



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

This meeting was conducted via teleconference in accordance with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20, approved AB 361, and COVID-19 pandemic protocols.

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

The teleconference meeting of the Planning Commission of January 12, 2022 was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chair Pace.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Nibert.

Staff Members Present: Natalie Amos, Associate Planner; Megan Campbell, Associate Planner; Ellen Clark, Director of Community Development; Melinda Denis, Planning and Permit Center Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Sachiko Riddle, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Justin Brown, Matt Gaidos, Jeff Nibert, and Chair Brandon Pace. Commissioner Ken Morgan joined the meeting late.

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Ken Morgan for Items 1-6

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

There were no amendments to the agenda.

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 November 10, 2021**
- 3. Approve the meeting minutes of December 15, 2021**
- 4. P21-0144, Mark Landolf, 3747 Trenergy Drive** – Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) development plan approval to establish developments standards for the construction of an approximately: 1) 5,067-square-foot, single-story home with two garages totaling approximately 1,967 square feet in area; and 2) 1,100-square-foot, detached accessory

dwelling unit with an approximately 457-square-foot garage and related improvements on a 1-acre vacant parcel. Zoning is PUD-LDR (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential) District

Commissioner Nibert moved to approve the Consent Calendar Items.

Commissioner Gaidos seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

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

The Meeting Minutes of November 10, 2021, were approved, as submitted.

The Meeting Minutes of December 15, 2021, were approved as submitted.

P21-0144, Mark Landolf, 3747 Trenerly Drive was approved as submitted.

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

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

There were no speaker cards submitted.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

- 6. Continued from December 8, 2021 - P21-0132, P21-0133, PUD-142, Ramprasad Srirama, 3707 Trenerly Drive –** Applications for: 1) Minor Subdivision approval to subdivide an approximately 1.3-acre "L" shaped vacant parcel on the southside of Trenerly Drive and westside of Martin Avenue into two parcels measuring approximately 21,886 square feet (Parcel 1/A) and approximately 34,840 square feet (Parcel 2/B) in area; and 2) Planned Unit Development rezoning and development plan approval to construct an approximately: a) 4,837-square-foot, two-story home with a 900-square-foot garage and related improvements on Parcel 1/A; and b) 4,776-square-foot, single-story home with an 853-square-foot garage and related improvements on Parcel 2/B

Associate Planner Natalie Amos presented the specifics of the item in the Agenda Report.

Commissioner Gaidos asked the timing and decision-making process making Cameron Circle one-story homes when the surrounding homes were two-stories. Ms. Amos discussed the Ponderosa development, explaining that the homes were approved for two-story homes but the applicant reapplied for single-story homes on Cameron Circle.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Cameron Circle homes could add a second story. Ms. Amos explained that the PUD stipulated only single-story homes but a PUD modification could be requested.

Commissioner Nibert referenced letters of opposition stating the neighbors and City blocked development of two-story homes. Ms. Amos stated that was incorrect information and the City had not blocked development of two-story homes. She explained that the applicant had decided to void their original approval for two-story homes and apply for single-story homes due to economic and marketing reasons. Commissioner Nibert referenced another email regarding setback requirements. Ms. Amos stated the Cameron Circle lots were smaller than the surrounding area and the larger lots of the proposed project warranted greater setbacks. Commissioner Nibert confirmed that the proposed homes exceeded the setbacks on Cameron Circle.

Commissioner Brown asked the distance from the proposed houses to the existing house on the corner. Ms. Amos stated the closest point on one side was 80 feet and the other side was a bit closer but she did not have the exact measurement. In response to Commissioner Brown, Ms. Amos indicated the corner property was not built by Ponderosa.

Commissioner Allen asked if there were line of site visuals from the house on the corner to show the impact to the existing property. Ms. Amos stated there were no visuals but the existing property had several trees and the applicant proposed planting more trees.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

Ramprasad Srirama, Applicant, and Terry Townsend, Architect, provided a presentation on the item.

Krishna Yalamanchi provided comments on Item 6 and shared his support for the project.

Akash Jayanthilal provided comments on Item 6 and shared his support for the project.

Anurag Jain provided comments on Item 6 and shared his support for the project.

Sue McKinley provided comments on Item 6 and shared her support for the project.

The Applicant, Mr. Srirama, thanked the speakers for support of the project and discussed efforts to retain the privacy of the neighbors.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

In response to Commissioner Nibert, Ms. Amos discussed the setbacks.

Chair Pace asked to see a view of the proposed landscaping between the proposed and existing lot. Ms. Amos displayed the landscape plan and proposed landscaping between the properties. She stated gallon sized plantings were common but box size trees could be required. She outlined the existing landscaping on Ms. Lister's property.

Commissioner Brown discussed the existing home on the corner lot, mature landscaping and reduced windows on the proposed development. He discussed the Ponderosa homes and agreed with the proposed two-story homes. He stated he found the architecture appealing and well thought out and designed. He indicated support for the project.

Commissioner Gaidos echoed Commissioner Brown. He stated he could not come up with any reason to deny the project. He commended the architect and property owner for their design and consideration of the neighbors.

Commissioner Nibert echoed the other Commissioners and stated the letters of opposition were not persuasive given the findings. He indicated support for the project.

Commissioner Allen concurred with the previous comments and stated she found the design attractive and believed it enhanced the neighborhood.

Chair Pace expressed his gratitude to those who submitted comments on both sides and indicated support of the project.

Commissioner Brown moved to approve P21-0132, P21-0133, and PUD-142 as submitted.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution PC-2022-02, approving Case P21-0132, P21-0133, and PUD-142 was adopted as motioned.

Commissioner Morgan joined the meeting via Zoom.

7. Continued from December 8, 2021 - **P20-1053, Hanna Naguib LLC, 218 Ray Street** – Application for Design Review to construct a new 1,069 square-foot two-story residential unit behind an existing commercial building located at 218 Ray Street. Zoning is C-C (Central-Commercial) District

Associate Planner Megan Campbell presented the specifics of the item in the Agenda Report.

Commissioner Gaidos asked about the parking in-lieu fee. Ms. Campbell explained that the current lot had 10 spaces but was being reconfigured to have 11 spaces, plus an upper lift space. She stated the in-lieu fee was to cover the 12th space because the lift could not be counted.

Commissioner Morgan asked the proposed number of bedrooms and if there were limitations on the number of resident cars. Ms. Campbell stated there were two bedrooms in the unit and there were no limitations on the number of cars but, because it was Downtown, in theory they would have fewer cars and walk or use transit. She stated parking on site was not currently limited for the residents but a condition could be added.

Commissioner Nibert asked staff's thoughts on exacerbating the current parking situation. Ms. Campbell referenced the memorandum provided to the Commission highlighting the parking study conducted a few years ago. She stated the area was 57% parked during the lunch hour and 85% parked during dinner along with most of the downtown. She stated Staff found the project was appropriate for the location and that the proposed parking, with the in-lieu, was sufficient.

Commissioner Nibert asked for clarification on the Code parking requirement. Ms. Campbell explained why the lift could not be counted towards the required parking and that deficient parking could be mitigated through an in-lieu fee. Ms. Clark explained the nine spaces dedicated to the office which could be used for residential tenants. She also stated the project was a rental unit and the landlord could control the tenants parking. Commissioner Nibert asked the history of in-lieu fees for parking deficiency. Ms. Clark discussed the use of in-lieu fees for other projects. Ms. Campbell provided examples of in-lieu fees or variances to reduce parking. Commissioner Nibert asked how the in-lieu fee related to adding parking. Ms. Clark explained that the fees were set aside in a special account to be applied to constructing additional parking in Downtown. Commissioner Nibert expressed his discomfort with considering the financial viability of the project. Ms. Harryman explained that the project was not in violation of the Pleasanton Municipal Code. Commissioner Nibert asked how much of the ~~inancial~~ financial viability should be considered. Ms. Clark stated the developer's financial return was not a consideration although the type of development such as a studio was considered.

Commissioner Allen also expressed concern about parking in Downtown and opening the door for in-lieu fees being used on new residential projects in the core Downtown. She asked if there were specific examples of allowing in-lieu fees on residential projects. Ms. Campbell clarified that the 273 Spring Street in-lieu fee was for the commercial piece of the project, but that is an example of a project with both commercial and residential on the site. Commissioner Allen stated the Commission had previously not allowed tandem parking nor in-lieu fees. Ms. Campbell discussed the examples provided and stated the proposed in-lieu fee could be conditioned to be just for the commercial aspect of the project. In response to Commissioner Allen, Ms. Clark stated in-lieu fees required City Council approval. Ms. Harryman clarified that in-lieu fees could be approved over the counter but the project before the Commission did not qualify.

Commissioner Brown clarified the hours of the dental office. Ms. Campbell confirmed that the dental office was open two days a week. Commissioner Brown asked why the project was proposing the lift. Ms. Clark explained that the lift spot was better than no space.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

The Applicant, Wassim Naguib, provided a presentation on the item.

Dawn Chatham provided her comment on Item 7. ~~and shared her concerns about parking.~~ She stated that after addressing her concerns about the patients and the staff of the dental office parking on her street to the dentist and staff themselves, there were still parking issues. She did not believe that the lift would solve the parking problem. She also stated that the signs that say “no parking” that are put out during the Candy Cane Lane December event did prevent people from parking on the street for that period, but she had to call the police and have vehicles ticketed to address the dentist office parking. She was still concerned about the issues that this project would cause.

Herb Ritter provided his comment on Item 7 and ~~expressed his support of using the parking lift as a creative parking solution.~~ He loved the parking lift as a creative parking solution. He also stated that he would like to change the PMC Code 18.20 to allow lifts to be classified as parking. He did not support in-lieu fees for the project and thought that all parking should be provided on site. He said that the Planning Commission could condition spots one through non in the lot to be for commercial only. He felt the lift meets the spirit of the code and should not be considered deficient.

Mr. Naguib explained that Walnut Drive had residential permit parking. He stated he did not want to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Commissioner Brown asked why the dental office that was only open two days a week was causing parking problems. Mr. Naguib stated he did not know and assumed people were not using the provided parking. He stated they added signage to help mitigate the issue.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

Commissioner Morgan asked if the unit was specifically a rental unit. Ms. Clark confirmed and stated it would have to be made into a condo or lot split to be sold separately. Commissioner Morgan then asked if there were any conditions that required retention of the lift. Ms. Campbell stated it would have to stay since it was part of the approval.

Commissioner Nibert asked if the public was encouraged to use the parking lot when the dental office was closed. Mr. Naguib explained that Adobe Shopping Center employees could use the parking. In response to Commissioner Nibert, Mr. Naguib confirmed that the parking lot was currently signed to indicate that parking was for the commercial building.

Commissioner Nibert stated he generally liked the project and the proposed parking was an innovative approach to address the parking concern. He expressed concern with allowing in-lieu fees for residential projects Downtown.

Commissioner Allen stated she would make her decision based on preserving the downtown parking to maintain retail vibrancy and ~~not~~ opening the door to set the precedent to approve in-lieu fees for residential projects ~~that are not fully parked.~~ ~~and~~ ~~Therefore,~~ she could not support the project. She stated she found the architecture of the building was good. She discussed parking habits and why people might park on the public street.

Commissioner Brown asked if there were other tenants in the commercial building that put demands on parking. Ms. Campbell stated Mr. Naguib's office was in the building and the parking requirement was calculated based on the entire footprint of the commercial building. Commissioner Brown asked how often all ten spaces were utilized. Ms. Campbell stated the required parking spaces were not completely utilized. Commissioner Brown stated he generally supported the project since it added vitality of the downtown and that he believed the Commission was over rotating over half a space as the commercial was currently under used. He suggested additional signage to encourage those going to the commercial building to use the private parking and that ticketing would right the behavior.

Commissioner Gaidos stated he did not find any problems with the design and structure of the building. He stated he did not like the lift and did not think it was a solution for the current parking problem. He described his own experience in parking on a lift, and how difficult, dangerous, and frightening he found it to be. He believed the difficulties would cause people to choose to park on the surface streets, rather than operate the lift, which would exacerbate the current parking problem. He stated he could not support the project if the lift was part of the approval. ~~He stated he was open to considering approving just the in-lieu fee.~~

Commissioner Morgan agreed with Commissioner Gaidos about the lift. He stated he was also concerned with the precedent of allowing in-lieu fees in residential areas. He stated, for those reasons, he was inclined to not support the project. He stated he would be more supportive if there was a condition restricting residents to two cars.

Chair Pace suggested the Council provide direction to the Commission on lifts and in-lieu fees. He discussed the need to manage density and policy questions on how to address the issues. Ms. Harryman stated the Council might not want to address the policy questions unless it knew the Commission liked the project. Chair Pace suggested the possibility of conditioning the approval in a way the Council would consider the lift. Ms. Clark stated the lift was not an acceptable solution to meet the parking requirement and the Commission should decide whether it supported the in-lieu fee. Ms. Harryman discussed the proposed lift and questioned whether the project was better without the lift or with the lift that would get used when needed.

Commissioner Brown stated the tenant might use the lift if they had two cars or to store a car used infrequently. He discussed options for the Commission's recommendations on the project.

Chair Pace asked if any Commissioners had concerns about the design. The Commissioners indicated support for the design and clarified that the only concerns were related to parking.

Commissioner Allen moved to deny the project as proposed.

Ms. Clark stated the applicant could appeal the decision to the City Council.

Commissioner Brown moved to approve the project removing the lift and lift screening but approve the in-lieu parking fee. The motion died due to lack of a second.

Commissioner Gaidos seconded Commissioner Allen's motion to deny the project.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION

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

Commissioners Allen and Gaidos reported on the recent Heritage Tree Meeting.

9. Actions of the City Council

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

10. Future Planning Calendar

Ms. Denis gave a brief overview of future items for the Commission's review.

MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

There were no matters initiated by the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Pace adjourned the meeting at 9:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sachiko Riddle
Recording Secretary