA cycle (2014 - 2023). Of the 35,080 units, approximately 60 percent are assigned as affordable units (see Table 1). Meeting this goal will be difficult due to a variety of challenges in providing affordable housing.

As noted in the table above, San Jose had an allocation of 34,721 units for the 2007-14 RHNA period. In total, the City met 46% of the total allocation. However, most of that was through the development of market-rate housing. The City met 85 percent of its Above Moderate (e.g., market-rate) housing allocation by issuing over 13,073 permits. Yet, the City only met 23% of its very low-income allocation (1,774 permits for 7,751 unit allocation), 20% of its low-income allocation (1,038 permits for 5,322 unit allocation), and 2% of its moderate-income allocation (144 permits for 6,198). Between 2012 and 2014, San José issued building permits for approximately 11,700 new residential units, of which approximately 1,400 (12 percent) were affordable units.

The disparity reflects the renewed strength of market-rate housing and the continued challenges in the provision of affordable housing. One of the primary challenges to providing affordable housing is the dissolution of the San José Redevelopment Agency in 2011. Without the Redevelopment Agency, an estimated \$40 million annually is no longer available to fund affordable housing with no current permanent source of funding identified to fill this gap. Additionally, the depletion of State funding sources and the reductions in federal housing programs also present significant financing hurdles. Other challenges include the price of land in San José and construction costs.

In addition to the challenge of creating housing opportunities for lower-income households, there is growing concern about the ability of locating affordable housing in key Growth Areas, such as in Urban Villages, which are proximate to jobs, amenities, and transit. In these Growth Areas, market-rate developers can outbid affordable housing developers for land. As the City continues to urbanize, the need to provide affordable housing in its Growth Areas becomes increasingly important. Proximity to transit helps decrease transportation costs and increases the quality of life for lower-income households, households that disproportionately use transit. Affordable housing close to transit also benefits transit operators, who depend on ridership, as well as the environment, through reduced traffic congestion and pollution. Creating affordable housing opportunities near transit will also help meet the needs of an aging population who may need transportation options not available to them in transit-poor communities.

Finally, increasing demand for more urban, walkable, and transit-oriented communities has increased the demand for real estate in urban areas, particularly in areas with regional transit stations. This can lead to “hot” neighborhoods that may cause the redevelopment of an older, more naturally affordable housing stock for new luxury housing and/or the displacement of lower-income families and workers.

Staff Recommended Policies to Facilitate Affordable Housing

To address affordable housing challenges in the context of the General Plan 4-Year Review, staff is recommending policy modifications and additions that reflect the need to facilitate new supply of affordable housing, especially in Urban Villages and other key growth areas, to preserve affordable housing stock, and to prevent or to mitigate the displacement of lower-income households. The following is a summary of staff’s recommendations. For a complete list of proposed affordable housing policy updates see **Attachment C** in ~~strikeout~~/underline format.

- As part of the preparation of an Urban Village Plan, establish a goal that, with full build out of the planned housing capacity of the given Village, twenty-five percent or more of the units built would be deed restricted affordable housing.
- Residential projects that are 100% affordable to extremely low income, very low, and low income can proceed within an Urban Village ahead of a Growth Horizon, or in a Village in a current Horizon that does not have a Council approved Plan, if the project meets the defined criteria (See Attachment C)
- One hundred percent deed restricted affordable housing developments would be allowed on sites one acre or less, outside of the existing growth areas, on properties with a Mixed-Use Commercial or Neighborhood/Community Commercial land use designation if the development meets defined criteria (See Attachment C).

- Identify, assess, and implement potential tools, policies, or programs to prevent or to mitigate the displacement of existing low-income residents due to market forces or to infrastructure investment

Agenda Item 4 – Task Force Preliminary Recommendation on Modifications to Urban Village Policies and Actions to Facilitate Affordable Housing

Task Force members will be given an opportunity to discuss, provide input, and propose a preliminary recommendation on the policy modifications to Urban Villages and affordable housing.

Agenda Item 5 – Public Comment

Members of the community will be provided with an opportunity to address the Task Force and provide input on the February 25, 2016 agenda items.

Reading/Resource Materials

Resource and reading materials for the Task Force are available on the Envision 2040 4-Year Review website. These materials include:

- February 25, 2016 Task Force Meeting Agenda
- January 28, 2016 Task Force Meeting Synopsis

Task Force Correspondence

The Task Force packet includes one Task Force correspondence item, posted on Envision San José 2040 4-Year Review website (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/GeneralPlanReview>).

- San Jose Mercury News editorial from Kevin Zwick, dated February 12, 2016.

Public Correspondence

The Task Force packet includes one public correspondence item, posted on Envision San José 2040 4-Year Review website (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/GeneralPlanReview>).

- Letter to Co-Chairs and members of the General Plan 4-Year Review Task Force from SV@ Home, dated February 12, 2016.

Follow-Up Items from January 28, 2016 Meeting

1. Some Task Force members have expressed confusion to staff regarding the scope of the 4-Year Review process. In order to gain clarity on this issue, please refer to the following documents that were distributed for Task Force Meeting #1:
 - Scope of the Envision San José 2040 4-Year Review (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47776>)
 - 4-Year Review Schedule and Outline of Task Force Meetings (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47773>)
 - Task Force Roles and Responsibilities, Items 5 and 6 (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47774>)

To date, the Task Force has covered the following topics:

- Planned jobs capacity and Jobs to Employed Resident Ratio
- Planned jobs allocation within designated Growth Areas

The remaining three Task Force meetings will cover the following topics:

- Urban Village implementation
- Affordable housing facilitation
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy
- Water supply, conservation, and recycling
- Mixed-use development in Neighborhood Business Districts
- Remaining identified items from the April 10, 2015 Mayor and Council member memorandums

2. Three Task Force members have resigned from the Envision San José 2040 General Plan 4-Year Review Task Force due to other commitments. These members include Don Little, Michael Van Every, and Dori Yob.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 24, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. This meeting will focus on water supply, water conservation and recycling, greenhouse gas goals and policies, proposed Neighborhood Business District policies, and remaining Council identified items from the April 10, 2015 memorandums.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Jared Hart. I can be reached by phone at (408) 535-6831 or by email at: michael.brilliot@sanjoseca.gov. Jared can be reached by phone at (408) 535-7896 or by email at: jared.hart@sanjoseca.gov.

Michael Brilliot
Division Manager

Attachment A: Growth Areas and Urban Villages Horizon Map

Attachment B: Urban Village Categories Map

Attachment C: Staff Recommended Updates to Urban Village and Affordable Housing Policies
(strikeout/underline format)