



PLEASANTON.

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 9, 2015

To: Members of the Planning Commission

From: Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager

Cc: Gerry Beaudin, Community Development Director
 Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney
 Larissa Seto, Assistant City Attorney
 Eric Luchini, Associate Planner
 Galen Grant, Applicant Representative

Subject: Item 6.a.
 PUD-109
 273 Spring Street

This memo was prepared to answer questions and respond to comments about the 273 Spring Street project recently posed by a member of the Commission, and to clarify and correct text in the staff report (text added to the staff report is shown in underline; deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~).

- 1. Question/Comment:** *Since Section 18.88.040(C) of the Pleasanton Municipal Code prohibits tandem parking, the tally of proposed residential parking spaces in the table on page 13 is misleading.*

Answer: The table on page 13 of the staff report is revised as follows:

Site Development Standard:	Required:	Proposed:
Floor Area Ratio	300 percent maximum	91 percent
Building Height	40 feet maximum	30 feet
Setbacks		
Front (Spring Street)	None Required	6 feet
Rear (north side)	None Required	5 feet
East Side	None Required	2.5 to 3 feet
West Side	None Required	30 feet
Site Area per Dwelling Unit	1,000 sq. ft. minimum per unit	3,397 sq. ft. per unit
Parking		
Commercial/Office Building	11 spaces with parking credit (see discussion below)	4 on-site spaces and in-lieu agreement for 7 spaces
Apartment Units	9 spaces	9 spaces*

*Please note that four of the proposed spaces would be tandem spaces, which are not allowed in base zoning districts, per Section 18.88.040(C) of the PMC. However, the PUD process is designed to provide relief from the base zoning district standards, at the discretion of the City.

2. **Question/Comment:** *The statement on page 3 of the staff report (“The use of the residential driveways for parking was supported.”) is incorrect or misleading in that the Commission never discussed reducing owner/renter garage or driveway parking.*

Answer: The text quoted above was intended to indicate that the Commission agreed that the previously-proposed driveways spaces could acceptably accommodate guest parking, and was not intended to suggest that the Planning Commission would support the currently-proposed use of driveways for tandem parking. Page 3 of the staff report is revised to clarify this point:

Parking

The Commission was not supportive of granting a parking credit for the existing building to be demolished or the in-lieu proposal and wanted adequate on-site parking provided for all proposed uses per the Pleasanton Municipal Code (PMC). The Commission agreed that adequate parking was not provided for the commercial use. The use of the residential driveways for two spaces of guest parking for each residential unit was supported.

3. **Question/Comment:** *The statement on page 14 of the staff report (“In this case, the proposal is providing 56.5 percent of its required on-site parking; therefore, the City Council must approve the requested in-lieu agreement.”) is incorrect in that the Council may also decide to deny the request.*

Answer: The quoted text above was intended to indicate that if the City Council desired to approve the project as currently-proposed it would also need to approve an in-lieu parking agreement for seven spaces. Page 14 of the staff report is revised to clarify this point:

The applicant is proposing four dedicated on-site parking spaces for the proposed commercial/office building. As a result, including the parking credit described above and the four dedicated on-site parking spaces, the applicant would be requesting an in-lieu parking agreement, as permitted by the PMC, for seven spaces for the proposed commercial/office building. PMC Section 18.88.120.A.1.b. states that new construction which provides less than 85 percent of its required on-site parking may satisfy its deficit parking through in lieu parking agreements. Such agreements shall be subject to the approval of the City Council. In this case, the proposal is providing 56.5 percent of its required on-site parking; therefore, the City Council would need to ~~must~~ approve the requested in-lieu agreement if it were to approve the project as currently proposed.

4. **Question/Comment:** *The statement on page 15 of the staff report (“Based on the direction provided by the Commission . . .”) implies that the Commission directed garage parking spaces to be removed.*

Answer: The text cited above was intended to indicate that, based on the general guidance provided by the Planning Commission (which encompassed comments on parking, but also other topics such as building setback and the size of the commercial space), the applicant revised the project. Page 15 of the staff report is clarified as follows:

The Work Session proposal included a total of four parking spaces for each of the four, three-story, multi-family residential units; two within a garage and two within a driveway. Based on the various suggestions for project modifications made by the Planning Commission (which encompassed many project elements), ~~direction provided by the Commission,~~ the applicant elected to reduce the square footage of the four, three-story, multi-family residential units, which includes providing only a one-car garage and a tandem space in the driveway, in order to expand the size of the commercial/office building and provide four on-site spaces dedicated to this component of the project. Staff notes that the square footage reduction did not reduce the bedroom count for each of the four, three-story, multi-family residential units, as they would all still include three bedrooms. Thus, while four

dedicated parking spaces have been created for the commercial/office building, each of the four, three-story, multi-family residential units have lost two parking spaces from the Work Session proposal and would rely on tandem parking to meet the minimum code requirement of two spaces for each of the four, three-story, multi-family residential units.

- 5. Question/Comment:** *The staff report recommendation to support the project as proposed (without designated guest parking for the residential units) is inconsistent with the previous staff report, past precedent, and the feedback from the Planning Commission workshop.*

Response: As discussed on page 15 of the staff report, the proposed residential parking meets the parking requirements of the Core Area Overlay District (which does not require the provision of guest parking). Although staff generally encourages the provision of guest parking in development projects, we realize that there are competing objectives that affect the quality of a development project. In this case, these competing objectives include the desire to set back the main commercial building from Spring Street, provide parking reserved for the commercial uses, minimize building massing, expand the commercial/retail building, and expand the parking supply. When reviewing the latest iteration of the project, staff took all of these competing objectives into account and believes that the provision of two tandem parking spaces per residential unit is acceptable in light of the location of the project (within the walkable and transit-accessible Downtown), key project objectives (to foster an active retail presence along Spring Street while accommodating new housing), and the overall urban design quality of the project (which staff believes will enhance a lot that has been mostly vacant for many years). However, the Planning Commission may rightfully disagree with staff's recommendation regarding the provision of parking or any other element of the project.

- 6. Question/Comment:** *Please provide the amount of required and provided parking at the project located at 261 Spring Street, next door to 273 Spring Street.*

Response: In March 2011, the Planning Commission held a workshop on a proposed project at 261 Spring Street, which included the construction of one three-story dwelling unit with an attached two-car garage and a 975-square-foot basement, which would be used for commercial storage. This project never advanced from the preliminary stage and was not ultimately approved.

- 7. Question/Comment:** *Why did the staff report not mention that the Downtown Specific Plan identifies the project site as a potential parking facility?*

Response: Figure VI-1 and page 50 of the Downtown Specific Plan identify the project site as a "Potential Public Parking Lot Assessment District." However, the site is also designated for Downtown Commercial uses in the Downtown Specific Plan, and in the absence of a land use designation for Public uses (similar to the Railroad Corridor), an existing Public Parking Lot Assessment District, or concrete plans to convert the site into a public parking lot, staff believes the Downtown Commercial land use designation should primarily govern analysis of the appropriateness of future development on the site. Staff is currently undertaking a comprehensive Downtown parking study that will evaluate existing parking conditions and potential solutions to meet parking demand (this work effort will include revisiting the parking facility schematics in the Downtown Specific Plan).

- 8. Question/Comment:** *Will the project result in the loss of an on-street parking space? And if so, why didn't staff recommend an in-lieu payment for the lost space?*

Response: The project will not result in the loss of an on-street parking space, with

implementation of a recommended condition of approval requiring the applicant to revise the project plans to reduce the width of the site entrance driveway from 25 feet wide to 20 feet wide, matching the on-site drive aisle width. Therefore, staff did not recommend the payment of an in-lieu fee for on-street parking.

- 9. Question/Comment:** *Kimberly Commons is a questionable precedent related to tandem parking, as it is different from the 273 Spring Street site in many respects.*

Response: Staff referenced the Kimberly Commons project as an example of tandem parking on page 11 of the staff report because the Kimberly Commons project is located Downtown; it is of relatively recent construction (about 10 years old); and staff isn't aware of any reported problems regarding the use of tandem parking on the site. The use of tandem parking in Kimberly Commons was debated when the project was considered by the Planning Commission and City Council. Arguably, that history is not relevant in ascertaining whether the tandem parking currently functions acceptably. Staff did not intend to suggest that the Kimberly Commons project is similar to the 273 Spring Street project in all respects, nor did staff rely solely on the Kimberly Commons project as justification for the inclusion of tandem parking within the subject project. Tandem parking is not common in newer residential projects in Pleasanton. As described on page 16 of the staff report, key considerations that staff believes support the acceptability of tandem parking include the project's Downtown location (and historic patterns of tandem parking) and the constrained nature of the narrow and deep site. The Planning Commission may rightfully disagree with this assessment.

- 10. Question/Comment:** *Please provide a link to the meeting minutes from the August 26, 2015 Planning Commission workshop on the project.*

Response: The workshop minutes can be accessed via the following link:
<http://admin.cityofpleasantonca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=26553>

- 11. Staff-initiated Comment:** In earlier comments, the Planning Commission requested visual simulations of the project from Main Street, and one such simulation was provided on page 10 of the staff report. Since publication of the report, staff has worked with the applicant to prepare an additional simulation of the project, to show views of the project looking northeast down Spring Street from a viewpoint near the intersection of Main and Spring Streets (see following page):

