



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

**City Council Chamber**  
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

**APPROVED**

**Wednesday, March 8, 2017**

*(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)*

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of March 8, 2017, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Balch.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Allen.

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Pamela Ott, Director of Economic Development; Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; and Kendall Granucci, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Justin Brown, David Nagler (arrived at 7:15 p.m.), Greg O'Connor, Herb Ritter and Chair Jack Balch

Commissioners Absent: None

#### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **a. February 8, 2017**

**Commissioner Ritter moved to approve the Minutes of the February 8, 2017 meeting as submitted.**

**Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Brown, O'Connor, and Ritter  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**RECUSED:** Commissioners Allen and Balch  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Nagler

The Minutes of the February 8, 2017 meeting were approved as submitted.

**3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

There were no members of the audience wishing to address the Commission.

**4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Chair Balch informed the public that Item 6.b., P15-0564, Tim Lewis Communities had been continued to a future meeting.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Commission or a member of the public by submitting a speaker card for that item.*

**a. P16-1854/P16-1876, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.**

Applications for Design Review and Conditional Use Permit approvals to construct and operate a medium-sized fuel cell facility totaling 1.2 megawatts at 5840 Owens Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial & Offices) District.

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve Cases P16-1854 and P16-1876, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the Staff Report.**

**Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Allen, Brown, Balch, and O'Connor  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**RECUSED:** Commissioner Ritter  
**ABSENT:** Commissioners Nagler

Resolution No. PC-2017-07 approving Cases P16-1854 and P16-1876 was entered and adopted as motioned.

## 6. **PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS**

### a. **P17-0055, Downtown Parking Strategy**

Review and consider the Downtown Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Allen recused, stating she received compensation from a business in the Downtown area and she left the Council Chamber.

Shweta Bonn presented the staff report.

Chair Balch: If there is information Commissioners might be relying upon that is not yet presented, you will want to disclose that or talk about it now before the public comment period just as a matter of good practice that came up that the State of California is now recommending strongly. I may be summarizing it wrong but I wanted to kind of mention that as a task of us all. So with that, questions?

Commissioner Brown: I would also recommend that maybe as a practice, we limit questions now to questions related to the presentation and then allow the public comment and debate on things that may not be covered in the presentation.

So to that end, related to your presentation, two questions—one was the spaces that you added. The charts aren't numbered but what was the timeline for adding those incremental spaces? Over what time period was that added? And did that include the re-gapping of parking spaces to take out oversized spaces? Or, is that still embedded within one of the other recommendations?

Bonn: Are you referring to the gaps that the report identifies along streets where some of the spaces are too long or too narrow?

Commissioner Brown: Yes.

Bonn: That's still is an outstanding issue.

Weinstein: And we think the spaces were added something like several months ago.

Commissioner Brown: So it is within the last year or since....

Bonn: The latter half of 2016.

Commissioner Brown: Okay and the other question I had on this presentation were the autonomous cars in the garage space. Something's not gelling with me. Are you suggesting that we may or may not need to garage autonomous cars? I would think that if it's an autonomous car, like I know the Tesla program, I would presume that car would go back to its home base and that we as a City wouldn't have to subsidize parking if it's a revenue generating thing for the owner.

Bonn: Yeah, well, it's obviously something yet to be vetted fully. There's a couple of things to that and as I was talking to the consultant about this, you're almost feeling like

you're talking about a science fiction movie or something because it's a futuristic thing, but based on the news we received today, maybe not so far in the future.

So in terms of if an autonomous car is continuously picking up and dropping off, it may not need to park anywhere if that's its role. If it is in fact parking somewhere, the dimensions of the parking stall may need to be adjusted, possibly reduced because obviously it's dropped off the passengers and once it's parked it needs to actually fit into the parking space a door to get interacted. So those are all things that need to get considered when you design a parking structure with autonomous cars.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, and I actually was at a Tesla website yesterday and their current plans are end of next year so it's not that far off. I'm glad that you're taking the future into account. Thank you. Those are all the questions I had on the presentation.

Commissioner Ritter: And you said if I had new information I should share this?

Chair Balch: Yes, we'll do it after questions but before public comments.

Commissioner O'Connor: I would like staff to comment on something that was in the staff report. It looks like if we're looking at the total square footage of what we have in the downtown commercial area and the number of parking spaces it has, we're parking now at about 250 square feet per parking spot, and our typical ratio in Pleasanton is around 300 square feet of space per parking spot. So, do we have a shortage or is it a perceived shortage? Or, is it because we're out of sync where the demand for parking is and where the parking is located?

Bonn: It's probably a combination of all of those things. You're right. The standard retail ratio is 1:300 so you would think that 1:250 we'd be over parked. A lot of that parking is on private property or is private parking and therefore, it's not necessarily available to the general public.

Commissioner O'Connor: What do you mean? The private parking lot is over-parked for that? Whoever owns the parking lot itself, it's over-parked then? If we're out of sync because of that, right?

Weinstein: I think what Shweta is saying is that if you take into account all of the public and all of the private parking and look at how it's applied in comparison as to how much development we have, that there's adequate parking. But what Shweta was saying was that because a lot of those spaces are private, somebody coming Downtown to go to a certain business might not be able to use that private parking supply such that there's not enough public parking and there could be an actual realistic shortage even though overall. If you count all the spaces in Downtown, there's enough for everybody based on the square footage of uses.

Chair Balch: Okay, any other questions? I just had a quick question which is maybe a little bit of one of the public comments which is about the one-way loop or let's just call it an alternative scenario. Were those looked at by the consultant or basically no major infrastructure improvements that would cause it to be a one-way looping system or like

no vehicular traffic on Main Street? Those weren't considered in the scope at this time, right?

Bonn: So we actually consulted traffic engineering staff and this has been brought up in the past. It would need to get vetted a little more fully before we could realistically consider it as an option. So, there were a couple of issues that Mike Tassano had brought to our attention, one being parallel parking on the right side of the roadway tends to be problematic when you have a one-way system. So that's something to consider. They had heard in the past that businesses at the end of this segment; at the end of the one-way segment sometimes are concerned that they're "last" on the route as opposed to if you had a two-way system, they could just as easily be first as opposed to being last. And, with the residential element on Peters, a one-way design could reduce access to and from the homes. So those would all be things to consider.

Weinstein: I think if I could highlight what Shweta said as well, I think cities in recent times have been relatively skittish about converting two-way streets to one-way as well. In addition to the reasons Shweta cited, traffic tends to go faster on one-way streets so there are safety issues involved. Shweta talked about economic vitality, navigation is also made more complicated when you have a one-way street. A lot of drivers get confused when they see a series of one-way streets they can't turn on, so people end up driving more and cities seeking to reduce congestion, for good reason, are skeptical or concerned about converting two-way streets to one-way streets.

Chair Balch: I know Mr. Tassano's not here but is there an evolution of streets in small towns? For example, do streets in cities and towns start off one lane each way and then convert to one way?

Weinstein: Cities have developed in lots of different ways in the U.S. over time and you have to remember that a lot of cities started without motor vehicles at all. People used to ride horses or carriages. I think the trend in sort of the immediate post-automobile era when automobiles first came on the scene, and especially starting in the 1940's, 50's and 60's was to really get traffic through cities as quickly as possible, and so I think in that period a lot of streets in major American cities converted to one-way patterns, at least in downtown areas, but the trend has been the opposite in recent past as cities have tried to become more pedestrian-accessible.

Commissioner Ritter: I just wanted to add that I found a study done in 87 urban areas, by Arizona State University researchers, that shows that Uber reduces traffic congestion. It just shows that by introducing the Uber concept, it did reduce traffic congestion, and I just thought I could share this with everybody. It's an interesting report from 87 different urban areas.

Balch: Okay. I attended a conference for Planning Commissioners in the State of California down in LA recently and parking was a hot topic, so I will disclose that I went to that conference and a couple of things I'll mention from that which I may be basing my decision on are, there was a presentation about parking meters. It was a heavily advocated-for presentation because the theory was that if you design them to be smart enough to be a supply-demand based system, so if there was strong demand, the price would go up and then it would cause people to go to auxiliary streets because they

would be cheaper. I believe he mentioned that Palo Alto and San Francisco have implemented it and have seen drastic improvement. The way they do it is they adjust the price every set amount of months to slowly balance out supply and demand. That's the first thing.

The second thing I'll just say is another presentation was exactly as you mentioned, Commissioner Ritter, which is a gentleman praised Uber and Lyft and other services like that for basically reducing traffic congestion, parking needs and specifically a good way to solve it if implemented in your city.

And the last thing I'll mention is that they are talking about when the car is gone. What are you going to do when the car is gone because it is something that many cities are foreseeing?

### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Angie Summers: My ears perked up when she said a one-way street loop, and I said Pleasanton is ideal the way it is. If it isn't broken, don't fix it and I mean it. Thank you.

Beaudin: Can we just clarify? That is not the recommendation in the report and not staff's recommendation. It was a comment letter that was received from the public.

Summers: Oh, well see I didn't hear that. Thank you.

Beaudin: I just wanted to clarify.

Chair Balch: Okay, so no additional speaker cards. With that, we've closed the public comment period and we'll bring it back before the Commission. Again, our goal is to decide if we are going to recommend adoption of the plan or not. I do want to mention that Commissioner Nagler joined us at 7:15 p.m. because we started a little late.

### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Commissioner Nagler: I did have a chance to greet Commissioner Allen on her way out the door so that was good. Just a general comment—I think that the plan has been very well strategized and it represents some real opportunities that I too support the idea of alternative strategies before we invest upwards of \$6 or \$8 million in a parking structure. And I would support the recommendation of this plan to the City Council.

Commissioner Brown: So, a few comments. I did see the promotion of the 10 items and the heavy recommendation around paving the transportation corridor. How can I put it...I'm not opposed to the paving of the transportation corridor. I am opposed to paving of the transportation corridor for the sole purposes of parking. I know it states there will be a design and other things, but one of the things I feel particularly passionate about is we don't provide enough transit through the downtown for pedestrians to access businesses from parking and that transportation corridor seems like a very logical place to have a nice multi-use, bike-friendly, pedestrian-friendly bikeway and that, to me, is actually more important than parking cars on. I think it needs to be both frankly, but that's just my own personal opinion. I've been to enough

downtowns that have that. Monterey comes to mind for example. It's got a very wide sidewalk that integrates some of the businesses and behind, etc. So just a comment on that.

Chair Balch: Can I pause you a minute if I may? Can I just clarify with staff? As I recall, the original plan for this transportation corridor is almost to carry the parking lot that's at that Firehouse Arts Center---that same design further on. Is that correct?

Weinstein: Yes, that's correct, and one of the greatest plans in the City that I think is often overlooked is the plan for the Railroad Corridor that includes both pedestrian and bike facilities but also parking, as well. So I think the intent here is to implement one of those top ten strategies, or the parking related component of that plan but to not forget about the fact that it includes really important bike and ped infrastructure that needs to be integrated into the Railroad Corridor.

Commissioner Brown: Yeah and the concern I have is, if you want me to get a bit more specific, like when I look at the design of that extension, I'm looking at Figure 10, right? So as an example it shows the pedestrian multi-use path is on the south side which is great for accessing the park where Concert in the Park is. But, if you were to say another purpose of parking is to feed the downtown which is I guess west towards past Railroad Avenue to Main Street, you're encouraging all of the pedestrians to go out into the park or First Avenue and not towards Main Street. And so as an example, if you were to replicate that to this "empty lot" that can be converted to public or employee parking, as an example, maybe you want the pedestrian parkway on the west side rather than on the east side, I mean...anyway, just take those things into account; that the transportation corridor should facilitate feeding downtown as well as feeding say, First Avenue and some of the events and things like that. So, again, I'm not trying to design from the dais. I'm trying to give constructive feedback.

I was kind of fascinated with the one-way. I know the member of the public said don't break it. I'm not suggesting we do. So, I'm on the Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force as well and one of our homework assignments is to go and visit other downtowns. You mentioned Palo Alto and I was there and one of the things I noticed is that outside of the downtown on the side roads—those are one-ways, okay? So they have one-ways. I didn't notice the parking. I parked for free in a two-hour parking spot and they also implement some interesting strategies. Like on the main street, the parking, in alternating blocks, was diagonal and curb faced. So on one side you park on the curb and in the other direction you park straight in with angular parking. And on the next block it was the opposite. So I'm not a traffic and parking expert but surely there was a reason they were doing that and I thought that was kind of interesting.

So the one thought I had about the one-way loop idea was that if you had a one-way loop you could turn some of these streets in between the two ends of that loop into one-ways and turn one of those lanes into parking as another way to get more parking space. So if I combine that suggestion from the member of the public, I think it was Mr. Jacobson, with the other request from the member of the public, notwithstanding the lady that spoke earlier, he was looking for a design target for the plan which is to say hey, we want to add at a minimum over the next 5 years another 150 parking spaces or

some sort of goal to increase supply and I think you'd be hard pressed to find people in Pleasanton that don't want to see an increase in supply.

And so I guess that would be my main question. It would be nice to at least explore the idea and vet it out and if the answer is a bad idea; if it breaks something, then I would certainly agree with the member of the public who spoke, Ms. Summers. I think it's an interesting idea anyway. And I would agree that as a plan we should be setting forth some goal of increasing supply. I would agree with that comment from Ms. Summers.

Commissioner Ritter: It looks like two of the 10 strategies that staff has come up with recommend additional parking supply in the Downtown which is the most expensive part of the recommendation which is the parking garage so I like that we have at least eight others that we can actually concentrate on surface space parking. One thing that was brought up—I don't know, do we have any ordinance that prohibits delivery trucks of any sort on Main Street during certain hours or peak hours or any of that? Has that ever been an issue?

Beaudin: No, we have loading zones and otherwise it's free parking available on a first come, first served basis.

Commissioner Ritter: Okay, so that's not an issue, but when we do the design, I think it's important to incorporate the loading zone for drop-off and pickup for the over concepts. I think, you know, to have a 20 minute loading zone spot where you can pick up Uber or something if that's an option. And then, I am for paving the transportation corridor, but I would rather it be closer to Delucchi Park down at that end, just closer to the Downtown so it's easier to get more people Downtown. Like Commissioner Brown was saying, it's a long ways up there to walk if you want to go to Inklings or so.

And then I do like the three-hour free parking. I think three hours is a good time. I thought about two but I think the concept of keeping the hours to three is that as an employee you can't park there and stay all day so I like that concept. And I love that we've got the short-term bicycle parking strategy built into the #9 option too. We can show that's easy to park your bike there versus driving a car and parking down there. It might be more people off the road. So those are my thoughts. In general, I appreciate staff's recommendations and I also think this updated plan is good. I just want to see it implemented faster.

Commissioner O'Connor: Am I right in my understanding that the top 10 strategies are listed in the order of City priority?

Beaudin: Right.

Commissioner O'Connor: And I agree also that the transportation corridor—I think we'd get more bang for our buck there. The transportation corridor parking lots that I've driven through too is one thing I've noticed is there are a lot of people that walk to the two ends. There's not a lot of access directly into some of the other corridors that bring them down Main Street and I think that's something we should be looking at as we take out even more of these lots, is that we have more than the two ends of the lot as an access into the Downtown. That's my only comment on the transportation corridor.



I also think the time restrictions—we need to leave those at three. I know we were at two once before and we moved that. Again, we want to encourage people to come and have a luncheon or friends that could take an hour and one-half or almost two hours. We want people to stay and shop. We want to. If they want to, we don't want to have to scoot them along too early so like Commissioner Ritter stated, I think three hours does a good job of keeping the employee out of those spots if we're managing them properly. But I think we have to have at least a three hour slot to increase the utilization Downtown. I think what everybody else said I agree with.

Chair Balch: Thank you. So I know we're not going to necessarily re-write it whether we push it off to Council or not so I'll kind of do like my fellow Commissioners and just give some commentary. I also support the three hour versus the two hour. I think as some of the others here have mentioned and maybe not this way, not to say I had any better reference point than anyone else has said, but two hours with lunch in Pleasanton—by the time you find it, walk to it, eat, you are hustling back too in my opinion.

I also like that it mentioned bike corrals. I think that is an important thing for us and the only hesitation I had with the Lyft or Uber or kind of the transportation, I just don't know if they can designate a drop-off spot. Maybe they do have that programming ability, but I don't know if we as a City have that in terms that we can designate it. I do know that we probably all have experienced, you know, they drop you off when you're in front of your restaurant and you've just stopped all the cars behind you to get out, right? They don't always stop in a spot. It's a little interesting sometimes where they stop. So that being said, if we had that ability to say this block stop here for the next two blocks, I think that'd be great personally. Kind of like a quick loading zone, or like a taxi station.

Commissioner Brown: Side street.

Chair Balch: Yeah, very good point right, so that we're not doing it. I want to mention coming back to this one-way because I said I would. My general comment is that before we build a parking structure of some millions of dollars, I think our plan needs to include a lot of different options and I'll just mention a few. My mind is the one-way. Hayward just converted from a two-way system to a one-way system loop and to Adam's comment it has significantly increased the speed of the traffic which I don't know is what we desire. I don't think we desire what they now have achieved, but they have a different set of issues than we've got here, but it's a case study ready to be studied.

So before we build a \$10 million parking structure, personally, I would like to see them weigh things like, do we go to one-way, do we do a loop, you know, these things need to be in the mix and my other thing—I know it's not going to be popular with the Downtown Association, but I think we should look at are we going to close Downtown's Main Street to vehicular traffic in the next 50 years or not; more long term. And I say that in light of the conference I went to where they're talking about....what they're doing in some cities is that they are closing streets to vehicle access longer than just the farmer's market that we might know of. They're doing it for longer periods and they're planting trees and stuff and making it more of a pedestrian corridor versus a vehicular corridor. And you know, maybe that's not a 10-year plan. Maybe that's a 50-year plan like I mentioned, but if we're going to put \$10 million into a parking structure, I think we

need to think outside of the parking structure and that would be the one-way or to get the parking on non-arterial streets as Commissioner Brown mentioned or the closing to all vehicular traffic, or something like Livermore did where they narrowed it, changed it and designed it. But that being said I think the 10 that they listed out except the parking structure right off the bat--I think those are good. I can see how some of the public comment has been supportive of one or two of them more than others, but it's on the list of the top 10 so I can support that.

Commissioner Nagler: I just wanted to echo what others have said which is, I obviously continue to support this as a recommendation of the Council, but in the larger context, I think we do need to start with the question about, and it's certainly part of the DSP conversation, is what do we want the personality of the Downtown to be? What are our larger global policy interests? There's a debate as we know underway today about having changed the number of lanes on Owens Drive from the BART station, and the focus is on those people who are angry about an additional 30 second delay in getting to and from the BART station during peak hours. But what seems to be lost in the conversation is why the lanes were narrowed in the first place. The reason the lanes were narrowed was because it was an attempt to implement a larger policy interest of encouraging people to use public transportation and to reduce the number of cars on the street. One way to do that is to make it safer to walk to and from public transportation and specifically on Owens Drive, the traffic went through so rapidly that the idea was to narrow the funnel of cars so that pedestrians could more safely get, particularly from that new development, to public transportation. But again, it was grounded in an over-arching interest of reducing the number of cars on the road, increasing therefore pedestrian safety as a way to encourage public transportation.

So similarly, I just think the conversation we're having is the right one. Whether there's a one-way street or not, I honestly believe is ground first in a question of what do we want the character of the Downtown to be. Then, that becomes a sort of an implementation strategy or challenge, parking being one of the issues. I actually think a one-way street would be an unfortunate development for Downtown because in fact, in Palo Alto when you're on Emerson and some of those other streets, you're on those streets to be off of University Avenue so you can go as quickly as possible from one end of Palo Alto to the other. That's why you're on those streets, right? So, one-way streets absolutely have their intended purpose. They work. They question is whether that's something that works once we determine what we want the personality of Downtown Pleasanton to be. So I just encourage us to start there as we have the DSP conversation and parking is just one of the elements.

Chair Balch: I'm going to tap into that. One of the presenters at the conference—I sound like a broken record—was the City of Livermore talking about their downtown. They specifically talked about how their downtown one way in the beginning and that they consciously chose to go one lane each way and the parking kind of semi-perpendicular at 45 because it purposely caused everyone that was doing cut-through to avoid it like the plaque and by doing that, it made it safer for pedestrians, it opened it up and it made it a much better city than the surrounding area to go and dine at. But, the comment is right. I do say that I've been in cities that I think one-way has worked and I'll mention San Luis Obispo which has several one-ways in order that kind of go across and their downtown is both long and wide in its downtown nature. It might not work there, but in

Hayward I think it's done that. I just don't know it's done that there or not—I'll just leave it as that.

Commissioner Brown: One other thing just to mention to staff and I'm not proposing that you implement it, but I took a photo of one thing in Palo Alto which I think is interesting. There was a sign that said corral zone—"No re-parking in corral zone after two-hour limit has expired; two-hour begins at initial parking time." So what they've actually implemented is that.... I think it is to stop people that work in the downtown from setting their time on their phone and every two hours moving their car and occupying parking or potential customers, but I just thought it was an interesting sign. No action, but just be aware.

And just to follow up on the one-way, I mean, the one-way can do two things. One, it can increase speed, yes, but you can adjust that with stop signs. The other thing that it does though is that it would also offer more through-put around and into the Downtown potentially. That's why I say, I don't know if it's a good idea or not. I just think it deserves a bit more study, and I don't want to make that determination. I'd rather the professionals and staff to make that determination.

Commissioner O'Connor: Definitely it could be looked at. One of the other side effects or bonuses of a one-way is when you have a loop you're going to have a second street that becomes a main street. You're going to have development opportunities on that second part of the loop, so everybody's not just one-way to see the downtown.

Commissioner Brown: It's same as a bisecting street. You couldn't also make a one-way and cut the loop.

Chair Balch: I was going to say, staff's pretty upset with us for going on with this one-way, but I think the comment is that....

Commissioner Brown: Well, just to respond to the public....

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm not sure if it would work for our town, but those are some of the pluses and minuses.

Commissioner Ritter: And as we do the DSP, there's even that option of making Peter's be a cut-through all the way to Bernal if they rezone that whole area. That would open up another option that maybe it would be the one-way and it would just have the two-ways.

Chair Balch: So I think as we probably remember, the matter before us is whether we are going to support this to go to Council or are we going to not.

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm happy to see that we brought the idea up of paved parking lots.

**Commissioner Ritter moved to recommend approval to City Council of P17-0055, Downtown Parking Strategy per staff's recommendation.**

**Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Balch, Nagler, O'Connor, and Ritter**

**NOES: Commissioner Brown**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**RECUSED: Commissioner Allen**

**ABSENT: None**

Resolution No. PC-2017-08 recommending approval of Case P17-0055, Downtown Parking Strategy was entered and adopted as motioned.

Commissioner Brown: I'm opposed to staff's recommendation just from the perspective of having to evaluate the one-way situation and rule it out as a non-recommendation.

Chair Balch: Okay, so the motion carries with Commissioner Brown in opposition.

Commissioner O'Connor: So the Council will hear our comments, right? I mean, we were pretty vocal on wanting them to look at some of those other items, but they'll see our comments?

Weinstein: Yes, we'll convey all of your comments to the Council and we'll also include the transcript of course when this goes to Council. We'll be talking about all of the comments and really re-thinking holistically how comprehensive the transportation network is Downtown, whether that's looking at one-way configurations or looking at making the pedestrian access over east/west streets a little better. The DSP is really a perfect forum for that because we're looking at land use and urban design and transportation altogether and obviously those are parts of Downtown that are really inter-linked and you can't do one without looking at the other. So we're hopeful and we're confident that these comments will get conveyed into the DSP process as well and evaluate it comprehensively at that point.

Chair Balch: Hopefully our DSP representatives carry our comments forward. Okay, thank you very much and moving on, we'll start with Item 7; Matters Initiated by Commission Members.

**b. P15-0564, Tim Lewis Communities**

Work session to review and receive comments on applications by Tim Lewis Communities for various entitlements, including a General Plan Amendment, Happy Valley Specific Plan Amendment, and Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning and development plan to construct 39 single-family detached homes and related improvements on the approximately 154-acre Spotorno property at 1000 Minnie Drive. In addition, a scoping session will be conducted to receive comments from the public and Planning Commission on the scope of analysis for the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that will analyze the environmental effects of the proposed development. Zoning for the project site is PUD-SRDR (Planned Unit Development – Semi-Rural Density Residential), PUD-MDR (Planned Unit

Development - Medium Density Residential), and PUD-A/OS (Planned Unit Development – Agriculture/Open Space) Districts.

*This item has been continued to a future meeting.*

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS**

No discussion was held or action taken.

**8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION**

**a. Reports from Meetings Attended (e.g., Committee, Task Force, etc.)**

No discussion was held or action taken.

**b. Future Planning Calendar**

Adam Weinstein informed the Commission that the agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting on March 22<sup>nd</sup> will include the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update, the Valley Trails PUD project and a CUP application for a Heritage School located at 6693 Owens Drive. Tentatively scheduled for the April is the Johnson Drive EDZ project, the Spotorno workshop which was continued off this agenda, and an application for a tap room located at 3020 Bernal Avenue.

**c. Actions of the City Council**

No discussion was held or action taken.

**d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator**

No discussion was held or action taken.

**e. Matters for Commission's Information**

Kendall Granucci reported to the Commission that the speaker cards for Commission and Council meetings had been revised and that a sign-up sheet was provided on the table in the back of the Chambers for members of the public to opt-in to receiving notices of future Planning Commission meetings.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Balch adjourned the meeting at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kendall Granucci  
Recording Secretary