

MEMORANDUM

DATE April 2, 2021
TO Hollister General Plan Advisory Committee
FROM David Early and Carey Stone
SUBJECT Policy Options Public Input for April 6 GPAC Meeting

In preparation for the GPAC meeting on April 6, this memorandum summarizes the public input from the Tuesday, March 9, 2021 and Wednesday, March 10, 2021 General Plan Policy Options Workshops for the following topics:

- Growth Management
- Special Planning Areas
- Residential Land Use Designations

The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) is reviewing these policy topics and other items at a series of five meetings. As part of the meeting packet for each meeting, PlaceWorks is releasing a summary of the public feedback relevant to the meeting topics to be discussed at each individual meeting.

Additional information regarding the policy topics and options is contained in the *General Plan Policy Issues Memorandum* which can be reviewed at www.Hollister2040.org.

The GPAC meeting dates and topics are as follows:

- » March 23, 2021
 - Parks and Recreation
 - New School Funding
 - Farmland Mitigation
 - Sensitive Habitats
 - Heritage Trees
 - Historic and Cultural Resources
 - Coordination with Local Tribes
 - Environmental Justice

- » March 30, 2021
 - Economic Development
 - Retail Leakage
 - Job Creation
 - Tourism
 - Industrial Uses
 - Airport
 - Cannabis
 - Circulation
 - Complete Streets and Safe Routes to School
 - Level of Service
 - Roundabouts
 - Inclusionary Housing

- » April 6, 2021
 - Growth Management
 - Special Planning Areas
 - Residential Land Use Designations

- » April 13, 2021: Arts and Culture

- » April 27, 2021
 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Natural Hazards
 - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
 - Sustainability

ABOUT THE WORKSHOPS

Approximately 16 people attended the first workshops, and 20 attended the second one. Each workshop included three rounds of small group discussion with three to five small groups per round of discussion. Participants pre-registered for the top three topics they wanted to discuss. Table 1 identifies the topics discussed by the small groups.

TABLE 1 POLICY OPTIONS SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION TOPICS

Small Group Policy Topics	March 9 Workshop (# of Small Groups)	March 10 Workshop (# of Small Groups)
Arts and Culture	1	1
Environmental Justice/Climate Change	1	1
Farmland Mitigation/ Sensitive Habitats/Heritage Trees	1	1
Growth Management	2	1
Housing	2	1
Parks/New School Funding	2	2
Retail Leakage/Job Creation/Tourism	2	2
Special Planning Areas	1	1
Circulation	1	1

Source: PlaceWorks, 2021.

The City is also collecting public input on the policy issues through an online survey available on www.Hollister2040.org. As of April 2, 2021, approximately eight respondents provided feedback on growth management, the Special Planning Areas, and residential land use designations. This feedback is reflected in the summary of public input below. The online survey will remain open through April 16, 2021. All feedback from the online survey will be summarized and presented to the Planning Commission and City Council in May and June 2021 (respectively).

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

- Workshop participants and online survey respondents had varying opinions on whether the existing Sphere of Influence (SOI) should be expanded. Various participants supported expanding the SOI to accommodate the robust growth scenario, the moderate growth scenario, or the area the County anticipates for future urbanization. Others did not support expanding the existing SOI.
- Many participants supported policies that promote a jobs-housing balance.
- Some participants supported forming a joint powers authority to provide wastewater service, but also wanted the City to maintain majority control of wastewater service.
- Online survey comments on the provision of wastewater service:

- Of the eight online survey responses for growth management, feedback shows general support for creating a joint powers authority to manage wastewater treatment plant.
 - One survey respondent supported extending wastewater and other City services to lands outside the SOI.
 - Some survey respondents thought the City should leave the Memorandum of Understanding regarding wastewater services.
 - Some survey respondents stated wastewater treatment service and other City services should only be extended to lands within the SOI that are anticipated to be annexed.
 - Some survey respondents stated no additional policies regarding extension of services are needed since they are already covered in the Government Code.
- Other comments on growth management:
- The City should ensure future growth can be supported by sufficient public facilities, and open space.
 - Future growth should maintain and enhance the existing community identity.
 - Ensure there is adequate water service and that residents are being properly charged for services.
 - There is a need for condominiums and apartments in the city.
 - Provide housing that is affordable for working residents and essential workers.
 - Consider expanding to the north of the city. New businesses on Flynn Road and the CA-25 highway need housing to accommodate workers.
 - Ensure views are preserved from open space lands if development occurs.
 - Ensure pace of development and number of homes being built within the city is controlled.
 - Housing growth should be accompanied with new jobs for residents.
 - Extract community benefits from new development.
 - Explore sales tax sharing between the City and County.

SPECIAL PLANNING AREAS

- Buena Vista Road/North Gateway Special Planning Area:
- Option 3 seemed to enjoy the widest support, since some participants believed that it provides a good balance between preservation of agricultural land and residential development. However, there was also support for alternatives with more ag

preservation and more development, as well as maintaining the existing Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary and General Plan land use designations.

- Concern with mixing residential and agricultural uses. Participants agreed that there should be buffer between these uses.
- Other comments regarding the Buena Vista area:
 - Build a new gas station along the highway to capture motorists passing by and increase the City's tax revenue.
 - Do not build homes near Highway 156.
 - High density residential should be built further to the west near the Highway 156 interchange, but away from the school area. Build medium density in between, and then high density.
 - Homes in the Buena Vista Road and North Gateway Special Planning Area should be affordable. The homes in Santana Ranch subdivision are too expensive.
 - There is a water line that brings reclaimed water from sewer ponds to this area which is used for landscaping. The soil quality is not good for agricultural uses in this area.
 - This special planning area seems like a good location for development in the coming years.
- Meridian Road Extension Special Planning Area
 - Workshop participants did not have time to discuss this planning area.
 - Online survey respondents supported Option 3, change the Mixed-Use land use designation to Low Density Residential and parts of the existing rural residential area where development has not occurred from Low Density Residential to Residential Estate.
- Union Road Special Planning Area
 - Small groups had limited time to consider this area. However, one person with real estate interests in the area suggested that this is a good area for additional development. Another participant stated that he liked the idea of the mixed use node shown in several alternatives.
 - Online survey respondents supported Options 3b and 6. Option 3b would extend the SOI to include all parcels that currently carry a development-oriented a General Plan Land Use designation and Option 6 would extend the SOI to include all parcels within the Union Road Planning Area.

RESIDENTIAL LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

- Participants generally supported a new residential designation with a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).
- Many participants supported spreading out the higher density sites throughout the city.
- Other comments regarding a new 20 du/ac residential designation:
 - Consider placing the new land use designation in commercial areas, away from existing high density residential sites.
 - Ensure there is sufficient parking for new multi-family developments to limit impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Santa Ana Road and Union Road could be a great location for a new 20 du/ac development.
 - Developing high density residential in Hollister can be challenging from a developer's perspective due to a lack of demand.
 - Ensure the community receives notification about new housing developments.
 - Concern residential growth could increase in traffic and congestion and reduce parking supply.
 - Opposed to higher density sites in neighborhoods that cannot withstand more traffic.
 - Increasing residential density adds pressure to schools and existing neighborhoods.
 - Collaborate with schools to ensure they have adequate school facilities.
 - Ensure emergency access is provided for new projects.
- Comments on using gross acres instead of net acres as the base residential density limit:
 - Increase housing supply and provide affordable units to help combat the housing crisis.
 - Ensure adequate space is provided in homes due to the pandemic.
 - Online survey responses:
 - Use using gross acres instead of net and maintaining the existing residential density ranges.
 - Use gross acres but apply a lower density range to reflect what has been getting built.
- Additional comments:
 - New housing should include parks and open space.

- Concern that developing more housing will result in a loss of open space land.
- Remove Euclidean zoning and allow increased densities and accessory dwelling units by right. For example, existing single-story neighborhoods should allow a second story, existing two-story neighborhoods should allow a third story, etc.
- Neighborhoods should be within a 15 minute bikeable distance from commercial services, jobs, and parks and open space.
- Preserve the scenic valley in Hollister.
- Of the two online survey responses about residential densities, one respondent supported increasing the maximum residential density in the Downtown and another did not.