



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

---

**DRAFT**  
**Wednesday, May 26, 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 May 26, 2021 was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chair Brown.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Nibert.

Staff Members Present: Ellen Clark, Director of Community Development; Melinda Denis, Planning and Permit Center Manager; Eric Luchini, Senior Planner; Larissa Seto, Assistant City Attorney; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; Stefanie Ananthan, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Matt Gaidos, Ken Morgan, Jeff Nibert, Brandon Pace (arrived during Item 3) and Chair Justin Brown

Commissioners Absent: None

### **AGENDA AMENDMENTS**

There were no agenda amendments.

**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**

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve Consent Calendar.**  
**Commissioner Gaidos seconded the motion.**

## ROLL CALL VOTE:

**AYES:** Commissioners Allen, Brown, Gaidos, Morgan, and Nibert  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Pace  
**ABSTAIN:** None

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

## MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

### **2. 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.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

### **3. PUD-139 and P20-0973, 10x Genomics, Inc., 1701 Springdale Avenue – Applications for: (1) a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning to rezone the subject parcel from C-R (p) (Regional Commercial - peripheral sites) District to PUD-C-O (Planned Unit Development – Commercial-Office) District; (2) a PUD Development Plan to construct up to three new multi-story research and development, office and laboratory buildings totaling approximately 381,000 square feet, a parking structure, and related site improvements over multiple phases; as well as (3) make a finding of General Plan conformity for a related Development Agreement to vest the entitlements for the PUD Rezoning and Development Plan.**

Senior Planner Eric Luchini presented the specifics of the item in the Agenda Report.

Commissioner Morgan inquired whether there would be chemical emissions from the ventilation system resulting from either the manufacturing of consumables or testing of products from laboratories. He then inquired about landscaping, referencing concerns about future droughts, and inquired about more drought-tolerant landscaping. He then referenced Phase 2 of the plan with the parking garage and the on-site parking lot and inquired the purpose of the on-site parking lot versus a larger parking garage or other parking options. He also asked about solar panels on the roof. Mr. Luchini stated his understanding that the use would have no emissions of concern. He discussed the City's water efficiency landscape ordinance (WELO), which the applicant would be required to adhere to. He then stated the landscape plan provided a preliminary plant palette that would need to be refined but the current proposal was intended to show the density of trees to illustrate shading and other features. He further stated the Commission could propose a condition of approval specific to landscape requirements. He responded that he would defer to the applicant regarding parking and use of solar.

Commissioner Nibert referenced the agreement between the applicant and Simon properties recently renegotiated to decrease the required number of parking spaces and the possibility of waiting for the agreement to expire to amend or lessen parking requirements. He inquired

whether the agreement was irrelevant based on what was negotiated between the applicant and Simon properties. Mr. Luchini responded that the original agreement was set to expire in 2028 but the applicant and Simon properties were able to agree to accelerate the end of the agreement and reduce the amount of parking as opposed to waiting until its original expiration. Commissioner Nibert referenced discussion from the November 18, 2020 Planning Commission Workshop around potential phasing of amenities and mitigation regarding floor area ratio (FAR). Mr. Luchini stated the amenity would include a \$1 million donation to the City for improvements to the fire station; the project would also provide other benefits including sales tax back to the City, expansion of business capacity and sales tax amount. He stated the Council would determine if \$1 million was acceptable.

Community Development Director Ellen Clark noted the \$1 million amenity payment was due when the campus expanded to exceed the 35-percent threshold, not with Phase 1 because the project would remain below the 35-percent FAR. Commissioner Nibert referenced the DA and inquired about the comparison between the vested right and project amendments in relation to one another. Assistant City Attorney Larissa Seto explained that the vested rights for both the original proposal, as well as future amendments would be covered in the same manner; the amendment sections of the DA would grant those amendments to the project. Commissioner Nibert referenced the traffic analysis and mitigation to construct a traffic signal at the project driveway and Springdale Avenue. He asked whether the traffic signal would be installed at the same time the parking garage was constructed. City Traffic Engineer Mike Tassano stated that the signal was not needed in Phase 1 and questionable as to whether it would be needed in Phase 2. He stated the signal would be bonded for and installed after Phase 2 if necessary. Mr. Luchini confirmed that Condition of Approval 114A covered the language regarding construction of the signal or bonding. Commissioner Nibert expressed concern with traffic queuing to enter the parking garage and traffic backing up on neighboring streets. He asked about Exhibits A through D. Ms. Clark stated the Agenda Report exhibits were available online. [Note: Exhibits A through D of the Development Agreement were not included in the Planning Commission draft DA]. Commissioner Nibert discussed the applicant's mention at the workshop regarding maintaining spaciousness of the design and setbacks. Mr. Luchini confirmed the proposed setback line of 32 feet, as shown on the plans, and included in the conditions of approval (COAs), as well as COAs to subsequently review Buildings 2 and 3 that would come back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Gaidos commended the thoroughness of both the agenda report and materials provided and further stated he did not have questions for staff at this time.

## **ARRIVAL**

**Commissioner Pace was noted present.**

Commissioner Pace also commended the agenda report and materials. He inquired about the traffic mitigation plan and whether the previous work proposed by Simon properties was part of the work and traffic analysis. Mr. Tassano responded the traffic model included expansion of the mall and additional residential. He explained that, since the driveway locations were unknown on the Simon property, staff did not look to that level of detail for the circulation but staff would work with Simon Properties to ensure they were appropriately located in the design. Commissioner Pace asked if the driveway finalizations would come back before the

Commission. Mr. Tassano confirmed that any modifications would be to the mall side, not the 10x Genomics side, which staff had accounted for.

Commissioner Allen asked if the \$1 million contribution would be adjusted for inflation. Ms. Clark stated there was no proposal to include an inflation factor. Commissioner Allen requested that be considered in the future. She then inquired about impact fees for affordable housing and traffic. Ms. Clark responded that the applicant would be required to pay development impact fees and that some were offset by credit associated with previous retail uses on the site. She stated that impact fees would inflate in the future. Commissioner Allen asked if the cost difference for affordable housing fees, which would have been paid previously and were likely minimal versus current requirements, would be accounted for. Ms. Clark stated both credits and fees (for Phase 1) would be paid at current rates, which was standard for all projects. Commissioner Allen discussed the exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS), which was cladding material around the building, and inquired if it was an industry standard material and the reputation for the durability for the proposed type of commercial building. Ms. Clark responded that EIFS was a material used widely throughout the Bay Area for both residential and commercial applications. She explained it was an engineered material, with a good reputation for durability, and that she had had the opportunity to visit a project using EIFS and research potential issues, and was satisfied by that research that the durability would be adequate. Commissioner Allen questioned how the Commission could approve the design details for one building without seeing the entire project (future phases). She expressed concern with the gray, "massive" design. Mr. Luchini stated the applicant could provide information on the phasing and aesthetics. Ms. Clark explained that the Commission was today reviewing the aesthetics of Building 1 only and would consider the design for future phases further in the process.

Chair Brown referenced the three-dimensional view of the architecture and stated the building aesthetics appeared to have a lot of chrome. He asked if that was an accurate representation and expressed concern with the amount of glare that could result. Mr. Luchini deferred to the architect regarding the accuracy of the depiction of the materials. Planning and Permit Center Manager Melinda Denis stated the images were placeholders for Buildings 2 and 3 and the design and materials would be finalized during future phases. Chair Brown questioned the materials presented in the architecture image.

## **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED**

Applicant Ben Hindson, 10x Genomics, provided a brief introduction of the company and background on the lab setting. He expressed appreciation for the City's support and expanding the company's headquarters in Pleasanton.

Architect Brian Jencek, HOK, provided a presentation regarding the existing site, location and the ability to create an enhanced campus for 10x Genomics. He referenced the Building 1 plan layout and the full layout of the site, highlighting the number of trees to remain and the new trees to be planted to create a lush landscape. He discussed the future parking structure off Stoneridge Mall Road and the benefits of the location. He referenced the queuing details and site circulation plan. He discussed efforts to remain compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Alan Bright, Architect at HOK, discussed the vision for the building and efforts to relate to science and saving energy by the design. He referenced the two and three-story massing of the buildings, metal panels and glass envelopes. He reviewed the various views from different locations on the campus.

Steve Van Dorn, Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce, provided his support regarding the project and applicant. He highlighted the public outreach from the applicant, the world class architects, design team chosen to design the building and the benefits of the project to the current site.

## **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED**

Commissioner Nibert mentioned he visited the site and was able to view the construction materials in person. He expressed concern regarding the building materials and wear over time. He discussed the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and asked if there were findings of significant impact. Ms. Clark stated there were no significant unavoidable impacts that could not be mitigated.

Commissioner Morgan inquired whether all public comments and public outreach from the applicant had been completed and received by the Commission. Mr. Luchini confirmed that Staff had forwarded all public comments received after publication of the agenda packet to the Commission. He discussed the public outreach conducted by the applicant and City. Commissioner Morgan inquired whether there were any emissions found to be of concern, specifically chemical compounds. Mr. Jencek responded that there were no emissions to be released into the environment. He responded that there was ventilation for the HVAC system, but nothing related to emissions. Mr. Hindson responded that 10x Genomics activities performed at their existing facility at Koll Center Parkway were similar to what was intended for the Springdale Avenue site and there were no significant emissions expected from manufacturing of those products. He stated organic compounds were used in very small amounts and there were no hazards. Mr. Hindson confirmed that the emissions produced did not require a permit.

Commissioner Pace commended the applicant on their responsiveness. He stated the neighbors, including the mall owner Simon Properties, were in support of the project. He mentioned setbacks and stated his previous concerns around privacy had been addressed.

Commissioner Gaidos thanked the applicant and architect for their presentation and noted the applicant answered previous concerns he had regarding the project. He commended the project and indicated support for the development agreement and rezoning.

Commissioner Allen commended the applicant for their outreach and time spent answering questions and concerns from neighbors and the Commission. She stated she found the building to be bland due to the use of the gray color and the design being too symmetrical. She suggested: 1) revisiting the color palette to add contrast and create a less industrial feel; 2) modifications to the roof screening material to reduce the “pop appearance”; and 3) reducing uniformity by creating a differentiated treatment around the corners and lower base of buildings, such as stone or masonry work. She requested an inflation increase to the \$1 million amenity contribution.

Chair Brown echoed the Commissioners in commending the applicant, their outreach and responsiveness with the Commission. He asked Commissioner Nibert if he was concerned with the material withstanding time. Commissioner Nibert stated the construction materials might be easily damaged but could also easily be fixed. Commissioner Allen concurred with the sufficiency of the construction materials, especially if suitable to the applicant.

Chair Brown requested clarification on Commissioner Allen's concern regarding building color and aesthetics. Commissioner Allen suggested the addition of another color and masonry to create contrast. Commissioner Pace expressed concern regarding the suggestion of using stone because it might be out of style in a short timeframe. He stated he liked the neutral color palette but expressed concern over outdated design elements and he did not want prominent design colors that deteriorate poorly over time. Commissioner Allen concurred with also not wanting to see bright colors, but re-stated she did not want an all gray building.

Commissioner Morgan inquired whether there were different textures in the building that could not be seen from the visuals. Mr. Jencek concurred that they did not want a homogenous building. He explained the proposed design, massing, and landscaping. Mr. Bright mentioned the panels above the windows which were a slightly different color and stated the glazing would produce good aesthetics, similar to jewel tones.

Chair Brown noted the varying corner notches and subtle articulations.

Commissioner Gaidos expressed his understanding of Commissioner Allen's concerns related to the visual and color scheme; however, noted his appreciation for the eye-catching entrances and visual of the window panels.

Commissioner Morgan stated he liked the building in Phase 1 and suggested potential modifications for Phase 2 and future phases.

Commissioner Nibert expressed his agreement with Commissioner Allen and encouraged improvements to aesthetics to make it even more attractive.

Chair Brown asked the Commissioners for feedback on Commissioner Allen's concerns related to amenity value and inflation.

Commissioner Nibert stated he would rely on experts to make the determination on the value of the proposed amenity.

In response to Chair Brown, Ms. Clark stated the amenity payment was triggered when the FAR exceeds 35-percent. She stated the DA provided certainty to the developer of their vesting in the project, and an inflation factor might be contrary to that intent. Chair Brown inquired whether previous PUDs included an inflation factor added to the amenity value. Ms. Clark stated it had not occurred in the past, to her knowledge.

Commissioner Pace stated he was reluctant to include a specific color in the motion. Commissioner Allen suggested the concept of an alternative color scheme to be presented to the Council.

**Commissioner Pace moved the Planning Commission find: 1) the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, 2) the proposed PUD Rezoning and Development Plan are consistent with the General Plan, 3) the proposed Development Agreement is consistent with the General Plan, 4) adopt a resolution recommending adoption of the Draft IS/MND, 5) adopt a resolution making the PUD findings and recommending approval of Cases PUD-139 and P20-0973, subject to the draft conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A2, 6) adopt a resolution recommending finding the Development Agreement is consistent with the General Plan, and 7) forward the IS/MND, Cases PUD-139 and P20-0973, and the Development Agreement to the City Council for consideration, with 8) an additional recommendation that the applicant work with staff to provide one potential alternative color palette to be considered by City Council.**

**Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, Gaidos, Nibert, and Pace**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSENT: None**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

Resolution PC-2021-06 recommending City Council adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a Planned Unit Development Rezoning and Development Plan for Cases PUD-139 and P20-0973 and Related Development Agreement was adopted, as motioned.

Resolution PC-2021-07 recommending approval of a Planned Unit Development Rezoning and Development Plan for Cases PUD-139 and P20-0973 was adopted, as motioned.

Resolution PC-2021-08 recommending a finding of consistency with the General Plan for a Development Agreement for a Planned Unit Development Rezoning and Development Plan for Cases PUD-139 and P20-0973 was adopted, as motioned.

**MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION**

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

Commissioner Gaidos mentioned his attendance at his first meeting of the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals.

**5. Actions of the City Council**

Ms. Clark provided a brief overview of the items listed in the report.

**6. 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**

Ms. Denis reported that the landscaping for the Lucky's shopping center located on Hopyard Road had been completed and the signage at Iron Horse Realty had been installed.

Commissioner Pace stated the Christensen's on Main Street was going out of business and inquired if staff was aware of future tenants for the location. Ms. Denis stated she was currently unaware of future tenants for the space.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stefanie Ananthan  
Recording Secretary