

PUD-110, Irby Ranch

Applications for the following on an approximately 15.03-acre site located at 3988 First Street, 3878 Stanley Boulevard, and 3780 Stanley Boulevard: (1) General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Retail/Highway/Service Commercial, Business and Professional Office to High Density Residential; (2) Specific Plan Amendment to change the Downtown Specific Plan designation from Downtown Commercial to High Density Residential; (3) Rezoning from the A (Agriculture) District and C-S (Service Commercial) District to the PUD-HDR/OS (Planning Unit Development – High Density Residential/Open Space) District; (4) Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan to construct 93 single-family homes and an affordable residential community for individuals with special needs; (5) Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide an approximately 15.06-acre property into 93 lots for 93 new single-family homes, one lot for future development of special needs housing, and 13 common area lots; and (6) Development Agreement to vest the entitlements for the project.

Commissioner Balch recused himself from participating in the hearing and left the Chamber.

Jennifer Hagen presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Chair Ritter asked for Mr. Beaudin to briefly address affordable housing issues in Pleasanton.

Gerry Beaudin explained that an application was received to rezone this property. There are many housing units under construction right now in the city which is largely the result of the lawsuit that the City has resolved through construction of residential units. City staff is going through the public process to have the project considered at this time and residential is the use proposed by the developer.

Commissioner Brown stated the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance (IZO) percentage requirement is 20 percent, but the staff presentation showed up to 30 percent as an alternative and asked why it was not 20 percent of 112 units but instead calculated 20 percent of 93 units.

Ms. Hagen explained that the IZO is being met through dedication of the land and the donation of \$1 million. Additionally, staff would like to see 20 percent of the market rate units be affordable so 20 percent of the 93 units would be 19 units.

Ms. Hagen then introduced Fran Reisner, the City's Housing Specialist who was available for questions.

Commissioner Allen stated the IZO also specified requirements that said that the low cost housing element of a project should be built prior to or in conjunction with the market rate element of a project. In this case, the Commission is being asked to approve single family homes. She asked if the homes cannot be built until the lower cost housing element is in place.

Ms. Reisner stated that this provision pertains to when the developer is providing inclusionary housing on site. In this case, the inclusionary requirement applies only to the market rate units, and the developer is providing a land dedication to meet that obligation. Under the ordinance stating the requirements of land dedication, they must have a site sufficient to develop the number of inclusionary units and the appropriate approvals, utility connections and funding toward fees, so this would meet the conditions of the ordinance.

Commissioner O'Connor indicated that an email received stated "if a residential project is proposed that offers inclusionary housing we also need to postpone the rezoning in order to help meet the future 2022 RHNA." He asked if the City would receive credit or carry over RHNA numbers for the affordable housing units given the City has already met its RHNA numbers in the current cycle.

Mr. Beaudin said no; there is no way to secure credit for future RHNA cycles. The City has zoned for its current RHNA obligations, and this is not a site that has been identified as an opportunity site in the Housing Element. That would mean that these units would not count toward the next RHNA cycle or that the City would get less of an allocation because of this. The City works with the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and provides a progress report on all housing types in the community so this is consistent with Housing Element policies. It is not a credit toward future RHNA allocation but it represents positive progress relative to the City's other housing policies and with respect to the City's reporting to the state.

Commissioner O'Connor asked why this would not reduce the City's RHNA allocation for the next cycle.

Mr. Beaudin explained there are various criteria that go into the calculation and the number of housing units is a factor as are the number of jobs, and the jobs/housing balance.

Chair Ritter stated the Commission received a letter from HCD and the author writes "approving and permitting the Irby Ranch project would be considered progress toward the regional housing need and can be reported as RHNA credit in the annual report on implementation of the General Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65400."

Commissioner Allen asked if the project the Commission is asked to approve tonight in any way guarantee that Sunflower Hills will be the provider of the affordable housing.

Mr. Beaudin said no, with the strong caveat that Sunflower Hill is an identified City Council Work Plan priority. The reason they do not have a project with the City tonight is due to the complicated nature of funding affordable housing projects. Sunflower Hill has a proven track record producing high quality projects like this in the area and in discussing the exclusive negotiating rights agreement with Sunflower Hill, they are the City's preferred partner.

Tonight, the recommendation would be to approve the market rate housing project with the affordable housing agreement that has been reviewed by the Housing Commission; to set aside that land and the money; and currently the City's preferred partner would be

Sunflower Hill in the form of an exclusive negotiating rights agreement that the City Council would ultimately make a final decision on, but they are not part of the application tonight.

Commissioner Allen said if for any reason anything changed she asked what would be the alternative for the affordable segment of the property.

Mr. Beaudin said the applicant will transfer land and money to the City to choose a preferred housing provider for that land at a future date.

Commissioners Allen asked if it was possible that market rate homes would be built in advance of any affordable housing being built.

Mr. Beaudin said it is possible. The City has been in discussions with Sunflower Hill and they will aggressively pursue this project, but the funding cycles for affordable housing projects is competitive and it is possible that Sunflower Hill would not be on the same schedule as this market rate project. The applicant needs the agreement and the land to be able to be competitive for the funding and this is the reason for the lag.

Commissioner Brown referred to traffic and said when looking at Exhibit G, his questions related to traffic demands and pressure on the intersection at First Street and Bernal Avenue, given there is a 350 unit project under development there. He knows the level of service on First Street south is already at LOS D, but he had questions about the table on page 106 of the report.

He stated that existing was today; near term was five years with or without the project, and cumulative was 20 years. He noted that Stanley Boulevard and First Street went from LOS B to LOS C in cumulative. Even the near term with the project without cumulative, there is degradation from LOS B to LOS C there. He said if 890 trips are added, he asked what traffic would be like at this level.

City Traffic Engineer Mike Tassano said 890 trips sounds like a lot and he would be concerned with adding that in a peak hour; however, the way to look at it is that 10 percent occur in each peak, or 90 trips. The 90 trips are taken and distributed. Half may go down First Street, the other half down Old Stanley, and some toward Livermore. The direction of travel is broken down in the transportation study.

When distilling down the 90 trips that leave or come back in the p.m. peak hour, half of them, or 45 vehicles, are now on First Street. This is a little less than one per minute. With this development, instead of three cars at a traffic signal, there may be four or five cars.

Mr. Tassano said added to this are the trips from the 345 units from residential development occurring on the Auf der Maur property which is included in the transportation study, and the question asked is what other traffic in Livermore and Dublin contributes towards Pleasanton's LOS. They then conduct a cumulative analysis and they look at how those new traffic volumes are written out and they get to the level of service.

One of drawbacks in looking at LOS, if there is a heavily traveled corridor in one direction he can add a lot more traffic to that because Pleasanton does not have a lot of cross streets. When sitting on Neal Street and someone wants to cross First Street, that traffic volume is light. So instead of having the car wait 30 seconds, they can delay the lights another 30 seconds which allows many more cars through on the main street.

Commissioner Brown asked and confirmed with Mr. Tassano the 345 units would be included and forecasted into the model. He referred to Row 11, page 108, and said when looking at the p.m. peak, the delay today is 25 seconds and it will go to 48 seconds, and with this project it would go to 50 seconds per vehicle. The change will be a lot from 25 seconds to 48 seconds, but not much from 48 to 50. Therefore, today when compared to in the future, traffic on First Street will have much longer delays, and Mr. Tassano agreed.

Chair Ritter referred to the three options which are: (1) the current proposal with 93 homes; (2) the Housing Element with more apartments; and (3) to leave as is scenario with office and zoning. He confirmed with Mr. Tassano that the least amount of traffic impact would be the 93 homes unless going to all warehouse.

Mr. Tassano said all analysis included having Nevada Street extended because this is a much more equitable way to analyze this project.

Commissioner Nagler asked what the impact on traffic would be with the Nevada Street extension.

Mr. Tassano said there is benefit in the response time to the fire station, improvement to Vineyard Avenue and reduction in traffic going through the Vineyard/First/Ray intersection.

Commissioner Nagler asked about its effect on apartments being built and the possibility that some of those residents will use Nevada Street to get to I-680.

Mr. Tassano said the model would have to show vehicles leaving Nevada Street, going all the way to First Street at which point they would make a left turn onto First Street and sit in stopped traffic. For Bernal, you have to go up and over the hill on the other side and sit and wait at Sunol. What the model does is show which route takes less time, and this is the Bernal route. The impacts to that Auf der Maur property using Nevada Street is a little less unless people are specifically going toward Amador.

Commissioner Brown asked what it would take to complete Nevada Street.

Mr. Tassano said when they were updating the General Plan he questioned whether or not it should be done in the next 10 years. Because it provides some benefit but is not a key corridor which must be done right away, it was not included as a high priority item. A greater need is the water and sewer infrastructure necessary through there.

Commissioner Brown commented that cars parked on Nevada Street today and he asked if there is currently an existing easement.

Ms. Hagen said there are currently easements on both properties which are already in place. The City Attorney and Engineering Department staff are in contact with both property owners to finalize actions needed to fulfill those easements, but these are deferred completion agreements which the City had back from the 1980's. The City is confident it has rights to those, but has to work out the details to obtain the properties. The applicant/developer will actually construct all improvements per City code standards and be reimbursed by the City as one construction project.

Commissioner Allen stated some of the other letters asked the City to wait until there is relief from Highway 84 before doing any type of rezoning and more housing. She asked staff to provide an update on the status of Highway 84.

Mr. Tassano said SR84 is envisioned to be a four-lane highway from I-580 to I-680. This plan has been in place since the mid 1980's. Design and construction work began in 2000 and they are in construction on the 4th segment, leaving the 5th segment from Pigeon Pass to I-680 as the final section. This is currently in environmental review and anticipated to be completed in 2017. After this process is the design process which will take another year or two and this will involve right-of-way acquisitions. In 2019 the City will advertise and anticipate starting construction sometime in 2020.

Commissioner Allen asked if 100 percent of the funding is lined up now.

Mr. Tassano said the anticipated cost for the 5th segment of State Route 84 is \$200 million which they are moving forward with. Local transportation fees have been used to help the design process along. Additionally, they have \$122 million set aside in Measure BB and \$10 million for TBTC which leaves about \$60 to \$65 million unfunded at this point for construction. He noted that federal money comes in easier if there is local money and a project is identified as needing to be completed.

Commissioner Nagler said given that gap, he asked when the final \$60 million can be secured to stay on the proposed timeline.

Mr. Tassano said up until the point when they advertise. In order to award, the City must have a funding plan in place.

Commissioner Brown asked if Mr. Tassano had enough confidence to put it in either the cumulative or near term traffic projections.

Mr. Tassano said no because while he is confident, he wants to show the Commission what happens if the City does not fully support State Route 84. He would rather show the worst case scenario and then construct it and show it is better.

Commissioner Brown asked which intersections would benefit from State Route 84 improvements.

Mr. Tassano said the entire First Street/Sunol corridor by a 20 percent to 25 percent reduction in both peak hour volumes and he briefly discussed traffic patterns of people either leaving to go out of Pleasanton or people going into Livermore to work.

Chair Ritter called upon the applicant to make a presentation.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Mike Serpa of Century Development Group stated that he and his partner Jeff Lee own Irby Ranch, LLC and he credited staff, consultants, agencies and their partner Sunflower Hill for working on and endorsing the project. If they proposed a commercial development there would be 1,000 to 4,000 more trips per day and if they developed apartments, the site could accommodate 300 to 400 apartments, and the minimum would be 800 more trips per day.

Mr. Serpa displayed a PowerPoint presentation, stating the City benefits through extension of Nevada Street which has been in the City's plans for 50 years. Since 1991 the City has pursued the sewer and water line through the area and what is on the site is a plan of over 4 years in the making, and he reiterated that while the development will not provide actual units towards RHNA, it does provide credit towards the City's overall regional housing goals.

After the Planning Commission workshop, Mr. Serpa said they returned to their plan and dispersed parking for a total of 274 parking spaces which is a lot for this type of community. They think the plan is creative, offers many benefits, and they were able to add almost 3 acres of open space since the Planning Commission workshop which they will maintain and which connects to each community. Regarding historic recreation, they are debating which house to move and they know it is important to the community.

Mr. Serpa then presented slides of various iterations and revisions during the development process which include increase in setbacks and pedestrian connections, decrease in the number of homes, increased open space, increased guest parking by 21 percent, evenly dispersed parking, the addition of a tot lot, restoration of one of the houses, realignment of First Street and Stanley intersection, and the addition of another six-foot bike lane next to the 10-foot multi-purpose trail on the future Nevada Street. He said this is a different buyer profile that drives this product and if the yards get bigger and there are driveways, the prices are higher and the buyer profile changes. This type of higher density housing provides empty nesters and new buyers with a lower cost alternative which is close to the downtown, and it is 8 units per acre and not 30 units per acre.

In closing, Mr. Serpa said the City has an opportunity on all levels for housing and not so much for commercial or high density apartments. He acknowledged there will be traffic generated from this but it is the lowest of any other considerations for the property and they still have to mitigate it. He asked the Commission for the opportunity to let them and Sunflower Hill have the chance to move forward with their vision in something the City will be proud of.

Commissioner O'Connor asked what the price range of the 1,800-1,824-square-foot homes would be given there are no driveways and no yards.

Mr. Serpa said he was not sure what the market will do, but he thought they would be in the \$800,000 range with the two-stories a bit more and three-stories a bit less. If they go

up in price, this means the next level of home increases, but they will always be attainable as compared to the next level of home.

Chair Ritter noted the median home price in Pleasanton is about \$1 million and he confirmed they will be below the median.

Mr. Serpa said the Sunflower Hill homes will be two stories which will surround the development and these will create opportunity for lower income buyers.

Commissioner Nagler referred to the plan for pedestrian lighting on Sheet L-6 and questioned the rationale for no lighting around B, C, D and E streets or the entire side of the neighborhood.

Mr. Serpa said at this stage of the project, a photometric study was done and this determines how much light needs to be provided and he introduced their lighting specialist.

The project engineer, Justin DeKnoblough confirmed that a photometric analysis is done to determine proper spacing of lighting to achieve requirements for illumination. With a product like this much is determined at the construction document level of the project. He noted with shorter driveways, wall pack lights are used and typically an HOA is required to maintain those, but all pedestrian pathways will have proper lighting. This is not shown on Sheet L-6 of the landscape plan, but it is something done off-line with staff to provide documentation that proper lighting is achieved.

Ms. Hagen reiterated that this is just the pedestrian lighting plan. Staff does not have the actual street lighting plan. In terms of street lights on D, K and C Streets, these are not identified here or in the plans and they would be provided at the building permit stage.

Commissioner Nagler said from a lighting and neighborhood aesthetic perspective, he asked what differentiates the triangular area of guest parking stalls and the outdoor planting which is at the intersection of E and C Streets from the triangular area located at the corner of J and H Streets that does have pedestrian lighting.

Mr. DeKnoblough said at the intersection of E and C Streets, there is likely a light that will serve to provide that lighting need which is not identified on Sheet L-6 that serves as a secondary source of light for those locations.

Commissioner Nagler asked and confirmed that the developer will be more specific moving forward in providing information on how the neighborhood is lit.

Commissioner Nagler then asked for the number of paseos in the current plan.

Mr. Serpa said it depends on how they are counted, as some are 30 feet wide and some are 10 feet wide.

Commissioner Nagler said paseos are shown in the streetscapes and he referred to E Street, stating there seems to be green spaces between two of the home sites, and he asked if those were pedestrian walk-throughs.

Mr. Serpa said these are private yards and he pointed out that many of the homes do have private yards and not pass through paseos on that particular street.

Commissioner Nagler pointed out that the paseos as depicted break up the home sites and they add to the usability of the neighborhood and to the overall pedestrian traffic flows to the neighborhood, so he encouraged the developer to use them.

Regarding the historic building, he asked if Mr. Serpa had a preference between preservation of the Irby or Zia house.

Mr. Serpa said his preference comes from a construction standpoint and ease of move. Both homes are very old and there will be significant reconstruction of these houses. The Zia house is probably easier to move, it is closer to its final location, and it has less lead and asbestos than the Irby house.

Commissioner Nagler stated there will be more discussion about the probability of Sunflower Hill constructing in the neighborhood and being the provider of special needs housing. The question has been asked as to whether there is a tie-in of building out this project and Sunflower Hill in a way that would potentially create a necessity to keep Sunflower Hill moving for the developer to continue with the project. He asked how long Mr. Serpa anticipated it would take to build out this project from beginning to end.

Mr. Serpa said the draft development agreement identifies 15 units in 2017, then 60 in 2018 and the balance in 2019. With respect to Sunflower Hill, there are three milestones in their schedule. He imagined they will be pushing them as they need approvals of this project for their project. For them to get funding they need entitlements and they need this project's infrastructure.

Therefore, this project's success is tied to their success and they have packaged this as a deal. Sunflower Hill is a brand they have aligned themselves with and are committed to and he believes they need to get Sunflower Hill out of the ground as soon as possible to demonstrate to the City this model. As soon as they file their Final Map, they can transfer the land.

Commissioner Nagler stated from a skeptic's perspective, he said Sunflower Hill is going to have complications getting their tax credits approved and federal housing construction grants approved which will realistically take years and not months. He was trying to determine timing and building out this project neighborhood which will be completed in 2019. If the infrastructure is built by the end of 2017, there are 2 ½ years between that time and the time the neighborhood is completed.

Through the growth management of the project, the City could accomplish a practical tie-in between Irby Ranch LLC being able to complete the project and Sunflower being able to get built.

Mr. Serpa said funding is complex, but he believes that their pursuit of their funding can happen early in the process and it is not quite as sequential as Commissioner Nagler's comments.

Commissioner Nagler clarified there are 42, three-story houses proposed and he asked for the concept behind how these have been configured.

Mr. Serpa explained that about the time Township Square was built the highway was 40 feet above the site with 3500 square foot homes being built in the middle of the field in a grid pattern. All were together in one spot and very visible which would be an impact until the community matured.

He noted that their development is so different in massing and density and does not compare. In working with the City it was determined that they would wrap the project in two stories because they did not want that same issue. They mixed two and three stories within the community and basically the two stories are all on the outside with more three-stories inside. They also like to put two stories on corner for a softer visual impact and mix the two stories into the three story units for a moving street scene with curvilinear streets.

Commissioner Nagler stated his last question has to do with the location of the historical building. He thinks from the standpoint of the view from Stanley Boulevard and the experience of the broader community visually as they drive by and to break up the linearity of the houses on Stanley, to place the building near the oak tree would be a substantial improvement to the development as opposed to tucking it to the side. It would also emphasize the fact that this is Irby Ranch, and he asked for Mr. Serpa's comments.

Mr. Serpa said he completely understands this suggestion from a drive-by perspective; however, many other variables include the fact that they would like to create a farmstead park. The oak tree has a massive dripline and nothing can be built in this. They decided to preserve the oak tree and make a park out of it with developed space, benches and gathering places in front of it to celebrate the tree. To make a home next to it would almost be overdoing it.

The problem is the circulation on the other side inside the community where there would be traffic on their private street which becomes an impact. If they place it along Nevada Street, there is parking, it will be its own structure sitting in its own farmstead with a decorative fence and landscaping with open space around it. The realignment of the intersection moved it and the view is much more direct than it was before, so they think they have chosen a good location for it.

Commissioner Nagler stated there are several home sites between Stanley Boulevard and the site proposed.

Mr. Serpa pointed to the lower left corner of the intersection and said they have a deep landscape setback. When coming down Stanley either way there is a fairly direct view of the farmstead.

Commissioner Brown thanked Mr. Serpa for showing him the massing and for demonstrating how the project is different from the development at Safeway. He asked for an explanation of what seems to be a gap for the last three homes on D Street shown in Sheet L-4.

Mr. Serpa explained there are three homes at the end of the street. The home on the end connects to a sidewalk directly to the left of it and across the street. It is the next two homes in that do not have a sidewalk in front and, from a builder's standpoint, they can put the sidewalks in front of them but this will take 5 feet from the backyards. Typically, homebuyers will want 5 feet more in their backyard and no sidewalk in front if given the choice, but they will do whatever the City requires.

Commissioner Brown said his personal preference would be for the connection and requirement for a sidewalk. Lastly, there is comment in the staff report that the fact that the design template was based on the design from the DSP and part of it has porches and other things. He noticed that C-3 is the only home that stands out as not being consistent with this design.

Mr. Serpa said all of the plans are different widths, different sizes and this provides a better look for the entire street scene. They are not finished with the details of the C-3 plan and while they may see changes with it, structurally he thinks it fits in well with their product mix.

Susan Houghton, President of the Board of Directors for Sunflower Hill, thanked City staff for their work and the Commission for its due diligence on this project. She had a presentation ready for tonight but will not give it due to questions and comments voiced which have surprised her because she thought Pleasanton was a community of character. She thinks she will need to go back as an organization and remind the City why they organized themselves as a Pleasanton nonprofit in 2012.

Many boardmembers and advisors lived in Pleasanton or had worked in Pleasanton and they knew this was the right city for their organization. They loved the embracing, respect and integrity that came with being a community of character. If any boardmembers or advisors thought they would be where they are now 4 years later they would have not come this far.

She relayed a story about their garden development at Hagemann Ranch which has produced 7,500 pounds of food for many non-profit organizations and they have given back to the community and are all volunteers. Most of them have kids with special needs, they know each other through Special Olympics and they want to live and play together and grow old together.

She said the advantage in Irby Ranch is an opportunity for families here to buy homes and be able to know their kids can access the Sunflower Hill campus. Without Irby Ranch there is no Sunflower Hill. They have searched the city for years to find a site and have tried to work with other developers which did not work and now they have this opportunity. However, if they focus on the things that could go wrong or why the timing is not right or financing issues, or whether or not kids would be able to access some amenities and traffic problems, it will never get built.

Their board, advisors and families join in the risk, but she was confident they can move forward together and she hoped to say in the future that they are building a community because Pleasanton believed in them. She asked the Commission to move forward and appealed as a mom, a resident, president of the Sunflower Hills Board of Directors to do the right thing and she thanked the Commission for their vote which will help many children live in the community for the rest of their lives.

Brock Roby said he lives near the proposed project, is the parent of a special needs adult, he relayed the great need in Pleasanton for such a project and asked the Commission to approve the project.

Peter MacDonald stated he has been working with Mr. Serpa and said the school district has signed the school mitigation agreement to address issues. The Sunflower Hill project will provide a much needed center for housing and care for autistic spectrum adults who have aged out of the district programs. He echoed the many benefits of the project, questioned how the single family project could be called high density at 6.2 units per gross acre when HCD classifies high density as 30 units per acre or 450 apartment units and asked the Commission to approve the project.

Rick Irby said on behalf of he and his sister, he thanked the Commission for consideration of what his mother began 4 years ago by signing a contract. It was her hope that the downtown area would grow that much more into their property; that it would be a good use, and he thanked the Commission.

BREAK

The Commission took a break from 8:56 p.m. and thereafter reconvened the regular meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Julie Testa asked staff if they are familiar with REACH, a program that provides affordable housing for special needs adults. She stated Pleasanton voters have voted three times for a 29,000 housing cap and while she recognized there was a lawsuit and that the city has RHNA requirements, numbers have been exceeded. To rezone properties when not needed is defiant of the will of voters and the cumulative effect of this project and those not yet built will be a significant burden on already overcrowded schools. She acknowledged that Sunflower Hill is a wonderful concept and she would love to see it happen, but it comes with housing units the city cannot accommodate at this time and she asked the Commission to respect the General Plan.

Scott Raty, CEO, Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce, said he used to buy bait at Irby's and used to go fishing at Shadow Cliffs and he was also able to do this with his young son. He said both buildings are beyond repair and thinks this project which the applicant and Sunflower Hill have put together is something to be proud of and hoped for approval.

John Sensiba said he is the Board Chair of Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group and member of the Sunflower Hill Advisory Board, as well as boardmember of a local non-profit with 1500 employees and Pleasanton employer with 40 employees. He echoed all comments of Scott Raty and said the city's chronic lack of adequate housing has a negative impact on families, the community and the society in general. He urged

approval of the General Plan amendment and this project and the ability to have Sunflower Hill to be a part of it.

Jan Batcheller said the entire Bay Area is in a housing crisis and Pleasanton is a job center and needs homes for people to work here. Housing is often controversial but neighbors are supporting this plan. As the founder of the Downtown Association and a person who is passionate about the Downtown, this plan expands the Downtown and will bring added dimension and customers. Sunflower Hill will add a great deal to the Downtown and to the lives of those who live there. It will provide them with a measure of independence and confidence. She also recognized the infrastructure and open space the plan provides and asked the Commission to give benefit to the Irby family who have owned the property and have paid taxes for generations.

Janet Brown said she is a lifelong resident since 1966 and she has seen a lot of positive growth and change. Her children all attended local schools and her son Austin is in a special education program from age 5 to 22. He is now 26 and she and her husband need to plan for his future. Sunflower Hill is the type of development where special needs adults can live and thrive. The noted Reach's waiting list is 3-5 years away and asked the Commission to approve the project.

Janeen Brumm said she and her husband have raised their family in Pleasanton and she voiced their support for the Irby Ranch and Sunflower Hill development. She cited the project's ability for inclusion into the mainstream population as well as families with the option to buy a home in that community so their family member can take advantage of amenities and social activities. Their family wants to buy a home in the new development so they can be a part of this special project.

Peter Dragula said he is a case manager for Dublin High School and has worked in Pleasanton and Dublin. He shared his experience in dedicating his life to special needs communities and non-profit organizations. Once special needs children age out at 14 to 22, there is no dovetail program available and typically he sees parents and kids struggling to find a place which is heartbreaking. He referred to two books, "The Boy in the Moon" and "The Chef who Called" which tells the history that these problems are nothing new. People took care of people and society changed and he challenged the Commission to change the paradigm of how they think; not as Commissioners but as people first.

Tanya Ludden said she and her family has seen the town grow and recognized the hard work and thought that went into development. She thinks the project is unusual and cited the many benefits the city is getting. Special needs folks need a place to live in the community and she encouraged the Commission to unanimously approve the project

Sandy Yamaoda recognized that the city needs this type of affordable housing and said her nephew is a special needs adult. However, this 93 unit project has no yards, no driveways, and no homes for aging citizens. She questioned how many people could afford \$800,000 for a home and the project will impact schools. There will be another bond issue and more portables will be added, and she questioned if this was right. The project will also impact water needs while the state is still in a drought and she asked to delay the project until it can be counted towards the City's RHNA.

David Stark stated he is a resident and also Public Affairs Director for the Bay East Association of Realtors and commented that the median price for this community has been over \$1 million all year long and it comes down to supply and demand. Putting the numbers aside, he said the 93 homes are an opportunity to put down roots in the community. He discusses new construction in Pleasanton and the vast majority of homes are rentals. There is a need for this, as well as for people to purchase a next step of their homeownership closer to the downtown and this product meets that demand. He thinks this is a fantastic opportunity and was glad that Susan Houghton recognized Pleasanton as a community of character and encouraged the Commission to accept the staff recommendation.

Sblend Sblendorio said he is an advisor to Sunflower Hill and on the board of Tri-Valley Innovation Leadership Group and chairs the Housing Infrastructure and Transportation Committee. They are made up of the largest employers in the area and he endorsed the project and said it is a wonderful opportunity.

Richard Spicka said he is a grandparent of a special needs junior at Foothill High School and supported the long time property owners, the developer, the Sunflower Hill group and supported development of a place for such adults with special needs.

Darin Lounds, Executive Director of the Housing Consortium of the East Bay, said their mission is to create inclusive communities for people with special needs in Alameda and Contra Costa County through affordable, high quality housing. They have worked with Sunflower Hill for over 3 years and have seen them blossom from a startup to an active, community-based organization making a positive impact in the region.

He commented that the land is free to Sunflower Hill. They have an excellent non-profit housing developer partner and affordable housing associates and residents will receive quality supportive services and Sunflower Hill will also benefit from additional funds from the City of Pleasanton, Alameda County and the California Tax Allocation Program and fundraising can start immediately once entitlements are in place. Lastly, the City Council has declared Sunflower Hill a top priority in the city and he asked the Commission to support the request.

Melody Royal said she is a baby boomer and spoke about those causes which have changed how society has cared for unique and often ignored populations. The project will meet the needs of special needs individuals who have very little say about how they live their lives. She respectfully asked that the Commission approve this and asked how the Commission would want their child to live.

Melanie Bailey-Bird said she is a teacher, tutor and special needs advocate in the Tri-Valley area and supported moving forward with the application. She asked that the City be a smart, inclusive city that continues to focus on developing character traits and quality of life projects. She spoke about the average median income, Pleasanton's high quality demographic statistics, about the need for independent living of special needs individuals, and supported approval of the project.

Pat O'Brien submitted a written comment as read by Sblend Sblendorio which states, on behalf of Tri-Valley Reach they strongly support the Sunflower Hill project, housing for special needs individuals, and asked for approval.

Cindy Usedom said she reviewed the Sunflower Hills and Irby Ranch projects and have come to the conclusion it is the right time and a wonderful opportunity for the community. She spoke about community of character and said this application provides a special chance to have a special group realize their vision and for the community to be an example for other communities to emulate. The project also offers new homeownership to those wishing to downsize and it completes sewer and water systems, better traffic flow through extension of Nevada Street, a pedestrian trail, and is walking distance to the downtown and urged the Commission to support its approval.

Anu Pai said Pleasanton is her and her family's home and was at Amador High School registering her autistic son who starts high school in the fall. She is grateful for the support from the City and questioned what would be done for special needs children once their parents pass on and she supported endorsement of the Irby Ranch project in order to move forward the Sunflower Hill project.

Andrew Wong voiced his support for the Irby Ranch development, as the City is in need of additional diverse housing to support job growth. The location of Irby Ranch is ideal for high density detached housing given its infill location. It is walkable to the downtown. The low maintenance of 93 homes will be attractive to many young families and he also has a daughter who graduated from Amador High School and he applauded the partnership with Sunflower Hill which will provide many local resources and commended the City for considering this innovative concept.

Rodger Miller said he supports the Irby Ranch project, thinks it is well-designed and respectful of the neighborhood. He likes the historic preservation and the idea that the privately owned open spaces will be accessible to the public, supports the idea of improving the First Street/Stanley Boulevard intersection, as well as the opportunity to extend Nevada Street and asked for the Commission's support.

Alan Throop said the development is special and unique and will serve as a model throughout the Bay Area. He has a 38 year old son who is developmentally disabled and is very social and friendly but he has lived in Fremont for 15 years. There is very little housing in the Tri-Valley area for special needs kids and Sunflower Hill is a great opportunity. He hopes the Commission will approve the project and thanked the Commission.

Bill Sadler said he lives in Vintage Hills and drives by the property on numerous occasions and supported this type of development to improve the neighborhood. He thinks the location is ideal, is key to providing safety and security to the Downtown, is walkable and pedestrian-friendly, and looks forward to seeing Nevada Street extended and connected. The site plan is creative and thinks the Sunflower Hill component is essential. He requested the Commission move the project forward to give this developer a chance to create something special.

Michael Brown said he was hired in 2012 by Mrs. Irby who passed away in 2013 and her request was to help her and her family understand how to respond to the City Engineer and Planning Director who had written to her requesting an easement on the property in order to extend the sewer and water system, as well as the ability to extend Nevada Street. It is an honor to be here. Her children are here and the Irbys are a 5-generation Pleasanton family.

He noted that their first ancestor bought the property next to the Arroyo in 1887 and they have been a lovely part of the community. Mrs. Irby graduated Amador High School in 1938 and Rick and Evie followed along in the 1960's. He is a real estate attorney and is familiar with RHNA requirements as well as the housing cap. An argument has been made to oppose this project on the basis that although it is a great project, perhaps it should be delayed and wait until HCD forces the City to allow this project. If the City is forced, this will result in many more homes on the property than are being proposed, and he asked that the Commission support the project.

Ginny Fods said she has taught in Pleasanton schools and she has a 26 year old autistic daughter who was ready to move from their home at 22. Her only option was to get on waiting lists for Section 8 vouchers all over the state. She also signed out for the Reach 11 homes and only 1 of the 11 is for females. She now is living almost across the street from where this project is located in the Promenade development. She is slightly more independent than those living in a group home but needs 10 hours a week of supportive living which is paid for by the regional center. She worries there is little socialization occurring between the 3 women and are excited to hear about Sunflower Hill where there would be more planned social interactions.

Sandy Richert said she supports the Irby Ranch neighborhood as it is a thoughtful housing development which adds value to the community. She cited benefits of infrastructure, the extension of Nevada Street, open space, trails, and said prices in the Bay Area have soared. This neighborhood will bring modestly sized homes which will fill the need between apartment renters and estate homeowners. More commercial development will bring more traffic than a residential neighborhood and the city does not need more apartments with higher density. The project is walkable to the Downtown, she appreciates the project's low maintenance, and she urged the Commission recommend approval to the City Council.

Paul Renker stated continuing the trail on the Arroyo is imperative. His son is 26 years old and he would love to have him live in Pleasanton, as millennials look for a community like this because they want to walk, ride bikes and interact with restaurants in the Downtown, and many work in the Silicon Valley. He noted buses are taking employees to Silicon Valley and he did not think that given the type of buyers and the availability for trains and buses, the traffic impact is not so great. He supported the recommendation, stating the property could get up zoned and the city would end up with very high density apartments.

Lauri Fehlberg, Senior Principal with Dahl Architecture and Sunflower Hill's architects stated she does not have a developmentally disabled family member but the question remains about what happens with these adults when their parents die. She said this is a unique opportunity for the City to support something like this which is very important. She spoke briefly about Dahl's employment base and said her employees cannot find housing in Pleasanton. As a 29 year resident, she would be willing to stop at a light knowing there were people taken care of in her neighborhood, and she asked for approval.

Tim Hunt said he supports this project as a long-time resident that has seen a lot of change. He echoed comments about the project being unique, said it will serve a

different niche and some people deliberately want to give up yards. He thinks the project is thoughtful with the least traffic impact and he asked for approval.

Susan Hayes said she is a Human Services Commission but is speaking as a resident who has shadowed a young man to age 22. She is not a parent of a special needs child but her son grew up with a friend of the same age who is. She witnessed the opportunities and challenges of the family for the younger brother as he grew up through the Pleasanton schools. At 22, opportunities in the district stop for those with special needs. She spoke about the many programs which he now uses in the local workforce and a community like Sunflower Hill is a good next step. She noted two prototypes for this kind of partnership exist in the Tri-Valley which is the School of Imagination in Dublin built with a residential development. There are assisted living and memory care environments in town which is also a model prototype. Potential delays could affect the timing of Sunflower Hill and she asked for Commission approval.

Rebuttal – Applicant

Mr. Serpa said there is a lot of compelling testimony and aspects of the community and they continue to work with staff on project refinements. The City has qualified staff and they are excited about the project and he asked the Commission to provide them with the opportunity to create something special which the City will be very proud of.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Ritter asked Mr. Beaudin to recap some of the questions and answers, and thereafter, the Commission will discuss the matter.

Mr. Beaudin summarized the following comments and questions brought up:

- Lighting in the pedestrian realm;
- Preserving the Zia house as the preferred alternative;
- Connecting a sidewalk for Lots 14, 15 and 16 in the plan; and
- Further refinement to Model C3 architecture

Commissioner Allen said at the workshop they discussed how the pool and Community Center within the Sunflower Hills community could be accessed by the broader special needs community. She understood this is changed and the new non-profit developer wants the pool at the Community Center used exclusively by Irby Ranch residents and not be available to the broader community. She asked if this is the current direction.

Mr. Beaudin said the Sunflower Hill PUD would be a separate application at a future date. There have been discussions about the kinds of amenities on site and how large they are, the number of people served, number of units, and this will be part of the PUD discussion.

Susan Houghton, President of the Board of Directors for Sunflower Hill, said at the last workshop they discussed the size of the Community Center at 5,000 square feet. They were planning for the myriad of individuals who might purchase the homes and their idea to come over and use the campus afterwards. Even though they have 19 units on

site, they anticipate 20 individuals who may be buying some of the homes and who would want to access the site.

One of the challenges with financing is what size is the Community Center and because it is not tied directly to the residence, they want to be sure they can get financing for it. As Mr. Beaudin said, this is influx. It could be anywhere from 2,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet depending on the final size of their site. They will have to decide how many homes they will be able to accommodate on site to plan for that.

Regarding the use of the pool and Community Center by others, they are open to the idea, but nothing has yet been fleshed out.

Commissioner Brown said not necessarily represented here were the speakers not highly in favor of Sunflower Hills, but also emails the Commission received and he asked for discussion regarding this point. He noted the General Plan specifies that elementary schools should not be over 600 and they are. There was also mention there were 1600 portables in schools today.

He had asked prior to the meeting for an idea of which schools would be impacted by this project and they include: Alisal Elementary, Harvest Park Middle School and Amador Valley High School. He asked if these schools were at or above capacity today and he asked if this development would likely put them over capacity.

Ms. Hagen said in the City's General Plan there were general numbers set for desired school district capacity. Based on PUSD's demographic study all three schools that would accommodate Irby students are currently operating below capacity. At the fall of 2020 they may increase in enrollment, but in the fall 2025, those schools will actually decrease in enrollment, according to the PUSD report. In all of the years up until that time they will remain below capacity.

Mr. Weinstein clarified that the City is relying on the school district for these numbers and he noted that the City meets with the district's demographers every year and staff supplies them with a list of foreseeable projects in Pleasanton. The last list from 2015 which resulted in the report did include Irby among other projects in the pipeline. Therefore, the numbers take into account student population growth from the Irby project in conjunction with other projects, as well.

Commissioner O'Connor asked when numbers were updated from the district.

Mr. Weinstein said the study was published last spring.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if staff was intending to change these numbers in the General Plan.

Mr. Beaudin said the City's General Plan cannot regulate PUSD standards. PUSD presented information to the Council in June 2015 and the City would not revise the General Plan to adjust that number. The next time a comprehensive review is undertaken, staff will confer with PUSD and confirm those numbers.

Commissioner Brown also questioned sizing. He referred to the number of 700 families mentioned and in other times 700 individuals. The other concern he has is that he loves the concept of Sunflower Hill but it seems as if it is not big enough. When he looks at 19 and the enthusiasm in the room from speakers, 19 will get consumed very, very quickly and asked if this community is one of many other communities Sunflower Hill will build or he asked if the Planning Commission should be waiting for a larger piece of property.

Ms. Houghton said if there is land, they will come and if the Commission knows of any land they are interested, but this is the only site they know of in Pleasanton. There was a period of time when they began looking when they thought this site would not work for them, they sought other possibilities and it did not occur. In Livermore, there will be 45 units but it is different because it is a closed community. The advantage here is that there will be families which can add to the Sunflower Hill community by purchasing a home. This is what is unique here.

Commissioner Brown noted tonight the Commission is being asked to approve the development for Irby Ranch, but not Sunflower Hill, and he said there is still an opportunity for determining how they can get more units.

Lastly, Commissioner Brown said when he and Ms. Houghton talked on Friday and they talked about an agreement around right of first refusal for the surrounding property. As a Planning Commissioner he is trying to weigh the community benefits against the incremental residential housing above RHNA. He asked how large is that right of first refusal and he asked if it was cast in stone.

Ms. Houghton said Mike Serpa has graciously offered the right of first refusal on the homes directly to the left of the Sunflower Hill site. There are 4 adjacent to Central Park, one at the top right corner as well, and these are two-story homes which they think are more conducive to their population.

They envision 2 or 3 families joining together to purchase the home and knowing that 700 individuals in Pleasanton need housing who have special needs, she would imagine there would be many families to be able to purchase a home at Irby Ranch. Their programming includes meals so it would be like a college meal plan where the community might come for dances, art activities and meals. Sunflower Hill has the obligation as an organization to make sure it is a right fit, and right now, they feel the size versus the number of homes is right.

Commissioner Nagler said it has been said several times by the applicant and through Mr. Beaudin's comments that there are still some refinements to be done on the architecture. There also have been questions about the height of some of the buildings. He asked what these further refinements will be.

Mr. Beaudin said they had their eye on the three-story homes not necessarily in terms of removing the third story but adding additional articulation to ensure there is not a canyon effect between the buildings. He thinks Irby has done a good job on pushing in the front or the back of the floor plans on the third floor and creating a step back, but they have not done this on all three-story homes.

They are also trying to tie this in with some of the architecture found in the Downtown, such as getting windows centered on wall planes, creating consistent sill heights or tops of windows lining up so things start to look more traditional. A porch is something that could help the housing type of C3 that could use some additional work on the front and back, and these are the types of details that would continue to move the architecture in the right direction and in most cases, the applicant has been willing to make those changes. These also are the kinds of refinements that staff could recommend through the building plan check process.

Commissioner Nagler said the way the applicant has laid out the community, there are corridors of three-story homes which have at the end of the row two story homes so it softens the corners. However, on the back side of the property towards the Arroyo and on the block in the middle of the neighborhood, there are rows of three-story homes, and this is where the 24 homes are. He asked if there were thoughts about mixing some of the three stories with some of the two stories more so there is a variety to the roofscape along those corridors.

Mr. Beaudin said most of the three-story homes occur in areas where the road curves slightly which does help with the streetscape. There are also blocks of buildings which terminate with two-story structures on the perimeter of the project or at the end of a block, particularly tapering into the Sunflower Hill site. The three stories are internal. He thinks that particularly where there are three-story structures next to the park, it can help frame it, but the interface must be articulated and that is where the front porch concept and stepping the upper floors back comes in to make the open space feel more open rather than having more of a residential green. He thinks some of the longer strips of the three stories are probably more beneficial to the project. Where there are two, three-story structures standing alone, they will be more noticeable especially when they have green around them. Therefore, there are some places in the project where this happens.

Commissioner Nagler asked Mr. Serpa what he thinks of these ideas.

Mike Serpa said their team needs to sit down with staff and pound through details. He thinks they are talking about a better plan and to the degree the architecture gets better, they will have better homes. They welcome the conversation and while changes can be made with the exterior, they also must look at what this does to the interior too such as bedroom sizes and circulation in units, but they will return.

Chair Ritter said he was worried a bit about the Nevada Street extension because it comes right through the Valley Humane Society there and he understands they may lose 7 parking spaces in that area. He has not heard much about whether this will be an issue with the project.

Mr. Tassano referred to the parking directly in front of the Humane Society along the roadway and said the City granted that with their knowledge that this will go away once the road is built which goes into a bike lane.

Chair Ritter said he goes back to the three options; the plan, all of the apartments the City could get, or the commercial and the water usage in all three of these plans. He asked if there was a better and worse option in relationship to water.

Mr. Beaudin said their Operations Service Center and water conservation staff conduct a presentation when talking about the differences between older and newer single family homes and they extrapolate that to smaller lot single family homes and into multi-family homes. Because one of the bigger uses of water is landscaping, water consumption tends to reduce when moving towards more compact development. He would not try to compare water usage with commercial development, but in moving towards more compact development, the amount of water used per unit is less.

Commissioner Nagler pointed out that one condition of approval is to pipe in recycled water.

Chair Ritter also cited the property taxes received from the three options, and said the apartments would generate the most taxes for the City, then the single family and then commercial. With that come more taxes for education and City services, but other than apartments, it is a better option with single family versus the commercially zoned option.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Zone 7's water allocations would increase as a result of the development. Mr. Beaudin said Zone 7 will review the application and they will tell the developer whether or not they can serve them through a will serve letter as a condition of approval. The applicant must confirm with the water provider that Zone 7 can serve them. He noted there is capacity for these types of projects and the City has not seen anyone declined at this time.

Commissioner Nagler said the time spent on this proposal gave him pause and caused him to ask himself why he asked to be on the Planning Commission because this kind of project defines communities and he thinks there are tough choices. He realized there are two simple choices: (1) to approve the project because there is a terrific component to it, it is a unique combination, and is innovative; (2) there will be some people in the community who will not like the project and the City will have to listen to those people about having too many cars, water shortages, etc. and they will want the City to leave it as open space and say no to the project.

Either of these answers might create good sound bites and may give one satisfaction at the moment for taking action, but neither addresses what this project requires to be successful. He said he will vote in favor of this project tonight because as has been said many times, this is the best alternative for the use of this piece of land that is in a very unique position relative to the Downtown and also relative to the developer's need to do something innovative, to be able to build this many homes on this property. Therefore, it is better than all other choices the Commission has talked about in the community's interests.

Also, when he was on the Human Services Commission, they were first presented with the idea of Sunflower Hill and it has come to fruition only because there has been a group of dedicated people working on it. Also, while funding partnerships are limited he thinks Sunflower Hill will get funded and built. He believes the project is innovative and

a hallmark for people in Sacramento and Washington about how communities integrate people with special needs. The reason he will vote for the project is because he believes the conversation is not over about what the housing piece should look like because even though some suggested having a partnership with the developer the details of the project do not go to the wayside, given it is dense and details should be paid attention to.

He also believes there still is a conversation to be had about how to make maximum use out of the historic building. He thinks the Zia house is the right one to reconstruct, but the historical element of this project is more important than some are giving attention to. He believes that there is still work to be done to maximizing the use of the historic building. It could be replacing a couple of home sites so the view from Stanley is more prominent to the location or moving the house closer to Stanley on that side of the development, but he thinks this conversation should not end and that it will be taken into account.

Lastly, the configuration of the two- and three-story houses should be looked at, given that he fears on paper, the neighborhood may not look organic enough and stark in its shapes.

Chair Ritter said the Human Services Commission, Housing Commission, the PDA, Chamber of Commerce, Supervisor Miley, HCD, Pleasanton Unified School District all endorse this project. He believes they have gone through the analysis and have looked at the alternatives. He keeps going back to the fact that this project provides for less traffic, more taxes to support education, provides improvements to sewer and water systems, provides extension for Nevada Street, provides historical importance with the Zia house reconstruction and location, and most importantly, the project has a community benefit. He wished they could provide more acreage, but 19 families will be able to move in and make it their home. He thinks the location is great to keep Downtown's economic vitality strong.

Traffic will always be a balancing act and he did not think waiting will do anything but hurt the City and the project and he voiced his support, recognizing there will be some tweaks along the way.

Commissioner Allen said she was struggling with the project, is touched by the outreach today and said she has a brother-in-law and they bring him to Arizona to a special needs home when his mother is in the hospital or not available. She has a strong appreciation for what it means to the family to have a community like this.

At first, she was definitely going to vote "no" on the project because she came in thinking that the cost exceeded the benefits. She still is concerned about that and is not ready to vote "yes" quite yet. The struggle she is having is that she would like to see a better project that is more baked before putting a rubber stamp on it and say "yes" to it. She was disappointed that at the workshop, all Commissioners said the cost did not exceed the benefits based on what they saw. Mr. Beaudin wrapped up the workshop by saying they need a project which is significantly changed, and that was the last summary of the workshop.

Today, she is seeing a project technically that was not significantly changed. It is basically the same number of houses, plus or minus two and the same number of special needs units. She was hoping for a few less homes and homes that had a greater setback to Stanley so they really had a beautiful fronting to Stanley that extended to First Street that had more side setbacks and a feeling of more openness.

Commissioner Allen noted that Sunflower Hill needs to raise approximately \$10 million to fund this project, they only have about \$1 million today. She was also really hoping they would be able to get Sunflower Hill 30 to 40 units because she knows how hard Susan Houghton and her team have struggled for the last two years to try and find a partner. She has been on the finance side of non-profits as well as other corporations and knows how tough it is to break even with 19 units. Right now, she does not believe that the benefits exceed the risks because this project has no "iron clad" tie to Sunflower Hill and this was the one thing most important to her in saying she could approve the project tonight.

Commissioner Allen noted that if she treated this as a workshop she would love to come back in three months with what she hoped today would have been; a project that was a little more baked and showed more significant changes. She is willing to return in another three or four months and asked to see:

1. Some kind of project that has some kind of stronger guarantee and tie-in that Sunflower Hill will be that linkage. She does not want the risk that 93 single family homes will be built and that the City will end up with a standard non-profit, low cost housing complex because this is not what Irby Ranch LLC wants nor is it something the community wants. She likened it to the Bernal property when Township Square was built out, but there was a much stronger tie-in to the apartments and homes and financing, and she asked to see this with Sunflower Hill;
2. She would like to see Sunflower Hill get more than 19 units which helps them to have better financial strength to sustain themselves.
3. She would like to see the architecture baked a little bit more which includes discussions of the Commission and staff discussions. Her ideal vision is the front facing homes along Stanley should feel like a gateway from First Street through Stanley into Pleasanton, and these do not feel that way yet to her. Setbacks in front should be greater, landscaping built out more and to ensure that the three-story buildings are not seen from Stanley.

Commissioner Allen said if she could see these three things, she could support the project solely because of Sunflower Hill and she would like the developer to also be in the same capacity; that the reason they are here is because of Sunflower Hill.

Commissioner Nagler said on Commissioner Allen's desire that there be a tie-in between the building of the development and Sunflower Hill, what he was trying to get to earlier is that it is possible to time the buildout of the development through the Growth Management Plan to a timetable of getting Sunflower Hill built such that the last piece of development could not occur by virtue of the Growth Management Plan until it was clear that Sunflower Hill was being built.

Ms. Hagen said the Growth Management Plan is something that goes before the City Council and the Planning staff does not have a copy of what it would say at this point. However, the Commission could within its recommendation have some language that they take this into consideration when looking at the growth management agreement.

Commissioner Allen said this could be one thing, but her idea is not to have 93 single family homes built and no Sunflower Hill development. This is not a project she wants to approve.

Commissioner Brown said a couple of speakers mentioned the fact that there are 700 families on the wait list out of a population of 70,000. He thinks the staff report pointed out a number of sections in the General Plan such as Policy 9 in the Housing Element; Support the development of housing for persons with special needs; Promote the provision of affordable and special needs housing as far as the DSP; and they quoted a dozen different references. Therefore, he said the Planning Commission's role is to ensure the project moving forth is consistent with the General Plan and he knows this requires a General Plan Amendment to change land use.

In terms of the other overarching elements in the General Plan is one of land use. He said he agrees with staff's recommendation that it is in compliance with the purpose of the General Plan and also in compliance with the priority that Council has set as a work priority to find a home for Sunflower Hill and it is not like Sunflower Hill has not looked for other options.

The other part of a Commissioner's role in his opinion is to make sure they have the best use in zoning. Commissioner Brown said Chair Ritter pushed on this point in terms of the concern he has that if the rezoning is not approved and if they were to come back with other projects in the existing zoning, will the City have less of an opportunity. His first instinct would be to push it out and keep it undeveloped for now and avoid the traffic burden. However, another use will be encouraged that has no benefits.

From a community benefits perspective, the fact that the homes are maintained by the HOA, the Nevada Street being pushed through and he wanted staff to confirm if this was actually part of the approval tonight, traffic concerns and the impact on First Street and Bernal, and the likelihood of SR84 improvements.

He believes in Sunflower Hill's mission and in trying to represent all residents in Pleasanton traffic, schools and water impacts are seen. He was encouraged to hear that SR84 might alleviate 20 percent to 25 percent at some point in the future, that school numbers in the table are correct and there is no negative impact, and that water is covered. Regarding RHNA it is important to note that waiting until 2022 is wrong because the City should be in charge of its own land use. The community can elect to make an investment for a special need within the community which is also covered in the General Plan.

Regarding quantity and size, he has the same concerns in that he wished Sunflower Hill was 3 acres of this, but he also recognizes that the amount of buildable space becomes much smaller.

In terms of product, while this is not a development he would buy into, there should be a mix of products within the City and a mix of prices. He has been thinking about the development every day for the past few weeks and he flip flops around because he is trying to weigh the community benefits versus sticking 93 homes around what is an already congested street and down the road from 350 units in the process of being built. Therefore, he has hesitations around the timing and also around waiting because if they miss the opportunity they may not get it back.

In terms of preserving the houses, he thinks the Irby house is more structurally sound so the applicant's point could be that it is more easily moved. However, Commissioner Nagler's preference for the Zia property is okay with him as well.

In terms of confidence with Sunflower Hill delivering, he sees enough people in the room and movement and support externally with the various agencies, he thinks the City should be willing to take the risk associated with doing the allocations and letting Sunflower Hill go through the process of securing the financing.

Ms. Hagen stated Condition No. 49 has a requirement to construct Nevada Street extension including portions over and across the two adjacent parcels. The actual design of that has not been done and is not shown on the plans.

Commissioner O'Connor said he agrees with fellow Commissioner comments, but he was generally not supportive of a General Plan Amendment and rezoning for additional discretionary housing. He thinks they are running low on available space for highway service commercial. At the last workshop he was not as supportive as he is this evening. He thinks this type of development is going to use less water because it has no yards.

He thinks the water issues are much less concerning that he had originally thought. Regarding schools overcrowding, he was looking at General Plan numbers and not what PUSD was using so he was softened a bit on that.

From the workshop he was disappointed that the applicant only came down from 95 units to 93 units. He thinks they also discussed redesign of some of the lots so there were fewer three-story homes and this did not seem to happen, and they only added six more parking spaces. Therefore, he wished there was more progress made in those areas. He was not looking for more open space, but like Commissioner Allen, if they had fewer units they could enlarge the acreage for Sunflower Hill. It seems so small even when adding in what is being built in Livermore. While it is a start to address special needs housing, he likened it to a "drop in the bucket" and wished they could get more units for Sunflower Hill.

Therefore, Commissioner O'Connor said because he thinks waiting until 2022 is not the right answer and the alternatives are that the City will end up with more traffic on the road than they would if they did not build this project and he is in support of the project because of Sunflower Hill.

He would support the project but would like others besides Commissioner Allen to consider having it return with a redraft if the meeting is continued to see if even a couple

of units could be added to make Sunflower Hill larger. However, if the Commission was not prepared to continue it, he would be prepared to support it.

Chair Ritter asked if a motion could be made that suggests it go to the City Council with the recommendation from the Planning Commission to add these options so they do not have to continue it and to keep it moving.

Mr. Beaudin said this is an option for the Commission and it is what staff had in mind when they developed the conditions of approval. He thinks the Commission could make clear that its expectation is that the City Council see that redesign and be very clear about getting consensus around whether there be fewer units, fewer three-story buildings or homes in the development, and he wants to know if there is support from the Commission before moving to the City Council. His concern is that by going in and sitting down with the developers if there is any lack of clarity, direction should be sorted out before getting to the Council.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that in the workshop they talked about fewer units, fewer two- and three-story units, and personally he would rather leave the three-story units in if they can remove some of the units. If doing both he thinks they will lose too many units for the developer. At 93 units, with the land of about 11 ½ acres, they are at a higher density than normally approved, but he does not want to cut the project in half but make it reasonable for the developer as well. He was hoping to have three or four units to carve out in some strategic areas, they could expand the land available for somebody else.

Commissioner Brown said he thinks Mr. Beaudin is looking for more prescriptive items such as moving Lots 42, 43, etc.

Mr. Beaudin said he will not ask the Commission to design from the dais which is difficult. He wants to make sure there is consensus for fewer units, reducing the number of 3 story units, but if there is no consensus from the group, it is harder for him to have those subsequent discussions.

Chair Ritter said he thinks there is general consensus to have more than 19 units for Sunflower Hill.

Commissioner Nagler said obviously what Sunflower Hill wants is germane, but to be realistic, to get enough more space for there to be a larger footprint for a building for Sunflower, he thinks they must be realistic in the number of homes they would be asking the applicant to give up.

Mr. Beaudin said he thinks the difficulty is that there is a Housing Commission in the City and they have negotiated an affordable housing agreement which is in draft form and will be referred to the City Council. Sunflower Hill and the developer have forwarded their proposals to the Housing Commission and that number is the 1.35 acres with the \$1 million. Therefore, he is not suggesting the Commission cannot change the land plan, but he asked to keep in mind that this is a conversation that has occurred with hearings and this is the Housing Commission's recommendation at this time.

Commissioner Allen said she would prefer to have less units. She can live with three-story units so long as they are not visible from Stanley. She would like this to be a medium density project and not a high density project, and closer to reflect what is across the street in Reflections.

Chair Ritter said if they had less units, the price would go up. Commissioner Allen said a home for \$800,000 is for a family that is making \$200,000 each per year.

Mr. Beaudin suggested taking the conditions of approval as they have been written and staff will make sure they make changes and that they receive a straw vote on it. By the time the Council sees this project, and it has incorporated the intent of the Commission this evening, he thinks it comes down to:

- Density;
- There seems to be at least three Commissioners who wanted to see fewer units within the development and that number does not necessarily have to be big, but the idea is to create additional open space for the future neighborhood;
- There is a concern about three-story homes potentially looking out of place in the configuration they have been shown, so there is a need to either move around the number of three-story homes or create fewer three-story homes to ensure they are not visible from Stanley and so the green spaces and the block faces appear more like the perimeter of the project with two-story homes.

Commissioner Nagler suggested that this might be the wrong way to ask the question. Perhaps the way to ask the Commission the question is what goals they have to change the project from what is currently before them. He questioned whether there was a goal to create more space for Sunflower Hill, recognizing this could involve a good number of home sites.

Commissioner O'Connor suggested eliminating 4 three-story units across the front.

City Attorney Julie Harryman said it was 11:09 p.m. and procedurally, per the Commissioner's Handbook, before 11:00 p.m. the Commission is supposed to decide what it will do this evening by a vote and not go past 11:30 p.m.. It does not appear that the Commission will get to another item on the agenda. Commissioners voted to continue P16-1201, PUD-120, Tract 8326, Catalyst Development Partners to its August 24th meeting and agreed to continue discussing the Irby Ranch item.

Commissioner O'Connor stated he thinks there should be more creation of space even though there is a proposal by the Housing Commission.

Commissioner Brown said he was on the same page as Commissioner O'Connor and one can either say the goal is to get to a certain lot size for Sunflower Hill or they could say the goal is to get a certain number of market value units. His recommendation would be to get to either a certain number of minimum units or a certain size for the Sunflower Hills property. He thinks the 4 units across the front could be changed.

Mr. Beaudin said the Planning Commission has the ability to look at the land plan and make recommendations to the City Council. The housing agreement that went to the Housing Commission includes the 1.35 acres and the \$1 million contribution for the affordable housing project. This is what the applicant and Sunflower Hill representatives have agreed to up to this point. If the Commission wants to go further, it can.

Chair Ritter said if Lots 42, 43, 54 and 55 were deleted, this would make the Sunflower Hill lot larger.

Commissioner Nagler noted there must be a walkway and other improvements. In creating more space, he is against the idea of changing the layout of the plan to create more Sunflower Hill space because Sunflower Hills is not asking for it. The applicant is not asking for it, and while a great idea, it is theoretical based on what the Commission thinks as opposed to what the parties of interest think.

Chair Ritter concurred.

Mr. Beaudin said in returning with some broader principles for the private development and rather than being as specific as reducing units, staff will try and increase the amount of connectivity in the development to keep it at a high level and work with the developer on massing, scale and height, and hopefully by keeping the principles at that level gives some direction. He thinks the design could be resolved before the City Council hears it rather than leaving it as a condition of approval on the project.

Commissioner Nagler asked that the historical structure also be added to the list.

Commissioner Brown said his only issue with staff's proposal is that his goal is not to want more open space but to add more units to Sunflower Hills.

Mr. Beaudin asked for clarification from the Commission as to whether they want to add units to Sunflower Hill through increase of land or add units to Sunflower Hills, which is a separate PUD application with the 1.35 acres.

Commissioner Brown recognized this challenge, but his point is that if staff wants the Commission to approve the 93 units, he would like a greater commitment that he will see more than 19 units in Sunflower Hills, and he said he could not design from the dais.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if there was a reason why the City limited Sunflower Hills to a two-story building, and Mr. Beaudin said no, there is not a reason.

Ms. Hagen noted that the two-story building was part of their original proposal, but there is no limitation on heights right now. Mr. Beaudin said he thinks it is more of an operational issue. It is a type of development and he thinks two stories operationally makes more sense, and this came across at the workshop.

Chair Ritter allowed Ms. Houghton and Mr. Serpa to address comments.

Ms. Houghton said Sunflower Hills would not want a three-story operation. Some children have physical issues and two stories maximize this space. There is also a direct correlation with the size of the acreage and the number of people they can house on that site. It is not about taking 1.35 acres and putting 30 people on them which cannot be done.

She said their Board has already voted to not increase the density past 22 per acre. She reminded people that there are 20 people buying the homes and who will be coming over and using their site. With autism, more space is needed.

Mr. Serpa stated when doing the math, when including the homes around the site, there are far more than 19 homes. They have a chance of developing this in a way where it is not done anywhere else. All of the internal agreements that have been negotiated have been an exhaustive process for them and for them to adjust the land plan at this point opens up many issues.

Mr. Beaudin said the decision is up to the Planning Commission and he restated that staff simply wants to hear consensus on items and to further refine the condition which states “to work with staff prior to the City Council meeting on architecture.”

Commissioner Nagler moved to make the CEQA and PUD findings as listed in the staff report and to adopt resolutions and forward the applications to the City Council for PUD-110, P15-0245, P15-0246, P15-0405, and Vesting Tentative Map 8245, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Chair Ritter seconded the motion.

Commissioner Brown suggested an amendment to reduce the number of units in the Irby Ranch development and associated infrastructure which would result in more acreage for Sunflower Hill.

Commissioner Nagler did not support the amendment and he suggested calling for the vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioner Nagler, Chair Ritter
NOES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, O’Connor
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: Commissioner Balch
ABSENT: None

Commissioner Nagler stated he will make the same motion but with the additional condition that consideration be given to increase the allocation of land to the affordable housing special needs project.

Commissioner Nagler moved to make the CEQA and PUD findings as listed in the staff report and to adopt resolutions and forward the applications to the City

Council for PUD-110, P15-0245, P15-0246, P15-0405, and Vesting Tentative Map 8245, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report, with the direction to revise project per Planning Commission recommendations, prior to the City Council consideration of project. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, Nagler, O'Connor, and Chair Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: Commissioner Balch
ABSENT: None

Resolutions Nos. PC-2016-24 recommending approval of Cases P15-0245 (General Plan Amendment), P15-0405 (Specific Plan Amendment), and P15-0246 (Rezoning); and PC-2016-25 recommending approval of Case PUD-110 (PUD Development Plan); and PC-2016-26 recommending approval of Vesting Tentative Map 8245, were entered and adopted as motioned.