



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SOUTH COYOTE
VALLEY/ GREENBELT PROPERTY
OWNERS MEETING ON 5/5/04**

DATE: June 1, 2004

Approved

Date

Property Owners and Representatives: Leonard Walker, Bill Speegle, Richard Barberi, Helen Marchese, Chris Marchese, Elizabeth Hirata, Rosalie Cacitti, N. P. Mussallem, Sin Lung Mok, Whi Fong Chan, Ted Lzung, Wayland Tam, Leo J. Cacitti, Ray Russo, Carmen Russo, Roger Costa, Mike Salewske, Mark Sellers, Roger Socks, Bob Wright, Hen Tan, Young S. Tan, Carolyn Schimandle, Rocky Tam, Lowell Tam, Rachael Gibson, Eric Fippo, Don Piazza, Jerry Hoefling, Rose Navara, Nick Navara, Ray Russo Jr., Tom Montex, Idelly Tim, Lucy Noy, Bin Thung, Carolyn Schimandle, Richard Barberi, Tim Delong, Steve O'Steen, and Soon Lim.

Members of the Public Present:

Bill Shoe (County Planning), Rebecca Tolentino (Morgan Hill Planning) and Kerry Williams (CHG).

San Jose City Staff Present and Consultants:

Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Thompson (HMH), Jim Musbach (EPS) and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

1) Welcome and Introductions:

The meeting was held at the Coyote Grange Hall and begun at about 7:00 a.m. Eileen Goodwin, with APEX Strategies, introduced herself as the facilitator for the meeting and welcomed

everyone in attendance. She asked for a show of hands to identify long-term property owners in the valley, and how they heard about the meeting. It became apparent that a majority of the attendees received a flyer from staff informing them of the meeting, and had owned their properties for more than 10 years. Also by show of hands, several people indicated that they had previously attended some Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meetings. Eileen indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the CVSP and its potential implications for the Coyote Greenbelt. She also explained the expected outcomes for the meeting, which included 1) understanding the CVSP process, 2) initiating a discussion about the owner's viewpoints about the Coyote Greenbelt, and 3) encouraging participation in the planning process.

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the City's Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, reviewed the background of the specific plan and history of land planning in Coyote Valley. She noted that North Coyote has been planned for Campus Industrial uses since 1983, while the Urban Reserve and Coyote Greenbelt areas were established as a part of the City's Horizon 2000 General Plan in 1984. Laurel indicated that the City's General Plan requires a Specific Plan to be prepared and adopted prior to development in Coyote Valley, and in August 2002 the City Council initiated the process to develop the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP). She indicated that the Council appointed a 20-member Task Force to guide the planning effort, and explained the elements and milestones of the planning process.

Laurel said the City has previously adopted eight Specific Plans, all of which were based on community-driven processes. Laurel described the basic elements of a Specific Plan including the land use, transportation, infrastructure, public facilities, implementation and phasing, financing, and environmental assessment. Finally, she explained the regulatory framework, stating that the Specific Plan will be a policy document and become part of the City's General Plan. Zoning districts and land use regulations, annexation and other implementation policies would be prepared as a part of the process.

Laurel introduced Jim Musbach, with Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), as the economic consultant for the CVSP. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Jim explained the typical infrastructure issues involved in a project of this scope and magnitude and the general alternative financing principles that could be used. He indicated that the infrastructure financing principles are most pertinent to North Coyote and the Urban Reserve. Urban services would not be extended into the Greenbelt in accordance with the General Plan. If required, areas in the Greenbelt may be used to mitigate potential impacts from urbanization to the north, but in no case would property owners of the Greenbelt be liable for the mitigation costs. As part of the CVSP process, the Task Force is exploring strategies to maintain the Coyote Greenbelt as a non-urban buffer between San Jose and Morgan Hill. Jim indicated that financial and economic aspects of these strategies will be discussed at future meetings as they are identified and developed.

2) Property Owner Comments and Questions:

Eileen invited the property owners for their comments and questions on the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. She explained that one of the major or primary goals for the meeting was to listen to their concerns, and that questions that could not be answered because of the lack of adequate current information would be addressed during the course of the project. The Coyote Greenbelt property owners had the following questions and comments.

The questions included:

1. How would property owners who miss the workshop on May 15th obtain materials and information from the workshop?

Response: Workshop materials would be posted on the CVSP website.

2. What benefits would owners derive from properties designated as Coyote Greenbelt?

Response: The City designated South Coyote as a greenbelt more than 20 years ago, and has no intention of annexing it at this time consistent with current policies. It is conceivable that Coyote Valley property owners would derive some property appreciation benefits from neighboring urbanization to the north.

3. What is the recourse for owners who previously purchased properties as an investment with the intention to develop? How can they profit from their properties, given the infeasibility of traditional agriculture in the valley?

Response: Property owners may be able to apply other forms of sustainable agriculture, such as is practiced in South Livermore and Napa Valley, which may be viable in Coyote.

4. The Greenbelt designation is unfair to property owners. Is the City of San Jose willing to purchase and maintain properties as orchard lands in order to ensure a true greenbelt?

Response: The City has not considered purchasing, nor is it required to purchase, properties in the Coyote Greenbelt for any purpose.

5. What is the fate of those properties in the Coyote Greenbelt that are currently entitled with urban zoning designations?

Response: Properties that have been annexed would remain in San Jose. Any future changes in zoning would recognize legally existing uses as "legal non-conforming uses."

6. What is the County's role in the CVSP process since a majority of properties in the Greenbelt are in the County?

Response: Supervisor Don Gage is a member of the CVSP Task Force, while several County departments, such as County Planning, Roads and Aviation, Parks and Recreation, etc., are members of the CVSP Technical Advisory Committee.

7. What is the City's position on existing subdivisions in the Greenbelt?

Response: The City recognizes all existing subdivisions that were properly created. Subdivisions in the County are subject to the County's development regulations.

8. What assurance has the City that the Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) would support the annexation of the Coyote Greenbelt into San Jose?

Response: The City does not desire to annex, but if we did has no assurances. LAFCO is a separate agency and maintains a website for those interested in learning more about its operations.

9. What are the benefits for Coyote Valley property owners to annex into the City of San Jose?

Response: It depends on what property owners consider a "benefit" and want to do with their properties. The City will, however, not extend urban services into the Coyote Greenbelt area.

10. What is the City's position with respect to providing services to annexed properties that currently have urban zoning designations?

Response: The Coyote Greenbelt is outside the Urban Service Area and Urban Growth Boundary, and therefore the City would not extend sanitary sewer into the area.

11. Is the Greenbelt slated for use as a retention basin to meet the run-off requirements for development in the Urban Reserve?

Response: It has not been decided to use the Greenbelt, or even portions of it, for storm water detention requirements of development to the north, or for any other mitigation.

12. Would the City of San Jose object if property owners requested development permits from County while the CVSP is in progress?

Response: The City and County policies are in agreement about the agricultural designation with a minimum parcel requirement of 20 acres for the Greenbelt. Property owners meeting the minimum development standards can obtain approvals from the County, at their discretion (not a guarantee).

13. What is the possibility of extending urban services into the Coyote Greenbelt?

Response: The City has no plans to provide water and sewer to the Greenbelt, and it is contrary to current policy.

14. How can the Task Force make informed decisions on the specific plan given the rather short timeframe?

Response: The CVSP is currently on schedule. The Task Force will reassess the work plan if it determines that additional time is needed for the project.

15. Will the Coyote Greenbelt property owners be forced into participating in an Assessment District with no benefits?

Response: No.

16. Will the City object to property owners videotaping future meetings?

Response: No, since the CVSP is an open process, and so long as it does not disrupt the meetings.

17. Does the CVSP work plan include provisions for extending the time to develop the plan?

Response: We are currently on schedule. The Task Force would consider an extension if warranted.

Comments included:

1. The development of the Urban Reserve should include a buffer along its southern boundary with the Coyote Greenbelt.
2. The CVSP staff should organize additional meetings to discuss the progress of the CVSP with the Coyote Greenbelt property owners.
3. The City of San Jose cannot promise to develop parks in Coyote when existing parks in the City are not being adequately maintained as evidenced by the closing of restrooms, etc.
4. Consider projects in the Greenbelt that promote agriculture, such as food processing, trucking, etc.
5. Urban development in the Urban Reserve and North Coyote would produce significant traffic impacts on the Greenbelt.

6. The Coyote Greenbelt designation has no “benefits” what-so-ever to property owners
7. The CVSP should develop an “Athertonesque” image for the Coyote Greenbelt with development restricted to one house on twenty acres is appropriate and ought to be considered.
8. The proposed re-alignment of Fisher Creek is good for the ecology and should be pursued.
9. Owners of smaller properties (e.g. one or two acre parcels) have long been aware of the development limitations in the Coyote Greenbelt, and should accept the consequences.
10. The term “Greenbelt” is a misnomer, as South Coyote is currently the most urbanized area in Coyote Valley.
11. The Coyote Greenbelt should be kept from additional development. Landowners should be adequately compensated for Greenbelt properties that are purchased for parklands required by urbanization in the Urban Reserve.
12. The Greenbelt property owners are not represented on the Task Force.
13. Properties along Monterey Road should be designated for urban uses even if located in the Greenbelt.

3) Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 a.m.