General Plan 4-Year Review
Task Force Meeting #2

December 18, 2019
1. Welcome & Agenda Overview
2. Urban Villages Follow-Up Presentation
3. Public Comment & Task Force Recommendation on Urban Villages
4. Missing Middle Housing: Presentation by Opticos Design
5. Plex Housing - A Developer’s Perspective: Presentation by Mayberry Workshop LLC
6. Discussion/Questions on Plex Housing
7. Residential Uses in Neighborhood Business Districts
8. Task Force Discussion and Public Comment
Agenda Item 2
Follow-Up Presentation on Urban Village Policy Changes
Envision 2040 General Plan 4-Year Review
Horizons

• Why do we have Horizons and how do they work?
• Do we need them?
• Can we eliminate and/or accelerate horizons for more flexibility and to encourage more housing development?
Purpose of Horizons (see page A-2)

• Phase housing production
  • Focused near transit and established infrastructure
  • Away from areas without current transit/infrastructure investments

• Help staff where to plan next
### Paths Under Horizons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project</th>
<th>Current Horizon (Can Project Proceed – Yes/No)</th>
<th>Future Horizon (Can Project Proceed – Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Approved UV Plan</td>
<td>Without Approved UV Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market-Rate Residential or Mixed-Use Residential Project</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature Project</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100% Deed Restricted Affordable Housing Project</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Horizons Were Eliminated (see page A-3)

• Path for housing **does not change**
  • Still need urban village plan to build housing
  • Three exceptions:
    • Signature Projects (not intended to be common-place)
    • Site with residential General Plan designation
    • 100% affordable housing projects

• Don’t need to open a new growth horizon
• Residential Pool Policy not applicable
Solutions Moving Forward

• Mixed-Use and Multifamily Zoning Districts ➔ streamline housing permitting, objective requirements

• Citywide Design Guidelines and Complete Streets Design Standards and Guidelines ➔ shorten UV Plans/timeline and create consistency for design expectations
Signature Projects

• Why do the Signature Project policy changes have such prescriptive requirements?

• Why do projects have to provide more than fair share of commercial?
Amazing, unique project that:

• Catalyst for entire village
• Provides above and beyond jobs and housing
• More community engagement
• High-quality design
• Public open space
• Prominent location
Why Update Signature Project Policy?

• Provide clear requirements/expectations to development community and public

• State law changes
  • Requirements for housing must be measurable and objective
  • Personal judgement cannot be used to approve/deny housing project
More Than Fair Share of Commercial

- Council wanted only exceptional projects to move ahead of Urban Village Plan adoption (IP-2.9 and IP-2.10)
- One parameter was more jobs production
## Proposed Signature Project Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Village Type</th>
<th>Site Land Use Requirement</th>
<th>Site Selection Requirement</th>
<th>Commercial Requirement (Above Fair Share)</th>
<th>Additional Commercial Requirement by Site Size</th>
<th>Residential Density Requirement</th>
<th>Open Space Requirement (Publicly Accessible)</th>
<th>City Policy Compliance</th>
<th>Public Meeting Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Village</td>
<td>(1) Within an Urban Village AND (2) General Plan Land Use Designation of Urban Village, residential, or commercial. (No change)</td>
<td>(1) Corner parcel; OR (2) Interior parcel of at least 3 acres with 150 ft of street frontage. Shall not result in remnant parcels of smaller than 1 acre.</td>
<td>≥ 5%</td>
<td>≥ 5% additional: 5% 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 30 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 2,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 5%</td>
<td>5 to 10 acres: ≥ 10% additional ≥ 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 55 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 5,000 sq ft</td>
<td>(1) Urban Village Mixed Use zoning district; (2) Citywide Design Guidelines; AND (3) Complete Streets Guidelines</td>
<td>≥ 2 public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor and Center Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10%</td>
<td>5 to 10 acres: ≥ 10% additional ≥ 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 55 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 5,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10%</td>
<td>5 to 10 acres: ≥ 10% additional ≥ 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 55 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 5,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 15%</td>
<td>5 to 10 acres: ≥ 10% additional ≥ 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 75 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 10,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Signature Project Policy Feasibility

• The Signature Project Policy requirements have been applied inconsistently in the past
• 3 approved Signature Projects would be approved under the proposed changes
• 3 other approved Signature projects would only need to provide an additional approx. 1,800 square feet of commercial
Agenda Item 3
Public Comment & Task Force Recommendation on Urban Villages
Envision 2040 General Plan 4-Year Review
## Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Redistribution of Planned Growth and Urban Village Boundary Modifications | Eliminate Evergreen Village (V55)  
Eliminate E. Capitol/Foxdale Dr. (V52)  
Remove Reed & Graham site from Race Light Rail Urban Village boundary |
| 2    | Urban Village Growth Horizons                               | No wholesale move to Horizon 2  
Shift Five Wounds BART and S. 24th St./William Ct. to Horizon 1                      |
| 3    | Residential Pool Units                                      | Eliminate Residential Pool Policy                                                     |
| 4    | General Plan Policy IP-5.5                                  | Restore originally adopted Policy language for flexibility                            |
| 5    | General Plan Policy IP-5.10 (Signature Project Policy)     | Adopt objective standard requirements for Signature Projects                           |
1) Boundary Change Staff Recommendation

- Eliminate Evergreen Village (V55)
  - Horizon 1
  - Only 1.3 acres of available land
  - Recently built homes, shopping center, and plaza
  - 385-unit residential capacity
1) Boundary Change Staff Recommendation

- Eliminate E. Capitol/Foxdale Dr. (V52)
  - Horizon 3
  - Redevelopment would displace existing affordable housing apartments
  - Capacity of 100 jobs and 170 units on 14 acres
1) Boundary Change Staff Recommendation

- **Modify Race Light Rail UV boundary (VR9)**
  - Horizon 1
  - Remove Reed & Graham site - heavy industrial use and unsuitable site for residential redevelopment
  - Remove area east of Lincoln Ave and west of Reed & Graham site
2) Horizon Shift Staff Recommendation

• No wholesale move to Horizon 2

• Shift Five Wounds BART and S. 24th St./William Ct. to Horizon 1
  • 1,062 additional housing units available for development
3) Residential Pool Policy Staff Recommendation

- Eliminate the Residential Pool Policy (General Plan Policy IP-2.11)
  - Originally established to limit residential in areas not in current Plan Horizon and promoting job growth to fix jobs/housing imbalance
  - Could be additional hurdle in current housing crisis
  - Policy is not necessary and adds no value
4) Policy IP-5.5 Staff Recommendation

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 can move together on a case by case basis.
## 5) Proposed Signature Project Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Village Type</th>
<th>Site Land Use Requirement</th>
<th>Site Selection Requirement</th>
<th>Commercial Requirement (Above Fair Share)</th>
<th>Additional Commercial Requirement by Site Size</th>
<th>Residential Density Requirement</th>
<th>Open Space Requirement (Publicly Accessible)</th>
<th>City Policy Compliance</th>
<th>Public Meeting Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Village</td>
<td>(1) Within an Urban Village AND (2) General Plan Land Use Designation of Urban Village, residential, or commercial. (No change)</td>
<td>(1) Corner parcel; OR (2) Interior parcel of at least 3 acres with 150 ft of street frontage. Shall not result in remnant parcels of smaller than 1 acre.</td>
<td>≥ 5%</td>
<td>5 to 10 acres: 5% additional &gt; 10 acres: 10% additional</td>
<td>≥ 30 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 2,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 2 public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 55 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 5,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor and Center Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 55 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 5,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 75 DU/AC</td>
<td>≥ 10,000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Selection Requirement

- Show how many parcels in each would qualify 150 feet
Agenda Item 4
Missing Middle Housing Presentation
Daniel Parolek with Opticos Design
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Agenda Item 5
Plex Housing: A Developer’s Perspective
Adam Mayberry with Mayberry Workshop
Envision 2040 General Plan 4-Year Review
Myrtle Commons

Missing Middle Development

by Mayberry Workshop and Urban West

Adam S. Mayberry, AIA
Purchased "Vacant" Lot

- Zoning: R-2
- GP: Residential Neighborhood
- All that remained was garage from previous residence.
Key to success with this type of development is speed.

Quick to Design --> Build --> Sell

- Design
- Entitle
  - Prelim Review
  - Site Development Permit
- Permit (Construction Docs)
  - Building
  - Off-Site Improvements
- Build
  - Inspect
  - Subcontractors
- Sell (Timing)
"Urban"
Farmhouse Style
Blend urbanist centric style with more traditional aesthetic values of the market
Lean Development

- Build Less
- All area sellable
- No Garage
- Volume
- Smallish bedrooms
- "Affordable By Design"
Planning Process

Modified Design

- Typically what others have done
- More Traditional Aesthetic
- Added Cost
Permitting Process Delays

- Separate Permits
- Off-Site Improvements
Additional Exterior

(iPhone photos with automatic edit)
Agenda Item 6
Discussion and Questions on Plex Housing
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Agenda Item 8
Task Force Discussion & Public Comment
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Agenda Item 9
Announcements
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