



Manteca

General Plan Update

AGENDA

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #9

Monday, September 10, 2018 – 6:00 pm

Manteca Transit Center Meeting Room, 220 Moffat Boulevard, Manteca, CA

6:00 PM - GPAC Workshop

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Summary Minutes Meeting 8 – August 6, 2018
4. General Plan Update: Land Use Discussion
5. General Plan Update: Community Design Discussion
6. Public Comment
7. Adjournment

The next scheduled meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee of the City of Manteca is Monday, October 22, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in the Manteca Transit Center, 220 Moffat Boulevard, Manteca, CA.

I hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location accessible to members of the public at City Hall, 1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA prior to Friday, September 7, 2018, by 5:00 pm.

LISA SCHIMMELFENNIG
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III

In Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please call (209) 456 8017. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35.102 35.104 ADA Title II).



Manteca

General Plan Update

MEMORANDUM

Meeting 9 – September 10, 2018

TO: Manteca General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

FROM: Beth Thompson and Martti Eckert, De Novo Planning Group

SUBJECT: General Plan Land Use and Community Design Discussion

DATE: August 28, 2018

The September 10th GPAC meeting will focus on land use and community design issues. This meeting packet identifies specific reading materials related to economic development and raises key issues to consider in preparation for the GPAC meeting.

LAND USE

The Land Use Element is a required element of the General Plan. The element provides policy direction on the distribution and characteristics of land uses located in the City of Manteca and the adjoining unincorporated areas in the City's sphere of influence (SOI). The element is a cornerstone of the General Plan. All other elements relate to and include factors that influence land use and the physical form of the city. The City's current Land Use Element, adopted as part of Manteca General Plan 2023, addresses economic development potential, housing, traffic generation and circulation patterns, requirements for public serves and utilities, safety from hazards, and environmental conditions. The element comprises land use designations (referred to as "categories") that describe where and at what intensity land uses may be developed; a land use map that illustrates where the land use categories are applied within the city and the City's SOI; and goals, policies, and actions.

The meeting's discussion will focus on land use goals, policies, and implementation measures on pages 2-11 through 2-27 of the adopted General Plan. However, the discussion is not anticipated to focus on issues related to growth management, which were previously discussed, nor issues related to specific land use designations and the land use map. Subsequent GPAC discussions pertaining to the land use designations and the land use map will occur following the distribution of the Land Use Alternatives Report later this year.

REQUIRED READING

Prior to the meeting on September 10th, please read the following items:

- Existing Conditions Report, Chapter 1.0 Land Use and Socioeconomics – *please note that the Existing Conditions Report was provided previously in the Meeting Packet for November 6, 2017*

Subject: General Plan Land Use and Community Design Discussion
Date: August 28, 2018
Page: 2 of 8

- City of Manteca General Plan 2023, Chapter 2 – Land Use Element – *please note that the General Plan 2023 was provided previously in the Meeting Packet for October 2, 2017*
- City of Manteca Economic Development Committee Land Use Recommendations Memorandum – *Included in the meeting packet as Attachment 1, the memo provides the Future Land Use Subcommittee’s conclusions on locations within the city limits and SOI worthy of discussion for General Plan land use designation and zoning to accommodate the city’s future growth. The memo is intended to facilitate the GPAC’s discussion of land use-related issues, especially those related to specific land use designations and the land use map. Consequently, the document will also be reference at the future meetings where the designations and map are discussed.*

WORK EXERCISE – LAND USE

After reading the materials identified above, please consider the following questions and be prepared to discuss.

1. In developing a goal and policy framework to address land use issues, what top three issues or actions should the City prioritize?
2. In reviewing the existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs (pages 2-11 through 2-27) related to land use:
 - a. Which existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs best address the concerns you identified?
 - b. What additional issues or priorities are not addressed in the existing General Plan?

COMMUNITY DESIGN

The Community Design Element is an optional element of the General Plan. The element addresses the characteristics and quality of the city’s community form and built environment. The Manteca General Plan 2023 includes a Community Design Element that encourages the development of a compact community form, the maintenance and perpetuation of a memorable city identity, the adaption of resource efficient buildings, the accommodation of pedestrian and bicyclists, and preservation of visual characteristics associated with the city’s agricultural heritage.

REQUIRED READING

Prior to the meeting on March 5th, please read the following item:

- City of Manteca General Plan 2023, Chapter 3 – Community Design Element – *please note that the General Plan 2023 was provided previously in the Meeting Packet for October 2, 2017*

Subject: General Plan Land Use and Community Design Discussion
Date: August 28, 2018
Page: 3 of 8

WORK EXERCISE – COMMUNITY DESIGN

After reading the materials identified above, please consider the following questions and be prepared to discuss.

1. In developing a goal and policy framework to address community design, what top three issues or actions should the City prioritize?
2. In reviewing the existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs (pages 3-1 through 3-10) related to land use:
 - a. Which existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs best address the concerns you identified?
 - b. What additional issues or priorities are not addressed in the existing General Plan?

ATTACHMENT

1. City of Manteca Economic Development Committee Land Use Recommendations Memorandum
2. Summary Notes - GPAC Meeting #8, August 6, 2018

Attachment 1

**City of Manteca Economic Development Committee Land
Use Recommendations Memorandum**

1001 West Center St.
Manteca, CA 95337
(209)456-8015
www.ci.manteca.ca.us

City of Manteca
Economic Development
Division

Memo

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| To: | Economic Development Committee | From: | Future Land Use Subcommittee |
| cc: | Tim Ogden, CM; Don Smail, ED Mgr. | Pages: | 2 |
| Phone: | Phone Number | Date | July 31, 2018 |
| Re: | Land Use Recommendations | | |

- Summary of Findings -

The Future Land Use Subcommittee meet on Wednesday July 18th to conduct a final review of locations within the city limits and sphere of influence (SOI) worthy of discussion for general plan land use designation and zoning to meet the needs of our growing community.

The conclusions are as follows:

- 1.) **Housing:** Currently Manteca has over 8,000 entitled lots that are zoned for housing within the city limits. The current rate of housing production is about 650 units per year. The Subcommittee observed that the current supply is adequate for the next 10-15 years at current rates of construction, but agreed that consideration should be given regarding future land areas suitable for housing development beyond the 15 year horizon.
- 2.) **Housing Variety:** The Subcommittee observed that conventional track housing was in good supply, but that other types of housing were lacking. In particular, there was concern about the need for more affordable housing units, both rental and owner occupied, condo, townhouse style, etc. In addition, the lack of executive homes in the Manteca was another concern, since the perception is that the community is losing many of those executive home clients to the City of Ripon, Brookside Village in Stockton and the River Islands development in Lathrop.
- 3.) **Commercial:** In general, the Sub Committee's perception was that currently there is adequate land and buildings available for commercial development city-wide, but some parts of the community are not well served, especially neighborhoods south of Hwy 120. Prime areas available for infill development or occupancy that were discussed included:
 - Long vacant commercial space at Promenade Shops/Bass Pro Shopping Center. If Poag moves forward with their plans to construct high density residential at the Promenade site, demand for a different assortment of neighborhood commercial retail and service uses would likely occur, potentially creating a "village" community concept.

- New opportunity for adjacent development at Union Crossing, triggered by the recent commitment of Living Spaces to build a 120,000 sq.ft. retail furniture store and interior design center on the new extension of Atherton Road, on the west side of Union Avenue and abutting Hwy 120.
- Development of the City-owned parcel on Daniels, east of Airport Way and abutting Hwy 120. This 9-acre parcel has been identified as a prime location for development of a Class A office building complex, similar to the AG Spanos office building on I-5 in Stockton.

Other areas in line for future development or infill include:

- Yosemite Square on the east side of Hwy 99.
- Vacant land within the city limits and/or SOI at the Hwy 99 Interchange at Lathrop Road/Main Street.
- Land development opportunities that may result from combining remnants and additional land acquired as part of the Hwy 120/McKinley Interchange.
- Commercial development opportunities along Atherton Road to serve South Manteca
- Infill development opportunities within Downtown Manteca, including around the Manteca Transit Center on Moffat Blvd., once ACE rail begins service to Modesto.

- 4.) **Industrial:** Considerable discussion was held regarding where Manteca could reasonably accommodate industrial and office park development to assure a balance and better jobs/housing mix as the community continues to grow. The recent 2017 San Joaquin Partnership report identified that of the 16,000 acres of vacant industrial land in San Joaquin County, Manteca sites totaled about 544 acres, (less than 5% of the available industrial land county-wide, ahead of only the cities of Ripon and Escalon). Future planning for industrial land both inside the city limits and within the SOI were identified as important objectives. The most significant opportunities identified were as follows:

a. 10 to 15 Year Development Horizon

- **CITY - Villa Ticino Property, south of Louise Avenue, West of Airport Way:**
This large 237 acre parcel was sold for residential development per current zoning, but fell out of escrow. Currently there are two developers proposing to purchase this infill site and convert the land use to industrial, with perhaps some small sections of commercial, commercial office. The Subcommittee was unanimous in their support for this potential land use conversion, particularly given the proximity to the intermodal rail facility, and the potential to develop an internal industrial truck road that would carry heavy vehicles and employee traffic internally, rather than adding traffic to Airport Way. Another factor was that as ACE commuter trains increase, and the intermodal rail facility expands per current projections from 200K to 400K to 720K container movements per year, the rail traffic is projected to increase from the current 50 trains per day, up to 70 trains and eventually up to 130 trains per day over the next decade. Proximity to increasing train traffic was thought to be more compatible with industrial land uses. Industrial buildings, berms and landscaping could be designed to baffle train and truck noise to the benefit of residences on the east side of Airport Way, rather than having house lots abutting the railroad tracks.

- CITY – Austin Road Business Park: This master planned project is within the City limits at the far southeast corner of Manteca. It was on track for development and investment, but encountered some issues regarding access to Hwy 99 and conflict with the UP rail line along Moffat Blvd. that could affect access in the event of a train stoppage or other rail incident. City staff should meet with the property owner to determine what their future plans are for this prime industrial project, and take appropriate action to develop solutions.
- CITY – Infill at Manteca Industrial Park (MIP): Although mostly developed, there are several parcels in the MIP, including a few attractive sites on Industrial Park Drive, the only STAA truck route in the City. City staff will continue to gather information on the availability of these parcels, encourage willing owner to list the properties with industrial brokers and find job producing companies to occupy these prime sites in the center of our community.

In addition, there is one large parcel used for ag-processing that is adjacent to the MIP, but in the unincorporated County Area. City staff should reach out to the property owner to inquire about current or future interest in the benefits of incorporation if the owners have plans to develop.

- CITY – Moffat Boulevard: There is a large vacant parcel adjacent to the Hwy 120 off ramp to Southbound Hwy 99. That parcel was originally the site for a proposed 6 story commercial office building anchored by a local bank. City staff should contact the owner and inquire about their plans for developing the site, and offer assistance if needed.

Adjacent to the commercial office building parcel and further south on the east side of Moffat Boulevard, there is other industrially zoned land next to and part of the original Cranbrook development. Cranbrook has decided they no longer intend to finish the project and construct additional flex industrial/office space. This type of real estate product is in high demand among many emerging companies in the Bay Area and Silicon Valley. City staff should contact Cranbrook and determine if and when they intend to sell the remaining property, and help find a local developer who can finish out the project and provide more of this much needed industrial space. Staff should also conduct an inventory of parcels along Moffat and contact the owners to determine if there are any other opportunity sites as Moffat transitions to southbound Hwy 99.

- SOI Amendment – Land North of Roth Road, West of Airport Way, up to French Camp Road: This section of property is currently within the City of Stockton Sphere of Influence. It is the only area where the Stockton sphere protrudes south of French Camp Road. There is a 100 acre vacant land site on the north side of Roth Road that is immediately adjacent to the CenterPoint development and the UP Intermodal Cargo facility. Proximity to French Camp Road as the nearest STAA truck route was also mentioned as a benefit. City staff should meet with Stockton staff to discuss their willingness to amend the sphere line to allow Manteca to bring this property into the control of the City of Manteca. Local residents in this area would need to be consulted to get their support. However, members of the subcommittee observed that many of those residents already believed they were in Manteca based upon their mailing address.

- SOI – Land East of Airport Way, West of Union, North of Lovelace, up to French Camp: There was discussion about the prospects for residential development occurring in this section of land. However, given the proximity to the UP Intermodal Rail facility, being located adjacent to the CenterPoint Industrial Park, and having the SJ County solid waste transfer station located on the north side of Lovelace, there was a counter position that this particular section of the land should be considered for industrial development.
- SOI – Land East of Union, West of Hwy 99, North of Lovelace, up to French Camp: The most significant land use in this section of property other than agriculture is the Delicato Family Wine Company. The Delicato complex is clustered near to Hwy 99 on the west side of the Highway at the newly reconstructed French Camp intersection. Preserving this important industrial company was recognized as a prime objective for land use decisions in this area. Although this section of property might be attractive for residential development, anything that might impede the growth and development of Delicato should be given careful consideration. Another idea discussed was to cluster other ag related businesses nearby, such as ag equipment sales and repair and other food processing.
- SOI – Land East of Hwy 99, North of Northland, West of Castle, up to French Camp: Looking farther east from Hwy 99, the long-term view discussed was that this property might also be suitable for consideration as an industrial growth area. Proximity to Hwy 99 was the most obvious factor, along with the new interchange, and access to French Camp Road as an STAA truck route for vehicles heading to Interstate 5.

b. 15 to 25 Year Development Horizon

- SOI – Land East of Castle, North of Northland, West of Austin Road, up to French Camp:
- SOI – Land East of Austin Road, North of Southland, West of Prescott, up to French Camp:

Expectation for both of these large undeveloped areas was that agricultural uses would predominate for the next decade or longer. The consensus was that eventually these areas may slowly convert to residential uses, perhaps some executive home development

ATTACHMENT 1

GPAC MEETING #8 – SUMMARY MINUTES



Manteca

General Plan Update

Summary Minutes

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 8 – August 6, 2018

These meeting notes provide an overview and summary of the input received during the March 5, 2018 General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting which addressed growth management approaches, the General Plan's implementation approach, and General Plan evaluation.

Attendance

GPAC Members Present: Daryll Quaresma (Chair), Victoria Brunn (Vice Chair), Bill Barnhart, Wendy Benavides, Ronald Cheek, James DuClair, Demetri Filios, Ronald Light, Richard Paz, Parminder Singh Sahi, David Tenney, Stephen Tompkins

GPAC Member Absent: Joann Beattie, Jose Nuno, Jack Snyder

GPAC Alternates Present: Benjamin Cantu, David Cushman, Jason Laughlin, John Reilla

GPAC Alternates Absent: Marco Galeazzi

GPAC Growth Management Approaches Discussion

- Consensus for standalone Growth Management Element with appropriate cross-references to the other elements, rather than incorporating growth management-related goals, policies, and actions into the General Plan's other elements.
 - This will prevent growth management goals, policies, and actions from being overlooked, as they are now.
- Include growth management policy direction that:
 - Requires services to expand to accommodate growth
 - Ties back to the City's existing Growth Management Ordinance
 - Establishes a committee that reviews growth management-related issues
 - Addresses the following topics:
 - Air Quality and Climate Protection – 2 mentions
 - Community Centers – 2 mentions
 - Drainage/Flooding – 3 mentions
 - Fire and Emergency Medical Services – 6 mentions
 - Fiscal – 2 mentions
 - Libraries – 3 mentions

- Parks (and Recreation) – 3 mentions
- Police Services – 6 mentions
- Schools – 4 mentions
 - The Antioch General Plan policy pertaining to the support of schools, located on page 5 of the meeting memo, was cited as an appropriate example policy.
 - Tie growth management to School Improvement Grant tiering system (Tiers 1-3).
- Sewer and Waste Water – 5 mentions
 - Important to avoid another moratorium, the City’s original impetus for its Growth Management Ordinance.
- Traffic – 3 mentions
- Water – 4 mentions
- Additional topics mentioned:
 - Economic Development – 2 mentions
 - Environmental Justice – 1 mention
 - Housing – 1 mention

Implementation Approach Discussion

- Format:
 - General support for formatting in example
 - Enforcement/review party should be included
- Timeframes associated with completion:
 - “E”: it was noted that the lack of funding can be used as an excuse to not implement an action. To place impetus on the actions, consider reviewing these items on some time interval, such every 10 years.
 - Concern was voiced regarding the “Ongoing” category because it does not define a timeframe for completion. Since the actions are continuously implemented, it was recommended that a regular timeframe be established to review implementation of these items.

Public Comment

- Martin Harris, Terra Land Group
 - Reflective of the letter that he submitted to the City and De Novo Planning Group the previous week, Mr. Harris voiced concerns about the ability to insure development within the floodplain following a catastrophic flood.

- His perspective is informed by witnessing the wildfire damage in and around Santa Rosa and learning about property owners' inability to insure their properties following the recent volcano eruption in Hawaii.
 - Sedimentation could become an issue. The City has approved significant development without constructing infrastructure that can accommodate sediment. The issue is now heightened by the state's support of routing more water to Southern California. This amounts to increased flows and sediment coming through Manteca.
 - Flooding is going to be an issue, because there is no where for the water to go.
- Kit Oase, Ripon Unified School District
 - The district supports growth management.
 - Requests that the General Plan include policy language to require water and sewer service to school sites that are ripe for annexation.
 - The school board will respond to the list of growth management topics at the appropriate time.
 - Leonard Smith, Resident
 - Read the definition of Environmental Justice from SB 1000, the legislation that requires General Plans to address the topic.
 - As an example to address environmental justice concerns, warehousing by low income housing could become re-designated for mixed use development.