

PUD-68-06M, Stoneridge Creek Pleasanton (CLC)

Application for a Major Modification to an approved Planned Unit Development (PUD-68) Development Plan to reduce the unit count, modify the density, construct subterranean parking, amenities, and related site improvements in the northern 10 acres of the Continuing Life Communities retirement community located at 3300 Stoneridge Creek Way. Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial) District.

Chair Allen indicated that she talked to Mr. Weinstein briefly regarding removing this item from the Consent Calendar for a brief discussion and asked staff if it would be appropriate to have a staff report or just say what her concern is.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff would be happy to give a presentation with some PowerPoint slides and a brief overview of the project, or the Commission can just proceed to the conversation.

Chair Allen stated that the main reason she wanted this item pulled from the Consent Calendar is because she was looking for staff detail on Growth Management that may be helpful before the item goes before the City Council. She indicated that she is in support of the project overall; however, an assumption was made in the staff report that because the number of units in the project was lower and because this was approved previously, there is no Growth Management impact. She noted that the number of units is not the only thing that impacts Growth Management; there is a formula that was used when this project was approved, which includes things such as number of parking spaces, number of occupants in a unit, and water usage, that all get calculated in to define a Growth Management number. She added that roughly, about 1/3 of the units were given Growth Management, essentially taking 30 percent of the whole project and stated that is the Growth Management number. She requested staff to really look at those assumptions and make sure to indicate what the real answer is about Growth Management since Growth Management is so important. She further requested that this be done prior to the item going before the Council because it should not be assumed that there is no impact.

Chair Allen stated that a good standard should be set for Major Modifications to projects. She pointed out the latest Summerhill project included a lower number of residential units than previously proposed, and many of the assumptions around the Housing Element and project impacts were re-considered; however, she was not sure if, for this proposed project, Growth Management would be lower or higher, and she would like to know the answer to that. She added that with that, she did not feel a need for a staff presentation unless any of the Commissioners feel otherwise. She noted that she does not need an answer tonight and is satisfied that staff has committed to updating the material for the Council. She indicated that it is important that this information be out there, and if the number is higher, it needs to be built into the Growth Management plan.

Mr. Weinstein replied that Shweta Bonn, project planner, has been working hard today on compiling that data and noted that the preliminary data are pointing in the direction of the overall impact actually being reduced. He noted, for instance, that the overall number of bedrooms that would be provided as part of that previous project, compared

to the current project, is diminishing from 235 to 217, and associated impacts, including water use, traffic, and so forth would also be expected to diminish. He added that the data will be incorporated into the City Council agenda report once they are refined and triple-checked.

Chair Allen thanked staff and clarified that her reason for bringing this up was not so much a big concern of this project because it did not appear to be significant, but because there could be other projects for which the Commission would need to know the answer.

Commissioner Ritter expressed concern about the affordable housing numbers and wanted to make sure that the City is still meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements even with the reduction in the number of units.

Mr. Weinstein replied that there is an Affordable Housing Agreement that would still apply to this current project, and the reduction in the number of units would not affect that. He explained that the RHNA requirements are really just the capacity of the City's residentially zoned lands to accommodate housing; it does not necessarily require the actual construction of the housing units. He reiterated that a change in the number of units in this respect should not affect the City's affordable housing obligations.

Commissioner O'Connor moved to: (1) find that the previously prepared Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Supplemental EIR, including the adopted California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, are adequate to serve as the environmental documentation for this project and satisfy all the requirements of CEQA; (2) find that the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan is consistent with the Pleasanton General Plan and Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch; (3) make the PUD findings for the proposed Development Plan, as listed in the staff report; and (4) recommend approval of Case PUD-68-06M, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, O'Connor, Nagler, Piper, and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Balch

Resolution No. PC-2015-20 recommending approval of Case PUD-68-06M was entered and adopted as motioned.