

# MEMORANDUM



**TO: Honorable Mayor & City Council**

**FROM: Vice Mayor Dave Cortese  
Councilmember Sam Liccardo**

**SUBJECT: Evergreen Development Policy**

**DATE: June 22, 2007**

APPROVED:

DATE:

*Sam Liccardo* *Dave Cortese* *6-22-07*  
*M.P.*

## RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the City Council:

1. Direct staff to bring forward amendments to the Evergreen Development Policy (EDP) that establish a maximum allocation pool of 500 units allowing for:
  - a. Development of infill properties for up to 35 units or less. Staff should provide policy language that will prohibit "clustering" and other attempts to transfer or exploit the allocation process while subdividing existing parcels.
  - b. Development of affordable housing projects.
  - c. Incorporate the EEHVS Guiding Principles
  - d. Incorporate the EEHVS amenities list
  - e. Direct staff to bring forth a proposed traffic impact fee for the pool units as described in 1a and 1b.
2. Direct staff to not bring back amendments to the EDP (beyond Recommendation 1) until:
  - a. The employment capacity contemplated in the Evergreen Specific Plan to be provided by the industrial lands has been filled. As part of this trigger, a traffic study should verify that a recirculation of traffic patterns to foster a reverse commute is in fact occurring as prescribed in the current EDP; **OR**
  - b. Staff has a bona fide plan prepared that can fully accomplish those requirements set forth in the Guiding Principles concurrent with development, including full funding for the entire 101 corridor project and all other traffic infrastructure requirements within the study area, and "fair share" funding for those items recommended in the EEHVS amenities list.
3. Staff should continue to discourage residential development applications (a policy already adopted by the City Council in January 2004) including general plan amendments which do not conform to the EDP and the direction noted above.
4. Staff is directed to return to Council with policies that encourage development of employment producing lands and quality commercial/retail opportunities. Such opportunities are not restricted under the EDP and that should continue to be the case with the exception of future supermarket developments in Southeast Evergreen.

5. Staff should return to council prior to the Fall General Plan Hearings with a policy (or amendment to that EDP) that addresses future supermarket development (over 20,000 SF) in Southeast Evergreen that should take into account the use of market studies, potential growth, and the possibility of loss of existing supermarket square footage.

### **BACKGROUND**

As a result of actions taken by the City Council on May 15, 2007, staff has put forth a proposed workplan on amending the EDP and has asked for the Council's input on suggested triggers. The above recommendations are intended to provide direction on what amendments to the EDP should be undertaken as part of staff's workplan. They are designed to appropriately pace residential growth with employment growth in order to ensure the commensurate infrastructure and realize the reverse commute as specified in the current EDP. These recommendations allow for certain types of development to proceed. Specifically, a 500 unit pool has been established for developers seeking 35 units or less and affordable housing (with a preference for senior affordable housing). This pool is subject to a traffic impact fee (to be developed by staff) and adjustments as related to the population-dwelling unit equivalency formula. The TIF is above and beyond any fees statutorily required of development projects through the city's development process.

Commercial/retail development should be pursued consistent with the council adopted Guiding Principles and Key Outcomes which specify capturing "new retail and commercial opportunities while strengthening all existing retail including the commercial center at the Evergreen Village."

Council's approval of this memorandum will signify its support for the Campus Industrial site to be preserved and encouraged for employment growth as well as demonstrate its strong desire to reject piecemeal growth in the form of approving significant residential growth absent appropriate mitigations as outlined above.