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

APPROVED

Wednesday, May 25, 2016

(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 May 25, 2016, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Ritter.

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; Dan Sodergren, City Attorney; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; Jennifer Hagen, Associate Planner; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; Natalie Amos, Associate Planner; and Kendall Rose, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, Justin Brown David Nagler, Greg O'Connor, and Chair Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 27, 2016

Commissioner Allen requested the following corrections:

- Modify the third sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 17 to read as follows: "...also need one almost next door ~~and that had a slightly higher rent and it had more units so it...~~"

- Remove the fifth sentence of paragraph four on page 41 reading: “That’s been long coming because of financial and business model.”

Commissioner Nagler moved to approve the Minutes of the April 27, 2016 Meeting, as amended.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Nagler, O’Connor, and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

The Minutes of the April 27, 2016 Meeting were approved, as amended.

b. May 11, 2016

Commissioner Balch requested that the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 3 be modified to read as follows: “I noticed in the staff report that it the maximum height is 25 feet...”

Commissioner Balch moved to approve the Minutes of the May 11, 2016 Meeting, as amended.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Nagler, O’Connor, and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

The Minutes of the May 11, 2016 Meeting were approved, as amended.

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

There were no revisions 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. P16-0863, Tim and Cathy Swain

Application for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 1,200-square-foot single-story home with an attached 764-square-foot garage and 565-square-foot storage area at 1101 Sleepy Head Lane. Zoning for the property is Planned Unit Development – Semi-Rural Density Residential (PUD-SRDR) District.

b. P16-0871, Dave and Cindy Johnston

Application for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 4,640-square-foot, one-story single-family residence with an approximately 933-square-foot attached garage on a 3.76-acre parcel at 7 Winding Oaks Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-HR/OS (Planned Unit Development – Hillside Residential / Open Space) Districts.

c. Vesting Tentative Map 8317, Ponderosa Homes II, Inc.

Application for a Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide an approximately nine-acre property located at 1851 Rose Avenue into 20 lots for 19 new single-family homes (approved under PUD-99) and one common area lot. Zoning for the property is Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential (PUD-MDR) District.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve Cases P16-0863, P16-0871, and Vesting Tentative Map 8317, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the respective staff reports.

Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

Resolution No. PC-2016-15 approving Case P16-0863, Resolution No. PC-2016-16 approving Case P16-0871, and Resolution No. PC-2016-17 approving Vesting Tentative Map 8317 were entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

a. PUD-118, Mike Carey

Work Session to review and receive comments on applications for:
(1) certificate of appropriateness to demolish all existing structures; and
(2) Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning and Development Plan to construct an approximately 2,032-square-foot, three-story mixed-use building with retail/office space on the ground floor and three apartments on the second- and third-floor and three, three-story, single-family homes at the property located at 4791 Augustine Street.

Natalie Amos presented the staff report and described the scope, layout and key elements of the proposal.

Commissioner Nagler: As pointed out in the staff report, the code would require nine parking spaces and the applicant is proposing six for the mixed use building, but as I understand the application, there are also a total of six more spaces, right? Two covered spaces per residence.

Amos: Correct.

Commissioner Nagler: Why wouldn't those additional six spaces be used in your calculation of the total number of spaces being provided.

Amos: They're provided for the detached single family homes because they're in garages. There would be a total of 12 spaces on site that are being provided. Per the code, we are required two spaces for each single family dwelling unit and that's how they are meeting that for each one.

Commissioner Nagler: I see, so the nine is strictly applicable to the mixed use building.

Amos: Correct, and as I mentioned, they are proposing a PUD which does offer flexibility in terms of setbacks, heights and parking standards.

Commissioner O'Connor: So Natalie, can you expand a little bit on this office overlay. That's what's driving the two spaces per apartment unit or flat or studio?

Amos: Probably more similar to a studio.

Commissioner O'Connor: So we're requiring two per studio because it has the office overlay?

Amos: We're suggesting that it be two given that's what the code states for parking requirements. Because the applicant is proposing a PUD you can offer flexibility to the parking standards. So just looking at it as what the Pleasanton Municipal Code requires on apartment units based on the number of bedrooms, it would be two spaces per unit.

Commissioner O'Connor: Would that change if it didn't have the office overlay, if it was strictly a mixed use development?

Amos: It could change because of the rezoning. So if you're asking if he's having the office designation and he left it strictly as office, he'd have a whole different parking ratio for it. But if they're doing the rezoning for it, we were looking at it and trying to keep it as close as possible to meeting the code requirements.

Commissioner O'Connor: Okay. I thought what was driving the two per apartment was that it had the office overlay.

Weinstein: These parking standards are not unique to the Office District. They would apply to any mixed use project throughout the city unless there were specific reduced standards for that mixed use project. I think what is happening is that there is a core area overlay that's located in this area but only applies to multi-family residentially zoned properties and that core area overlay offers reduced parking requirements for projects like this.

For instance, the parcel just to the north of this one that was looked at by the Planning Commission several months ago: the Alok Damireddy project, that included apartment units. Because those apartment units were in the Core Area Overlay District in a residentially zoned district, the parking requirement was only one space per unit. So again, just one parcel over has different parking regulations in our code compared to the one that we're looking at here.

Commissioner Balch: Can I ask a quick follow-up? So on the Knuppe project which we did up on Spring Street, we were looking at the size of the square footage of one use versus the residential uses as well on that same parcel, right? That's not happening here because of the mixed use element of the building?

Weinstein: Yes, I think what you're asking is maybe a land use question, like what's the right ratio of commercial to.....

Commissioner Balch:yeah, so maybe it was because it was commercial because when it came to workshop it was one size. It got expanded, and then that created a parking issue as well because parking was based more on square footage of the commercial use. But in this, the office use, that doesn't drive....?

Weinstein: It is actually because there's one per the code. If we're just looking at code requirements right now, there's one space required for every 300 square feet of office. So the bigger the office grows, the more parking is required and that's an important consideration when thinking about design modifications of the site. If you increase a land use, it's going to require more parking and it's a relatively constrained site so it can be tough to fit the additional land use and the additional parking into one site.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, so then applying it to this particular site, then the square footage calculation was done and that's where these nine spots came from, right?

Amos: Yes.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, thank you.

Chair Ritter: Any other questions?

Commissioner Brown: Yes, if you could expand on the PMC amendment for limiting the height and stories in downtown, as it relates to Land Use Policy 15?

Amos: The Downtown Specific Plan policy says that we need to initiate an amendment to the Specific Plan to limit the height, whereas the zoning district allows the maximum height in the zoning district of Office to be 30 feet. That's measured to the mid-point of the roof, so it could actually be a couple of feet taller than that. The policies in the Downtown Specific Plan, if staff were to initiate it and the City were to adopt it, would be to limit any development in the downtown to have a maximum height of 30 feet and be no more than two stories. So in this instance, the applicant is not exceeding the 30-foot height limit allowed by the zoning district for Office, but they are proposing three stories.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, so it's basically only the Specific Plan Land Use Policy 15 that talks about the two-story restriction, but it's not in the Municipal Code; it's just part of the Specific Plan so it's guidance that could be over-ridden by a PUD?

Weinstein: Yes, we have this policy that says an amendment to the code should happen but it hasn't actually happened yet and it's possible that when a policy like this actually gets converted into Municipal Code policy that the requirement might be a little more nuanced than this. There might be certain exemptions for certain types of buildings. It's hard to predict how this would translate to the Municipal Code, but in the meantime, we try to stick to the spirit of what this policy requests which is that buildings be less than 30 feet in height and not more than two stories, as well, but there's some flexibility there because there is not a Municipal Code amendment that has been undertaken at this point.

Commissioner Brown: Okay. As part of the whole civic center proposal, will we be looking at this area and zoning, because as you said, it's residential primarily today. It was zoned or rezoned some time ago as Office which is not currently being used as such and essentially the proposal for this property is suddenly back to mixed use and residential. Is that north side of the street going to be re-examined as part of the civic center and what is the prevailing theory as to what that might become, or is that too much out of scope for today?

Weinstein: The Office district is not going to be revisited as part of the civic center master plan which really focuses on that site and where the civic center is going, but it will definitely be looked at as part of the Downtown Specific Plan Update which we are going to embark on in the next couple of months. If you talk to people downtown and you ask them what their top 10 list of updates to the Downtown Specific Plan should be, revisiting the Office district will be in the top 5, so we're certainly going to look at that.

Again, sort of looking at the principles that resulted in the Office district being there in the first place; it was intended to be sort of a buffer district between the Central Commercial Retail district and residential uses to the west. But principles behind that seem pretty good, but the actual land use implications of that need to be re-visited.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, thank you.

Chair Ritter: Could you put up the slide that has the picture of the blue office or the zoning. So basically, just down Main Street is the only office?

Amos: Peters Street.

Chair Ritter: Peters Street I mean is the only Office and then along Old Stanley it looks like right now.

Amos: Peters and Ray Street. If you're looking at those two other purple parcels, that's Ray Street.

Chair Ritter: Okay Ray Street. Adam said there is a top 5. Do they want more offices in the downtown? Is that what you're saying?

Weinstein: No, it's just the fact that the Office district in the Specific Plan hasn't responded well to market conditions. There was a sense that there was an over-supply of office space, that maybe Office district should be more flexible or less flexible. I mean, depending on who you talk to there are very different opinions. So there is a desire to look at what purpose the Office district serves and that might change in the future.

Chair Ritter: And we don't know what the City Hall/Library area would turn into should they move across the street?

Weinstein: Not yet.

Chair Ritter: They are zoned Office right now, right?

Commissioner O'Connor: They are, so I guess that's something I was looking at. If in this analysis the civic center does not stay zoned Office, it would seem bizarre that we would have the other side of the street have a strip of office where there's no other office.

Weinstein: Right, exactly. So when we re-look at the DSP, we'll be taking into account other planning efforts in the city and in downtown and most prominently, the Civic Center Master Plan.

Commissioner Nagler: If I could just add a quick comment. As part of the Civic Center/Library Task Force deliberations a request was made by City staff and it was answered in the presentation to the task force about potential uses of the current civic center property. It was certainly not definitive and it was no way intended to get a recommendation out of the task force because that is not the task force's place. But, what was interesting about their data was a reflection of what are the current market conditions and what might be appropriate uses based upon where demand exists as opposed to what's sort of perfect urban planning.

The idea that there would be offices as part of the current civic center property was suggested by these consultants to not be the highest and best use of the land and the reason for that is they talked about the patterns of office use in Pleasanton and the

market demands for small offices because obviously you're not going to put a high rise office building on the civic center site so you're, by definition, talking about insurance offices, accountant and lawyer offices and things like that and there isn't demand in the community for that kind of use of that property. I'm not saying that should dictate clearly our conversation tonight, but it's another data point about a piece of property directly across the street.

Commissioner O'Connor: Sure, as we keep talking about vitality downtown, office doesn't usually generate the vitality you're talking about in a downtown location.

Commissioner Allen: If I could just follow-up with that, so if it's not office then what are the choices—retail, mixed use or residential?

Commissioner Nagler: Retail, mixed use, residential, potentially a small movie theater, restaurants, entertainment.

Commissioner Allen: So we don't know. I mean if it's retail then do we want to turn property across the street which is office into residential or is it better to consider it for retail? I mean, we don't know which way it's going to go.

Commissioner Nagler: No, we don't have any idea.

Commissioner Allen: Do you know in terms of where it's going?

Commissioner Balch: We'll keep it to this item.

Chair Ritter: Okay, so let's hear from the applicant. We have Mike Carey and after that we have a speaker card from Tim Ward.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Mike Carey – Applicant: Tim is the architect so he can kind of jump in with me. Thanks everybody. Staff has been awesome to work with. Tim designed the Starbuck's downtown so we're really excited to work with him because he has some great ideas and concepts on mixed use and he's done a lot of projects in Lafayette and kind of all of the surrounding towns.

We're super excited from where we started and how we evolved. We started with Gerry and we started out with live/work on site. We brought in three live/work units and I believe two or three houses?

Tim Ward: Two.

Carey: The live/work was a great idea but we kind of explored and we talked to Gerry and we figured they'd probably move into the units and never work there. We were ahead of ourselves and we are not quite Berkeley and all that, but we started with that a little bit. And then we started changing the plans. Tim came up with studios on top which I thought was a great idea because everybody's looking to downsize, looking for smaller units, cheaper units, the affordability in towns and we're trying to play with what staff

wanted which was office, office, office. It's zoned office, and I'll fall back on that discussion about the zoning and how that kind of feel fits in or not.

So we designed everything and Tim came up with the office building of 900 square feet on the bottom with the three units on top and three houses.

We do have two separate driveways so we don't have to make any curb cuts or lose any street parking. There's an Augustine entrance which would enter for the office and the three studios and there's an Old Bernal entrance which would enter for the three houses. We also stepped the houses away from the other house. The driveway on the west side is bordering the house. The neighbors like that. The house is sort of away from them. Then he kind of clustered the houses.

Natalie's idea at one point on our third or fourth revision was to stretch the houses out and pull them apart so they're not so close and so they are wider with more space around them and then we decided to make the office look more office-like and more commercial. So Tim kind of tweaked it, pulled it forward, gave it some outside seating in the front, raised the ceiling plates and all of the transom windows made the ceilings higher and kind of turned the building. That got us our magic missing parking spot. So all along we were under the illusion that we nailed the parking and nailed the height. From our last project with Brian Bowers the feedback was to keep it under 30 feet. We heard that loud and clear from everybody. So they are 29'8".

Tim Ward: 29'10" and I think one is 30' to the peak.

Carey: 29'11" are the heights. So we thought we nailed the parking. The parking for our neighbor next door is one space per studio. We're in the Core Area Overlay district which carries through the whole downtown so we share that same right to do cool stuff, core overlay, a little flexibility, but the O zoning kind of clips us a little bit. We're ready to debate that though. We have O zoning and now we need two spaces per studio. So we can have two spaces per two-bedroom, three-bedroom, four-bedroom, five-bedroom. Is it up to seven bedrooms? Is that right? For the apartments?

Amos: Yes.

Carey: So technically, by right, we could have a seven bedroom apartment on top and we need two spaces. So to me, the zoning and where we're at on this parcel defies common sense if we're trying to do three studios, we're trying to get a new type of housing downtown. For our neighbor he only needs one space which we have. For us, technically because we're in the O zone, we need six spaces but we could put a giant apartment up top of seven bedrooms and would need two spaces, so just kind of a weird twist on the whole examination of the rules and what we have been going through with our research.

We still want to stick with the three studios. We'd like to go with the Core Area Overlay district which allows us one space per studio, and I just wanted to jump in on the map. Could you show the map of the downtown again; the purple zones?

So you're seeing the purple as Office. Well, the Old Bernal piece is truly zoned O (Office). The whole Peters Street, which you guys did the project for Brian Bowers and the 377—that is zoned C-C but overlaid to O. So it doesn't have O zoning which the piece that we're working on tonight does. So those sites are zoned C-C but they have an overlay to O, which the intention was to soften the blow for the neighborhood maybe, but then I question when they do the Specific Plan again, why the whole First Street that faces Express Liquors and Specialty Sales and all of that—that faces a residential district and that goes straight to C-C. So why do we only want to buffer the west neighbors a little bit and overlay to O but leave the east neighbors out of this. To point out, all the other purples; Ray Street and everything you're seeing as purple, the true zoning is still C-C. They either PUD'd it to O or they built O, but their right by law is C-C zoning which is what we'd like this site to have.

I have some paperwork for you guys. It's just something from the Pleasanton Downtown Association and I'll hand out a couple of things real quick and then I'll let Tim jump in. The PDA recommended what direction they'd like to see on the site. Then I talked to the neighbor next door too which is the big white building.

So the PDA kind of went through the project and their recommendation which I highlighted at the bottom was to allow uses beyond the Office designation on the first floor. We'd like to see modified C-C zoning which is the same thing you did on the St. Mary project for us which is kind of like a light duty C-C. We've talked to staff about, is it a full C-C and we can do everything you could have on Main? Is it a watered-down version that gives you coffee shop, restaurant, whatever? Maybe it's open until 9:00 p.m. and not midnight. We really think the site should be zoned C-C which shares the same core overlay and zoning as my neighbor and parking requirements and all of that. But regardless, we're kind of working on a similar site zoning to the other project you guys just did. Behind the PDA letter is information from the office building across the street. I've talked to the owner a couple of times. I've talked to the commercial brokers who represent him. It's been for sale for 4 ½ years and the upstairs has been three-quarters vacant for 3-4 years.

He called me when he got the mailing and he said, "Hey! I got your card. I'm excited." He said, "I'd like to do something with mine, redo it, something," and so we started talking. He said, "I own tons of office buildings," and so he wrote and faxed it in today his statement, and signed it.

Where I'm going with our process is that it's been zoned 30 years for Office. There's only one office over there, okay? The guy that has the office is not doing that great. I think he's an island on his own. The owners that own the piece next door, this 10-unit apartment complex we can see on the corner and the one lot over are also in my letters. They went to Gerry and Nelson and everybody and wanted to do a project on their site and they said, well it's currently zoned O. We have a 10-plex next door. How are they zoned O? So their vacant lot is currently zoned O so they're trying to figure out, looking at me, looking at the civic center, so I'm not sure what you're going to zone the civic center—I'm sorry, our site here and not the new civic center. If this does move across the field, what is the City going to zone this? I don't believe they're going to stamp the "O" on it. It will be C-C and a mixed use variety.

There's a 52-page study from the Civic Center Master Plan Task Force that talks all about this. It talks about usage, ideas, thoughts, and nowhere do they say O is this smoking hot deal to go to. So I just wanted to throw some of that out there because we've really ping-ponged back and forth with staff on the O zoning. I think when we drew it, Tim did a lot of research trying to get the best fit for the City, and I don't think it's O. I think it's mixed use and everybody's going to figure that out pretty soon. So I'll let Tim talk on the site and all that.

Tim Ward – Architect: I'd like to talk more about the architecture and planning. In working with this and actually going to the farm vernacular, what we were trying to do is develop a palette of a variety of materials. The low pitched roofs, the buildings themselves are much smaller, for instance all of the residences are half the square footage. We're around 393 square feet on the upper floor and within the roof. So we've lowered the plane heights down by seven feet so that the whole appearance is a cluster of sort of a farm with different materials. I know no one seems to like the galvanized metal siding that we have on some of the residences on the upper floors but it's really sort of trying to pick up some of the nuances of the old farm style and the metal roofs that used to be there.

The placement of the buildings was originally much closer to the street and we spread them further back and re-arranged the parking so that it was clear that there was a very simple way to get in and out of garages for the residential sites. On the commercial part of the project, the lower floor, we have about 900 square feet or a little bit more than that, and the three studio units. They aren't really three floors. Technically, we have a mezzanine because they are open to the lower floor. And that was one of the things we weighed when we looked at the residences; if we did a mezzanine kind of room on the upper floor, technically the building department looks at them as a mezzanine and not a full floor.

I think working around the trees, in terms of the guest parking, we have some additional space there and I think we have some flexibility to make it work. Our hope was that we would provide a little variety of housing types that are so close to that transit, that's like three blocks away. The studios and the small 1,800-square-foot homes would offer a different kind of housing type to single people or single couples than we typically see in this neighborhood. It's sympathetic really to the houses, on the west side the houses are adjacent to another two-story house, two-story houses behind them, and they're all in the same range. We're 30 feet at the ridge and probably 27 feet at the eave line. So that's kind of where the thrust of where the architecture was coming from. If you have questions on that, I'd be glad to answer.

Chair Ritter: Questions for either speaker?

Commissioner Brown: So for the mixed use building with the studios up, is that considered per the City's Planning Division a three-story or two-story with a mezzanine?

Ward: You know, I don't know. Planning looks at it differently than the building code. The California Building Code, I don't know.....

Beaudin: A mezzanine level would be considered a third story.

Ritter: All right, any other questions?

Carey: You visited the whole height thing before and whether it's 30 feet, 50 feet, two or three stories, and everything's under interpretation. We're hoping that we evolved to a set height I think. Whatever you can get into it, I think height is the key element.

Beaudin: And that's what we've been comfortable with as well and that's why we're recommending that the height be considered at 30 feet. You know, the difference between two stories and three stories when you're walking by on the street isn't perceptible, but height and massing are. So the idea here is to get a well-articulated architectural style that fits with the neighborhood. The street is interesting. It kind of narrows and widens as you go along Old Bernal, so whatever happens on this site will likely be newer, closer to the street, and I want to make sure what we put on the opposite side at this point in time is going to provide some balance for the street. Like I said, in some places it's wider than others, so I want to make sure we get a significant enough corner building and probably that residential building as well closer to the street if this is a site plan we stick with.

Commissioner Brown: Yeah, I was just asking as it related to the Land Use Policy 15. That's why I was asking. So one final question and maybe it's not appropriate. The Alok Damireddy project and his email around of being denied at 32 feet; was his 32 feet to the top of the building or was it to the other dimension that you mentioned? And, any other comment around precedent-setting, fairness, etc. as it relates to this project.

I would agree with Gerry's comments that at the end of the day when you're on the street, it's the mass of the building.

Carey: Could I just say, I talked to him because he's the neighbor. He, I think in fairness, he had a couple of ideas going on and he did a workshop and when he came to the Planning Commission, I don't know if he had a 40-foot one or not, but he had a three-story one, a two-story one, so he had two or three different plans and so his zoning district is 40 feet next door. You can have a 10-plex next door at 40 feet. Here we're only zoned O so it's a little mixed match on our zoning and specific plan mixes, but I don't think they wanted to see 40 feet because we don't have 40 feet except for the Rose Hotel and buildings on Main, but I think the Planning Commission—because I read the minutes too and I wasn't there for the workshop—he had two or three ideas and he told me on the phone, "I love your project. It looks great. Pretty much I'm going to vent that I didn't get what I wanted." I think he did but I think he didn't have his plans lined up. He had three options and I think you guys blended it into one.

Chair Ritter: Yes, we had that before you were on the Commission, so, thank you. I think staff could answer more. Great, thank you Mr. Carey. So we'll close the public hearing and we'll bring it back to the Commission.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Ritter: This is a workshop so no decisions are made. We're just exploring ideas. We're going to answer these questions. Could you please, before we go through these,

just explain what makes this a workshop? I always ask this question. Why did we have to go through a workshop for the record?

Weinstein: So all major downtown projects involving new construction go through workshops and all projects involving legislative changes throughout the city, like changes in General Plan land use designation or zoning go through workshops.

Chair Ritter: Great, all right.

Commissioner Balch: I apologize, but one other quick question I wanted to bring up is, has staff had a proposal to adjust resident one to a mixed use building as well?

Amos: In this slide?

Commissioner Balch: Yes.

Amos: So we did have conversations with the applicant about that being an alternative as well.

Commissioner Balch: How did that go over?

Amos: We're presenting the project before you with one mixed use building.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, my question to this is wouldn't this mixed use then increase the parking requirement significantly?

Amos: It could, depending on the square footage you have on the ground floor.

Commissioner Balch: Presumably, you'd almost do the exact same square footage and you have nine and you already had two, so you need seven more in-lieu.

Beaudin: There's a room on the first floor that could be a live/work situation so I think this gets us back to the earlier concept that we were talking about very early in the discussions where you could theoretically have someone with a home office who has the ability to operate there with a pretty small footprint on the ground floor of an office space.

Commissioner Balch: So the City allows you to be self-employed or live/work in your residence, but they don't allow you to have employees in a residence, correct?

Beaudin: So that's true for Home Occupation, but live/work is a little bit different. We don't have live/work in the Code right now. I think it's something we could certainly explore for downtown when we get into the Downtown Specific Plan effort. In a PUD scenario like this, we have a little bit of flexibility to play with that concept, particularly because we're trying to get this project into an O district and I think, if I could just take the opportunity while I have the opportunity—the idea of creating that taller plate height and getting those transom windows in there, what you start to see is the possibility for a space that can evolve with the neighborhood. So we're talking about it in the context of an Office district but we're being mindful of the fact that when we get into this Downtown

Specific Plan, the O district is likely to evolve to something else. So the kind of design that Tim and Mike are putting forward tonight really is flexible. And so if it evolves to a retail use in the future or to an office, I think it's going to be a pleasant space for this corner. What we're trying to do is get a great design for a corner space that is flexible.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, so I apologize then because the staff report talks how they would like offices on the ground floor of all four buildings. Is that still where staff is at?

Weinstein: It's a judgment call, right? I think staff's default is to make this project as consistent as possible with the Office district, keeping in mind what Gerry just said, which is that it is possible that the Office district will evolve in the future and that the office space might be better used as retail space. But, we're sort of employing the same principle that we used on the Spring Street project, right? That was a C-C district project which calls for, if you're a strict constructionist of the Downtown Specific Plan, it calls for all ground floor retail space on the Spring Street side. We realized on that site that covering that entire ground floor space with retail was not really practical. It was a really long, narrow lot. So the compromise we came up with was a strong commercial presence right on Spring Street and then whatever you wanted to do in terms of residential on the back and on the upper floors, so we're trying to employ that same principle here on this site. So our suggestion in talking with the applicant earlier was to have the street-fronting buildings have a strong office or maybe retail presence and then do whatever housing you want in the back buildings that are not actually on the streets. So we were trying to employ that same principle that we used on Spring Street to this site to be consistent with the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Balch: So slightly different than the written staff report.

Weinstein: Again, this is a workshop and we're presenting the project that was proposed but we try to steer applicants to do projects that are consistent with the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Nagler: Just to follow up, and sort of come down to it, the conversation between staff and the applicant has really turned on the ground floor of Residence 1 which is the ground floor of the residence on the street on Old Bernal and the amount of parking. There is some discussion about the materials and architecture and such, but the discussion of whether it can sort of shoehorn into the current designation or with a slight change of policy is really about the ground floor and its proximity to the street.

Weinstein: Yes, that's right. That's the gist of our conversations with the applicant. I do want to add that on the staff level at least, there's a lot to like about this project. There are a lot of things we really like about it. The architecture is something we like and the applicant has worked really hard with his design team on adjusting the architecture and making it even better. We like the fact that there's a mixture of residential units on the site, really small studio units, plus single family is great. So I don't want to understate the good things about the project as well, but we're just sort of debating internally how much residential should be on this site.

Commissioner Nagler: It really comes down to that ground floor about one building, right? I mean, as far as where the conversation has at least gone between the staff and applicant.

Beaudin: So we're in a position now where all ground floor office is not practical. It hasn't happened and we're in a position now where we can get a strong office corner and the possibility of, as Commissioner Nagler was mentioning, that residential unit fronting the street, has the potential for flexible space on the ground floor, and not the entire ground floor of that unit. So that's interesting to us and we think it meets the intent of the Code. We're trying to keep that on the dash as we're looking ahead because we all recognize that the existing Downtown Specific Plan is not functioning the way it should for certain areas of the downtown.

Commissioner Balch: Can I just follow-up with you on that Gerry. I understand it comes back to the parking question. Given the site constraints, if the second residence did go as we're saying here, we'd be shy of potentially seven spaces or maybe less depending on the square footage of that, correct? Am I interpreting that correctly?

Beaudin: That's the parking discussion that we need to have. This is a Planned Unit Development application. The applicant has the ability to request different parking requirements relative to the Code. We can, again, go back to the base zoning district which would apply anywhere in town and talk about the amount of parking that would be required for a commercial use like this. There is some possibility you could share the parking behind the mixed use building for that second mixed use building in this diagram. There are ways that you can play with the parking requirement if there's a desire to do that and we could talk a little bit about that.

Chair Ritter: I think when we go through these, we might have questions. Is that okay?

Commissioner Allen: Could I ask one question that's not on here at this moment? It's regarding RHNA. Could you just recap the implications of RHNA to add residences at this point in time? Do we receive any credit?

Amos: It's not a part of our RHNA numbers because we've met all of the requirements for it. Rezoning this and adding these residential units on to it won't apply to it. They don't have to go through that process and it won't affect anything we have with those requirements.

Commissioner Allen: So it doesn't help us meet our RHNA requirements. If it's built we never get credit for it in terms of RHNA numbers.

Amos: Correct.

Chair Ritter: But it could help workforce housing because they're studios, correct?

Beaudin: Yes, and I think Natalie has answered your question pretty directly, but, I'll say that there's a regional need for housing. We have folks coming to the podium from time to time talking to us about the fact that they work at Workday and they cannot find a place to live in town. So the RHNA is certainly one component that we're looking at, but

this project will come with affordable housing dollars that will go into other efforts in town to increase and diversify our housing stock. And you know that but I wanted to just put it out there for the conversation tonight.

Commissioner Allen: Thank you.

Chair Ritter: *(A) Does the Planning Commission support demolishing the home and any related accessory structures?*

Chair Ritter: If we all agree, it's an easy one.

All Commissioners: Yes.

Chair Ritter: *(B) Should the project be revised to conform to the existing Downtown Specific Plan Office designation (office on ground-floors and multi-family on the upper-levels)? And (C) If not, does the Planning Commission support site specific amendments to the General Plan and Downtown Specific Plan (and zoning district for this site)?*

Commissioner Allen: I'll go first. My answer is 'yes'. I believe this should be consistent with the spirit of the current General Plan and Specific Plan. I do recognize that long-term traditional office may not be appropriate, but there's an effort going on to look at that. I don't think it's appropriate for us to jump the gun and you might say overdo the residential side of this because it may be the answer is more retail belongs here. And the third point I want to make is that I think if we didn't support the spirit of the current zoning, it's very dangerous right now because we're setting a precedent for other properties around there. Mike mentioned the 10 unit apartment building that's right around the corner that's already approached staff about wanting to get away from Office and do something different. So I think we need to be very, very careful about jumping the gun and so that's why I think we need to follow the spirit.

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm conflicted. I don't understand why this one street is zoned Office when right next door it's not. And if we get away from the Office, and maybe I am jumping the gun, I think we're going to get away from Office down here if the City offices move, I don't think we're going to retain Office down here. So I'm concerned about having a project come through where we enforce a different parking regulation than something in a year or two or three from now we're going to change it all when everyone else is going to be off the hook. So I'm conflicted on this one because I'm usually pretty tight on parking. I just don't understand why this one has the Office designation; I mean I understand it's zoned that way, but why.

Commissioner Allen: May I ask a process question to Commission O'Connor's answer? That would be, we're going to discuss parking later and not now. Is it fair for us—when I was answering this I was setting aside the parking question for a later discussion and I was just looking at the question asked about the intent of the zoning in terms of mixed use versus residence. So if we just stick with that purview of this question, we might be able to answer that and deal with parking later. That would be my suggestion on how this might be answered, and I'm wondering if that changes this.

Commissioner O'Connor: The conformity is on office on ground floor only for the two fronting buildings we're talking about?

Weinstein: Again, that's staff's interpretation. We felt like that's a reasonable compromise or reasonable interpretation of how the Office district should be implemented on this site. You might have a different opinion, but that's just our suggestion; getting a little more office space on just the ground floor and only the buildings that front the street. We think that will bring this project into conformance with the Office district, but you might have different opinions on that.

Commissioner Allen: And when you say office, you're talking office/retail, right?

Weinstein: Yes, office space with really good floor plates that can be used as retail in the future.

Commissioner Nagler: Without saying yes to this, Office cannot have residential on site, correct? That's the issue?

Amos: For the zoning district; strictly for zoning, but the Specific Plan and General Plan could allow it.

Commissioner Balch: But that's a Policy 15 question we were talking about earlier right?

Weinstein: Policy 15 is the height question.

Commissioner O'Connor: So when there's conflict between the General Plan and Specific Plan, the General Plan prevails. So, should they conform to the existing Downtown Specific Plan guidelines? I would be inclined to say yes, it should conform if you can put retail there.

Beaudin: Does the interpretation that Adam just gave resonate with you? Or, are you suggesting the entire ground floor of all structures on the property. I just want to make sure....

Commissioner O'Connor: Not all ground floor on the property, no. Where I'm conflicted with this obviously is that there are so many homes down there today that have been there for a long time and I don't see anybody at the prices you can get for a home, I can't see anybody tearing down a home and building something that's going to conform to this Office district. I don't see that happening. I think they are going to stay homes for a very long time which is why I don't have a problem with this thing going either way. I mean, you know, I would probably rather see what was proposed by the applicant. I can get on board with retail on the two in the front but I really think long-term these homes are going to stay homes for a long time.

Chair Ritter: Okay, let's just keep going down, so I'll go next. I think the Downtown Specific Plan dated March 5, 2002 is 14 years old and a lot of things change in 14 years, so I'm not opposed to making an adjustment a little bit. My kids have changed a lot in 14 years and I think this town has changed a lot in 14 years. I don't like this permanent "office space for lease" sign. It's not a normal lease sign. It's permanently

embedded in there and I've been looking at it for 8 years driving to the City Hall here coming to the Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation meetings and so that's got to be telling me something that maybe office is not a high need in that location. Also I think if the City Hall moves across to Bernal that opens up that whole opportunity and at that time we'll know if we do need office spaces and we could zone for that at that time. But I don't think it's fair to push off and have an applicant wait for 5 or 10 years when we finally do that, or even another year for the Downtown Specific Plan to get updated based on market needs. So, I'm okay with deviating a little from it, but I do like having that mixed use building in there. I don't mind just the one. I like that Ace Train is right there and it's workforce housing, we have a shortage of that. And I think there's a market need in Pleasanton for the people who come in and out and I want my kids to come back here and work and be able to afford to live in a little studio.

Commissioner O'Connor: Maybe I didn't understand the question on conformance, but I thought we were talking about whether the downstairs could be either retail or office.

Weinstein: That's right.

Commissioner O'Connor: Okay, because I really don't see office coming in here.

Chair Ritter: I agree. Those are my thoughts.

Commissioner Balch: I think I'm ditto of you. So I don't think the project necessarily needs to be revised. I think how staff has interpreted it is extremely practical in light of a lot of complex issues that it sounds like staff has gone through. So from my point of view, I think this office mixed use on the corner is a good mix. I think it also allows flexibility. Residence 1 converting—I could see that. I'm not sure I'm all the way there yet with it, and with that I'm reserving the parking element challenge that that would bring with it, but the premise of me being able to say "I could see it" is that when it doesn't work, he can flip it back to a residential project and I don't know how we would handle that. So maybe I'm throwing a little hat towards staff's recommendation or alternative.

Commissioner Nagler: I appreciate all of the comments that have been made because I'm viewing this project in the context of what I think is likely to occur in the general neighborhood because if we're able to find the funding for a new civic center and library, it's going to be on Bernal and if the civic center/library moved to Bernal, then we're going to have a terrific opportunity in many ways to redefine downtown Pleasanton by virtue of the property we're sitting on. That is an incredibly exciting prospect. If you look at what is a reasonable expectation for the outcome of that planning effort it's going to be a mixed use. There's going to be interesting residences, there's going to be some retail, there may be a small boutique movie theater, presumably there will be a restaurant or two, and it's going to be an extension of what we know has become downtown Pleasanton and I think that's a reasonable expectation.

And so as a result, I support allowing the applicant to deviate from the office requirement because it isn't reasonable, therefore, and I'm agreeing, to hold this applicant accountable to decisions made in a completely different context because we're making decisions for the next 30, 40, 50 years not based upon criteria or

circumstance of the past. So, if it's a reasonable expectation that the civic center site is going to become this new vital mixed use area, then the question becomes what's appropriate for right across the street? It strikes me as what's appropriate across the street is what the applicant is proposing or something very similar. So it turns it seems to me on the issue of what happens with this secondary building: Residence 1. To me, that's where if I were the applicant wanting guidance from the Planning Commission, I'd be asking, okay, let's just really focus on what we think about Residence 1. And on that point, I would ask the applicant and architect to put some creativity into what might be done with that building to both re-orient it more towards the street and also potentially use part of the first floor for mixed use and if it isn't feasible or if it somehow doesn't work in the context of what the applicant is attempting to do, I would vote for the project as presented..

Commissioner Brown: So, to me this is a cornerstone property in that I think all of the properties around are looking at this project and we are setting a precedent. My only concern is that we're getting ahead of the Specific Plan update. The specific planning process would take into account what should we do with the O space, and so the conservative approach would be staff's which is in the spirit of the O you could look at changing Residence 1 into mixed use which I think we all agree that there's probably not the demand there for office, so if you make it office/retail, you're more flexible and you're setting yourself up for whatever is the outcome of that Specific Plan redesign.

In summary, what I would say is if you're not willing to wait for the Specific Plan redesign, if you approve the project as it is, you're essentially setting a precedent and you're essentially pre-dating that Specific Plan redesign. My advice would be to wait for the Specific Plan, and one of my questions is what the timeline is for that in terms of whether that's fair or not. And if you're not willing to wait, my recommendation would be to David's point, put some architect time into considering making that other building more flexible.

In terms of the project itself, the look of the building, what it looks like now, it is miles ahead. I love the project, I love the architecture, love the mixed use, but that would be my advice.

Commissioner O'Connor: What's the timeline on the Specific Plan?

Beaudin: We're going to start this summer and it's a 12-24 month process, depending on our public outreach and scope of work that we felt for the effort.

Chair Ritter: The job of the Planning Commission is to do it in the spirit of what the need is at the time when applicants come forward, right? We have deviated from Specific Plans or General Plan amendments before, haven't we?

Weinstein: Yes, there have been General Plan Amendments and Specific Plan Amendments, including one from Mike Carey's project up on St. Mary and Peters. I'd probably characterize it a bit differently. It seems like the first priority should be staying true to the planning documents that we have, with amendments being allowed if there are extraordinary circumstances or there's a clear gap or missing tooth in the Specific Plan or General Plan.

Chair Ritter: All right. *(D) Does the Planning Commission support parking facilities that are shared by the office/retail space and upper apartment units?*

Commissioner Brown: Yes.

Commissioner Nagler: But what do you think about the number?

Commissioner Balch: Oh well, that's the next question.

Commissioner Brown: He's giving me only one word questions.

Chair Ritter: Are they shared by the office/retail and upper unit apartments?

Commissioner Nagler: It sort of doesn't matter what the principle is. The question is how many spaces do you need for all the use, right? And what's the right way to get to the number of spaces whether you define it as melding the two or not, it sort of doesn't matter to me.

Commissioner Balch: I would agree with Commissioner Nagler. It's an interesting way the question was put because I think by the nature of it, they are going to be shared. They're in the same building and they're accessing call it mixed use building 1. I don't have a problem with it. I don't think it has to be designated similar to the Knuppe project where I believe there was a handicapped stall that could be used for anyone, even though it would say resident only. Now that I think about it, we did have that in at the end, right? So I don't have a problem with it.

Chair Ritter: Yes.

Commissioner O'Connor: Yes.

Commissioner Allen: I'm torn on this and the reason I'm torn is for this specific project on this site with a 300-square-foot apartment building I think one car is fine. I always worry about precedent. The Knuppe project we did not allow sharing. We absolutely did not and so I always worry when we start bending rules because of the issue of precedent. So to the degree that we did agree to this, I think we should be very, very clear in the staff report and everything else about why we are doing it so that it doesn't set a precedent just to be done loosely everywhere else. I worry about that.

Chair Ritter: *(E) If not, would the Planning Commission support having the applicant/developer pay in-lieu fees or would the Planning Commission prefer that the parking requirements be met on-site?*

Commissioner Allen: Well, again I said I would be open to that for this so then the in-lieu fee would be okay or maybe even not required.

Commissioner O'Connor: They're not required.

Commissioner Allen: The last thing I want to mention about this parking is that I'd like to see it be a little bit of a trade-off. If we're giving on the parking, then I think we ought to

get to something closer to that second building; the residence on Old Bernal being office/retail because that will create more office/retail parking. Then I'm willing to give up some of this as a trade-off to that benefit. I'm willing to give up some of the residential studio parking, so to me it's a little bit of a give and take that makes me feel better about that decision.

Commissioner O'Connor: So I always like to see the parking met on site as opposed to in-lieu. If we're getting something different I could see a variation if we're actually getting something extra. I'd rather it be met on site. That of course brings up what's required and say this whole Office designation is changing some of what would otherwise be required for studio.

Chair Ritter: I tend to agree with Commissioner Allen and O'Connor that I'm not in favor of in-lieu fees but I'm in favor of working the site to make it make sense for the parking requirements.

Commissioner Balch: Same here; on-site is definitely better and the number's obviously the driver, but I'd prefer it better than in-lieu.

Commissioner Nagler: I completely agree with that because I don't think in-lieu fees give us much bang for the dollar. As far as the actual number, I'm not sure why we wouldn't use the apartment requirement number of one and maximize the number of parking spaces we can get for the mixed use/retail portion, and if it turns out to be six and six, I don't know that that's the wrong number. But I would start with the application of the apartment requirement.

Commissioner Brown: So I think it's unlikely that Pleasanton's going to adopt the New York style of stacking cars on top of each other. Given that, I agree with the other comments in terms where I think an apartment ratio is fine.

Chair Ritter: Great.

Commissioner Balch: Can I just mention something? I do want to acknowledge that I personally foresee that we've created a balancing act between this second building, Residence 1, what is it going to be, if it is going to change or not, the parking need for it plus the fact that what we have done is, it's not like we're getting a seventh spot on the lot right now. So if we have two in-garage parking spots for Residence 1 in their garage right now and if we refigure that in some manner and now we have an office that has a 3:1 or some other ratio and we need three more spots, we're not getting three more spots. The only way you get out of an in-lieu fee then—and I'm not proposing it—but the only way is to say the residence is a mixed use building which only requires 1:1 and therefore there's enough on site. Therefore, you're virtually back to this same question of possibly three or possibly more in-lieu being asked. So I want to acknowledge it. I don't think we have the answer.

Commissioner O'Connor: Well, certainly if we do a second mixed use building where the requirements change and now you have a problem with parking.

Commissioner Balch: The reason I mention it is because I've talked with applicants that have done workshop and then walked away and we've said something and then we've said something later and it is completely contradictory to what we said before. I'm just saying, I remember we've said, or at least a few of us said, this Residence 1 possibly having a different use on the ground floor does create the parking issue that we're talking about now and I acknowledge it and I just want to say we know we're contradicting...I know I'm contradicting myself.

Chair Ritter: Good point, until we know the plan.

Commissioner Balch: Until we know the final plan.

Commissioner Allen: May I ask just a follow-up to Commissioner Balch's question that I think would be helpful for us to clarify. So to your point, if we do create the Old Bernal building, we're creating an additional gap we know of three more commercial/retail spots, right?

Commissioner Balch: Well, that's where my question came up because if you have a mixed use, two per residence, and it all depends on how they would redesign Residence 1...

Commissioner Nagler: It's one space per 300 square feet so it depends on how many square feet we're talking about.

Commissioner O'Connor: But how many units go upstairs?

Commissioner Allen: Let's just pretend it's duplicated and it creates more parking demand, and this also prompts the question of guest parking because there's now going to be six potential studios. So it does prompt the question to us then of should we ask the developer to therefore consider changing the footprint of the other two residences such that they can meet the parking requirement while still allowing one car per studio. And my answer to that is yes, I think we should at least have a proposal to show how they would meet the commercial aspect as well as our give of one resident car per studio.

Commissioner Balch: I'm actually going to go to where Commissioner Nagler said earlier. Personally I would not redesign. I think the exercise, and that's why I say I only toss my hat in a little bit because for me to get Residence 1 converted to mixed use in any manner, it can be an exercise that can be had on the back of a cocktail napkin, but if it gets to where it's infeasible.....I'm out and I'm back to the original project that was proposed.

Commissioner Nagler: Me too. And also Commissioner Allen, you said something that went way beyond at least what I was suggesting which is, if by chance there is mixed use created in Residence 1 that by implication the rest of the building would be studio apartments and I don't know if that's true. Just to be clear about what we're saying. It could be a residence. It could be a live/work.

Commissioner Allen: Right.

Chair Ritter: I think we have some really good conversations for the staff and applicant on this. Did you get enough on that bullet?

Beaudin: Can I just ask a clarifying question. So, on page A-4 in your plans; if you look at the lower floor plan in the top right corner of that page.

Amos: Just to clarify, there's two exhibits—Exhibit B and Exhibit B-1. I think Gerry is referring to Exhibit B.

Beaudin: Okay, I'm going to talk a little bit more about what staff had in mind when we talked about live/work or at least some commercial/office space fronting Old Bernal. So this building—what you're seeing as the large square on that; this is the floor plan in the upper right corner. It's the lower floor plan. You can see that the garage is dimensioned here at 434 square feet. That's the largest box in the floor plan. The smaller box in the front is what would be the room that faces the street and that's the space I was contemplating as a live/work office space that would front Bernal. You would still come in the home from the driveway or paseo proposed between the existing development on the new site. If you look at the amount of square footage that would be dedicated to this office space, it's almost a home office kind of environment and the garage is 434 square feet, so this is going to be a lot less than 300 square feet, which would kick to the one parking space.

If we use the plan that's in front of us tonight, we're probably talking about one additional space. If you think about the context of this environment and the kind of office user that might be here, you may or may not want to consider an additional parking space requirement for something like this. The idea wasn't to try and get the entire ground floor in this particular site plan to work as office. It was still going to be an entrance to a home, maybe a bathroom or some other kind of space on the ground floor and then stairs leading to the living space.

Commissioner Balch: So I apologize because I grabbed onto that thinking that you would have the exterior architecture change to almost match your mixed use on the corner because you had talked about it.

Beaudin: And I think that was the direction staff was going with; more of a commercial presence at least at the street level, so maybe there are some different windows for that office space for example. Maybe there's room to hang a shingle for a stay at home office space, so you could make it look and feel a little more oriented to the street, a little more like an office but still on the back side be a residential unit.

Commissioner Balch: I think I'm still aligned with the initial comment. I like that idea but I wasn't necessarily supportive of the redesigned mixed use repeated on Residence 1 site because of the parking and other challenges.

Commissioner O'Connor: I don't think I would be supportive of the home office concept because I don't think we're there. I think we're creating something that isn't going to be very viable for the developer. I think I would want to leave it as presented.

Chair Ritter: I kind of agree too.

Commissioner Balch: I can go that way.

Chair Ritter: Okay, this is a good workshop. *F) Are the proposed building designs, area, massing, number of stories, heights, and colors and materials acceptable and compatible with the Downtown and surrounding area?*

Amos: Before the Commission goes into this question just in case, I would look at Exhibit B-1 for the elevation drawings. They're better than what is proposed as Exhibit B and there are some minor changes in that the standing seam metal roof is proposed on the lower gables of the residential units. So before you dive into this question, I would suggest you look at B-1 for reference.

Commissioner Nagler: And the siding has been changed too.

Amos: Yes; they're using the horizontal and vertical siding and the standing seam metal roof on the residence.

Commissioner Nagler: In response to staff's comments, right?

Amos: Yes.

Commissioner Allen: Do you have anything you could put on the screen on this one?

Amos: The elevation drawings in the staff report or the presentation reflect B-1. So if you want to start with any particular building, what's presented in the presentation is what is reflective of B-1.

Chair Ritter: Any thoughts on the massing?

Commissioner Nagler: The massing is fine. The height is 30 feet. I'm fine with it being three stories mostly because the square footage of the upper floor is so much less square footage than on the ground floor so it doesn't, to me, having a massing challenge. And I think that the architecture is terrific; that it's pushing us in the downtown area to go beyond what is currently sort of our comfort zone but within the same general parameters of farm or whatever you call it, but the point is, I think the architecture is great and I would hope that the applicant is not pushed further to make it less interesting.

Commissioner Balch: I'm actually the same. The design I think is excellent. Massing, I have no problems with it. I think they've done a great job with addressing that. I think the number of stories works here in a practical sense as well as in the fact that it is a mezzanine level that creates a unique space for, call them micro-units, right? So I think it's really a top-notch design. I really like it, so I'm fine all the way.

Chair Ritter: I agree. Tim Ward, the architect did the Starbucks and he understands our downtown. You studied that I remember pretty hard, so I kind of agree with the other commissioners.

Commissioner O'Connor: So former Commissioner Phil Blank would have a problem with the "Pleasanton look" but I like it. I like it. I believe David's right. You're pushing us a bit into some of the older farm style look and it's a little different and I like it. I like the roofing that goes along with the siding of the homes. I don't have a problem at all with the design.

Commissioner Allen: I like the design too. The only little thing—this is a nice-to-have but it's not a requirement would be, is there a little bit more we could do at the south elevation of the mixed use building to make it feel just a little more retail/business? That would be the only thing. I think it's gone a long ways, but is there anything else we could do just to enhance it a tiny bit more?

Commissioner Brown: Being a man of few words tonight, regarding the design, I think it's a good one.

Chair Ritter: All right, we're onto the last item. *G.)What other information would assist the Planning Commission in its decision on the proposal?*

Commissioner O'Connor: I just wish we knew what was going to be going on the civic center site, which would help a lot, but other than that, I don't have anything.

Commissioner Allen: Nothing to add.

Commissioner Brown: May I ask one question of staff? Outside of the Specific Plan redesign which you said would start in the summer and take 12-24 months, my overriding concern is not with the project as it is. I like the project and notwithstanding discussion about possibly the other residence as an option there. What I really would like to see is resolution of O space on this part of the City and the fact that it's mostly residential today. Is there any option to resolve that and take into account the properties together and establish what that should be as guidance in approving this? Because if we were to approve it the way it is right now which like I said is a good design, I think it's going to create a domino for the neighboring properties and that's the number one concern I have, not the project itself.

Beaudin: There's always an option to take on a rezoning effort on a smaller scale. The City Council work plan is really the right place to address policy changes that aren't project-specific. What Council did when they put the Downtown Specific Plan on the work plan is they really prioritized this. As Adam mentioned, when we were getting going, it is in the top five concerns that people have about the downtown and the dysfunction relative to the lack of performance for the Office district. So the short answer to your question is, it's not an effort that we would undertake without that Council direction and in light of the fact that we're going to start in a couple of months, we wouldn't necessarily get through an Office review or rezone effort any faster at this time. It would still take us the time to do the necessary environmental review, public consultation, and so it's pretty much going to happen as part of that Downtown Specific Plan at this stage. And, if other people come forward in the meantime, then we'll be using some of the discussion that we've had here tonight, but we're also being really mindful of the fact that this is a really interesting opportunity site here at the civic center

and we want to make sure that anything that happens is going to be as attractive and as exciting as what the applicant has shown us tonight.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, fair, thank you.

Weinstein: If I could just add to that really quickly too, I think it also makes sense to tackle the district as part of the Downtown Specific Plan because the downtown is really a complete organism. Its districts sort of work in conjunction with each other and it's possible as well that there might be tweaks to the Central-Commercial district as well and that could also affect how we treat the Office district, so it seems to make sense to do everything together just to make sure that the land uses are compatible and sort of work off each other.

Commissioner Brown: My preference was that it be addressed as part of the Downtown Specific Plan. In fairness to the applicant, I wanted to ask the question in terms of are the timelines coincidental, which you explained they are. So if the recommendation was to wait until the Downtown Specific Plan, then that's the time I'm looking at versus approving this as a one-off, knowing that it may trigger additional properties that would potentially have to be resolved before that Specific Plan came about. Thank you.

Commissioner Nagler: So there's nothing else specifically other than responses that we came up with today other than the big question that's unanswered.

Commissioner Balch: For me, maybe it would just be for staff is how we would handle this Residence 1 as Gerry put forth a very good plan to do it, and I don't want my comments tonight to give it more weight to go that route, but I think that's got to be addressed.

Chair Ritter: Okay, the only other thing I would like to see is that they do analysis of office/commercial; a projection like a normal real estate analysis that is probably out there already just in case there's any proposal so we know what the current and future needs are based on the market studies they've done for office, residential, and retail in Pleasanton. Can they do that for a segment of the town?

Commissioner Brown: The PDA does it.

Beaudin: And we also have the civic center task force analysis which is across the street. We can make sure that it gets around to the commission.

Chair Ritter: But even when the proposal comes, just have that be part of the analysis so we can understand why we might have to change it based on market needs of our residents. Okay, we're good? Okay, staff, did you get enough feedback?

Amos: Yes, thank you.

Commissioner Balch: Are we at least more consistent for staff now? Are we a more unified message?

Amos: I can say yes.

No action was taken.

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.)

Chair Ritter: I did sit in with a Chamber event where Brian Dolan presented to a few people at the chamber about the civic center task force update, issues, costs and timeframe and it was very interesting, so that's coming. And I just went to a school board facilities and capital needs meeting where they talked about all the needs in the city for the schools and how they're talking about a bond also. So that's interesting.

Commissioner Balch: Oh, and I was just going to mention, but did anyone go to the Kottinger Gardens groundbreaking?

Chair Ritter: I did and it was fantastic. A lot of people were there. It was nice. They talked about value of seniors and affordable housing, so we met a bunch of checkoff lists. Nate Miley and some City Council members showed up and it was kind of like a fun groundbreaking opportunity to celebrate what we've done.

Commissioner Balch: That was a good segway because I'd like to mention that I've noticed that the City is doing the construction and is not using recycled water. As a commissioner, I'm up here requiring it as a condition of approval.

Beaudin: I'll look into it, I'm not sure.

Commissioner Balch: Just as an aside, it might be a little odd for optics in light of the fact that the City did such a great job trying to make sure people knew they were using reclaimed water on Bernal.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Weinstein: I wanted to mention two things. So at the next meeting the long-awaited policy discussion will happen. The residential policy check or whatever you want to call it; it's going to be on the 8th, and then the following PC meeting which I think is on the 22nd is the Masonic Lodge CUP coming back, so two good items coming up in the next two meetings.

Commissioner Allen: Will it be a workshop?

Weinstein: It will be specific recommendations on how to revise that Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Nagler: May I just ask. Are we going to have the Chabad Tri-Valley conversation a different time then when we have the Masonic discussion?

Weinstein: Correct. So we're still waiting for that Chabad Tri-Valley application. They keep telling us it's imminent but we haven't gotten the revised version yet and we had a lot of questions on the initial submittal so we don't know when that's going to happen. It could be in two weeks, three weeks or in a year or two. So in the meantime, we are bringing the Masonic Lodge CUP back for a re-look and when Chabad Tri-Valley submits a complete application on their CUP, we'll bring that back as well and if that CUP is approved, it will replace the Masonic Lodge CUP.

Commissioner Balch: So Chabad Tri-Valley has not given you any sense of when they're going to come forth?

Commissioner O'Connor: Are they still in escrow?

Weinstein: Unclear. We think they are but I haven't gotten an update in recent weeks.

c. Actions of the City Council

Commissioner Balch: I'd like to point out that they approved the Workday by 5-0 which was outstanding.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

Commissioner Balch: I'd like to point out that two beehives were approved.

e. Matters for Commission's Information

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ritter adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein
Secretary