



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

Contents

GPAC Meeting #13: May 11, 2021 1

GPAC Meeting #14: June 23, 2021..... 2

Housing Element Workshop: July 14, 2021 7

Housing Element Townhall: October 27 2021 19

Emailed Comments 20

Website Comments..... 40

GPAC Meeting #13: May 11, 2021

<p>Lynda Deschanbault Public Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP should reflect climate action plan • equity needs to be considered • jobs/transportation access are important • liked using box store areas for housing • impacts need to be mitigated
<p>Alan Bade Public Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History: Chilpanchango Park was given to city to protect the old Valley Oak trees – to build over this park would go against other goals of GP • Serves an underserved areas • In an area underserved with parks • Maybe look in Pacheco? • Consider old gas station off Hookston
<p>Wendy Gollop Public Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps consider areas north of DVC? Martinez area? • Seems like a lot of high density concentrated in areas in southern areas of the city • Salvation Army a good site?



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

GPAC Meeting #14: June 23, 2021

Frank Hall Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owns 555-559 Contra Costa Blvd • 4800 sqft space empty • Wants review of retail commercial designation – hope will allow additional potential uses
GPAC Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the RHNA, what about projects underway? • Response: We can only count toward RHNA if permit pulled after June 2022 (6 months before projection period starts on January 2023), including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 85 Cleaveland – 180 units ○ Choice in Aging – 89 units (by DVC Overflow Parking Lot) ○ 401 Taylor Project – would be good above mod units ○ 490 Golf Club
Jack Prosek Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a loss of jobs on JFK and JC Penny sites • Low densities proposed in Mangini – area could support higher densities • Winslow Center – will they sell the site? • Appreciate efforts to put in increased density in the city
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site A: DVC Overflow Parking Lot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be student housing with smaller units (e.g., studios) • DVC has considered developing housing in the past • The site backs up to 4 story developments • Potential for increasing density on this site – but hold off increasing unless needed to meet the RHNA
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site B: Chilpancingo Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove from consideration
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site C: Winslow Center/PH-Taylor Intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would Rec and Park be willing to sell the site for development? • A creek goes through this site – would want to preserve that and may impact amount of available buildable land • Density could be decreased here.
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site D: Mangini-Delu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2 du/ac a little low – the potential to bump up to 5-6 du/ac? • There is community interest in green spaces in this area/on this site • It's the last vestige of PH's ag heritage • Would be great to incorporate park/urban ag(?) part of the site
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site E: JFK University Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building is close to trail and other city amenities • Maybe a good spot for Mixed Use, first floor retail – would allow to retain some potential for sales tax generation • Higher density on this site can help offset lower densities elsewhere in the city • Consider 70-100 du/ac MU on this site



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

GPAC Discussion	<p>Site F. ACE Hardware</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the site boundary north to include TAP plastics
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site G. Gregory Gardens Shopping Center</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be a good Mixed Use area
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site H. Salvation Army</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove from Consideration
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site I. Pleasant Hill/Gregory intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about 2 new buildings – Walgreens and Zio Fraedo’s very new • More potential on south side of Gregory or east of Zio Fraedo’s • Would like Mixed Use in this area • Walgreens could be the anchor • Consider 40-70 du/ac MU designation for this site
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site J: Gregory Lane/Contra Costa Boulevard Intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the focus area boundary north to Caspers • Potential site for brewery or brew pub • Consider 40-70 du/ac Mixed Use
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site K: Jewel Neighborhood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently there’s an informal housing development proposal in the works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rezoning would be good for that development project • Expand the focus area to include the L-shaped building to the east
GPAC Discussion	<p>L. Beatrice Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of site is taken by Habitat for Humanity build; remove from site area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flooding issues on the site • Not impossible to build, but would cost a lot of money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most people would go elsewhere before building here • Remove from consideration – reconsider if having trouble meeting RHNA targets
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site M: Monument Triangle Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenging to displace a mobile home park; remove this parcel from consideration within the focus area
GPAC Discussion	<p>Site N: Former JCPenny Furniture Store Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider to 40-70 du/ac Mixed Use in this area.
GPAC Discussion	<p>New suggested areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunn Edwards – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On Contra Costa Blvd, basically Target to Pacheco ○ Mixed Use should allow for office, retail ○ GP needs to make sure city can retain commercial capacity • Taylor/Morello Ave <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good area for Mixed Use ○ All along Taylor, some of these commercial areas would be good for Mixed Use – consider a Mixed Use General Plan Land Use Designation along the corridor.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>Danielle Drier Emailed Comment</p>	<p>I am making a comment on the proposed Land Use plan that was shared On July 14th, 2021.</p> <p>I am a local Pleasant Hill resident with 4 young children we're a very active family in the community- always biking,hiking and using the park space available to us. I was highly alarmed when the discussion of the Mangini Land came up as an option to build living units on it. It only seems natural for the City of Pleasant Hill to want to preserve the very last vestige of Pleasant Hill's rural roots.</p> <p>As an active member of our community raising a family here in Pleasant Hill it would be my hope that we can offer our future beings knowledge of land, history and community. Restoring part of the land to its natural being and creating a space for our community-parks, trails, biking area etc. for the health of our people, families and community would be my vote!</p> <p>LESS HOUSES. More people outside.</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Overall, it was a long but productive GPAC meeting last night.</p> <p>However, some of the comments on the eight density figure used left a lot to be desired. There was some indication that the numbers represented only one point on a range of values rather than a fixed number, but we do not know what those figures are.</p> <p>The consultants were vague about the number of stories & building heights that each density range might involve, but the public needs to be provided with a much better sense of this for each density, will the buildings need to be 3 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 10, or more than ten stories for both Mixed Use & pure residential developments ??? And you need to include any elevated parking levels that may be required in order to meet the overall demands.</p> <p>My thoughts on the specific sites follow:</p> <p>A - DVC North Parking Lot DVC still needs to INCREASE the number of parking stalls for their commuter students. I would see this site as being developed with three story walk-up housing units over a podium of a three-level parking garage - possibly one level underground. ADA accessible units can all be provided on the first residential level. It also should be noted that the residents on the west side of the canal were already concerned about the height of the CiA project to the north</p> <p>C - Winslow Center & D - Mangini/Delu Given the right terms, the RPD should be interested in a land swap - perhaps a parcel along the creek towards the southern end of this property that could be developed into a park serving this new part of our community. This was strongly suggested (but totally ignored) during their Master Plan process ! The Winslow Center building itself is dilapidated & has been living on borrowed time ever since</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

they needed to bring in a Structural Engineer TEN YEARS ago. It was good to see that "D" was revised to include the entire site; you also must recognize the slopes of the east & north parts of this site. I always envisioned a more dense development of this site than what is being proposed.

E - JFK University

Chad's comments about the loss of jobs here was inappropriate - just because JFKU is leaving does not make this site less attractive to other office tenants. At the very least, serious consideration should be given to a multi-use development as the AC suggested. And do remember the numerous objections that were made for the FOUR story hotel project to the north - portions of that building were reduced to 2 & 3 stories in order to gain approval !!

I - PH Road / Gregory Lane

For the RHNA study, you might want to consider excluding the Walgreens site; the larger area discussed seems appropriate for the 2040 GP.

L - Beatrice Area

Development of a significant portion of this area would likely require the construction of a large retention pond for stormwater control - far too heavy a burden for even Moderate Housing. (The Library could have been constructed here elevated over a parking garage that could be allowed to flood during critical times since it is not essential that a Library be open every day; however, the opponents to this concept carried the day. The City or County Staff also gave the LTF a very bleak picture of the cost to purchase the three existing homes).

N - JC Penney

Here, as at "E", adding a multi-use component makes a great deal of sense.

O - CCB North (added)

Adding the retail areas along CCB north of Chilpancingo (including Dunn-Edwards & Target) to the GP 2040 for a future MU development makes good sense.

P - Hillcrest Shopping Center (added)

Same as "O" but do note that a portion of the site is occupied by the very active Hope Center Church.

All of the Multi-use developments will need to consider the potential need for parking on elevated level(s) to accommodate the more intense site development. Many areas along CCB are unlikely to be very conducive to underground parking solutions due to the naturally high groundwater elevations. Note that a MINIMUM of three residential floors are needed to be cost effective for the proposed developments.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Please provide a listing for all the vacant lots including the proposed density & type of development.</p> <p>Just my thoughts in the hours following</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Your Memorandum for the June 23rd meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) included a great deal of valuable information about potential sites for additional housing within the City of Pleasant Hill. After making a brief review, I have one major issue & found a few minor clarifications that are needed.</p> <p>First, the major issue is that I could not follow the information shown in going from the details for the individual sites to Table 17 under the Site Summary. The only number that is directly supported is the TOTAL of 1,898 new units on the twelve (of 14) listed Sites. Nothing in this Memorandum appears to support the distribution of these units into the various Income Categories shown nor the numbers shown for the Vacant Sites & the Assumed ADUs please connect the dots !!! A Chart showing the number of each type of units from each of the 12 sites would be helpful.</p> <p>Minor items noted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - which are the "two additional sites" referred to on the third page (numbering of the pages would be helpful for references) ? - Figure 4 shows the Winslow Center site (not Chilpancingo Park). - for Table 6 - there are one or more existing housing units on the Mangini-Delu property that would be displaced which would reduce the net increase. - the site boundaries shown in Figure 5 are significantly different than shown in the aerial view ... why is the land area shown on the East side not included ? - the development of site "E" (JFK University) as shown would result in a significant loss in the number of JOBS available in the local area; smaller numbers of jobs would also be lost on sites "C" (Winslow Center) and "N" (JC Penney). This conflicts with the objective to locate housing near jobs - sites such as the Flood Control District property "L" Beatrice Area may be cheap to acquire, but will be very expensive to develop due to the potential flooding here & elsewhere. <p>One final note for today: with all these new housing units, will there also be a need to increase the areas available for new retail spaces ... especially at sites C, D, E and/or N ????</p> <p>I would hope that you will clarify all of these items prior to the meeting on Wednesday !</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

Housing Element Workshop: July 14, 2021

Darcy Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please consider historic homes and work to preserve them.
Karen Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider parking, we may not need so many parking spots in the future. • Walgreens is brand new and won't work.
Jack Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested via email and in person types of data and would like that request filled. • Please provide density range for each density. • Clarify what the density levels look like. This would be helpful for the public. • JFK University and JC Penney site. We don't want to lose jobs.
Alex Public comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contra Costa Boulevard has congestion. Be mindful when placing units here. • ADUs present an opportunity to reach housing goals. How can we get the word out? • Mixed use: be mindful of our character when choosing where to allow Mixed Use.
Max Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If businesses are profitable, they may not want to sell. Let's make sure those owners are willing to sell. Can we use a confidence number within the methodology? • RE: congestion: We can reduce parking by locating units near transportation routes.
Alan Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older commercial centers have cheaper rents and are valuable for small businesses compared to new developments that have higher rents. • Concerned about congestion and parking. It will be a complex issue. • Thank you for removing Chilpancingo. • Beatrice has environmental constraints. • Winslow, Mangini, and Beatrice have our last remaining open creeks. We need to plan for creek corridors with public access and restored riparian areas. They will enhance the property value and will be a benefit to residents. Please identify creeks on maps and diagrams. • Open Space/Parkland standard: consider this when planning units.
Wendy Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys show that people want smaller low density areas. • Schools, how can we deal with added capacity? Where would new schools be built? • Childcare: is there enough available? • Open space standard: We need to consider this as part of the process. We need a livable community. • Transportation: consider bus routes. Buses don't run on the weekend. Sometimes run only every 80 minutes. • Existing solar should be considered. New development should not shade existing solar panels. • List the creeks on the map. The city has flooding issues in some areas.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

Jack Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities does the City have for the areas within the Sphere of Influence, outside the city boundary.
Darcy Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing should be inclusive for all. • Consider tiny homes and other housing formats. Build for the people and the community. We don't need more hotels.
Alan Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADU's are really helpful but they may or may not increase our low density numbers.
Martin Gibb Emailed Comment	<p>The Housing Element (HE) as a subpart of the General Plan (GP) does not consider the desired future characteristics of PH which are yet to be articulated in a GP draft. The general trend appears to be changing PH toward a higher density, semi-urban area. The HE needs to be aligned toward future needs and avoid creating dense residential “islands” where cars are the only viable way to access the daily needs (job, groceries, shopping).</p> <p>Toward this end I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · support continued challenge to RHNA targets based on viability; · propose grouping and prioritizing mixed use designations consistent with the long-term vision of the GP. i.e. development of area close to Contra Costa Blvd corridor first; · propose outlying areas are designated at lower densities (e.g. west PH areas C, D and I); · propose that an overarching story be included that supports the HE and will help explain its direction, rather than present a seemingly hodgepodge grab-bag of sites of unknown availability or interest. <p>My specific area of concern is the west PH areas C, D and I in July 14, 2021 presentation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Propose lowering overall density to be more consistent with areas characteristics; Need to Articulate long-term vision for complete area since these three areas are in close proximity and interrelated (housing and shopping). These three would be significant traffic adds to area with limited public transit. <p>C. Winslow Center/Pleasant Hill-Taylor property - Multi Fam -LD – 40 units proposed</p> <p>and</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>D. Mangini-Delu Area – mix of designations – 221 units proposed</p> <p>a. In the last HE (April 2015), this site was shown supporting 60 AMI housing units. A change to 221 (and 40 multi family, low density on Winslow) is a significant increase.</p> <p>b. This would be a significant change to the characteristic of the surrounding neighborhood, generally Single Fam R10, R7 and R6 type.</p> <p>c. Consider no more than 110 units for this area (incl. Winslow) 4/ac consistent with existing zoning.</p> <p>d. Consider setting aside some of this area as open space/ parkland because higher densities will need this amenity.</p> <p>e. Continue with community use area for Winslow – adjacent parkland?</p> <p>I. Pleasant Hill-Gregory lane Intersection - Mixed use High density – 309 units proposed</p> <p>a. Consider how to retain current community shopping area features (vegetable store, drug store, bike shop, café restaurants, etc.) in consideration of total area needs.</p> <p>b. Significant traffic adds to area with limited public transit</p> <p>c. Consider lower density or height restrictions to keep more in character with area and limit traffic impact</p> <p>Additional site specific comments based on July 14, 2021 presentation:</p> <p>A. DVC Overflow Parking Lot – Mixed Use VHD - 350</p> <p>a. Appears to be a site with potential to create housing on underutilized land.</p> <p>B. Chilpancingo Park - removed</p> <p>C. Winslow Center/Pleasant Hill-Taylor property - Multi Fam -LD – 40</p> <p>a. See above</p> <p>D. Mangini-Delu Area – (mix of designations – East = Single fam HD)</p> <p>a. See above</p>
--	---



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>E. JFK University</p> <p>F. ACE Hardware (+adjacent) – Mixed use HD - 120</p> <p>a. Agree this is an opportunity area with underutilized land area (large parking lots)</p> <p>b. Propose there be an overarching plan for community shopping needs (groceries, sundries, etc.) in conjunction with areas G, I and J below</p> <p>G. Gregory Gardens Shopping Center (Grocery Outlet) – Mixed User HD – 175</p> <p>a. Consider how to meet current and future community shopping area features grocery, dining, etc. in consideration of total area needs.</p> <p>H. Salvation Army - removed</p> <p>I. Pleasant Hill-Gregory lane Intersection - Mixed use High density – 309</p> <p>a. See above</p> <p>J. Gregory-Contra Costa Intersection – Mixed use - HD 115</p> <p>a. Consider expanding all the way to Woodsworth Lane – the other buildings are not of better stock</p> <p>b. Extension of “downtown” – walkability and connection to shopping center on east side of Contra Costa Blvd.</p> <p>K. Jewel lane Area – Mixed use HD - 71</p> <p>a. Appears to be a site with potential to continue in character of area – Apts and retail</p> <p>b. Consider adding adjacent triangular area (shopping center/ biz park?)</p> <p>L. Beatrice Area – Mixed User HD</p> <p>a. Agree the area is an opportunity to develop housing – disagree with the mixed use concept for this area – no existing retail in area</p> <p>b. Propose changing to housing only option.</p> <p>M. Monument Triangle – Mixed User HD - 220</p>
--	--



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>a. Agree that this is a potential site</p> <p>N. Former JCPenny Furniture store Site - Mixed User HD – 281</p> <p>a. Agree that this is a potential site</p>
Chris Klein	<p>My family happily resides at 8 Erin Ct and we are writing you to express our deepest disappointment after hearing about this recent Mangini and Winslow Center proposed high density housing development.</p> <p>I, alongside everyone in this neighborhood, am 100% against this proposal. I do not support it and will fight it alongside everyone in this area.</p> <p>It is absolutely ridiculous to even consider adding that many units to that area. How are we going to support the cars, parking and traffic bottleneck? Among other many issues this would cause.</p> <p>We just did a beautiful job redoing this corridor. I attended city council meetings and fully supported the planning committee. Great job on that.</p> <p>Please do not disappoint us long standing citizens of this community and ruin it with a greedy proposal that will crush the charm of Pleasant Hill that we call home. I will move my family right out of here.</p> <p>Block this proposal and think about single family or low density housing or just preserve this beautiful land!</p>
Debby Badsky	<p>I have lived in PH. for over 30 years. I don't want PH like WC. PH has a much needed home town feeling- I worked in SF and and loved to come home and feel like I lived in a homey community. I don't want 261 units in the Mangini area. more traffic more problems with the sewer lines- Not to mention redoing the sewer lines on PH RD. twice in a couple of years. I never really found out why you had to redo the sewers. The bikes lanes, the congestion of more people in 261 units, and cars in the morning will be a nightmare. Please stop zoning for condo- high density areas in PH.</p> <p>Thank You, Debby Badsky</p> <p>I've paid property tax for a PH home for 35 years- trying to make PH a community I want to live in- PH you get enough money from downtown. Stop trying to make it a WC apartments complex</p>
Mark de Wit	<p>Opposition to proposed land use changes to high density for the Mangini-Delu and Winslow Center properties</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

My family and I are strongly opposed to the proposed changes for the Mangini-Delu and Winslow Center properties as described in the virtual community workshop because the proposed housing density changes are in gross conflict with the General Plan and the values of Pleasant Hill. The proposed plan for the properties changing the current single-family medium density (63 dwelling units) to high-density housing (221 dwelling units) will severely negatively impact existing residential neighborhoods and families.

The proposed increase in housing density does not comport with the General Plan, which states retaining the character and charm of residential neighborhoods is a top priority for Pleasant Hill residents. The proposed plan with rezoning from SF Medium Density to a combination of SF High Density and Multi-Family Low and Medium Density will change the area and negatively impact the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. (It is quite disturbing how the presentation glossed over the proposed changes, neglected to identify the current and proposed zoning changes, and did not make clear the overall change from 63 dwelling units to 221 high density units). The proposed changes for these properties do not protect and maintain the character of Pleasant Hill's residential neighborhood and quality of life. To the contrary, the proposed changes will degrade the residential neighborhoods with looming multi-story structures and increases of congestion and traffic, hazards to bicycles and pedestrians, and noise impacts.

The proposed plan is not compatible with adjacent neighborhoods. The General Plan says that multifamily developments generally are separated from single-family neighborhoods. The properties are surrounded by single-family residential neighborhoods. The proposed plan would be in conflict with Community Development Policy to encourage aesthetic enhancement of residential areas, while retaining the charm and character of individual neighborhoods.

The proposed high density plan would greatly increase impacts to Grayson Creek beyond those of a single-family medium density development. The General Plan emphasizes preserving and reclaiming streams, wetlands, and riparian areas to function as open space and requires reclamation of degraded streams. High density housing on both sides of Grayson Creek will diminish its potential as riparian habitat and surely increase the quantity of pollutants entering waters of the creek.

Rezoning to high density housing is not justified on any transit basis. The properties are not near public mass transit as BART is 3 miles away, too far to walk. The local CCC Transit bus route runs so infrequently (every 80 minutes), that proximity to a high-quality bus corridor cannot be claimed.

Pleasant Hill has long prided itself on being a wonderful community to live in and raise families in safe single-family residential neighborhoods that have charm and character. It is the City's responsibility per the General Plan to protect and



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>preserve our residential neighborhoods. The proposed housing high density changes for the two properties fly in the face of this top priority and should be dropped.</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Today's email did absolutely NOTHING to actually ANSWER the questions that I raised</p> <p>Rather, the only real new information is the inclusion of 13 du's on the Salvation Site "H". The Staff Recommendation for the June 23rd GPAC meeting was that this site should be removed from inventory - maybe I missed it, but I did not hear anything during the public meetings about keeping this site - much less increasing its density from 6 units.</p> <p>Also, I believe that I acknowledged up front that there is no hard & fast way to determine the possible number of stories & the likely building heights for each density being proposed, especially since the size of the units is also unknown. But ranges for these numbers can be reasonably estimated; I recognize that many of the general public will be unable to evaluate your proposals without having some idea of these parameters.</p> <p>You must have had some methodology to go from the densities at each site to the total number of units for each income category. With the proper incentives I can even see the potential for Moderate or Above Moderate Income units on the upper floors of taller buildings (likely over ten stories) that are along the freeway given the views that they would have - sites E & N in particular especially if they have separate entrances !! And how did you get MINUS 8.45 Acres for MF-MD ?</p> <p>Still looking for the City's List of Vacant Properties as well</p>
<p>Bruce Irion</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing me to comment on the Housing Element of the PH 2040 General Plan. The RHNA goals for the General Plan represent an audacious goal, one that will take ingenuity, creativity, and a different mindset to solve - As Albert Einstein said, "No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it."</p> <p>My comments and questions fall into several categories:</p> <p>Agreement on overriding objectives, Comments on 2040 trends impacting housing, and Specifics on the 2040 Housing Element presented in the July 14, 2021 meeting.</p> <p>Agreement on overriding objectives:</p> <p>While RHNA mandates that all California cities, towns and counties must plan for the housing needs of residents regardless of income, it sets the backdrop that this will be done in a way that protects the environment; encourages efficient development patterns; achieves greenhouse gas reduction targets; and improves</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

intra-regional jobs-to-housing relationship. In a nutshell, the RHNA mandate seeks to optimize the quality of life for the maximum number of people by encouraging sustainable development.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) used the RHNA methodology to set housing targets for each city in CCCounty. It did so on the projected growth in population which presumes a growth in jobs.

QUESTION #1 – ABAG used RHNA to set income specific city housing targets. But how did RHNA address the recognized need to improve intra-regional jobs-to-housing relationship? More specifically, did RHNA do an assessment of the current housing need in Pleasant Hill based on local jobs or address the jobs imbalance in the Bay Area that has allowed job growth in SF and the Silicon Valley to impacting housing and transportation infrastructure around the Bay Area?

Comment #1 – RHNA says it recognized the need to “improve intra-regional jobs-to-housing relationship” yet it seems to focus exclusively on housing and setting targets for the distribution of income specific housing. The housing/housing distribution crisis can equally be described as a jobs/jobs distribution crisis. Yet there is no focus or assessment of jobs. If, as Einstein said, “No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it”, then this need to change! During the July 14 th teleconference, one of the PH officials asked how to manage Sacramento. The Bay Area housing crisis was created because there was no regional jobs planning, and a regional housing plan alone will NOT solve that problem!!!

Further comment – Pleasant Hill is a great place to live! People live in Pleasant Hill by choice – they do not resign themselves to live here. And that is because Pleasant Hill is an actively managed and planned community for all residents. It values parks and open space, maintains its infrastructure, provides activities for all ages from children through seniors, all while being fiscally responsible. In short, I think Pleasant Hill does a great job of sustainable development and optimizing the quality of life for the maximum number of people, something I can’t say for all communities in the Bay Area. If there is credible data to show that Pleasant Hill is not fairly treating residents who live and work here, please show it to me. But I do not see why Pleasant Hill should be tasked with solving problems that were created elsewhere. (FYI – I see where Pleasant Hill has sent an appeal to ABAG on the RHNA target for Pleasant Hill. I have sent an email supporting the city’s appeal.)

Comments on 2040 trends impacting housing:

While I recognize the agenda of the July 14, 2021 meeting was the Housing Element of the 2040 General Plan, I believe it would have been helpful to have summarized this against the backdrop of trends which are and will impact the



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Housing Element. Specifically, here are a few trends that I believe have significant impact on housing:</p> <p>Growth in e-commerce and a commensurate reduction in brick and mortar stores Trend toward tele-commuting for jobs Trend toward on-line learning Automation is/will reduce the number of lower income service industry jobs Let's look at each of these trends and the potential impact it would have on housing needs for the 2040 General Plan.</p> <p>Growth in e-commerce and a commensurate reduction in brick and mortar stores As this trend continues, there will be less need for retail stores freeing up space for more housing.</p> <p>Comment #2 – I saw some conversion of business to housing in the proposed 2040 General Plan but I think considerably more is possible. Further, while I saw some leverage of the idea in the 2040 General Plan, I think there is room for considerably more conversion of retail space to mixed use. This would allow for retail owners and employees to live above retail space which, in line with RHNA goals, would reduce commuting and minimize carbon footprint</p> <p>Trend toward tele-commuting for jobs As this trend continues, more people working in SF and the Silicon Valley will be working from home. This trend helps to mitigate the deficiency of the failure of RHNA to address the jobs imbalance in the Bay Area.</p> <p>Comment #3 – The RHNA income specific housing target disproportionately emphasized lower income housing. As telecommuting allows higher income workers to choose where they elect to live, more will move to suburbs and Pleasant Hill reducing the apparent “over-abundance” of higher end housing.</p> <p>Trend toward on-line learning As this trend continues, there will be less need for classrooms, especially at colleges. This means DVC will need fewer classrooms.</p> <p>Question 2 – Has this been discussed with DVC, and since the trend is true for the state as a whole, has the issue been addressed with the state who set the RHNA mandate? More pointedly, as the demand for classrooms declines, to what degree is the state prepared to use this windfall to build on-campus housing and thus reduce the housing impact colleges have on their surrounding communities?</p> <p>Automation is and will continue to reduce the number of lower income service industry jobs As this trend continues, there will be fewer low income jobs and less need for low income housing.</p>
--	---



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Comment #4 – As previously commented, the RHNA income specific housing target disproportionately emphasized low income housing. The need for low income housing will decline as the number of low income jobs declines. Additionally, this further supports my belief that the 2040 General Plan MUST start with an assessment of current and future jobs in the Pleasant Hill vicinity so that equal weight is given to jobs as to housing.</p> <p>Specifics on the 2040 Housing Element presented in the July 14, 2021 meeting.</p> <p>I will provide comments on specifics in the 2040 Housing Element presentation by the letter corresponding to the specific site in the plan.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>A – DVC Overflow Parking lot As stated above, given the trend for on-line learning, I believe there will be an opportunity to repurpose sites on-campus for student housing.</p> <p>B – Chilpancingo Park While I applaud conserving open space, given the magnitude of the housing goal set by RHNA, it seems early in the process to categorically eliminate the whole of this site</p> <p>C & D – Winslow Center & Mangini Delu Area The Winslow, Eastern, Northern and Southern areas are respectively targeted for 13.9, 4.8, 8.3, & 21.0 du/ac. With closer access to the greater capacity of Taylor Blvd (vs PH Road), it would seem the higher density housing would be better suited for the Winslow or Northern site as opposed to the Southern Site. With such a large area, the General Plan should provide for a park or other open area.</p> <p>E – JFK University No comment</p> <p>F – ACE Hardware No comment on this site Given previous comment about trend toward e-commerce and ability to leverage additional retail to residential or mixed use sites, what other sites can be considered? Thoughts around the Orchard Hardware site?</p> <p>G – Gregory Gardens No comment</p> <p>H – Salvation Army Given the magnitude of the housing goal set by RHNA, it is not clear why this site would be eliminated.</p> <p>I & J – Gregory/PH & Gregory/Contra Costa Intersections Both are targeted to average 49 du/ac. With closer proximity to freeways, the Gregory Lane/Contra Costa Blvd intersection would seem to warrant higher</p>
--	--



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>density what Gregory Lane/PH Road intersection would seem to warrant lower density development.</p> <p>K – Jewel Lane No comment</p> <p>L – Beatrice Area GPAC recommendation is to “Review and use if needed to meet RHNA”. – QUESTION 3 – What does this mean??? Where does this site sit in the prioritization for use and at what density?</p> <p>M – Monument Triangle As with many other areas, this area is targeted to average 49 du/ac. This site would seem the most appropriate to consider for even higher density should that be required.</p> <p>N – Former JCPenny Again, as with many other areas, this area is targeted to average 49 du/ac. This site would seem the most appropriate to consider for even higher density should that be required</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Second Effort - The morning light brought out some additional comments as follows:</p> <p>I. Sites F, G, I, J, K, L & M - these smaller MU sites should be limited to a maximum of six stories & about 80' in height.</p> <p>II. Think that I heard a comment about developing around the existing Winslow Center building - that structure has been living on borrowed time for TEN YEARS now & definitely will need to be demolished within the next few years. The RPD will be much better off trading that prime land for a new park elsewhere - my choice would be on the Mangini/Delu property along the creek.</p> <p>We should continue to fight to maintain our suburban environment - the well planned, small town atmosphere that has been included in the City Council's stated GOALS for a number of two year cycles now - not the urban one that the politicians in Sacramento want us to have !!!</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Overall, it was a good meeting tonight on the Housing Element despite the small number of residents who spoke</p> <p>but it was extremely disappointing to find that the consultants did NOT respond either before or during the meeting to my requests for additional information that were made before, during and/or immediately following the June 23rd meeting.</p> <p>1- A listing of the vacant properties, their assigned densities & the potential number of units. 2- Descriptions of what the various densities (now six) would likely represent in terms of the numbers (ranges okay) of stories & building heights.</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

3- A spreadsheet showing the transition from the various parcels A thru N to the counts in Table 2 of the June 23rd Staff Report.

In my opinion, many of the interested citizens would need some or all of these documents in order to provide meaningful comments on the plans being presented ! Thanks Ken for your support on the typical density build-outs !!

In addition, I have the these thoughts on the various sites following the presentation:

A. Another reminder that DVC needs to ADD parking for their current number of commuter students while many residents - especially those living nearby - would object to having dormitory TOWERS there.

C & D. Consider allowing multi-use developments on these two sites. Also, I think that these are the best locations for Moderate & Above Moderate Income level - hence larger - units, so that should be reflected in the building sizes. Also need to allow landscape area for the creek riparian area.

E & N. Noted that these were changed to allow multi-use - as previously suggested to retain jobs close to the new housing.

G. There was some discussion during the June 23rd meeting about expanding this area to include the houses immediately west of the shopping center - which I support.

We also note that the densities for sites F, G, I, J, K, L & M were all increased from 30 units per acre to a range of 40-70 units per acre - not sure what the justification is for this especially since these all are the smaller MU sites ?? This might be too much to expect !

Of course, ample PARKING will be a big issue as each of these sites are developed so there is not a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods !!!

Looking forward to receiving the requested documents sooner rather than later (needed NOW - not after August 11th) !!!



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

Housing Element Townhall: October 27 2021

David Blau Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mangini site: to dense, no transit, no jobs. Traffic issue is likely most critical. Public safety, environmental, school and water issues. • Reconsider to keep R-10 (with the inclusion of expected ADUs).
Bruce Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mangini: The proposed density will change the neighborhood. Also, single family homes are in demand, and this focus area is the only area left to develop single family homes in Pleasant Hill. Please do not change the zoning.
Max Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: Mangini: Why is everyone saying 500 new cars? Can a developer choose no parking? Please would ride transportation, rather than all bring 2 cars. Suggest allowing developments to come in below parking requirements; let the developer decide.
Jonathan Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I echo the Mangini comments. Please reconsider the density increase here.
Bobby Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCD does this to try to fix the issues with housing, but with those large numbers, can we have to approve that many units in the planning period? • Consider Diversity Equity and Inclusion. Stop putting up barriers to housing.
Eric Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADUs: No parking required within 0.5 miles of transit. They may be a solution to addressing the RHNA.
Joyce Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the public be involved? When will the zoning changes happen? How can the public be involved in the zoning amendments? • There is a site on Cleaveland to explore further.
Dave Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider active transportation. A built-out bike network is needed if we are to meet our RHNA goals.
Shereen Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with Mangini site. What if a developer wants to do something different than the proposed zoning changes?
David Blau Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the State's goal of spreading out density throughout the community is not right for Pleasant Hill.
Denise Gudzikowski	<p>I listened with interest to tonight's session with the consultant on the Housing Element update, and look forward to the General Plan update workshops on the Housing Element. One idea that did not come up in the discussion of possible ways to get to the current draft 1803 number. And that is - ADUs. Perhaps it is possible to come up with a city wide number of potential ADU additions (5%? 2.5%?) that might be built over the next 8 year RHNA period? Given there is data on the number of ADUs permitted in the past few years, there is data to support and a reasonable assumption could potentially be made there. That could be several hundred units, easily. As was mentioned, we are going to have to get creative and realistic on this next 8 year plan. I look forward to public input on under-utilized properties (Winslow Center, many church parking lots, DVC parking lots, etc etc) thanks, Denise</p>



Emailed Comments

<p>Sharron Breedlove</p>	<p>I reside at Steven Circle/Linda Lane across from the Mangini property for the past forty years. After viewing the housing video, what I can determine from all lettered general plan proposals for the next 8 years to satisfy the state's various housing quota, we are 382 units short of low density housing by 8 years' end & at a surplus of high density housing beyond the state's requirements.</p> <p>The Mangini land tract was initially zoned years ago for low density housing & was the only remaining open space on PH to build so many single family homes in one place. Now the city has rezoned it for mixed density. The Molino's property that was recently built with only low density housing, it does makes a resident wonder why one project requires mixed density & another builds only million dollar single family homes.</p> <p>As a resident, I do ask the question what's the differences between the two properties that warrants the rezoning changes? When the city has already designated so many other possible sites for high density housing why consider this Mangini/Delu site for mixed density?</p> <p>However, working with the current status of mixed density of the Mangini/Delu properties here is what I propose, a couple alternative solutions to deal with this massive land tract previously known as the Mangini/Delu farms. Hopefully, a fresh view on how to divide it up may be considered.</p> <p>Two alternate rezoning plans to consider with the Mangini/Delu property:</p> <p>First alternate Mangini/Delu plan proposal:</p> <p>If you have to build high density units on the Mangini property consider totally rezoning it by rearranging the areas. (High density) to the center area as a long strip for apartments/condos rather than placing them along PH road & then surround them with single family homes on all sides. In other words, have single family homes along the back side of the property like in the original drawing but add them also along side PH Rd then place a strip of apartment/condos no taller than two stories in the center portion (middle area section long strip) place them all the way up to Taylor Blvd. Restricting the height to only 2 story apartments/condos which would be more eye appealing & it would be no worse than looking at a two story home. Plan to have three roads exiting the entire Mangini property (the current intersection at Linda Lane, close the road at the Winslow center, then create a new road out to Taylor Blvd right turn only & then create another exit on Mercury (optional may be needed for emergency fire exit). If you place apartments/condos as in the city's original drawing with 2-3 stories (high density) along PH Rd the city may devalue the current properties facing across the street(on PH Rd). If those current homeowners move away with significant loss of property value it may domino into the surrounding streets which could be catastrophic. By placing the high density in the center of Mangini property the future(low density) single family homeowners will buy</p>
--------------------------	--



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

knowing their (high density) neighbors, it will make for a more cohesive neighborhood.

In the current drawing, the city gives the current homeowners across the street on PH Rd a long strip of high density apartments/condos with the potential of 2-3 stories height (based on the video's chart original drawing) that may reduce their property values. This is something to consider when the developer presents their plans to the city council, planning commission, etc.

The city could encourage the developer to "enclose" or surround the high density with low density housing because the city could rezone and specify in "new" drawings redrafted by the city by my proposal(s) to streamline and hide the high density units within the entire complex. The "current" drawing lacks imagination & doesn't take into account the surrounding neighborhoods' character, integrity & maturity. My proposal integrates the high density smoothly within the new neighborhood without making the units unsightly and noticeable.

A high rise apartment/condo complex placed all along PH RD may contribute significantly to the current PH Rd homeowners' property value reduction. The city should consider concerns about property values maintained as it benefits from taxes paid to city coffers.

Second alternate Mangini/Delu plan proposal:

Rezone Delu Winslow center property to "high density" housing from its current low density status. Placing a high density complex (reasonable height of 2 stories max) there makes sense & would not devalue the church property value across the street as most churches are not generally on the real estate market. Also plan to close off the Winslow center street exit/entrance onto PH Rd & create a new exit further up the road onto Taylor Blvd as a right turn only exit which would eliminate traffic off of PH Rd. The new road right turn exit onto Taylor Blvd from the high density units (no traffic light needed) will allow traffic to flow easier easing onto Taylor Blvd freeing up PH RD commuter traffic which was supposedly the purpose of the recent repaving project. If this Delu property corner is done with high density & Mangini property is entirely kept as single family homes (low density) this could satisfy the state's requirements by concentrating each property with only one type of building structure. This would require one intersection at Linda Lane probably needing a traffic light, a new exit right hand turn lane onto Taylor Blvd between the two existing stop lights-no traffic light needed, closing existing entrance/exit at Winslow center, adding exit on Mercury(optional) but probably needed for emergencies with that much housing density.

Either proposal satisfies state's housing density requirements. Hopefully, the city will consider the current residents input as possible alternatives or adjustments to the general plan.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>With the recent repavement, new LED lights, low water landscaping & new traffic lights added on PH Rd, I would hope that the Mangini/Delu project would not jeopardize all the forward strides toward reducing our carbon footprint & dealing with climate change. The city has many sites stated in the video proposed to the state that could be used for high or mixed density. I would like to see each location become a possible project since the city missed that opportunity with the Molino's property so now the it's playing catchup to hit goal.</p> <p>There also should be some designated open space for kids to play & adults to walk about under trees within this complex. In the UK, in a neighborhood there is a center garden square park area where only residents can enjoy...it's something to consider instead of wall to wall homes. If the city mandates it, the developers will have to build something similar as well as mandating how many trees, what kind need to be planted & what the landscape should look like. Again this may address climate change & reduce our carbon footprint.</p> <p>Generally, for every one resident's email or input it represents ten unspoken opinions.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and time. Be safe.</p>
<p>John Cumbers</p>	<p>I placed a call to you during the December 16, 2020 GPAC meeting asking the committee to include the Grayson Woods Golf Course Open Space parcel into the General Plan alongside the other open space land parcels in our community.</p> <p>Thank you on behalf of the 5 neighborhoods bordering this land for formally including this open space parcel in the City of Pleasant Hill's General Plan.</p> <p>We are grateful that you honored your commitment to exchange the increased housing density for the open space in perpetuity designation. Thank you for protecting this open space land for us and for future generations. We genuinely appreciate your efforts and dedication.</p>
<p>Karen Panico</p>	<p>Hi Rick and Troy, I'm still getting up to speed on all things related to Pleasant Hill Planning. In the meantime here are my comments (I've piggybacked on others) for the Housing Element.</p> <p>I believe we have a great community and want to continue our success.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have questions or need more input.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Comments on Housing Element for General Plan update</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Challenge the imposed RHNA targets of 1800 units.</p> <p>Articulate the drivers for the imposed RHNA targets (1800 units)</p> <p>PH is not adding jobs so why should our community bear the burden of already scarce resources.</p> <p>Articulate the consequences if we do not meet the targets? Is 'no' a viable option?</p> <p>The proposed Housing Element (HE) Workshop 'opportunities' do not represent Pleasant Hill's (PH) community for many reasons:</p> <p>Pleasant Hill does not have an updated articulated General Plan (GP) to which this proposal can be tested. We're addressing a sub-element (housing) before broader trends.</p> <p>The proposed opportunities change some quiet suburban neighborhoods to a semi-urban environments.</p> <p>Limited natural resources including water are a real concern. Adding more units directly threatens our environment and resources.</p> <p>I have similar comments to those submitted by another resident as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· support continued challenge to RHNA targets based on viability;· propose grouping and prioritizing mixed use designations consistent with the long-term vision of the GP. i.e. development of area close to Contra Costa Blvd corridor· propose outlying areas are designated at lower densities (e.g. west PH areas C, D and I);· propose that an overarching story be included that supports the HE and will help explain its direction, rather than present a seemingly hodgepodge grab-bag of sites of unknown availability or interest. <p>Specific area of concern, west PH areas C, D and I</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Propose lowering overall density proposed to be more consistent with areab. Need to Articulate long-term vision for complete area since these three areas are in close proximity and interrelated (housing and shopping).
--	---



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>c. These three would be significant traffic adds to area with limited public transit.</p> <p>C. AND D. Winslow Center (40 units) /Pleasant Hill-Taylor Mangini (221 units) properties</p> <p>a. In the last HE (April 2015), this site was shown supporting 60 AMI housing units. A change to 221 (and 40 multi family, low density on Winslow) is a significant increase.</p> <p>b. This would be a significant change to the characteristic of the surrounding neighborhood, generally Single Fam R10, R7 and R6 type.</p> <p>c. Consider no more than 110 units for this area (incl. Winslow) 4/ac consistent with existing zoning.</p> <p>d. Consider setting aside some of this area as open space/ parkland because higher densities will need this amenity.</p> <p>e. Continue with community use area for Winslow – adjacent parkland?</p> <p>I. Pleasant Hill-Gregory lane Intersection - Mixed use High density – 309 units proposed</p> <p>a. Consider how to retain current community shopping area features (vegetable store, drug store, bike shop, café restaurants, etc.) in consideration of total area needs.</p> <p>b. Significant traffic adds to area with limited public transit</p> <p>c. Consider lower density or height restrictions to keep more in character with area and limit traffic impact</p> <p>+++++</p> <p>A. DVC Overflow Parking Lot – Mixed Use VHD - 350</p> <p>a. Appears to be a good site with potential to create housing on underutilized land.</p> <p>B. Chilpancingo Park - removed</p> <p>C.</p>
--	--



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. See aboveD.a. See aboveE. JFK UniversityF. ACE Hardware (+adjacent) – Mixed use HD - 120a. Agree this is an opportunity area with underutilized land area (large parking lots)b. Propose there be an overarching plan for community shopping needs (groceries, sundries, etc.) in conjunction with areas G, I and J belowG. Gregory Gardens Shopping Center (Grocery Outlet) – Mixed User HD – 175a. Consider how to meet current and future community shopping area features grocery, dining, etc. in consideration of total area needs.H. Salvation Army - removedI.a. See aboveJ. Gregory-Contra Costa Intersection – Mixed use - HD 115a. Consider expanding all the way to Woodsworth Lane – the other buildings are not of better stockb. Extension of “downtown” – walkability and connection to shopping center on east side of Contra Costa Blvd.K. Jewel lane Area – Mixed use HD - 71a. Appears to be a site with mixed-use potentialb. Consider adding adjacent triangular area (shopping center/ biz park?)L. Beatrice Area – Mixed User HD
--	---



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>a. Agree the area is an opportunity to develop housing – disagree with the mixed use concept for this area – no existing retail in area</p> <p>b. Propose changing to housing only option.</p> <p>M. Monument Triangle – Mixed User HD - 220</p> <p>a. Agree that this is a potential site</p> <p>N. Former JCPenny Furniture store Site - Mixed User HD – 281</p> <p>a. Agree that this is a potential site</p>
<p>Alan Bade</p>	<p>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 we 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.</p> <p>Focus area 1 (DVC);</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. 2. This concept is also being articulated in the bike and pedestrian path plan update that will come to the GPAC later this summer. 3. 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. <p>Focus area 2 (Mangini);</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>2. 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.</p> <p>Focus area 3 (Downtown);</p> <p>1. I agree with leaving as is, with the idea that mixed use here allows for housing/commercial combinations.</p> <p>Focus area 4 (Hookston);</p> <p>1. Light industrial is important to retain as it allows for diversity possibilities in employment. Expanding the definition could spur new economic development.</p> <p>Focus Area 5 (Contra Costa Blvd);</p> <p>1. 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.</p> <p>Focus areas 6 and 7 (Gregory and Taylor);</p> <p>1. I agree with the discussion on traffic safety being a priority.</p> <p>Focus area 8 (Oak Park);</p> <p>1. 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.</p>
--	--



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Focus area 9 (Pleasant Hill Plaza); makes sense to incorporate into Downtown, as it's immediately adjacent.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>Dr. Quy Tran, Chair, on behalf of the Pleasant Hill Commission on Aging</p>	<p>The Pleasant Hill Commission on Aging recognizes the challenges of securing adequate and affordable housing for all communities. We appreciate the careful deliberation of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) as the City attempts to move forward. As part of our advisory role, we wish to present some information that may assist the GPAC in this purposeful process and to ensure that the needs of the fast-growing senior population are taken into account.</p> <p>1. As we have previously advised the Pleasant Hill City Council, the population of older adults will exceed the population of children by 2035. In Pleasant Hill, that will mean that over 40% of all residents will be over the age of 55 and 10% of all residents will be over the age of 75. Moreover, about 2/3rd of seniors will have at least 1 medical limitation and about 1/4th could be considered disabled by In-Home Support Services standards. The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) projects that about 30% of adults are or will be living alone, which exceeds the 20% of residents who live in an idealized nuclear family. Yet the AARP also notes that the US housing stock to house these single older adults for studio accommodations are <1% and 1 bedroom accommodations are <12%. In contrast, 2 bedroom homes are 27%, 3 bedroom homes are 40%, and 4 bedroom homes are 17%. As a mainly suburban community, this distribution is likely very similar in Pleasant Hill.</p> <p>2. Given the above, we are supportive of the GPAC's concept of Flexible Density Options that potentially allow for a wide variety of intermingled housing choices and mixed-income housing that may not fit in the traditional single family residential planning rubric. In the 2018 AARP Home and Community Preferences Survey, 76% of respondents aged 50 and over expressed a preference to stay in both their current community and residence. This number jumps to 86% in respondents aged 65 and older. The vast majority of older adults wish to age in place and remain integrated within their current community. In order to make this possible, we support the GPAC's suggestion to include a wide mix of housing options that seniors may find attractive like Missing Middle housing options, Accessory Dwelling Units, multigenerational and intergenerational housing, shared housing, cohousing, and tiny homes (in addition to traditional senior housing options of assisted living, residential care, and skilled nursing facilities).</p> <p>3. We have also presented data to the Pleasant Hill City Council that the majority of single older adults in Contra Costa County are housing cost-burdened. 54% of single older adults who rent and 65% of single older adults with a mortgage spend more than 30% of their income on housing. Over half of these older adults depend solely on</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Social Security for their income while about a quarter live below the 200% Federal Poverty Line. This presents a gap as the median Social Security income is about \$1800 per month while the Elder Economic Security Index notes that living and housing costs in Contra Costa County total about \$2300 per month. Given that, we strongly support GPAC’s efforts to make Very Low and Low Income housing stock a priority. In addition, we are proponents of affordable housing policies and practices that may potentially take into account rent stabilization, sustainable low income funding sources, and more flexible planning and permitting processes. We are hopeful that many of these decisions and practices will support the needs of Pleasant Hill’s senior population.</p> <p>4. Finally, we support the promotion of an age-friendly community that includes age-friendly housing, services, and businesses. Age-friendly communities constitute a wide variety of concepts. In general, we feel that the 8 domains of the World Health Organization and AARP Age-Friendly Cities Framework may be helpful for the GPAC in ensuring inclusivity and equity for the senior population. The 8 domains include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Care and Health Promotion which may include local community activities and services that support wellness and greater access to health, mental health and home health care; • Transportation which may include increased public transit, reduced-cost ride services, walkability, mobility, and accessibility; • Housing and other Building Design which may include building standards for affordable, adaptive and accessible housing, increased age-friendly planning practices and multi-generational options; • Social participation and Services which may include local meal delivery, adult day programs, and caregiving support; • Social Inclusion which may include activities and initiatives that meaningfully engage seniors to keep them connected within the community; • Outdoor Spaces which may include accessible, equitable and inclusive green spaces that are safe and secure for the older population; • Civic Participation and Engagement which may include intergenerational initiatives and opportunities for meaningful volunteering and paid work that benefit older people; and • Communication and Information which may include effective systems and technology that is accessible and available to residents of all ages. <p>We are appreciative of the time and effort that the GPAC commits to this process. We are optimistic that as the General Plan moves forward, we will continue to have a welcoming community for all Pleasant Hill residents, including our older population. We remain available if the GPAC wishes to access any expertise within the Pleasant Hill Commission on Aging.</p>
<p>Friends of the Pleasant Hill Creeks</p>	<p>Friends of Pleasant Hill Creeks (FPHC) is a nonprofit organization of Pleasant Hill residents who care about our creeks. Since 2017, FPHC volunteers have participated in creek cleanups, wildlife surveys, water quality monitoring, habitat restoration, and</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

educational activities in our community. FPHC appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the General Plan Housing Element.

General Comments

1. At the Pleasant Hill General Plan Planning and Design Workshops, the community expressed strong support for restoration of creeks, riparian corridors, and open space areas, all of which improve our urban environment for both people and wildlife.
2. Five of the 14 potential housing sites reviewed in the Preliminary Housing Sites Memorandum (June 23, 2021) and Workshop (July 14, 2021) are adjacent to or crossed by creeks. We offer specific comments on these sites below. **Where creeks are adjacent to or cross a development site, we support designation of a Creek Protection Zone**, a riparian corridor/buffer zone that extends 50 feet from the top of each bank, with wider buffers where significant habitat areas or high potential wetlands exist. This is consistent with Pleasant Hill's Draft Environment Element (ENV-3) as well as Contra Costa County's policies for new development along natural watercourses ([General Plan, Conservation Element, Section 8.12](#)).
3. Access to natural open space, parks, and walking/biking trails is important for residents at all income levels and should be a priority when evaluating and planning potential housing sites. This priority is consistent with General Plan Guiding Principles, which call for protection of the environment and open space resources as part of the sustainable development of our City.

Specific Comments to Preliminary Housing Sites Adjacent to or Crossed by Creeks

Site B: Chilpancingo Park

- We **support** GPAC and staff recommendations to remove this site from inventory due to its current use as a community park, with multiple heritage oaks and deeded restrictions, in an underserved area.

Site C: Winslow Center

- The site description and map should indicate that Grayson Creek flows through this site. The creek channel is in a natural state and includes mature native oaks and other riparian species. Native and migratory bird species, including raptors, have been observed at the site.
- We **recommend** designation of the riparian corridor extending at least 50 feet from each creek bank as a Creek Protection Zone with adjacent open space and public access trails serving as a benefit for future residents and the Pleasant Hill community. This site also has potential for creek restoration as part of a future mixed-use / housing development.

Site D: Mangini-Delu Area

- The site description and map should indicate that Grayson Creek flows through this site. The creek channel is in a natural state and, as an extension of the creek that flows through the Winslow Center, is likely to include mature native oaks and other riparian species. Native and migratory bird species, including raptors, are likely to be present at the site.
- We **recommend** designation of the riparian corridor extending at least 50 feet from each creek bank as a Creek Protection Zone with adjacent open space and public access trails serving as a benefit for future residents and the Pleasant Hill community.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>This site also has potential for creek restoration as part of a future mixed-use / housing development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that the creek corridors on Sites C and D are connected and should have equivalent levels of protection. <p>Site E: JFK University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site description and map should indicate that this site is adjacent to Ellinwood Creek, a section of historic Walnut Creek. The creek channel is in a natural state and includes mature native oaks and other riparian species. The southwest corner of this site currently has an open space area (with benches) adjacent to the creek. • We recommend that the existing creekside open space area be retained and improved as part of a future mixed-use / housing development to serve as a benefit for residents and the Pleasant Hill community. This site also has potential for creek restoration as part of a future mixed-use / housing development. <p>Site L: Beatrice Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the GPAC recommendation to hold this site outside of inventory due to hydrology/flooding issues and sensitivity of habitat. Grayson Creek flows through this site. <p>The creek channel is in a natural state and includes mature native oaks and other riparian species. This site is part of an ongoing avian biodiversity survey that has documented more than 80 species of native and migratory birds, including multiple raptor species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend this site for consideration as protected open space. This site has outstanding potential for restoring riparian habitat and enhancing public access via connectivity to the existing East Bay MUD trail and school/park/library sites. <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments.</p>
Betsy Webb	<p>Thank you very much for the very informative Housing Element meeting last night. It was professional yet relaxed; open and engaging. I learned a great deal. I wonder if parking lots, school yards and parks could be looked at as housing possibilities. Just small slices of properties that would help to increase housing. As example, Christ the King church on Gregory rarely fills its parking lot, even in the best of times. When College Park was built, the DVC football field was shared. School yards are important, but many could be whittled down a bit. The cash strapped school district might welcome, and benefit, from additional money. Small sections of city parks might be utilized as well, although I can only imagine the uproar that would create. Finally, my parents bought our house in 1948. The Mangini family has been close neighbors for decades. This year has been a very hard for them with the passing of Louie and Marian. It would be difficult to see a wall of tall condos in place of a cornfield or walnut orchard. But time does move along. I understand the city is between that proverbial rock and a hard place. I trust you and other members will do the best for our community. Thanks for reading. And thanks again to you and other staff for a clear presentation last night.</p>
Andrew Pierce	<p>Councilmember Carlson, I would like to commend you and Mayor Noack for the recent Housing Element Town Hall meeting held on 10/27. I learned an immense amount about the upcoming RHNA cycle and what it could mean to the PH landscape. Members of the public asked thoughtful questions and those were answered</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>concisely by you, Sue, and staff. I'm hopeful that the virtual meeting will be linked to the city website and the pleasanthill2040 site for residents to view, and that the FAQ page on both sites might be updated to include questions and answers from the meeting specific to the housing element and this sixth RHNA cycle. I think it would behoove all PH residents to have a better understanding of the potential development sites, density, zoning, and why PH and neighboring cities are suddenly faced with a mandatory housing construction increase. I commend the city's transparency, the available resources/ materials for the public's consumption/education, and the council's position on RHNA in the Bay Area (and housing numbers specific to PH). I'm confident that continued transparency and communication with the public will only lead to more thoughtful conversation, understanding, engagement, and involvement. Thank you again.</p>
<p>Jeremy Magruder</p>	<p>I noticed that the Mangini property was listed as a focus area in the General Plan feedback report, and that discussion of focus areas was included on last night's 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 any news regarding plans for that 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 those 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.</p>
<p>Wendy Gollop</p>	<p>Regarding the Winslow site. If it is decided to be used for RHNA, I think that this site is better for mixed use instead of all residential. It is located at the intersection of two major streets. Any commercial development could be situated to have minimal impact on residential development. In the present plan it is designated all residential.</p>
<p>Jack Prosek</p>	<p>Reminder that DVC needs to ADD parking for their current number of commuter students while many residents – especially those living nearby would object to having dormitory TOWERS there.</p> <p>C&D Consider allowing multi-use development on these two sites. Also, I think that these are the best locations for Moderate and Above Moderate income level – hence larger – units, so that should be reflected in the building sizes. Also need to allow landscape area for the creek riparian area.</p> <p>E&N – Noted that these were changed to allow multi-use – as previous suggested to retain jobs close to the new housing.</p> <p>G – There was some discussion during the June 23rd meeting about expanding this earea to include the houses immediately west of the shopping center, which I support.</p> <p>We also note that the densities for sites F, G, I, J, K, L, & M were increase from 30 units per acre to a crange for 40-70 units per acre – not sure what the justification is for this epecially since thes are the smaller MU sites?? This might be too much to expect!</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>Of course, ample PARKING will be a big issue as each of these sites are developed so that there is not a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods!!</p>
<p>Nancy Anderson</p>	<p>I am pleased to hear you are in the process of appealing the RHNA numbers. I attended one of the meetings pre-COVID and heard the city council members/GPAC members place the blame on the state. They then engaged in this exercise in futility by cramming housing into every possible nook and cranny in PH. I think it explains why so many residents are so frustrated with our City Council and their lack of vision. The plan does not reflect the values and wishes of our community. It simply is a check mark to meet the RHNA numbers, and please ABAG.</p> <p>The correct action is to challenge the requirement. I recently listened to a Podcast about the poor governance in San Francisco. The city has allowed unconstrained growth in business and jobs without accounting for housing. We in the Bay Area are living with those poor decisions, and now we are asked to solve the problem. However, businesses and residents are leaving the area in considerable numbers. What will that do to the needs in the area? I encourage our city council to be more thoughtful and progressive in their plan. We are a suburb. We moved here to enjoy the benefits of suburban life.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the Winslow Center and Mangini property. To see that you are considering 261 units between those two properties is astounding! The increase in population and vehicles will be unsustainable in this neighborhood. We have yet to see what traffic will be like when COVID has run its course and commutes have resumed full force. The intersection at Pleasant Hill Road and Gregory/Grayson was modified pre-pandemic. I am curious what that intersection will be like when things return to normal -- then add population and cars from Mangini/Winslow -- it will definitely feel like a San Francisco traffic jam!</p> <p>What about the environmental impact? This area is rich with wildlife. The creeks and native oaks are home to so many birds, animals, reptiles. At a time when we need to be focused on saving, nurturing, and regenerating our natural world, this should not even be under consideration. I urge you to, at the very least, maintain the current zoning of R-10 for the Mangini property.</p> <p>Lastly, transparency was mentioned at the Housing Element Workshop of July 14, 2021. I did not see any reference to conversations that have occurred with the Mangini Family. Has anyone on the city council, and/or GPAC members been having conversations with them? If so, why was this not disclosed? If so, please direct us to documentation of the context and content of these conversations.</p> <p>Please do right by the residents of Pleasant Hill.</p>
<p>David Blau</p>	<p>I'd like to introduce myself to you. My wife, Jennifer, and I have lived happily in Victoria Crossings since this development was constructed in the late 1970s. We have always loved being located next to a true working farm that has produced an amazing</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

variety of crops year after year. It's one of the main reasons that we moved here from Walnut Creek in 1980.

I served for many years as the Senior VP for EDAW, an internationally renowned land planning, environmental, and design firm headquartered in San Francisco. I built and directed the environmental practice for 38 years and retired about eight years ago. I have a career's worth of experience in land planning, site master planning, and EIR/EIS preparation. I personally have directed the preparation of over 200 EIRs and EISs and understand all the in's and out's of these documents. I have been an expert witness in lawsuits over ill-conceived project proposals.

I have followed the multi-year General Planning process that the City has undertaken and appreciate the pressure that you are under to comply with the State mandate for adding housing. I am also aware of the many communities that are fighting to reduce their mandate as being unreasonable based on limited vacant land supply. (I believe Beverly Hills has a mandate of adding three housing units!)

I see that you are currently in Phase 5 of the GP process, "Plan Preparation", and hope that the CEQA process is being done concurrently or at least has begun. Your City website states that the EIR will be released along with the Draft GP next spring. We are anxious to see its content and more specifically, how you address and theme the alternatives in the DEIR. Your 2003 EIR on the GP concluded that Alternative C, the "Reduced Density/ Open Space Alternative" was the "Environmentally Superior Alternative", which we applaud.

I realize that times have changed, but many of us that live in the surrounding area are seriously concerned with the ultimate density and character of housing that would be built on the Mangini property. When and if the owners decide to sell, we want to make sure that the master plan for the site and its associated EIR fully explore the range of alternatives between housing and agricultural/ open space preservation. In fact, we suggest that this theme be the basis for the "reasonable range of alternatives" as defined in CEQA. A number of communities are preserving a component of their developments for a working farm. We, however, do not want to see this as "tokenism" to appease the community but a real, honest and viable component.

The Mangini heirs will make plenty of money regardless of the ultimate number of housing units built on this site, so protecting the creek corridor, providing open space, and including a working agricultural component should be paramount. We do not want to see a crowded, unsightly development like the Molino Ravioli property just down the road where the homes are oversized, the lots are undersized, there are no setbacks from the street, and the architectural design is very poor. One of the ugliest housing developments I have ever seen.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>The EIR for the Mangini property will have to address a number of serious environmental impact issues and offer suitable and effective mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. Top of the list will be the significant increase in traffic due to added congestion, increased wait times at intersections, safety crossing issues, turning lanes, etc. Other issues include air quality, climate change, noise, aesthetics, stream corridor protection, soils and erosion, vegetation, etc.</p> <p>Keeping the density at a moderate level will help to keep the balance that we are all looking for on this property. Please let me know if you have any thoughts on my comments.</p>
David Blau	<p>I wanted to thank you for your response and for forwarding my comments to your planning consultant, Rick Rust, at mintierharnish for his consideration. I also wanted to comment that many locals were on vacation during mid-July and missed the opportunity to express their serious concerns about the future use of the Mangini property. Please do not use the low attendance at this event as any indication of the level of interest. In future public meetings, I assure you that there will be much greater attendance and participation by neighbors on all sides of the property and from HOAs.</p> <p>To be clear, many of us feel very strongly that the current zoning of R-10 should not be changed to allow for increased densities on this 29-acre property. Constructing 100 or so housing units on this site is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Victoria Crossings, for example, has 106 single family homes on 40 acres. The density allowed under the R-10 designation would offer full protection and enhancement of the creek corridor as well as the historic significance of some of the Mangini buildings. We do not want to see anywhere near 261 housing units with multi-story structures crowded onto this site as quantified in two of Rick's slides, "Potential Sites C & D".</p> <p>You owe it to the community to illustrate clearly what different densities might look and feel like. Density is an abstract term to most people. They cannot visualize densities. They need to see examples from other communities of what 4 units/ acre, 6 units/acre, 10 units/ acre, etc., would look like with photo images. Please make sure that your planning consultant illustrates these at all subsequent public meetings.</p> <p>Finally, as an example of the neighborhood's passion, about five years ago, a fellow from Antioch proposed to construct an 18-hole disc golf course in Paso Nogal Park. He said that "the use was compatible with other passive park uses" plus he claimed that "nobody uses the Park anyways". The neighborhoods surrounding the Park were incensed and mobilized to defend the Park from a use that forces out all other park users. We successfully argued that the disc golf course was inappropriate for the Park and had about 250 people attend the Recreation & Parks District public meeting to decide its fate. We received a unanimous decision to decline the proposal from the District Board after illustrating the environmental damage caused by these</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>courses in other communities. In other words, do not underestimate the power of the people (i.e., voters) in this community.</p>
<p>David Blau</p>	<p>The PPT slide in the Housing Workshop in mid-July showed a potential for 261 housing units on 29 acres on the Mangini/ Winslow properties. Simple math says that would be an average density of 9 units per acre. If you intend to see a good amount of single family residential homes constructed on this site, the density for the multi-family housing component would have to be considerably higher, I'm guessing maybe as high as 12-15 units per acre and a high number of floors.</p> <p>This would be totally out of character with the surrounding suburban residential neighborhood. Maybe suitable for the transit-oriented village at the BART Pleasant Hill Station or even for the Cleaveland Road project closer to the town center, but entirely inappropriate for the Mangini/ Winslow property.</p> <p>Please do not push for a change in zoning for this property. The R-10 designation is entirely appropriate for this site, which would allow for approximately 100 homes.</p> <p>The community is very upset and is organizing around the banner, "Neighbors for Mangini/ Winslow 100".</p>
<p>David Blau</p>	<p>Troy, thank you for having your planning consultant prepare such an informative set of built housing density examples both within Pleasant Hill and beyond. It is very difficult for the average person to comprehend density and the photos really help visualize what is possible.</p> <p>We appreciate more than ever how difficult a spot the City is in. Very little vacant land left. All projects will be complex. But I hope the City now understands more about us as well. We are not against housing development. We just want to see it done properly and with a character that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. The question asked by Dr.Joyce Tang was very direct: "If a developer builds 100 single family homes on that site, how many ADUs could the City get credit for?" The response was, "Well, it depends on the past 3 yrs results". Not an answer that we understood. Would the number likely be: 10 20, 50? How and who determines the number that the City would be credited with?</p> <p>I also found it curious that there was no mention of CEQA in the meeting. Even under the last slide on "Next Steps", there was no mention of certifying an EIR before the GP and Housing Element are adopted. I realize there are many State bills floating around to streamline and even pre-empt CEQA, particularly if a project provides affordable housing, is an urban infill project, or is in a transit-rich area. It's difficult to even follow the huge number of proposed bills and what is actually law and what is not.</p> <p>So, here's my three questions for Brena Weatherby of RINCON, your environmental consultant:</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>1. What portion of the City's Housing Element needs to address affordable housing to qualify the City as exempt from CEQA?</p> <p>2. Isn't a full EIR still required to support the General Plan?</p> <p>3. If the Mangini/ Delu/ Winslow development has a component of affordable housing, does that qualify as exempt under CEQA?</p> <p>Could you please forward these three "burning" questions to your env. consultant and have her respond with some clear answers? That would be very helpful. And thank Mayor Noack and Council member Carlson for their time and attention.</p>
<p>David and Veronica Roche</p>	<p>I was unable to send our comments on the website.</p> <p>This is ridiculous. You are trying to force a square peg into a round hole How will squeezing more people into PH make it a better city?; more traffic, less parking, more demands on infrastructure (schools/police). The city needs to fight harder against these mandates put on to us by larger cities and counties that have made mistakes with their own planning. Having lived in Stockton I have seen the disastrous impact that forced higher density housing (apartments, duplexes, triplexes etc) into single family housing neighborhoods has been. The once nice neighborhoods became "tired", dirty and crime ridden very quickly and bringing down the values of the pre-existing single family homes. The proposed project at 401 Taylor for multi family is a terrible idea and would do a great disservice to the city and the neighborhoods that would be directly impacted. More ADU's would allow for a more organic solution as it would allow for citizens make their own decisions w/ their own property.</p> <p>The people mandating this do not and will not live in Pleasant Hill and be forced to live with consequences.</p>
<p>Russell Erickson, Patty Erickson</p>	<p>We understand, via a well to do acquaintance who plans to lead some opposition, that the Mangini "farm" on Pleasant Hill Road, might begin development in the next year. That might entail condominiums or town houses such as sold so well near downtown PH years ago. He and other "NIMBYS" appear against anything other than over \$1 Million single homes. The last 3 housing developments allowed in Pleasant Hill all involve single family homes at \$1.1 million and up! Where will our children and grandchildren live? Where will city workers, teachers, police, business employees live in the future? Will we drive them all away from Pleasant Hill? Shall they have excessive commutes trying to stay where they grew up or work?</p> <p>Our acquaintance states Pleasant Hill should follow the path of "Lamorinda" where monied powers and too many lawyers stand off the state mandate for more homes, which he states "has no legal teeth" for compliance. We lived in Moraga once and Lafayette and much prefer Pleasant Hill and its more equal outlook for all citizens. The Mangini property could easily accommodate clustered townhomes (downtown PH demonstrated their worth and easy salability), or condominiums which likely will</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>still be expensive, but much less so than single family homes. Pleasant Hill Road fronting it was recently redone and can handle the traffic with another stop light at the entry. Alhambra Avenue is already a small freeway at commute hours, but most splits off at Taylor, though our NIMBYS will use traffic and maintaining home values as the usual excuse for limiting development.</p> <p>SB9 and SB10, recently passed by the state legislature, allowing up to 4 units per single family lot and up to 10 apartments per lot, will likely influence the city's judgement, though these will doubtless face many court challenges by people dedicated to no change even in the face of increasing population world-wide (more than doubled in our lifetime).</p> <p>California has 12% of USA population and 28% of its homeless, partially due to our weather, broad outlook on welfare, but also greatly to the fact that the average USA home is \$374,000 and the average Bay Area home is over \$1 million. Please think in terms of not adding to this with so many good people we have mentioned above!</p>
<p>Richard & Patricia Albright</p>	<p>We have received information and requests related to subject. While we understand the desire of the Mangini family to maximize the value of its (inherited) property and the (insatiable) desire of Pleasant Hill (and other government entities) to increase the property tax base and consequent revenues, we are opposed to the proposed development and, absent more cogent arguments, any development.</p> <p>High density housing may improve the property's value to its current owners and the City's tax coffers, but it significantly and permanently impairs the value of surrounding single family housing, increases traffic congestion, would reverse the claimed improvements to pedestrian and bicycle safety.</p> <p>Our opposition to the proposal(s) is not merely the result of 'NIMBY'. We are philosophically opposed to government officials, whether elected or not, arbitrarily enacting laws, regulations, etc. that effect our lives and the quality of life that attracted us to this community. What this community needs is more open space, safe recreational fields, and restored wildlife and watershed spaces..</p> <p>The City initiated the Pleasant Hill Road ("PH Rd") project and trumpeted its promised effect on traffic, and bicycle and pedestrian safety. The Mangini Land Plan would appear to be counter productive to the claimed benefits of the PH Rd project, add to the burden on neighborhood schools and tax the shrunken traffic lanes.</p> <p>Which brings us to the PH Rd project itself; viz.,</p> <p>The sidewalk bump-out at Linda Lane remains an invitation to accidents, causing southbound vehicles which are attempting to turn on to Linda Lane to merge back into traffic;</p> <p>The narrowed lanes increase the risk of accidents as large vehicles (buses, fire engines, 18-wheelers) tend to impinge on the adjoining lane;</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>The reduced speed limit does appear to have materially reduced actual speeds. I have yet to see a vehicle pulled over;</p> <p>Northbound sign reducing speed to 30 mph is idiotic, at best, since a 35 mph speed limit sign is seemingly yards after the 30 mph sign;</p> <p>Making a left turn from Linda Lane remains an adventure given the limited visibility and speed of north-bound traffic combined with the narrowed traffic lanes. I remain convinced a traffic light at Linda Lane is needed without the increased traffic the Mangini Land Plan would bring, was and is more needed than the additional (confusing) traffic light on Gregory Lane and Eleanora Drive given that there is no alternative outlet for residences on Linda Lane, Linda Court, Stevens Circle and Erin Court;</p> <p>The reduction in left-turn lanes at Gregory Lane should be reversed, traffic cones delineating the change were quickly mowed down and vehicles continue making left turns from the now straight only lane;</p> <p>Prohibition of left turns from southbound PH Road into Walgreens while permitting U-turns to accommodate apartment dwellers was a problem before the PH Rd project and remains problematic and dangerous as drivers make left turns into and out of Walgreens and apartment dwellers make left turns out of their complex onto southbound PH Rd. Moreover, drivers who obey the signage and are then trying to make a left turn into Walgreens from eastbound Gregory Lane frequently find themselves partially or fully obstructing the #1 eastbound lane and in danger of being rear-ended.</p>
<p>Richard & Patricia Albright</p>	<p>California is in another drought. Why is Pleasant Hill's government even considering adding homes and the resultant increased demand for water while simultaneously asking current residents to greatly reduce water consumption?</p>
<p>Jared Gragg</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to discuss the future of the Oak Park Shopping Center. This letter is to reiterate the following points from our conversation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are the owners of the Oak Park Center. • As the shopping center was built in the 1960's, the next stage of the property's life should be considered in planning for the neighborhood. • We believe the property could become a great mixed use neighborhood amenity, as it makes up the heart of the Oak Park Boulevard GPAC Focus Area. • If zoning were amended to allow such development, Oak Park Property, LLC would pursue a mixed use redevelopment of the site, incorporating neighborhood commercial businesses as well as housing. • In this scenario, Oak Park Property, LLC would attempt the acquisition of the vacant and underutilized neighboring parcels for incorporation into a unified development. • Mixed use development is feasible from a business perspective, as the property's existing leases largely expire before 2029. <p>Please let us know if we may be of additional assistance.</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

Website Comments

jmagruder0@gmail.com	I was unable to attend the 6/23 meeting but noticed that the recommended density for redevelopment on the Mangini/Delu property had increased substantially compared to the previous preferred alternative. The previous recommendation rezoned the southern section to multi-family low density and the northern section to single-family high, while retaining the section bordering Apollo Way as Single Family Low. This recommendation balanced the need for new housing with the need to protect the community and families who already live in the Apollo/Mercury community. If I'm not mistaken, the new recommendations would further increase the density on both the southern and northern portions substantially. This would substantially harm the families, community, and traffic in and around Apollo/Mercury. I urge the GPAC to return to the previous "preferred alternative" recommendations for this property.
golwern@gmail.com	Regarding the Winslow site. If it is decided to be used for RHNA, I think that this site is better for mixed use instead of all residential. It is located at the intersection of two major streets. Any commercial development could be situated to have minimal impact on residential development. In the present plan it is designated all residential.
cathleen.kirk@sbcglobal.net	So, we're in phase 5. What does preparing the plan mean? Is all of this building a done deal as of today? We can't handle any more traffic in this area. Where is the water coming from for these houses? Pleasant Hill road was just redesigned but this design won't accommodate 200 houses on Mangini Farm. You'll need a stop light. I'm against all of this development but don't want to waste my time giving input if this is already a done deal. Please contact me and let me know.
briannabeall@gmail.com	I am not in favor of developing this land with so many houses on it. However, I understand that housing is needed in our area. One solution could be housing in the back part of Mangini area with a public park/green space along the land that butts up against Pleasant Hill Road.
aprilbush@comcast.net	Please find a solution that keeps the Mangini Property part of the agriculturally history of Pleasant Hill AND develops needed housing. Be creative! How about a... community garden and play area along Pleasant Hill Road with housing behind, and a green community with solar, and connecting the walking trails, and thinking about the space for future generations. Building a community not just housing. You have the power to save the last remaining evidence of the heritage of our town and build for future climate friendly needs!
csgraham228@yahoo.com	HORRORS!! TWO HUNDRED UNITS IN THAT SPACE IS A WAY TO MAKE LIVING IN THIS AREA IMPOSSIBLE. ALL THE STATE MANDATES INCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ARE REDICULOUS. MAY GOD PROTECT US FROM MORE OVERCROWDING, OVERTAXATION AND BLIGHT IN OUR COMMUNITY.
telzeyhome@yahoo.com	Worried about the overuse of ADU's in neighborhoods, don't like that idea AT ALL. I am worried about taking away business property to build housing. I think we need to be very careful and thoughtful about where housing is inserted. Preservation of our community is vital.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>khelfter@yahoo.com</p>	<p>I live at 44 Erin Court. I am commenting on the proposed use for Mangini and Winslow center areas. I am opposed to the plan to add 261 housing units</p> <p>**Estimated 500 additional cars / drivers would be added to an already congested area along Pleasant Hill Road</p> <p>**The city just spent money updating PH road with the new bike lanes. Extra traffic will negatively impact that progress by forcing cars to the green lane.</p> <p>**Residents and guests would end up parking on our streets</p> <p>We would ask for 33% (?) of this land to be used for low density housing (single family homes) and the rest to be preserved. This land has a rich history of farming and seasonal activities for our local families to enjoy. It has been a place for: agriculture, outdoor landscape painting, spring Easter events, summer fruit/veg stand, autumn hay rides/pumpkin patch etc., Christmas tree lot and open space to observe wildlife and nature.</p> <p>The property contains a canal that we believe should be restored</p> <p>No High Density!</p>
<p>catherine.boccellari@gmail.com</p>	<p>We are opposed to the proposed plan for the Mangini Land. We would like to see the following instead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1/3 of the land used for low density housing/single family homes -The remaining 2/3 preserved for the community and residents of Pleasant Hill. -Restore the canal to its natural condition. <p>There are so many other multi-unit developments in Walnut Creek area that are close to Bart that haven't even been filled yet- adding yet another one and contributing to more traffic and pollution, not to mention water consumption in drought-sensitive conditions, is not the right path for this plan.</p>
<p>nancy.gerber63@gmail.com</p>	<p>I think it's a shame how little the city cares about developing soccer fields and ideally a soccer complex. While you can't turn around without running into baseball/softball fields, there are no high quality soccer fields in the entire city of Pleasant Hill. The Mangini space would have been perfect for a complex, but no, we're putting more houses in an area with massive commuter traffic. With a soccer complex the local clubs could host tournaments that could bring in needed dollars from players and their families, as well as help our kids develop as athletes.</p> <p>Reconsider, PLEASE!</p>
<p>mdwsmw@comcast.net</p>	<p>I support the general plan in relation to the Mangini development. We have seen too many LARGE single family homes built recently in PH, and the Mangini development would provide housing for more people, on a corridor that would support the additional traffic and access to public transport. Prior developments of condominiums and townhouses along Pleasant Hill Rd. seem to me to be appropriate for the area, and the Mangini Farm can easily fit into this same pattern. Ingress and egress from that development is straightforward, and utilities are right along that corridor. Please do not capitulate to the single family home cries, and keep to the plan you have developed. Thank you, Mike Weston</p>
<p>paul.boccellari@gmail.com</p>	<p>I am opposed to the proposed mangini land plan to build 221 total units. The proposed high density development will create additional cars on an already congested area along pleasant hill road. Extra traffic will negatively impact the</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	investment that the city just spent updating PH road with new bike lanes. It is recommended to use the land for low density housing and the preserve a majority of the land for open space.
chicostategrad@gmail.com	Low density housing along with green space would preserve the character of Pleasant Hill. The sense of community is why I moved back from San Francisco to raise my kids in the shadow of the Mangini's farm. My children enjoy the Winslow Center and we hope it is greatly expanded. I will leave the city if these plans are realized. Voting with my pocketbook may be all I have at this point
mdewit@sspa.com	I am strongly opposed to the proposed plan for the Mangini-Winslow properties because the housing density changes are in conflict with the General Plan and the values of PH. Changing the current SF medium density to high-density housing will negatively impact existing residential neighborhoods and families. The proposed increase in housing density is does not comport with the General Plan, which says retaining the character and charm of residential neighborhoods is a top priority for Pleasant Hill. The proposed plan is not compatible with adjacent neighborhoods. The General Plan says that multifamily developments are separated from single-family neighborhoods, which surround the properties. The proposed high density plan would greatly increase impacts to Grayson Creek. It is the City's responsibility per the General Plan to protect and preserve our residential neighborhoods. The proposed changes for the two properties fly in the face of this top priority and should be dropped.
bpjeas6@comcast.net	The southern section of the Mangini-Deluc site should be targeted for 4.8du/ac which is consistent with the eastern section. In addition, a portion of this area should be designated as a park/open space. The proposed plan of 21 du/ac is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood, inconsistent with the current R10 zoning, and will lead to excessive congestion along Pleasant Hill Road. As your presentation shows, you are significantly over the RHNA target for low and very low income housing (2154 vs 892) and under for above moderate housing (295 vs 657). This change can easily be accommodated and will put you closer to RHNA targets.
jskroner@pacbell.net	Opposed to the plan for the Winslow Center and Mangini farm. This should NOT be high density housing with 261 units. This would be a crime to the existing residential area-adding too much traffic on our very small streets, erode the quiet nature of the residential area, would not preserve the canal/wildlife status. Not opposed to similar housing that already exists but NOT condominiums or townhomes, or apartments. Please be considerate of the already existing neighborhoods and plan something that would appear seamless and low density to this corner window of Pleasant Hill.
spechtleslee@gmail.com	I am opposed to the housing proposal for the Mangini property. There will be too much traffic coming through Taylor and Pleasant Hill Rd. I would like to see less houses and children's park built. Thank you.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>shereen56@yahoo.com</p>	<p>In general, I would hope that most development could be concentrated near the CC Blvd. corridor.</p> <p>Regarding the Mangini property: I understand that housing is inevitable, but could we please consider a so-called Agri-hood? Let us preserve a small patch of the farm for a community garden for example. Please require that the design of new housing reflect our town's charm. I wouldn't be opposed to tiny homes for low income people as part of it.</p>
<p>kpmg@sbcglobal.net</p>	<p>The Housing Element (HE) as a subpart of the General Plan (GP) does not consider the desired future characteristics of PH which are yet to be articulated in a GP draft. The general trend appears to be changing PH toward a higher density, semi-urban area. The HE needs to be aligned toward future needs and avoid creating dense residential "islands" where cars are the only viable way to access the daily needs (job, groceries, shopping).</p> <p>Toward this end I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support continued challenge to RHNA targets based on viability; • propose grouping and prioritizing mixed use designations consistent with the long-term vision of the GP. i.e. development of area close to Contra Costa Blvd corridor first; • propose outlying areas are designated at lower densities (e.g. west PH areas C, D and I); • propose that an overarching story be included that supports the HE and will help explain its direction, rather than present a seemingly hodgepodge grab-bag of sites of unknown availability or interest.
<p>pwmosher@att.net</p>	<p>Think the proposal for the Mangini property has too many homes - will overly impact that intersection and property.</p> <p>Also feel a Starbucks Drive Thru on the old Tahoe Joe's site is overkill - maybe a Starbucks but NOT a Drive Thru</p>
<p>f.levy@comcast.net</p>	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the city's plans for Mangini's. I have lived in P.H. for 56 years and little by little the open spaces where kids used to be able run, play and have fun have been paved over. The field that was at the end of Linda Ln where we had 2 creeks meet into a pond and a giant oak tree with a rope swing gone, the field on the other side of Taylor Blvd where kids used to build forts gone, hangman's hill where we use to go to ride our bike's gone. Instead of building more high density housing packing us in like sardines in a can why not use part of the land to teach kids at the local schools how to grow food, rent out other parts of the land to residents who want to grow their own food.</p>
<p>vickiweiland@gmail.com</p>	<p>I understand the City is considering how the land previously held by Mangini Farm on Pleasant Hill Road is going to be developed. Is this correct? If so, I would strongly encourage the City to engage the community with goals that could be to 1) preserve the historical nature of this property; 2) preserve as much open space as possible; 3) be as environmentally conscious as possible. It is NOT ok to keep developing land (like we've done with Molino's on Boyd and Pleasant Hill Road and like we've done on Taylor and Mercury and now the homes that are about to be built just down the street on Taylor) with \$1.5m++ single family homes. Our City is</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

	<p>turning into a cement jungle and the traffic and number of people living in the area continues to explode. And the "privilege" that we continue to attract with housing that only the top 1% can afford, waters down our ability to be inclusive and attract a diverse profile residents. Please respond. Thank you.</p>
debbyclary@cs.com	<p>Re the Mangini property, I am against high density housing on our already depleted resources, i.e., WATER. We do NOT need more housing, period, in Pleasant Hill.</p>
k.barese@comcast.net	<p>I'm very concerned about future development to the Mangini property. Traffic is already an issue and adding 221 units will make it unbearable. Please take into concern those of us living in this area.</p>
shari.riffe@sbcglobal.net	<p>If the Mangini property is up for sale I think the agri-community idea would be great for P Hill. With the property at the corner of Lucille and Taylor being developed the congestion will be bad enough. Too bad it can't be a park.</p>
gelinasannette@gmail.com	<p>I was active in the General Plan 2020 process and still stand by my opinion that the Mangini property should stay zoned as it is. Although there will still be a lot of impact to the surrounding area in the way of traffic, schools, and other services, it is much less than the proposed 221 units. Pleasant Hill road already has traffic issues. Although the city needs affordable housing, placing it closer to the 680 corridor makes more sense. Most will miss the Mangini Farm and many would like to preserve the land but unfortunately I know that is probably not feasible. Leaving the zoning reduces the impact that will occur when this property is developed.</p>
NormaJ49@gmail.com	<p>As a 40+ year resident who lives just blocks from the Mangini Farm, as a local Realtor for 34 years,, I would love to see NO more density than the property is currently zoned for. This is not the area to put high density housing. It would change what we have all loved and enjoyed as long as each of us has lived here. To change it to high density would not appeal to any of the local residents. It would of course create traffic, drowded schools and an ambiance none of us look for in our beloved central Pleasant Hill location! Please keep the Pleasant in Pleasant Hill. I believe Louie Mangini would want it to remine as the area he loved so much! I know I would and my friends and neighbors would. Thank you for listentin. Adding 120 single family homes is a lot iin itself! Thank you for considering our input.</p>
suzannejo16@gmail.com	<p>On Nextdoor someone brought up the idea of an Agrihood. Sounds fabulous. I would vote for no more houses or density. More green space please!</p>
estherann11@gmail.com	<p>Regarding development of the Mangini property. I fully support the idea of creating a Agrihood on the Mangini property. It's time for Pleasant Hill planning commission to embrace ideas that benefit residents and the environment. Agriculture is a part of our history. Thank you.</p>
amy_email_1@yahoo.com	<p>I am opposed to the city approving increased housing units on the Mangini property located between Pleasant Hill Rd, Taylor Blvd, and Westover. Reduced housing would be even better to avoid traffic congestion, keep the area safe for bikes and pedestrians, and potentially avoid a hideous skyline of tall buildings.. I live 2 blocks away and am greatly concerned about traffic, crime and safety. Ideally, the property would be turned into agrihood. Thank you.</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

kma751@gmail.com	We do not need 221 additional housing units on the Mangini Farm property. We are already dealing with the awful houses being built on the Molino property. The traffic in this area is already much, much worse than it was even 5 years ago. I will not support any council member who thinks this is a good idea. I would support an "Agrihood", but not mass housing on this property. You are ruining Pleasant Hill.
kostreet75@gmail.com	As a resident of the Mercury and Apollo Way neighborhood I believe it is imperative to the to maintain the R-10 zoning of the Mangini/Delu property to keep with the surrounding area and the character of our neighborhood. Please keep the R-10 zoning for this property for the 2040 General Plan.
helenjcrump@gmail.com	Thank you for considering comments from residents of Pleasant Hill. The idea of agrihood is very appealing for the Mangini property. It seems to be the new and innovative way to incorporate the agricultural roots of this valley with the need for housing. Please consider an agrihood project when making decisions about the Mangini property.
kphillips101@gmail.com	I would like the city to accomplish the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please save open space and align with California's 30x30 conservation plan - to permanently protect 30% of open space by year 2030. 2. Incorporate new development with green spaces - trees, community gardens, parks. Plant pollinator plants and drought tolerant plants. Avoid water-hungry plants. 3. Include affordable housing per the state's requirement. Thank you.
ronaldred2@aol.com	restrict growth! Too many people, too much traffic, noise is ungodly, and it just isn't anything like the town I grew up in. This is not progress!
dansheridan@comcast.net	The city should buy the Mancini farm and create some special farm, playground, multi-use community facility
bsuefine@outlook.com	I love the idea of an "agrihood" that has been suggested, and see no reason why it couldn't work here in Pleasant Hill, a former farm community. I realize that growth is inevitable and feel that we need more affordable housing in town. Also not opposed to some high-density development here, such as the proposed building near the city center, as long as we don't end up looking like downtown Walnut Creek. However, Walnut Creek and Lafayette high-rises are being built close to their BART stations. That would be a more appropriate place for PH to build high-rises, rather than on this traditionally agricultural property. I also acknowledge the Mancini's right to profit from their property. Perhaps a compromise could be reached?
karelinnea@yahoo.com	I'm writing to ask that the Mangini/Delu property not be re-zoned. As it already stands, we will suffer the impact of increased school attendance, traffic, and other services.
golwern@gmail.com	There are no documents or other information links to the focus areas that you want comments to on the Pleasant Hill 2040 website. You have to know to go to the General Plan advisory agenda to find them. Perhaps I am just not finding them. Please make links and documents easy to find for people not following everything that is going on with the General Plan.



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

pgreid2@gmail.com	Leave the property as is. Too many cars and we have no water.
pgreid2@gmail.com	Leave the land as is. Too many cars & we have no water.
jaykee8@aol.com	i think single family homes on the back perimeter of the mangini property with a small park in front bordering pleasant hill rd. thank you, dan b.
shereen56@yahoo.com	I would like to see a balance of housing and green space on the Mangini property. Ideally, 100-150 dwellings. The exquisitely beautiful creek corridor should be preserved for all as green space. Other green spaces throughout could be walkways, playground, a community garden or agriculture. I would like to find a way to pay for this green space — maybe a bond or a land grant. Would you know how I find out more about that? Thanks for listening 🙏!
masarweh63@gmail.com	Pleasant hill is a beautiful town and it should stay that way. I am opposed to any housing or density housing on the Mangini properties. We don't want our view blocked.
julie39@comcast.net	My choices for the Mangini development are: 1. Save the land as is 2. Part Housing/ Part Agriculture
betswebb@sbcglobal.net	Pleasant Hill is a great place to live; schools, restaurants, parks, housing. Additionally, we cherish what little rural open space we have in our land locked community. The 2040 general plan should preserve as much open area as possible. I understand the need for development income, but there is importance in balance between housing and parkland. Look into the possibility of an 'agrihood' (https://cngf.org/agrihood/) designation as a potential for future development on the Mangini/Delu property. The 2040 general plan calls for more than 200 housing units there in an area already extremely burdened by heavy traffic. Infrastructure expenditures (police, fire, schools, utilities, etc.) would increase as well, and not be significantly offset by any garnered income. 2040 is a long way off, but what is planned for the future impacts us all, and our community. When open land is taken away it is rarely replaced. This is much more than just a plan on paper. It is your legacy. Balance.
dani.ferris@gmail.com	Let's preserve our limited land in pleasant hill. I've recently heard of one of the proposed plans to build on the Mangini property. My family choose to move to Pleasant Hill 15 years ago because we enjoyed the lifestyle of suburban living. If we wanted urban living we wouldn't have moved here. That being said it is my hope the city does not develop these plots of land into multiple housing units. It is my hope this space can be preserved to some level, a community park and a small number of single family homes that aren't on top of each other. Thank you, Dan



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>catwraa@msn.com</p>	<p>I was born and raised in Pleasant Hill, left for college and came back to buy my home 6 blocks from the house I grew up in that my parents still live in 55 years later. My family and I know what Pleasant Hill used to be like and the farms and ranches were a big part of that. We were so sad to see the Molino's property turned into urban sprawl and now I am very, very against any developer building on the Mangini property should they choose to sell. I feel this land should be preserved either a community farm or park. Please don't allow another development on this property. The traffic is already terrible down P Hill road, high density development would be horrendous here; crime would increase and our homes would depreciate in value. Thanks for listening. Catherine Beekmann, RN</p>
<p>rgelinas@dvc.edu</p>	<p>The property on Pleasant Hill Rd commonly known as the Mangini Farm has been zoned R-10 for many decades. While a change in zoning to allow for higher density would benefit the current owners, it would be at the expense of hundreds of others who live in that part of Pleasant Hill. It is not appropriate to subject many hundreds of residents to increased traffic and noise, to further impacted schools, and to potentially lowered home values so that one property owner can benefit. As a resident of Pleasant Hill for more than 30 years, I urge you to NOT change the zoning for the Mangini Farm.</p>
<p>golwern@gmail.com</p>	<p>Since the City is looking for suggestions on where to put RHNA housing, there is a parcel on Woodsworth and Contra Costa Blvd with a laundromat, cigarette store and is next to Big O Tires. This might be suitable for rezoning as there is a large parking lot in the back of the tire store. There is some residential nearby Perhaps better for mixed use than other areas being looked at.</p>
<p>golwern@gmail.com</p>	<p>There are large empty lots that front Geary Rd near the fire station that are zoned R 10. The corner of Bonnie and Geary (1 acre and more). Since these front a very busy street, these lots may be more suitable for higher zoning than single family.</p>
<p>golwern@gmail.com</p>	<p>Beatrice Rd site. That is not a good site for mixed use. It is a flood plain and a lot of the parcel is land locked. It is owned by Flood Control. It is surrounded by single family homes. There is also a creek corridor that has perennial water. The creek area supports wildlife such as birds, otters, and other wildlife. These issues will all need to be considered in developing the area. Any development should include large protected riparian corridor with public access. .</p>
<p>steve@saguaro equine.com</p>	<p>As much as we would love to see the Mangini farm remain, we understand this may not be practical. An "agrihood" would be a great compromise. At the very least, single family homes, with a neighborhood park, would be in keeping with the surrounding neighborhoods and have the least impact on traffic congestion. High density housing would surely cause serious problems in the area, degrade and devalue the surrounding neighborhoods, and increase crime. It is notable that residents love this area for its quiet atmosphere and low crime rate, in contrast with the downtown area where housing density and crime are proportionately higher. Thank you for taking these ideas into consideration when planning future development.</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>kandrhogan@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Thank you for the detailed information. I would greatly prefer that area C/D (Mangini area) plans for low density housing, maintaining the farms as is or be used as a park. I am not in favor of mid or high-density housing. The additional traffic, noise and crime inherent with high-density housing are certainly all negative factors which would detrimentally affect my family's security and quality of life. This would also have a negative impact on my home's value.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>imenegas@comcast.net</p>	<p>We have lived on Malaga Way for over 30 years. When we bought our home, we knew that the Mangini-Delu Area was zoned for housing at 4 houses to the acre, just like the neighborhood we were buying into. We understood that Malaga Way could be opened through that development. We recognize the urgent need for housing, but do not believe that land should now have twice the number of housing units as originally zoned. 221 units of housing will destroy the character of our neighborhood & will create terrible traffic & air pollution from all those cars. We have no objection to building 100 houses on the 25.90 acres, but apartments, condos or townhouses to create the density of 221 units would make our streets even more susceptible to car accidents. Happily, we have many children in the neighborhood who ride their bikes on Apollo. That would not be possible with the influx of some 500 cars passing through this quiet neighborhood. Please respect the zoning in place when we invested in our home.</p>
<p>scoutmom2wwm@gmail.com</p>	<p>As much as you messed things up In the past, for fear of Lawsuits or just inviting Boutique hotel development to our city for the tax Money, you need to stop! Tiny homes and communities are they only way we will meet the RHNA #. No more HOA, tacky ugly Strip malls, no HOTELS and no Mansions! You have damaged ALL character this city has no history left! Nothing left to do but partner with Rec and Park, and preserve the 1920's school house! Your bad decisions have no class , after decades, the Pleasant Hill Historical Society folded. You couldn't even give us a closet or shelf In the new library! Vallie Jo Whitfield is rolling over in her grave! Get it together- stop chasing money over charm. The crime is horrendous- get license plate readers!</p> <p>Or don't run for office again.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>size1@sbcglobal.net</p>	<p>After living in Pleasant Hill 23 years, and Lafayette the prior 25 years, I am very familiar with the Mangini tract . I believe that the current zoning for single family residential homes should not be changed both to maintain the character of the neighborhood and that of Pleasant Hill. The increased traffic on Alhambra from the Valley Ridge apartments on Alhambra, near me, is very substantial, and the increased vehicle traffic on Pleasant Hill Road from dense apartments would be a significant downgrade to the area. There is no rapid transit nearby, so residents would all use cars. The population density increase near the Concord, Walnut Creek, and Pleasant Hill (actually in Walnut Creek)is acceptable because residents can walk to the nearby BART station if they wish. There is no penalty to Pleasant Hill to maintain the current zoning.</p>
<p>snfstc19@gmail.com</p>	<p>I am concerned about high density housing on the corner of Pleasant Hill Rd and Taylor.</p>



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

dmg0039@comcast.net	the plan must resist the temptation to over build our city. we must retain our small town appeal and not resort to highly dense developments.
willett.jason@gmail.com	We are at 213 Apollo Way, next to the Mangini property. Perhaps the most unique thing about Pleasant Hill - and one of aspects that attracted us most to this community - is the fact that the Mangini family farm exists at all. It is rare for a municipality, particularly one in a dense urban area, to be home to an agricultural landmark that continues to generate crops for the local community, and remain highly visible to residents and visitors. It is immeasurably valuable that Pleasant Hill can showcase a working farm so close to its downtown hub. Let's preserve this integral character and charm. In the aftermath of the global quarantine, there are massive quantities of existing commercial office space that can be repurposed for high-density residential housing. Explore those options, but don't pave over our agricultural origins. From the plowing tractors and the fruit stand to the pumpkin patch, hayrides, and sunflower fields, Mangini Farm is essential and necessary to our city.
petersymonds@kennedyjens.com	When will citizens who are unable to attend meetings be given an opportunity to comment on the draft documents?
golwern@gmail.com	If looking at rezoning in residential areas, Please consider areas along large roadways such as Contra Costa Blvd, Taylor Blvd near Co Co Blvd. There are residential areas that front or back to those roads that might be better suited to higher density housing than along smaller corridors such as Oak Park Blvd.
cindyXcats@gmail.com	Please NO MORE HOUSES. No more Car Max, Floor Decor. NO MORE PEOPLE. Leave the land green. Too many people, lines, overcrowded venues and restaurants. Not enough parking. Too much traffic . Only housing should be tiny homes and limit that. PLEASE.
paulamichael@gmail.com	Hi there! We live in the Linda Lane neighborhood, directly across from Mangini's produce stand and farm. We are incredibly concerned about the plan for new housing, especially regarding the increase in traffic. Have you ever tried to turn left out of Linda Lane during rush hour? Have you ever used Pleasant Hill Road to connect to Lafayette during rush hour? Have you tried turning left from Pleasant Hill Road on to Gregory Lane, with only one left turning lane instead of two? It's incredibly challenging with the amount of vehicle traffic today and to increase it would be debilitating for those of us living in the neighborhood, including our first responders. If you must use the Mangini space, please consider single family homes only. High density housing is a much better fit for downtown areas, which are close to amenities and public transportation hubs. The suburbs are meant to be suburbs. Thank you for listening and we'll be sure to continue to speak up. Have a great day!
billfeil57@outlook.com	Please consider living conditions for all. Many of us cannot afford these large houses and we also don't want to afford cramped in small houses. Something in between that will incorporate more green ideas so the homes will have the efficiency needed to get us through these tough times. I see Pleasant Hill losing its small town atmosphere with too many hotels, too many large home, and poorly designed roadways. I am not sure where you are planning on letting homes being built, but do it smartly, please!



Comments on Housing Focus Areas

November 2021

<p>mike_flake@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Preserve the character and quality of Pleasant Hill by eliminating high density housing goals. Do not eliminate single family housing in favor of any type of development or redevelopment. Increasing density also causes more traffic and negative impacts on city services, and other items such as schools, energy, and water.</p>
<p>storeygianakos@gmail.com</p>	<p>Regarding development of the Mangini property: Whatever is done, DO NOT PERMIT OPENING OF MALAGA WAY TO THROUGH TRAFFIC. Please follow the precedent set by planning for the Lippincott property. An attractive privacy barrier would be a valuable improvement. "Malaga Court" has a nice ring to it!</p>
<p>jocyetangmd@gmail.com</p>	<p>I oppose development of Mangini's Farm & Winslow Center into 200+ units of high density housing. I've lived in the neighborhood across from Mangini's Farm for 19 years. We own the homes at both 39 Erin Ct. & 158 Linda Ln. Our neighborhood of homeowners on Linda Ln., Linda Ct., Steven Cir. and Erin Ct. all know each other; we are organized, and are unified in vehemently opposing high density housing there. That would have devastatingly negative effects on our neighborhood. Our home values will go down and our location would become less desirable. We don't want the crime that comes with it, like the shooting that had happened in the downtown Pleasant Hill high density housing after a drug deal gone bad, or the drug deals that routinely occur in the parking lots of condos in Lafayette, or more traffic, or visitors of that development parking on our streets. WE WILL OPPOSE IT!!! However, we'll happily support building single family homes on 1/4+ acre lots to match the surrounding area.</p>
<p>khelfter@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Thank you to the council for the town hall meeting tonight. It was well organized and did a good job explaining the difficult position we are in. I hope we can find a creative way to maybe "spread the units" among as many sites as we can. Thank you for all your hard work.</p>