

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

DRAFT

Wednesday, April 23, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of April 23, 2014, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Olson.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Olson.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Shweta Bonn, Associate Planner; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; Jennifer Wallis, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jennifer Pearce, Arne Olson, and Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Greg O'Connor and Mark Posson

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 9, 2014

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the Minutes of the April 9, 2014 Meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Olson, Pearce, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: Commissioners O'Connor and Posson.

The Minutes of the April 9, 2014 Meeting were approved as submitted.

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

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

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

Janice Stern advised that there were no revisions or omissions 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. P14-0011 and PUD-101, MidPen Housing

Applications for General Plan Amendment and Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning and Development Plan approval to demolish the 90 existing senior apartments at Pleasanton Gardens and Kottinger Place and to construct a 185-unit senior apartment project (Kottinger Gardens) on an approximately 6.43-acre site located at 240 and 251 Kottinger Drive, 4138 Vineyard Avenue, and 4133 Regalia Court. Zoning for the properties is RM-2,500 and RM-4,000 (Multi-Family Residential) Districts and R-1-6,500 (One-Family Residential) District.

Also consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project.

Commissioner Pearce moved to find that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment; to make the PUD findings for the proposed Development Plan as listed in the staff report; and to recommend approval to the City Council of: (1) the Mitigated Negative Declaration as shown in Exhibit E of the staff report; (2) Case P14-0011, the General Plan Amendment; and (3) Case PUD-101, the PUD Rezoning and Development Plan for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Olson, Pearce, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: Commissioners O'Connor and Posson.

Resolution Nos. PC-2014-16 recommending approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project, PC-2014-17 recommending approval of Case P14-0011 (General Plan Amendment), PC-2014-18 and PC-2014-19 recommending approval of Case PUD-101 (PUD Rezoning and PUD Development Plan, respectively) were entered and adopted as motioned.

- b. PUD-85-02-02D-06M, Hendrick Automotive Group**
Application for PUD Major Modification to the existing PUD Development Plan (PUD-85-02-02D) for: (1) the demolition of all existing buildings; and (2) the construction and operation of an approximately 83,300-square-foot automobile showroom and service facility for Lexus of Pleasanton located at 4335-4345 Rosewood Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-C-C (Planned Unit Development Central Commercial) District.

Commissioner Pearce moved to find that the proposed PUD Development Plan is consistent with the General Plan, to make the PUD findings for the Development Plan as listed in the staff report, and to recommend approval to the City Council of Case PUD-85-02-02D-06M, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Olson, Pearce, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: Commissioners O'Connor and Posson.

Resolution No. PC-2014-20 recommending approval of Case PUD-85-02-02D-06M was entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. PUD-104/PUD-81-22-14M/P14-0590, Workday, Inc.

Applications for: (1) Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning and development plan to construct a six-story, approximately 430,000 square foot office building, parking garage, and related site improvements at 6110 Stoneridge Mall Road (adjacent to the West Dublin/Pleasanton BART station); (2) PUD Major Modification to the PUD governing Stoneridge Corporate Plaza (6120-6160 Stoneridge Mall Road) to construct a parking garage, surface parking modifications, and private landscaped area between the existing office buildings; and (3) Development Agreement to vest the entitlements for the project. Zoning for 6110 Stoneridge Mall Road is PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial) District and zoning for 6120-6160 Stoneridge Mall Road is PUD-C-O (Planned Unit Development – Commercial-Office) District.

Also consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project.

Chair Olson recused himself due to a conflict of interest. Commissioner Pearce chaired the discussion.

Steve Otto presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Commissioner Ritter referred to the visual showing the buildings and greenscape and noted the gate next to the BART garage between the BART parking lot and the Workday site. He inquired if this is all Workday parking and if there is another gate on the south end of the building.

Mr. Otto replied that Workday has not proposed gates anywhere else on the site and that this would be the most desirable spot for anyone wanting to park at Workday.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if it is a one-way access into the Workday site.

Mr. Otto replied that this is also an access out from Workday. He added that there is also access through the garage and the drive aisle on the northern end of the garage for Workday employees.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if the only enclosed area is the park area.

Mr. Otto said yes, in terms of the secure area. He noted that there would be gates inside the buildings.

Commissioner Ritter stated that it was his understanding that the parking garage being constructed would be for Workday employees only.

Mr. Otto replied that was correct.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Brian Griggs, representing Workday, stated that his project staff are also present at the meeting: Paul Ferro from Form 4, Project Architect; Rich Sharp, Landscape Architect; Steve Calcagno, Civil Engineer; and two Workday representatives, Jim Shaughnessy and Michele Hodge. He indicated that he has been fortunate to do some real estate consulting and advisory work for Workday for about six or seven years. He added that also present are Steve Hill, representing Stoneridge Corporate Plaza, Workday's partner in developing the campus, and John Rennels from Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART).

Mr. Griggs stated that the proposed project is a culmination of Workday's move five years ago from Walnut Creek to Pleasanton. He indicated that their hope is that, given the design and effort they have made to come up with a project they are proud of and one that the City can be proud of, their project will receive approval so they can proceed. He noted that Planning staff had given them some great direction and that it has been a pleasure working with Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, and several people from the Building and Safety Division to try and create a project that was not going to be controversial and that would really be representative of what Workday wants to present to the City of Pleasanton.

John Rennels, Principal Property Development Officer, BART, stated that he has been doing transit-oriented development at BART for 22 years, previous to which he was Secretary to the General Loan Committee for Bank of America. He commended City staff and the Workday team for the quality of this project which has come forward so quickly. He acknowledged the work they have done to retain such a critical employer in the area and what it will do in the way of business. He added that he is proud to be a partner in this project.

Becky Dennis, Citizens for a Caring Community (CCC), stated that this is a lovely project but that it is not really their primary concern. She indicated that CCC's concern is the loss of the housing and the fact that staff is not recommending the replacement of acreage which would normally be done when high-density acreage to accommodate lower-income workforce housing is removed. She added that it was not clear how much acreage would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of this project.

Ms. Dennis stated that she was not really satisfied with the environmental analysis done in the air quality report and was hoping to get a more detailed environmental analysis. She indicated that the trip lengths are too high in the area of the shopping trips the project is going to generate and too low in terms of the mileage that is going to be traveled for Workday employees to get here. She noted that those numbers and the

greenhouse gas (GHG) generation profiles are very important for the City because the City is charged with a reduction of GHG emissions by a certain time. She further noted that this means that the City needs to begin to look at all projects in terms of how much carbon they are putting in the air. She added that there is nothing wrong with this project by itself, except that it has displaced housing that was going to be mitigating the commute trips of other businesses in the City. She indicated that now the City has both the Workday project, whose impacts are uncertain as far as GHG emission is concerned, and the elimination of the Windstar project which would also have prevented trip generations from occurring. She stated that if it were to be found that the project did need housing as a mitigation for GHG emissions, it is important to recognize that this project will not pace sufficient lower-income housing fees to mitigate those impacts because the City Council has frozen those fees at the 2003 levels. She indicated that the Commission could perhaps make a recommendation that those fees be increased as this is a big project and there will be many employees working here.

Ms. Dennis stated that the Workday narrative indicates that there is no definite timeline for moving the Workday workforce into this building; that they were not really sure about the construction timing or how quickly that needed to happen for them. In light of this, she indicated that she would very much appreciate a Planning Commission recommendation to do an expanded environmental analysis with more detail than what is in the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Jocelyn Combs, Citizens for a Caring Community (CCC), stated that Ms. Dennis covered what CCC's major issues are, and she wanted to suggest there is time to wait before doing this. She indicated that there are very few sites left in Pleasanton, and taking a considerable amount of time looking at its impacts would be in everybody's best interests. She stated that she is not sure what the City's commercial/office vacancy rate is or could be in the future, noting that the Safeway buildings right down the street are going to be vacant soon in all likelihood.

Ms. Combs stated that there will always be a need for housing, and that if houses are built here, they will always be full, as opposed to businesses which undergo changes when they are bought out or turn virtual. She noted that this has happened a lot in Pleasanton and is another reason to take a little more time and a closer look at what impacts this project may have. She stated that she knows it probably was not required, but the traffic and this project's impacts on I-580 resulting from the 900-plus commuters into and out of this project should be considered as well. She recalled that looking at EIR's back in the days of Dublin's, Livermore's, and Pleasanton's projects, a 12-lane freeway suddenly came to be, which is what the Tri-Valley is going to have in the next few years, and that is probably buildout.

Ms. Combs concluded that there are very few non-controversial high-density project sites left within the City, and to lose one of those and put the City in a position of bringing more infill and more controversial projects is something the Commission needs to think about as well.

Brian Griggs stated that he thinks there are concerns brought out which the environmental documents hopefully have explored. He indicated that certainly the last thing Workday wants to do is be perceived as an unfavorable partner with the City. He noted that there are some concerns about timing if this project were to be delayed; he indicated that Workday has commenced drawings to actually be able to bid the project. He added that the uncertainty as to start of construction really has to do with flexibility and should not be perceived in any way as an indication that Workday is going slow. He indicated that they have spent a lot of money and will continue to spend a lot more speculatively to try and have the ability to start in a fairly timely manner.

Mr. Griggs stated that Workday certainly has alternatives to find space, and they did look. He noted that there are a couple of very large vacant projects both in Pleasanton and outside Pleasanton. He further noted that the culture that Workday is founded upon really is indicative of an inclusive culture, and that was one of the reasons they wanted to be proximate to the other two buildings they occupy and, pretty soon, possibly part of a third building in the complex. He indicated that having the ability to keep the company together is really what the main emphasis of this will be. He added that candidly, Workday has a very good partnership with the City of Pleasanton, having employed a lot of residents and planning to continue to employ residents as they grow. He asked the Commission to take this into consideration and to not delay the project.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Allen asked staff to address the process for creating some of the assumptions that were used around air quality and the miles traveled.

Mr. Dolan replied that there are really two points in Ms. Dennis' letter: the first relates to air quality/greenhouse gases (GHG) issues, and the other one is about the housing inventory. He indicated that he would address the first issue on environmental.

Mr. Dolan stated that the air quality analysis is the traditional analysis staff has been doing for years in CEQA about specific contaminants. He indicated that there are models that are approved for this, and the normal model was used. He added that there are some averages there that are assumed and that it is accepted practice to use the default settings for a project like this. He explained that the idea is that if one is too high in a certain situation and the other is too low, it is going to average out. He noted that that is completely different from the GHG analysis: the first one is relatively routine, and the GHG analysis is something that is relatively recent. He pointed out that when the City did its General Plan, the City was sued over its Housing Element, and there was another lawsuit that included an inadequate GHG analysis of the City's overall development. He noted that collectively, the State and the region have come up with an approach to that; and one of the things the City was asked to do was prepare a Climate Action Plan (CAP), which it did and added it to its General Plan. He continued that once a Climate Action Plan is done, individual GHG analysis for every project does not need to be done; all the City needs to do is analyze whether the project that is being proposed is consistent with the Climate Action Plan. He pointed out that the

Commission has become familiar with the Climate Action Plan checklist and the analysis staff goes through. He added that this is done throughout the City on every project, and the conclusion is that the City will meet its numbers and has done everything correctly. He indicated that every project the Commission has seen of any size since the Climate Action Plan was adopted has gone through that process, in the same manner that this one has, and staff has ensured that relative to GHG, this project complies with the Climate Action Plan.

Mr. Dolan then asked Ms. Stern to address the second issue regarding housing inventory.

Ms. Stern explained that when the amount of housing that has been previously counted in the adopted Housing Element is reduced, the State requires that findings be made that it is consistent with the current Housing Element and that the RHNA requirements can be met on the remaining sites. She stated that Exhibit D of the staff report outlines staff's analysis on how these findings could be made: staff looked at the surplus units the City had from the last Housing Element and compared them to the 350 units that are being removed from the inventory. She indicated that staff believes the City has sufficient units, in addition to the fact that the Housing Element has a program that states that the amount of multi-family housing should not be reduced. She added that the caveat to that is unless there are adequate sites, and the City does have adequate sites remaining.

Mr. Dolan added that, as the Commission knows and has heard about a little bit and you will hear more later tonight, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers went down. He noted that the City had to have a certain number for last time; but with the new numbers, the City will have a big surplus. He added that once the new Housing Element is done, there will be over 1,000 extra units. He indicated that there are some people who have criticized the City for doing this, but the City had to do it the last time to meet RHNA numbers; however, with the new numbers, the surplus will be very generous.

Mr. Dolan then stated that there has been an insinuation that this is not a transit-oriented development (TOD) project and is not consistent with the City's TOD policies. He indicated that he thinks it is very fair to say that the definition of TOD goes well beyond just putting housing by a BART station. He noted that there is a lot of thinking, including the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and regional and non-profit planning organizations, that definitely includes office. He added that the creation of a TOD district does not revolve around one project; it includes what else is around it, and often there is a mix of uses.

Mr. Dolan stated that there will be a reduction in the traffic from this project because of its location, which is one of the reasons Workday selected this area and will purchase the adjacent campus and expand it. He indicated that the City did approve that housing project almost six years ago and liked that project a lot. He noted that there has been no transit ridership generated from that site since it was approved, and BART is very

anxious for Workday to build something so they will get some ridership off of this; and the City can take advantage of this location as well.

Commissioner Ritter commented that the State never changes its minds, and the government does not either, and inquired how the numbers went down by 1,000 units. He further inquired what the chances are that the State will change it again after it has revamped all of its RHNA numbers.

Mr. Dolan replied that the City has its numbers for the next Housing Element which it needs to complete by the end of this year. He noted that there will not be another RHNA assignment for another eight years. He noted that it is difficult to say which direction it will go and that a lot of it depends on the economy.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he does not want the City to be sued again based on what it does now.

Mr. Dolan replied that he does not really see that happening. He explained that the last time the City was behind, it did not have the zoning for the numbers it was assigned, but it has extra units this time.

Commissioner Ritter referred to Figure 5 of the transportation analysis and noted that it looked like there was an error on No. 10 on the turn lanes, which shows they are all going right when they probably should be going left onto the freeway. He noted that No. 3 and No. 10 are going to be the most commonly used, and No. 10 will be adding an extended turn lane to get more vehicles going onto the I-580 freeway. He pointed out that the arrows seem to be going the wrong direction, and he wanted to make sure that got corrected because it did not make sense.

Mike Tassano replied that the arrows will all be switched the right way. He noted that he does not really look at the arrows as opposed to ensuring the number is correct.

Commissioner Ritter stated that when he was looking at the numbers, it looked like traffic did not go up that much based on the buildout plans. He noted that it mostly went up in the A.M. and not the P.M., and sounded like the A.M. traffic was busy getting on and off Stoneridge Drive and Stoneridge Mall Road.

Mr. Tassano replied that was correct and added that the P.M. traffic is busy as well. He stated that one of the things seen in the cumulative hour is that there is a lot of congestion, so there is already some spreading that occurs. He added that it is one of those things that needs to be balanced: how much traffic is going to be there, and where that other traffic is going to be diverted to. He noted that there would be more diversion in traffic farther away from this project, which the City also analyzes to make sure it works, although it is not included in this report.

Commissioner Ritter noted that it looked like it went to two lanes versus three lanes.

Commissioner Allen noted that traffic forecasts are not necessarily reality all the time and inquired what other levers the City has to pull in a worst-case scenario, if the traffic impact is worse than what is expected.

Mr. Tassano stated that the two key intersections that this project contributes traffic towards are Stoneridge Mall Road and Stoneridge Drive, which is a "T" intersection with three southbound left-turn lanes. He explained that there are some capacity issues, with only a limited number of vehicles actually being able to use those lanes, and then quite a number of eastbound and westbound lanes to go through as well. He continued that one of the things that the City will be requiring of the Workday project is to improve that intersection to make that signal more efficient. He indicated that the intersection can be potentially extended to the south to increase capacity for the east and west. He added that the street cannot be widened more; building four left-turn lanes will make it the main movement and something else will need to be closed down. He pointed out that it is kind of land-locked; it is a "T" intersection, and he does not see the City not being able to process those volumes.

Mr. Tassano stated that the other intersection that is critical is the Foothill Road at Canyon Way intersection. He noted that it is a gateway intersection, so it is exempted in the General Plan from actually having to do anything; it does not mean, however, that the City should not make every effort to make sure it can process the vehicles that come through that intersection. He indicated that it has a double right-turn lane for the P.M. peak hour right now, which is one of the traps onto the freeway. He stated that the City is going to bring that further up to try and process more traffic through there; that construction is underway. He added that the Workday project will also be required to build a third southbound left-turn lane and a third receiving lane to improve the efficiency of the traffic signal; and there is the opportunity as well to add a fourth northbound through-lane on Foothill Road. He pointed out that it was in the 1996 General Plan but not in the 2006 General Plan only because it was not identified as a needed improvement going forward. He indicated that the right-of-way still exists there, and that improvement and some other modifications to the Foothill Road at the Canyon Way intersection can still be done as another fallback.

Commissioner Allen moved to: (1) find that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment; and (2) find that the proposed Rezoning and Development Plan for the project, the PUD Major Modification for the Stoneridge Corporate Plaza site, and the Development Agreement for the project are consistent with the General Plan, including the reduction of the residential density, and that the remaining sites identified in the City's Housing Element are adequate to accommodate the City's share of the regional housing need after the elimination of the Windstar project's 350 apartment units; (3) make the PUD findings for the proposed Development Plan as listed in the staff report; and (4) recommend approval to the City Council of (a) the Mitigated Negative Declaration; (b) Cases PUD-104, the PUD Rezoning and Development Plan, and PUD-81-22-14M, the Major Modification, subject to the Conditions of Approval as

listed in Exhibit A of the staff report; and (c) Case P14-0590, the Development Agreement for the project, as shown on Exhibit B of the staff report.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Pearce, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: Commissioner Olson
ABSENT: Commissioners O'Connor and Posson.

Resolutions Nos. PC-2014-21 recommending approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project; PC-2014-22 recommending approval of Case PUD-104, the PUD Rezoning and the Development Plan; PC-2014-23 recommending approval of Case PUD-81-22-14M, the PUD Major Modification; and PC-2014-24 recommending approval of Case P14-0590, the Development Agreement for the project, were entered and adopted as motioned.

Chair Olson then returned to the dais.

- b. P14-0440, 2015-2023 Housing Element Update**
Status report on the 2015– 2023 Housing Element Update and discussion regarding the draft housing site inventory, including the CM Capital site (5758 and 5794 West Las Positas Blvd.), the Irby-Kaplan-Zia site (3760, 3780, 3878, and 3988 Stanley Blvd.), the Pleasant View Church of Christ site (11300 Dublin Canyon Rd.), the Lester site (11033 Dublin Canyon Road), the Shriners Hospital site (10807 Dublin Canyon Road), the CenterPointe Presbyterian site (3410, 3420, 3430, 3440, and 3450 Cornerstone Court), and the Merritt site (4131 and 4141 Foothill Road).

Janice Stern introduced the item, stating that the City anticipates the Housing Element update for this go-around to be a less onerous effort than that of the one adopted in 2012. She pointed out that at that time, the City was under court-ordered settlement agreements with several strict deadlines, and much of the effort of that update went into finding, analyzing, and discussing a number of sites for multi-family development. She noted that the City looked at over 30 sites during that time and ended up with adopting rezoning for none sites for a total of about 70 acres. She added that during the last two years since, the City adopted that Housing Element, followed through on a number of implementation measures including adopting zoning to allow emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing, and housing for agricultural workers; a density bonus ordinance; and regulations allowing second residential units over detached garages.

Ms. Stern explained that because the City has a certified Housing Element and followed through on a number of implementation measures that it needed to do, staff believes

that the City will qualify for a streamline and quicker review by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of only those parts of the Housing Element that are changed.

Ms. Stern stated that the City's housing sites inventory is sufficient to meet its RHNA needs and that no rezoning would be needed to meet the RHNA numbers. She noted that staff has received some pieces of correspondence in disagreement with that, and the City will be working through that over the next several weeks, talking with HCD to confirm its assumptions. She added that, nevertheless, the City has received a number of letters of interest from some property owners around the City who wish to have their sites considered as part of this process. She indicated that staff's intent this evening is only to introduce those sites and have their representatives make some comment on them if they so desire. She added that staff will then be doing a lot more analysis on the sites, speak to neighbors, and hear from the Commission if there is additional information the Commission will need during this process in order to look at those further.

Jennifer Wallis then presented the staff report on the Housing Element update, describing the RHNA numbers, some of the public outreach done to date including comments from the Housing Commission, the potential updates to the Housing Element which include goals and policies as well as potential changes to the housing sites, and an overview of what comes after and how to proceed with the Housing Element update.

Chair Olson inquired if economic activity explains the reduction in RHNA allocation of 2,000 units over time.

Ms. Stern replied that exactly what goes into the formulation of our RHNA requirements is a bit of a black box, but part of it is based on job generation, general growth, and the recession that definitely occurred over the last eight years.

Chair Olson inquired if it were conceivable for RHNA to raise its head and give a new allocation if the economy is robust for the next couple of years.

Ms. Stern replied that it would not occur for this next eight years but could happen later.

Mr. Dolan stated that the State has never done that, and the law does not authorize the State to do that; it is done on these eight-year cycles.

Commissioner Ritter noted that the workforce housing is based on 50 percent to 80 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) and inquired what the AMI is at today's rate.

Ms. Stern replied that the above-moderate income rate for a family of four is \$99,000, and the moderate income rate is between \$65,000 and \$99,000; the median would be about \$90,000.

Commissioner Allen referred to the current capacity table which shows an excess capacity of 1,245 units and inquired if that does not yet include the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area. She requested staff to specifically address what the Preferred Plan numbers might be and how that could potentially be added to this capacity over time.

Ms. Stern replied that it could be added over time but would probably not be in time for this Housing Element update because HCD requires the City to have that available and annexed into the City. She noted that a large part of East Pleasanton is not within the City, and the City would not be able to achieve adoption of the Plan and annexation by the time it needs to submit its Housing Element, which is the end of January next year. She noted, however, that at some point, the City will be able to use those numbers if a Specific Plan is adopted for that area. She stated that the Preferred Plan that was under discussion before the Task Force took a break was about 1,758 units, consisting of about 35-percent multi-family units. She added that the Task Force is doing work right now that could lead to some input that might change some of the alternatives that were being considered for that.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

John Lange stated that he would like the CM Capital site completely rezoned back to strictly commercial. He indicated that the neighborhood is already dealing with the Summerhill Apartments site, and although the applicants worked with the neighbors on changing some of the aspects of the plan, he still wishes there was no action to build apartments within a football field of his house. He added that if the site cannot be changed all the way back to business, then he would like to see the buildings there reduced to at least two stories and not any higher, and to get some of the density lowered to about ten units per acre.

Mike Serpa, Concentric Development Group, representing the owners of the Irby-Kaplan-Zia site, stated that the development conceived by the owners for this site was a medium-density development, which would be higher density single-family detached homes with densities that can reach up to 12-13 homes per acre. He indicated that this brings the sales prices down and makes them more attainable to a larger number of people. He noted that this is an infill site and suggested that in terms of sound planning, this should be done not because it has to be done or State law indicates it has to be done but because it is smart planning. He added that it is a walk to the Downtown.

Mr. Serpa stated that he represents the three owners who have been patient since the early 1990's to develop this site. He noted that the City has wanted to extend Nevada Street, to install a new sewer extension through Nevada Street, and to connect a creek trail. He added that the time is right to get this done. He pointed out that the City of Livermore just did four projects in the Downtown with the same type of product and a lot of success.

Becky Dennis, Citizens for a Caring Community (CCC), stated that she just wanted to say a few things as she has already submitted a letter to the Commission with more details in it. She indicated that the highest priorities for CCC are to develop better program and policy structure for actually having workforce housing proposals come forward that are either non-profit in nature or are partnerships between non-profit and market rate. She noted that the Housing Element language says the City prefers those partnerships; however, this cannot be done if none are coming forward, so the City really needs to take a look at the structure and make it the obvious, good, smart financial decision for these developers and for property owners to say they need two kinds of developers: a non-profit and a for-profit to share the site, or just a non-profit. She added that because she does not want to penalize developers for doing this, this brings her to the other issue, which is funding.

Ms. Dennis stated that there is a discrimination problem with respect to what the City has accomplished in terms of development for lower-income housing. She pointed out that the City has produced a lot of housing for very-low-income seniors at 100-percent affordability; yet, because the City has relied on the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and market-rate developers to set the affordability levels, it has not produced any housing for members of the workforce who earn between 51 percent and 79 percent or below 50 percent. She noted that the City will only provide units affordable to people who are in exactly 50 percent or exactly 80 percent, and that discriminates against the majority of the workforce, at 49.6 percent, who earn below the 50 percent or between 51 percent and 79 percent. She further noted that more and more, people who work in Pleasanton do not make a lot of money because they commute in and out of the City.

Ms. Dennis stated that she has some ideas about funding, and if the City Council is not willing to raise the lower-income housing fee and there was a nexus, the City could devote a portion of its sales tax revenue to provide housing for the people who work in Pleasanton. She indicated that she does not know how much that would be or how much it makes sense, but Pleasanton has 40 percent of the retail in the Valley. She pointed out that if ½ percent of the sales tax was pledged for this purpose, it might make it more possible to accommodate this in any new developments that come forward. She added that affordable workforce housing would also be a mitigation for greenhouse gas emissions, and that it makes sense that funding for housing come from a source that addresses that requirement as well. She urged the Commission to look at this when coming up with ideas to send forward to the City Council. She indicated that she really liked the Housing Commission's idea of encouraging folks to rent their secondary units to members of the workforce. She added that the City needs to provide more incentives for this as well, and suggested that discounts on sewer and water might be good because the little extra income and the discount might encourage some folks to sign up.

Lynn Kriegbaum thanked the Commission for working with the community on the original CM Capital plan for 177 apartment units and asked that it reconsider the rezoning of the remaining CM Capital property to avoid another 200 units that would be built on that site. She stated that when her family moved into their home almost 30 years ago, they were told that the site was a business park and would always and

forever be a business park, that there would be no apartments or housing built on that property. She added that she was also told two years ago and was just repeated tonight that the City just needs to show it has the acreage and that the development may probably never happen; yet, there are now 177 apartment units being built behind their homes. She pointed out that 850 units have already been approved for construction in Hacienda Business Park, and this will impact the schools that are already over-extended with students. She indicated that the City has over 1,000 units in excess, and not building on this site will not impact its numbers. She added that while the City's numbers show that there would be very-low- or low-income units, the developer can buy out of that by paying a fee and not have those units available, which does not really benefit the people who need low-income housing.

George Bowen, a 29-year resident of Pleasanton, stated that there are a number of reasons to request the rezoning of the CM Capital property, focusing on the perspective of "WWPD: What Would Pleasanton Do?" He indicated that Pleasanton had a General Plan that was largely driven by Measure GG, a voter cap, a housing cap, the Urban Habitat Pleasanton lawsuit which Pleasanton vigorously fought, he believes, for two reasons: first, because Pleasanton did not agree with the outside intervention and its ability to plan the City of Planned Progress, and second, because Pleasanton did not agree with the needs imposed by the State. He noted that as part of that settlement, Pleasanton was forced to comply with the State-imposed housing mandate which was in staggering conflict with the City's General Plan. He stated that then Mayor Hosterman said that the Council, with help from City staff, was going to lawfully protect the City's best interests and maintain as much local discretion as possible. He added that the 2012 rezoning plan was forced upon the City, which had no choice then. He indicated that the only reason the housing cap was increased and the 70 acres was rezoned to allow high-density housing was because of external pressure and not because it was what was best for Pleasanton. He added that, in fact, it could be argued that it was a windfall for property owners and developers.

Mr. Bowen stated that the City has a choice now: since the RHNA requirements have been significantly reduced, the City has a surplus of high-density-zoned properties which will allow the construction of unneeded and unwanted high-density properties. He indicated that after being forced to shoehorn numerous high-density properties and less than desirable parcels which already have resulted in building review processes for over 800 units, the City has a historic but fleeting opportunity to recapture some of its civic self-determination in deciding the character of the City. He stated that he strongly advocates, and believes that many of the citizenry present tonight also believe, that the City needs need to continue to be the "City of Planned Progress" and not take the opportunity to rezone. He added that he thinks the voters would believe this is needed in order to maintain the City's long-standing approach to growth.

Anthony Ghio stated that he would like to see the CM Capital site rezoned as well, having gone through the entire Summerhill planning stages of 30 units per acre which ties the hands of the Planning Commission. He indicated that he thinks Summerhill provided a blueprint and, while slightly altered, the 30 units had to go in there, and the

Commission was not provided a lot of latitude on how to adjust that. He added that he thinks everybody in the Parkside neighborhood and other parts of the City whose children attend Hart Middle School would like to see it rezoned back to commercial the way it was prior to 2012. He requested, if that does not happen, that the buildings be limited to two stories and brought down to ten units per acre with a building height limitation. He further indicated that after the Summerhill project is completed, the City will realize on hindsight that, for example, there was not enough parking provided and that there were many things recommended but overlooked at the Planning Commission, such as underground parking. He added that if this property is not rezoned, that same situation will happen again, and more and more properties along this Arroyo corridor will be converted to rentals.

Tom Wright, a deacon and trustee at the Pleasant View Church of Christ, stated that this church property could easily be thought of in two pieces: the upper part where the church sits, and the bottom five acres bordering Dublin Canyon Road which could be developed as a medium-density, single-family project with an estimate of about 15-19 units. He added that this would be an attractive way to improve the area. He indicated that the church has no intention of leaving and, in fact, likes being a part of Pleasanton, adding that although the church's application is to rezone the entire property, it is willing to sign something that says the church is going to stay around. He stated that he would appreciate the opportunity to speak further on this to the Commission.

Glenn Newton, Minister at Pleasant View Church of Christ, stated that the church has been in the Pleasanton community since the late 1970's and has owned that property the entire time. He explained that their elders and trustees thought hard about whether or not they wanted to sell part of the property and that it was not something they came upon lightly. He echoed Mr. Wright's statement that the church is not going anywhere and enjoys being in Pleasanton. He added that the proceeds from the sale of this land will be reinvested in their building and their property, with a great portion of the money going to badly needed upgrades of the facility, including upgrading from a septic tank to a sewer connection. He noted that millions of people drive by their facility on a weekly basis, and they want them to see a beautiful facility that they and the community can be proud of.

Mr. Newton stated that as part of their spiritual mission, their resources can be used for the betterment of the community. He indicated that they are committed to reaching out to their neighbors, to providing life skills such as marriage workshops, financial management workshops, parenting classes. He noted that they do not want a church where they just do their own thing, but rather, they want to have an impact on the community. He added that they can begin to do that by selling the lower portion of their property.

Guy Houston, representing the Pleasant View Church of Christ, stated that the church is interested in this time period to develop only the 3.25-acre lower portion of its property. Referring to the City's current RHNA projections, he noted that the City has a housing

deficit in the above-moderate-income level, which is the type of housing density they are looking at with about four to six units to the acre. He added that the Dublin Canyon Road section of this property is absolutely flat and can be categorized as infill, and that they have water and sewer adjacent to the property. He stated that they are looking forward to working with staff and the elected officials and Commission members in developing a plan that they can all be very proud of.

Jocelyn Combs, Citizens for a Caring Community (CCC), agreed that Pleasanton is the City of Planned Progress. She stated that back in the 1980's, the City was talking about having a jobs/housing balance. She indicated that she has not seen the numbers for that but believes that the City is not in balance there. She pointed out that the staff report and CCC's letter says that the in-commute to Pleasanton is 76 percent, and the citizens who live and work in Pleasanton is 15 percent. She stated that she alluded earlier to problems she faced when she moved to Pleasanton 30 years ago regarding a worsening of the air quality, which she sees happening again. She noted that she is also probably not alone in wanting to leave Pleasanton on a Friday afternoon to go to the Sierras and trying to figure out what time she would have to leave in order not to be bumper-to-bumper all the way there; or if she wanted to commute into San Francisco or Oakland by car and not by BART, what time in the morning she would have to leave so as not to be in bumper-to-bumper traffic. She pointed out that I-580 will have six lanes in each direction, and the City does have some control over that. She noted that the Workday development heard earlier estimates that at one employee for every 300 square feet, there will be 1,400 new employees commuting in and out of Pleasanton, and only three percent will be take BART. She indicated that the City is not absorbing the number of people it could who work in the City. She added that the City can go higher than the RHNA numbers and do a better job of balancing the input and outflow in the City, which is not a static thing and will increase in the future.

Ms. Combs pointed out that she tried to get a secondary unit on her property, and the fees alone were \$80,000, which is what it would cost her to actually build the unit. She added that on-site parking would completely obliterate her front yard. She indicated that anecdotally, her neighbor's son works at the Livermore Outlets, and he said he was the only one there who lived in Pleasanton; everyone else came from the Central Valley. She noted that this is the City's workforce development, along with people who work at Stoneridge Mall, who are commuting for the most part from Central Valley. She added that this workforce development is now her children, but it used to be her when she worked and lived at an apartment, which she was really glad were there for her.

Alicia Starron, Pleasanton residents for 19 years, stated that there have been two attempts to develop the Merritt site, which the neighborhood has mostly supported as the owners have a right to develop the property. She indicated that they had negotiated in good faith with the developers for both of those attempts: the first attempt ended in a referendum, and the second a few years later did not go forward because of the economic situation. She further indicated that they had reached agreements for the most part on certain concessions that worked with the existing communities, noting that the proposal was for above-moderate housing at two units per acre for a total of about

85-90 houses for the site. She continued that they also negotiated setbacks because these were going to be very large houses that would be looming over existing single-story moderate houses of about 1,800 square feet. She added that another thing that was really important to the neighborhoods on both Foothill Farms and Foothill Knolls related to the three stub streets that border this area: Eastwood Way, Fernwood Way and Prairie Drive. She noted that the stub streets were originally constructed in a Housing Element plan years ago to actually continue all the way to connect to Bernal Avenue; however, Laguna Oaks was developed as an infill, and that plan on the stub streets did not materialize. She indicated that what they had negotiated with the developers in the previous two attempts was to create emergency vehicle access (EVA) at two of the stub streets and then actually create the main access to Foothill Road, to address the traffic impact on their neighborhood, where the houses have been there since 1968 or 1969, and children play in the stub streets. She requested that, should the developer return with plans to redevelop, the Commission and staff consider all the efforts the neighborhood has done to work with the developers in good faith and continue out those negotiations.

Jay Atkinson, a member of Ownership Energy, Las Positas Properties, LLC, which is the present owner of the CM Capital site, stated that they bought the property in 2012 from CM Capital and focused on the commercial aspects of the property, which is their business. He indicated that they recognize and compensated CM Capital for the residential component and mixed-use zoning, and speak out of self-interest, as all speakers have done this evening, while at the same time thinking it is ultimately good policy. He noted that infill housing is needed in the greater Bay area, and there is value to that. He, therefore, asked that the Commission retain the mixed-use zoning of the property. He added that it is good policy and certainly does not necessarily compel development opportunity at the property. He further added that they also think anything developed there will go through a very extensive and involved design process, as the Summerhill housing team went through on the other parcel.

Kay Ayala stated that this is the fourth General Plan Housing Element meeting she has attended, and this is the most people that have been present at all those meetings she has attended. She noted that the non-profits and for-profits are here again tonight and that only a handful of speakers attended the Housing Commission meeting because the public does not know this is happening.

Ms. Ayala stated that she was floored when she received all these letters from the developers wanting to rezone and be part of the Housing Element. She indicated that she could have called multiple people and there would have been a roomful of people on the Merritt property alone had they known this meeting was happening. She then read a few lines from the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the City's Constitution and the plan the City is supposed to be following: "By 2025, if all residential land on the General Plan map is built out, Pleasanton will contain a maximum of 29,000 housing units, approximately 600 second units and approximately 1,100 residents in congregate living facilities. These units will support a residential population of about 78,200." She noted that Pleasanton citizens voted twice on a 29,000 housing cap, and she realizes

that the City has to bend and fill its RHNA numbers; however, she absolutely is asking the Commission to stick to the voters of Pleasanton and the 29,000 unit housing cap.

Ms. Ayala then read the following from the General Plan: "Encourage school enrollment sizes that maintain neighborhood character, provide facilities, specialized programs." She noted that the current target is 600 students in the elementary level, and Pleasanton has upwards of 800 students; 1,000 students in middle school, and there are 1,500 students in the three middle schools; and 2,000 students at comprehensive high schools, and there are over 2,500 at each of the comprehensive high schools. She pointed out that it is the Commission's task to plan the City for all its infrastructure needs, including water which is a big problem, and asked that it stand to the General Plan when it is rezoning properties.

Jeff Schroeder, Ponderosa Homes, stated that he is here representing the Lester property and the CenterPointe Presbyterian Church property and would also like to speak on behalf of the Shriner property, which has a General Plan designation of up to two units per acre on a portion of that property.

Mr. Schroeder congratulated the developers of the Workday project, which is fantastic and really great for the City. He indicated that Ponderosa is a tenant there and that it has changed a lot in the last two years; for example, the parking lot was empty when they moved in, and it is now full, which is wonderful and shows the unknowns and uncertainties that can happen in the process. He noted that obviously, in the previous Housing Element update, no one knew Workday was going to come in, take over and buy 550,000 square feet of space already there and build another million square feet, which is great for this community.

Mr. Schroeder stated that one of the reasons the RHNA numbers dropped was the economy. He noted that the process that was gone through to prepare those numbers is not done by the real world but by people serving in an ivory tower with some input from the real world. He indicated that the numbers that they come up with assume that everybody is going to live in high rises in Oakland and San Francisco, and clearly this is not going to happen. He added that they will need to live somewhere, and even if they do live in high rises in San Francisco, when they have children, they're going to want to live in Pleasanton, Danville, or San Ramon, and there is not enough housing. He noted that there are uncertainties, and some of the sites for the 2,067 housing units will never get built. He pointed out that the City is down 238 units on the above-market level, and that is what he is representing tonight. He noted that there is still a demand for that, and the market prices are up 20 percent in almost two straight years. He indicated that this is back to where the City was, but it is not healthy or good for the City to keep going like that because it will not be able to continue to attract jobs that make this City healthy. He stated that he thinks the best thing for the Commission to consider in this process is maintaining flexibility. He added that one of the reasons property owners and developers are here tonight is because they are concerned that if these properties are not on the list, there is a prejudice against them of becoming rezoned over the next Housing Element period. He encouraged the Commission to give itself some flexibility

because not all of those sites are going to get developed. He pointed out that there is a need for housing, and here are some great sites that are in the General Plan that ought to get developed and will provide housing for people who work at Workday.

James Paxson, Hacienda Business Park, stated that he is present mostly to speak in support of over ten years of comprehensive planning through four independent planning efforts that led to the current contribution of the Hacienda sites to the City's inventory in the existing Housing Element. He urged the Commission to continue to keep those properties in there, and in support of that, he offered five points that he thinks are really worthy of the Commission's consideration:

1. During the Housing Element process when these sites were being considered, they were among the most highly ranked sites in the last Housing Element cycle in terms of the evaluation done on various sites.
2. In looking at the goals and objectives of the General Plan, particularly with regard to meeting sustainability objectives, these sites meet those objectives in a way that no other sites on the inventory can.
3. These sites have produced outstanding projects. The projects that have come forward since the last Housing Element are really fantastic contributions to the Pleasanton housing stock. They are projects in which the community can take pride.
4. The fact that developers have been able to successfully bring forward projects that the Commission has been able to approve is because these sites are viable and will do the job of producing housing through the Housing Element. These sites are uniquely qualified to help meet some of the affordability objectives that were outlined for not only workforce housing but other types of affordability too. These sites have unique opportunities for non-profit partnership that will not be found with other inventory sites.
5. The infill at the Business Park is second to none. The types of infrastructure at the Park, the types of benefits all housing projects will be able to access, including, not the least of which is a nationally recognized commute program that will be available to any resident who moves into the Park, do not come at any of the other locations.

Mr. Paxson concluded that none of this is meant in any way to diminish the legitimate concerns and critiques that come with every project brought forward. He noted that in his tenure at Hacienda, projects, especially housing projects, always invite lots of critique, and they should because that process helps produce better projects. He thanked the Commission for its consideration and encouraged a favorable recommendation to the City Council to keep the current inventory as it is.

Julie Testa stated that she has been here twice in the last year – during the process of the last Housing Element and again more recently – and this is the third time she is attending to remind the Commission, as she has tried to remind the Council, that with Pleasanton schools currently impacted, every campus is beyond capacity as identified in the General Plan, with significant percentages of overcrowding. She indicated that the School District's finances are completely distressed, and there is no ability to build more capacity or more schools. She pointed out that every unit that is rezoned and approved will allow and bring children to the schools, and this violates the General Plan and erodes the quality of life at the schools.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Pearce requested clarification that, given the RHNA numbers and housing inventory, the City does not actually need to rezone anything for the next RHNA cycle.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct. He noted that a statement was made that the City is short in the above-moderate category, but the higher density zoning can be used to count towards that.

Commissioner Allen inquired, following up on one speaker and to clarify numbers in her mind regarding the housing cap the City had and where it is today, how many units would the City have if all the units on the table were built and if the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Preferred Plan was also built. She stated that from the March 4, 2014 City Council meeting, she counted about 26,500 units; adding the 3,312 units from the table would give 29,812 units; and topping that with the East Pleasanton Preferred Plan potential of 1,700 units would total 31,512 units. She inquired if the count is roughly right, noting that not all the units will necessarily be built.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct.

Commissioner Allen stated that the City does not have a housing cap of 29,000 because that was overturned. She noted, however, that she thinks the Commission needs to just keep that in mind because she has heard the City Council and many people say that the City wants to try and live the spirit of what the voters and citizens were interested in when that came through, and the City was abiding by State law.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he listened to all the numbers and still liked the comment made by a speaker that the City needs to be flexible, that it was smart planning. He indicated that he does not know if the City always needs to do it just because they are RHNA numbers. He noted that workforce housing is how he got into Pleasanton, starting at Springtown Apartments and then moving to Stoneridge Apartments, then buying a house in Livermore, and now he's still in Pleasanton. He stated that he thinks the City gets caught up with the numbers, and it just needs to make sure to do the right thing for each of these properties so the children of today's

residents can live here as well. He noted that this is his goal in doing this as smart planning, as the City of Planned Progress.

Chair Olson stated that Ms. Dennis' letter pointed out the big mismatch between employees commuting in from outside the area versus residents who live here and work here, and the mismatch gets greater over time from 1990 through 2010. Looking back to the acquisition of PeopleSoft by Oracle and the extension of BART out to Pleasanton, both of which happened during this period of time, he wondered if the City had the ability to determine how many of these workers were coming in via mass transit, as he did not think 75 percent were driving automobiles. He indicated that he used to ride the ACE train to San Jose, and every morning, the train was full of people who got off in Pleasanton, coming in from the Stockton area to work in Pleasanton. He pointed out that the statistics may not be as alarming as they appear.

Chair Olson stated that what he hears tonight are cross currents. He indicated that there certainly are properties on this list that are more controversial than others as the turnout of people in the audience indicates. He stated that Pleasanton has a need for housing, and looking at the housing numbers, some may say that they do not want the City to go over 29,000 housing units. He emphasized that Pleasanton has no housing cap, and trying to live within the spirit of the housing cap runs the risk of being sued again. He pointed out that this desire to limit housing in the City needs to be balanced against the need for low-income housing. He referred to the Kottinger Gardens project the Commission just recommended for approval, where the applicant indicated there is a long waiting list of seniors wanting to live in the existing facilities and the additional 95 units to the new facility will not still be able to accommodate them all. He reiterated that both low-income and senior housing represent a need which runs counter to the desire to limit housing in this town, and finding a happy medium means that the City needs to continue planning and developing alternatives. He added that there is also the need for schools, which would lead some to say that the City should not do any more housing. He stated that these three elements are at cross-currents and need to be balanced with one another; it cannot be all just one way. He stated that based on this big picture view, he thinks that many of these sites should stay on the list, and the City should continue to try to work through this and make sure the City has alternatives available. He then asked staff if they had any specific questions on this for the Commission.

Ms. Stern stated that it sounds like the Commission wants the City to continue with the sites, so staff will provide additional information for the next go around.

Commissioner Allen stated that with respect to the rezoning of the sites, she could argue for two or three of the sites that on their own look good. She noted, however, that she does not think this is the right time in this Housing Element to rezone more properties. She added that she thinks the City needs to focus on helping support the needs Chair Olson mentioned by encouraging people to build the 3,000 units on the sites that have already been rezoned so the City can get more senior housing and more low-income housing. She added that there is also the East Pleasanton Specific Plan

area underway where there has been talk about senior housing and housing for autistic children and adults, as well as serving other needs of multi-density housing. She indicated that those are the places the City needs to really leverage first before approving additional sites.

In summary, Commissioner Allen stated that she had four points: (1) The City has excess capacity here today that is already on this list; (2) The East Pleasanton Specific Plan will provide another 1,700 units; (3) There is no urgent business need within the City that would be driving a rezoning; and (4) The City needs to maintain flexibility, which means to not change zoning now but to do so when the City finds there is a need or there is another business driver that would cause the City to do so.

That said, Commissioner Allen stated that there is one site specifically that she would like additional information on, because there may be a business need she does not know about, and that is the Irby-Kaplan-Zia site. She indicated that it sounds like there could be some benefits to the City in terms of sewer, water, and roadway, and while she is making the assumption that it is not an urgent business need, she thinks it is worthy of looking into and having it come back to the Commission to determine how urgent that really is and what that would mean to the City.

Commissioner Allen added that the other piece of information she would like to have that she thinks staff is already preparing is around demographics. She asked where the need will be in the next ten years, whether it would be workforce housing or senior housing or something else. She noted that the City clearly has a gap today with workforce housing, but there is also a lot of surplus in housing that will come on board that will serve that need. She added that she believes senior housing is really critical and would like to see the demographics there.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she agrees a great deal with what has already been said. She noted that she was on the Housing Element Task Force, and she considers the work of that Task Force to be well done, exhaustive, extensive, and with a lot of community outreach. She indicated that she is gratified to see that the City still has excess numbers from all that work that can be used in the next RHNA cycle, and given that, her inclination is not to rezone any additional properties at this time. She continued that she agrees with Commissioner Allen that the one site that would be a great site for housing is the Irby-Kaplan-Zia site. She added that she is inclined to have a conversation about that, but she is aware that staff has said additional information is needed. She noted, however, that when she saw some of these sites when she got the Planning Commission meeting packet, she did not know they were even remotely possible in terms of housing and certainly thinks that there has not been enough outreach. She stated that she has the schedule and knows there will be extensive outreach, but given all the outreach done with the Housing Element Task Force, a lot more discussion is needed if some of these sites are to be considered. With respect to the CM Capital site, she indicated that she has been around awhile and has never seen a situation where the City has rezoned a site against the owner's preference. She stated that she has heard what the neighbors are saying and understand the concerns,

and she would be inclined to downzone it but not take the residential off the table entirely; she believes that is a decent compromise for that site.

Commissioner Pearce stated that Pleasanton is the City of Planned Progress; the City did a heck of a job with the last Housing Element Task Force, and if the City does not need any additional units, she is not inclined to add them above what it already has, which is a considerable number. She pointed out that the City has a lot of projects with planning approval capacity that it can work with to accommodate what is obviously a desperate need for workforce housing, and while recognizing that need, she thinks there is some capacity to do that in the next RHNA cycle. She then asked staff if they want additional discussion regarding programs and policies.

Mr. Dolan replied that he is not sure if staff has provided the Commission with enough information to react just yet, but staff would welcome anything that the Commissioners have that jumps out at them and want staff to know, in addition to the areas that have already been identified with the assistance of the City consultant and from some of the input that staff has received that will get extra scrutiny on.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she has a couple of things off the top. She indicated that she was around for the condominium conversion discussions a long time ago, and she remembers feeling like all of a sudden people, wanted to do condo conversions and the City was not prepared for it. She noted that it ended up not happening, and the City was able to pull back, but what it looks like here is that the City will consider modifying its condo conversion policies when those favorable market conditions exist. She wondered if it could be considered ahead of that because she recalls how quickly it jumped out at staff the last time.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the other thing that she has been muttering about for a while, and she does not know if the Housing Element is the right place to start as this is sort of a chicken-and-egg situation, is if it is time to consider the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance (IZO) in general. She noted that the City has had this long-standing policy of just having this IZO or scattering housing, and over the years she has heard from developers, from housing advocates, from for-profit developers, and from non-profit developers that this is not an effective way to get low-income people the services they need to rise out of their income situation. She indicated that she appreciates that this IZO has worked for the City for a while, but she is wondering if there is an opportunity with this next Housing Element to have that conversation again because she believes it has been a while since that was done with regard to City policy.

Mr. Dolan replied that he wanted to tell the Commission that staff was sort of compelled, because the letters have been submitted, to at least go through an analysis of all sites. He indicated that, at a minimum, with the more detail staff would provide, the Commission would rate them all compared to the same criteria that were used in the last Housing Element update. He noted that it is going to be different because very few of these sites are actually high-density; it is a whole different type of development as opposed to the last time when everything that was being considered was 30 units per

acre. He added that staff will be compelled to do some kind of CEQA analysis just in case the City Council tells staff to proceed. He indicated that if the Council gives an earlier direction not to proceed, then these will be excluded, but his sense is that the Council might want to see the results of the CEQA before they actually make that determination.

Chair Olson stated that he agrees with Commissioner Pearce relative to the CM Capital site, given what the owner wants to do with the property. He noted that a couple of the concerned citizens who live across the Arroyo stated that they could live with two stories. He pointed out that that was one of the controversies looking at the Summerhill Apartments, so he would certainly want to keep that one on the list. He indicated that the Irby-Kaplan-Zia site just looks like a natural to him, noting that he walks by there a lot, it is totally infill, and the City could benefit from it. He added that another one that looks like a natural as well is the CenterPointe Church site.

Chair Olson stated that all of this tells him that the City needs to continue to work on a Specific Plan for East Pleasanton. He indicated that while some have argued that the City does not need to do that, he believes that it needs to be done in order to come up with something that the City really likes out there rather than having it annexed by another city. He concluded that what the Commission has heard tonight, including the cross currents he discussed, argues that the City complete that Specific Plan.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if there are any of the sites that are more urgent where the developers are ready to proceed and, therefore, need to be moved up to the "let's make a decision" list. He noted that sometimes, something is approved and it does not happen for eight or ten years.

Mr. Dolan replied that he thinks staff is not privy to that. He indicated that staff has probably been working with the Irby-Kaplan-Zia property the longest because it was involved in the last round. He noted that it is also a unique situation where there is the opportunity to do all three together, and it is three families and not developers, and they all agreed to go at the same time, which is a circumstance that exists right now. He added that staff just assumes that everyone who submitted a letter wants to do it right away.

Commissioner Ritter added that he also agrees with Chair Olson that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan process needs to keep going just to have the plan ready 10-15 years from now.

No action was taken.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

“Welcome to Pleasanton” Sign at the DSRSD Property

Commissioner Pearce stated that recently, a “Welcome to Pleasanton” sign was installed above the DSRSD sign at its property along Stoneridge Drive. She inquired if the City had anything to do with that because the bio-solid facility seemed to be an odd place to have the “Welcome” sign and does not send a great message. She further inquired if the City has any authority over that or if DSRSD can just do it as a government property.

Mr. Dolan indicated that he has not seen the sign and asked if it had the City emblem on it.

Commissioner Pearce replied that it did not; it just says “Welcome to Pleasanton” right over the word “bio-solid.”

Mr. Dolan stated that staff would look into it.

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

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

East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force

Commissioner Pearce inquired if there would be an East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force meeting on May 1st.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

e. Matters for Commission’s Action

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Olson adjourned the Planning Commission 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN
Secretary

DRAFT