



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, January 10, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission meeting of January 10, 2007 was called to order at 7:20 p.m. by Chairperson Fox.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Jerry Iserson, Planning & Building Director; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Wes Jost, Development Services Manager; Robin Giffin, Associate Planner; and Cory Emberson, Recording Secretary.

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Anne Fox, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, and Jennifer Pearce.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Chairperson Fox requested that the minutes be considered at the end of the 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.

Aman Bawa, 2632 Ingrid Court, expressed concern about the construction trucks using the residential streets in his area as conditioned in the Hatsushi PUD. He stated that this is impacting the residents now living in the area, and he did not think it was fair that all construction traffic in the area should go through his neighborhood. He requested that the matter be revisited as part of Item 6.a., PUD-56, Michael Aminian/Mohsen Sadri.

Mr. Iserson replied that the Hatsushi development is an approved PUD and is not up for discussion at this meeting. He added that construction traffic for PUD-56 can be discussed during the public hearing for that item.

Chairperson Fox recalled that one issue for the Hatsushi development was that construction traffic would go along the emergency vehicle access (EVA) until Clara Lane is developed, after which construction traffic would follow another route.

Mr. Iserson concurred, noting that according to the Specific Plan, construction traffic for the Hatsushi development would use Montevino Drive and the EVA off that road. When the Clara Lane extension onto the property is extended, the EVA would be closed to any traffic other than emergency vehicles; construction traffic would use Clara Lane to serve the Hatsushi development.

Mr. Bawa noted that he and other neighbors were not notified of those plans and inquired what their course of action could be. Mr. Iserson noted that every property owner would have been sent a notice at that time. He added that there is no specific process for the residents at this time because the PUD for the Hatsushi development had been approved, and the appeal period was over. He suggested that Mr. Bawa contact him in the Planning office during business hours.

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no items.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. PUD-56, Michael Aminian/Mohsen Sadri

Application for PUD development plan approval to allow three new single-family homes on an approximately 2.45-acre parcel located at 865 Clara Lane, in the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan area. Zoning for the property is PUD-LDR and OS (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential and Open Space) District.

Associate Planner Robin Giffin summarized the staff report and detailed the background, scope and layout of the proposed project. Regarding the Hatsushi property, the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan stated that some of the homes could be limited to 25 feet in height to preserve the privacy and views of the homes on Montevino Drive. The Specific Plan does not have such a restriction for the proposed home on Lot 1 and set the maximum house height limit at 30 feet. The applicant noted to staff that if he is required to build a one-story home on Lot 1, he would prefer to keep the existing one-story house and possibly propose a new one-story house at a later date. If the Commission supported this scenario, staff recommended that a condition of approval be added that a fire truck hammerhead still be required on the project site if deemed necessary by the Fire Department.

Ms. Giffin noted that two existing residents on Clara Lane expressed concern about the extension of Clara Lane. The City was granted land and easements from neighboring property owners for this extension; staff will continue to meet with the neighboring property owners to ensure that all outstanding issues are addressed. A resident on Ingrid Court expressed an initial concern about construction traffic on Clara Lane. After discussions with staff, he appeared to accept the City's standard condition regarding construction hours. However, he would like language to be added to the condition, stating that no trucks can arrive at the site before 8:00 a.m. This resident would also like to modify the Hatsushi property PUD, as noted during the public comment period of this meeting.

Staff believed that the applicants had adequately addressed all the standards and guidelines of the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan for this area. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission find that there are no new or changed circumstances or information which require additional CEQA review of the project. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission find that the proposed PUD development plan is consistent with the General Plan, the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan, and the purpose of the PUD Ordinance. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission make the PUD findings in the staff report, and adopt a resolution recommending approval of Case PUD-56 subject to the conditions of approval, either as shown in Exhibit B or as shown in Exhibit B with a modification requiring the applicant to dig down the grade under the house on Lot 1 by at least two feet and reduce the roof height by 1.5 feet. In the latter scenario, this would be a modification to Condition 7.a.2. Staff displayed a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the proposed plan.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding whether the building on Lot 1 as proposed was in compliance with the Specific Plan without any changes, Ms. Giffin confirmed that it was in compliance with the height requirements of the Specific Plan. As conditioned with the darker colors and additional screening trees, it would also be in compliance regarding the design.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding whether there were any aspects of this application that were not in compliance with the Specific Plan, Ms. Giffin replied that as conditioned by staff, it was in compliance with the Specific Plan.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that if the applicant was willing to implement staff's suggestion to grade down the site by five feet and if that necessitated removing some trees, the City would require him to replace twice as many trees as he removed and pay a fee into the Urban Forestry Fund for any value difference. He felt that was a bit harsh to impose that on the applicant and would agree with waiving the fee.

Commissioner Pearce noted that in the original staff report, the staff recommendations would make the house on Lot 1 appear to be 25 feet high; the addendum seemed to state that the height would also be 25 feet high. She inquired whether it would appear to be the same height from the neighbor's point of view. Ms. Giffin confirmed that it was

approximately the same; the first report showed the house to be approximately 23.5 feet high, and the second report showed it to be exactly 25 feet high.

Chairperson Fox requested staff's comments regarding the materials and straight nature of the driveway in addition to the darkening of the house and regarding reducing the visibility of the driveway. Ms. Giffin noted that the driveway was wider because it would also be used by the Fire Department. Normally, staff would request a 10- to 12-foot wide driveway, but the Fire Department requires at least 16 feet, with 20 feet of clearance on either side.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding whether the garage for the second house could be reoriented by 90 degree from its lengthwise placement and still meet turnaround requirements, Ms. Giffin replied that they would have to be able to back out of the driveway safely, which appeared to be feasible. She added that a 25-foot backup area would be required.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox whether the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan required that homes at higher elevations to be custom or semi-custom, Ms. Giffin replied that there were special rules above 475-foot elevation, mostly addressing the screening of the homes. There was no special requirement for changing the design of the homes. She noted that because this was a discretionary review, the Commission could make that request.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding the apparent lack of trees on the right-hand side of the second house in the middle, Ms. Giffin replied that staff recommended that five oaks be planted. Overall, staff recommended that ten more trees be planted on each lot.

Chairperson Fox disclosed that she visited the property and met with the applicant approximately three weeks ago.

Commissioner Blank disclosed that he visited the property on an informal basis approximately one year ago and that there was no discussion of this project at that time.

Commissioner O'Connor disclosed that he visited the property several weeks ago with the applicant.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Michael Aminian, applicant, described the background of this project and noted that he had no objection to the City's recommendations regarding the color. He had met with several concerned neighbors to answer their questions regarding Lot 1; he increased the setback. After he read the report, he met with some of the neighbors and reduced the grading to bring the height to 25 feet. He also added nine trees to the landscaping plan to include pepper trees and non-fruit olive trees to increase the screening in the back; there are now 16 trees in the back yard. He noted that there was a misunderstanding about the

location of storypole 5 due to the general contractor's mislabeling of the pole, and he clarified it in his letter of January 2, 2007. He would like to build Clara Lane first to bring all the utilities to the site, and then build the homes on Lots 3 and 2 and build the house on Lot 1 last.

Aman Bawa, 2632 Ingrid Court, noted that overall he had no issues with the construction itself and added that it would be an attractive addition to the neighborhood. He was concerned about the construction traffic using Clara Lane and thanked staff for acknowledging that concern. He hoped there would be an equal and fair distribution of traffic going up his road. He was very concerned about trucks using the road early in the morning and late at night and requested that any construction traffic using Clara Lane not come up before 8:00 a.m. or leave after 5:00 p.m. He was also concerned about the safety of the older children and teenagers on the road, and babies having their sleep disrupted. He noted that a \$10,000 bond was posted to address any damages and was concerned that the new roundabout would be damaged by the trucks.

Dave Flashberger, 874 Gray Fox Circle, noted that he purchased his home to enjoy the privacy and quiet environment. He was very concerned about the loss of privacy and property value that may result because of the impacts of this project. He believed the residents who live in developments at a higher elevation than this project should be notified, such as Grey Eagle Estates and Crestablanca Drive. He believed that some of staff's recommendation were heading in the right direction and would like to see a grade at least five feet to lower the property's vertical visual impact. He also suggested moving the home farther to the north to reduce its visual impact on his property.

Chris Beratlis, 10 Beratlis Place, spoke in support of this project. He noted that he lived at a higher elevation than this property. He noted that while he would have a full view of this property, he did not have any objection to the project. He believed this was a high-quality development that fit into the neighborhood. He noted that the applicant had complied with every request made in the staff report and noted that the 25-foot height was lower than many surrounding homes.

Muthana Ibrahim, project architect, 2960 Camino Diablo, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, noted that he would be available to answer any questions.

Jeff Nespor, 837 Clara Lane, noted that he lived next door to the subject property; he shared the neighborhood concerns about traffic and noted that they had been addressed in the staff report. He expressed concern about the logistics and details of the Clara Lane extension, particularly the drainage, construction of the retaining wall, and repair of any potential damage during construction.

Mark Smead, 862 Gray Fox Circle, noted that the pictures in the presentation were taken from his backyard and expressed concern about the visual impact of the project. His immediate concern was that he did not want a two-story house replacing the current one-story house and added that he also did not want a large structure on top of the hill looking into his yard. He was not yet convinced that a one-story solution would work.

He noted that the roof pitch was not as important to him as the lowered grade. He thanked the applicant for the number of trees he would be planting and favored evergreens and fast-growing trees. He expressed concern about any changes in the mitigation measures if the property were sold to another owner. He would like a condition added to ensure the maintenance of the trees as well as moving the structure five feet to the north. He agreed with the change in color as noted in the staff report.

Frank Jardin, 751 Clara Lane, recalled the background of the neighbors' involvement with the Delco Builders project and the extension of Clara Lane. He expressed concern about the loss of frontage he would experience by the building of two retaining walls and was very concerned about the impact on the front of his property. He was very concerned about the seeming lack of candor on the part of Delco Builders. He did not want road improvements on his property and would like it to be moved. He expressed concern about the impact on his property value and demonstrated the location of his home on the overhead map. He noted that if he had anticipated the current events, he would not have agreed to the changes.

Bruce Torquemada, 3071 Alburni Court, expressed support for this project. He believed that the applicant had followed all the rules and did everything the Planning Commission had requested. He asked when looking at an attractive home became a negative occurrence. He noted that slight changes in design may be desirable to make them appear more custom-made, but he did not have a problem with being able to see another home. He believed this will be a good project.

Mr. Aminian thanked the speakers for their input and summarized the background of this project, especially regarding the road-related and easements granted to deed to the City. With respect to Mr. Nespor's comments regarding the extension of Clara Lane, he indicated that he would have his engineer contact him and ensure that there was minimal disruption from the construction. He added that their contractor was bonded and insured and that they had no intention to disrupt the neighbors' lives. He noted that the olive trees and pepper trees in the backyard should be fast-growing. He did not believe a one-story home would help the neighbor, but that they were willing to take two feet off the top and push the home north to the hillside in order to make the lot more workable. The pitch and height of the roof would also be reduced; he believed it would look very attractive. He was also considering putting more trees on all the properties.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding staff's position on Clara Lane, Mr. Iserson replied that the Clara Lane extension was shown on the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan and that it was delineated to come up from Vineyard Avenue, curve around, and then provide access to the Hatsushi property. He noted that the Engineering Department has been working on the detailed design work and that the general alignment was shown in the Specific Plan. He added that the exact location of the road would be engineered to take design considerations, slopes, and emergency access into account. He was aware that these issues had been under discussion between the City and Mr. Jardin

for some time and that the road was pushed further up the hill, away from his house. When the Hatsushi PUD was approved by the City Council in 2005, the construction of the Clara Lane extension was a very high priority to them. A condition of approval was added to indicate a preference that Clara Lane be extended to the Hatsushi property at the earliest feasible opportunity. He noted that it was fortunate that Mr. Aminian's plan was going through at the same time.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner O'Connor regarding the removal of trees in front of Mr. Jardin's home, Mr. Jost replied that when Delco Builders entered into an agreement with Mr. Jardin to subdivide his property, there was also a discussion regarding the extension of Clara Lane. At that time, Delco Builder's engineers prepared an alignment plan, shown as Exhibit F. Grant deeds to the City for both the right of way of Clara Lane and easements as well as construction easements were sent to Mr. Jardin, who then signed those deeds, which were turned over to the City. Staff felt that the grant deeds signed by Mr. Jardin at that time were sufficient for the alignment. There was also a grant deed to the City by Mr. Nespor, which added to the alignment for Clara Lane, which did not have much wiggle room.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Olson regarding whether the new road would be farther north than the current edge, Mr. Jost confirmed that was correct and displayed the layout of the road on the overhead screen. He added that Mr. Jardin's house would be below the grade and that a three-foot retaining wall would be installed.

A discussion of the setback measurements ensued.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Pearce regarding whether the legal issues surrounding Mr. Jardin's property had been resolved, Ms. Harryman replied that there had been several phone meetings with Mr. Jardin's attorney, and that this issue had been thoroughly discussed and resolved. She realized that Mr. Jardin was not happy with the results and that it was close to his home. She noted that this was the deal struck with Mr. Jardin when he sold the property to Delco Builders.

Commissioner O'Connor suggested that the City narrow the road slightly if possible, near the small setback on Mr. Jardin's property by removing the parking allowed on one side of the street.

Commissioner Olson inquired whether the retaining wall could be placed at the edge of the current paved road and work from there. Mr. Jost believed there may be a problem getting down to Mr. Jardin's driveway if that were to occur, and that he may have to give up the driveway in front of his house.

Chairperson Fox moved to reopen the public hearing .
Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Fox, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

The motion passed.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS RE-OPENED.

Mr. Jardin noted that the problem would be solved if the retaining wall on Mr. Nespor's side were taller so the wall could be pushed back farther. He noted that when he spoke to the City inspector about the right of way, he was told it would not infringe at all into his property. He would try to get a letter from the inspector to confirm his understanding of that assurance. He noted that no one ever staked the area.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Iserson noted that staff had responded to Mr. Jardin's attorney letter and provided copies of the drawings and the grant deeds signed by Mr. Jardin. Staff had not heard from Mr. Jardin's attorney since then.

Commissioner Blank noted that there appeared to be a legally-binding agreement that had been reviewed by the City and that he did not want to be involved with that aspect in the event of future litigation. He did not believe that was within the purview of the Planning Commission. He urged caution in this matter and noted that the Planning Commission could not change the routing of that street as a condition of approval.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank about noises generated by legally-kept wildlife, Ms. Harryman noted that a deed disclosure could be required.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding the possible impact if Condition No. 58 were changed to 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., Ms. Giffin replied that could be expanded to specifically state "construction traffic."

Commissioner O'Connor suggested that the language be changed to address the arrival of garbage trucks within the specified hours.

Chairperson Fox noted that a stone chimney was specified for Lot 2, but the conditions were silent for the other lots. She requested that the conditions be changed to call out stone chimneys for those lots and include the color of the top of the chimneys.

Commissioner O'Connor expressed concern that everything would look alike if all the chimneys were made of stone. He would support darkening the color of the arrestors so they were not shiny or white.

Ms. Giffin noted that the chimneys could be made of brick, and added that Lot 3 appeared to have a stone chimney.

Mr. Aminian indicated that they would support the Planning Commission's proposed changes. He reiterated that on Lot 1, he would like to lower the roof pitch by 1.5 feet and lower the grade under the house by two feet. He also reiterated that he wants to build the Clara Lane extension first in order to bring the utilities in before building on Lots 2 and 3; Lot 1 would be last. He believed Delco Builders would have some information about the Clara Lane extension.

Commissioner Olson requested further clarification regarding Condition No. 73, and a 3:1 slope versus a 2:1 slope, as well as discussion about retaining walls. Ms. Giffin replied that staff recommended that the slope go to 3:1, unless that was not feasible for an unforeseen reason such as geotechnical constraints. The Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan recommended that the slope be 3:1, which would necessitate the installation of two retaining walls.

Commissioner Blank moved to find that there are no new or changed circumstances or information that require additional CEQA review of the project and that the proposed PUD development is consistent with the General Plan, the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan, and the purposes of the PUD ordinance; to make the PUD findings listed in the staff report; and to recommend approval of Case PUD-56, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit B of the staff report as recommended by staff, with the modification that a disclosure be made that animals live near the property and may create noise, odor, and other impacts; that the grade under the house on Lot 1 be dug down by two feet and the roof be lowered by 1.5 feet; and that construction-related equipment and vehicles come to and from the site between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. only.

Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.

Chairperson Fox requested an amendment to the motion that the driveway leading to Lot 1 be a color and material which blend in with the hillsides, with the color and material subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director, that the chimney materials on each lot be different from one another and from the main exterior body material of the house and that the spark arrestors blend in with the color of the chimney, with the colors and materials subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director

Chairperson Fox would like the orientation of the middle house to be changed so the garage would be rotated 90 degrees to reduce the mass of the house.

Mr. Ibrahim noted that if the garage on Lot 2 were to be rotated 90 degrees, higher retaining walls would be required because of the slope of the lot.

Commissioner Blank requested an amendment that significant tree landscaping such as seven to eight additional trees be added around the garage on Lot 2 to reduce the garage's appearance, with the final landscaping plan to be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Director.

Commissioners Blank and O'Connor accepted the proposed amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Fox, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Resolution No. PC-2007-01 approving PUD-56 was entered and adopted as motioned.

A recess was called at 9:00 p.m.

Acting Chairperson Fox reconvened the meeting at 9:12 p.m.

b. PREV-621, Adam and Colleen Schwartz

Work Session to review and receive comments on an application for preliminary review to construct an approximately 9,200-square-foot three-story building with six live-work dwelling units at the property located at 273 Spring Street. Zoning for the property is C-C (Central Commercial) District, Core Area Overlay District, and Downtown Revitalization District.

Ms. Giffin presented the staff report and summarized the background, layout and scope of the proposed project. Staff supported the live-work concept in the Downtown because the residents will shop, eat, and walk in the Downtown, enhancing the economic vitality and vibrancy of the Downtown area. The units will be affordable by design because they would be small and would eliminate the need for a separate work or living space. Some or all of the residents would likely be artists, which would enhance the Downtown's cultural life. Automobile impacts such as traffic congestion and pollution would be reduced. The applicants will be flexible regarding the project's design and would be willing to propose a mixed-use project instead of a live-work project, if preferred. Staff had some initial concerns about the design character of the building, the number of stories proposed, and the proposed number of parking spaces.

Since the staff report was drafted, staff has received three public comments regarding the project. The adjacent neighbor at 261 Spring Street believed the proposed building was too tall and too close to the property line and did not believe the proposed design was characteristic of Spring Street. The resident at 340 Ray Street, located behind the site, commented that any building on the lot would be an improvement and added that parking on Spring Street can sometimes be tight, requiring adequate visitor parking. He requested that no outdoor music or wedding receptions be allowed for noise-related reasons. A resident on St. Mary's Street was not supportive of a three-story building; she believed that if the City continued to allow three-story buildings, sunlight in the Downtown area will be blocked. She was concerned about parking in front of her house, which was often taken, and she would like the project to provide all the needed parking on its own site.

Ms. Giffin advised that the Pleasanton Downtown Association also reviewed the project and was supportive of the project concept. She displayed a PowerPoint presentation detailing the proposed project.

Commissioner Olson inquired whether the pilates studio had to stay there and whether an L-shaped two-story building could be built to take over the space occupied by the studio. He expressed reservations about the three-story building on that site. Ms. Giffin noted that the applicant intended to put her business, the pilates studio, in the back space. She added that the space has just been remodeled to accommodate that occupancy.

Commissioner Blank noted that he loved the concept of a live-work space, and he noted that this use was successfully used in many areas in Europe. He preferred the east side to the west side aesthetically, and he agreed with Commissioner Olson's comments regarding a three-story building.

Commissioner O'Connor expressed support for the live-work concept in the Downtown. He believed that in the sale of the building on the front corner where Century 21 had been located, the parking lot was required to be sold with the building. He inquired whether that had changed with this proposal.

Mr. Iseron noted that this was a separate lot from the Century 21 building, and he was not aware of any requirement that the parking lot must go with the Century 21 building. Because this was a separate legal lot, it had entitlements to develop separately; he believed there were a few spaces behind the Century 21 building.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that information was received from the Planning Department because he had been in contract to buy that building; they would have been required to buy the parking lot and the building together, so they dropped out of the contract.

Mr. Iseron did not know the genesis of that requirement, and his understanding was that it was not correct.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Adam and Colleen Schwartz, applicants, thanked staff for their efforts in this project and noted that they would be available to answer questions.

Mark Kearns, 261 Spring Street, noted that this would be his office space for his home inspection company. His first reaction when he saw the plans was that the three stories would divorce him somewhat from the Downtown area and would like to see something that flowed more. He noted that all the buildings on Spring Street had 20-25-foot setbacks from the sidewalk using a Mission-style motif. He was not aware of any two-story buildings on the north side of the street and believed that remodeling on the south side of the street had utilized basements as an extra story. He did not believe the architectural plan followed suit with Spring Street, and he wondered if there was a way to move it to the west side so his views would not be obstructed. He believed the building was too big for the lot and was concerned about sufficient parking. He would like to see a Mission-style design which blends in with the heritage feel of the Downtown.

Bruce Torquemada, 3071 Alburni Court, noted that he had several properties on Division Street and that he was pleased to see this property developed. He believed the live-work concept was interesting and a good match for the Downtown. He suggested that the redwood trees be taken down so the building could be designed to be seen from Main Street. He liked the possibility of bringing smaller businesses Downtown and believed the Mission design would blend well with the existing buildings Downtown.

Simone Hyde, 213 Spring Street, spoke in support of this project but was concerned that the building looked wider than the actual property appeared. She was concerned that it may be too crowded and overwhelming to face Spring Street. She supported the idea of live-work spaces in Downtown Pleasanton. She believed a three-story building would be too overwhelming for the scale of the street.

Mr. Schwartz noted that they became interested in the site because his wife intended to open a pilates studio; at that time, there were very few suitable places to rent in the Downtown, and he saw a potential to renovate this building. They believed that Downtown Pleasanton needed space for small incubator start-up businesses, which was affirmed by the Pleasanton Downtown Association. He noted that they planned to develop this space in three sections and described their plans. He noted that the initial sketches had all of the development on the west side, and they would have proposed removing the redwood trees; there was a potential issue with a retaining wall that he believed they could engineer around. He noted that they were very flexible with respect to the design and site orientation. He anticipated restrictions about the size or the number of units.

Ms. Schwartz noted that the pilates studio was nearly completed and added that they placed the retail right on Spring Street to bring the pedestrians up the street. She noted that they were open to Mission-style architecture for the front building and believed it related to a Main Street feel.

Mr. Schwartz noted that his wife and Ms. Giffin had done a significant amount of work looking into what other cities deemed to be appropriate parking requirements for live-work units. He noted that a table was included that described one to two-and-a-half parking spots for each live-work unit.

Ms. Schwartz noted that it was not intended to be an extremely busy building.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner O'Connor regarding the number of people using the pilates studio at one time, Ms. Schwartz replied that there may be a maximum of four people in a group.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired what the contingency plan was if the business portion of a live-work unit closed. Ms. Schwartz noted that they must have an active business license.

A discussion ensued about the possibility of a business failing.

Commissioner Blank noted that in Europe, the unit was deeded as a single unit. If the business failed, the person could continue to live there as long as they made payments to the bank.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding whether the unit could be subleased to a renter, Commissioner Pearce noted that would not be possible and noted that in many cities such as Berkeley and Glendale, the live or work portions could not be rented to subtenants.

The Commission then addressed each question.

Should the building be located on the east or west side of the lot?

Commissioner Blank believed the east side would be more appealing because having the lead-in space would be better. He believed that if the building were closer to Main Street, the view down the north side of Spring Street would be blocked.

Commissioner Pearce noted that she is supportive of the live-work concept. She liked the redwoods on the west side and believed that it provided some space before approaching the buildings on the lot.

Commissioner Olson believed the building should be on located on the east side of the lot.

Commissioner O'Connor believed it should be located on the west side. He would like to see at least one redwood saved. He would also like to see the front of the building set back from Spring Street. He believed a three-story building on the east side would dwarf the adjacent home being remodeled. He believed the back side of the buildings on Main

Street were generally unattractive, so he would not mind backing the development to the backside of the businesses on Main Street.

Chairperson Fox liked the redwood trees, and believed the building should be located on the west side. She was concerned about the narrow parking lot and would like to see the building split into two pieces, with a pedestrian path between them.

Should the buildings be two or three stories?

Commissioner Blank's first impression was to have two stories but believed that there may be some ways to put in three stories, with the exception of the units nearest Spring Street, which should have a lower profile. He believed that could work architecturally.

Commissioner Pearce noted that she leaned toward two stories, given the size of Spring Street. However, she would like to see a streetscape that showed the entire street and the perspective from the adjacent neighbors. She was more concerned with the visual impact than the number of stories. She would like to see as many renderings as possible.

Based on the concerns of the owner at 261 Spring Street, Commissioner Olson believed the unit closest to Spring Street should be one story, and the buildings could be stepped up to two stories going back on the lot, and ultimately an L-shaped three-story building. He believed the trees should also remain.

Commissioner O'Connor believed the front of the building should not be taller than two stories. He noted that the building on Main Street had a tower element that lent extra height, but the rest of Spring Street was only one story. He believed that two stories in the front would be the maximum, and that a three-story building may work toward the back of the lot.

Chairperson Fox believed the building should be no more than two stories and thought that it may be appropriate to have one-story units closest to Spring Street. She believed that the Commission should be sensitive to the residents fronting Spring Street, with smaller houses in that area. She noted that she would like to see more details regarding the heights of the surrounding buildings before commenting further.

Is the proposed building too big for the lot?

Commissioner Blank noted that it may be, but without seeing drawings and floor plan layouts, it would be impossible to determine that decisively.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the visual impact would be a determining factor in answering this question.

Commissioner Olson noted that it was difficult to determine this question before seeing more detailed renderings.

Commissioner O'Connor believed that it was too big for the lot as proposed. He believed that with the pilates studio, there was a lot of activity surrounding that building and was unsure whether there would be adequate parking. He suggested eliminating the pilates studio, but was unsure how much money had been invested in its renovation and whether that was a viable option.

Chairperson Fox believed that the building was too big for the existing lot and would like to see a less massive design.

Architectural theme

Commissioner Blank personally preferred the Mission style rather than the Downtown style but believed it should be peer reviewed by an architect conversant in Mission style architecture.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with Commissioner Blank and believed the Mission style was unique to that street and blended with the residential units on the street. She would like to see a peer review to ensure that the features and details made the building look like it belonged on the street.

Commissioner Olson believed the architectural theme should be in keeping with the rest of the street, which would make an argument for the Mission style. He requested a photomontage from Main Street.

Commissioner O'Connor believed the Mission style should be retained.

Chairperson Fox noted that she would like to see a different style than Mission in that part of town and that she liked the design of the building at 325 Ray Street. Mr. Iserson noted that the building at 325 Ray Street was an excellent example of Mission Style/Spanish-style architecture. She noted that she liked the Victorian or Queen Anne style, which would look less like a modern condominium complex and more like the houses on Neal Street. She noted that she was not a particular fan of the Mission architectural style.

Should all the units be live-work units?

Commissioner Blank believed all the units should be live-work units.

Commissioner Pearce believed all the units should be live-work units and that it would be a distinctive and unique feature in the Downtown area. She would also like to see a second workshop on this project.

Commissioner Olson would not be in favor of any restaurants in this area. He would like to see some focus toward business incubators in this location as described by the applicant; perhaps a 500-700-square-foot facility for venture-funded companies. He would like to see the living and work units tied together on the deed.

Commissioner O'Connor would be concerned with restaurants, even a small one, due to the traffic generation. He did not believe the parking lot would be able to handle it.

Chairperson Fox noted that she did not mind a mixed-used development but had concerns about the feasibility of a live-work parking requirement. She did not believe it would be a viable long-term option. She would support a mixed-use development there rather than a live-work. She would like to see a revised schematic of the two-story building.

Parking

Commissioner Blank stated that it would be fine to require fewer parking spaces. It was his experience that there was generally only one car per unit.

Commissioner Pearce had some parking concerns and understood that Commissioner Blank's statements about having only one car may reflect the fact that Commissioner Blank's experience of live-work was limited to that in Europe. She thinks the occupants will have more than one car. She suggested that underground parking be considered.

Commissioner Olson did not have an answer on the parking issue at this time but believed that a good parking scheme could be developed.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed with Commissioner Pearce' assessment that it would be unlikely for a household to have only one car. He was worried about approving more in-lieu parking in the Downtown since there is currently not enough parking in the Downtown.

Chairperson Fox expressed concern about parking. She cited the building on 344 Division Street, which had an indented wall in the back with parking underneath the building, supported by pillars. She suggested that considering that parking scheme may be beneficial. She does not think a reduced parking requirement would likely be viable in the long-term and that it should meet the parking requirement for a mixed-use project.

Should the ground floor work uses be restricted?

Commissioner Blank believed they should absolutely be restricted but believed more work should be done to determine what uses would be acceptable. He believed that office uses would be fine, such as an accountant or attorney. Any retail should be an art-oriented or specialty retail such as a numismatist or philatelist, rather than a high-traffic retail use such as a convenience store. He suggested holding another workshop after the peer review was performed and after some layouts and building designs have been created. He believed that would generate some good feedback.

Commissioner Pearce did not believe it would be practical to restrict the uses to artists. As long as the use was compatible with Downtown, she would generally agree with it.

She did not want to see any generation of hazardous materials. Restaurants would be fine. She stated that she would like the live and work portions of a unit to be all one unit. Commissioner Olson did not favor restaurants. He would like to see incubator-type businesses. He would like a deed restriction on live-work all in one unit.

Commissioner O'Connor did not think a restaurant use would be appropriate for there is not enough parking.

Chairperson Fox would like to see retail or office on the first floor and residential on the second floor. She would like to see what the planned uses would be as well as the surrounding uses before discussing restriction of uses. She noted that classes with 8-10 students would be a problem.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Iserson regarding whether Commissioner Blank drew a distinction between the uses that may be appropriate on Spring Street and on the other streets, Commissioner Blank replied that he did not. He believed that as long as they were live-work units, a restaurant would not be appropriate in that environment.

Although Chairperson Fox noted that she is supportive of mixed-use developments, she did not think that in terms of parking, the live-work concept is viable in the long term.

Commissioner Pearce believed the live-work concept was a great idea from a cultural, affordable-by-design and green building perspective, and she had been waiting to see this take place in the Downtown area. She would like to have a second workshop.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he was only concerned with the live-work unit from a long-term viability standpoint. He would not want a retail unit go vacant and remain that way because they could not sublet it. He liked the idea in principal but was unsure how viable it might be. He was unsure how the restrictions would work in terms of long-term feasibility.

Commissioner Blank noted that he was sensitive to the comments make by Chairperson Fox and Commissioner O'Connor regarding the viability of live-work as a concept. He did not believe the Commission should be too judgmental about some of the business ideas. He did not believe that the Commission should deny a particular business concept strictly on sustainability grounds, such as if it appears to be a money-loser, if it met all the City's design guidelines.

Mr. Iserson agreed that this was a different kind of use for a town and that the development and management over time should be addressed specifically. He noted that strong CC&Rs and an association may be beneficial to maintain the applicants' visions and to market it to people appropriate for the development.

Chairperson Fox would like to know the heights of the surrounding buildings and would like to see a streetscape visual.

Mr. Schwartz requested a summary of the Commissioners' comments and noted a split on east versus west as well as style to some extent.

Commissioner Blank noted that it was rare for the Planning Commission to vote unanimously on all items in a workshop and noted that minutes were very detailed and would contain the necessary information. He encouraged the applicant to work with staff, who are very good at summarizing the Commissioners' comments.

Ms. Hyde expressed concern about delivery trucks for the businesses, generating congestion and blocking the street. Otherwise, she liked the idea.

No action was taken.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. November 29, 2006

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of paragraph 2 on page 3 should be modified to read as follows: *"~~In response to~~ With respect to an inquiry by Acting Chairperson Fox regarding a request from a resident who was unable to attend the meeting to videotape this hearing, Acting Chairperson Fox requested that Ms. Decker clarify Mr. Iserson's response that had been made prior to the meeting that the meeting could not be videotaped."* Chairperson Fox wished to clarify that it was not her request to videotape the meeting. She would like the following language to be placed at the end of the paragraph: *"Ms. Decker indicated that the neighbors could request to listen to the audiotapes."*

Chairperson Fox believed there were some questions after Mr. Otto presented the staff report and requested that the following language be added after the staff presentation on page 3: *"Acting Chairperson Fox noted that the 1998 Master Plan approved by Council had the addition of two parking lots to accompany the gym and meeting room building. She asked whether staff had actually visited St. Elizabeth Seton to determine the parking situation during the Sunday afternoon services and observed it themselves. She indicated that she had information that the parking lot was filled during services and that parking in the surrounding commercial properties was currently done. Mr. Otto indicated that staff had not actually visited the site during peak usage."*

Chairperson Fox requested that the following language be added after the staff presentation on page 3: *"Acting Chairperson Fox asked a question to clarify the approval process regarding Stoneridge Drive modifications. She indicated that it was her understanding that proposing that a street be changed from no parking to restricted parking requires a change to the Municipal Code, thus requiring a resolution from the City Council. She indicated that in the past, staff had indicated that this was the case, including a recent hearing where staff had proposed to increase speed limits on various roads in town several years ago."* She believed that it was Mr. Iserson, not Mr. Otto, who replied that the parking status of roads did not require City Council action.

Chairperson Fox requested that the following language also be added on page 3: *“Acting Chairperson Fox also inquired about bike lane changes. She recalled that three years ago, staff, through the Traffic Committee, attempted to make changes to the Stoneridge Drive bike lanes. Council directed staff to make the changes only through the City Council.”*

Chairperson Fox requested that the following language be added to the end of the first paragraph on page 4: *“This was a project with a gymnasium that had recently been denied by the City of Livermore Planning Commission and the Alameda County Planning Commission.”*

Chairperson Fox noted that in the first paragraph of page 5, she believed she stated there was a change from 35 feet to 30 feet in the City of Livermore’s Cedar Grove Church project.

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of the third full paragraph on page 5 should be changed to read as follows: *“In response to Acting Chairperson Fox’s inquiry regarding why the Church decided to combine both the buildings originally proposed on the property next to Nielsen Park and change them to the site located ~~place the building~~ next to Rheem Drive rather than at its location on the 1998 Master Plan....”*

Chairperson Fox believed she had addressed a question to either Mr. Iseron or Mr. Otto regarding whether a conditional use permit was required because staff considered the gymnasium to be a private recreational facility in an A District. She believed that Mr. Iseron replied that no conditional use permit would be required. She requested that the following language be added on page 5: *“Acting Chairperson Fox noted that in the previous Master Plan staff reports, a conditional use permit would be required for a future school. Mr. Iseron indicated that he felt the school did not require a conditional use permit when that would be proposed in the future.”*

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 6 should be modified to read as follows: *“In response to an inquiry by Acting Chairperson Fox regarding whether it would be feasible to move the gymnasium towards the front along Stoneridge Drive so that the tallest portion of the building would be away from the adjacent neighbors, Mr. Miller replied....”*

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 8 should be modified to read as follows: *“Acting Chairperson Fox noted that the proposed project had the gym open from 10:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. She further noted that the conditions of approval for the Early Learning Institute...provided for operating hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays only with no school activities of any type allowed in the evening and weekends.”*

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of paragraph 3 on page 13 should be modified to read as follows: “Acting Chairperson Fox expressed concern about the safety of the neighborhood and parishioners at night. *She was concerned that if parking were allowed on Stoneridge Drive, a parishioner entering or exiting a vehicle during the dark hours at night could be injured or killed.*”

Chairperson Fox noted that the paragraph 3 on page 14 should be modified to read as follows: “Acting Chairperson Fox noted that although she was supportive of the project, she believed the building was sited in the incorrect location *in the property, and preferred to see it consistent with the 1989 and 1998 plans. In addition, she had safety concerns regarding allowing parking on Stoneridge Drive, as well as concerns regarding the height of the building.*”

Commissioner Blank noted that normally, corrections to the minutes addressed typographical errors or missing wording and inquired whether the minutes were produced based on the audiotape. Recording Secretary Emberson confirmed that they were produced from the audiotape in chronological order of the proceedings.

Commissioner Blank advised that he would not support the approval of these minutes and had significant issues with making massive paragraph changes and additions of the content that may not be supported by the audiotape.

Commissioner Pearce inquired whether the text changes could be checked against the audiotape before approval of the minutes and whether approval of these minutes may be postponed until Mr. Iserson had the opportunity to respond to the addition of these comments.

Chairperson Fox requested the opportunity to listen to the audiotape. Mr. Iserson confirmed that she may listen to the audiotape in the Planning office. He noted that there were concerns about making massive changes and added that customarily, when approval and corrections to the minutes were made, they generally addressed minor corrections and wording changes. He noted that the introduction of new concepts into the text of the minutes normally went beyond the scope of the correction of the minutes.

Chairperson Fox recalled that she had asked those questions during the hearing. Mr. Iserson noted that while she may have asked those questions, he did not recall who made each statement at what time and that the audiotape would clarify that issue. He noted that each time he had reviewed the minutes, the minutes had been fairly thorough and that the question must be raised whether every single word or thought must be recorded faithfully in the minutes. He added that it was not the intention to produce strictly verbatim minutes and that summary minutes were intended to capture the essence of the statements made.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Pearce regarding the process of correcting minutes, Ms. Harryman replied that in the future, if a Commissioner wished to make more substantive changes than normal, he or she may listen to the audiotape ahead of

time and determine whether those changes should be made. If so, the exact location and statement may be identified more exactly. She noted that it was common to believe that statements were made in a precise manner and that they were not always made with clarity.

Mr. Iserson advised that the minutes were not intended to be strictly verbatim minutes, and noted that Ms. Emberson did an excellent job in capturing the content and character of the Commissioners' statements without capturing every word that was said.

Chairperson Fox inquired whether these minutes could be deferred until the next meeting. Mr. Iserson noted that would be possible.

Commissioner Blank noted that on page 15, he had suggested that the meeting audio be available on the City website as a podcast. He believed implementing that suggestion would greatly streamline the review process.

Chairperson Fox noted that it would be helpful to review the minutes within a shorter period of time to aid in recollection.

Mr. Iserson requested that the Commissioners consider where the line should be drawn with respect to verbatim minutes. He had seen minutes from other communities and commented that Pleasanton's minutes were much more complete. He noted that at some point, it would become a burden.

Ms. Harryman noted that the audiotapes were complete and that minutes were not meant to be a verbatim transcript.

Commissioner Blank noted that the Commissioners' Handbook stated that the audiotape was not considered to be an official record.

Commissioner Olson noted that the first sentence of paragraph 5 on page 8 should be modified to read as follows: "Commissioner Olson noted that he had ~~visited~~ looked at Mr. Gupta's home from the parking lot of the Church and indicated to Mr. Gupta that he ~~and~~ believed that it was the most impacted home by the proposal."

Commissioner Olson noted that the last sentence of paragraph 5 on page 18 should be modified to read as follows: "She requested that staff *check* the tape for confirmation."

With respect to paragraph 5 on page 18 regarding the Sarich workshop, Chairperson Fox inquired whether staff had been able to determine whether she said that she liked the project.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that language should be added before the motion on page 12 to reflect his support of having the parking on Stoneridge Drive.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the last sentence of paragraph 4 on page 13 should be modified to read as follows: "Ms. Decker responded that the ~~land~~ lane could be painted...."

Chairperson Fox noted that with respect to paragraph 4 under Item 6.b., Consideration of the City Council Annual Work Plan Priorities for 2007-2008 on page 14, she wanted it clarified that her statement was not meant to imply that Commissioner Olson was lax in reading the material but that he had indicated that he had not received the staff report prior to the meeting.

**Commissioner Blank moved to defer approval of the minutes of November 29, 2006, until the next meeting.
Commissioner Fox seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Fox, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

The motion passed.

b. December 13, 2006

Commissioner Blank noted that the sentence on paragraph 4 of page 13 should be modified to read as follows: "Commissioner Blank disclosed that he knew Ms. Dennis personally but that they *had not* ~~did not~~ *discussed* this issue at all."

Commissioner Blank inquired whether the word "Delta" on the last paragraph under Traffic Study Accountability on page 23 should be capitalized. The Recording Secretary confirmed that was standard usage.

Commissioner Pearce noted that the second sentence of the second full paragraph on page 17 should be modified to read as follows: "She believed that Home Depot would provide less traffic in the long run than other business options being considered *because it would not be a unique business in the City.*"

Chairperson Fox noted that the first sentence of paragraph 1 under 4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA on page 2 should be modified to read as follows: "Acting Chairperson Fox noted that *staff had received* a request ~~had been received from~~ *Ponderosa Homes* to continue Item 6.b., Vesting Tentative Map 7721, Ponderosa Homes..."

Chairperson Fox noted that one of the reasons she did not support the Home Depot application was the passerby-traffic percentage and would like the following language added after paragraph 7 on page 6: "In response to an inquiry by Acting Chairperson Fox regarding the percentage of traffic that would be newly attracted to the facility versus passersby, the applicant indicated that the rate was 48 percent."

Chairperson Fox noted that the sixth sentence of the fourth full paragraph on page 17 should be modified to read as follows, "She noted that the 100-foot buffer *between the Beth Emek Synagogue and the Home Depot complex* had not been included as discussed in the first two workshops."

**Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the minutes of December 13, 2006.
Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Fox, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

The motion passed.

The minutes were approved as amended.

c. December 27, 2006

Commissioner Blank believed that the motion on page 7 included a tabletop traffic mitigation that was smooth. He did not see it in the motion or the amendments. The Commissioners concurred with his recollection.

Ms. Harryman recalled that it had been discussed and that it was part of the motion. She noted that staff would check the tape and recalled that there had been some wordsmithing as well regarding the material.

**Commissioner Blank moved to approve the minutes of December 13, 2006, subject to verification of the tabletop traffic mitigation wording.
Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Fox, O'Connor, Olson, and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

The motion passed.

The minutes were approved as amended.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Natural Lighting

Commissioner Blank requested follow-up for natural light sources to look at color and materials boards and samples.

Podcast of Hearings

Commissioner Blank requested follow-up on the podcast idea to simplify the ability for the Commissioners to verify the meeting audio without traveling to City Hall and to add transparency for the public by allowing them to hear the audio as well. He noted that technologically, it was fairly simple to accomplish.

Mr. Iseron agreed that it was a good idea and noted that he would pursue that issue.

Planning Commission Priorities

Chairperson Fox requested a session to discuss miscellaneous ideas for the Planning Commission and to rank-order them.

Commissioner Blank noted that he had been told that staff could do no work unless it was authorized by the City Council.

Mr. Iseron wished to clarify that Commissioner Blank referred to major projects regarding staff work. He noted that items such as the sprinklers ordinance was more involved with respect to community participation and review.

Chairperson Fox believed prioritizing items would prioritize the level of effort and that some items requiring staff work did not come from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Iseron noted that policies also came from General Plans and Specific Plans that have work programs and policies that must be addressed by staff and that staff must work those items into the schedule as well.

Chairperson Fox noted that there had been several discussions addressing practices by other cities that had never been placed for follow-up.

Commissioner Blank believed it was a good idea but that Chairperson Fox's expectations of the follow-up was overblown; he cited the lack of follow-up on sprinklers as an examples and added that although it had been prioritized by the Planning Commission and the City Council, nothing had occurred.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner O'Connor regarding prioritizing of items, Mr. Iserson replied that the vast majority of items were developer applications, which were always the top priority. He noted that other items such as the building construction and developer ordinance had been on the list for years, although they had come from Council or the City Manager as a priority. He noted that staff had input from the Commission and City Council that had not been addressed, and he added that he apologized that the sprinkler ordinance was not on there. He agreed with Commissioner Blank that it should be and that he would follow up on that item.

Chairperson Fox noted that she would like the ridgetop preservation item added as a priority. Mr. Iserson noted that the time to do that would be at the CIP priorities meeting with Steve Bocian.

Chairperson Fox believed that having a meeting to order the miscellaneous priorities would keep items such as the sprinklers from falling through the cracks.

Commissioner Olson noted that it was good for the Commission to have some input, but he realized that the priorities were ultimately driven by the City Council and the City Manager.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the City Council members stated that traffic congestion and flow were priorities for them.

St. Elizabeth Seton Church Noticing

Chairperson Fox understood that the noticing for this appeal did not include an email address to submit comments.

Mr. Iserson noted that staff had a standard noticing format that included email input, and would follow-up on that item. He did not believe there was any reason to not include email. He added that everyone involved in the project knew Steve Otto's email address.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the newspaper had published various agendas, including the workshop for the Parks & Recreation Commission and Trails *Ad Hoc* Committee and that an agenda was not published at that time. He inquired whether that could be considered as proper notice.

Ms. Harryman noted that it would have been required for Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Iseron noted that a 300-foot notice would have been acceptable under Planning law but that those agendas were handled under Parks and Community Services law. He noted that the Planning Department exceeded noticing requirements.

Commissioner O'Connor requested that staff clarify this issue with respect to Planning Commissioners attending outside meetings and making comment as a resident.

Ms. Harryman noted that if Commissioners wished to speak as residents and planned to recuse themselves from the Planning hearing, that would be fine. She added that she would follow up this matter with a memo to the Commissioners.

Mr. Iseron noted that they wished to avoid any appearance of prejudicial actions.

Chairperson Fox stated that she had requested a copy of the staff report for that meeting and had not received it by email or online.

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

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the Colliers International item contained a misprint regarding the total number of acres, and it was short about 7 acres.

Mr. Iseron noted that was common open space, which was a commercial condominium project. He noted that there were separate parcels required to be commonly owned by the owners and added that it should have been worded more precisely.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Blank inquired whether an alternate had been selected for the Planning Commission vacancy.

Mr. Iserson noted that a decision had not yet been made.

10. REFERRALS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

No discussion was held or action taken.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chairperson Fox adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 11:24 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary