



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, March 14, 2018

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

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission Meeting of March 14, 2018, was called to order at 7 p.m. by Commissioner O'Connor.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner O'Connor.

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Ellen Clark, Planning Manager; Melinda Denis, Permit Center Manager; Jennifer Hagen, Associate Planner, Eric Luchini, Associate Planner, Steve Kirkpatrick, City Engineer, Cindy Quintero, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, Justin Brown, Greg O'Connor, Herb Ritter, and Chair David Nagler (arrived at 7:06 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. February 28, 2018

Commissioner Ritter moved to approve the Minutes of the February 28, 2018 meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Balch seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the February 28, 2018 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. AGENDA AMENDMENTS

There were no amendments to the agenda.

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. P17-0827, Robert and Jean Blocka/Blocka Construction

Application for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 22,367-square-foot, two-story industrial building with outdoor equipment storage and related site improvements located at 445 Boulder Court. Zoning for the property is I-G-40,000 (General Industrial) District.

**Commissioner Balch moved to approve the Consent Calendar.
Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution PC-2016-06 approving case P17-0827 was entered and adopted as motioned.

Noted Present:

Chair Nagler arrived at 7:06 p.m.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. P17-0941, LPFD Station #3, City of Pleasanton

Application for Design Review approval to demolish an existing fire station and construct an approximately 8,870-square foot fire station and related site/landscaping improvements for the Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department located at 3200 Santa Rita Road. Zoning for the property is RM-2,500 (Multi-Family Residential) District.

Associate Planner Eric Luchini presented the agenda report.

Commissioner Ritter asked and confirmed with Mr. Luchini there were no deviations from standard codes for the project and that staff agendized it as a public hearing, and not on the Consent Calendar, to ensure transparency of what is a public project.

Commissioner Brown asked and confirmed with Mr. Luchini there will be a total of 14 trees at completion of the project.

Commissioner Brown noted the requirement for parking is for four spaces and the City is providing 11 spaces, seven of which can be used for visitors. He commented that the visitor section is identified as having four spaces and asked if the remaining seven spaces would be used for City personnel. City Engineer Steve Kirkpatrick clarified there are a total of eight parking spaces along the back edge for four firefighters. They want to ensure there is parking during shift change, and afterwards those additional spaces will be available for the public. There are also spaces in the front and handicapped spaces to access the front door, totaling 11 spaces.

Commissioner Brown asked if any road or striping reconfiguration is planned for the move of the driveway to the north on Santa Rita and consolidating the two smaller driveways, to which Mr. Kirkpatrick replied no.

Commissioner Balch commented that he was disheartened with the overall number of heritage trees lost on the site and ratio of tree replacement. He pointed out an error in the plans, stating the two trees on the north property line in the front driveway will not be retained due to consolidation of the driveway. Also, the two visitor spaces across from the handicapped area have planting all the way around them which typically does not survive. He recommended use of permeable surface one foot each way from those two spaces, and otherwise believed the architecture to be outstanding.

Commissioner Allen expressed support for the architecture and landscaping, stating it enhances the neighborhood. She, too, was disheartened with removal of heritage trees and had asked if something could be done for extra visitor parking. However, she learned of the need for sufficient truck turning radiuses for fire trucks.

Chair Nagler agreed with comments and said the plan has been well vetted. The architecture will provide a superior example to others of how architecture can be advanced for public buildings.

**Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve Case P17-0941.
Commissioner Balch seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution PC-2018-07 approving Case P17-0941 was entered and adopted as motioned.

b. PUD-125, Carpenter's Training Center

Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) development plan approval to demolish an existing 67,000-square-foot building and construct a new 87,000-square-foot two-story Carpenter's Training Center with associated site improvements located at 2350 Santa Rita Road. Zoning for the property is PUD-O/C-C (Planned Unit Development - Office/Central Commercial) District.

Chair Nagler introduced the matter and indicated the project was before the Commission for the third time and staff was recommending denial.

Community Development Director Gerry Beaudin provided options the Commission could consider in reviewing the application.

Associate Planner Jennifer Hagen presented the agenda report.

Commissioner Balch referred to setbacks of existing and new retail projects, asked if the Safeway Center on Bernal Avenue should reflect the City's standard and whether there were other centers to base arguments on as to whether they should be set forward or backwards.

Ms. Hagen stated staff was not just looking at it as larger scale commercial but rather its consistency with all land use patterns and development within the area. Overall, the Safeway Center was specific to the Santa Rita area and variety of uses there.

Planning Manager Ellen Clark added that staff also reviewed was the change in condition; going from a building closer to the street with a pleasing street presence versus the opposite expansive parking and a building at the south of the site which will not be seen and said the City seeks improvement, upgrade and positive change for this section of Santa Rita.

Commissioner Balch asked if traffic and speed of vehicles would be affected by buildings with parking in the front versus buildings with an on-street presence.

Ms. Hagen replied that she had discussed this at length with the Traffic Engineering division and there has been no documentation or analysis to account for this.

Mr. Beaudin also explained that staff was making design changes across City with development applications, reviewing Hacienda PUD and design guideline updates which serves more of an appropriate comparison for an office project, and moving towards bringing buildings to the street in that part of the community. The goal here is to continue to bring buildings to the street which is consistent with the existing fabric around this area and to enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment.

Commissioner Allen referred to page 5.0 and sheet L-1 of the submitted plans and questioned what the streetscape would look like if she were walking or driving northbound along Santa Rita Road and looking towards the bio-retention area.

Mr. Beaudin referred to page C2.1 and pointed to the 3:1 slope for about 17 feet and nearly 100 feet at its longest dimension. Santa Rita Road at the curb is 342 feet and the parking lot is at about 345 feet as a reference point, leaving a 5-foot difference, and people walking would be looking at car bumpers and tires for at least a portion of this walk.

Chair Nagler summarized the net changes from the last hearing and this hearing as the building on Santa Rita Road moving and compact parking added. He suggested hearing the items discussed and either rejected by staff or by the applicant to address the issues the Commission had discussed such as view from the street, landscaping, and others.

Ms. Hagen replied that staff met with the applicant and looked various alternatives. Due to finances or infeasibility of having modular and training space for technical and welding work, the applicant indicated this as the only feasible project they would entertain and no other alternatives were amenable to them. They also indicated they were not willing to add landscaping past what they had proposed, questioned the nexus for the requirement and were not comfortable with what they viewed as an open-ended public art requirement.

Chair Nagler referred to the issue of parking during the phases of construction and asked if there have been subsequent discussions regarding that challenge. Ms. Hagen confirmed the applicant is aware of this requirement, but have not presented potential sites.

Commissioner Balch noted that 82 vehicles as the peak for 1 year and 3 months as he read the plans and asked if this was a typical level of parking needed as mitigation. Ms. Hagen said mitigation like this is not common and staff had no comparison of recent history.

Chair Nagler said 82 vehicles seemed like a large number of off-site parking especially in light of the city's downtown parking challenges. He asked if the weight of that concern was valid. Ms. Hagen explained that the applicant indicated this could be achieved. Staff would need to review and verify surplus parking in those locations and the applicant would need to provide documented lease agreements for the duration of each phase.

Commissioner Balch asked and confirmed with Ms. Hagen that at this time, the applicant did not yet have this arranged. Ms. Clark noted there are often details of the project not fully resolved at this stage of review and it was not completely unreasonable to find alternative sites. She reiterated that details of mitigation and provisions would need to be provided to confirm its workability.

Commissioner Allen asked and confirmed with Ms. Hagen that the City would not issue a building permit until the condition for mitigation is approved and is met by the applicant.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Steve Guest, Principal, RMW Architects, introduced David Crawford from RMW Architects, David Blackwell with Allen Matkins, and Bob Alvarado with the Carpenter's Fund. He asked if there was not another option; for the Commission to forward the application to the City Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Beaudin said while not commonly used, this is an option that allows the Commission to do that. There are also options to continue the item off-calendar and continue to refine the design. If there is a recommendation for approval, findings could be developed now or later and the hearing could be continued.

Mr. Guest voiced appreciation of the Commission's and staff's time and believe they have made significant efforts. The single biggest issue for them is a business decision. What works for them is to have the program in a single building and move once, given costs, equipment values, and program functionality. He believes they can demonstrate a path forward for findings other than a denial recommendation. The project is of high quality, is in the interests of the City and applicant, and he likened the situation to the previously discussed City Fire Station project, minus its location at the front of the site, which is their main issue. He referred to the Commission discussion early on regarding a potential landscape solution and he hoped not to give the impression they were not in favor of this, as they are. In fact, it could be pursued as mitigation for this main issue but they have not held this dialogue.

Chair Nagler asked if Mr. Guest was suggesting that staff's representation that they objected to that condition of approval was inaccurate. Mr. Guest said yes; that they proposed this to staff initially and he believed it was an initial recommendation the Commission made at the workshop but not staff's preferred option.

Commissioner O'Connor said he brought up at the workshop the fact that if there was another office building coming at a later date and not a set date that some sort of landscape plan be done to address the open dirt area. He did not recall anyone mentioning a landscape plan as opposed to where the building goes because he eventually thought there would be an office building coming to the front of Santa Rita Road.

Mr. Guest commented that he remembered comments of three things; a building in the front, potential landscape, or maybe public art. He did not think they were opposed to public art but believed it to be open-ended and that a specific amount of funds could be committed to an art piece they have control over. They agreed the parking management plan was a challenge and would most likely involve off-site parking and shuttle buses which they can manage to make this work. Most importantly, the applicant needs to know what their next step is.

Commissioner Balch commented that while the Commission appreciates the applicant saying they would like to move, he was once an applicant and was continued by the Commission almost six times himself. Mr. Guest acknowledged this was the Commission's prerogative and noted they have invested over a year in this site and need to get their project going. They would like to move once, but if they need to move elsewhere, they will.

Commissioner Balch referred to page 3 of Mr. Blackwell's letter which states, "Reliance on Community of Character is misguided" and he asked for an explanation.

David Blackwell, Allen Matkins, said his point is that the General Plan reference is to a smart growth concept but believes this has nothing to do with smart growth. There is also nothing in the Community of Character element that this project is contrary to and that policies and goals cited do not apply here.

Commissioner Balch voiced concern with the statement and stated he did not agree with it.

Chair Nagler asked for Commissioners' comments as to whether there was a way to get to a positive conclusion or whether the applicant was being inflexible.

Commissioner Allen asked for staff's perspective on whether there was a solution or that a landscape solution should not be pursued.

Mr. Beaudin said he thinks there is always a solution and a landscape solution is often a secondary opportunity when looking at new construction and development. This is a long-term building for the community and he was reluctant to suggest a parking lot should be landscaped where the current building on Santa Rita Road was doing more of what is expected in the public realm. Staff believes while a landscape solution could be explored with the applicant, it ultimately comes down to whether the Commission believes the findings can be made that this project fits with Santa Rita Road area for the long term, but based on what is presented tonight, he would not recommend it. If enhanced, it may be an option but it still does not achieve the streetscape the City is targeting for this particular site.

Commissioner Balch asked and confirmed with Mr. Beaudin that if the project was sent onto the City Council the Commission could expand on the type of landscape enhancement in their advisory comments.

Commissioner Ritter said he missed the first workshop but recognized the issue as the aesthetics of 600 feet of Santa Rita Road frontage and asked how to resolve that in order to keep the Carpenters Training Center in Pleasanton. Chair Nagler confirmed with Commissioner Ritter that the project was not so far off that this was possible to achieve.

Commissioner Brown concurred but said the applicant still has a parking space issue with the office building removed which then requires stepping forward and then backwards, further aggravating the aesthetic issue on Santa Rita Road. His personal view is that it is about design review and he was not sure he was supportive of the office arrangement with a large parking lot in front of a major frontage road. If this cannot be resolved here, he suggested the Commission make its recommendations and move it onto the City Council. The question is whether the Council can live with the location at the back or not and, if they cannot, the Commission should not make a recommendation either for or against. He added that the Commission did not address the legal advice as it relates to the letter. Both the staff report and letter go through the findings which need to be met for a recommendation. Given that he was not voting, his advice to his fellow Commissioners would be whether they agree that at least one of those seven findings has been met, assuming the City Attorney concurs with that advice of the rest of the staff.

City Attorney Julie Harryman confirmed that a majority of the Commission needs to either be able to make all of the findings or a majority needs to not be able to make the findings. She said they also discussed being neutral where Commissioners could pass on suggestions.

Commissioner Brown stated the attorney for the applicant and the staff report have gone through the seven findings point-by-point, and advised that the Commission must either deny or be neutral.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed with Commissioner Brown and said they were down to one major hurdle. While landscaping is preferred, the issue is more about the vision for Santa Rita Road, and he was not sure how to get past that. If there wasn't a way for the applicant to build their building near the existing building, he was not sure how to approve that.

Commissioner Allen agreed there was a problem and that she could not make all findings because the streetscape plan is inconsistent with the vision for Santa Rita Road, inconsistent with the Community of Character and the General Plan vision, and she did not see a solution.

Commissioner Balch reiterated his discontentment with Mr. Blackwell's letter but thinks landscaping could be a solution. He had asked about the retail centers explicitly because it is newer thinking and the city has done this with parking in front. He could make the findings and the project could be conditioned with landscaping and public art and could move onto the City Council against staff's recommendation for denial. He suggested the applicant move the buildings closer to the existing one so a greater presence could be seen when looking down the driveway. While it is not in the ideal spot, he believed the Commission could get to an imperfect solution.

Commissioner Brown pointed out that the applicant's legal letter indicates they do not support staff's proposal on page 11 which would require a continuance. In other words, the applicant is asking the Commission to either approve or move it on.

Chair Nagler returned to the statement that much of what is driving this is a business decision; that the most effective way to conduct their training is to have all activities under one roof. He asked Mr. Guest if he was ever asked to potentially have classrooms and offices in one building and actual training in a separate building with a covered walkway or something in between.

Mr. Guest said he had that discussion multiple times and each time it was triggered by a request from staff or Commissioners to consider this. He described his work in developing three other prototype facilities and all are in one building, requiring the same type of training and need for efficient operations.

Chair Nagler asked for the amount of square footage that is office space, conference rooms and/or eating areas. Mr. Guest replied that the classroom and shop areas constitute 85 percent of the plan, with 15-20 percent administrative offices and teacher training staff areas.

Commissioner Balch recognized these previous discussions and was sure that efficiencies of co-locating people together had been considered.

Mr. Guest added that they had discussed with staff their desire for prominence on the street but building an office building on the street eliminates parking they need and he described their efforts of moving the building forward, determining whether parking was sufficient, and said they thought there might be some forgiveness in the interpretation of the parking study.

Chair Nagler said he appreciates the fact that the applicant is acknowledging this and commented that the deficit during construction was significant and also a challenge. He also recognized the facility has been in Pleasanton for some time, has proven itself as a valuable element of the community and sets them apart from other towns. He admitted being quite opinionated about the streetscape and frustrated with the perception of inflexibility by the applicant and the 600-foot frontage along Santa Rita Road. He believes that this project should be built and asked that the new building be moved over, even as an incremental view from the street and thought that the applicant needs to do everything possible and not be concerned

about the economics, landscaping, or public art, but instead have the project integrated as best they can with the streetscape along Santa Rita Road. If not, the solution will end up being shrubs that die, that do not adequately block views, with gravel on an incline that degrades over time.

Chair Nagler concluded and felt there is a project ultimately to be built, even in the phases proposed but said the Commission has not yet seen the solution they have been asking for. He has not heard a majority vote to simply endorse staff's recommendation for denial, and Commissioners agreed. He asked if the majority of Commissioners wished to discuss the option of going back and reviewing the conditions of approval from the first public hearing and recommending approval, using earlier findings.

Commissioner Balch likened this to a large rock to lift and he was not sure it was the best option. He suggested discussing the other options first.

Commissioner Ritter said the Commission has approved projects that have gone back to staff before going to the next level, but the findings would need to be able to be made.

Commissioner Balch said he could make the findings but his question in going this route included using the conditions of approval from the December hearing which he believed were essential.

Chair Nagler read the condition of approval out loud relating to requirements before a certificate of occupancy could be issued, requirements for submittal of an enhanced streetscape plan, a cost estimate and entering into an improvement agreement with the City. The Commission has the impression, and the applicant disagrees that their reaction to this condition was negative.

Commissioner Balch said based on testimony it sounds as if this can be explored further with a compromise. To get to the majority of three votes the traffic demand management plan should be figured out and presented to staff for approval, as well as the landscaping along Santa Rita Road as best as it could be made. While he did not believe they could move the building, his desire was that the right side of the street hit their front building by the lower front driveway entrance at the last phase. He suggested the applicant modify this or the bio-swale structure so the street lines up to the front anchor of the building. If the building could move over just enough so the sidewalk and driveway is addressing concerns, he hoped this could be incorporated into the plan but not made a condition in order to enhance it.

Mr. Beaudin said it is an interesting proposition but a resolution is not drafted with findings of approval. When conditions of approval were written staff had received the letter just prior to the hearing showing opposition to conditions. Therefore, staff can attempt to use the findings included with the original staff report and modify them. He explained the way staff wrote the alternative section was because things never go as planned and having the extra time to go through conditions would be helpful for staff. He understands the applicant would like to go before the Council. This is just a different path and it is challenging. Staff can take direction and move it onto the Council with a staff layer between the Planning Commission and Council, but it may not capture everything the way the Commission exactly wants it.

Chair Nagler asked if staff's ability to find a solution would be enhanced if this Commission was to recommend denial unless certain things were done, or he asked if it would be neutral unless certain things would be done.

Mr. Beaudin said he thinks the Commission can characterize the recommendation in any way at this time. As long as comments and direction are clear, this is the piece that will get added to the staff report for the Council's consideration. The idea of not recommending approval or denial is the Commission's purview, but it sits slightly out of the norm because the Commission's responsibility and purview is making a recommendation to the Council on these tough land use discussions. He asked to focus on the PUD findings with a strong design component and making sure which findings can be made and which they cannot and why, which helps the Council make their decision.

Commissioner Balch said if there is a majority of the Commission that support the project as the applicant has shown, he personally did not want to deny it just so it could be continued and thought it should be shown that there is a recommendation of approval. In a perfect world, he asked how much time staff would need to draft findings and conditions.

Mr. Beaudin stated staff could return on March 28 at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Allen said she could move to the majority if she saw a landscape plan and a real streetscape with elevations built in, and the Council would want to see this as well. If this is what is needed she thinks it was incumbent on the Commission to be sure that is developed before moving onto the Council.

Mr. Beaudin noted this would likely take the matter past March 28.

Commissioner Ritter stated the Commission has moved on projects requiring these things in the past for the Council to then make its decision.

Commissioner Allen recognized the Commission has done this and it did not come out the way they wanted it. Secondly, this is the third time the Commission has seen the project and this is the elephant in the room, thereby elevating the importance of nailing this the right way. She cited the need for an additional level of diligence as has been done in other projects and said the Commission unanimously wanted this at the last meeting.

Chair Nagler said the challenge is they have spent a lot of time with little progress. They have been very clear and he offered that he would not be confident that the City Council was going to be any less energized on this topic than the Planning Commission was. Given that, it is frustrating that the Commission is then put in a position when they want the project in Pleasanton. The problem is the applicant is not providing a path forward.

Bob Alvarado stated landscaping was not a solution but said they had offered it before. Up until tonight, the Commission wanted the building moved but if they have direction tonight from the Commission to staff that landscaping is a solution, he agreed that a 3- or 4-foot high decorative wall could be included so the parking lot has a curve to it. Also, extensive landscaping could be prepared and he asked to allow them to locate a \$150,000 statue from their main training facility in Las Vegas to this location or something within a certain price range. If this is a solution, Mr. Alvarado said he would agree to return to the Planning

Commission, stating he has over \$500,000 invested and over a year into this project and at some point he must move forward or leave.

Commissioner Balch asked if it was acceptable to the applicant if the route was for continuance so staff could draft conditions and the applicant could work with staff to arrive at the landscape solution, Mr. Alvarado said yes.

Commissioner Balch suggested providing mock-ups to hopefully arrive at a unanimous recommendation.

Chair Nagler asked if Mr. Alvarado believed this Commission would support the project when the applicant leaves tonight.

Mr. Alvarado said if all Commissioners agree tonight that landscaping is a solution and the building can stay in the corner and they could provide a piece of public art he thinks the vote will be unanimous and then they can move onto the City Council.

Commissioner Allen added that her request in developing the landscape plan should include the applicant team walking and driving down Santa Rita Road and using that perspective to think about and create the plan because it is the visuals that should show what a walker or bicyclist will see.

Mr. Alvarado said he will ask for several designs to come back and if they are including a wall, he asked if the Commission would want a continuous wall or a wall broken up with developed landscaping. Or, he asked if they want a 4-foot type of wall that will block the cars with landscaping.

Commissioner Allen suggested the applicant return with both options. Chair Nagler added that a low wall could look bad or gorgeous, it would depend on design.

Commissioner Balch asked and confirmed with Mr. Beaudin that staff was working on updating design guidelines to put buildings in front and enhancing landscape for greater water-efficiency. Commissioner Balch thought these draft landscaping plans may serve as a good starting point for the applicant.

Mr. Beaudin stated it will be up to the applicant to submit the plans and for the Commission for review. He confirmed Commission direction as the applicant returning with landscape plans, findings for approval and streetscape visuals for review.

**Commissioner Ritter moved to continue PUD-125 off-calendar.
Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No items were discussed or actions taken.

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

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

No items were discussed or actions taken.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Ms. Clark provided an overview of upcoming agenda items as listed on the agenda report.

Commissioner Balch asked and confirmed with Mr. Beaudin that AB 827 will include an overview of the ADU map previously approved by the Commission as it relates to this and staff was monitoring the bill.

c. Actions of the City Council

No items were discussed or actions taken.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No items were discussed or actions taken.

e. 2018 Planning Commission "Roadmap"

Chair Nagler introduced the item, stating he asked staff to provide information of upcoming projects and to enable the Commission to have a larger master plan of what is coming up.

Ms. Clark reviewed the following actions staff was working on to help the Commission in its decision-making process:

1. Policy updates on housing which she described and will be discussed at the next meeting and a housing White Paper, which is an attempt to gather background information and historical context of housing in Pleasanton over time which will lead towards the next Housing Element cycle
2. Training opportunities for the Commission and she said the League of California Cities will be hosting a Planning Commissioner's Academy in April, as well as an in-house training over one or two meetings on aspects of design review for good projects; and;
3. An overview of potential upcoming applications which include a major housing application, a Planned Unit Development project, an additional housing project and hotel project.
4. Lastly, they will discuss policy updates on housing related guidelines, high density projects, review of the City's inclusionary zoning ordinance, focus updates to the zoning code, and the on-going work on the Downtown Specific Plan.

Attached to the agenda report is the Council's Work Program and many items relate to the Community Development Department and the Planning Commission which should provide a big picture overview.

Commissioner Balch referred to training and asked if staff could include a discussion on how close the city was to buildout, as well as the schedule for update of the General Plan. Mr. Beaudin briefly reviewed the schedule and said on-going updates have occurred. In response to a question regarding housing priorities, Mr. Beaudin said after the election, Brian Dolan (Assistant City Manager) will be assembling the comprehensive list which will integrate the Commission's work for the Council workshop wherein projects will be prioritized.

Commissioner Allen asked and confirmed that the next RHNA cycle starts in 2023 and the city is likely to get their numbers late in 2021 or in 2022.

Chair Nagler said it would be helpful to also include topics to be addressed as to how housing developments impact RHNA.

Mr. Beaudin explained that the legislative update at the next meeting will be helpful and the housing White Paper will have a lot of information on RHNA. He briefly spoke about opportunity sites identified and prioritized in the past which will be done again for other sites as well as a discussion about meeting obligations across all income categories.

Commissioner Brown asked if there will be updates on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan (EPSP) or Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Beaudin said until the Council re-prioritizes the EPSP, staff will be processing industrial applications the developer has come forward with. It will likely be discussed during the 2021 Work Plan process through Council direction.

f. Matters for Commission's Information

Commissioner Ritter stated he will not be able to attend the March 26 Bicycle Pedestrian meeting and asked Commissioner Allen if she was available to attend in his stead. Secondly, he complimented staff for forwarding a list of all projects completed which have been mapped out. Mr. Beaudin acknowledged that list is updated and published bi-monthly and the website has an interactive map of those items as well.

Commissioner Allen said she learned that Mr. Beaudin and his team are doing fabulous work on Council priorities relating to signage and story poling, and she asked and confirmed staff would be bringing this forward.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Nagler adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Quintero
Recording Secretary