



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, October 15, 2008

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission meeting of October 15, 2008, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Blank.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Planning and Community Development; Janice Stern, Principal Planner; Larissa Seto, Assistant City Attorney; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Anne Fox, Kathy Narum, Commissioner Arne Olson, and Jennifer Pearce

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Greg O'Connor

Chair Blank reminded everyone that the Commission is being taped live via podcast.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. September 24, 2008

Commissioner Fox referred to the correction made earlier by staff regarding the motion on page 38, and she confirmed that the motion was to uphold the appeal rather than to deny it.

Commissioner Pearce requested that the first sentence on the last paragraph on page 15 be modified to read as follows: "Commissioner Pearce commented that she was disappointed that the Commission was having the same discussion two weeks later, especially in light of the direction the Commission ~~is heading~~ had given."

Commissioner Pearce noted a typographical error in the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 15 and requested that it be corrected as follows: "She stated that she believed ... and that she is in favor ~~of~~ of Commissioner Fox's and Mr. Dolan's suggestion...."

Chair Blank noted that the phrase "Beth Emet Childcare Center" in the first sentence of the sixth paragraph on page 29 should read "Beth Emek Childcare Center" and requested that it be corrected.

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the Minutes of September 24, 2008, as amended.

Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Olson.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner O'Connor.

The motion passed, and the Minutes of September 24, 2008 were approved, as amended.

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

There were no speakers.

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

Mr. Dolan advised that Item 5.a., PUD-76, Nathaniel Morales/Cody White, is continued to the September 29, 2008 meeting. He stated that staff had received input from a neighbor which staff considered to be too involved and would need to be addressed through a revision to the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Fox stated that in one of the Commission's recent considerations to rezone a property to PUD-HDR, there was discussion on what the potential height limit would be under that rezoning. She requested that this be spelled out in more detail for this item when it returns at the next meeting.

Commissioner Narum requested that information be included on how far the back wall of the duplex has to be moved to be able to save the two trees. She further requested an opinion on the matter from Mr. Mike Fulford, the City Landscape Architect.

Commissioner Olson noted that on page 5 of the staff report, there is discussion on units per acre and stated that he was not sure that the math was correct with respect to the density limit. He added that per his computation, at .17 acre with 3 units, it grosses to 17.65 units per acre and not 8 units per acre. He requested staff to look into that.

Commissioner Fox inquired if Chair Blank would be amenable to considering the Draft General Plan before the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Chair Blank asked staff if there was a specific reason the Draft General Plan is scheduled to be heard before the Draft EIR. Mr. Dolan replied that the primary goal for tonight's meeting was to get feedback on the EIR. He added that staff wanted to make sure the Commission completed discussion on the EIR; and should there be insufficient time to complete the discussion on the Draft General Plan, it would be continued to a future meeting. He noted, however, that since there was no crowd in the audience, the order of discussion could be switched.

Chair Blank reiterated that the primary issue of the evening was to take public testimony and get information and input from the Commissioners on the EIR. He noted that comments on the EIR can also be done in writing and would have just as much weight and influence as the spoken word. He agreed with Mr. Dolan that the Commission must get through the EIR and he would rather put off the General Plan portion than the EIR. He noted, however, that it may not make any difference tonight as there are not many people in the audience.

Commissioner Narum stated that she would prefer to start with the EIR. Commissioner Olson likewise stated that he is in favor of starting with the EIR. Commissioner Pearce was of the same opinion. Commissioner Fox indicated that she felt it would make more sense to have the Draft General Plan first and then talk about the EIR. She added that she was planning to submit her comments on the Draft EIR in writing.

Chair Blank indicated that the Commission would start with the EIR.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. PUD-76, Nathaniel Morales/Cody White

Application to rezone an approximately 7,500-square-foot parcel located at 344 and 346 West Angela Street from the RM-1,500 (Multiple-Family Residential) District to the PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District and for Planned Unit Development plan approval to remodel and convert the existing duplex unit into one single-family residential home and to construct two new attached units in the rear with related site improvements.

This item was continued by staff to the October 29, 2008 meeting.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the General Plan Update

To provide an opportunity for the Commission to: (1) receive an overview of the Draft EIR prepared for the General Plan; (2) receive public comments on the Draft EIR; and (3) provide Commission comments on the Draft EIR

Ms. Janice Stern introduced John Steere, Project Manager at PBS&J, EIR Consultant; Sally Maxwell, Associate Planner; and Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer. She stated that the objective this evening is for staff to briefly describe the EIR process and to take testimony and provide an opportunity for oral comments. She added that staff does not anticipate answering questions or responding to comments at this time as these will be addressed in the final EIR after the public comment period closes on November 21, 2008.

Chair Blank addressed Mr. Jeb Bing of the Pleasanton Weekly, who was present in the audience, and requested that the Weekly publicize the fact that the public comment period has been extended for 60 days to November 21, 2008.

Ms. Stern noted that after the Planning Commission and City Council discussed the Draft General Plan Elements between 2005 and 2007, staff prepared a consolidated Draft General Plan which is the project for the purposes of the Draft EIR. She stated that the EIR process is governed by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and that while the Draft EIR has specific prescribed times for comment, the Draft General Plan does not, and the City can continue to take comment on the Draft General Plan until its adoption in early 2009.

With respect to the EIR process, Ms. Stern stated that a determination was made in December 2005 that the City would need an EIR for the project. She continued that a scoping meeting was then held in January 2006, which provided agencies and the public an opportunity submit information on what they think needs to be dealt with in the Draft EIR.

Ms. Stern indicated that following the consolidation of the Draft General Plan and Land Use Map and after the completion of the traffic modeling, staff and the City's consultants wrote the EIR, which was issued on September 22, 2008, with the public comment period extending through November 21, 2008. She noted that staff will be preparing the Response to Comments document, based on comments received, which is projected to be completed by mid-January 2009. She indicated that the final document will come before the Planning Commission around February 2009, at which time the Commission will make a decision whether or not to recommend to the City Council both the certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Draft General Plan. She added that the City Council will then take action in March 2009 whether or not to certify the Final EIR and to adopt the General Plan.

Ms. Stern stated that the project was the maps, text, goals, policies, and programs of the Draft General Plan (the preferred development scenario), the development assumptions within that encompassed the 29,000 residential units and 35 million square feet of office and industrial uses. She noted that this number includes approximately 3.5 to 4 million square feet of commercial uses for the East Pleasanton area as placeholders for preparing the traffic analyses. She added that staff recognizes and has informed the property owners that the actual development potential will be determined by a specific plan process. She noted that there is a no-project alternative, which would be the existing 1996 General Plan with the land use and circulation network within that General Plan.

Ms. Stern noted that a General Plan is not a focused EIR; it has a number of environmental topics and touches on all of the topics that are of interest as an environmental impact, from land use and agriculture to population and employment, utilities, geology, air quality, biological resources, etc. She stated that staff deals with them on a program level, looking at it at a higher level of analysis rather than at a project level. She added that subsequent development may require additional environmental review.

Ms. Stern stated that with respect to the proposed General Plan, there were several discussions about the Circulation Element when the model for the land use buildout was run and that there were two significant impacts shown in the Draft EIR: the first was the potential impacts at gateway intersections, which are the first intersections coming in from the freeway or from Stanley Boulevard. She noted that the 1996 General Plan adopted a LOS D for all City intersections other than those exempted in the Downtown, based on the rationale that the Downtown was to maintain its pedestrian-friendly character and that the objective in the Downtown was to maintain that rather than facilitate the flow of traffic. She indicated that there were several intersections where it was necessary to make improvements in order to achieve the LOS D and that tolerating a higher level of congestion at those intersections could act to meter traffic to some extent in the downstream to enable downstream traffic to move more smoothly. She noted that there was consensus to allow a LOS exception to go below LOS D; therefore, improvements at those intersections are not

being assumed, which is why there is the impact of significantly higher congestion levels. She added that improvements to intersections could be made in order to achieve Level of Service (LOS) D, but they must be mindful of retaining wide sidewalks, shade trees, sidewalk dining, etc., and may require landscaping, removal of crosswalks, and/or street widening.

Ms. Stern stated that the second impact was air quality as regards consistency with the 2005 ozone strategy and that it is important to note that this impact is related to assumptions that were contained in that strategy related to the number of housing units and the number of jobs. She pointed out that this is not something intuitive or discovered in casual reading because the impact is not identifying a potential current or future impact to the standards or a violation of air quality standards; thus, they are not necessarily experiencing bad air as a result of this impact. She indicated that staff looked at the potential carbon monoxide concentrations and does not believe that the City will exceed standards there, that emissions related to construction activities are not significant, and that there are no increases in other criteria pollutants or other toxic air contaminants that are a violation of standards. She noted that the impact is related to the fact that there is lack of consistency in the assumptions used. She stated that the 2005 strategy used *Projections 2003* numbers for jobs and housing for 2025. She noted that *Projections 2003* shows that the City's buildout will be 80,000 persons in the City, but the City's buildout calculations because of the cap are about 78,000. She noted that the difference is fewer housing and fewer people but more jobs than that assumed in *Projections 2003*. She indicated that the cure for this is to put more housing and fewer jobs in.

Commissioner Fox referred to the placeholders for East Pleasanton and inquired if staff assumed that jobs would be generated by these "placeholder: uses, and how many jobs staff included. Ms. Stern replied that staff looked at floor area ratios allowed potentially under the General Plan designation for that area and assumed a certain square footage for different combinations of commercial retail, industrial, R&D Office. She indicated that she did not have the precise number of jobs but that it would be about 15,000, considering the difference between "with" and "without" development in East Pleasanton.

Commissioner Fox noted that the area is currently used for sand and gravel harvesting and that there are not many employees in those areas. Ms. Stern agreed and added that there will be more jobs once any kind of office, retail jobs, or other uses are introduced.

Ms. Stern noted that having identified those significant impacts; the City would need to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to certifying the Final EIR and adopting the General Plan.

Commissioner Fox stated that the EIR made mention of the Tri-Valley Transportation Commission (TVTC). She asked Mr. Tassano what the proposed

regional improvements are versus what the TVTC current model is in terms of the buildout model, and what some of the cities have recently changed in terms of priorities for State Route 84.

Mr. Tassano replied that the TVTC set forth a new list of transportation projects and that it would be easier to list the differences of what were and were not assumed. He noted that some of the other local jurisdictions want to make sure that the State Route 84 is in the proper place according to regional priorities, and staff is in the process of adjusting those priorities; however, this does not really change the model because only funded projects are assumed in the model for this very reason.

Mr. Tassano stated that with respect to the General Plan EIR, there will be some impacts that can be improved if State Route 84 is widened to four lanes because the model assumes there are two lanes. He then requested Commissioner Fox to submit her questions in writing so he could provide more specific responses.

Chair Blank noted that there were places in the EIR where the language is a word-for-word replication of what was in the General Plan. He inquired if this was common. Ms. Stern replied that this was commonly used for background information. She added that in some cases, General Plans and EIRs are combined into one document.

Chair Blank stated that he asked the question because he believed that when the Commission went through the EIR, the EIR consultant would have vetted the information and the informational assumptions in the General Plan. He added that he thought what the EIR does is look at all those assumptions; he inquired if this took place. Ms. Stern replied that this did happen, adding that, for example, in Biology, staff worked with the consultants prior to doing the section because they are the experts, and the information was then incorporated into the General Plan.

Commissioner Fox inquired if the Pleasanton Unified School District, Zone 7, and TVTC as well as other agencies such as ABAG, MTC, Caltrans, and the State received copies of the documents. Ms. Stern confirmed that those agencies as well as other State and Federal agencies received copies of both the General Plan and the EIR.

Commissioner Fox stated that according to ABAG, State law requires that the Housing Element be updated every five years. She noted that the City's Housing Element was last updated in 2003 but is not included in this General Plan. She inquired if the City was due to update this Element. Ms. Stern replied the update requirement is not always five years but varies according to and is dependent upon when the regional housing needs determination numbers are released. She noted that the Housing Element would be due about a year-and-a-half after those numbers are developed. She indicated that the statutory date is now June 30, 2009 and that staff will be working on this.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

John Carroll stated that his main concern was the increase in miles driven within the City which is up by 46 percent. He noted that the City already has a lot of traffic and that this will be a dramatic increase. He added that the major driver of the increase will be the commercial development for the Hacienda Business Park. He stated that he felt people's air quality was not the greatest already and that he would like to come up with a plan to encourage businesses or get BART to Livermore, install more bike paths, or get some way to dramatically reduce the miles anticipated to be driven. He suggested providing carrots as incentives such as installing bike racks, hiring local workers, and other things to bring about decrease in miles driven. With respect to CEQA, he stated that it has been mentioned there may not be the need for additional study. He then inquired if the extension of Stoneridge Drive was looked at not only as part of the EIR but as a thoroughfare as well and if a traffic study was included. He further inquired if an additional study would be required if Stoneridge Drive were to go through.

Nancy Allen noted that she had submitted some questions in writing to Ms. Stern and requested confirmation that these questions would be answered. Ms. Stern replied that they would be addressed in the Final EIR. Ms. Allen voiced similar concerns as Mr. Carroll regarding the 46-percent increase. She added that the City is out of compliance with the air quality plan, which might be a technicality. She inquired what the break-even point might be for the City to be in compliance. She further inquired what the impact would be with respect to Downtown versus East Pleasanton and other areas, and if one area would be more impacted than others. She noted that a better understanding of the real impacts is necessary before any final decisions are made.

Ms. Allen inquired what would happen should the 46-percent increase be found to be unacceptable. She stated that she felt it might mean reducing the source, which are parking spots for cars. She suggested that there should be only one parking spot for every one or two new jobs created. She noted that this might mean that businesses get more creative in telecommuting alternatives and that this might also cause creative things like parking lots right outside the freeway with bus service between buildings. She added that bike lanes and car pools are great but do not change behavior. She indicated that she now takes the bus to the BART station when she goes to work because it is more convenient and does not require a parking space. She stated that she felt a real cost should be assessed or have less parking to really provide an incentive for people to change their behavior. She encouraged the City to place a stake in the ground, put something more aggressive in place, and partner with businesses.

Chair Blank stated that he felt 46 percent was an attention-getting number and that he hoped the public will weigh in and let everyone know their feelings. He then thanked the speakers for their comments.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Fox referenced where new jobs were being created, such as the 15,000 in the East Pleasanton area as placeholders, and inquired how many jobs were expected at buildout of Hacienda Business Park. Ms. Stern replied that she could not provide a precise answer but that future development in Hacienda Business Park may be a smaller proportion than the speaker might have realized. She noted that Table 2.2 in the Land Use section of the General Plan shows existing development and future development. She added that this looks at 2006 and that some of the expansion anticipated in 2006 has already happened. She explained that from the table, it appears like there is a little less than 2 million square feet that is to be built in Hacienda Business Park, but she believed it was less because several buildings have recently been completed.

Commissioner Fox noted that there are 4 million square feet assumed in addition to East Pleasanton and that it looks like the delta between 2006 and buildout of Hacienda Business Park is 2 million square feet. Ms. Stern clarified that this was a 2006 number and that some buildings have been recently completed; the balance is most likely less than 1 million.

Commissioner Fox inquired whether the 46 percent was being driven by that placeholder in East Pleasanton of 4 million square feet. Ms. Stern replied that about 13 million square feet is the total anticipated increase with about 4 million in East Pleasanton and 9 million in the rest of the City.

Chair Blank suggested adding a percentage figure to each one so one could see the delta of what is added, which might cause less work than doing the math. Ms. Stern noted that this could be included as supplemental information.

Commissioner Fox inquired how every additional 100 square feet of office space is translated to the number of jobs. Ms. Stern referred to Table 2.4, Employee Density Standards, on page 2-17. She noted that there is also a confusing factor because restaurants have different shifts of employees, so there is not a direct correspondence between the density standards and the number of jobs.

Commissioner Fox stated that she felt there might be a way to figure out how many employees are generated per square feet for office, light industrial, and commercial retail. She inquired what is included within each category. Ms. Stern replied that when looking at the model, there is a much finer definition of what the land uses are, and there would be generation factors which represent jobs. She noted that the table is a general idea but does not capture the nuances of the model.

Commissioner Fox inquired whether converting the R&D and retail and industrial park uses in East Pleasanton to office and light manufacturing in the table on page 2-17 might result in less employees. Ms. Stern replied that the office at

300 square feet per employee actually results in more employees per thousand square feet than warehouse or service commercial uses.

Commissioner Fox stated that she believed it was fair to say that for East Pleasanton, retail, R&D, and industrial park are kind of placeholders but that it is possible it could be something other than retail. Ms. Stern noted that it was assumed the area would be mostly industrial and R&D, with a small amount of retail.

b. Review of the Draft General Plan

To provide an opportunity for the Commission to review the Draft General Plan and to provide feedback.

Janice Stern noted that there were a couple of attachments to the staff report: one was replacement pages for the Subregional Planning Element, and the other was a revised map in the Circulation Element section. She apologized for overlooking a memo with information on changes made at the City Council level for the Subregional Planning Element and indicated that those changes would be incorporated into the next printing of the General Plan. With respect to the map, she stated that the actual information on that map which was focused on the intersections was entirely correct, but the base map used did not include all of the updates for the Circulation Element. She added that the Department of Conservation has recently approved some information for a new landslide and liquefaction map and that staff is in the process of preparing a new map that will substitute those in the Safety Element.

Chair Blank inquired if policy changes or substantial information would come before the Commission for discussion. Ms. Stern replied that staff anticipates there would not be any major policy changes as both the Commission and Council have previously reviewed this.

Mr. Dolan advised that once the Final EIR is completed, staff will bring the General Plan back to the Commission for its recommendation to Council. He noted that staff would like to know at this time if there were any items which will work themselves into the Commission's recommendation to the City Council. He indicated that while many things have been vetted at the Council review and direction has been given, it is possible there are more specific issues that the Commission may want to weigh in on.

Chair Blank stated that his comments have to do with fire safety and noise from the airport. He indicated from his recollection that the Planning Commission review was more thorough and detailed than what is reflected in the General Plan. He noted that he wanted to make sure the General Plan is as complete as possible and that he would provide an email.

Commissioner Fox stated that she is trying to figure out if the 1996 General Plan and the Community Trails Master Plan have some policies that were not included in the

Draft General Plan and that she was have some difficulty with matching them up as the General Plan has been reorganized. She inquired if in the absence of a Steering Committee for the update of the General Plan, staff has considered having some sort of citizen team to review each of the Elements and give some formal input toward the process. Ms. Stern replied that staff has checked in with the Council on a regular basis in terms of the status of the General Plan and how staff sees the steps going forward from this point to completion. She added that staff has also conducted a number of workshops and town meetings and has taken the various chapters to the various Commissions to discuss topics within their areas of expertise. She noted that both staff and the City Council feel and agree that outreach has occurred. She added that the public has the opportunity and the ability to comment on the Draft General Plan at this time.

Commissioner Fox inquired if the Parks and Recreation Commission was going to comment on the Open Space and Conservation Element. Ms. Stern replied that the Commissioners were informed that the Draft General Plan is now available and that they are welcome to submit comments.

Chair Blank stated that he thought that the Open Space and Conservation Element was sent to the Parks and Recreation Commission when the Planning Commission first looked at that Element. Ms. Stern confirmed that was the case and added that the Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed the Element at two different times: once with the Park Facilities information and then with the Open Space and Trails information. She noted that the Commission also discussed all of the policies in the existing General Plan and considered whether or not they should be included in the General Plan Update.

Commissioner Fox noted that the City has just formed a new Community Character Committee and inquired if the Committee reviewed the Community Character Element. She further inquired if the Human Services Commission had the opportunity to review the Public Facilities and Community Programs Element. Ms. Stern replied that the Human Services Commission reviewed the Public Facilities and Community Programs Element and that the Element was expanded to reflect new programs, given the more diverse population now than there was in 1996. With respect to the Community Character Element, Ms. Stern explained that the new Committee deals more with social-based values, which is mentioned in the Element. She noted that the Community Character Element is more related to urban design and the physical development of the City.

Commissioner Fox inquired if each of the Commissioners was given a copy of the General Plan. Ms. Stern replied that they were not provided a hard copy but were provided a card which included the link to the Draft General Plan on the website.

Commissioner Fox referred to the Youth Master Plan Implementation Committee (YMPIC) and inquired if this could be called the Youth Element and both documents be folded into one and added as a chapter. Ms. Stern stated that this went to the

Youth Commission early on, at which time it discussed issues related to youth and its interests related to the Bernal Park, the Community Center Youth Center. She added that the Youth Commission recommended supplement policies in the General Plan. Ms. Stern stated that staff has pulled out everything from the Youth Master Plan that had a physical development aspect to it but that she would be happy to look through it again and determine if staff needs to add anything else.

Commissioner Fox said if she saw some relevant information in the Youth Master Plan, such as childcare centers and inquired if she could add this as a comment and recommend that this be included in the General Plan. Ms. Stern replied that she could do so.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

There were no speakers.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Bank noted that he felt a lot of what was said in the EIR applies to the General Plan. He encouraged the public to voice out any other things they feel strongly about, and City staff will diligently respond to those questions and ensure they are addressed.

Commissioner Fox inquired if staff could include a placeholder in a future Planning Commission meeting prior to the November 21st deadline so staff could clarify any related comments. Ms. Stern noted that the comment period refers to the EIR and that staff would generally treat those comments as questions. She inquired if Commissioner Fox felt that there might be some policy changes related to this.

Commissioner Fox stated that she was trying to match the 1996 General Plan, see what the delta is and to look at the 1986 plan to make sure that policies were not dropped.

Ms. Stern reiterated there is no deadline for comment for the General Plan until the City Council adopts it.

Chair Blank noted that there is only one meeting in November, which is on the 12th. Commissioner Fox indicated that she will have her comments in for the EIR before the 12th.

Commissioner Olson complimented staff for an outstanding job. He noted that there still seems to be concern in the community that the Commission has not heard everyone on this subject. He suggested that the information in the City Manager's submittal memo be integrated into the introduction, so the reader immediately gets the point that the reason this has taken several years is because there has been a significant amount of public input on the document. He added that it may not be

appropriate for every policy that was put in place 10 or 15 years ago to be carried forward and re-emphasized in this General Plan; in fact, it may be appropriate for some of those policies to be dropped. He stated that he was not too concerned if this tracks with the Plans done 10-15 years ago but more about whether it goes after the issues the Commission has before it today. He noted that the metaphor of putting a stake in the ground is a good one and that the Commission needs to look at creative ways to mitigate some of the items that are brought to light in the EIR.

Chair Blank concurred with Commissioner Olson's statement.

Chair Blank commended Ms. Stern and her staff for having done a terrific job of putting up with the Commission's endless questions about traffic, policies, and program, and he thanked staff for their patience.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

- a. Discussion of the types of projects to be placed on the Consent Calendar.

No discussion was held or action taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

- a. Consideration of the Planning Commission's Decision Regarding the Timeline for the Sunrise Senior Living Facility Project Facilitation Process

Mr. Dolan stated that staff has just completed the third scheduled facilitation meeting for the project. He noted that the process had been delayed because the Sunrise representatives agreed to go into some very in-depth design revisions and that he is happy to report that at their last meeting, the representative presented a plan that was very substantially revised and well-received by the representative community group participating in the discussion. He added that all that is left to be done is the official submittal of the plans, after which staff will re-write the staff report. He indicated that the reconsideration of the issue of substantial conformance may come before the Commission at its November 12th meeting.

Commissioner Fox inquired how many stories the new design had, and Mr. Dolan replied that there are two stories in the new plan.

Commissioner Narum requested that the application be scheduled for a Commission hearing as soon as possible after the formal submittal. Mr. Dolan replied that the item can be accommodated in the Commission's schedule. He added that he believes the applicants will have sufficient time to prepare the submittal but that it was also not out of the question that they may inform staff three weeks from now that November 12th will not work for them. Mr. Dolan indicated that he believes the neighbors are appreciative of how the applicants responded to their concerns and are eager to move forward.

Chair Blank read from the Minutes of the last Planning Commission meeting, noting that it was unanimously agreed upon that a special meeting would be scheduled, if necessary, to hear the Pfund application. Commissioners Fox indicated that she was not present at that meeting. Chair Blank duly noted that both Commissioners Fox and Olson were absent at that meeting and that the Commission members present unanimously voted to expedite the application.

Chair Blank stated that he has since been advised by the City Attorney that as Chair, he has the authority to call a special meeting; however, he would like to have staff's support and inquired when the Pfund project will be heard.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff had sent out an email inquiring about the Commissioners' availability for a number of potential dates for a special meeting, and Commissioner Fox had indicated that she could not attend many or possibly all of those dates. Commissioner Fox noted that she could not attend on October 16th and October 30th.

Chair Blank read once more from the Minutes of the past Commission meeting that the Commissioners present agreed it would be all right to hold a special meeting even if only three Commissioners could be present. He noted that, regardless of the situation Mr. Pfund is in, this project is dragging on.

Mr. Dolan agreed with Chair Blank and stated that in order to rectify the situation; staff has reserved a slot on the October 29th regular meeting should staff be ready to bring the item forward then.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Mr. Dolan noted that a special meeting is scheduled on October 22nd to discuss the Staples Ranch applications on the EIR, the Specific Plan Amendment, and the Pre-zoning and Rezoning. He stated that the agenda for the regular meeting on October 29th includes several items for the Consent Calendar, including a single-family home on Foothill Road, a church in an existing building, and a school on Willow Road, and staff has reserved a spot for the Pfund item. He noted that the Consent Calendar item in this evening's agenda was continued to October 29th as well and that a special meeting is reserved on October 30th should the Staples Ranch applications require additional time.

Commissioner Fox inquired if the church application coming forward was the Pleasanton Community Church after school child care facility or the Sufi Church. Mr. Dolan replied that it was the Fountain Community Church.

Commissioner Fox stated that she believes the Pleasanton Community Church is looking into a childcare facility and noted that this facility is not currently licensed by the State of California. Mr. Dolan stated that he would clarify this.

c. Actions of the City Council

Mr. Dolan noted that the City Council had on its October 7th agenda the Raney application for a small subdivision Downtown, which was continued to the October 21st meeting as there were only three Councilmembers present.

d. 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

- a. Brief report on conferences, seminars, and meetings attended by Commission Members

Commissioner Pearce invited anyone interested to attend the public workshop on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Master Plan on October 23rd in the Pleasanton Library.

Chair Blank noted that the first public workshop on the new sprinkler ordinance was held and was attended by a small but passionate group of people.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Blank adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary