

### **PUD-87, P13-1981 Sares Regis/E&S Ring**

**Applications for: (1) Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan approval to construct 345 apartment units, an approximately 38,781-square-foot retail center consisting of four buildings, new surface parking, and related site improvements on an approximately 16-acre site located at 3150 Bernal Avenue (southeast corner of Bernal Avenue and Stanley Boulevard); (2) Development Agreement; (3) Affordable Housing Agreement; and (4) Growth Management Approval. Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) and PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial) Districts.**

Shweta Bonn stated that she would present the staff report and described the background, scope, and key elements of the proposed project; and the applicant's presentation would focus on the differences between what was presented at the December 12, 2012 Work Session and the current proposal.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Ms. Bonn to go over the changes made since the Work Session.

Ms. Bonn highlighted the changes, noting that details would be provided by the applicant's presentation:

- The residential architecture in Clusters 1 and 3 has incorporated more craftsman-style elements.
- Building E3 in Cluster 3 is now all three stories.
- The corner of Stanley Boulevard and Bernal Avenue has been modified to include wing walls and a large tree as a focal point.
- An additional tot lot has been added in Cluster 1.
- An additional bus stop was added 400 feet west of the Stanley Boulevard/Bernal Avenue/Valley Avenue intersection.
- Changes to the commercial area include an increased thickness to the cornice, a reduced overhang to the eave, and a more traditional lighting element.

Commissioner Ritter pointed out that on page 20 of the staff report, staff noted that the project does not meet the parking requirements for the commercial portion of the project but that the parking on the site will adequately serve the proposed commercial shopping center.

Ms. Bonn stated that was correct. She indicated that the Commercial Neighborhood zoning for the property requires one parking space for every 180 square feet of floor area, and the proposed ratios in both retail options come out to about one parking space for every 200 square feet. She noted that in each situation, the traffic study looked at the Institute of Transportation Engineers standards and found that it would be acceptable. She added that there is some internal trip capture based on the assumption that some residents living in the apartment units would walk to the commercial uses.

Brian Dolan stated that following that vein, one of the reasons staff is comfortable with this is that in a shopping center, the standard applied out of the zoning ordinance is for every square foot, as if these were all one individual building built by themselves. He noted that the chances are that not all the occupants are going to be at 100-percent capacity at the same time. He further noted that usually, people would go to a couple of different places and not necessarily everybody going to one spot at the same time. He added that there is some efficiency in a small shopping center. He pointed out that it is not always perfect, as in the case of the Safeway shopping center on Bernal Avenue, where the end of the shopping center that has the most concentration of restaurants has a little congestion at lunchtime and maybe even at dinnertime. He added that he thinks that has to do with the mix of restaurants.

Commissioner Allen inquired if some of the zoning use changes referenced on pages 14 and 15 of the staff report are changes staff is recommending at this stage or something staff is looking to the Commission for input. She further inquired if staff is comfortable with these changes.

Ms. Bonn replied that the applicant is proposing to have these uses as permitted uses and that staff is comfortable with these changes and has incorporated them in the Conditions of Approval. She indicated that there are a couple of modifications; an example would be the hours of operation at convenience markets, which has been incorporated as a condition of approval.

Chair Pearce noted that this was something the Commission went over at the Work Session.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed.

#### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

John Pringle, E&S Ring, Applicant, thanked staff for a great deal of effort and collaborative work with the applicants over the last two-and-a-half years, starting with the Task Force meetings through the rezoning process and appearances in front of Planning Commission on multiple occasions. He added that staff was also involved in helping them organize community outreach multiple times, and the plan has evolved to what they think is a terrific plan and great for the community. He introduced the project team present tonight and available to answer questions: Ken Rodriguez of Ken Rodriguez and Partners, Project Architect for the retail development; Rob Steinberg of Steinberg Architects, Project Architect for the residential development; Ken Bush of Sares-Regis, the Lead Project Manager since the beginning of this year; Paul Letierri of Guzzardo Partnership, Landscape Architect; and Frank Auf de Maur, property owner, who has been trying to develop the site for many years and has auctioned the land to E&S Ring. He then handed the floor over to Mr. Steinberg.

Rob Steinberg stated that he will limit his presentation to a few of the changes that have been made subsequent to the last meeting. He started by saying that they organized this project as a series of three different villages, so there would be variety between the different housing options, knitted together with a series of open spaces, including wide-open community spaces like the village center hardscape, a plaza as well as a large common green that would be appropriate for throwing a ball around, a whole series of neighborhood open spaces, an additional tot lot on the far left, and other active, greenbelts that begin to tie and knit all these together as well.

Mr. Steinberg continued that to reinforce this idea of the village, there are a variety of heights that are shown with different colors, with lower heights around the perimeter. He noted that in response to the Commission's concerns about the arches and the thinness of the plaster that connected the bases, the arches have been eliminated, and the bases are a little bit more solid, sitting on brick bases, with a variety of different roof forms to them. He displayed a rendition of the leasing center and the recreation center and how that integrates with the buildings and gives the variety of heights and character to the community. He then showed the proposed entry from Bernal Avenue, noting that in response to the Commission's concerns about the corners being a little bit weak and the inverted "L"-shape trim on the balconies, they have really anchored the ends with some special detailing, using a variety of materials, starting with a brick base.

Mr. Steinberg then presented a slide showing the view of the buildings from the Bernal Avenue entry. He stated that the body of the building is horizontal lap siding which gives a nice shadow pattern, stucco, and enhanced dormers, which really gives one a feeling for the quality of the buildings, a sense of the brick, the wood trim, and the accents. He noted that he thinks they have really been able to capture the character of Pleasanton in a way that will make this a very compatible part of the community.

Mr. Steinberg stated that one of the Commission's issues with the garages was that they were a little flat and that needed to be enhanced. He noted that they have added a variety of balconies -- single and double balconies -- trellises, and brick, which provide some richness to the courts as people come into their individual garages.

With respect to the entry sign on the corner of Bernal Avenue and Stanley Boulevard, the project's landscape architect did a masterful job by introducing paving and seating using warm, rich materials, and more mature trees and the arbor, all of which set a tone of permanence and quality.

#### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Chair Pearce thanked the applicant for a great presentation, concise and to the point.

Commissioner O'Connor disclosed that he had met with Mr. Pringle to go over some of the new changes.

Commissioner Ritter disclosed that he also met with Mr. Pringle and thanked him for showing him the property. He noted that on one of the exhibits it states the entryways to the residential buildings are all internal corridors and stairways that lead to the particular units. He indicated that safety is always an issue with women and children and corridors and inquired if that is going to be an issue at all.

Mr. Pringle replied that he does not have an issue with opening the corridors to the open air. He noted that the majority of the 8,000 apartment units that the E&S Ring family owns, some dating back as far as 1959, have interior hallways and virtually no crime. He indicated that it depends on the neighborhood and added that the individual apartment units will have individual alarm systems as an amenity.

Commissioner Ritter addressed the traffic issues and stated that staff has confirmed that based on the analysis, there is not going to be traffic issues even with the East Pleasanton Specific Plan site coming on in the next 20 to 30 years. He asked Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, to address that.

Mike Tassano stated that he thinks Commissioner Ritter is asking if the development of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area was considered in the traffic study. He indicated that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force is underway right now trying to determine what is actually going to be out there. He noted that for the last 20 years, staff has always assumed that something big is going to be out there, and has added a good deal of "Research and Development" and "Office" in the area for the traffic study. He continued that with the General Plan Update, staff actually added in some "Retail" and "Residential" and used all of that; and through the Housing Element Update, staff took all of that land use and added some more "Residential" and "Retail" on top of what was already there. He noted that the current analysis, through the traffic study using the Housing Element Update, already includes a whole lot of traffic on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area. He stated that he has been to all the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force meetings, and the numbers, even the highest end numbers, only come up to what is currently in the General Plan. He indicated that he feels very comfortable and confident that the analysis includes the correct amount of traffic.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Tassano to confirm that although it looks like there is going to be additional traffic, no efficiency at those intersections will be lost and that the levels of service are remaining the same.

Mr. Tassano replied that was correct. He stated that as with the East Pleasanton Specific Plan, staff has always assumed that there would be some use on the Auf der Maur property. He noted that staff had initially assumed "Office" for a while; and then with the Home Depot proposal, that was actually a larger trip than the "Office" was. He indicated that the current analysis is a combination of the two and is about the same as what was anticipated to go through the area. He confirmed that there will be no loss or gain, which is what is expected and what is in the General Plan.

Commissioner Allen noted that this is a really unique site in terms of being the intersection to major bike trails, the connection to the Iron Horse Trail, and a major connector on Bernal Avenue to the South Livermore Valley. She inquired what special consideration has been given to bike safety, not just in terms of signage but of things that might potentially be structurally related or landscape-related to protect children and adults.

Mr. Tassano replied that there are different things staff looks at with both pedestrian and bicycle safety. Referring to Commissioner Allen's comment about the Iron Horse Trail that runs from this property and then on street routes by there, he noted that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan is probably going to shift that alignment to the east, which will then create a complete off-street separated facility for that.

Mr. Tassano continued that what staff did with this project is look at how people would get into their site: a destination with 345 residential units and retail. He noted that with respect to child safety, the project has wider sidewalks where young children ride their bikes. He added that bike lanes are planned for Bernal Avenue. He indicated that one of the standards staff wants to try to hold on to when it moves forward with these types of projects is to make sure that dense residential have wider sidewalks so people can walk and children bike safely.

Chair Pearce stated that she was thrilled to have reached this point, having been on the Planning Commission so long and seeing a variety of iterations for this site. She indicated that this is a great use for the site and expressed her appreciation for the applicants' receptiveness to the Commission's comments and concerns at the Work Session. She noted that the architect has stepped up and thinks the project it looks great.

**Commissioner O'Connor moved to find that the conditions described in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162 have not occurred as described in the Addendum to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), including the adopted CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Addendum to the SEIR are adequate to serve as the environmental documentation for this project and satisfy all the requirements of CEQA; and that the proposed PUD Development Plan and Development Agreement are consistent with the General Plan; to make the PUD findings for the proposed Development Plan as listed in the staff report; to find that the exceptions to the Housing Site Development Standards and Design Guidelines as listed in the staff report are appropriate; and to recommend approval to the City Council of Case PUD-87, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report, and of Case P13-1981, the Development Agreement for the project.**  
Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Allen, O'Connor, Pearce, and Ritter.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTAIN:** None.

**RECUSED:** None.

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Olson and Posson.

Resolutions Nos. PC-2013-35 recommending approval of Case PUD-87 and PC-2013-36 recommending approval of Case P13-1981 were entered and adopted as motioned.