



GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

May 2020

The following provides a summary of community input received regarding the GPAC Preferred Alternative through online engagement via the General Plan website (pleasanthill2040.com). These items are presented as written, without editing, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the City. Any comments that contained profanities were removed.

GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

As a resident in the Mercury/Apollo neighborhood I am most impacted by the decisions made for the Mangini property (focus area 2). While I would not want to see any more intensive rezoning/redevelopment plans beyond what is listed in the preferred alternative memorandum, I do think the suggestions there provide for a fair plan that balances the needs of the existing community against the desire to develop. I appreciate that the committee considered the community's needs in the plan - retaining the R10 zoning for the parcels adjacent to existing Apollo properties is clearly a priority, as is keeping the rezoning suggestions to single family high density or multi-family low density.

Dear GPAC committee- I'd like to share my comments on the preferred alternatives presented. I hope we can support open space, riparian corridors, and creek restoration as was develop our new GP. Certainly, there is ample support in the community for this as evidenced by comments during the planning and scoping sessions. I believe these are compatible, even complimentary, with other planning goals.

Focus area 1 (DVC);

I fully support the idea of opening a multi-use trail along Grayson creek all the way from Pacheco to the Viking Bridge. Part of this is supposed to be opened as part of DVC Plaza's approval. I'm hopeful that this actually happens. This would be an excellent bike and pedestrian trail that can also be used for north/south non-motorized commuting, helping alleviate traffic issues. This concept is also being articulated in the bike and pedestrian path plan update that will come to the GPAC later this summer. Encouraging businesses to see the creek as an asset and opening up towards the creek I also support. Many communities have found their creeks to be economically and aesthetically beneficial to restaurants and other businesses. With a multi-use trail nearby and grand oaks in Chilpancingo Park, a restored creek could be very attractive and stimulate economic growth in the area. This concept is true for other areas as well.

Focus area 2 (Mangini);

This area also has a creek that needs to be carefully looked at if this area is developed. It is important to allow enough setback from the creek to achieve several goals. First, the creek needs to be publicly accessible with walking trails. Second, the Contra Costa Flood Control Agency has a goal of using more environmentally friendly flood control solutions than it has used in the past. Constrictive channels are not consistent with these goals. It is important to adopt policies that are not in conflict with the better flood control practices being advocated by CCFCA for the future.

The map for this area only had two colors in the legend, so it was hard to know where the multi-family low and single family-high densities were proposed. Was the gray Multi-family and the orange yellow the single family- high? This should have been clearer in the legend.



GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

May 2020

GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

Focus area 3 (Downtown);

I agree with leaving as is, with the idea that mixed use here allows for housing/commercial combinations.

Focus area 4 (Hookston); Light industrial is important to retain as it allows for diversity possibilities in employment. Expanding the definition could spur new economic development.

Focus area 5 (Contra Costa Blvd): I share the concerns of some about the East Vivien neighborhood being changed to mixed-use. These homes are probably more affordable than other housing stock in the city. Will we encourage these units to be bought up and removed from our housing stock with a mixed-use designation? Care should be taken to protect the residential character further east from Contra Costa Blvd frontage.

Focus areas 6 and 7 (Gregory and Taylor); I agree with the discussion on traffic safety being a priority.

Focus area 8 (Oak Park); I very much disagree with changing a row of single-family homes along the southern side of Oak park Blvd to mixed use, especially west of the EBMUD trail. I believe this would be counter to the goal of easing traffic, parking, and congestion along Oak Park Blvd. These are narrow lots, so consolidating an aggregate of them would NOT be amenable to creating parking in association with whatever business went in. This would lead to more street parking, exacerbating the existing problem. This area is already seeing a lot of development with the new Oak Park subdivision, a new library, etc. Also, these homes are once again lower priced in general and rezoning them to mixed use may lead to conversion of good, more affordable housing stock. They also back up to other similar homes, even if they are in Walnut Creek.

Focus area 9 (Pleasant Hill Plaza); makes sense to incorporate into Downtown, as it's immediately adjacent.

Additional identified area; I agree with the stated goal of preserving the mobile home park, as it is also an affordable housing option in the city.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Alan Bade, Pleasant Hill resident

P.S. I found it hard to understand some of the maps. They needed land-use color coded legends at each map.

In regards to area 8, the Oak Park Blvd corridor, I do not think that it is appropriate to change the zoning on single family housing to mixed use. These houses are on small lots that back to other single family one story houses. At present, these are some of the more affordable houses in the city and to remove them for more expensive multifamily or commercial development does not make sense. With a mixed use designation, height limits can be changed easily to increase density. Since the lots are small, that will leave little room for parking on an already parking stressed area. On street parking on Oak Park Blvd is already at capacity in some sections. I do not think that a multistory commercial



GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

May 2020

GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

building or multifamily apartments are a good fit backed up to small single family residential backyards. A 5 ft back yard lot line setback of a 2-4 story commercial or multistory apartment building to a small single story residential backyard would be very undesirable. Lots are small so there will not be a lot of room for a big buffer/landscaped areas in between. Also, people are being required or are choosing to put in solar panels which are quite expensive. Shading from tall buildings either to the east or west of them could make this option unavailable to some households. Noise and traffic are other issues that will need to be addressed.

The proposed changes do not go far enough to allow sustainable growth for pleasant hill residentially. The children of pleasant hill will not likely be able to afford to live here with the growth afforded in this plan.

My strong suggestion is to look at many of the areas designated for no change and to look at adding denser residential options.

Failing to allow change in density will ensure that the character of the neighborhoods will change over time: working families will be priced out and pleasant hill will not have the same character. We have seen time and again in Bay Area Cities that the fight against development prices out the current residents over time. Pleasant Hill will need thousands of new housing units by 2040 to retain the character of the city, and this plan does not deliver it.

I thought that the purpose of the General Plan Update was to provide a VISION for the FUTURE whereas the document that I see here is mostly an acknowledgement of what has already happened! Specific thoughts follow:

Area 1 - DVC College Area: if any student housing is going to be built in this area, it would likely be 3-story high apartments on top of a 2 to 3 level garage on the existing North / Overflow parking lot area.

Area 2 - Taylor / PH Road (Mangini Farm) - this site has the best potential to address our local housing shortage. The flatlands could accommodate mixed use condos/apartments & retail occupants up to seven stories high; lower buildings on the hillsides. Also, the "Institutional" land at the corner is actually Park District land which they hoe to develop further - the alternative there would be to trade that highly desirable site for another parcel elsewhere!

Area 8 - Oak Park Blvd. - these documents do NOT appear to even recognize the recently approved development at Monticello for our new Library building, the New Park & the 34-unit housing development.

These thoughts all represent a FUTURE for the City of Pleasant Hill consistent with the GOALS of the City Council!

Please make reducing car transportation and increasing biking/walking a strategic part of general plan

Hi, I noticed that the Mangini property was listed as a focus areas in the General Plan feedback report, and that discussion of focus areas was included on last nights GPAC meeting. I had a childcare obligation so I was unfortunately unable to attend but I would like to stay as up to date as possible on



GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

May 2020

GPAC Preferred Alternative Public Comments

any news regarding plans for the property. My house is immediately adjacent to the Mangini farm, and naturally any redevelopment or rezoning choices could have massive implications for my neighborhood and for my family's financial well-being. How can I ensure that I am updated about development and planning choices being considered regarding that property? Also, what is the best venue for me to provide feedback on these choices. If rezoning to high density housing or commercial development is being considered, it would clearly be devastating to the families who own homes in the neighborhood. Bes Regards, Jeremy Magruder.