



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Regular Meeting of October 27, 2010, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Kathy Narum.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan , Director of Community Development; Julie Harryman , Assistant City Attorney; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; Steven Bocian, Assistant City Manager; Robin Giffin, Senior Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Kathy Narum, Jennifer Pearce, and Jerry Pentin

Commissioners Absent: Chair Arne Olson and Commissioner Greg O'Connor

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. September 29, 2010

Vice Chair Narum continued the consideration of the minutes to the next meeting.

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 speakers.

4. **REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Ms. Stern advised that staff is continuing Item 6.b., PCUP-276, Tina Ardeshiri, Simeon Properties, to November 10, 2010 in order to provide additional information to the Commission regarding calls for service.

Vice Chair Narum asked if there were people in the audience who wished to speak regarding the item. There were none.

Vice Chair Narum indicated that the item will be continued to the November 10, 2010 Commission meeting.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Commissioner Pentin requested that Item 5.d., PTR-8020, Alameda County Surplus Property Authority, be removed from the Consent Calendar and be heard under the "Public Hearing and Other Matters" section.

Vice Chair Narum advised that the item will be heard as Item 6.c.

- a. **PCUP-274, Tri-Valley Bread of Life Christian Church**
Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a church at 6678 Owens Drive, Suite 102. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial-Office) District.
- b. **PCUP-282, Mark Anderson**
Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a music studio at 4430 Willow Road, Suite M. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial, Commercial, and Office) District.
- c. **PCUP-283, Fred Li**
Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a church at 4430 Willow Road, Suites L and N. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial, Commercial, and Office) District.

d. PTR-8020, Alameda County Surplus Property Authority

Application for Tentative Map approval for a 22-lot subdivision of approximately 124 acres located southwest of the intersection of I-580 and El Charro Road (Staples Ranch). 122.5 acres of the project site are in unincorporated Alameda County and are currently zoned Agriculture by Alameda County. City of Pleasanton pre-zoning for the property is PUD-C (Planned Unit Development-Commercial) for the portion of the project site with the proposed Health Center and PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial) for the remainder of the senior continuing care community site; PUD-P (Planned Unit Development – Park) for the two park sites; and PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial) for the auto mall site and the commercial site. An approximately 1.5-acre site already within the City of Pleasanton is zoned PUD-MDR (Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential), PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial), and PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial).

This item was removed from the Consent Calendar and will be heard as Item 6.a.

Commissioner Blank moved to make the required Conditional Use Permit findings for Cases PCUP-274, PCUP-282, and PCUP-283, as listed in their respective staff reports, and to approve Cases PCUP-274, PCUP-282, and PCUP-283, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the respective staff reports.

Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners O'Connor and Olson..

Resolutions Nos. PC-2010-34 approving Case PCUP-274, PC-2010-35 approving Case PCUP-282, and PC-2010-36 approving PCUP-283 were entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

Matter Continued for Decision:

- a. **PAP-148, Mark Lobaugh/Complete Wireless Consulting Inc.**
Appeal of the Zoning Administrator's denial of design review application for the construction of a 65-foot tall faux pine tree to be operated as a wireless facility for Verizon Wireless at 6890 Koll Center Parkway. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial - Office) District.

This item was continued from the September 22, 2010 meeting.

Janice Stern presented the staff report and gave a brief summary of the appeal and the proceedings at the last meeting. She noted that the neighbors had submitted another letter regarding their opposition to the project, a copy of which had been provided to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Blank stated that the consultant's report mentions one two-foot microwave dish and one four-foot microwave dish mounted on the faux tree. He inquired what the heights of the dishes are.

Ms. Stern replied that she did not know and that the representative from Verizon could respond when he makes his presentation. She then introduced the City's wireless consultant, Mr. Peter Gruchawka of Accord Communications.

Mr. Gruchawka stated that he was contracted by the City to review information submitted for the Verizon application to determine whether the pole could be of a different height or the facility located at a different building. He indicated that this can only be done by reviewing the data submitted by Verizon. He added that, to his knowledge, Verizon has submitted two coverage maps showing the existing coverage, the simplistic view from their current network, and enhanced coverage by adding this particular site.

Mr. Gruchawka stated that from a technical standpoint, the maps do not provide enough information to determine what the real changes would be. He noted that there are no indications of the signal strength Verizon is trying to achieve or the areas for which Verizon is trying to enhance coverage. He added that no technical information was provided with respect to the alternative sites; only simple statements that they would not work. He indicated that he needs more information in order to arrive at a conclusion that would be objective, based on the criteria Verizon is looking at.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the maps included proposed signal-to-noise ratios.

Mr. Gruchawka replied that they did not.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the maps were more for marketing rather than technical maps.

Mr. Gruchawka said yes. He added that he would also be looking for street level and inside building ratios, which are somewhat proprietary.

Commissioner Blank referred to the parabolic antennas and inquired if they were used for access to the service switch network.

Mr. Gruchawka replied that Verizon did not state their use in the application.

Commissioner Blank stated that he would think if they were accessing the antennas, they could be located in some other spot for access to the microwave network, and then land hardwired back into the cellular repeater site.

Commissioner Pentin inquired if the parabolic antennas on the tree needed to be at a certain height.

Mr. Gruchawka replied that Verizon listed the antennas as a future need without a specific application. He indicated that it would depend upon what is on the pole and what Verizon is trying to get to. He added that the diameter also has to do with the path length and what losses they may incur in-between.

Commissioner Pentin inquired whether the distance Verizon was trying to reach was northern Dublin.

Mr. Gruchawka replied that he would assume Verizon is trying to get to one of the Dublin cell sites to back-haul a connector system into the network.

Commissioner Pentin inquired whether it would be a matter of electronics if the City asked Verizon to downsize the antennas.

Mr. Gruchawka replied that downsizing the antenna size below a certain size is a limiting factor and would not be practical because Verizon must have a certain beam width on the antenna.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Mark Lobaugh, Complete Wireless Consulting, Inc., representing Verizon Wireless, Appellant, stated that they feel the site is ideal for a wireless antenna and that the antenna is well-situated in the compound. He then introduced Mr. Stefano Iachella, Verizon's technical engineer.

Stefano Iachella, Verizon Wireless Technical Engineer, stated that they would be able to move the facility back on the site only by a few feet and not the initial proposal of six to ten feet due to the utilities in the compound. With respect to the alternative location

on the roof of the one-story building to the east of the proposed site, he indicated that the building is surrounded by trees to the north and northwest. He added that it would be much lower than their proposed 60-foot tall tower. He noted that it would definitely not cover what is intended; it would not serve their goal for the site and they would need one or two more sites in the area to achieve their purpose.

Mr. Iachella stated that their propagation tool is not designed for variances of 10 to 15 to 20 feet, but for variations of coverage for a 300-foot tall tower which would show the differences for 50 to 100 feet and to help them design surrounding sites. He noted that most of the technical data being requested cannot be provided, and he would need to discuss with his superiors about what could be provided from the list. He indicated that they have used these tools with other sites and use them together to design the site, in conjunction with their own experience with different sites, with trees that surround the buildings, and with the line of sight to neighborhoods.

Mr. Lobaugh stated that at the last hearing, the Commission asked that Verizon study the adjacent site and had expressly stated not to pursue a third party study. He indicated that he and Verizon staff evaluated the parcel next door, and the large, mature Redwood trees would completely block their signal north. He noted that their evaluation may appear to be simplistic but that this was all the Commission asked them to do.

With respect to the satellite dish, Mr. Lobaugh stated that the Commission's concern is the visibility factor. He indicated that the dishes come in different sizes and can be moved up and down a few feet. He added that they can also put antenna socks on them which are netting materials that go over the dish to obscure them within the branches similar to the antenna. He noted that the dishes would be positioned at a height that is required for them to achieve their purpose.

Commissioner Pentin inquired how many monopines there are in the area with similar satellite dishes and coverage as described, and where they are located.

Mr. Lobaugh replied that there is only one he is aware of is located north of I-680 in a self-storage yard. He stated that the needle color looks bluish and would not be a good example.

Commissioner Pentin inquired if there were examples outside the area, for example, in San Jose, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Marin County, or Santa Cruz.

Mr. Lobaugh replied that its use in the Bay Area it is not that prevalent and added that there are excellent examples going up Highway 50 to the Tahoe area.

Commissioner Pentin noted that Highway 50 is a scenic highway and he inquired if the facilities along the highway incorporate dishes, needles, and other items as described.

Mr. Lobaugh stated that it is not an unusual situation to put satellite dishes on a monopine.

Commissioner Pentin asked Mr. Lobaugh if his company could obtain pictures of these monopines in other places in California.

Mr. Lobaugh said yes.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the proposal include satellite dishes as well as a microwave dishes.

Mr. Lobaugh replied the they were microwave dishes.

Commissioner Blank inquired what the signal-to-noise ratio was in terms of coverage improvement.

Mr. Iachella stated that signal-to-noise ratio determines the quality of the signal and that they are not typically asked to provide this type of information.

Commissioner Blank explained that he was trying to understand whether Verizon was experiencing an issue of signal strength or an issue of frequency congestion with the frequency switching on the cell towers.

Mr. Iachella replied that it is a combination of both: where there is no signal strength and poor quality, there would be poor signal-to-noise ratio.

Commissioner Blank inquired if it is also a frequency congestion issue.

Mr. Iachella said yes..

Commissioner Blank inquired if the microwave antenna is for circuit switch access.

Mr. Iachella replied that it is for the back haul--to get back to the switch which is located in Pleasanton on Willow Road. He noted that he was not sure this microwave dish would be pointed to that dish or to another on an adjacent site.

Commissioner Blank inquired why there are two antennas.

Mr. Iachella replied that he was not certain but that it is probably taking signal from one direction and relaying it to another direction. He indicated that he does not typically deal with the back haul.

Commissioner Blank stated that he was trying to determine how Verizon was trunking into the network with the antenna. He indicated that he assumed it is not hardwired, and inquired if the microwave was for the switching between the cell sites.

Mr. Iachella replied that it is used for switching back to the switch.

Commissioner Blank stated that if Verizon is using this as a relay, there would be only one dish.

Mr. Iachella stated that he did not know whether there would be one or two dishes at the site.

Commissioner Blank noted that the wireless expert had indicated that there were two dishes.

Mr. Gruchawka stated that there are two proposed dishes and that it is standard procedure to put two on the planning application and to request two dishes.

Commissioner Blank stated that given the issues and oppositions regarding this proposal, it would be important to have precise information, not standard things but what is actually needed.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the staff report indicates that Verizon could prepare and submit the additional information required by Mr. Gruchawka to complete his assessment. She inquired whether or not this was happening.

Mr. Lobaugh replied that they could provide more information given more time, but they were provided the consultant's request on Thursday of the preceding week, and there was simply not enough time to do the research.

Mr. Iachella stated that he looked at the matter briefly, and it looked very extensive. He noted that Verizon does not typically go into that much detail and that he would need to discuss this with his manager to determine what can and cannot be provided and what would be meaningful. He indicated that their propagation tool is not designed for that.

Nancy Wedge stated that she has read that home values have decreased near cell phone towers. She added that she has looked out from her backyard and tried to envision what a 60-foot tower would look like from her property. She commended the Commission for its detailed questions and expressed hope that the Commission would continue its pursuit in making this a good project.

Gerry Gire spoke in opposition to the Verizon cell phone tower, noting that many neighbors were not present because of the Giants game. She stated that it is the job of local government to strike a balance between the needs, not the wishes, of the carriers and protecting the nature and character of the community; she indicated that she was pleased to see the City retain a third party expert because the neighbors have been asking for that since they do not know where the line of sight is and why the facility needs all the equipment. She added that they were not pleased that this determination could not be made because of the very limited information provided by Verizon. She added that this facility would be a health and safety issue and would negatively affect property values.

Ms. Gire stated that the Arroyo is part of the Centennial Trail and unlike other trails, it is a park-like wilderness, a full nature with birds and frogs. She noted that the tower is visible from their court and would look more like 85 feet tall from their side of the bank. She also voiced concern that one fake tree will become a tree farm or an ugly debacle of microwave dishes. She referred to her October 22nd letter and stated that of the ten questions asked, the most pressing is why Verizon states they need line of sight. She indicated that she believes moving back the tree ten feet is not enough and requested the Commission to deny the case.

Lori Hanson stated that she is currently selling her house and will have to disclose the project. She expressed concern that when buyers see this in the disclosure, they may lower their asking price or back out of the deal.

Mr. Lobaugh presented a photo montage and displayed views of someone walking down the trail and approaching the site, which shows the tower to be completely obscured. He then displayed the latest photo-simulation taken from the trail. He indicated that staff had requested that he take an additional photo-simulation from the site, which he had forwarded to staff. He added that staff requested more photos from the trail which he displayed, showing that the site is not visible. He then presented photos with no leaves on the tree, taken from the only location on the court where one would see the faux tree, as well as from the freeway, and standing on the trail behind the homes. He noted that when the tree is full of foliage, it is completely obscure.

Mr. Lobaugh stated that Verizon representatives have spent countless hours with staff to arrive at a design and color of a pine tree with needles similar in color to the existing redwoods. He stated that the location they chose is ideal and that he is not sure where they would go if they are not able to locate here.

Commissioner Blank questioned the stability of the needle color after five years of being exposed to elements.

Mr. Lobaugh stated that everything fades to a certain extent, but Verizon's maintenance crew will visit the site monthly, check on equipment, and maintain the branches and needles. He added that over time and as part of the maintenance, the needles would be replaced as needed, but there is no set time period to accomplish this.

Commissioner Blank referred to the fading of cars and voiced concern about whether or not five years into the future, maintenance and replacement of faded materials would be addressed through the maintenance.

Mr. Lobaugh replied that he did not have a definitive maintenance schedule but that he could make a commitment on behalf of Verizon that it would maintain its intended look. He referred to an example in the City of Fresno where Verizon developed a maintenance schedule. He indicated that Verizon will stand by their equipment.

Vice Chair Narum referred to the photo simulations along the trail and noted that most of the trees look deciduous. She stated that when the leaves fall off, the faux tree would become visible. She inquired if there is a possibility of planting some redwood trees around the faux tree to hide it, at least from the ground level on the east side.

Ms. Stern noted that one side of the property was owned by CalTrans and the other by a private property owner.

Mr. Lobaugh replied that there is a possibility they could add some foliage, but he was unsure what this would accomplish. He indicated that alternatively, they could install some slats and a fence around the enclosure to screen the ground equipment; however, if redwoods grow in front of it, it will potentially obscure the signal they are trying to achieve.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Referring to the issue of disclosure in real estate transactions brought up by one of the speakers, Commissioner Blank inquired if the tower was something that would require formal disclosure.

Ms. Harryman replied that she has not researched this but could do so to determine whether it is required.

Commissioner Blank stated that part of the neighbors' concern involves property values but that he was not sure he would make a decision based solely on that. He added that an opinion that it absolutely had to be disclosed would be valuable information and might influence his decision.

Commissioner Pentin inquired if the ordinance requires a 300-foot setback distance.

Ms. Harryman replied that in cases she has reviewed regarding cell and radio frequency towers, property valuation and safety issues have not come into aesthetics because it is pre-empted by Federal law.

Commissioner Pentin inquired if the current redwood trees on the property were part of the conditions of approval for a landscaping plan for the sewer plant and compound.

Ms. Stern replied that it is hard to tell from the map, but it appears from the diagram on page 2 of the staff report that all trees are outside of the City's property; they are either within the CalTrans right-of-way or on the private lands around the business park and on the Arroyo.

Commissioner Pentin commented that CalTrans could remove any trees. He inquired if the trees on private property were heritage trees and would require approval to be removed.

Ms. Stern replied that they would be heritage trees if they were over 35 feet tall.

Commissioner Pentin inquired if, should the item be continued, the City's Landscape Architect could check the trees along the Arroyo to determine if they are were deciduous trees.

Ms. Stern replied that staff will request that this be done.

Commissioner Blank moved to continue the item to the November 10, 2010 Planning Commission meeting for the expressed purpose of allowing time for the appellant to respond to questions posed by the Commission and to provide the necessary additional information to the consultant, and for staff to conduct additional research.

Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.

Commissioner Pearce indicated that if the additional data needed had been provided, she would not need a third party consultant; however, absent those data, she is pleased that staff brought in a third party consultant.

Commissioner Pentin requested an amendment to the motion to require the appellant to present a picture of a monopine tree, alone and amongst other trees to recreate a similar environment, and from a 300- foot distance.

Commissioners Blank and Pearce accepted the proposed amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Olson and O'Connor.

New Items:

b. PCUP-276, Tina Ardeshiri, Simeon Properties

Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a 24-hour convenience store (7-Eleven) at 3506 Old Santa Rita Road. Zoning for the property is C-C (Central Commercial) District.

This item was continued to the November 10, 2010 meeting.

Item 5.d., PTR-8020, Alameda County Surplus Property Authority
Application for Tentative Map approval for a 22-lot subdivision of approximately 124 acres located southwest of the intersection of I-580 and El Charro Road (Staples Ranch). 122.5 acres of the project site are in unincorporated Alameda County and are currently zoned Agriculture by Alameda County. City of Pleasanton pre-zoning for the property is PUD-C (Planned Unit Development-Commercial) for the portion of the project site with the proposed Health Center and PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial) for the remainder of the senior continuing care community site; PUD-P (Planned Unit Development – Park) for the two park sites; and PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial) for the auto mall site and the commercial site. An approximately 1.5-acre site already within the City of Pleasanton is zoned PUD-MDR (Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential), PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial), and PUD-HDR/C (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential/Commercial).

Mr. Bocian indicated that there would be no staff presentation. He added that he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Pentin stated that he served on the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and advocates bicycle safety and encourages bicycling in the City. He indicated that he had the opportunity to review the tentative map and understood that it is a Vesting Tentative Tract Map. He noted that the bicycle routes and improvements on roadways appear to be standard. He then referred to the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and what will be done to implement the Plan. He added that the General Plan also talks about how bicycling would be improved in Pleasanton. Commissioner Pentin pointed out that this is a brand new roadway going in and provides an opportunity to start implementing some of the Plan without existing obstacles.

Mr. Bocian indicated that the overall bicycle pathways and the roadway widths have been set for the project for some time.

Commissioner Pentin indicated that the Master Plan began two or three years ago and was approved in January 2010. He added that there is the opportunity here to be innovative and install pathways on brand new roadways. He noted that there are no sharrows or bicycle detectors, but rather, a standard width next to the sidewalk, and no opportunities at intersections for bicyclists to leave the bike lane and have a bike left-turn spot with protectors. He stated that it would be good to implement this before the item goes forward.

Mr. Bocian indicated that the geometry and width of the roads was determined by Mr. Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, who was also involved in the review of the Tentative Map. He added that he believes issues like the detectors are matters that Mr. Tassano

would review when the more detailed improvement plans are submitted. He stated that Issues relating to the additional two-foot bike-lane buffer are another point that Mr. Tassano would have to weigh in on; however, that may not be accommodated by the way the roadway is currently configured.

Commissioner Pentin stated that this is a great opportunity now to decrease the size of the travel lanes in order to gain another two feet in the street. He added that the roadway will become busy, and bringing in bike traffic, and if done right, will allow bicyclists to travel through a community park and senior housing and would encourage a better bike and pedestrian community. He expressed concern that once the roadway is in, this will not be able to be done because of the cost.

Mr. Bocian stated that he could not address the question relative to reducing lane widths for the purpose of accommodating two-foot buffers and reiterated that this is something Mr. Tassano has to weigh in on. He added that if it was the interest of the Commission to incorporate these, staff could have it reviewed by Mr. Tassano and report back to the Commission, or a condition could be incorporated within the approval of the Tentative Map that directs the City Traffic Engineer to review these matters and make appropriate changes.

Commissioner Blank stated that a third option would be to include this as a strong recommendation for when the item goes before the City Council.

Mr. Bocian advised that the item would not move forward to the Council.

Commissioner Blank voiced support for Commissioner Pentin's comments and suggested that a condition be added indicating it should be done and that if it cannot happen, the Traffic Engineer should return and state why it cannot happen.

Vice Chair Narum supported Commissioner Pentin's comments but indicated that she was not that familiar with the Master Plan. She suggested that the item be continued so Commissioner Pentin could meet with Mr. Tassano and try to get the appropriate provisions of the Plan incorporated into the Map and then returned to the Commission.

Commissioner Pearce inquired about the time line for Staples Ranch.

Mr. Bocian replied that staff is scheduled to submit the application to LAFCO by November 12, 2010; then bring it before LAFCO on January 13, 2010. He noted that approval of the Tentative Map should be completed before the application is submitted to LAFCO.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she finds Commissioner Pentin's point salient and is glad it was brought up. She indicated that she believes the issue needs to be in conformance with the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and that Mr. Tassano was also very invested in this Plan. Given this and the Commission's timeline, she recommended that a condition be incorporated that states that it must be

in conformance with the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and ensure that the items be done.

Commissioner Pentin stated that his biggest concern is that the issue would return with an indication that it cannot be done.

Commissioner Blank stated that if direction is given that the Map must be in conformance with the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, it would be accomplished.

Commissioner Pentin still voiced concern, noting that Stoneridge Drive is not addressed as far as new roadway improvements. He stated that the Commission's goals and policies state "to increase and to incorporate and to update," and this is an opportunity to go above and beyond. He indicated that if it just meets the standard, it probably does so without the innovation, and he believes this is the time to make the change and not address improvements later.

Commissioner Blank stated that there is a Master Plan for a reason, and the same discussion could occur for the Downtown Specific Plan, the Foothill Overlay District, and other master plans. He indicated that he wants to be cautious and believes that it is absolutely legitimate to say the Commission wants to implement the Master Plan; however, he would be somewhat concerned about going over and above the Plan. He noted that if the Plan cannot be put into effect without changing anything, then quite possibly it was not a good master plan to begin with.

Vice Chair Narum inquired whether the roads were locked in stone when a Vesting Tentative Map is approved.

Mr. Bocian replied that generally, the Commission does not get into the details with the lane markers at this stage.

Vice Chair Narum suggested that a condition be included to direct Mr. Tassano to ensure that bicycle lanes are incorporated per the Master Plan, as well as other items that could also be incorporated.

Commissioner Pearce stated that this is something that could go to the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Committee.

Commissioner Pentin stated that as things get locked in stone, the first thing one gets hit with is when trying to come back to it is that there is no budget to make it happen.

Commissioner Blank indicated that everyone appears to be in agreement that the Plan should be put into effect in a meaningful way and not simply be lip service. He asked staff to arrive at verbiage which would provide that improvements to be made and to meet timetables.

Mr. Bocian stated that to meet the timetable, staff would recommend that the Tentative Map be approved this evening with an additional recommendation that a condition be added that staff implement the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan to the extent feasible, as determined by the City's Traffic Engineer.

Commissioner Blank moved to find that there are no new or changed circumstances which require additional CEQA review of the project, to make the tentative map findings regarding the acceptability/suitability of the project, and to approve PTR-8020, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 8020, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report, with the addition of a condition that the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be implemented to the greatest extent feasible.

Commissioner Pentin indicated that he did not agree with the proposed motion.

Vice Chair Narum suggested the item return to the Commission.

Commissioner Blank suggested that the following language be added at the end of the motion: "...and that implementation of the Plan return to the Planning Commission for further review."

Commissioner Pearce suggested delineating items requested such as bicycle detection.

Commissioner Pentin felt there was an opportunity to sit down, look at the streets, and identify certain innovations that could be done to the streets in the Master Plan that the City is not required to do.

Commissioner Blank indicated that he thinks the language "to the greatest extent feasible" covered this.

Commissioner Pentin stated that the Master Plan points out innovative things that other cities are using as opportunities to change the way the City does its bicycle planning.

Vice Chair Narum indicated that the Commission needs to approve the Tentative Map tonight but also ensure that the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan be incorporated through a condition and include a review of it. She noted that the roads can be changed upon review by Mr. Tassano and not hold up the approval of the Tentative Map.

Vice Chair Narum called for a five-minute break at 8:15 p.m. and thereafter reconvened the regular meeting.

Mr. Bocian stated that to the extent there is right-of-way and there are not safety issues, the City can incorporate issues relating to the two-foot buffer and bicycle detection. He indicated that the vast majority of issues in the Master Plan do not impact the right-of-way or road width and most likely could be incorporated. He noted that the only

things staff sees as a problem is the two-foot buffer because this involves reducing lane widths which Mr. Tassano needs to review for safety conditions.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the suggested language “to the greatest extent feasible” covers the implementation of the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

Mr. Bocian said yes.

Commissioner Pentin seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Narum requested that Mr. Tassano attend a Commission meeting in the near future and walk the Commission through the suggested amendments.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Olson and O’Connor.

Resolution No. PC-2010-37 approving Case PTR-8020 was entered and adopted as motioned.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

PUD-82, David DiDonato, Donato Builders, Inc.

Commissioner Pearce inquired when this project on the Stanley Boulevard property was coming from the City Council.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would be on the December meeting agenda.

Historic Building Ordinance

Commissioner Pearce inquired if any headway was being made with the Historic Building Ordinance.

Mr. Dolan said no.

The Commissioners voiced support for progress to be made.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

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.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

No discussion was held or action taken.

10. REFERRALS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

Commissioner Pearce stated that the Hacienda Task Force is continuing to meet. She added that the meeting for tomorrow had been canceled but that they will meet next Thursday and again on November 18, 2010.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Olson adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN
Secretary