



Planning Commission Staff Report

December 14, 2016
Item 6.a.

SUBJECT: P16-1418

APPLICANT: City of Pleasanton

PROPERTY OWNER: City-wide

PURPOSE: Consider an amendment to the Pleasanton Municipal Code to: update and simplify the list of permitted and conditionally permitted land uses; establish a Minor Conditional Use Permit process for routine uses; reflect current practices; clarify and streamline review procedures; replace out-of-date references; and undertake other changes to make the Code more user-friendly.

GENERAL PLAN: Various

ZONING: Various

LOCATION: City-wide

EXHIBITS:

- A. [Draft Amendment to the Pleasanton Municipal Code](#)
- B. [Comments Summary Matrix](#)
- C. [August 31, 2016 Planning Commission Excerpt Minutes](#)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

1. Find that the proposed amendment to the Municipal Code is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and
2. Adopt a resolution recommending approval of Case P16-1418, an amendment to the Pleasanton Municipal Code as shown in Exhibit A, and forward the application to the City Council for public hearing and review.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed update to the Zoning Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code) is intended primarily to: (1) simplify and update the list of permitted and conditionally permitted land uses; (2) establish a Minor Conditional Use Permit process that would allow staff to administer discretion over uses that are more routine in nature, but still require an evaluation and mitigation of potential impacts, such as those related to parking, noise, odor, and land use

compatibility; and (3) undertake other changes to reflect current practice/law and increase the usability of the document. A key objective is to make the regulations in the Zoning Code easier for members of the community to interpret and use. Exhibit A is the proposed amendment to the Zoning Code.

Staff has conducted an extensive outreach effort related to the code amendment, and has presented the code update and solicited feedback from the Economic Vitality Committee, the Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Vitality Committee (a subcommittee of the Pleasanton Downtown Association), the Pleasanton Downtown Association, and Planning Commission (during a Work Session on August 31, 2016). Staff also held a Stakeholder Meeting with interested parties on November 9, 2016, and has met one-on-one with interested members of the public on an as-requested basis. In total, staff has held six stakeholder meetings on the code amendment. The proposed amendment to the code has generally received a favorable review by these entities, and thus staff is bringing the code amendments forward to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to City Council.

PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION AND OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS

The tables in Exhibit B to this staff report summarize the comments received to-date, either from the Planning Commission during its August 31st Work Session (excerpt minutes are attached as Exhibit C), or from one of the other meetings staff has hosted regarding the Zoning Code Update. The tables are organized into two categories: Table 1 identifies the comments that have been implemented (including a description of how the comments have been implemented), and Table 2 identifies the comments that are suggested for future updates or that have not been implemented. Generally, staff incorporated comments that were consistent with the overall objectives of this initial phase of the Zoning Code Update and those that resulted in clarifications to existing or new definitions or sections of the code. Comments that were not implemented or deferred generally were those that are already addressed by State law, those that pertain to existing performance standards in the code, or those that are outside the scope of this phase of the Zoning Code update and would be best addressed in a future phase of an update. Future phases of the Zoning Code Update could include updates to the Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.04), evaluating whether uses should be added as permitted or conditionally permitted uses in zoning districts, or evaluating existing development standards.

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The City Council has identified as a priority an update of the Zoning Code for purposes of establishing a Minor Conditional Use Permit process and simplifying the development review process. Staff has been working on this update over the last several months, as part of a broader effort to make the City's development regulations more transparent and easier to navigate. This effort has been paired with the recent development and launch of the City's new PleasantonPermits portal, which assists applicants in navigating the Zoning Code and permit process.

The Zoning Code divides the City into various zoning or use districts, each of which has its own list of permitted and conditionally permitted land uses and development regulations (e.g., limitations on building height, building setbacks, and overall square footage), along with a purpose (e.g., to provide appropriately located areas for commercial facilities). The Zoning

Code currently contains three chapters pertinent to Office, Commercial, and Industrial zoning districts – Chapters 18.40, 18.44, and 18.48 – which include nine different use districts.

Currently, the Zoning Code lists permitted and conditionally permitted uses for the Office and Industrial districts in Chapters 18.40 and 18.48, respectively, and identifies permitted and conditionally permitted uses for the Commercial districts in a table format in Chapter 18.44 (Table 18.44.090), where caveats for particular uses are listed within the table itself. The dispersed nature of the lists of permitted and conditionally permitted land uses in the Zoning Code makes it difficult for property owners and applicants to identify where a specific land uses is permitted, or broad land use trends in individual districts. The key objectives of this code modification include: (1) simplify and update the list of permitted and conditionally permitted uses, including simplifying Table 18.44.090; (2) establish a Minor Conditional Use Permit process that would allow staff to administer discretion over uses that are more routine in nature, but still require an evaluation of potential impacts, such as those related to parking, noise, odor, and land use compatibility; and (3) undertake other changes to reflect current practice/law and increase the usability of the document.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of simplifying and updating the list of permitted and conditionally permitted uses is to allow that information to be more easily digested, understood, and navigated. Currently, Table 18.44.090 contains a long list of often-redundant and outdated land uses, making it difficult for community members to ascertain whether a specific use is permitted or conditionally permitted, and sometimes requiring a visit to City Hall to seek a staff interpretation (note that this table is proposed to be identified as Table 18.44.080 as part of the code update). Additionally, information that is currently noted in the body of the table identifying permitted and conditionally permitted uses is proposed to be footnoted. This, in addition to formatting changes, is intended to make the table easier to read and understand. Summarized below are proposed deletions from the code, new definitions, and new land use categories, in addition to an explanation of how the new use table is organized. A discussion of the proposed Minor Conditional Use Permit process, the existing Administrative Conditional Use Permit process, and determinations regarding uses that are not expressly identified in the code is also provided below.

Deletions

In keeping with the objective of modernizing and simplifying the code, staff proposes to delete two zoning districts (which do not apply to specific properties) and specific uses that are outdated and do not logically fit into one of the existing or proposed land use categories.

The two zoning districts proposed for deletion include the Automobile Commercial (C-A) District and the Light Industrial (L-I) District. One of the purposes of the C-A district is to provide an opportunity for automobile dealers and closely related businesses to benefit from the proximity and high design standards possible in an automotive district. The City's automobile dealerships and related businesses are located in Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and design regulations and lists of allowed uses are developed on a case-by-case basis. Since there are no properties currently zoned C-A (or PUDs that reference the C-A District), staff believes it is appropriate to delete the C-A District. Similarly, the main purpose of the L-I District is to provide locations for industries that are more restrictive in terms of use

than the I-G District and can operate in relatively close proximity to commercial and residential uses with a minimum of adverse effects. There are no properties zoned L-I District, and there are no PUDs that reference the L-I District. Since the I-P District has a similar objective in providing locations for industries that can operate in close proximity to commercial and residential land uses with minimal adverse impacts, and since there are no properties currently zoned L-I District, the L-I District is proposed to be deleted. The deletion of the C-A and L-I districts would not limit the ability of the City to attract desired automotive and industrial uses, and would allow for further simplification of the Zoning Code.

In reviewing the list of existing land uses proposed for deletion, staff found that some uses are antiquated (e.g., blacksmiths), others are not actual land uses (e.g. office *buildings*), and others are not frequently used or relevant to current business practices, or could be encompassed within a smaller number of broader and more easily-understood land use categories.

New Use Categories

The proposed Zoning Code update includes new use categories that are not currently identified and that are needed to respond to the evolving nature of the local economy (including the need to accommodate change in the future). Examples of new use categories include: art and craft studios, farmer’s markets, mobile food trucks, transportation dispatch facilities, and governmental facilities. In addition, thematic use categories (Cultural and Entertainment, Educational, Energy/Accessory Uses, Governmental, Industrial, Office/Business Service, Outdoor Uses, Personal and General Service, Places of Assembly, Residential, Retail, and Temporary Lodging) have been used to organize the permitted and conditionally permitted use table to help users better navigate the use restrictions and to accommodate appropriate future uses that aren’t currently anticipated. These are discussed further in the Organization and Footnotes section, below.

The “retail” category is divided into two categories by square footage (up to 60,000 square feet and greater than 60,000 square feet), and represents a substantial consolidation of uses in existing Table 18.44.090, resulting in a simplification of the use table. Instead of treating every different retail use differently, retail uses up to 60,000 square feet are permitted in all Commercial Districts, and retail uses greater than 60,000 square feet are conditionally permitted in all Commercial Districts with the exception of the C-N District, where retail uses greater than 60,000 square feet are not permitted. In general, staff believes that retail uses exceeding 60,000 square feet have operational characteristics (e.g., traffic, parking, overall activity patterns) that require special consideration, and thus warrant different treatment in the use table. Staff believes that 60,000 square feet is a reasonable threshold triggering additional evaluation that would protect the small-scale retail character that is predominant in many of the City’s commercial districts. Table 1 illustrates the size of a representative group of retail uses in the City.

Table 1: Approximate Square Footage of Existing Retail Venues

STORE	ADDRESS	APPROXIMATE SQUARE FOOTAGE
Walmart	4501 Rosewood Drive	126,000

Table 1: Approximate Square Footage of Existing Retail Venues

STORE	ADDRESS	APPROXIMATE SQUARE FOOTAGE
Home Depot	6000 Johnson Drive	100,000
Raley's (Oak Hills Shopping Center)	5420 Sunol Boulevard	60,000
Safeway (Pleasanton Gateway)	6790 Bernal Avenue	58,000
Safeway (Amador Center)	1701 Santa Rita Road	58,000
Macy's Furniture Store (Rose Pavilion)	4255 Rosewood Drive	55,500
Lucky (Val Vista Center)	6155 W. Las Positas Boulevard	50,000
99 Ranch Market	4299 Rosewood Drive	45,000
Walmart Neighborhood Market	3112 Santa Rita Road	35,000
Former CVS (Rose Pavilion)	4225 Rosewood Drive	28,500
Smart and Final	5775 Johnson Drive	25,000
Gene's Fine Foods	2803 Hopyard Road	20,500
New Leaf Community Market	3550 Bernal Avenue	19,000

Examples of uses that have been combined into this single “retail” category include: antique stores, bicycle shops, candy stores, clothing, shoe, and accessory stores, department stores, dry goods stores, gift shops, hobby shops, music stores, second hand stores, shoe stores, stamp and coin stores, stationary stores, tobacco stores, toy stores, and variety stores. In combining these uses, the districts within which land uses are permitted or conditionally permitted remain largely the same as in the existing Zoning Code. This reclassification and consolidation of retail uses is based on the principle that the impacts from a retail use in an existing tenant space or building are largely the same, irrespective of whether the store sells shoes, stamps, or stationary, and thus combining the land use categories lends to greater simplicity and ease of use by both the public and staff. As indicated below, there are retail uses that become permitted in districts where they are not permitted currently, uses that become conditionally permitted where they are permitted currently, and uses that are omitted from districts as either a permitted or conditionally permitted use. However, this change in classification is not expected to pose land use compatibility problems based on the principle identified above – that retail establishment impacts are primarily a function of size and not product (or type of products) sold.

Examples of retail use re-classifications include:

- The land use category “regional attraction, including amusement parks, automobile racing stadiums, drive-in theater, miniature golf, indoor skating rinks, sports arenas, or stadiums” is proposed as a conditional use in the C-F and C-S Districts. This category is a combination of uses that are currently permitted/conditionally permitted as follows:
 - amusement parks, which are conditionally permitted in the C-S District;

- automobile racing stadiums and drag strips, which are conditionally permitted in the C-S District;
- drive-in theater, which is conditionally permitted in the C-S District;
- miniature golf, which is permitted in the C-R(m) District and conditionally permitted in the C-R(p) District;
- indoor skating rinks, which are permitted in the C-R(m), C-R(p), and C-S Districts, and conditionally permitted in the C-F District; and
- sports arenas or stadiums, which are conditionally permitted in the C-S and C-F Districts.

As noted, with the combination of these categories, miniature golf would no longer be a permitted use in the C-R(m) District and indoor skating rinks would no longer be a permitted use in the C-R(m), C-R(p), and C-S Districts, and would no longer be a conditionally permitted use in the C-F District. Staff proposes to add this “regional attraction” category as a conditional use to the C-R(m) and C-R(p) Districts.

- Outdoor recreation and sports facilities including racetracks, golf driving ranges, skateboard parks, riding stables, etc. are currently conditionally permitted only in the C-S District, but have also been added as conditional uses in the C-F District.
- Indoor rifle and pistol ranges, with or without firearm sales have been eliminated as a conditional use in the C-C District (currently, “indoor shooting galleries” are permitted in the C-R(m) and C-S Districts, and are subject to CUP in the C-C District. “Indoor shooting galleries with firearm sales” are currently conditionally permitted in the C-R(m), C-C and C-S Districts.).
- Taxidermists has been removed as a permitted use in the C-R(m) District, but remain as a permitted use in the C-R(p), C-C, and C-S Districts.
- Glass replacement and repair shops are currently subject to a CUP in the C-S District and are permitted in the C-F District. Instead of being subject to a CUP in the C-S District, this use is now permitted in both the C-S and C-F Districts.
- The use category “tires, batteries, and accessories” was removed from the C-R(m) District as a permitted use and added as a permitted use to the C-S District (it remains a permitted use in the C-R(p) District).
- The use category “tire sales and service, not including retreading and recapping or mounting of heavy truck tires” is removed as a conditional use from the C-C District (it would remain conditionally permitted in the C-R(p) District, and permitted in the C-S District).
- Sales, rental, and/or leasing of automobiles, motorcycles, and boats, without service, has been added as a permitted use in the C-R(p) District, and subject to a Minor Conditional Use Permit in the C-S District (it would remain a permitted use in the C-C, C-R(m) Districts, and conditionally permitted in the C-F District).
- The “restaurants and catering establishments” category combines the following existing categories: catering establishments, delicatessen stores, ice cream sales, and restaurants and soda fountain food establishments, with and without take-out. The new definition of restaurants also includes specialty coffee establishments and tea rooms, which makes explicit the current practice of classifying these restaurant-like uses as restaurants for zoning purposes (no change is proposed to the definition of “bar,” which

indicates that a restaurant which sells alcoholic beverages any time after 11:00 p.m. and before 6:00 a.m. is classified as a bar). Catering establishments are currently permitted in the C-S District. However, with the proposed Code modifications, catering establishments would be conditionally permitted in the C-S District to align with the way restaurants are classified. However, catering establishments are not currently permitted or conditionally permitted in the I-P District, but would become conditionally permitted with this proposal to align with the way restaurants are classified. Further, delicatessen stores and ice cream sales are not permitted or conditionally permitted in the C-S, C-F, I-P, or I-G district, but combining these uses into a single category results in these uses becoming permitted in the C-F District and conditionally permitted in the C-S, I-P, and I-G districts. Finally, the new category omits the distinction between “drive-ins” and “take-out food establishments” the Code currently makes (also please reference the drive-through footnote discussed in the Organization and Footnotes section).

- Currently, the code does not permit nursery schools and private schools in the same zoning districts. To account for facilities that provide infant/toddler care in addition to being a private school, the “private school” category is proposed to be added as a conditional use in the C-N, C-R(m), and C-R (p) Districts (these are the same districts where nursery schools are currently conditional uses).

Combining land use categories as described above leads to differences in which districts permit and conditionally permit certain land uses, but this flexibility is balanced by improved simplicity and ease of use. Furthermore, staff believes there would be a minimal potential for unanticipated impacts (because similar uses would tend to have similar effects on parking, noise, and overall activity levels). A use that becomes a nonconforming use after adoption of this Zoning Code Update would be subject to the provisions of Chapter 18.120 (Nonconforming Uses).

Overall, staff finds that the benefit of combining uses into fewer categories (when they are similar in scope and land use impact) outweighs the potential problems associated with employing a more permissive approach to a handful of retail uses. In addition, staff will undertake a periodic evaluation of all Zoning Code amendments undertaken as part of this first phase, with the first evaluation likely occurring at 6 or 12 months after adoption. If the amendments result in land use incompatibilities or other problems, further refinements will be brought to the Planning Commission for consideration.

New Definitions

Chapter 18.08 provides a list of definitions that are common to planning and land use practice. While this list is extensive, staff has found that it lacks definitions for certain common uses (e.g., restaurant and medical office). Also, definitions for new, proposed land uses have also been incorporated. Definitions for the following uses are proposed: community facility, financial institution, governmental facility, industrial (heavy), industrial (light), mixed-use development, office (general), office (medical), personal service, restaurant, retail, and winery. The definition of “birthing center” is proposed to be deleted since this use category would be categorized as a medical office.

Organization and Footnotes

Uses for the Commercial District are currently identified in Table 18.44.090 of the Zoning Code, and uses for the Office and Industrial Districts are identified in Chapters 18.40 and 18.48, respectively. Since many of the permitted and conditionally permitted uses in each of these zoning districts overlap, and for simplification, staff is proposing to include permitted and conditionally permitted uses for the Office, Commercial, and Industrial Districts in the same table. Additionally, headings have been added to uses to organize these uses into subcategories (e.g. retail, personal and general service, office and business service, outdoor uses) to assist with navigation and to capture compatible uses that may be proposed in the future but that are not explicitly identified in the table.

As mentioned previously in this report, footnotes have been added to the table of uses that reference particular requirements. These footnotes are intended to reduce the need to cross-reference multiple sections of the Zoning Code in order to ascertain the performance standards or other requirements that apply to a specific use. Many of the footnotes reflect requirements that are currently in the Code (e.g., that massage establishments must meet the requirements of Chapter 6.24). There are also footnotes that propose new standards. For example, a footnote proposes that any use that includes a drive-through is subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

Minor Conditional Use Permit Process

Currently the Zoning Code identifies uses that are either permitted or conditionally permitted, with all Conditional Use Permits requiring review and approval by the Planning Commission. One of the main purposes of the current update to the Zoning Code is to establish a Minor Conditional Use Permit process for uses that currently require Conditional Use Permit approval, but are often approved on the consent calendar and do not necessarily warrant Planning Commission review. However, the Minor Conditional Use Permit process would still allow the Zoning Administrator to effectively analyze land use, parking, noise, and other factors for uses that are less routine than permitted uses, ensuring that potential issues are addressed. In addition, the Planning Commission and City Council would have the ability to review any Minor Conditional Use Permits issued by the Zoning Administrator (issued Minor Conditional Use Permits would be published in the Zoning Administrator report distributed to City Council and Planning Commission on a regular basis).

The proposed Minor Conditional Use Permit process is outlined in Chapter 18.124 of the revised Zoning Code. As written, the submittal requirements are similar to those for Conditional Use Permits. However, instead of undergoing Planning Commission review, the Zoning Administrator would grant or deny an application for a Minor Conditional Use Permit subsequent to a 10-day notification period to neighbors within a 300-foot radius of the project site. This 300-foot distribution radius is the same as that currently undertaken for Variance applications (for perspective, a 100-foot radius noticing is required for Large Family Day Care Homes and Beekeeping applications, and a 1,000-foot radius noticing radius is required for PUD Minor Modifications and any project that goes to Planning Commission and City Council). Staff believes the proposed 300-foot radius is commensurate with the geographic extent of potential impacts associated with Minor Conditional Use Permits, which are routine in nature. The decision by the Zoning Administrator is subject to the appeal process currently outlined in Chapter 18.144. Also, the fee schedule adopted by City Council in 2015 does not identify a fee for Minor Conditional Use Permits, and the City Council decided to wait to raise the fee for

Conditional Use Permits until the Minor Conditional Use Permit process was established. An ordinance to amend the fee schedule would be included as part of the staff report that is provided to City Council.

In an effort to provide applicants with guidance regarding the criteria that will be used to evaluate the appropriateness of a Minor Conditional Use Permit application, staff is proposing to establish performance standards that include the following:

- a. The facility shall adhere to all occupancy, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), California Building Code, and exiting requirements;
- b. Adequate parking is available for the use, and the proposal has an effective traffic circulation system including pick-up and drop-off for business patrons; and
- c. The use meets the city noise ordinance.

The proposed language also indicates that the Zoning Administrator may request a traffic study, noise study, or other technical study in order to determine whether the proposed use meets the above performance standards.

Similar to the Conditional Use Permit process, the Zoning Administrator would make findings indicating that the proposed use is consistent with the purpose of the subject zoning district; that the use would not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare; and that the use would comply with applicable provisions of the Code. Also similar to the Conditional Use Permit process, and as noted above, the Planning Commission and City Council would be notified of the decision made by the Zoning Administrator and could appeal the decision if desired.

The types of uses that are proposed to be subject to the Minor Conditional Use Permit process are identified in Exhibit B (please reference Comment 13 in Table 1).

Administrative Conditional Use Permit

Chapter 9.22 of the Code prescribes the City's regulations and procedural requirements related to recycling facilities (defined as "a center for the collection and/or processing of recyclable materials"). Both recycling *collection* facilities and recycling *processing* facilities are distinguished by size, and depending on size, are currently subject to either an Administrative Conditional Use Permit process, or a Conditional Use Permit process. The Administrative Conditional Use Permit is unique to this chapter of the Code and applies only to recycling facilities. Such facilities are typically mailbox- or larger-sized bins where people can deposit recyclable materials and are typically located in parking lots. The Zoning Administrator is responsible for reviewing and making a decision for Administrative Conditional Use Permits, and the Code stipulates that, if granted, they are valid for a period of 12 months from the date of approval (approval for another 12-month term requires a new request). Since the Administrative Conditional Use Permit is unique to this chapter of the Code, and with the objective of reducing redundancies within the Code, staff is proposing to delete the Administrative Conditional Use Permit process for recycling facilities and replace it with the Temporary Conditional Use process instead. Temporary Conditional Uses are detailed in Chapter 18.124 of the Code, and function similarly to Administrative Conditional Use Permits in that they are subject to review and approval by the Zoning Administrator. Section 9.22.040,

which specifies that approval for recycling facilities is valid for a 12-month period, is not proposed for revision. Therefore, the removal of the Administrative Conditional Use Permit process from the Code would not substantively affect the City's review and permitting of recycling facilities.

Determinations as to Uses Not Listed

Chapter 18.128 of the Code prescribes the process for making a determination regarding uses that are not specifically listed as permitted or conditionally permitted uses. Specifically, the Planning Commission is charged with the responsibility for making the determination for such uses on the basis of similarity to uses that are specifically listed. Since business types and proposals are dynamic (and the use categories in the Zoning Code change infrequently), the Planning Division occasionally receives requests from prospective business owners to open a business type which is not specifically identified in the Zoning Code as a permitted or conditionally permitted use. In practice, the new use is often sufficiently similar (or dissimilar) in activity patterns and other characteristics to an already-identified use such that the Zoning Administrator can make a determination as to whether the use is permitted, conditionally permitted, or not allowed. With the objective of making such a process easier for prospective business owners and to reflect current practice, Chapter 18.128 is proposed to be modified so that the Zoning Administrator may make a use determination. These use determinations would be facilitated by the new use definitions added to the Zoning Code. If the Zoning Administrator finds it necessary, the use determination can be referred to the Planning Commission.

Modifications Specific to Downtown

There are several proposed amendments to the C-C District, and since most commercial properties in the Downtown have a C-C zoning designation, these modifications are specific to Downtown Pleasanton (while a select number of properties are zoned C-C outside of the Downtown area, the proposed text below is most applicable to properties in Downtown). The proposed change to the special purpose of the C-C District emphasizes pedestrian scale since this is an important design feature for Downtown, and modifies the term "central business district" to say, "Downtown Revitalization district" since the extent of the Downtown Revitalization District is more in keeping with this specific purpose. For residential uses, the proposed modifications to the Zoning Code are intended to identify mixed-use as a permitted type of development (to bring the Zoning Code into compliance with the Downtown Specific Plan, which encourages mixed-use projects in central commercial areas of the Downtown).

ALTERNATIVES

Staff explored multiple alternatives to elements of the currently-proposed Zoning Code Update during the project formulation stage and in response to public comments. Alternatives included a more conservative approach to refining the Zoning Code (i.e., retaining the existing lists of permitted and conditionally permitted uses, while removing antiquated uses and adding new, previously-unlisted uses). Staff also **considered** a Minor Conditional Use Permit process that would encompass fewer uses. Ultimately, staff believes that the currently-proposed tabular approach to organizing permitted and conditionally permitted land uses is the most user-friendly alternative, and that the scope of the update meets Council expectations for the first phase of the work effort in a way that is protective of community expectations for the built environment.

PROS/CONS

The proposed Zoning Code update is intended to simplify the existing code and make it more navigable. Similar to other changes to a code that has been fairly static over the last few decades, the proposed amendment may initially cause confusion among applicants who are accustomed to the organization of the old code. In addition, there is a potential for uses that were once conditionally permitted and that are now permitted to result in land use incompatibilities. Similarly, there may be a few businesses that would be nonconforming uses, and that would be subject to associated requirements in the Municipal Code.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Notice of this public hearing was published in *The Valley Times*, was noted in the Pleasanton Weekly, and was shared on the City's social media accounts (e.g., Twitter). As part of the outreach efforts related to the Zoning Code Update, staff has presented the draft code update to the Economic Vitality Committee, Economic Development & Government Relations Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Vitality Committee (a subcommittee of the Pleasanton Downtown Association), the Pleasanton Downtown Association, and invited all of these groups to participate in a stakeholder meeting on November 9, 2016. Staff has not received any additional comments as of the publication of this report, and will forward to the Commission any public comments received after publication of this report.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3), as it has been determined that the Municipal Code amendment will not cause a significant negative effect on the environment. The changes to the Zoning Code will not intensify land uses, result in land use incompatibilities, or generate other unmitigated impacts beyond those that would result from the existing Zoning Code.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Municipal Code update is intended to simplify the existing code language and streamline the code's overall organization. Additionally, the Minor Conditional Use Permit process is intended to provide a more streamlined alternative to the Conditional Use Permit process so that applicants for routine uses do not have to go through the expense (monetary and time) associated with the Conditional Use Permit process. Although a substantial reorganization of the code has been undertaken, staff does not believe that this code update will change the pattern of land uses in the City or introduce a new potential for land use incompatibilities.

Primary Author:

Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner, (925) 931-5611 or sbonn@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Reviewed/Approved By:

Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager

Gerry Beaudin, Community Development Director