

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

DRAFT

Wednesday, July 8, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of July 8, 2015, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Allen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Commissioner Ritter.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, David Nagler, Greg O'Connor, Gina Piper, and Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Jack Balch

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no Minutes to consider.

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

John Bauer stated that he had a chance to listen to parts of the audio recording from the June 24, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, and he sent a few emails which he hoped would get into the Minutes. He indicated, however, that he would first like to discuss a couple of topics that came from the long discussion between the Commissioners and City staff:

1. Traffic signs on Sycamore and Sycamore Creek Way. Parking is essentially controlled on both sides of the street from Sunol Boulevard all the way to the dead end at the water tank; however, in Bridal Creek, parking of cars is controlled: once one passes the water pumping station and enters Sycamore Heights, there are “No Parking” signs. So, essentially, no parking is allowed on Sycamore and Sycamore Creek Way throughout the whole length of the roadway.
2. Measure PP. Assistant City Manager Dolan made an enlightening comment regarding Measure PP which should not be overlooked. He stated that Measure PP was never intended to be a Municipal Code or City ordinance; it was an Initiative to revise the General Plan. This should be evaluated further to take into consideration all current and future hillside and ridge development. He noted that he went back and read the full text of the Initiative, and Assistant City Manager Dolan was absolutely correct. He added that underneath the text of the Initiative is the Notice of Intent to circulate a petition within the City of Pleasanton for the purpose of amending the August 6, 1996 General Plan. This is an important distinction the Commission should note when it considers the Lund Ranch project as well as all hillside and ridgeline development in Measure PP. It is not an ordinance but an amendment to the General Plan and should have equal weight with the other items within the General Plan.
3. Emails sent to the Planning Division and the City Attorney’s Office. Mr. Bauer read the following written text into the record:

During the Planning Commission meeting of June 24, 2015, Chair Allen asked if a road connection can be made between Sunset Creek and the Lund property without traversing a 25% grade.

The response to this question is at 2:22 of the audio file.

Before the answer is entered into the minutes of the meeting, I’d like to give the Planning Department the opportunity at the July 8, 2015 meeting to evaluate and review their response to the questions.

Please consider the Lund Property does not abut the Sycamore Heights development. Tract 7193 (7198?) separates the Lund Property from Sycamore Heights.

Any road connection between the Lund property and Sycamore Heights (Sunset Creek) would need to traverse Tract 7193 (Shown as Fig 5-3 of EIR).

A road connection between the Lund Property and Sycamore Heights CAN be made without crossing a 25% grade on the Lund property.

The road location simply needs to be moved North of it’s proposed location. The road would traverse Tract 7193 and connect into Sycamore Heights. The connection point would be McCutchen Ct (Current EVA may need to be modified). Or the road could cross the EVA and connect into the Sycamore Heights neighborhood at Ellis Ct, or Sunset Creek Ct.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration

*John Bauer
Resident of South Pleasanton*

Mr. Bauer also read into the record, the following email he sent to the Pleasanton City Attorney's office with copies to the Planning Commission:

During the Planning Commission meeting of June 24, 2015, Chair Allen asked if Measure PP "trumps" prior agreements.

The response to this question is at 2:24 of the audio file.

Before the answer is entered into the minutes of the meeting, I'd like to give the City Attorney's office the opportunity at the July 8, 2015 to revise their response to the question.

Please consider that the City Manager, and the Assistant City Manager stated during the City Council Meeting of June 2, 2015 (Time stamp 3:05 ~ 3:16) that tentative maps, Final maps, General Plans, Specific Plans, design revisions of 2001, 2003, 2005, and development agreements are exempt from Measure PP.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration.

*John Bauer
Resident of South Pleasanton*

4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Adam Weinstein advised that 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. PUD-68-06M, Stoneridge Creek Pleasanton (CLC)

Application for a Major Modification to an approved Planned Unit Development (PUD-68) Development Plan to reduce the unit count, modify the density, construct subterranean parking, amenities, and related site improvements in the northern 10 acres of the Continuing Life Communities retirement community located at 3300 Stoneridge Creek Way. Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial) District.

Chair Allen indicated that she talked to Mr. Weinstein briefly regarding removing this item from the Consent Calendar for a brief discussion and asked staff if it would be appropriate to have a staff report or just say what her concern is.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff would be happy to give a presentation with some PowerPoint slides and a brief overview of the project, or the Commission can just proceed to the conversation.

Chair Allen stated that the main reason she wanted this item pulled from the Consent Calendar is because she was looking for staff detail on Growth Management that may be helpful before the item goes before the City Council. She indicated that she is in support of the project overall; however, an assumption was made in the staff report that because the number of units in the project was lower and because this was approved previously, there is no Growth Management impact. She noted that the number of units is not the only thing that impacts Growth Management; there is a formula that was used when this project was approved, which includes things such as number of parking spaces, number of occupants in a unit, and water usage, that all get calculated in to define a Growth Management number. She added that roughly, about 1/3 of the units were given Growth Management, essentially taking 30 percent of the whole project and stated that is the Growth Management number. She requested staff to really look at those assumptions and make sure to indicate what the real answer is about Growth Management since Growth Management is so important. She further requested that this be done prior to the item going before the Council because it should not be assumed that there is no impact.

Chair Allen stated that a good standard should be set for Major Modifications to projects. She pointed out the latest Summerhill project included a lower number of residential units than previously proposed, and many of the assumptions around the Housing Element and project impacts were re-considered; however, she was not sure if, for this proposed project, Growth Management would be lower or higher, and she would like to know the answer to that. She added that with that, she did not feel a need for a staff presentation unless any of the Commissioners feel otherwise. She noted that she does not need an answer tonight and is satisfied that staff has committed to updating the material for the Council. She indicated that it is important that this information be out there, and if the number is higher, it needs to be built into the Growth Management plan.

Mr. Weinstein replied that Shweta Bonn, project planner, has been working hard today on compiling that data and noted that the preliminary data are pointing in the direction of the overall impact actually being reduced. He noted, for instance, that the overall number of bedrooms that would be provided as part of that previous project, compared to the current project, is diminishing from 235 to 217, and associated impacts, including water use, traffic, and so forth would also be expected to diminish. He added that the data will be incorporated into the City Council agenda report once they are refined and triple-checked.

Chair Allen thanked staff and clarified that her reason for bringing this up was not so much a big concern of this project because it did not appear to be significant, but because there could be other projects for which the Commission would need to know the answer.

Commissioner Ritter expressed concern about the affordable housing numbers and wanted to make sure that the City is still meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements even with the reduction in the number of units.

Mr. Weinstein replied that there is an Affordable Housing Agreement that would still apply to this current project, and the reduction in the number of units would not affect that. He explained that the RHNA requirements are really just the capacity of the City's residentially zoned lands to accommodate housing; it does not necessarily require the actual construction of the housing units. He reiterated that a change in the number of units in this respect should not affect the City's affordable housing obligations.

Commissioner O'Connor moved to: (1) find that the previously prepared Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Supplemental EIR, including the adopted California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, are adequate to serve as the environmental documentation for this project and satisfy all the requirements of CEQA; (2) find that the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan is consistent with the Pleasanton General Plan and Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch; (3) make the PUD findings for the proposed Development Plan, as listed in the staff report; and (4) recommend approval of Case PUD-68-06M, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution No. PC-2015-18 recommending approval of Case PUD-68-06M was entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

There were no public hearing items for consideration.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Lund Ranch II Project

Commissioner Ritter stated that he felt bad he was not present at the last meeting, knowing that only four of the Commissioners would be able to vote. He recommended for future reference that bigger items be scheduled when at least five Commission members can be in attendance.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff will try its best to present big items to the full Commission. He noted, however, that projects Planning deals with, including the Lund Ranch II project, are sometimes really dynamic in terms of outstanding information and research tasks that are part of those projects. He added that sometimes, there are other things associated with the project, such as, in the case of the Lund Ranch project, the Affordable Housing Agreement.

Chair Allen inquired if a meeting date has been set for the Lund Ranch II project.

Mr. Weinstein replied that it will go to the Commission on the second Planning Commission hearing in August, which would be on the 26th.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if the meeting will go through the whole process again.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff would be willing to do whatever the Commission desires that would help the Commissioners make a decision. He recommended, however, having a very short staff presentation that essentially summarizes what happened at the previous meeting, after which the Commission can discuss the relevant issues.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he does not want to put the public or anyone else through a long presentation.

Chair Allen asked Commissioner Ritter if he would be comfortable with a short presentation.

Commissioner Ritter said yes.

Commissioner Piper inquired if the hearing will still be open for public remarks.

Mr. Weinstein said yes. He indicated that it is a public hearing and that how long it will take would depend on how many people show up and how much the Commission wants to debate.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if there will be any changes to the staff recommendation based on feedback from the Commission.

Mr. Weinstein replied that that is something that needs to be resolved.

Commissioner Ritter stated that it could be a 5-0 vote if things were changed based on what the Commissions said at the last hearing.

Mr. Weinstein replied that he would convey that message to Brian Dolan, who is taking the lead on the report and the staff recommendation.

a. Future Planning Calendar

No discussion was held or action taken.

b. Actions of the City Council

No discussion was held or action taken.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Matters for Commission's Information

No discussion was held or action taken.

a. Matters for Commission's Action

- (1) Request to name the private street "Augustine Place" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUT-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street.**

Mr. Weinstein stated that this item is a routine conveyance to the Planning Commission based on the Pleasanton Municipal Code requirement that changes in street names be sent to the Planning Commission for approval. He noted that it is not going to be a controversial item and does not require a lot of discussion.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if staff goes back to or confers with the original developer who had the street named.

Mr. Weinstein replied that this change was initiated by the original developer.

Chair Allen inquired if there was a fee for someone to change a street name. She noted that, in a worst-case scenario, this could be a very expensive proposition, with staff preparing a staff report on a street name. She inquired if the City recovers any money for this type of application.

Mr. Weinstein replied that he did not think there is a fee for a street re-naming and that it actually does not happen all that much, noting that this is the first time in the past year that something like this came before the Commission. He stated that the City has fairly strict standards on how streets can be re-named: the City has a book of historical street names, and applicants are encouraged to use names from that book. He continued that when a proposal is made for re-naming of a street, it goes through review by City staff, including the Fire Department, to make sure there are no redundancies or that the proposed street name does not sound like another street name in the City, so that emergency responders can access people who are calling them for the emergency.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if City staff does not find any issue with similarly named streets, such as Sycamore Creek Way and Sycamore Road and Sycamore Terrace; or Augustine Street and Augustine Place.

Mr. Weinstein replied that there are standards that are applied to decide whether the street names are similar or not. He stated that street names are presumably all right if the suffix is different, such as "Place" vs. "Court" or "Avenue" vs. "Boulevard."

Commissioner Nagler inquired who pays for the change in street signs.

Mr. Weinstein replied that he believes they are paid for the City.

Ms. Harryman stated that she believes the City's Street Department creates all street signs. She indicated that she was not certain if there is a charge and added that she has not seen a street be renamed in the nine years she has been sitting with the Planning Commission, although that does not mean that it has not happened.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that there obviously is no cost if the street name is changed before the street sign goes up.

Mr. Weinstein encouraged the Commissioners to visit the sign shop at the Operations Services Center, where all City signs are made: "Stop" signs, the water conservation sign out on Bernal Property for the new park, and the banners that go up in the City. He noted that it is very interesting and is actually a pretty efficient operation. He indicated that the impression he got from a field trip is that the signs do not cost all that much to make, and City staff can turn them out really fast.

Commissioner Nagler commented that there is also the cost for the installation of the sign.

Mr. Weinstein agreed and added that it is a point well taken, that it takes some sort of investment.

Commissioner Nagler added that it is his understanding that private parties can contract with the sign shop and have signs made, so there must be some sort of fee structure that exists for signs to be made, which can be utilized if the private developer were required to pay for the sign.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff will track the cost recovery and get back to the Commission with the information.

Chair Allen commented that would be great because it does seem like the developer who wants the sign should be bearing the cost of the sign and not the community.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he has always assumed that developers put in the streets and have to build them, and that they just have to put up the signs.

Commissioner Nagler stated that if the Commissioners were of a common mind that there ought to be a cost borne by the developer, then that could be part of the Commission's approval.

Commissioner Nagler moved to approve the private street name of “Augustine Place” for the previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUD-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street; and any costs associated with the creation and installation of the signs be borne by the requesting party.

Commissioner Piper noted that the motion is changing the rules without knowing what the rules are.

Ms. Harryman stated that the Master Fee Schedule resolution, which was recently adopted by the City Council, dictates how much everything costs, from a copy of a City record to having a Conditional Use Permit process, so one that is not currently set up is not something the Planning Commission could dictate. She noted, however, that the Commission can make a recommendation to the City Council that that be included in the next Master Fee Schedule to be considered.

Commissioner O’Connor clarified that the Commission could make a motion that this be approved as long as it is in line with the Master Fee Schedule resolution.

Ms. Harryman replied that was correct.

**Commissioner Nagler moved to approve the private street name of “Augustine Place” for the previously approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUD-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street.
Commissioner Piper seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The motion passed.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.