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

DRAFT

Wednesday, October 26, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of October 26, 2016, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Ritter.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Allen.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; and Kendall Rose, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, Justin Brown, David Nagler (arrived at 7:12 p.m.) Greg O'Connor, and Chair Ritter

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. August 31, 2016

Commissioner Balch requested the following changes:

- In the first sentence of Page 16 remove Commissioner Brown, he did not agree at that time.
- Fix the typo on Page 20 as follows: "...you have to deal with it at every ~~life~~ light cycle with Ken Mercer's sports park..."
- Modify the fourth sentence of the fourth paragraph on Page 21 to read: "I will say just like that, ~~we~~ the Council just stopped building two tennis parks..."

Commissioner Allen requested the following changes:

- Modify the second paragraph under Item 6.a. on Page 3 to read as follows: "...we have a General Plan that ~~are~~ is inconsistent with zoning and so I'm trying to understand the ~~potential issues in this one layer over another~~ implications."
- Modify the second sentence of the second paragraph on Page 20 to read "I may be the only person here involved during the Housing Element Task Force."

Commissioner Brown requested the following changes:

- Add the word "only" to the third sentence from the bottom of the first paragraph on Page 19, so it reads as follows: "...at this point when we only have 60 acres.."

Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Minutes of the August 31, 2016 Meeting, as amended.

Commissioner Balch seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Brown, and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: Commissioner O'Connor

ABSENT: Commissioner Nagler

The Minutes of the August 31, 2016 Meeting were approved, as amended.

b. September 14, 2016

Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve the Minutes of the September 14, 2016 Meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Allen, Balch, Brown, O'Connor and Ritter

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Nagler

The Minutes of the September 14, 2016 Meeting were approved, as submitted.

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

Adam Weinstein informed the Commission that the applicant for Item 5.b., Vesting Tentative Map 8352, GHC Lund Ranch, LLC, as requested the item be continued to the November 9, 2016 meeting.

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. P16-1383, St. Innocent Church

Application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a religious facility within an existing building located at 1047 Serpentine Lane, Suite 300. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

b. Vesting Tentative Map Tract 8352, GHC Lund Ranch, LLC

Application for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map to subdivide an approximately 194.7-acre property at 1500 Lund Ranch Road into 46 lots for 43 single-family homes (approved under PUD-25) and three lots to be dedicated to the City of Pleasanton for permanent open space. Zoning for the property is PUD-LDR/RDR/OS-PHS/WO (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential/Rural Density Residential/Open Space – Public Health & Safety/Wildland Overlay) District.

Commissioner Balch recused from Item 5.a., P16-1383, St. Innocent Church, due to a due process conflict of interest.

Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve Case P16-1383, 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, Brown, O'Connor and Ritter
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: Commissioner Balch
ABSENT: Commissioner Nagler

Resolution No. PC-2016-32 approving Case P16-1383 was entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

There were no public hearing items on the agenda.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Brown: The photo on the left is a photo I took about a week and one half ago when I ordered on the Starbucks app from the wrong Starbucks and had to go to this one, and I just made a note that the EV parking; the charging station is at the back. It's in the middle of a triangular island. I didn't actually pull the charging cable off but I find it difficult to believe that the charging cable would reach an EV car parked in the stall to the right and the charging jack on the left you would have to have a disabled placard to be charging on the left. And so I just felt that was a poor design. I don't know if it was intentional but the photo on the right I actually took today outside my office, so that's my office in the background there over in Santa Clara. They just actually redid the EV charging and you can see that they clearly marked it for EV parking. It's a universal symbol there and the charging outlet is centered on the line between the two parking spaces and easily accessible on both.

The only reason I bring this up is, I have an EV car but don't use public charging that much, but from a best practices perspective as we approve additional projects that may include EV power I just thought it might be a thing to look out for and I don't know if staff has any comment on that particular one or not.

Commissioner O'Connor: Just out of curiosity, the one on the left—do they have any stepping stones?

Commissioner Brown: I did not see any stepping stones and I don't see any in the picture.

Commissioner O'Connor: I was just surprised to see that the charging station is in the middle of a planter.

Commissioner Brown: Exactly, it is a triangular planter. The photo doesn't do it justice but it is actually closer to the handicapped spot than it is to the non-handicapped spot and as you can see the spot immediately to the right of the planter is not reserved for EV parking so essentially if I wanted to charge my car there, I'd have to wait for that non-EV car to leave and hope that the cable could reach. On my car the charging jack is on the driver's side rear and so there's no way that would reach on my particular car unless I flipped the car around. Just a best practices design suggestion.

Chair Ritter: Good point noted. One suggestion is to use the mobile citizen app. That actually logs it in to staff as a concern, and this would be a good example of when to use that app.

Commissioner Brown: The reason I brought it up here was just if we were approving designs.

Chair Ritter: I agree.

Commissioner Brown: I've actually used the mobile citizens app about five times.

Commissioner Balch: I would just comment that I don't agree with using a mobile citizen app to report to the city that a private property owner has made a mistake on their private property with where they put an EV charging station. Would you like the city to come out and tell them?

Chair Ritter: Is this a private property?

Commissioner O'Connor: We would have approved this.

Commissioner Brown: We would have approved the plans.

Noted Present: Commissioner Nagler was noted present at 7:12 p.m.

Commissioner Nagler: When we're looking at plans like at Lund Ranch, are we looking at where they're going to put a public charging station?

Commissioner O'Connor: We don't, but whoever looks at the...

Commissioner Brown: I don't know if staff wanted to comment.

Beaudin: So it's not an agenda item so I'm not going to go very far here at all tonight. I will say I'm happy to talk with any of you at any given time about EV charging stations. We do look at these when we approve projects. In this particular instance, I was able to talk with the person who was the Community Development Director at the time and this was early in the EV charging game for the City of Pleasanton in general. There just weren't that many cars when we were approving this project and not as many as now and so what ended up happening here is we didn't want to forego the regular vehicle parking at that point in time as part of the approval process. It was put there. It was part of the applicant's program. It wasn't required by the City and the expectation was that this would be a station used for staff and not necessarily for the general public. Obviously, it's there and people will want to use it and it could be designed better and we would do it differently if we were looking at it today. So we do look at this. We are also doing a zoning code update and so when we're looking at our parking standards and requirements, we'll get into EV charging in more detail just like we'll get into bicycle parking requirements in more detail. That's probably as far as I'll go here tonight, but that's kind of a project specific and maybe higher level look at EV charging.

Chair Ritter: Thank you. Any other matters?

Commissioner Allen: For staff, I was just reading the latest Independent which had an article about ABAG housing projections for Tri-Valley cities that said that through 2040 Pleasanton would add 9,900 units and it had numbers for Dublin, Livermore, and I guess the other cities are having their forecasts verified and then it goes to their City Council for ratification. What I'm wondering, one, is the number right, and number two is what is our process if any for validating or taking this number further?

Commissioner O'Connor: Isn't this early for ABAG?

Beaudin: It's not. They're doing an update to Plan Bay Area. We've been corresponding with them for several months now. We've put letters in from staff questioning methodologies and some of the assumptions they've been using and on November 15th we'll have a letter from the Mayor that does the same on behalf of the City of Pleasanton for the City Council's consideration. We're following it closely, and we're not in agreement. We haven't gotten a lot of responsiveness from our partners at ABAG and MTC at this point in time so it will be discussed. It will be on the City Council agenda in some form on November 15th.

Commissioner Allen: Thank you, and just one follow-up question, if in fact these are the numbers over time, I'm assuming this would be fed into our RHNA numbers in some way or how is it related?

Beaudin: So Plan Bay Area is a regional planning program. ABAG is a regional planning effort, but ABAG and our RHNA numbers translate into the City's need to rezone for a certain number and type of units so the Plan Bay Area projections are a 30 year planning effort and RHNA is an 8 year planning cycle where we actually look at ways to make sure the City can accommodate the numbers. They're not directly related but they do inform one another.

Commissioner Allen: Thank you.

Chair Ritter: Okay, great, any other matters? All right.

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

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

No discussion was held or action taken.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Adam Weinstein informed the Commission that Vesting Tentative Map Tract 8352, GHC Lund Ranch, LLC will be on the November 9, 2016 agenda and the Valley Trails residential project and Zoning Code Update will be on the December 14, 2016 agenda.

Chair Ritter: Okay, the zoning code update—you're doing outreach right now?

Weinstein: Yes, we've received some really great feedback from the Economic Vitality Committee and individuals in the community; the PDA, Chamber of Commerce, and we want to hold one more meeting to circle back to those folks just to let them know how we incorporated their edits before bringing the proposed code update to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner O'Connor: So the two items you said are on the December calendar will be Valley Trails and...?

Weinstein: Yes, the Valley Trails residential project and the zoning code update.

c. Actions of the City Council

Commissioner Nagler: May I go back and ask a question on the Council item? I'm sorry. Is Irby Ranch coming up to the Council this calendar year?

Weinstein: It's not going to happen this year. As you all know, Sunflower Hill dropped out of the agreement with the developer so right now the developer is trying to find a new partner that would allow them to proceed with the Irby Ranch project and it's likely that that process is going to take a bit of time and it's possible that could trigger modifications to the design that you saw already. So we really don't expect that to come back this year.

Beaudin: Can I maybe add to that just a little bit? Do you have more?

Commissioner Nagler: I have questions about that, but go ahead.

Beaudin: So Adam characterized it as Sunflower Hill dropping out and I just want to make sure it's clarified for the record. It's true but it's a little more complicated. Obviously, when they were here we started talking about considering additional property. I don't want to talk too much about it because I actually do think it's something that could potentially come back. I don't know if it will be with Sunflower Hill or with someone else, but I think there is an interest in keeping that project alive on the part of the developer and ultimately Sunflower Hill did come down with a 2 acre request and that was just too much for the developer to be able to accommodate. So that's the situation we're in right now. The developer has asked us to pause the application and we'll do that for a reasonable amount of time then they're going to have to decide if they're going to go forward or withdraw their application.

Commissioner Nagler: So if I could just ask a quick follow-up? I believe this would be so, but let me just confirm. If the application changes in any substantive way; substantive being defined by a new partner, a change in configuration in the plan of any meaningful sort, that would come back to the Commission, right?

Beaudin: Yes, you all would see it again and really, you know, unless they were able to come back with the program that the Planning Commission already recommended to the City Council; if there was an agreement on an amount of land and they were able to meet the other criteria, I think that would be the only way that you wouldn't see it again. If it's a different partner, a different configuration, or the project differs even moderately, we'll bring it back through this process.

Commissioner Nagler: Thank you.

Commissioner Balch: And to that end, does the process include the workshop again and the full process?

Beaudin: It really depends on the scale of changes that are being discussed.

Commissioner Balch: Fair enough.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

e. Matters for Commission's Information

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ritter adjourned the meeting at 7:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein
Secretary