

ATTACHMENT 3

Union City General Plan Update Summary of Feedback on Preliminary Draft Special Areas Element and Community Design Element

EDAT Comments (February 7, 2018)

Special Areas Element

Station East

1. Link the land use framework plan (Figure SA-4.2) to the policy that identifies the targeted mix of uses (Policy SA-4.2) for the Station East area by showing on the plan how the designated areas meet the land use targets as identified by the City Council.

Modified Figure SA-4.2 to identify targets land use mix

Gateway Site

2. Add a policy supporting construction of the East-West Connector.

New policy added: The City shall facilitate construction of the East-West Connector.

3. Add a description to the introduction of the ownership history of this site to explain the connection to Caltrans and the East-West Connector and describe the importance of this site for meeting the Housing Element obligations.

Introduction text added

El Mercado/Safeway Marketplace

4. Change the name to "The Marketplace."

Change made

Union City Boulevard District

5. Add the number of acres to the introduction.

Added to introduction

6. Add a policy supporting removal of the barrier at the railroad tracks located on the westerly end of Whipple Road allowing for through access to the Lincoln-Alvarado Business Park.

New policy added: The City shall support efforts to gain through access along the westerly portion of Whipple Road adjacent to the Kaiser facility across the Coast Subdivision (Mulford) railroad line.

7. Add a policy in support of the train station in this area if Capitol Corridor decides to use the Mulford line, recognizing that the City's preferred location is the intermodal Station.

New policy added: Should the Capital Corridor passenger rail service switch to the Coast Subdivision railroad line, the City shall advocate for establishment of a passenger rail station within the vicinity of Union City Boulevard and Whipple Road.

8. There was a question about why the land use diagram for UCB does not show Mixed Use Commercial, which was the direction from the City Council coming out of the Land Use Alternatives Phase. Staff provided feedback that a policy was added requiring an area plan be prepared prior to allowing residential in this area because more study is needed to ensure the residential is integrated and compatible with the surrounding employment uses (see Policy SA-7.3 and Implementation Program SA-7.A)

Comment is duly noted.

Alvarado Historic District

9. Add policy to establish property maintenance standards

Two new policies added:

The City shall establish property maintenance standards for the Smith Street Commercial Core area and support outreach efforts to property owners, business owners, and tenants regarding the standards. (Source: New Policy)

The City shall work with property owners to use paint colors that are complimentary to the historic vision for the Smith Street Commercial Core area and appropriate to the architecture. (Source: New Policy)

10. Add policy supporting outreach/education to property owners /tenants regarding development and maintenance standards

See policy above

11. Add policy encouraging property owners to reinvest /upgrade properties

New policy added: The City shall encourage property owners in the Historic Alvarado District to reinvest and upgrade properties. (Source: New Policy)

12. Add policy encouraging “pop-up” retail uses

Modified Policy SA-11.9 as follows: SA-11.9 Allow Uses that Support the Vision for the Historic Alvarado District. The City shall ensure the range of permitted uses in the Historic Alvarado District is appropriate and helps achieve the vision as a destination-oriented commercial center, including allowances for pop-up retail uses.

Union Landing

13. Add policy that as Union Landing redevelops /intensifies visibility of buildings from freeways shall be maintained (i.e. avoid walled off look) and building design shall be engaging and inviting

Modified Policy SA-12.22 to add: “The City shall ensure that new development addresses the following..... f. Visibility from the freeways is maintained and buildings are designed and oriented to avoid a “walled-off” look.”

GPAC Comments (February 7, 2018)

Special Areas Element

Station East

14. Policy SA-4.3 should be reworded to require a minimum density of 45 units per acre. Currently, the proposed minimum density in the Station East area is 45 units per acre on average with a minimum density of 30 units per acre.

The Planning Commission recommended no change to Policy SA-4.3.

Gateway Site

15. Provide ownership history of this site

Introduction text modified to reflect ownership history.

Union City Boulevard District

16. Define “human scale”

Will be addressed in subsequent version of the document through photos and illustrations.

Union Landing

17. There is less of a need to adhere to the sub-areas. Would like to see a more flexible approach in terms of what uses are allowed where, especially given changing retail trends.

Staff recommends modifying Implementation Program SA-12.A to review and consider updating the sub-area designations.

18. Add a legend to the sub-areas map (Figure SA-12.2) and codes to Policy SA-12.4 that relate to the map

Figure SA-12.2 updated to add a legend and Policy SA-12.4 updated to add codes.

Community Design Element

19. Natural Setting: Add a policy to work with Alameda County Flood Control to increase access to creeks.

New policy added: The City shall work with the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and any other partner agencies to increase access to creeks.

20. Public Realm: Change “public realm” to “community spaces” or more clearly define and illustrate the term

Staff recommends keeping the term “public realm” and adding photos to the final version to illustrate the concept.

21. Public Art: Encourage public art to be accessible and functional (e.g., provide places where people can sit and enjoy the art).

New policy added: The City shall encourage public art to be accessible and functional (e.g., provide places where people can sit and enjoy the art).

Planning Commission Comments (March 1, 2018)

Special Areas Element

Greater Station District

22. Address the need to plan for autonomous vehicles

- Comment noted. The Land Use Element contains, and the Mobility Element will contain, policies about planning for autonomous vehicles.*

23. Address the City's dark fiber program

- The introduction of The Core Station District section was updated to reference the City's current efforts to install dark fiber. In addition, the Economic Development Element contains policies and programs supporting high-speed internet and the Public Facilities and Services Element (scheduled to be released next month) includes a special section on communications infrastructure including policies that encourage and guide the installation of broadband infrastructure including dark fiber. There is a policy that specifically prioritizes the need for installation of dark fiber in the Station District, which the City is currently working on. .*

24. Hope to see another attempt at the farmers market in the Station District

- New policy added: The City shall explore opportunities for community events within the Greater Station District. The Health and Quality of Life Element will specifically address farmers markets.*

25. The City doesn't allow enough variation in architectural styles

- Comment noted. Policy SA-1.4 encourages a variety of architectural styles.*

26. The introduction mentions "climate-friendly development" but there are no policies addressing this

- The term "climate-friendly" development is used to characterize higher-density, transit-oriented development as being "climate-friendly". The sentence reads: "Locating a mix of high-density residential, commercial, and employment uses close to BART, bus, and rail transit services will ensure that Union City can accommodate its share of regional growth in a climate-friendly manner. "*

27. The city could encourage all building to conform to LEED standards and pursue grant funding for development that is entirely green

- The City has an existing General Plan policy requiring new public buildings and construction associated with public-private partnerships to build to a LEED gold standard. The residential development in the core Station District is either LEED certified already or proposed to meet this standard. The City Council provided feedback when the policy was adopted that they did not want to require private development to be LEED certified. The updated Natural and Cultural Resources Element will carry forward the City's existing green building policies. Expansion of this policy to private development projects can be discussed during review of that draft element.*

Restoration Site

28. Look at the CSMU designation and make sure it allows for hospitality uses/hotels

- The CSMU designation provides for hotels.*

Station East

29. Not supportive of changing the density standard in Policy SA-4.3, as suggested by GPAC member.

- Staff is not recommending any changes to Policy SA-4.3 per feedback from the Planning Commission.*

Gateway Site

30. Supportive of the open space focus for the Gateway site

- Comment noted.*

31. Add a description of the City's housing element obligation to the Gateway Site description

- Gateway introduction has been updated.*

Union City Boulevard District

32. Remove the dashed line over Alameda Creek on Figure SA-7.2

- Revision completed*

33. Clarify that not all the intersection are needed on Figure SA-7.2

- The intent of the diagram was to show potential locations for a new intersection to consolidate access from future redevelopment of the Union City Boulevard District area. Policy SA-7.4 clarifies that the City is seeking to have only one additional intersection installed on Union City Boulevard.*

Alvarado Historic District

34. Generally not supportive of mandating a paint palette for residential uses in the Alvarado Historic District commercial core (as was proposed by staff to address need for consistent design theme), but could support if mandate only applied to buildings being used for commercial uses.

- New policy added: The City shall work with property owners in the Historic Alvarado District to use paint colors that are complimentary to the historic vision for the district and appropriate to the architecture.*

Union Landing

35. Some support for allowing more flexibility within the subareas.

- Staff recommends modifying Implementation Program SA-12.A to review and consider updating the sub-area designations.*

Community Design Element

36. The Planning Commission expressed general support for addressing compatibility of infill housing in existing residential neighborhoods, but felt that compatibility could be handled through design modifications (such as setbacks) rather than limiting the size of new infill housing
- Policy CA-1.14 and Implementation Program CD-1.B were moved from the Draft Land Use Element and updated to include consideration of design standards, such as increased setbacks, as a means for encouraging compatibility.*
37. The Planning Commission expressed support for adding a policy requiring additional parking for large single-family homes above a certain size threshold (e.g., 3,000 square feet)
- Staff will address this comment in the parking section of the Mobility Element.*

Public Comments

GPAC Meeting Public Comments (February 7, 2018)

38. Preserve the Gateway Site as a natural open space.
39. Retain the policy in the existing 2002 Land Use Element to provide a park site that serves as a gateway to Union City.
40. The City should land bank the site and continue to lease it as a farm. When Caltrans sells off the site, the City will have an opportunity to purchase the site. The City should zone it as agriculture and get it at agricultural prices to keep as open space and parkland.
- Comments are duly noted. The Gateway Site has been planned for residential development for over 20 years and has been included in the last three Housing Element cycles. The property will be sold by Caltrans once the East-West Connector project is underway. The draft Land Use and Special Areas Elements identify a portion of the site to be developed as a park.*

Whenever the City adds new parkland, it must consider the financial aspects of acquisition and maintenance. Regarding the Gateway Site, it is anticipated that future residential development projects will be required to either dedicate parkland to the City or pay park impact fees, which will minimize acquisition costs. In addition, there is an opportunity to create a special Community Facilities District that would apply to the new residential development to cover the costs of maintaining any new parkland. The Gateway Site presents a unique opportunity to develop a new park to serve the community in a fiscally responsible manner.

Alvarado District Historic Merchant's Association (February 12, 2018)

41. Add policy regarding need for additional public parking within the Historic Alvarado District.
- New policy added: The City shall seek out additional parking opportunities in the Historic Alvarado District.*

Public Comments Received via Email

42. Jaswinder Singh: Our library needs to be upgraded same as Santa Clara County pattern.
- Comment noted. Library facilities are discussed in the Public Facilities and Services Element, which is scheduled to be released next month.
43. Anonymous: We need tall buildings in Station District (email accompanied by an image of high rise design renderings from Dublin, CA)
- Comment noted. The Station District allows for high rise development.*
44. Kendahl Wallace: Provided idea for Alvarado sign design and suggested the addition of colored lights to buildings in the Historic Alvarado District (email accompanied by images of an archway of the Distillery District in Toronto and a fountain with lights)
- Comment noted*
45. Rollie Arbolante, Union Sanitary District: The Union Sanitary District supports the City's Draft Special Areas Element. Specifically in regards to the Horner/Veasby Area, which is adjacent to the District's existing site, the District is in agreement with the proposed plan of light industrial development for the area. Due to the District's normal operations, which include perpetual upgrades and improvements to District facilities requiring ongoing construction activities at the site, industrial use is a more compatible use than residential use for the area.
- Comment noted.*
46. Harris Mojadedi, Planning Commissioner (emailed comment): Expressed interest in a proposal for staff to implement design standards in neighborhoods.
- Comment noted. The draft Land Use, Special Areas, and Community Design Elements call for updates to the Zoning Ordinance to implement the general plan policies. Some of these policies address neighborhood design and compatibility issues. In addition, staff will be working on updates to the Zoning Ordinance in response to recently passed State housing legislation that will provide more design direction for new residential development as well as additions.*
47. Erica Benton: Upon review of the Draft Special Areas element, I notice that the Historic Alvarado District does not include 7 historic homes along the south side of Smith Street before the railroad tracks, and also omits the entire Granger neighborhood on the south side of Smith Street.

As this area is a key gateway to the Historic Alvarado District - you literally cannot enter the neighborhood from 800/Union Landing without passing these homes - I urge the City to consider their inclusion as a Historic Residential Neighborhood (HRC) in the planning of this area.

Model for inclusion: According to the Union City Historical Museum, these homes are among the oldest in the City, built between 1890 and 1930. The ages and condition of these homes is commensurate with those currently marked for inclusion in the HRC on Vallejo St, Tay St, and Watkins St., as well as those marked for inclusion in the HRC on Horner St, Maiden Lane, Brier St, Bulmer St, Marsten Ave, etc., as well as those in the smaller HRCs planned that abut Horner St. Both of the larger planned HRCs include dead end streets and homes that have been converted from single to multi-family, which are also found in the proposed inclusion of the historic Granger area. There are also two

smaller HRCs planned abutting Horner St, that appear to contain as few as 4 homes of commensurate age and condition to the 16 homes proposed for inclusion from the historic Granger area. There appears to be no current model for inclusion that would rightfully deny these homes from being considered a HRC.

Implied inclusion: The gateway signage proposed for this district includes a sign at the corner of Smith Street and Dyer, welcoming visitors from the 880/Union Landing side of the neighborhood to the Historic Alvarado District. While the immediate priority has been placed on installing signage at the Union City Blvd/Smith St. intersection, the planned placement of a future Historic Alvarado District sign at the intersection of Dyer and Smith St. strongly implies that all residences that fit the model for HRC inclusion between the intended signs should be included as Historic Alvarado District HRC homes.

Per the rendering above, the only thing separating the proposed Granger HRC from connecting to the Smith Street Commercial Core is the Alvarado Elementary School on the south side of Smith Street. The school was originally built in 1878, renovated in 1924, and -- barring its demolition for replacement in 1958 -- would have surely been worthy of inclusion
<http://museumoflocalhistory.org/wordpress2/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/AlvElem_report.pdf> in the Historic Alvarado District.

If the homes in the historic Granger area do not fit the criteria for inclusion as a HRC, please provide such inclusion criteria in writing so that the homeowners of this area may understand their exclusion fully.

- ❑ *Staff will modify Figures SA-11.1 and SA-11.2 in the next version of the Element to include this portion of Smith Street. Staff did not have enough time to modify the version prior to the City Council meeting.*

Jo Ann Lew, Planning Commissioner (emailed comments)

48. I agree with removing the current sub-area designations in Union Landing and replacing them with a policy for continuous updating and renovating of Union Landing to address changes in retail markets, provide opportunities for small and local businesses, support the center as a community-gathering place, and address parking and traffic circulation around the center. In addition, I am in agreement with staff's proposed updates on page 5 of 6.

- ❑ *Staff recommends modifying Implementation Program SA-12.A to review and consider updating the sub-area designations.*

Special Areas Element

49. Pg. 3, 1st line refers to "regional growth in a climate-friendly manner." However, there is no policy, goal or implementation program that addresses this. I recommend a policy, goal or implementation program be added or an existing one be revised to include building LEED-certified and/or smart buildings.

- ❑ *Comment noted. See comments #26 and #27 of this document.*

50. Pg 4, SA-1.4 – regarding "encouraging variety in architectural styles", please clarify whether the variety will be within the sub-areas or throughout the Greater Station District. Union City has not historically allowed developers to deviate from established architectural designs within shopping

centers, residential areas, and neighborhoods, particularly when there are existing buildings, and required architectural compatibility. Please clarify the City's expectations in regards to "a variety of architectural styles.

- Policy SA-1.4 refers to varied architectural style throughout the entire Greater Station District. The intent of this policy is to provide varied architectural styles throughout the entire District. This policy is not intended to preclude buildings that accommodate similar uses or our grouped together geographically to share similar architectural traits. For example, residential development in the core Station District area is grouped together and shares some similar design features which provides a strong design theme for that portion of the District.*

51. Pg. 4, SA-1.10 – I recommend deleting the word "potential" in the 2nd line.

- Revision completed*

52. Pg. 9, 2nd para., 2nd line – correct "a157-unit" to "a 157-unit."

- Revision completed*

53. Pg. 18, Fig. SA-4-2 – please clarify where mixed-use residential will be built. It is unclear whether the areas identified in yellow are solely residential or mixed-use residential. Also, what do the blue arrows designate? Please identify them in the map legend for this figure. I support 45-units per acre if residential mix-use is included in the retail/commercial area.

- Policy SA-4.2 says that "mixed-use residential development may be considered for the areas identified for commercial/retail uses...." This refers to the area in red on Figure SA-4.2. The blue arrows indicate proposed streets (see blue dashed line in the legend). Several members of the Planning Commission were not supportive of modifying Policy SA-4.3 to increase the average density.*

54. Pg. 19, Fig. SA-4.3 – what do the blue arrows designate? Please identify them in the map legend for this figure.

- The blue arrows indicate proposed streets (see blue dashed line in the legend). The arrows are used to indicate that street connections are needed, but the exact layout of the streets is not shown.*

55. Pg 20, SA-4.7 – regarding the pedestrian and bicycle connections, will walkers and bicyclists share the same paths similar to a trail or will they have separate paths? Please seriously consider the dangers when pedestrians and bicyclists share the same path—bicyclists who should announce their presence before passing instead sneaking up on unsuspecting pedestrians, width of the path to allow bicyclists to safely pass pedestrians, and type of pavement to provide a safe path for both walking and riding.

- The policies describe complete streets that provide for both pedestrians and bicycles, but do not suggest shared bicycle and pedestrian paths. Policy SA-4.9 describes wide pedestrian sidewalks separate by landscaping and dedicated bicycle lanes.*

56. Pg. 21, SA-4.13 – please clarify “shall transition to the adjacent single-family neighborhood.” What is the significance of allowing greater access to the residential neighborhood? Is there a potential to bring more noise, traffic and/or crime to the area?
- The term “transition” refers to a transition in density to encourage compatibility with the scale of the nearby residential neighborhood. It is not used to describe access. In fact, the adjacent residential neighborhood does not have any traffic access off of 7th Street. The neighborhood is walled off from 7th Street and access is limited to two pedestrian paths.*
57. Pg. 22, SA-4.22 – would allow public gathering spaces to contribute to the City’s parkland requirements. What will be the standards for these public gathering spaces that would make them “park-like”? Would the standards include requirements similar to a neighborhood park that provides play and/or picnic areas or more like a downtown plaza that is open and uncluttered? Also clarify whether these public gathering spaces would be owned by the developers or the City.
- Policy SA-4.22 states that the City shall “consider allowing plazas, civic spaces, and other gathering spaces that contribute to the public realm as a contribution towards meeting parkland requirements.” The intent of this policy is to acknowledge the mix of diverse uses in the Station East area and to provide flexibility in the design of outdoor spaces based on the context of the surrounding environment. Details of the design and ownership would be addressed on a case-by case basis when new development is proposed through the City’s development review process.*
58. Pg. 24, last line - I recommend deleting “first” because it is redundant.
- Revision completed*
59. Pg. 26, last sentence, and pg. 27, SA-6.5 – please clarify “central community gathering place” on page 26 and “community gathering places” on page 27. Which locations in this shopping area would be suitable as a “community gathering place”? This shopping area is already built out and appears to be fully occupied.
- The policies in this section are meant to guide the potential future redevelopment of the shopping area. The City would encourage community gathering places if this area were to redevelop in the future.*
60. Pgs. 29 through 35 – please ensure all references to the Lincoln-Alvarado Business Park are consistent. For example, page 29, last paragraph, says Lincoln-Alvarado industrial park, which appears to be incorrect.
- Revision completed*
61. Pg. 31, S-7.3.c – I recommend deleting the word “along” which appears twice in the same sentence.
- Revision completed*
62. Pg. 31, S-7.3.d – I recommend the first line be revised as follows: “Provides for a circulation network that creates an efficient and connected grid and takes”
- Revision completed*

63. Pg. 32, S-7.3.d – remove the comma between “of” and “the.”
- Revision completed*
64. Pg. 32, S-7.3.f – correct “exiting” to “existing.”
- Revision completed*
65. Pg. 33, Fig. SA-7.2 – what do the blue arrows designate? Please identify them in the map legend for this figure.
- The blue arrows indicate streets, as noted in the legend.*
66. Pg. 38, SA-8.4 – what happens to the non-conforming uses after 2024? Must these uses cease operation?
- Yes, the non-conforming uses must cease operations per the amortization agreements.*
67. Pgs 47 through 52, section titled “Historic Alvarado District” – I strongly object to any requirement that residents select paint colors from a specified palette prior to painting the exteriors of their homes. I consider this requirement intrusive to the rights of private property owners and overreaching by the City. I recommend that planning, updating and redevelopment of the Historic Alvarado District include participation by residential and commercial property owners and, particularly, the residents.
- Staff modified the proposed new policy to include working with property owners on appropriate paint colors.*
68. Pg. 51, SA-11.A, 4th line – delete the colon after “including.”
- Revision completed.*
69. Pg. 54, SA-12.4 – I agree with the feedback to remove the designation of individual sub-areas within Union Landing, thereby allowing greater flexibility in expanding building footprints and locating businesses.
- Staff recommends modifying Implementation Program SA-12.A to review and consider updating the sub-area designations.*
70. Pg. 55, SA-12.5 – please clarify the intent of prohibiting expansion of the community commercial area.
- Clarification language added to the introduction.*
71. Pg. 55, SA-12.6 – this policy appears restrictive in an already difficult retail marketplace. Please clarify the need for a “qualified retail expert” in lieu of the developer or property owner providing an analysis. I recommend deleting this policy.
- Comment noted. The intent of this policy is to have an independent third-party analysis of any future subdivisions of tenant spaces of large big box stores to ensure the new configuration does not impact the future economic viability of the buildings and Union Landing as a whole. No changes are proposed.*

72. Pg. 54, SA-12.1, and Pg. 59, SA-12.B – Policy SA-12.1 encourages additional development; however, implementation program SA-12.B excludes additional development. Please include “additional development,” in SA-12.B by inserting it after “a plan for” and before “parking.”

Revision completed.

Community Design Element

73. Pg. 7, CA-2.8, 2nd line – Should this policy be numbered “CD-2.8”? Also, I recommend removing the word “their.”

Revisions completed

74. Pg. 9, CD-3.5, 2nd line – I recommend “that will” be changed to “to.”

Revision completed

75. Pg. 9, CD-3.6 – please clarify the need for and purpose of masonry walls on major arterials. This appears to contradict the City’s policy to avoid “walled enclaves” in CD-1.11.

This policy was included in the 2002 General Plan and is proposed to be carried forward. The purpose of this policy is to provide a consistent design theme and to provide additional safety and noise mitigation for residential uses built along the City’s major arterials.

76. Pg. 12, Section titled “Public Realm” – I recommend keeping the title “Public Realm” because it is a commonly-used term, defined in the first paragraph, and used throughout both the Special Areas and the Community Design Elements.

Staff recommends keeping the term “public realm” and adding photos to the final version to illustrate the concept.

77. Pg. 12, 2nd paragraph, 4th line, includes a reference to “reducing the presence of parking.” Please clarify this reference as it appears to conflict with the City’s zoning code, which specifies minimum parking requirements.

As describe in the text, the policies in this element and others encourage placing buildings at the street edge and parking at the side or rear to reduce the visual impact of parking.

Staff Updates

78. Add updated Figures SA-2.2 (Core Station District Detailed Land Use Diagram) and SA-2.3 (Core Station District Concept Plan).

Figures were added to the Element.

79. Add images of Union City 1.2 to the Core Station District section to illustrate examples of potential future development.

Images were added to the Element.

80. Show East-West Connector on the Station East diagram (Figure SA-4.1).

Figure SA-4.1 was updated to show East-West Connector

81. Clarify that the 80-acres within the Station East area does not include the Corporation Yard.

Acreage updated to reflect entire 105-acre subarea

82. Add the following policy to the Gateway Site section that describes that the location of the designated land uses is flexible so long as the development maintains a certain minimum number of units

New policy added: The City shall allow flexibility in the siting of a park, provided the City's Housing Element obligations are met.