



ITEM 1: SUMMARY OF MEETING #10

Draft Summary of Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force Meeting #10

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Task Force Members Present

1 Jerry Thorne, Mayor (Chair)	2 Dirk Christiansen, Pleasanton Downtown Association
3 Justin Brown, Planning Commission	4 Herb Ritter, Planning Commission
5 Laura Olson, Pleasanton Downtown Association	6 Steve Baker, Economic Vitality Committee
7 Jan Batcheller, At-Large	8 Jim Merryman, At-Large
9 Teri Pohl, At-Large	

City of Pleasanton Staff

1 Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development	2 Brian Dolan, Assistant City Manager
3 Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner	4 Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer
5 Pamela Ott, Director of Economic Development	6 Kendall Granucci, Office Manager
7 Melinda Denis, Interim Planning Manager	8 Megan Canales, Assistant Planner

Professional Services

1 Sophie Martin, Principal, Dyett & Bhatia	2 Meghan McNulty, Planner, Dyett & Bhatia
---	--

1. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview. The meeting was called to order and the meeting agenda was discussed.

B. Review and Approval of Meeting #9 Summary. The Task Force voted to approve the Meeting #9 Summary. *Nine in favor; zero opposed.*

2. Public Comment

A. Correspondence. The City provided a summary of public correspondence received. Topics raised included:

- Transportation, including potential traffic impacts, potential parking impacts, and the desire for improved public transportation service
- Providing pedestrian access to community spaces throughout the downtown
- Providing amenities for multiple generations of downtown users
- Parklets and other street features
- Degree of change related to streetscapes
- Whether the existing Civic Center should relocate, and if so, proposed Civic Center uses

B. Meeting Open to the Public. Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment on items not on the agenda. There were no comments at this time.

3. Review Public Feedback on Preliminary Options

A. Presentation and Discussion of Public Feedback. City staff summarized outreach activities, including the online survey, community workshop, and City staff-led outreach.

B. Presentation and Discussion of Online Survey Results. Dyett & Bhatia discussed the findings from the online survey and other outreach activities. Key findings from the outreach activities are below:

- Division Street
 - In the online survey, the High-Degree Change had the most first choice votes
 - In the online survey, the Medium-Degree Change had the highest weighted score
 - Workshop participants mostly preferred the Medium- or High-Degree Change
 - Many respondents said that they were concerned about access to businesses on Division Street and parking, should Division Street become pedestrian-only

- Peters Avenue
 - In the online survey, the No Change option had the most first-choice votes
 - In the online survey, the Medium-Degree Change had the highest weighted score
 - Workshop participants mostly preferred the Medium- or High-Degree Changes
 - Some respondents expressed concern about the impacts narrowing travel lanes would have on vehicle movement
- First Street
 - In the online survey, Medium-Degree Change had the most first choice votes
 - In the online survey, Medium-Degree Change had the highest weighted score
 - Workshop participants preferred the Medium-Degree Change
 - Most respondents expressed an interest in having street parking remain in place
- Main Street
 - In the online survey, the High-Degree Change received the most first choice votes
 - In the online survey, the Medium-Degree change had the highest weighted score
 - Workshop participants preferred the Medium- or High-Degree Change
 - Many respondents were concerned about removing parking and street trees
- Civic Center
 - In the online survey, respondents had positive reactions to the land use emphasis (Arts and Culture)
 - In the online survey, respondents indicated interest in seeing a food hall, followed by a larger town square, and pedestrian-only streets incorporated into this option
 - Respondents overall liked the Town Square but wanted it to be larger
 - Some respondents did not want to see housing in this area but others were supportive of housing on the Civic Center site
 - Respondents liked the idea of having amenities on the Civic Center site that will make it an attractive place for families
 - Some respondents expressed reluctance about moving the Civic Center and/or Library

- Many respondents thought the parking garage should move closer to the ACE station
- Respondents want any new changes to keep with the scale and character of Downtown
- Active Ground Floor Uses
 - The Chamber of Commerce thought active ground floor uses should be encouraged but not required
 - The PDA Board of Directors preferred requiring active ground floor uses
- Community Benefits
 - In the online survey, about half of respondents said buildings on Main Street should never be allowed to exceed the allowed height limits (2-3 stories)
 - At the community workshop, most people were interested in allowing greater heights (up to one story) in exchange for a substantial community benefit

C. Task Force Comments and Questions. There were no Task Force comments at this time.

D. Public Comments and Questions.

- The ranking system in the online survey did not specify that 1 was the highest ranking and 3 was the lowest ranking. Therefore, the ranking results should have less weight in the Task Force’s decision-making process
- People at the community workshop had unlimited votes in community benefits question, which may have skewed the results towards allowing greater building heights in exchange for community benefits
- The Task Force should take the online survey responses into higher consideration than the community workshop because there were 1,000 online survey responses but only 20 people at the workshop
- There should be a contingency plan in case the Civic Center does not move
- Two-story buildings are allowed on Main Street as-of-right and three-story buildings are allowed conditionally. The public is likely not familiar with these regulations, which may have impacted the results of the community benefits question

4. Provide Direction on Preferred Plan

A. Discussion and Direction on Preferred Options. Task Force members discussed the options and voted on their preferred direction.

- Division Street
 - The Task Force selected the High-Degree Change
 - Comments:

- Some expressed concern about how removing cars will impact traffic on Main Street
 - Want to know about costs of implementing the High-Degree Change
 - A few Task Force members recommended removing bollards from the High-Degree Change
 - Concern about businesses and parking on this street if Division Street is closed to cars
 - A few Task Force members were interested in an option somewhere between the Medium- and High-Degree Change
 - Could start by implementing something like the Medium-Degree Change (shared vehicle and pedestrian road) and transition to the High-Degree Change (pedestrians-only) over time
- Peters Avenue
 - The Task Force selected the High-Degree Change
 - Comments:
 - The cycle track in the High-Degree Change should move to the other side of the street
 - Peters Avenue makes sense as a primary cycling corridor
 - Medium-Degree Change was also acceptable to many Task Force Members
 - A Task Force member did not want street trees to reduce the number of parallel parking spaces
 - Task Force members want to make sure narrowing travel lanes will not impede vehicle traffic
 - Landscaping along Peters Avenue should mimic that of Main Street
- First Street
 - The Task Force selected the Medium-Degree Change
 - Comments:
 - Parking needs to remain on First Street
 - There should be very clear signage and wayfinding to guide cyclists to the parallel Transportation Corridor
 - If the preferred option for Peters Avenue is the High-Degree Change, the High-Degree Change on the First Street is not necessary because Peters Avenue will be the primary biking corridor

- Landscaping along First Street should be of a similar quality to that of Main Street
- Main Street
 - The Task Force selected the Medium-Degree Change
 - Comments
 - Many were opposed to moving dining areas into parking lanes
 - In some places, it may be appropriate to move the curb out into the parking lane to widen the sidewalk, but not necessarily place outdoor dining adjacent to traffic
 - Sidewalks could possibly be widened only near restaurants to accommodate dining
 - The Plan should consider the transition from Main Street to the rest of the Planning Area
 - Landscaping needs to be improved and carefully considered
- Civic Center
 - Town Square
 - The Task Force decided the Town Square needs to be bigger than shown in the draft land use diagram
 - Comments:
 - Some Task Force members liked the idea of moving the Town Square where the hotel is shown, but others did not
 - Task Force members generally agreed the Town Square should be next to the theater and retail
 - Ground floor residential
 - The Task Force decided not to allow residential on the ground floor
 - Parking structure
 - The Task Force recommended moving the parking structure to Block 3
 - Comments
 - City should consider paid parking downtown
 - Some Task Force members thought locating the parking structure at Block 1, 2, or 3 would not serve Main Street
 - The Plan could potentially add more parking elsewhere to serve Main Street
 - Some wanted to move the parking structure to Block 2
 - Should the City partner with ACE to construct the structure, some Task Force members want to make sure it not predominantly be used by ACE users alone

- Replacing the police station with a parking structure would be a difficult sell to voters
 - Overflow from sports fields can use the parking structure
 - Hotel
 - The Task Force recommended keeping the hotel as part of the land use diagram.
 - Other comments:
 - Need a shuttle system along Main Street
 - The draft land use diagram is not inspiring
 - The land use diagram should be more pedestrian-oriented
 - Limit retail on the site so as to support the theater but not compete with Main Street
 - Peters Avenue should connect to Bernal Avenue
 - Need to take into account the possibility of just some of the Civic Center uses moving and their phasing
- Active Ground Floor Uses
 - The Task Force recommended requiring active ground floor uses, with exceptions subject to Zoning Administrator approval
 - The Task Floor recommended excluding personal service establishments from the definition of active ground floor uses
 - Comments:
 - A few Task Force members wanted to include personal service establishments in the active ground floor use definition, but exclude massage uses
 - Some Task Force Members expressed hesitance to require active ground floor uses, as this may be onerous to property owners
- Community Benefits
 - The Task Force decided to wait to vote on this until they have additional information, but did agree that they would like to learn more about this concept
 - Comments:
 - Some thought it might be acceptable to allow more height only if it is a community building
 - Public feedback was against taller buildings

5. Task Force Check-In

A. Task Force Members Comment on the Planning Process To-Date. No questions or comments at this time.

6. Brief Announcements from Task Force and Staff, Summary and Next Steps

A. Summary of the Meeting and Review of Next Meeting Topics. The Planning Staff and Professional Services team will check in with City Council on December 19.