

**Hacienda PUD and Guidelines Update**

**PUD-81-30-57/PUD-85-08-30M and PUD-81-30-58M/PUD-85-08-31M**

**Application for Major Modifications to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Hacienda Business Park (Hacienda) to update the Hacienda PUD development plan and Design Guidelines.**

**Recused**

Commissioner Balch recused himself from participating in Items 6a and 6b due to financial interests and left the dais.

Associate Planner Jennifer Hagen gave the staff report and overview of the application for major modifications to the PUD for Hacienda Business Park to update its PUD development plan and design guidelines.

Staff has reviewed proposed changes to the PUD development plan and finds they are consistent with the policy of the zoning ordinance and the General Plan as well as the goals and objectives of the Hacienda PUD. Overall, staff is supportive and finds the new methodology provides a unified approach consistent across all projects and would be appropriate for all new development.

Ms. Hagen then discussed updates and modifications for the permitted uses and modifications to the design guidelines. Staff believes the document is consistent with the scope, content and intent of the original guidelines and will aid in streamlining the development process within Hacienda Business Park.

Lastly, staff believes the proposed modifications are consistent with the original intent and purpose of the PUD development plan and the City's General Plan and staff recommends the Commission find that the findings can be made pursuant to CEQA guidelines, that the application is consistent with the General Plan, make the findings of the proposed modifications listed within Exhibit A and adopt the resolution recommending the City Council approve the application numbers, subject to the PUD Development Plan draft conditions as well as draft conditions in Exhibit A.

Commissioner Brown asked staff to explain the rationale for the change to the post-1993 system which takes traffic into account when calculating development against the "cap".

Mr. Beaudin directed the question to James Paxson, General Manager, Hacienda Business Park.

James Paxson explained the change was to help Hacienda at a difficult time during the downturn in the economy in 1993. A master traffic study was done at the time that considered all the undeveloped land and equated it to a certain amount of office development. The traffic study correlated the capacity of the then undeveloped land and set up an equivalency of trip rates to be used on new development such that if an office building was built, they drew down one for one, but if something more intensive was built, like a restaurant, they would take the ratio of the trip rates and accelerate the drawdown on the cap based on the ratio of two or more trip rates. Conversely, when a lower-intensity use like warehousing was developed, the draw-down from the cap was lower.

Vice Chair Ritter asked if the Hacienda Owners Association had worked with a task force, and if the Association had sought feedback from its business on what updates were needed to the PUD and Design Guidelines.

Mr. Paxon said there had not been a task force and noted it had been 25 years since the PUD had last undergone a major modification to the PUD, with no update to the design guidelines since then. The Association had solicited feedback over time and the zoning code amendment approved a couple of years ago was the “springboard” that motivated the comprehensive update. They took the opportunity, as part of their update, to better align their uses within the PUD to the City Zoning Code which will make things much simpler.

He thanked staff for their support and efforts to go thoughtfully through this and come up with the documents before the Commission.

**THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Chair Allen asked and confirmed there were no speakers.

**THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Commissioners voiced support of the request.

**Commissioner Ritter moved to approve Case PUD-81-30-57/PUD-85-08-30M and PUD-81-30-58M/PUD-85-08-31M.**

**Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, Ritter**  
**NOES: None**  
**RECUSED: Balch**  
**ABSENT: O’Connor**