

Downtown Specific Plan Update

To review, consider, and recommend adoption of: (1) the updated Downtown Specific Plan; (2) various amendments to the General Plan, Downtown Design Guidelines, Downtown Hospitality Guidelines, and Municipal Code regulations; (3) modifications to land use designations for certain properties within the specific plan area; and review, consider, and recommend certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the updated plan.

Senior Planner Shweta Bonn presented the specifics of the item in the Agenda Report.

Commissioner Brown referred to Item 3 regarding corner lots and stated this was not discussed during any of the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) Task Force meetings, and he asked why this was added.

Mr. Beaudin responded that as the discussion about residential visibility proceeded, the issue was apparent, and staff was therefore looking to the Planning Commission for policy direction. The Commission does not have to address this topic in the plan, but staff will want to ensure these issues are raised through the remainder of the process because it is not clear how residential visibility is addressed on a corner lot.

Commissioner Ritter inquired how the City addresses visibility in other parts of Pleasanton.

Mr. Beaudin responded that the City currently does not have policies that require a project to minimize visibility of a use or structure. Staff arrived at the options to address visibility, and staff is looking for guidance to clarify for applicants and staff as to how to move forward on these particular locations in the downtown.

Commissioner Ritter inquired as to who came up with the idea of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for residential development.

Mr. Beaudin responded that after the DSP Task Force meeting and City Council meeting it was clear there was a lot of concern in how and where residential is added. The suggested approach is a way to have direction from the Planning Commission on how to add residential uses in the downtown and proceed with this process.

Commissioner Brown referenced Mike Carey's email regarding Policy LD.P-49 regarding existing buildings and landscaping on City property as part of the new residential infill project. He questioned whether the policy raised was ever brought up during a Task Force meeting.

Ms. Clark responded this particular policy has been part of the plan since the red-lined draft was reviewed, early on in the Task Force's discussions. Therefore, it has been included in the draft plan for some time.

Commissioner Brown asked if it was incremental or different than the plan proposed.

Ms. Clark responded that the existing Downtown Specific Plan does not include a similar policy.

Mr. Beaudin commented that staff is open to discussing and making changes to the currently proposed policy given this is a public process and there is every intention to keep information transparent. The Task Force has gone through chapter by chapter with the red-lined versions of the document and everything has been publicly available since November 2018, short of the things that had come up in the February Task Force meeting and at City Council direction.

Commissioner Ritter inquired about the existing General Plan and amendments made to it and the process for making changes. He noted that there have been six instances where changes were made to the General Plan up until 2015 and possibly a few more afterwards. He asked what the main reason was for these General Plan amendments.

Mr. Beaudin responded that the reasons have varied. For example, the 2015 changes related to the Housing Element. The Planning Commission will be reviewing a request for a General Plan Amendment related to Workday, Inc. and an office project in the coming months. The General Plan is a living document, with robust public, Planning Commission and City Council review undertaken whenever changes are proposed.

Chair Allen posed a clarifying question regarding corner lots. Her understanding in listening to the City Council's input on ground floor residential was that it needed to be behind commercial on the key streets identified in the downtown plan. She asked staff to confirm if the item about residential visibility on corner lots had been raised because staff had identified it as an implementation issue, or if the City Council was asking staff to re-look at corner lots because it has been brought up as a concern.

Mr. Beaudin responded that it became an implementation question for staff in how to evaluate a project that has residential behind commercial on a corner lot if the goal is to minimize visibility. There is a practical question about how to minimize visibility of a corner lot from an adjacent location. The residential is behind from the narrower frontage, but it will be fully exposed from the side.

Chair Allen referenced live/work and her understanding from a Task Force meeting was that live/work would not be on the ground floor in commercial areas. In the latest recommendation she is reading that live/work could be allowed anywhere but on Main Street. Therefore, she asked whether this shifted because she would think they would want to have live/work be consistent with whatever the strategy was for ground floor residential.

Mr. Beaudin responded that it depends on the configuration of live/work. By code, it is considered a residential use and it is habitable space for living, but the configuration will matter. There could be live/work where there is a commercial use at grade and residential above or residential behind, depending on where it sits in the district. And, staff does not want to preclude live/work because it has a commercial component as well but will be looking at it in the same light as residential use.

Chair Allen inquired about how the Planning Commission should be thinking about input on parking issues in this process.

Mr. Beaudin suggested continuing to address parking the same way that had been recommended to the Task Force, which is to rely on the existing Downtown Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan, which includes prioritized means of addressing both parking supply

and parking management. Specific Plan Chapter 5 is the Mobility and Parking chapter in the document, and it refers back to the Parking Strategy document and other plans by reference. The Parking Strategy reflects City Council's policy related to downtown parking and there is a strategy to add supply and to better manage the current supply. Therefore, Mr. Beaudin encouraged the Planning Commission to rely on the documents that have been adopted. He hears concerns about parking regularly and staff is continuing to move forward to implement the Parking Strategy.

Commissioner Brown inquired about the formal process to modify the parking strategy if so desired. He asked if it would require one of the Councilmembers to table it as a work item.

Mr. Beaudin responded that if there is a desire from the Planning Commission to address parking a different way, staff would like to hear from the Commission at this time as to how they recommend the Parking Strategy be amended, noting there is a process to do so. The City Council can consider it as part of the DSP, or to go back and re-evaluate the Downtown Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan as a City Council Work Plan item. In the context of the downtown plan, he would recommend the Commission make their recommendation with an indication of the kinds of changes desired.

Commissioner Brown inquired about an alternate way for the City Council to consider the feedback from the public around parking, and he inquired if City Council would have to identify downtown parking as a work plan priority item.

Mr. Beaudin confirmed, and indicated that the Planning Commission could recommend specific suggestions related to parking. He added that this is where policymaking in an engaged community comes into play. He acknowledged that the City Council is weighing those issues as they pertain to parking in the downtown. He referenced the parking structure originally recommended by City Council and the significant costs and other issues surrounding that concept.

Commissioner Brown said his purpose is not to hold up the process, but he wanted to identify what the process would be for the parking strategy as a subject of continued debate. He summarized that the City Council would have to add it to the Work Plan.

Chair Allen clarified that the Planning Commission can choose to make a strong recommendation that the City Council take this on.

Commissioner Ritter referenced asterisks next to some of the comments and changes that state "per City Council direction." He asked if the Planning Commission could make modifications or suggestions for these.

Mr. Beaudin said staff wanted to let the Planning Commission know those were the topics the City Council has weighed in on previously, and the Commission can include its recommendation for final consideration by the City Council.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

Steve Van Dorn, President and CEO of the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce, spoke of the Chamber's support of the Task Force. He said the Chamber's position differs from the Task

Force on the active ground floor overlay but that the Chamber supports the residential overlay for the Shell site located at 4212 First Street and the Barone's site located at 475 and 493 St. John Street, which was not in their letter. The Chamber represents over 725 businesses throughout the City and all they hear is that parking is not sufficient downtown and that more parking is needed to keep downtown vibrant. There are also concerns with the added PUD process which constrains development and they would like this removed.

Regarding the process, he recognized it as unfortunate that some of the stakeholders that are now speaking up were not involved in the beginning. In closing, he relayed that the Chamber supports the Task Force's recommendations and asked that more parking downtown be discussed.

Peter MacDonald asked that the Planning Commission vote "no" on the draft DSP. He was generally in support of the comments submitted by the Chamber of Commerce and the Pleasanton Downtown Association (PDA), Mike Carey and most of what the Task Force recommended at their last meeting. He said the plan's fatal flaw is that there is no mention of additional parking in the downtown area. The plan proposes to manage the parking problem by having shorter time limits for parking, and until the specific plan is revised to provide for substantial public parking in the downtown core, he asked to vote "no."

Property Owner Shashi Raj said his architect, Tony Meo, has worked on hundreds of projects now and in the past and thinks foot traffic is what adds to the vitality of any neighborhood, as well as adequate parking, safety, and mixed use, and he favors mixed zoning in the downtown neighborhoods.

Tony Meo, Architect, said he would love to live and work in the downtown and patronize restaurants, stores and businesses. He suggested having a shuttle to downtown from other areas and to allow mixed use and Live Work to encourage more people to live in the downtown. He referred to two- and three-story buildings and, commented that some two-story buildings can appear more massive than three-story buildings, and that three-story buildings can be better architecturally articulated, and hopes that three-story buildings will be permitted in downtown Pleasanton.

Paulette Goodrich said she is a long-time resident of Pleasanton, is retired and was involved in a marketing career and active service with local organizations. She spoke of what Pleasanton used to look like in the 1970s, and voiced concern that the Planning Commission has turned down the City Council's height recommendations and concerns about residential uses. Having lived and worked in San Francisco, she indicated her position against having three-story structures on Main Street because of wind, shade, and aesthetics and she asked to keep the downtown core on Main Street as is.

Jan Batcheller, DSP Task Force member, said there are things being presented in this plan that were not brought up during the Task Force meetings and not fully understood by the Task Force. The City used to want to hear from stakeholders, but now stakeholders are considered to have a conflict of interest and not allowed to be involved. She agrees with most of what the Chamber of Commerce and PDA has communicated, and they are key stakeholders. She referred to parking apps which indicate where parking is available, and she asked for a right to do business ordinance. She strongly disagrees with the PUD recommendation, stating there

are more costs, time and staff involved. She also agrees with the Chamber and PDA regarding building height and Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

Kelly Mokashi said she is a new resident to the community and referred to Number 5 of the development standards. She is speaking on maintaining the preservation of the downtown historical areas and noted that one goal states to maintain traditional character and scale when new buildings are built. She indicated that some of the recently constructed buildings downtown are disproportional when compared to existing buildings. She asked that scale, proportion, and historic quaintness be preserved in the downtown, particularly a two-story maximum.

Wilson Wendt, Attorney representing the Safreno family who own 4212 First Street (Shell service station), urged the Planning Commission to follow the Task Force recommendation and City Council's recommendation that the gas station property be designated with an overlay so it can be developed for residential use. He said they have done some work on projects that would provide amenities to the community and understands their obligation, but this allows them to move forward without having to amend the recently adopted DSP.

Guy Houston, representing the Safreno family and the gas station, referred to the two- and three-story buildings and said it seems the Task Force and City Council both indicate 30 feet as a limitation. He believes that a 30-foot, two-story building would be unattractive and out of proportion and asked to keep in mind the compatibility of other three-story structures next door to the gas station. The City Council has stated two stories maximum with the ability to consider additional height through a PUD. Therefore, he asked the Planning Commission to maintain the 30-foot maximum, but that three-stories within the 30-foot limit be permitted in the outlying areas, such as on First Street.

Gene Finch voiced concerns with the Downtown Specific Plan review, its recommendations and what is being presented. He believes there are issues surrounding the lack of parking in the downtown area, does not want the downtown area changed, asked to keep things simple and to stop changing rules and regulations.

Bryan Bowers said he is a downtown property owner and current President of the PDA. He reiterated the PDA's support for the Task Force recommendations made at the February 26 meeting and re-affirmed at the last DSP meeting. He referred to the removal of the PUD process for residential in the downtown, stating the PUD process is a long, cumbersome and sometimes expensive process. He cited change of ownership in achieving the highest and best use of property while keeping the historic charm of the downtown.

The PDA is against having the PUD required for residential projects. And, while he appreciates staff's efforts in balancing competing viewpoints, they would not want a PUD for options such as new ground floor residential or if residential does not already exist since two properties side by side could have very different requirements. He also asked that outdoor seating be a Zoning Administrator (ZA) decision and not a Planning Commission decision. Lastly, requiring commercial to wrap around the corner seems like overkill where this is an issue that can be resolved by the ZA.

Laura Olson, Executive Director of PDA, and member of the Downtown Specific Plan Task Force, voiced disappointment with what was being presented, stating the PDA Vitality

Committee began meeting and red-lining the 2002 DSP in 2013. They provided it to staff in 2014 and have been awaiting this process. She said although there have been wins, there have also been some very big missed opportunities and she asked to explore what other communities are doing or have done and expressed her disappointment in the plan.

Arne Olson expressed that he feels the Planning Commission tonight is being asked to make decisions on too much during this meeting and asked why. He agrees with a previous comment that there is more to be done with the Task Force, but believes the Commission is being pushed. The real objective here is to move everything across Bernal Avenue, and this should be done but things are moving too quickly and he asked that the Commission push back on the parking.

Sharrell Michelotti voiced support of the Chamber of Commerce and PDA's comments, echoed parking concerns and challenged the Planning Commission to review what has been presented and what has been sent by the Chamber and PDA via public comments. She expressed her concerns surrounding the parking situation and was also very disappointed in the City Council's action to come up with so many new requirements that did not reflect what the Task Force spent over two years in presenting.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

BREAK- Chair Allen called for a 5-minute recess at 8:18 p.m. and, thereafter, reconvened the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Chair Allen reiterated that the Planning Commission will take time to work through the issues and, if they do not finish tonight, they will continue the matter to another meeting.

Commissioner Brown suggested adding to the list of discussion items: the PUD process; draft Policy LD-P.49, the Shell and Barone's properties; parking; MU-T (FAR versus 300); outdoor dining; a discussion around residential two-story versus three-story; and the ground floor residential piece and put that ahead of corner lots to ensure there is concurrence.

Chair Allen suggested putting the discussion of ground floor residential ahead of the PUD item, because there may be some implications as a result.

Commissioner Ritter noted there are seven items being asked of the Planning Commission tonight and he expressed that decisions are being expected to be made by the Commission on multiple plans and the idea that many Commissioners are split on their opinions.

He said staff provided the Task Force and City Council's recommendations but did not evaluate both and did not provide any recommendations. He noted prospective business/building owners are calling him directly prior to filing a permit to see if they can get their idea through the planning process and he voiced concerns with this and noted that we are simply adding to the list of requirements for homeowners and developers. He indicated he does not want to over-regulate and recommended breaking down the topics more.

Commissioner Brown thought the Planning Commission could break down the topics at hand and he did not see it quite as dire, stating there are many things they are not debating tonight such as the renderings on what they eventually would like Main Street to look like. He agreed,

for example, that making PUDs mandatory for all residential projects that fill all of the zoning requirements is adding an undue burden. And, he does not want to necessarily throw everything out or say everything needs to be separated out.

Commissioner Ritter said he also noted there are only three Planning Commissioners present tonight and the General Plan Amendment could encompass the entire meeting alone. He asked if all three Commissioners could participate.

Mr. Beaudin said of the three Planning Commissioners not participating, two Commissioners have conflicts of interest and one is absent.

Chair Allen said she feels it is a lot of content but also cited a sense of responsibility to move forward. She suggested starting with the simpler items and getting them out of the way or starting with the more difficult, starting with the ground floor residential issue. Conversely, she expressed Planning Commissioners could start with the existing topic list and move on from there.

Outdoor Dining in MU-T:

Chair Allen asked if Planning Commissioners wanted approval of outdoor dining to go to the Planning Commission or through the normal process other discretionary projects might go through with the ZA.

Commissioner Brown stated the purpose of the MU-T was to feather between commercial and residential and to provide a buffer. The concern was around liquor licenses, noise, etc. When considering noise and outdoor dining, that would require extra oversight. He did not want to overburden Planning Commissioners with regulating it when it could be addressed through the ZA.

Commissioner Ritter concurred, but with the caveat that there is a right to do business ordinance in place.

Chair Allen expressed that the ZA should be able to make these decisions. She asked Commissioner Ritter to comment more about why the City would have to have a right to do business ordinance.

Commissioner Ritter explained the concept is that people need to acknowledge that if they move to the downtown they will be living in a zone where there will be noise, outside dining, and other factors.

Chair Allen referred to the discussion of the Task Force because this was brought up as a recommendation, and staff said there were problems with a right to do business ordinance like Livermore has. The Task Force agreed to back away from it, so she wanted to understand the downsides of it.

Mr. Beaudin responded that during the Downtown Hospitality Guideline discussion the idea of a right to do business ordinance was brought forward. At the time, it was deemed to be too onerous. In the meantime, staff is using the Hospitality Guidelines and conditions of approval on new residential projects that require disclosures. If moving to the downtown, there is noise

that comes along with that and this is the approach recommended and that was endorsed by the City Council.

Chair Allen asked if every residence built in the downtown would have to sign a disclosure at the time of sale.

Mr. Beaudin responded that they require this as part of the conditions of approval on residential projects in the downtown. There is a disclosure for for-sale units and provisions contained in lease agreements if units are leased. He noted these provisions would also provide more legality in cases where units surround businesses.

Commissioner Ritter expressed that he was in favor of the concept that people need to know what they are agreeing to.

Commissioner Brown asked if a right to do business ordinance would also be retroactive to existing residences versus only for new projects.

Mr. Beaudin said it could be, depending upon the way it is written and adopted by the City Council.

Chair Allen said she was somewhat on the edge because of the downsides. She asked how strongly Planning Commissioners feel about the right to do business ordinance versus what exists today.

Commissioner Ritter voiced his support for having such an ordinance in creating vitality in the downtown; otherwise, complaints from residents will be received.

Commissioner Brown said one of the objectives of the DSP was to have clearer rules.

Chair Allen confirmed Planning Commissioners were in agreement for a right to do business ordinance which would provide "more teeth" than today.

Commissioner Brown suggested phrasing it as agreeing with staff's recommendation that the ZA could administer requests for outdoor dining in the MU-T district with a strong recommendation from the Planning Commission that the City Council consider or re-consider a right to do business ordinance.

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus to support staff's recommendation that the Zoning Administrator could administer requests for outdoor dining in the Mixed Use-Transitional (MU-T) district with a strong recommendation from the Planning Commission that the City Council consider or re-consider a right to do business ordinance.

Residential Visibility:

Mr. Beaudin stated this item ties into corner lots, minimizing the visibility of residential uses in the downtown and how the City goes about doing that. The question is whether it is enough to have a general policy or a general policy with more specifics based on the geography of sites.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks the Planning Commission should also discuss this as it relates to the MU-T District because the pre-February Task Force meeting recommendation to feathering heights resulted in having the downtown at 40 feet, then Peters at 36 feet and residential at 30 feet. He liked this from a visibility perspective. When the City Council opted in and reasserted it was more in favor of the 36 feet/125 FAR versus the 40 feet/300 FAR, from his perspective, the main purpose of that was to feather the residential into the commercial and it was in keeping with the existing character of the downtown.

He recognized arguments around vitality but, at the end of the day they are establishing the opportunity for Peters Avenue to become a transitional district and what is there is not 40 feet/300 FAR. If it is changed to 40 feet/300 FAR, he thinks this encourages a different kind of thought than the 36 feet/125 FAR.

Commissioner Ritter asked about the 36 feet/300 FAR, noting it would be a mix of both to give some options on the feathering.

Commissioner Brown said he did not think 36 feet/300 FAR made sense in encouraging a different product.

Chair Allen agreed it did not make sense. It is currently designated as Office which is 30 feet and well below 100 FAR. It is increasing what the standards are today for the properties along here that are designated as Office.

Commissioner Brown concurred and said this is an opportunity to enhance the downtown and be a transitional district between residential and commercial, and to encourage a different type of product that feathers the two and allows for revitalization of the downtown. He thinks 36 feet/125 FAR still does that, whereas at 40 feet/300 FAR, they are just extending the downtown commercial into Peters Avenue and he was not sure he was in agreement with that.

Commissioner Ritter inquired whether there were currently existing buildings above 36-feet in the Mixed-Use Transitional area.

Mr. Beaudin said the West Angela/Peters Avenue townhouses are 34 feet, 6 inches in height. The St. Mary's Street project is 36 feet tall. The other two things that fall into this residential visibility category are the story poles and visual simulations which could be added to discussion.

Commissioner Brown proposed a motion that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council's recommendation around just the Mixed Use Transitional being 36 feet/125 maximum FAR.

Commissioner Ritter seconded, and said he would push against using the word "two-story" and "three-story" because if they keep to the number of feet, this is what the Task Force discussed.

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus that the Planning Commission support the City Council's direction for the MU-T District for 36 feet maximum height and 125 maximum Floor-Area-Ratio.

Commissioner Brown referred to “stories” and stated for the record, the City Council is putting this in there to be responsive to all of the feedback from all people. The reality is some of the public and architects love to talk about feet but everyone in day-to-day life talks about stories. They are trying to relate it to something people understand. The purpose of public government and public service is to produce things that people understand and can relate to. This is why he leans more towards the City Council for the purposes of moving this meeting along. Chair Allen suggested taking corner lots or residential visibility as the next topic of discussion.

Mr. Beaudin suggested discussing story poles and visual simulations.

Story Poles and Visual Simulations:

Chair Allen said she was in full support of the staff recommendation that requires story poles and visuals. The Planning Commission requires these on most of their controversial projects anyway, such as the project at 273 Spring Street, but they wanted to do a better job.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks it adds a new burden. If the project requires a PUD then he would support the Planning Commission requiring story poles. But, outside of the PUD process he did not believe it was necessary to regulate it.

Commissioner Ritter agreed story poles are useful in certain spots. He likes the idea of the picture visuals and commented that the Planning Commission also had drone visuals presented in the past.

Chair Allen asked if staff was proposing this on every project or mainly those that would fall into the PUD category.

Mr. Beaudin said staff is asking for guidance on where to apply it and to what level. Based upon recent projects, the types of story poles that are erected vary greatly. So, staff would be establishing standards to show how story poles should demonstrate the massing so there is consistency and so it is clear to the applicant and the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ritter asked if this could be addressed during PUD process.

Mr. Beaudin said staff would like to have clear direction to applicants about what story poles should look like and what types of projects the Planning Commission wants to see story poles, and it could be a PUD.

Commissioner Ritter asked for standards of other cities and asked if there was a minimum or maximum level.

Mr. Beaudin said some places are clearer than others about what story poles should look like. It is not up to the applicant to design their story pole program but instead in a way that the City sets out.

Chair Allen said to the degree story poles or visuals are used she believes there is some merit to having a standard. They had this as a potential for their priority list to the City Council, but it never met the test. If they use story poles it should be done in a way where people know what they expect.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks story poles and visuals should be considered a part of the PUD process and that standards should be developed, but he suggested this be brought back at a different time and meeting.

Commissioner Ritter agreed.

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus that a discussion of standards for story poles and visuals should be brought back at a future meeting.

Ground Floor Residential Uses on Corner Lots:

Commissioner Ritter said he was not in favor of doing anything to add to the existing permitting process in place which would create more regulation and burden. In the permit process, those questions are going to be asked and answered.

Commissioner Brown inquired whether Commissioner Ritter was in favor of the February 26 Task Force recommendation or the April 16 and May 7 City Council direction, or neither.

Commissioner Ritter said he was in favor of the February 26 Task Force recommendation.

Chair Allen said she was in favor of the City Council direction which, as she perceived, it was that both sides of a lot would be commercial. She referenced the Salt Craft project located at 377 St. Mary's Street and said if a project like that came forward, instead of having townhouses the goal would be to have the Peters Avenue side be commercial. Her reasoning is that if they want to get the side streets activated to be more commercial, they need to be made commercial. She said a lot of the long, narrower lots are along the east side of Peters Avenue and one of the goals of the Task Force was to begin to move more commercial and retail to side streets. If they allow what could be three-quarters of a long lot and have a small building similar to that where Salt Craft is located, and then the rest be townhouses, this would move residential and would give up the east side of Peters Avenue as a street that could be used in the future for commercial.

With that said, if commercial was impractical, she would be open to a PUD on a very, very narrow lot of 50 feet, but not 75 feet. Also, some of the corner lots are about 65 feet deep and in researching coffee shops and salons, the average salon is 1,250 square feet for six to eight people. The average coffee shop is about 1,500 square feet. So, there could easily be a 50- or 60-foot storefront but just not as deep, similar to Town Hall Books reversed which is about 30 feet of storefront and 70 feet deep.

Commissioner Ritter said he did not want to rule from the bench.

Chair Allen disagreed and said there is no ground floor residential on a street front, and a corner has two street fronts. To her, it is really clear if they keep it simple.

Commissioner Ritter said the Task Force had the same simple recommendation too.

Commissioner Brown said the Task Force recommendation talks about 50 feet commercial on the frontage on Main Street and side streets, whereas the City Council broke it down into downtown commercial which, by definition would include those corner ones and the mixed-use

transitional addresses Peters Avenue. The whole point of transitional is that there can be mixed-use.

Commissioner Ritter stated the Task Force voted 9-0 on ground floor residential use. Chair Allen noted that two months before the Task Force voted at its February meeting, it had directed almost the opposite: to support absolutely no ground floor residential downtown.

Commissioner Brown said the point is both the February 26 Task Force and April/May City Council recommendations are allowing ground floor residential and commercial. The question is whether or not you want to break it down by downtown commercial or a generic 50-foot recommendation for commercial frontage. In both cases, it allows residential behind commercial and trying to restrict residential on Main Street.

Chair Allen said the question is that on a corner lot there is a Salt Craft-type project and ground floor residential behind the St. Mary's Street side on that project. What you have is all residential right on the street front for Peters Avenue and at least two other long properties like those on Mr. Beaudin's list, including the mortgage company across the street that is almost the same lot size as where Salt Craft is located.

To be clear, if the Planning Commission was to allow the long side of that corner to go all residential, they would end up turning the east side of Peters Avenue into a predominantly residential area and not giving it an opportunity to go more commercial. She thinks the City Council clearly wants the commercial streets they are trying to protect for commercial to be commercial. If residential does not fit behind there then the lot does not make sense for residential, and this is where she comes out.

Commissioner Brown said to be honest, the City Council's definition with the same intent is a better definition because it is clearer and broken down, but this is just his view. He thinks in both cases they are sending a message they are allowing residential behind commercial, but they do not front the main commercial street.

Chair Allen asked if Commissioner Brown was saying that on a corner lot both sides need to be fronted with commercial.

Commissioner Brown stated this is a question specific to Downtown Commercial as it relates to Mixed-Use Transitional. He thought the Planning Commission should not prevent someone if they have a lot that fronts two streets on Peters Avenue to not have housing facing the street, because that is in alignment with the Downtown Design Guidelines. They want front doors facing streets, and he was not keen on wrapping around on Peters Avenue of commercial and having impractical residential behind.

Chair Allen said her read of some comments from staff and the City Council was that the streets including the east side of Peters Avenue are in the defined area and residential is not on the street front. She stated Mr. Beaudin had answered that twice when asked by Councilmembers Narum and Brown if there could be a residence in front. The answer was "no;" commercial has to be in front and the residence is in back.

Mr. Beaudin confirmed this is correct.

Commissioner Brown said in talking about Salt Craft with houses behind, those houses behind are oriented towards the street which is in line with the design guidelines that say you want a front door facing the street. He is saying that should not be prohibited on Peters Avenue to have housing “in behind” but facing the street and maintaining a commercial presence because they are trying to maintain vitality. But, he would not want to see that on Main Street, someone putting residential in the front and commercial behind.

Chair Allen said it sounds as if they are in agreement with Main Street that residential has to be behind and they are not in agreement with the transition district and side streets where there is a corner and whether there can be residential in the front of one of the sides of the corner. She thinks this is a big question because there are a number of lots on Peters Avenue that are long. If they say they can have more townhouses like those behind Salt Craft, there could be a lot of long lots that end up taking up two-thirds of a block that are mainly townhouses. The east side is zoned transitional and not residential.

Commissioner Brown said the purpose of creating a transitional zoning district is to drive investment in commercial as well as residential in that area. He did not know it made sense to force commercial on both streets of a long piece of property as long as they are getting commercial on one side, which creates the transitional district.

Chair Allen suggested voting on this. She said the residential could still go on the second and third story in a transitional zone. It could be a use similar to Salt Craft if it was a brand-new building and it could have residential at the top.

Commissioner Brown said he prefers the City Council recommendation around defining it according to the three districts. It does not say anything about corner lots. The Task Force did not vet on this and he did not want to give the City Council advice.

Chair Allen asked if Commissioner Brown wanted to vote on this.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks trying to regulate corner lots is being overly restrictive, and Commissioner Ritter concurred.

ACTION: Chair Allen took a straw poll which resulted in a vote of 2-1 to not move forward with including additional regulation for corner lots, with Chair Allen opposed.

Commissioner Brown asked if they needed a straw vote on the ground floor residential use definition between the February 26 and the City Council.

Mr. Beaudin said he did not think staff had any additional open questions.

Commissioner Brown said he wanted to clarify that if the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to forward this to the City Council, he asked if they would put in the February 26 Task Force recommendation of 50 feet or would they put in a recommendation around the downtown commercial, mixed use, transitional and have separate definitions for those three districts.

Mr. Beaudin said it will be up the City Council unless directed otherwise.

ACTION: Chair Allen took a straw poll in regards to ground floor, and by a vote of 2-1 she and Commissioner Brown voiced support for the City Council direction, and Commissioner Ritter voiced support for that of the Task Force.

Chair Allen added one clarification on the first bullet on ground floor criteria. She referred to agenda report page 8 of 15 and the first criteria—“Is street-fronting commercial spaces required with a minimum depth of 50 feet?” She believes the 50 feet was interior or storefront space. It did not include setbacks or landscaping, and she asked to clarify that.

Mr. Beaudin said the 50 feet was for the depth of the commercial space itself; including the storefront and not setbacks.

Planned Unit Developments:

Chair Allen noted there were a couple of questions from the audience about whether they were changing the process today and also how much a PUD costs. She asked what the process is today relative to PUDs including projects like Salt Craft, Spring Street and a number of their projects which have ground floor residential involved with them behind a commercial space. She wanted to verify those projects did have a PUD. And, if they required a PUD on something it would be ground floor residential like those in the future that met other standard requirements; that it is not a change from what they have been doing.

Ms. Clark said there are some projects downtown that request PUD approval. This has come as a result of the applicant wanting to deviate from the development standards, such as with height, parking or setbacks. If no deviation is required, it is processed through a design review approval.

Commissioners Ritter and Brown voiced their support for continuing this approach.

Chair Allen asked if Spring Street came in and the project is two stories, theoretically, Commissioners Ritter and Brown would approve it. She said the reason she is asking is because there is a very subjective and important criteria that they have which is minimized visibility.

Commissioner Ritter said if someone comes in and purchases property, they want to know what they will get. They look at the guidelines and standards and determine the cost to deviate from those and go through a PUD and/or stick with the standards. He would like to give an investor some opportunity to revitalize a dead property and this is why he was not in favor of over-regulations in the initial process.

Chair Allen referred to page A-15 which is the criteria for ground floor commercial. This is the one she was most concerned about, the townhouses behind Salt Craft and Spring Street and all of the public comments received about the visibility impact. Right now, one of the criteria is that it is designed to minimize visibility from the commercial street front. She did not know how that criteria can be vetted absent having a PUD. She thinks of all of the discussion that went on with Spring Street early on that changed that design significantly. It still did not hit the mark from the public’s perspective. However, that vetting would not go on absent having a PUD.

Commissioner Brown said the Spring Street example pre-dated his time on the Planning Commission, but given the current proposals, if they were to eliminate requiring a PUD as mandatory for all residential projects in the downtown based on everything else in place, the Spring Street property would not require a PUD anyway.

Mr. Beaudin clarified that there were parking issues with the Spring Street project, that they cannot meet standards on site by maintaining the commercial establishment, so it fell into a PUD in that particular instance. Spring Street is the counter to that argument where there is commercial in the front and they managed to park the commercial and residential on site. In some instances, if standards cannot be met on site, they get put into a PUD process. If they can be met, then they would be in a design review process.

Commissioner Brown said some of the feedback from the public is that the way it is written today, with any extension change or something else, any residential property would fall victim to the PUD process which he thinks is expensive and burdensome.

Commissioner Ritter concurred.

Chair Allen said they are not talking about all residential property, but Spring Street. Assuming it came in meeting all of the other standards which, in the end it did, it could be built if there was no review. The question is how to deal with this vague area of minimizing visibility and ensuring compatibility.

Mr. Beaudin responded that this is the difficulty of looking back and trying to apply the current standards. It is not possible to do it. In minimizing visibility, and it is visible from Main Street, they would have that conversation through the design review process. There would be different conversations about the residential projects that have been built in recent years based on the policy language put into the draft Downtown Specific Plan.

Commissioner Ritter added that he believes technology is better and they will start seeing much better presentations about visibility, what it does and could look like.

Chair Allen said in using something like that as an example she asked if it goes to the ZA who then review it and decides it could be controversial and bumps it to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Beaudin said design review for new buildings would come to the Planning Commission for review. Design review findings are a little different than the PUD findings, but it is a process where they would still have to show compliance with the General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan, zoning and environmental processes, including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Planning Commission agreed with the City Council's recommendation or the Task Force's recommendation which is there should be no PUD requirement for all residential in the downtown.

Chair Allen said she thought there was a hybrid staff proposed.

Ms. Clark confirmed the suggested policy language was on page 6 of 15 of the agenda report.

Chair Allen said the City Council agreed with the initial recommendation in April that a PUD be required just specifically for residential projects that were behind commercial in the designated areas. They agreed that a PUD was warranted there. They did not ask staff to take that further. It was after the last Task Force that staff added the idea of a PUD for any residential, including the remodel because of the sensitivity of the public to residential.

She said the hybrid asks to step back and look at whether there are certain occasions where a PUD makes sense. One is to just do it only with what the City Council originally agreed to which is new ground floor residential behind commercial. This is an option they have to say yes or no to. It does not mean they go any further. Another option is requiring a PUD given Barone's has been a concern of some of the public, requiring a PUD for certain residential projects if they are of a certain scale that could be risky.

Commissioner Ritter noted this will be a PUD because it is outside of the normal guidelines and standards for that lot.

Chair Allen stated she did not believe it was.

Mr. Beaudin stated that this site is zoned Downtown Commercial. If commercial remained at front and residential in rear, then it would warrant a similar process to the Spring Street project. If there was a large site in the downtown, they would hold a workshop. It would not necessarily be a PUD but would warrant that consultation.

Commissioner Brown said when looking at the Task Force recommendation or the City Council recommendation regarding Barone's, the Task Force recommendation was to incorporate a residential overlay which does not mean it was approved for rezoning. The City Council's recommendation was to incorporate a map annotation to note potential for future mixed-use subject to approval of a PUD rezoning for that. So, a PUD is required regardless of whether the Planning Commission went with a February 26 Task Force recommendation or the City Council recommendation.

Chair Allen said this is not correct because the annotation that Councilmember Kathy Narum provided was only specific to zoning if they came in with a PUD for mixed use zoning. Then in fact, they would require a PUD. But Barone's could come in with a commercial zoning request just because that is their existing zoning. They could come in and as long as they had the square footage of the restaurant, they could come in with a valid request to put residential behind it up to 26 or 28 units.

Mr. Beaudin said he was not sure of the unit count but the possibility of putting residential behind commercial does exist.

Commissioner Ritter said he thought if it had the overlay it would be a PUD.

Chair Allen clarified that this is only if it came in as mixed-use zoning.

Mr. Beaudin commented that while there may be the possibility of it coming through without a PUD, it is highly unlikely that they would be able to meet the commercial requirements and the residential requirements. They will be looking to maximize residential development in that area, so there will not be four units in the back if they move forward with this kind of a project. They would then then get into internal circulation, open space requirements for residences, and the

thresholds as the project gets larger increases, and this is where the PUD would kick in and where exactly will depend on the actual project proposed.

Commissioner Brown indicated he thought Barone's would be a PUD.

Chair Allen asked to go back through the three because Barone's is an example of the third item. If there is a project site that is large in the downtown, such as Inklings, this would say those, by definition, require a PUD because they are higher risk sites and there should be no question the Planning Commission wants a PUD on them. She would support saying that if the site is three-quarters of an acre or one-half acre then it should require a PUD and come to the Planning Commission for public comment and review. She asked how other Planning Commissioners felt about that.

Commissioner Ritter said he thinks if it meets the guidelines and standards then it should not require a PUD.

Commissioner Brown said he prefers to simplify the process rather than raise costs and added staff time. He does not think it achieves the purpose of trying to simplify and clarify the regulations and proposals.

Chair Allen returned to the first item; requiring a PUD for projects that include new ground floor residential using the Spring Street example. She asked if Commissioner Brown was open to this.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks any projects in or around the commercial district or that has any degree of density will go through PUD process. He does not want to over-regulate the process for downtown projects and worry that if someone proposes a project at a lower density in order to meet all of the requirements that it is not in their best interests to do so. He thinks the Barone's are unlikely to come in with a project that proposes three homes in the back in order to avoid the high costs associated with the PUD. He did not want to burn staff time and resident dollars on doing PUDs for a lot of projects that are outside of the ones the Planning Commission is worried about.

Chair Allen said lastly, staff indicated it was likely for Barone's to come in with design review. She asked what the difference was between Design Review and a PUD as it relates to the Planning Commission and the City Council being able to ask for amenities in return for the project.

Mr. Beaudin said a PUD is a legislative change which allows for more discretion and more ability to extract from applicants. The Design Review is a more straight forward process. His final point is that if a decision is brought to the ballot, a legislative change can be brought to the ballot. A quasi-judicial decision or a more administrative decision cannot be brought to the voters after a decision is made by the City Council or the Planning Commission.

ACTION: Chair Allen took a straw poll which resulted in a vote of 2-1 to strike the requirement for a PUD on all residential projects, with Chair Allen opposed.

Residential Height Limits (inclusion of three-story versus two-story height limits) per Commissioner Brown:

Commissioner Brown said both Commissioner Allen and Commissioner Ritter indicated earlier they do not want to require stories in the recommendations, and Chair Allen was the swing vote.

Chair Allen said she agrees with the City Council recommendation, and the proposed staff position in that two stories is the standard and three stories is the exception.

Commissioner Brown spoke about his work on the Planning Commission as a representative for the community at large, and residents want the character of the City to remain.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to recommend including the three-story and two-story maximum against the four overlay districts which the City Council amended.

Mr. Beaudin referred to agenda report page 5 of 15 and he confirmed Commissioner Brown's motion was in support of making the recommendation to the City Council consistent with their April 16 and May 7 summary in the table for height and stories.

Commissioner Brown said they discussed the MU-T and agreed to recommend 36 feet and 125 FAR, and he confirmed this was what he was motioning, except without the PUD.

Commissioner Ritter said he agreed with the verbiage with the exception of including about the maximum number of stories.

Commissioner Brown asked if there was agreement to strike the proposed language that called out allowing additional height through a PUD; and if there was support from two Planning Commissioners for adding back the reference to maximum stories.

Chair Allen stated she will second the motion with the exception she could not support the striking through a PUD.

Mr. Beaudin clarified the Planning Commission was just voting on the 30 feet and two stories.

ACTION: Chair Allen took a straw poll which resulted in a vote of 2-1 to support making the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council consistent with the City Council's April 16 and May 7 direction for height and stories, with Commissioner Ritter opposed.

Mr. Beaudin asked for clarification, stating in the table on page 5, the last line talks about allowing a maximum height of 30 feet and two stories with the ability to consider additional height through a PUD. He asked if the Planning Commission would like the ability to consider additional height or he asked if the Commission wished to cap it at 30 feet and two stories.

Chair Allen and Commissioner Brown confirmed they wanted to cap it at 30 feet and two stories. Commissioner Ritter stated people will ask for a PUD if they want, but he did not want that language included in the regulation.

Mr. Beaudin clarified the process that exists today, where an applicant can ask for more height through a PUD process. If the policy language is changed to strike the clause noted, he asked if the Planning Commission still wanted to allow people to be able to go higher than 30 feet through some process.

Commissioner Ritter noted anyone can request a PUD, so the words are not needed to be included in the policy.

Commissioner Brown concurred and said he did not think they needed the words in there. By putting the words in there they are encouraging it and he did not want to encourage it. The PUD process is an exception process for those wanting exception. The Planning Commission does not have to grant them.

Chair Allen said she thinks Mr. Beaudin wants to know what the intent of people is.

Mr. Beaudin noted that when there is silence on issues like this, people come to the counter, get into the process and the process is then muddled from the beginning. If the Planning Commission wants people to be able to come to the counter and they would consider it, then they should say "with the ability to add more." If they do not and remove it this helps staff clarify, from a permit intent perspective, that they are not interested in it and are discouraging it.

Commissioner Ritter said he was supportive of that. He said he was not in favor of making it a *requirement* to do a PUD.

Commissioner Brown said he was not trying to reduce the number of PUDs, but reduce the *addition* of PUDs because the way it was written before they would create even more PUDs than they had today, and he did not want that. If there is a special circumstance in residential, such as where a person is eight feet below grade, maybe they can go to 38 feet. So, there may be some exceptions and he just does not want to encourage the exceptions, and this is why he was struggling with the language.

Mr. Beaudin stated then staff will strike the language and be silent on how an applicant can get something different.

Chair Allen voiced her support of this. Relating to stories if someone wanted to come in with a residential project of 30 feet and three stories, she asked and confirmed that the City was not encouraging people to go higher than the stories listed here.

Mr. Beaudin said this is correct. Anywhere else in Pleasanton there is the 35-foot height limit and they can put in three stories. This will be unique to the downtown and there will be people who want the extra floor and they will come forward and submit their PUD and the Planning Commission will see it. They will not encourage this but real estate is expensive and that extra floor will be valuable to some people and they will go through the process.

Commissioner Brown stated he was okay with Shell service station site as proposed in the agenda report and Commissioner Ritter agreed.

Chair Allen said in principle she does not like the idea of changing the process and doing a zoning change in advance of what would be a PUD. For that reason, she will vote “no” on the Shell service station, thinking that in the end, Shell should be residential. She was not in support of having an overlay because the concept feels like it could be a precedent. She just think it sets the wrong standard to do that in advance of having an application and thinks it side-steps the planning process.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks staff’s point there was that by running the plan as an overlay, it has already been discussed and agreed that residential probably makes sense there, but it will require rezoning at a later date. But, it does not mean they have to go back. They can already see as part of the long list of deliverables that they are modifying the Downtown Design Guidelines and the Downtown Hospitality Guidelines to try and get things aligned. The purpose here was to avoid having to do that at a later date.

Chair Allen stated she was going to be flexible on this and voiced support of the Shell service station going residential with an overlay. For Barone’s, she did not want any risk of that coming through without a PUD as it is too risky and the land could be used for other opportunities.

Commissioner Brown suggested having an annotation that any use that includes residential will require a PUD.

Chair Allen stated, and Ms. Clark confirmed, the annotation would say both commercial and mixed use would be allowed and that they would both require a PUD.

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission to support residential development on the Shell site with an overlay, to have an annotation that would say both commercial and mixed use would be allowed, and that development of either site would require a Planned Unit Development.

Commissioner Brown asked, and Commissioner Ritter and Chair Allen agreed, to address LD.P-49 requiring upgrading existing buildings and landscaping on the same property as far as new residential infill projects.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks the policy seems to be overly burdensome.

Mr. Beaudin provided an example, of a nearby project on Augustine Street where applicants have come in with a little bungalow home on the front and they want to put two or three units in the back. They are talking about significant new rental income coming to the property. The front of the property and the driveway along the side all looks the same from the front, but now there are new units in the back and no upgrade or tie in with the existing residential unit or with landscaping for the property. The neighbors get all of the impacts of new development with none of the improvements that come with it if that house is on the front.

He explained that the idea here is specific to residential properties and not mixed use properties; that if someone is going to invest in the downtown in a way that puts additional development into the community they should enhance the front property or the other pieces of the property that exist today. It is not meant to be punitive or burdensome but meant to enhance the neighborhood as they increase the amount of development on the site.

It is a policy question and staff has had problems with applicants where they must put new siding on the home because it is in disrepair. The applicant will say “no”, we will just invest in the back.

Chair Allen referred to the Chabad project and improvements required to make the building look better. A year ago, the Planning Commission was unanimous about a project on Harrison Street where the same thing occurred where the Commission was unanimous in requiring the applicant upgrade the front building to get approval to expand the lot.

Mr. Beaudin commented that the City will see more residential infill with legislation and increasing land costs.

Chair Allen stated she would like to reconsider her prior input on this item.

Commissioner Ritter questioned if the use of the word “required upgrade” was needed and suggested the word “encourage.”

Commissioner Brown said the other option if the concern is creating an undue burden on commercial, require new building standards, interior sprinklers, etc., would be to add the word “residential” to read, “upgrade of existing residential buildings and associated landscaping.”

Chair Allen asked to leave it more generic to state, “Upgrade existing buildings and landscaping as deemed by the Director of Community Development on the same property as residential infill projects.” She also suggested adding something that indicates they should make the front look as attractive as the rear.

Commissioner Brown said if Mr. Beaudin feels strongly about this from a staff perspective in order to coach people coming to the counter then he would recommend the word “residential” in there in order to exclude the commercial side which is the cost-prohibitive and burdensome side.

Commissioner Ritter concurred.

Chair Allen suggested “upgrade existing residential buildings and landscaping on the same property as part of new residential infill projects.”

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission to modify policy LD.P-49 to say, “upgrade existing residential buildings and landscaping on the same property as part of new residential infill projects.”

Parking:

Commissioner Brown said throughout the 18-month process the DSP was supposed to address parking. He respects staff’s opinion that it is addressed in the parking plan adopted by the City Council, but the Task Force has failed in that endeavor of addressing it. He tried to sway his colleagues at the last Task Force meeting but failed to get consensus. He asked that as part of the Planning Commission’s recommendation there be a side recommendation for a subcommittee or Task Force to discuss parking in the downtown with the sole purpose of making recommendations to the City Council to amend the adopted parking plan. This would

be his counter-proposal and he would be in favor of clear language to the City Council as to recommending that part of the plan is incomplete, and does not want to take the advice of some to simply vote no on the entire plan since there are many good things in it.

Commissioner Ritter commented that there does not appear to be an implementation of the Parking Plan.

Chair Allen and Commissioner Ritter agreed, and the Planning Commission briefly discussed scenarios relating to parking apps and related ideas for amendments to the parking plan.

Commissioner Brown commented that he is a proponent of needing a timetable in regard to parking and coming to some relief aside from resizing parking spaces.

Mr. Beaudin referred to page 79 in the plan MP-P.33; the Parking Strategy Implementation Plan. He referred to the Transportation Corridor and said the City Council discussed the design last week. He also mentioned the effort must be multi-faceted to address parking, and that one of the most straight-forward ways to address parking is to introduce paid parking but this was ruled out in the Downtown Parking Strategy Implementation Plan.

Currently, the Alameda County Fair is taking place and employees cannot even get a parking spot in the City Hall parking lot, and it is not a normal time to find parking in downtown Pleasanton. There is a parking structure contemplated in this planning effort. It comes with redevelopment of the Civic Center site and with investment from Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) and a three or more-party agreement to build the parking structure.

Lastly, Mr. Beaudin said on page 79 is a list of things and everyone wants to see more parking built. It is the most expensive and takes the longest. Tomorrow, employees that work downtown can park in strategic locations so parking supply is available for people to come and eat lunch or shop. It is not something anyone has wanted to take on for the commercial side, but it is something we can do tomorrow. There are a number of steps, but it requires a very collaborative effort and team approach, and City Council has a challenging task to reconcile multiple demands. The idea to have a Task Force or smaller group to work on the parking issue means people need to come to it with the willingness to look at things beyond just adding supply two years from now through a parking structure.

Commissioner Ritter questioned what is prohibiting them from saying the PDA, the Chamber of Commerce and downtown business need to create their own task force and that it not be City led, and that this group take recommendations and bring them forward to the City.

Mr. Beaudin said he was not opposed to working with a group like that towards solutions, but supply is not the only factor in the equation. There is a parking management issue, as well.

Commissioner Brown said he does not disagree with these comments surrounding parking and downtown. If part of it goes forward, he asked what else could be done to revitalize and keep the downtown alive, with new restaurants and shopping coming in. This is what he was referred to as Plan B at the last meeting. The plan as written has some good proposals for what to do with this site, but there is no Plan B. He suggested being clear to the City Council that the Downtown Specific Plan has some great recommendations and they should not be

abandoned, but the work product is incomplete and there needs to be some combined City / public / commercial collaboration to come up with an actionable plan that is viable.

Commissioner Ritter seconded Commissioner Brown's recommendation.

Chair Allen stated she fully supports this, as well. The assumption of the plan was that they would have a civic center. The community and Chamber of Commerce have been weighing in and if they do not have a civic center they have not truly addressed parking in the plan so it is a major gap.

ACTION: There was unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission to recommend the creation of a small working group (potentially with the Pleasanton Downtown Association and the Chamber of Commerce) to improve parking supply and management and establish a timeline for implementation.

The Planning Commissioners agreed that they would not vote "no" on the specific plan solely because the parking topic was incomplete, but that this was a significant piece in public opinion that needs to get addressed.

Chair Allen asked if there were remaining items, and there were none.

Commissioner Ritter asked if this will be brought back with updates to approve it and move forward to the City Council.

Mr. Beaudin stated the Planning Commission could take this action if ready tonight or continue the item to the next meeting.

Commissioner Ritter suggested seeing the changes, summarized as a workshop and returned when there is the fourth Commissioner present for final recommendation.

Chair Allen stated it could be continued but did not feel there was controversy on the items in terms of how they would be written up. She also cited the fact that a new Planning Commissioner was not involved with the Task Force and this meeting and it may cause a "restart" issue.

Commissioner Brown cited support for any additional input, but at the same time, part of public service is being efficient so he did not see the value of continuing the item to add the fourth member. He thinks there will be added opportunities for public input at the City Council level, and he would also like to see what the City Council does with the Planning Commission's recommendation around a parking subcommittee.

Commissioner Ritter said he trusts staff will provide accurate revisions and Commissioner Brown asked staff to copy the Planning Commission on the staff report when it goes to the City Council, and Mr. Beaudin confirmed.

Chair Allen asked if they take a vote to move the item onto the City Council, she asked how to reflect those instances where there were split votes.

Mr. Beaudin stated staff has the straw votes on each of those the recommendation will reflect that expressed by the majority of the Planning Commission on those topics. He confirmed the Planning Commission's action is moving each item along based on the votes for each item and staff will ensure the minutes are clear and summarize this meeting and the straw votes taken.

Commissioner Ritter commented that he thinks they missed the opportunity for the ACE Train to be moved to the Bernal Property and he did not think this was analyzed enough.

Chair Allen moved to approve amendments to the General Plan, the Downtown Design Guidelines, and Downtown Hospitality Guidelines; rescind the 2002 Downtown Specific Plan; and adopt the updated Downtown Specific Plan, except as amended by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioners Balch, O'Connor and Pace

Chair Allen moved to approve changes to the zoning designations for certain properties as amended by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioners Balch, O'Connor and Pace

Chair Allen moved to approve amendments to the Pleasanton Municipal Code as amended by the Planning Commission

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioners Balch, O'Connor and Pace

Chair Allen moved to recommend the City Council certify the FEIR.

Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen and Brown
NOES: Commissioner Ritter
ABSENT: Commissioners Balch, O'Connor and Pace