

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, August 9, 2017

(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of August 9, 2017, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Balch.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Balch.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Dan Sodergren, City Attorney; Jennifer Hagen, Associate Planner; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; Natalie Amos, Associate Planner; and Kendall Granucci, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, David Nagler (arrived at 7:10 p.m.), Herb Ritter, and Chair Jack Balch

Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Justin Brown and Greg O'Connor

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. June 28, 2017

Commissioner Nagler moved to approve the Minutes of the June 14, 2017 meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the June 28, 2017 meeting were approved, as submitted.

b. July 12, 2017

Chair Balch clarified the fifth paragraph on Page 7 to appropriately reflect his “dissenting opinion” was not in reference to the previous comment but rather to the number of bedrooms and there could be rooms for other uses. He also requested the action on page 8 of 9, continuing Case P17-0372, be amended to reflect the three items the Commission directed to staff to address: (1) review massing; (2) the front façade, specifically the front window in the lower corner and side window; and (3) the number of bedrooms.

Commissioner Ritter moved to approve the Minutes of the July 12, 2017 meeting as amended.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the July 12, 2017 meeting were approved, as amended.

3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

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

4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

There were no revisions to the agenda.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted 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.

a. P17-0496, Crosspoint Church

Application for a modification to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an existing church located at 5627 Gibraltar Drive, Suite 100, to add an after-school program that includes tutoring, sports/games, and other activities, for students in grades K-5, with a maximum of 100 students on-site at any given time. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial and Offices) District.

Commissioner Nagler moved to approve Case P17-0496, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the Staff Report. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution PC-2017-18 approving Case P17-0496 was entered and approved as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

a. PUD-123, Mathew Zaheri

Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) development plan to construct a 201-stall parking lot for vehicle display/inventory to be shared by Stoneridge Chrysler-Jeep-Dodge-Ram and a future dealership located at 2694 Stoneridge Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-C (Planned Unit Development - Commercial) District.

Jennifer Hagen presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Ritter referred to dealership #2 and asked about drainage and whether the reconfiguration would just be striping changes.

Ms. Hagen replied yes; the bioswales will be designed per drainage and engineering requirements.

Commissioner Allen referred to trees and whether staff could support the streetscape plan based on comments the Commission made at the work session.

Ms. Hagen replied she and Landscape Architect, Matt Gruber visited the site and believes the landscaping is appropriate and adequate for the current dealership.

Commissioner Allen asked if the irrigation system and maintenance plan were adequate in staff's opinion.

Ms. Hagen replied yes, the applicant has changed landscape companies and is working to ensure the landscaping works.

Chair Balch asked and confirmed that the applicant was using recycled water.

Chair Balch noted the bioswale is State-mandated and he confirmed with Ms. Hagen that landscaping must be maintained in perpetuity.

Chair Balch referred to the Pleasanton Municipal Code (PMC) relating to parking and asked about proportions of compact spots (40%) in a parking lot.

Ms. Hagen explained that PUDs are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and, in this case, staff looked at this lot as a private vehicle display inventory and not a public parking lot. Staff is comfortable allowing the greater amount of compact spaces in this particular case.

Chair Balch questioned the requirements in parking lots for fingers with landscaping.

Mr. Weinstein replied that staff reviews planting and landscaping, there are no numerical requirements per the PMC and not in dealerships.

Chair Balch stated that with dealership #2 unknown the Commission does not know the size of the vehicles or customers and noted 8'x6' parking spaces were very small. Staff has clarified. He asked staff about visitor stalls and those at the existing dealership do not seem to be used for non-display vehicles, and he questioned whether this is under the current PUD.

Ms. Hagen confirmed that this is a zoning enforcement for visitor stalls.

Chair Balch disclosed that he visited the site and Commissioners had no other disclosures.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

The applicant waived his time to speak regarding the request.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

Chair Balch discussed concerns of how the lot does not comply with PMC and would likely not be approved at any other site in the City.

Staff clarified that the lot is private and, regardless of striping, the owner can park it how he wants.

Chair Balch voiced concern that the north sidewalk needs walkways that traverse the bioswales north/south to connect the current dealership with the lot and that queuing backs up on the public street, especially car carriers.

Commissioner Nagler thanked the applicant for taking the work session comments into consideration. He was supportive of the size of stalls notwithstanding Chair Balch's comments, knowing this is a private lot and the applicant will take care of the cars. He agreed with Chair Balch's comments regarding foot traffic across the bioswales and asked that this change be made prior to final construction, and otherwise he was in support.

Commissioner Allen echoed Commissioner Nagler's comments and voiced support of the project based on comments brought up.

Commissioner Ritter and he asked for clarification regarding the bioswale walkway.

Chair Balch pointed to the locations. Ms. Hagen pointed out two possible locations and Chair Balch suggested leaving this to staff to work out with applicant, and Commissioner Ritter agreed.

Commissioner Allen requested a condition be added for the applicant to submit an irrigation audit within one year.

Commissioner Ritter moved to recommend approval of Case PUD-123 to City Council, per staff's recommendation with the amendment to add a walkway across the north bioswale at the approval of the Director of Community Development and an audit of irrigation system within one year.

Commissioner Nagler seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution PC-2017-19 recommending approval of Case PUD-123 was entered and adopted as motioned.

~~b. Consider an amendment to the Pleasanton Municipal Code to amend Chapter 18.110 (Personal Wireless Service Facilities) to allow for small cell wireless systems in the Hacienda Business Park where the systems are concealed.~~

This item was continued to the August 23, 2017 meeting.

c. P17-0356 & PUD-124, Dale Morris

Work Session to review and receive comments on applications for a 0.59-acre site located at 4664, 4676, and 4682 Augustine Street: (1) rezoning three properties from RM-4,000 (Multi-Family Residential) to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential); and (2) a PUD Development Plan to: (a) retain and expand three existing homes; and (b) construct three, two-story single-family homes on the eastern portion of

the project site, and associated site improvements. Zoning for the property is RM-4,000 (Multi-Family Residential) within the Core Overlay District.

Natalie Amos presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Ritter referred to overhead electrical lines and asked whether there were any plans to underground them.

Ms. Amos stated there were no plans but it could come out of the Downtown Specific Plan Update.

Commissioner Ritter referred to RM-4,000 zoning and asked for the maximum number of units per the Municipal Code.

Ms. Amos replied that it depends on size, layout and parking, but it could potentially be bigger than what is being proposed.

Commissioner Allen referred to parking lots 2 and 3, and these are legal non-conforming lots. She asked if someone were to expand their home would the Commission have the right to require additional parking.

Ms. Amos replied this is something the Commission could consider but if they are not making any changes it is part of a proposed development application.

Commissioner Allen referred to Heritage tree questions, specifically the location of the walnut tree mentioned in the comment letter.

Staff and Commissioners discussed and clarified the locations and condition of walnut trees.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

Dale Morris, Applicant, commented on the “cons” of the project as listed in the Staff Report, and responded that a new development would be added to an established neighborhood and said Pleasanton is in dire need of housing. He said there will be no added parking on Augustine Street as there is adequate parking on site and two spaces will be added to the street. Regarding the two trees on the Angela street side, he said they will not be disturbed, and additional measures will be taken to save those trees. Regarding the sizes of the houses, Mr. Morris noted that the homes just constructed across the street are larger at 1,900 to 2,300 square feet and are affordable in comparison to today’s market averages, and he said the trees provide view coverage from cars driving down the street.

Mary Jo Cotter, neighbor, noted her concerns are addressed in her comment letter and displayed a picture showing what will be a two-story home looking in her and other neighbors’ living spaces.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

Commissioner Ritter offered his general opinion of the project and said he would like to be able to see some greenery. He thinks the design fits with the neighborhood, but voiced concerns with density and massing, noting parking for the development down the street on Augustine was underneath and this project has two car garages except for six units.

Commissioner Nagler supports and believes the Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force (DSPTF) will encourage this kind of infill development on large lots as it is an effective way to maintain the integrity of downtown and also provides for varying and additional housing for the City. He also recognized that the City has made several similar decisions on this street with infill projects; however, the structures previously approved were too large for Augustine Street and in his opinion, a mistake. Additionally, while these decisions have been made, each application should be reviewed individually. He supported the community benefits from the architectural enhancements being made to the three existing homes, and he would like to see additional enhancements to Lots 2 and 3.

Chair Balch supported Commissioner Nagler's statements in reference to discussion point C, and Commissioner Allen agreed.

Commissioner Nagler asked the applicant to instead propose what staff refers to as cottages. To have something constructed that is not high density multi-family housing is appropriate; however, there is a stopping point in between that the Commission needs to see in the final application.

Commissioner Allen said her comments are very much in line with Commissioner Nagler's comments. Usually she sticks to straight zoning but this could be a model for other lots that have not come forward yet. She too did not like the mass nor materials of the referenced project previously approved in 2008 and did not want that repeated. She suggested creating a model of what the Commission wants other infill sites to look like. Regarding the three back houses, she pointed out, these are more along the lines of Options C which is a cottage style, single-story or 1.5 story home with a loft. Commissioner Allen recognized there is an opportunity to set a model here that the DSPTF can endorse. For the front three homes she agrees with Commissioner Nagler because the City is offering an opportunity for flexibility with a PUD and not sticking to strict zoning and there is an opportunity to improve the front homes which would benefit the community.

Chair Balch agreed with prior comments and is not beholden to any prior decisions made by Commission. He said he was not sold on the proposed plans, visited the street and became less supportive of the plans. Chair Balch added how improving the front homes so the back homes fit in the neighborhood needs to be a requirement. He was also not opposed to limiting the rear homes to single-story and asked for better balance such as at the corner of St. Mary's and the house right behind it where the front façade was greatly improved for the street.

Commissioner Ritter agreed with many of the comments. In going back to 4547 Augustine the three apartment units and two buildings, there were other issues and it was not a blank lot. He agrees the Commission has an opportunity now which

could house a family's elderly parents with the children living in front. He was supportive of possibly having two stories because it provides more open ground space and landscaping. Commissioner Ritter recognized while the Commission may not support it now; it was a great outcome from what the Commission was presented with.

Chair Balch said he was not opposed to a second story in this area because of where the downtown is heading.

Commissioner Allen said she was open to seeing different designs. She thinks the square footage is too much and it needs to be narrower, more cottage-like, and has a prejudice against second stories but could be open to a second story with great design and streetscape.

Chair Balch mentioned that one other thing he would require is four-sided architecture which was learned at the Planning Commission conference.

Commissioner Nagler said he was open to suggestions and proposals but he strongly starts with a prejudice to a second story unless the applicant wants to put money in the front units to balance out the six structures.

Commissioner Ritter asked staff if the apartments/condos behind are one or two stories.

Ms. Amos pointed out on the map which were one story units and which were two story units.

Discussion ensued by Commissioners Allen and Balch regarding high density multi-family housing versus one story cottage-like design.

Chair Balch summarized for the staff and applicant that the Commission has two Commissioners open to two stories with a good design and two Commissioners that start with a prejudice against two stories but could be persuaded with good architecture. The Commission asked that tree #24 at the rear of Lot 6 be saved and that the design be adjusted to save it, as well as the tree between 1 and 6 which is also Heritage size. He asked to add trees to replace those trees being removed in a greater ratio than a one to one ratio.

All Commissioners voiced support of tree comments.

Chair Balch asked that the plans submitted for the next phase be of higher quality, asked that the front 3 lots (lots 1, 2 and 3) be improved including Parcel 1's proposed updates, and for the applicant to address tandem parking which is not allowed without a high threshold.

Commissioner Allen came in thinking more parking was needed on the front three homes and she provided pictures and an example of the neighboring property. She said the street was nearly 85% to 90% parked and neighbors have commented that the street is almost always nearly full over the last year. Commissioner Allen then described the use of garage on the front house, parking and storage on the side of the house, trash cans outside of the garage and how all of that would be worsened by additional

houses on the lot. She came in believing there needed to be two dedicated parking spaces if the additions are going in and suggested a determination be made as to whether this meets City zoning at a minimum, as well as something for garbage cans.

Chair Balch summarized that this is encouraging conformance to zoning by design and questioned cottage design.

Commissioner Allen said reducing the size of the rear homes will allow an opportunity for additional parking for the front homes or for two dedicated spots for each of the front homes.

Chair Balch summarized Commission comments thus far as the need for something in the middle of low to high density, that parking in the rear is okay but the front is not in light of additional density and wants both occupants to be able to park two cars and Lots 1, 2 and 3 are the challenge, the architecture is too difficult to determine by the plans submitted. Regarding whether the homes' architecture and proposed façade improvements acceptable, Chair Balch said the rears appear to be Craftsman style, but the fronts would not meet that requirement.

Commissioner Nagler agreed. He thinks improvements for Lot 1 are what the Commission would look for like a front porch, variety of finishes, depth to the façade; that the garage is moved to the back and if detailed out could be adequate as conceptualized. For Lots 2 and 3 something needs to be similar.

Commissioners Allen, Ritter and Balch all agreed. All four sides need to look good and meet privacy concerns of neighbors.

Chair Balch made comments on how the plans submitted today are too far from final to make any decisions as far as the color/material boards, photo simulations, landscape simulations, etc.

All Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Allen asked that the houses across the street are not used as a model for materials but rather the Ponderosa project at Valley Trails and/or the Mike Carey project be used for reference. She asked that story poles be erected if the proposal is two stories but not for one story homes.

Chair Balch agreed that story poles would help inform the neighborhood of a second story or 1.5 story concept coming for review.

Commissioner Ritter said he was less in support of story poles and more in support of neighborhood outreach.

Mr. Weinstein clarified that the Code requires story poles for two story developments in Downtown.

Chair Balch voiced concerns with Floor Area Ratio (FAR) variances. Commissioner Allen agreed.

Commissioner Nagler clarified that each unit does not need to conform but that it is a factor and that it be a consideration. Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Allen said it will be challenging to vote on this at the next meeting because of the options that could be presented. She requested a second workshop to fine-tune the project.

Chair Balch said he did not think the project required a second workshop but he could see the possibility of the project being continued.

Commissioner Ritter agreed.

Commissioner Allen asked for a neighborhood meeting in lieu of a workshop.

Commissioner Ritter suggested the developer talk to the neighbors to provide feedback.

Chair Balch summarized that the Commission has requested additional community outreach.

Commissioner Nagler agreed that a second workshop may not be necessary but said he could see the project being continued if the Commission is unable to come to an agreement.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No items were discussed or actions taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION

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

Commissioner Nagler reported out on the Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force meeting.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Mr. Weinstein reported out on the upcoming agenda items.

c. Actions of the City Council

No items were discussed or actions taken.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No items were discussed or actions taken.

e. Matters for Commission's Information

Mr. Weinstein announced there will be a special Council Meeting on August 29 at 6:30 p.m. regarding the Johnson Drive Economic Development Zone.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Balch adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kendall Granucci
Recording Secretary