



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DRAFT
Wednesday, February 24, 2021

This meeting was conducted via teleconference in accordance with Governor Newsom's Executive Orders N-20-20 and N-35-20 and COVID-19 pandemic protocols.

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

The teleconference meeting of the Planning Commission of February 24, 2021 was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chair Brown.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Ritter.

Staff Members Present: Ellen Clark, Community Development Director; Melinda Denis, Planning and Permit Center Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Sachiko Riddle, Planning Office Assistant; Sachiko Riddle, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Matt Gaidos, Brandon Pace, Greg O'Connor, Herb Ritter and Chair Justin Brown

Commissioners Absent: None

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

It was requested that the Matters for the Commissioners' Review/Action/Information be moved to the beginning of the meeting so that Commissioners Herb Ritter and Matt Gaidos could participate in those items before recusing themselves from Item 5. The Commissioners all agreed.

CONSENT CALENDAR - *Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted 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.*

1. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

2. Approve the meeting minutes of February 10, 2021

Commissioner Nancy Allen suggested adding to Chair Brown's comments on Page 5 "that an action item to update our Municipal Code with a new standard related to active use that is consistent with our intent." Chair Brown concurred to the addition.

Commissioner Allen also suggested amending the motion on Page 9 of 10. Community Development Director Clark read into the record some suggested language to reflect that the Commission had consensus on prioritizing the Housing Element and Johnson Drive EDZ, with the Commission split on the housing projects and the East Pleasanton Specific Plan as the third priority.”

- 3. P20-1058 and P20-1059, Gyre and Ann Renwick, 751 Clara Lane** – Applications for: 1) Animal Use Permit approval to keep up to six farm animals; and 2) Administrative Design Review approval to construct an approximately 550-square-foot, 12-foot tall partial open-sided barn. The project site is in the Vineyard Avenue Specific Plan and zoning is PUD-LDR (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential) and PUD-OS (Planned Unit Development - Open Space) Districts.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Consent Calendar with the proposed changes to the February 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes. Commissioner O’Connor seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, O’Connor, Pace, and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

The Actions of the Zoning Administrator were approved, as submitted.

The Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2021 were approved, as amended.

Resolution PC-2021-04 approving Cases P20-1058 and P20-1059 was adopted, as motioned.

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

- 4. Public Comment from the audience regarding items not listed on the agenda –**
Speakers are encouraged to limit comments to 3 minutes.

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

The Commission reordered the agenda to hear Items 6, 7 and 8 prior to Item 5.

MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION

- 6. Reports from Meetings Attended (e.g., Committee, Task Force, etc.)**

There were no reports from meetings attended.

7. Actions of the City Council

Community Development Director Ellen Clark gave a brief overview of items listed in the report.

Chair Brown asked if the standard Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) plans would be scaled. Ms. Clark stated there could be some flexibility built into the standard plans, to allow certain changes without voiding the streamline process.

8. Future Planning Calendar

Planning and Permit Center Manager Melinda Denis gave a brief overview of future items for the Commission's review.

MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Allen asked the next steps for obtaining Council support regarding updating the DSP. Ms. Clark stated the matter would be brought to the Council on March 2, 2021.

Commissioner Allen encouraged the Commission to request the Council remove the item from the Consent Calendar for discussion. She also suggested the Commission view the video link of Professor Condon that had been shared, regarding increasing density through up-zoning and retention of home prices.

Commissioner O'Connor informed the Commission that he would be retiring from the Planning Commission on April 1st, after 15 years of service. The Commission congratulated Commissioner O'Connor.

Commissioner Ritter requested an update on the Costco project and, separately, on shutting down Main Street. Ms. Clark stated the Costco project was appealed but the City would continue to advance it as possible. She stated the Economic Development Director Pamela Ott would be able to provide more information in her presentation on Main Street businesses to the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

Commissioner Pace inquired about the Caltrans work on the off-ramp with regards to the Costco project. Ms. Denis discussed the work proceeding on the ramp being led by City Traffic Engineer Mike Tassano and the widening on Johnson and left turn from Stoneridge Drive to Johnson led by Director of Engineering Steve Kirkpatrick.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

Commissioners Ritter and Gaidos recused from the item and were placed in a virtual waiting room.

- 5. P20-0542, Douglas and Mary Safreno, 4212 First Street** - Work Session for Preliminary Review application to consider the demolition of an existing gas station and construction of 11 new attached townhomes with associated site improvements located at 4212 and 4226 First Street. The project site is located in the Downton Specific Plan and zoning for 4212

first Street is C-F (Freeway Commercial) District and zoning for 4226 First Street is RM-2,500 (Multi-Family Residential) District.

Associate Planner Jennifer Hagen presented the specifics of the item in the Agenda Report.

Commissioner Allen asked the standard front setback if it were not a PUD. Ms. Hagen informed her that zoning of similar properties in the vicinity would require 12 feet to the porch and 20 feet to the home, but many of the setbacks on First Street were smaller than required by Code because of the widening of the street in the last 100 years. Commissioner Allen asked the setbacks at 4238, 4124 and 4158 First Street. Ms. Hagen confirmed 4238 First Street was setback 19 feet. She stated GIS data could be used due to the age of the homes. Commissioner Allen stated the two single families home looked like new construction. In response to Commissioner Allen, Ms. Hagen confirmed that affordable housing and amenities were not a City policy or PMC requirement. She explained that turn arounds had not been included and final trash service would be confirmed in consultation with the provider.

Commissioner Pace asked about the setbacks on the back side of the development and the surrounding buildings. Ms. Hagen discussed the surrounding existing buildings and setbacks. Commissioner Pace asked if the neighboring apartment complex had provided feedback. Ms. Hagen stated no comments had been received. She stated the applicant could address the question of parking.

In response to Chair Brown, Ms. Hagen explained that GoogleMaps had misnamed Valleta Lane. Chair Brown read an excerpt from the DSP about properties facing the street and asked if Buildings 1 and 2 would be considered street facing. Ms. Hagen stated those buildings were considered generally facing the street and the applicant had attempted to make entry to Building 1 face the street. She stated staff felt it met the spirit of the DSP policy.

Chair Brown referenced the plans and asked about the notches along the access driveway on the backside. Ms. Hagen stated the original intent was to provide parallel parking spaces, although they were not wide enough to meet the City's standards and would have to be revised. She discussed the lack of turnaround. Chair Brown questioned the curb cuts. Ms. Hagen stated the Traffic Department approved the curb cuts as shown, provided it remained no left turns out of either of the driveways.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

Guy Houston, Lauri Moffet-Fehlberg, and Aaron O'Brien gave a presentation on the item.

Joanie Fields submitted a speaker card and gave a presentation about her various concerns with the project. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg stated the Palm Tree did not meet the heritage tree requirements; Fire Code; ingress and egress and traffic safety; use of decks, porches and barbeques; town-house lifestyle.

Commissioner Allen inquired about the previous designs with one drive aisle and semi-circular driveway. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg stated the project was three-stories and additional driveway would prohibit a feasible project. In response to Commissioner Allen, Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg

discussed the location of air conditioning units and garbage cans. Chair Brown discussed the importance of the placement of air conditioner units.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if a single round about driveway would be feasible if one unit was removed. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg stated the turning radius was not possible. Commissioner O'Connor asked about the drop off/pick up space. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg stated this short-term parking space could be relocated. Commissioner O'Connor suggested the addition of guest parking. Ms. Hagen explained the floor plan of Unit B, indicating the area noted by Commissioner O'Connor was not usable space for parking.

Commissioner Pace inquired whether there was a parking study to determine the visitor spaces. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg discussed the required two parking spaces per unit and available parking in the area. Commissioner O'Connor asked if that was acceptable to the City. Ms. Hagen stated Traffic Engineering staff would make that determination.

Greg Wohlenberg submitted a speaker card and posed questions about how any environmental concerns related to the gas station would be addressed. Mr. Houston stated they would follow the regulatory requirements for a vapor barrier and gave a lengthy presentation about environmental remediation.

Chair Brown asked if the property to the south was elevated and if there was crossover between the properties for a drive aisle. Ms. Moffet-Fehlberg stated the elevation was essentially the same, but the southern property rose towards the back and there was a curb and fence on the southern property.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

Discussion Point #1

- 1. Is the site appropriate for a residential-only development? Does the Commission support a General Plan Amendment and rezoning with PUD Development Plan for a residential-only project at the proposed density?**

Commissioner Allen stated the site was appropriate for a residential-only development, but she did not support the project at the proposed density as it's too cramped as evidenced by: 1) visible air conditioning unit location, 2) lack of parking, 3) close setbacks, and 4) no safe turnaround. She guessed nine units rather than eleven units.

Commissioner O'Connor concurred that residential only was preferable, but the proposed design was too cramped. He expressed concern about limited parking and lack of turn around. He agreed that nine units would be better.

Commissioner Pace echoed concerns about parking, thought the project was a meaningful upgrade to the experience of entering Downtown on that corner and residential was preferable.

Chair Brown indicated support for residential and expressed concern about parking and turnaround.

Discussion Point #2

- 2. Are the setbacks along First Street and Vineyard acceptable? Is the overall site plan and layout acceptable, or are adjustments to the site plan (including potential modification to total number of units) necessary?**

Commissioner O'Connor stated the setbacks were adequate, but the site plan looked crowded.

Commissioner Pace stated the setback could be changes with the PUD but should be consistent with the other properties on the street.

Commissioner Allen agreed with Commissioner Pace and expressed concern with the setbacks. She suggested at least a 19-foot setback to provide vegetation, landscaping and a larger porch. She stated she was very concerned about the setback for the southern building.

Chair Brown stated the proposed setback seemed to conform with the existing properties. He suggested the possibility of on street parking.

Discussion Point #3

- 3. Is the proposed parking for the project acceptable, and should guest parking be required?**

Chair Brown mentioned guest parking should be required.

Commissioner Allen stated guest parking and a turnaround should be required. She said she wanted at least three parking spots.

Commissioner Pace stated two guest parking spaces was not enough for 11 units and suggested at least three spaces. He stated he was focused on safety and wanted to mitigate some of the issues.

Commissioner O'Connor stated he would prefer three guest spaces and turnaround should be included.

Discussion Point #4

- 4. Does the Planning Commission support the proposed building positioning, massing, and home designs including architecture, colors, and materials?**

Commissioner O'Connor stated he liked the architecture, colors, and materials. He suggested that landscaping could help address the massing. He discussed the odd shaped lot and suggested nine units to correct positioning.

Commissioner Pace stated the applicant had generally done a good job with the project and were thoughtful about making it fit in the City. He stated he was still concerned about parking and proposed reserved parking at night that can be used as a turnaround space during the day.

Commissioner Allen reiterated that the footprint of the project needs to be reduced. She stated the air conditioners need to be hidden and screened. She stated she liked the quality of the

materials and Craftsman style. She indicated support to reduced massing. She discussed the importance of the side views of Unit B in each of the buildings so there is a 360-degree streetscape view. She suggested a larger opening between the two buildings to allow views of the sky and landscaping, and so it does not appear as one large building.

Chair Brown stated the architecture, color, and materials were more than adequate and agreed with Commissioner Allen about moving the air conditioner units.

Discussion Point #5

5. Is there additional information needed to assist the Commission in its decision on the proposal?

Chair Brown stated story poles would help.

Commissioner Allen requested confirmation on whether the Palm tree was a Heritage tree. She also assumed there would be streetscapes. She suggested a prominent sign at the site to show the public the proposed street scape and how to provide input.

Commissioner Pace suggested the need for remedial work and safety measures and ensure that the Commission had appropriate information for its review.

The Commission reiterated its support for the project with the discussed modifications.

Mr. Houston discussed efforts to develop the property and expressed concern about the limited space to implement the Commission's desires. He stated the initial goal was an amazing entry to Downtown.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sachiko Riddle
Recording Secretary