

MEMORANDUM

DATE October 14, 2011

TO Vacaville City Council

FROM The Planning Center | DC&E and City Staff

RE **Steering Committee Recommendations for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area**

This memorandum documents the Steering Committee's recommendations for a Preferred Land Use Alternative for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. The Steering Committee's recommendations are organized according to the evaluation questions on pages 53 through 70 of the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook.

1. Would you like to see new active adult housing in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area?

The Steering Committee supports a medium amount of active adult: more than Alternative A, but less than Alternative C. The Committee also suggested that the active adult area be distributed in pockets so that it is integrated into the community. The Committee also mentioned that amenities for seniors are important in these areas, such as ensuring that active adult communities are close to shopping, parks, and transportation facilities, and planning for recreational vehicle parking or community gardens in projects. One Committee member supports the approach used in Alternative B (no designated active adult area) to maintain flexibility for future development.

2. What mix of housing is appropriate for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area?

The Steering Committee supports maintaining the existing housing mix policy, and believes that the proposed revisions to Alternative C from the Jepson Ranch Group (dated September 15, 2011) would achieve this housing mix.

3. Should there be service commercial uses in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

The Steering Committee supports Alternative C, with a moderately-size area for Service Commercial along the railroad tracks. The Committee also suggested that a buffer between Service Commercial and residential uses be provided.

4. Should there be offices in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

The Steering Committee supports the inclusion of some office space in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Specifically, space for small offices, such as medical or dental offices, should be provided, rather than space for large office buildings. The small office space needs could also potentially be accommodated in the Neighborhood Commercial areas.

5. Should there be industrial uses in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

The Steering Committee believes that industrial uses are not appropriate in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area, and therefore supports this aspect of Alternatives A and C. The Committee believes that this use is not compatible with the residential uses and that other areas would be preferred.

Other Non-Residential Uses

Although not an evaluation exercise question in the Alternatives Evaluation Workbook, the Steering Committee also discussed the appropriate amount and location of neighborhood commercial uses in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. The Steering Committee supports some Neighborhood Commercial along Leisure Town Road, and recommends that this area include medical and dental offices. In addition, one Committee member was opposed to the configuration of the Neighborhood Commercial designation on both the north and south side of the Leisure Town Road and Hawkins Road intersection under Alternative C because it could lead to poor performance at one of the two shopping centers, similar to the city's experience with under-performing shopping centers discussed in the Focus Area sites under consideration for the General Plan Update..

6. Should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area meet the neighborhood parkland requirements?

The Steering Committee believes that the neighborhood parkland requirements should be exceeded, and therefore supports this aspect of Alternatives A and C.

7. Should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area meet the community parkland requirements?

The Steering Committee believes that the community parkland requirements should be met, and preferably exceeded, and therefore supports this aspect of Alternative A and Alternative C as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group on September 15, 2011.

8. Is preserving agricultural land a priority?

The Steering Committee believes that agricultural land is important, and supports Alternative C, as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group. The Committee feels that it is important to allow some pieces of Vacaville's agricultural heritage to continue. The Committee also feels that it is important to allow the small-scale agricultural lifestyle in the Locke Paddon community to continue by creating a buffer with a Rural Residential designation at the north end of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area.

9. How wide should the Agricultural Buffer be?

The Steering Committee supports a 500-foot agricultural buffer, as reflected in Alternative C, but noted that the buffer width will require input from the Solano Irrigation District (SID).

10. Where should the Agricultural Buffer be located in relation to the Urban Growth Boundary and PG&E easement?

The Steering Committee supports the location of the Agricultural Buffer shown in Alternative C, as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group on September 15, 2011. They believe that the configuration will maintain City control over the buffer because the property owners for the area that would be subject to the Agricultural Buffer are part of the Jepson Ranch Group, and could work with the City to ensure that the Agricultural Buffer is protected from urban or agricultural uses, but that this would depend on the City limiting the types of uses that could occur beyond the Urban Growth Boundary.

11. How much additional traffic is acceptable with future development?

In general, the Steering Committee supports additional development in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area, especially as shown in Alternative C as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group on September 15, 2011. The Committee acknowledges that this development will increase traffic, but notes that the amount of the increase due to development in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area is relatively minor.

12. How should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area connect to Interstate 80 and other areas to the north?

The Steering Committee supports the roadway configuration shown in Alternative C, as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group on September 15, 2011, which eliminates the Willow Road connection from the previous version of Alternative C. The Committee also discussed whether it would be appropriate to allow six lanes on Leisure Town Road, and agreed that right-of-way for six lanes should be acquired in order to leave open the option for six lanes in the future.

13. Should the bicycle and pedestrian network rely on dedicated bicycle and pedestrian paths, on-street bicycle lanes and sidewalks, or both?

The Steering Committee supports a mix of dedicated and on-street bicycle and pedestrian paths, lanes, and sidewalks. The comments included having the trail system serve both recreational and transportation system needs.

14. Is supporting transit in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area a priority?

The Steering Committee believes that it is important for the development in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area to support transit, and therefore supports this aspect of Alternatives B and C.

15. What uses should be adjacent to the Locke Paddon community?

The Steering Committee supports the land uses adjacent to the Locke Paddon community shown in Alternative C, as revised by the Jepson Ranch Group on September 15, 2011, which include rural residential, estate residential, a park, and a trail. One Committee member also suggested an overlay that would allow uses similar to the existing uses in the Locke Paddon community.

16. Should the Preferred Land Use Alternative be the same as the proposed plan from the Brighton Landing developer? If not, what should be included in this area?

The Steering Committee believes that the Preferred Land Use Alternative should match the proposed plan from the Brighton Landing developer, and therefore supports this component of Alternative C.

17. Is it important that new development be arranged around a new town square or other central focal point?

The Steering Committee does not support the concept of a town square for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area, and therefore, supports this aspect of Alternative C. Committee comments were that gathering places are needed in new growth areas, but not a new Town Square project.