



Gilroy General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

June 29, 2017, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Gilroy City Council Chambers, 7351 Rosanna St., Gilroy, CA 95020

Chair: Councilmember Cat Tucker

Vice-Chair: Mayor Roland Velasco

Meeting Notes

The meeting notes are intended to capture the main points of discussion from the primary agenda items.

III. Reintroducing the Gilroy 2040 General Plan

Jim Harnish opened the meeting and reintroduced the General Plan Process. He provided a brief overview of the prior General Plan process, what led to the previous alternatives and how it affects the process we are currently undertaking. For new GPAC members, Jim explained the role of the Committee and how their input would be used moving forward. Lastly, Jim explained Measure H (the Urban Growth Boundary Initiative) and what potential implications it may have on the General Plan process.

GPAC Member Dialogue, Suggestions, and Questions

- None

IV. Land Use Possibilities for General Plan Focus Areas

Chelsey Payne continued the presentation to the GPAC covering the topics of growth projections, holding capacity, and focus area concepts. During the discussion pertaining to growth projections and holding capacity, several GPAC members voiced concerns over the data presented.

GPAC Member Dialogue, Suggestions, and Questions – Growth Projections and Holding Capacity

- Concern that the holding capacity figures for jobs, housing units, and population are too high. Gilroy currently has 22,000 jobs, and a holding capacity of twice that seems inconsistent with the amount of available industrial and commercial land and with the types of jobs that are currently in demand in the City. Ms. Payne explained that the holding capacity is based on the average number of employees, not maximum and that they would revisit the projections to

confirm their accuracy. It was suggested that the Consultants take a second look at the capacity analysis.

- It is difficult to understand these capacity numbers without having the growth projections.
- City staff and the consultants were requested to re-examine the jobs capacity numbers; possibly providing a breakdown by wage type and level.

GPAC Member Dialogue, Suggestions, and Questions – Focus Areas

Focus Areas 1 - North Neighborhood District and 2 - South Neighborhood District

- The GPAC previously spent a long time working out the dynamics and weighing the pros and cons of the neighborhood districts and questioned whether the GPAC should revisit that work. It was noted that regardless of the reduced size of the north area, the ratios of housing types and densities would still be in place. Many GPAC members also questioned why the land use maps did not show school locations. Stan Ketchum responded that the Draft General Plan Land Use Diagram from the prior process includes the general locations of proposed future schools, based on discussions with the school district. The locations are described as “floating” due to the lack of a decision on a specific site. The Consultants were asked to consider including school icons on the map.
- The map for these areas should also indicate parks and open space areas.
- The consultants should determine what portions of the north and south neighborhood districts have been partially or fully developed.
- An option should be considered that includes employment land uses in the Neighborhood District North, not just neighborhood commercial.
- The city should be sensitive to the amount of multi-family and high-density housing envisioned since Gilroy is an area where people relocate to purchase single-family homes to enjoy the small-town lifestyle.
- When considering alternatives for Focus Areas 1 and 2 City staff and consultants should remember that voters approved Measure H because they did not like growth and traffic, and that adding more multi-family and dense housing to the neighborhood districts could potentially go against the will of the voters.
- City staff and the consultants should research demographic characteristics to determine whether there is a demand for higher density housing.
- **FOCUS AREAS 1 AND 2 DIRECTION:** Take a closer look at the trends in housing before identifying how much low or high density residential is needed. The consultants and City staff should provide multiple options, including more single family, larger commercial centers, schools, parks, a broader range of residential densities, and employment center land uses for both the north and south neighborhood districts.

Focus Area 3 – First Street Corridor

- The Consultant team is asked to clarify the PDA Grant funding process for First Street and whether funding would only be applicable to projects in that corridor or if it can be used city-wide.
- Several land use options for the First Street Corridor should be prepared, including increased residential density.
- City staff and the Consultants are asked to re-evaluate the properties noted as vacant along First Street, since there are some projects in the pipeline for development.
- **FOCUS AREA 3 DIRECTION:** Develop a variety of options. About half of the GPAC members did not favor higher density development along First Street, particularly the integration of increased residential development. Other GPAC members pointed out that this area already has an approved 200-unit townhome project at First and Santa Teresa, and other sites being considered for high density housing.

Focus Area 4 – Downtown Specific Plan Area

- Some GPAC Members felt that regardless if the HSR ends up moving forward in Gilroy, Downtown land use planning and design should rely on the already existing Downtown Specific Plan adopted in 2005.
- Other possible locations for High Speed Rail were noted, including the placement of the station on the west side of 101.
- Some GPAC members were concerned about the impact from a Downtown HSR station because it has the potential to create significant disruptions to visitors, residents, and the business community. It was also noted that the Downtown rail alignment would further divide residents of Gilroy on the east and west side, particularly if the embankment design is approved.
- Other comments included considering an alternative reflecting the High Speed Rail Authority's alternate station location east of the Gilroy Outlets, although such a location could potentially stimulate growth and development outside the UGB.
- Another possible station location mentioned is adjacent to Monterey Road, north of Leavesley Road, west of U.S. Highway 101 in the vacant industrial area.
- **FOCUS AREA 4 DIRECTION:** GPAC requested that the consultants prepare more options, including an eastern HSR station location and an alternative with no Downtown HSR station.

Focus Area 5 – Northeast Gilroy

- Since land designated for industrial and employment center uses are limited, allowing for residential could reduce the potential number of new jobs being created in Gilroy. It would be best to maintain the industrial and employment properties, and allow diverse commercial options.
- Increasing the opportunity for expanded commercial and industrial development should be a top priority of the City.
- **FOCUS AREA DIRECTION:** GPAC directed the consultants to provide more options for Focus Area 5 including more employment center land uses in the area west of Highway 101. The GPAC suggested The alternatives process should consider changing retail trends and development when evaluating options for the Gilroy Premium Outlets site. Options may include enhanced commercial, office, and some residential uses.

Focus Area 6 – Southeast Gilroy

- This Focus Area should remain industrial, to preserve areas for employment growth.
- A majority of GPAC members felt that this area was extensively discussed in the prior GPAC process, and that this area should be removed from consideration for new land uses during the alternatives phase.
- More land use and policy planning should be applied to the 10th street Corridor; and strengthening the connection between Focus Areas 5 and 6.
- Several GPAC members brought up the idea of combining Focus Area 5 and 6.
- **FOCUS AREA 5 DIRECTION:** GPAC direction was to drop Focus Area 6 from further alternatives consideration.

Next Steps – Planning staff indicated that the consultants would use the GPAC feedback to prepare multiple concepts for each of the five focus areas. City staff and the Consultants will then present the concepts at the September 28th GPAC meeting for the GPAC to consider in developing two alternatives for analysis. The upcoming GPAC meeting in August will include stakeholder forums on Housing and Economic Development, consisting of panelists with expertise in both housing and economic development to provide input on current trends and other information for use by the GPAC in formulating the alternatives.