



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

**DRAFT**

**Wednesday, August 24, 2016**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of August 24, 2016, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Commissioner Balch.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Balch.

### **1. ROLL CALL**

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Pamela Ott, Director of Economic Development; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; Jay Lee, Associate Planner; and Kendall Rose, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Jack Balch, Justin Brown, David Nagler, Greg O'Connor (arrived at 6:53 p.m.), and Chair Ritter (arrived at 6:47 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Nancy Allen

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes for consideration.

### **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. P16-1115, Yani Rong, Red Dragonfly Tutoring**

Application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a Heritage School for Red Dragonfly Tutoring within an existing building located at 6640-6642 Owens Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/ Commercial - Offices) District.

##### **b. P15-0740, Praveen Gupta**

Application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a jewelry warehouse with incidental gold smelting at 5627 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 323. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial - Offices) District.

**Commissioner Nagler moved to make the CUP findings as listed in the respective staff reports and to adopt resolutions approving Cases P16-1115 and P15-0740, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff reports. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.**

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

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

Resolution PC-2016-25 approving Case P16-1115 and Resolution PC-2016-26 approving Case P15-0740 were entered and adopted as motioned.

#### **6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS**

Continued from August 10, 2016:

##### **a. P16-1201, PUD-120, Tract 8326, Catalyst Development Partners**

Applications for: (1) Rezoning of three parcels totaling approximately 31,798 square feet at 536 and 550 St. John Street and an adjacent vacant parcel from RM-1,500 (Multi-Family Residential) to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District; (2) PUD Development Plan

approval to retain and relocate the existing single-family residence on-site and construct 10 two-story townhomes and related site improvements; and (3) Vesting Tentative Map approval to subdivide the three parcels into 11 residential parcels. Zoning for the properties is RM-1,500 (Multi Family Residential) which is within the Core Area Overlay District.

Steve Otto presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Noted Present:

Chair Ritter was noted present at 6:47 p.m. and Commissioner O'Connor was noted present at 6:53 p.m.

Commissioner Nagler: On the setbacks, if we were to desire greater setbacks on St. John Street, what would be the potential impacts of creating extra space on the street?

Otto: Assuming all things remain the same as far as sizes and shapes of the units, if you wanted to increase setbacks here you would have to shift everything south so you would be shortening the setbacks in the rear. One thing I didn't mention in the presentation, this street has a separated sidewalk so there is a five-foot sidewalk then eight feet before the front curb, so that helps reduce the perceived setback of the units as well.

Beaudin: There is the possibility of changing the unit dimensions as well, if you're looking at all the scenarios.

Commissioner Nagler: Just one more question on this. In your work with the applicant, I imagine you spent time discussing the setbacks, right, around the property, particularly in the front? And the setbacks as they are proposed on the street, the planning perspective was this is the optimum outcome for the project?

Beaudin: Yes, the answer is yes. We did look at the setbacks. We're trying to get houses close to the street but not overwhelming the street. They are two stories tall which is different from some of the other products in the downtown and with the front porch additions it seems like the kind of walkable downtown environment we're trying to create is facilitated by these types of setbacks.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay.

Weinstein: Yeah, if you walk down St. John Street on a nice summer's night like maybe tonight and you look at the townhouse project across the street that Steve talked about, you often find that the folks who live there, at least in the units facing St. John Street, are actually pulling their chairs out into their driveway and sitting. So they're actually trying to recreate the porch that is being designed as part of this project. So we're trying to give people a chance to be at the street and be on their porches as part of this project as opposed to having to make their own street/house interface.

Commissioner Nagler: Got it. Probably now is not the time, but I have some questions about the look of the building too, but they're more comments though so thank you.

Commissioner Balch: I asked staff earlier and I think I see it now, but my question is about fire access to Unit 1. To confirm, staff let me know that fire had looked at the design and confirmed they would have proper access for a truck and service to Unit 1 for example. And I see it now. I'm just confirming—it's between 8 and 9. It's the walkway path that would let you have access and that's the path fire would access to get to the back here, right?

Weinstein: That's right. The Fire Department is not going to be maneuvering the fire truck into this driveway. They're going to be parking the truck on St. John Street adjacent to the project and then pulling in a fire hose through that pedestrian walkway between, as Mr. Balch said, Buildings 8 and 9.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, and then my other quick question was when the item was on the initial agenda and then when it got back here, there were some comments it seemed from residents related to the rear fence. Has there been any further development or comment when the item got re-agendized?

Weinstein: We haven't heard anything.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, no additional comments at this time. Thank you.

Brown: On page 21 at the bottom around the garage use, I noted the condition that the residents will have restrictions as part of the approval around making sure that the parking is park-able within the garages. Is that a standard term or is that specific to this PUD?

Otto: I've got different page numbers than you, but we do normally include that condition when we definitely want to make sure to provide the parking. We normally wouldn't put this on a typical subdivision that has street parking and driveway parking, but when we're tight on sites when there is no driveway parking and limited on-street parking, we want to put that in there and make sure it's in the CC&R's, a PUD condition, and disclosure, etc.

Commissioner Brown: Okay. I mean, obviously enforcement is another issue but it's a good condition. I was just wondering if it's a condition that's a standard condition being a Downtown Plan or just because, so I know for future projects.

Otto: I think it's probably included in the last five or six Downtown projects and we included it in some of the other high density residential projects that were approved throughout town as well.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, I don't recall seeing it in the Irby Ranch and that's why I ask. And then I had one final question. In the pictures you showed fences between the three buildings on the southern side; Lots 1 through 6. I was just wondering, is that fence halfway between or is it pushed towards the back? I'm referring to Figure 3 in the staff report on page 11, the fence that's shown between the three buildings on the southern lots, I'm just wondering is that front, mid or back?

Otto: I think it may be back, but let me see if I can pull that up real quick for you. It looks like there are some mid ones as well. If you look at the landscape plan, sheet L-1, if you look between units 4 and 5 and in between 2 and 3 they show a little fence. The setback there is probably 30 feet.

Commissioner Brown: Okay.

Weinstein: Gerry pointed out that L-1, which is the landscape plan, shows the fences as well that are illustrated on the plan.

Commissioner Brown: All right, I need to go back to the previous package so thank you. That's the sum of my questions.

Ritter: Okay so we'll open it up to the applicant to present and then after the applicant if there are any speaker cards other than the applicant, bring them up, but I'll welcome Todd.

### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Todd Deutscher: Let me begin with saying, thank you to the Commission for seeing us again after our subsequent workshop and the feedback that you gave us then. I'd also like to reiterate thanks to Steve because he clearly came up to speed pretty quick on presenting this. I won't take much of your time because he did such a good job of pointing out the project history. I will just reiterate that we worked really hard to produce a product that was consistent with the Downtown feel and as well as the Specific Plan; something that everyone could be proud of now and 30 years from now. When we first started this we realized that we could probably put 22 units there given the existing zoning, but it was not going to be a product that anybody was going to like. Likewise, when we first started this we approached this with three stories and decided that, you know what, let's try and be consistent and take the path of least resistance and William Hezmalhalch Architects did a very nice job with the architecture in providing good, livable sized units so that's kind of where we ended up.

We worked with the Pleasanton Historical Association with regard to preservation of the home and Linda Garbarino and the rest of the group there have been very helpful with feedback and considered all of the alternatives and I think we were all mutually pleased when we concluded that we're just going to keep it on site and just position it more efficiently to accommodate the project.

With regard to the feedback that came from the March 23<sup>rd</sup> workshop, we did put two additional parking spaces as requested on site that were approved by the traffic folks on staff. With regard to the wall on the rear portion, I met with George and Alice, two of the three residents, we discussed the wall and agreed that the 7-foot concrete panel wall would be mutually beneficial both in terms of privacy, sound transmission, aesthetics, etc. so that's what we committed to. We also agreed, and I think it's a condition as well, but we proactively agreed to make sure there are adequate disclosures in any purchase and sale agreements or lease agreements with regard to noise at night, downtown activity and that sort of thing so that down the road there is not someone saying, gosh, I didn't realize that Barone's had fun or whatever it is.

With that, I would ask if you had any questions of me. If they're architecturally specific, I've got Adam Gardner here who's got the next speaker card who can probably address those more intelligently than I can.

Adam Gardner: Good evening, Adam Gardner with William Hezmalhalch Architects, again I want to thank everybody for their input in getting us where we are tonight. There's one condition of approval I just wanted to address and that's the relocation of the detached garage for the historic home. The condition requires that the garage and the tandem parking space be flipped and I just wanted to explain how we got to where we are with the plan. The existing house was essentially located on the site currently so we pushed it off to the west side and tried to create kind of a single family environment with a front yard and generous side yard. If we take that detached garage which is essentially an alleyway and push it up towards St. John Street, I think it will really crowd the house quite a bit. We have about a total of 15 feet from the house to the property line and the garage should be somewhere in the 11 to 12 feet, so we'll wind up with about 3 to 4 feet and kind of squeeze by. The condition of approval is to require that the garage not be used for storage which shows that it would need to be accessible for garage space and then we do have the garage rear door and the idea is that we just drive through and use that pad parking for the second parking space. So we'd like your consideration to not require us to push the garage back; to keep the space around the house and the integrity of the existing home intact. So if you have any questions about the architecture, I'd be happy to answer them.

Commissioner O'Connor: So I have one and maybe I misunderstood, but the way the plan is drawn today with the pad closer to St. John, do you have a driveway coming off of St. John to get to that pad?

Gardner: No, we do not.

Commissioner O'Connor: Only going through the garage?

Gardner: Only going through the garage. The garage has two garage doors, one at the front off of the alley and one at the rear of the garage which is towards St. John. So you drive through the garage to access the second parking space. And the idea there again was to reduce curb cuts off the street and to provide more parking.

Commissioner O'Connor: Okay, thank you.

## **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Commissioner Brown: Why don't we start with first the applicant's concern regarding the carport?

Chair Ritter: Okay, so that's one of the conditions that staff proposed. What's the feeling on modifying that? Just the carport discussion.

Commissioner Balch: Maybe we should ask what staff's position is on it and why; if they could explain or elaborate.

Weinstein: We're on the same page with the applicant team with regard to the fact that we really don't like curb cuts off of St. John so we're there on that point. The parking space beyond the garage, having to drive through a garage to get to a service parking space is just a really odd configuration that poses complications typical to regular tandem parking but it's even more unique in that you have to pull through an open garage to get out to the street. We just don't see a lot of parking configurations like that and it did seem like when we were looking at the site plan with the applicant team that there would be, even pushing the garage back closer to St. John Street, that there would be adequate space between the building and the garage to meet code requirements and maneuver between the buildings. We get that it's a really tight fit and if the Commission ends up deciding that moving the garage back is desirable, I don't think we'd have massive objections to that, but it just seemed like in its current proposal, it's kind of a weird configuration and more difficult to maneuver out of a parking space than what we're proposing.

Commissioner O'Connor: How close would it be between the garage wall and the house wall?

Otto: The staff report said two feet and I'm assuming that it's this pinch point here.

Commissioner O'Connor: Two feet?

Otto: Two feet.

Commissioner Brown: Is there a side door on the existing house?

Gardner: There is. On the east side.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, so the same side as the garage parking.

Commissioner Nagler: Where's the door from front to back on the structure?

Gardner: It's in the back portion of the existing structure. So it's roughly in line where the garage is right now.

Otto: Sheet A-3.1 has a floor plan of the house. It shows a back door on that side...nothing on the side there other than as you get further back there's one on the side but it is set back.

Commissioner Balch: So there's two. There's one outside the family room and then one outside the kitchen area?

Otto: Yes, that's the added one.

Commissioner Balch: They're both at that corner.

Beaudin: Can I just add, this is kind of a design issue and a functionality issue and I think the primary reason we looked to push it back was that the Commission at the workshop was looking at parking pretty critically and the idea of giving each unit a

minimum of two spaces and having two guest parking spaces was what we were trying to achieve. The concern with leaving the garage at the front was that the drive-through tandem space; the outdoor space is essentially just a side yard patio. So the idea of moving the garage forward makes it real clear that there's a parking pad and a garage and it's still a tandem configuration and it still involves what it involves with tandem but that's the reason we picked one option over the other.

Commissioner Balch: If I could just make a quick statement and to echo what staff has just said, the fact that its tandem already adds a complication that we typically don't like and then on top of the tandem, to have the garage first and then the pad second, I completely understand staff's position on that because we typically don't like tandem, or at least I think that's what we've said in the past. We don't like tandem, and then if you're adding tandem and adding this element that you have to go through, I mean, I can't see the future but I think I can foresee problems here. I can also foresee that someone's going to park in that little spot between 1 and 11 right at that little corner.

Chair Ritter: Like a boat?

Commissioner Balch: Well, like your car because you don't want to go through a garage to get to the pad on the other side. So....I'll say to come out in a straw poll, I'm leaning towards staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Brown: Can I suggest....

Commissioner Balch: The garage is towards the back which would require you to drive through it with this configuration and staff says you flip.

Commissioner Brown: The other thing I noticed though is the exit from the garage is on the east side so you're exiting towards Building 10 or did I misread the....

Commissioner Balch: It flipped. So when looking here, the door....

Commissioner Brown: Oh, I see the door in the diagram. So if you were to move that garage up to the pinch point, would you not move that door down?

Commissioner Balch: The garage isn't built, so yeah, the garage you could redesign so your door is located at the southern end, or call that the west end side and then yes, you presumably create a breezeway or something.

Commissioner Brown: In which case you're clear to get out of the garage with an increase in two feet.

Commissioner Nagler: Well the distance between the two structures would remain the same obviously. You'd just locate the door so you could easily access past the door.

Commissioner Balch: O'Connor and I are in favor of staff. Anyone else want to come out on a straw poll so we can move forward?

Commissioner Nagler: I agree.



Chair Ritter: I kind of agree with staff's recommendation too just because of the tandem issue.

Deutscher: Can I interject and....

Chair Ritter: Let's wait. We'll direct it to staff as a question. Hold on. Do you have any other comments?

Commissioner Brown: No, I mean I can see both sides of things. On the one hand you now have a garage detracting from the visual appeal of the historic house much closer to the street, so I do see that dimension of things. On the other hand, the garage in the staff's proposed location is more in line with the front of Building 10 so it visually isn't too far out of whack. So I can see those sides.

Chair Ritter: What is your opinion in what the applicant's concern is of that?

Beaudin: They proposed it the way that they have shown it, and I don't disagree that the garage structure is farther away from the home and that's desirable in most instances. Here we've looked at a landscape solution and front yard treatment that we think is going to appropriately screen the garage and it moves closer to the street. There's going to be the two-foot setback. We've cleared it with building. We can meet building code with construction of the new structure that close to the existing home. Two feet is not a walking path but it will be comfortable enough to do maintenance and to walk through the yard. It's not really a cut through area and so I would imagine that a one-story garage next to a taller home, you know, it's raised up a little bit; the floor is up a little higher on the historic home and having the parking spaces function with a little bit more ease seemed like the better outcome for us. So that's staff's position and our recommendation. Ultimately, it's still tandem parking and you're still looking at a situation where you're going to have a garage close to a historic home in either scenario.

Commissioner Balch: If it pleases the Chair, it might be something we would like the applicant to comment on. I don't know if we want to re-open public comment?

Chair Ritter: I just wanted to know if staff had any feedback, so I'll ask, after our discussions, do you want to stand up and say what your feelings are on that? Thanks.

#### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Deutscher: The applicant has no objection to flipping it if you prefer. The only thing I might add is to give staff the ability to work with us perhaps on sizing, if there's any possibility to make it sized a little narrower just to still accommodate. If not, that's fine, flipping it is just fine.

#### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Chair Ritter: All right, any more comments on any of the other items?

Commissioner Brown: No other comments. I did have one clarification in the same arena because it always comes up. But, going from RM-1,500 to PUD high density makes no difference with the future RHNA allocations because either way, it's residential, correct?

Weinstein: That's right, so again, the RHNA obligation is to zone for an adequate amount of land to build housing to accommodate our 8 year requirement set up by the regional government. This site is already designated for residential uses and it will continue to be designated for residential uses. We're playing around with the development standards a little bit with the PUD, but it doesn't change the site's basic function as a site for residential uses. So it does not affect our RHNA obligation. It's not going to change our ability to provide housing in the community. In fact, a project like this that is actually real housing construction in the City will be reported in our annual report to the state so we'll be showing that we're not only zoning land for housing but we're actually building housing in the community as well which is a good thing from the state's perspective.

Commissioner O'Connor: The only thing I was disappointed to see was there was no small fence, but it showed up in the conditions of approval. So I'm good to go.

Chair Ritter: I think having the workshop first was helpful. You listened to a lot of things. You worked with the neighbors on the fencing issue, disclosure agreement about the noise so they know what they're getting into. I like that, and I only had a few comments because of the workshop.

Commissioner Balch: I think it's a very nice project. I took the time to actually drive by St. John and looked at both the historical building that you're relocating and I really appreciate that you put the time and energy into designing something that's as nice as this is in my opinion, and I really appreciate as staff has probably complimented you on, finding a good solution for this historical building. I know the garage issue is probably not the best for you generally, but it shows your willingness to work with staff and the desires of it and I truly appreciate that. I was a bit concerned and I did voice to staff, this isn't my favorite design of houses...I know several people who live in, I call it the "coffin" configuration because I do not like a dead-end street where a fire truck can't get down and turn around in a hammerhead type of configuration, but given the constraints of the lot, I think you guys have done a nice job and I really like the walkway which I didn't see earlier when I was talking with staff about specifically. I really appreciate the accommodation of the two visitor spots on the corner. I think they're well laid out so I generally think it's a great design. I really appreciate it. With that, I'm ready to support it.

Chair Ritter: Is there a motion?

Commissioner Nagler: No, hold on. A couple of things; one just a general comment and not so much about this project but to put in the public record—I think that we're going to see increasing numbers of projects that ask for PUDs on what were previously lots of single family dwellings. It's something obviously the Commission is receptive to so there's no reason why the applicants wouldn't continue to come forward with them and I'd just ask when the Downtown Specific Task Force meets and recommends an updated Downtown Plan that this specific topic of repurposing pieces of property in this

way be rationalized and address questions like, is it a housing type that we want to encourage? Is there some sort of a limit on the number of them we would consider? Would we go so far as identifying specific pieces of property that should an applicant be interested we would be willing to consider this kind of development for specific pieces of property? But, however it's addressed by the Downtown Specific Task Force, I as one member of the Commission would ask that that conversation occur because without some sort of a plan I would anticipate this would be a type of project that is requested over and over again.

I'll move onto two specifics. The first is let me just say I think it's a great project. I said it during the workshop. My colleagues have said it. I think you did a great job of designing a quality project, you were responsive to what you heard back from us, no matter what the answers may be to the questions I previously posed, I think this is a perfect site for this kind of a project, so all that being said, I have two specific things. If you look on page 11 of 32 of the newer staff report the image that's there actually highlights the question I'm about to ask. The aesthetic of the architecture is quite interesting in its articulation, depth, changing surfaces, in's and out's, dormer windows and so forth, except for the top roofline. And whether this is a fair representation or not, I had the notion both through the workshop and on this that from the sort of the front of the structure's second story back you see a block, flat roofline that I actually think detracts from the interest of the architecture, and I'm just wondering if there's something that could be done that's reasonable, affordable to break up that sort of uniformity of that top roofline?

Beaudin: This has been a discussion item for us as well and so there are a couple of points. When you look at these things directly in elevation like this you're rarely if ever going to see the roofs the way they are shown here. There's a couple of factors; there's the landscape and just also the perspective when down on the sidewalk and when you're both on the same side of the street and across the street. This is probably an odd angle to look at any residential project. That being said, the rooflines are different and so this would be one where we would want to bring the applicant into the discussion. We talked a little bit about potentially tilting the roof down a little bit and lowering the pitch. It's a 4:12 pitch in the plan set and we wondered about doing a 3:12. The other option here could be adding some kind of a dormer or a design. It would be purely aesthetic because that's not habitable space as far as I can tell from a plan set so adding a dormer, window or something like that in there is a possibility as well to dress up that roof if it did stay at the same angle or same pitch.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay. So, if my fellow Commissioners agree, I would encourage the motion to include asking staff to continue to work with the applicant on this specific topic. My second issue is what I asked about earlier which is the setback on St. John. I think if you look at the projects that we as a City have approved in the Downtown Core over the past 5 years, the setbacks have suffered in my opinion. And it's particularly true around the corner; the three-story project where there's 2 ½ -foot setback, and even the one that's right around the corner from this, right? So again, I understand there is a finite amount of land and that something has to give to create additional street setback. I personally, as much as the backside neighbors wouldn't appreciate it, would rather give up the territory on the back of the project than on the street because much more of the community is impacted by the setback on St. John than the distance between the back

unit and the neighbors to the back. And, so from a community perspective it strikes me that a better use of that sort of limited land would be to create more setback in the front than the rear. I'm not suggesting that the square footage of the units themselves be adjusted because that would be a major redesign and I just don't think that's appropriate, so I raise that as a comment and as probably no more than direction to staff to continue to consider that issue and see, in cooperation with the applicant, if there's some movement that could be made on the setback on St. John.

Commissioner O'Connor: So on the second item, I would disagree. With the length of the planting area and the size of the sidewalk, I do think we get the setback to the building. The technicality is where the City property line is and where the developer's property line is, but it does set back. I would rather not infringe on the rear neighbors. I mean if we really felt that strongly about moving back further, I would say it has to come off the sides. Of course, that would be something that should have been discussed a very long time ago. But, I do think the way the City property, the planter area and sidewalk is, I think we have the look and the feel of the larger setback even though it may not be the developer's property.

Chair Ritter: I tend to agree with Commissioner O'Connor. Just looking at the pictures, the front with the trees too, in first looking at the slide up there, I like the dormer idea but there's still quite a bit up there and it's on the back side. When you look at the front view, hopefully there's going to be trees growing up in that area so I'm still kind of in line with staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Brown: I'll just add two things. First of all, I appreciate Commissioner Nagler's focus around the aesthetics. My question on the dormer idea is wouldn't that increase height when we're trying to stay below 30 feet?

Beaudin: So the dormer would literally pop into the existing roof structure. It wouldn't rise above it; it would be within it. Dormers come in all shapes and sizes. You'll see them on traditional homes like this with a long flat roof with several windows underneath. Sometimes they just pop out with another gable on it. Sometimes they're round and they could be within the roof.

Commissioner Brown: Yeah, I'm not opposed to that, but my concern is in keeping with the width of the other ones on the front, they'd have to be fairly wide. I'll leave that to staff's discretion, but it would be good to break that up, but I'm not passionate one way or the other. Then on the second point, I would tend to agree with Commissioner Ritter and O'Connor. Buildings 7, 8, 9 and 10 are essentially street facing with no backyard, and then 1 through 6 have no front with a backyard. So to get a larger front on 7, 8, 9 and 10 by taking away from 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 I'm not sure I would agree. Like I said, I appreciate the intent of the suggestion.

Commissioner Nagler: So let me again just say I fully appreciate comments, but if we're looking at sort of the community impact of a project, I would think we would consider sort of the greater good or where are the impacts felt and I'm not being insensitive to the neighbors in the back but I'm just making sure, planting aside, that there is that sense of it being a community friendly aesthetic in the front is a greater good than the proximity of the back of the buildings to a handful of neighbors. The only thing again I would say

is that on the rendering we were given this evening, these plants are looming, fully mature, a nice height, you know they're characterized in the most ideal and optimistic way possible and what matters, the actual footage from the street to the property, is what it is and you know the plants may or may not end up looking like this. As was said in the response to the questions that various Commissioners asked, Lot 7 and 8 have an 8-foot setback to the porch which is not the same as some of the other projects I mentioned, but again, it's not much of a setback.

Commissioner O'Connor: I do certainly agree with you. I think on projects going forward we need to start making sure we have a proper setback that's not going to look like a San Francisco home built on this site.

Commissioner Balch: I'm torn because as staff mentioned earlier the issue is the sidewalk and we have also the area in front of us the sidewalk which is a landscape buffer of some kind. I don't see it mentioned on the plan, but so I'm torn with the additional pushback call it, and I question how much of it is being pushed back and I don't know. So I can see it both ways, but I'm not going to make it an issue.

In terms of the dormer I actually agree it would probably look a little bit better for the pitch of the roof if something was done. It's a challenge because it's only a two-story as well so that's where I'm really trying to figure out what the balance is. I don't know if we make it a condition. I'd support it maybe being a recommendation that if a better design came forward that they integrate it in the plans for the next generation, but I mean it's a roof, but I'd be comfortable with that changing but I'd leave it as that.

Commissioners Ritter and O'Connor: Me too, I'd be good with that.

**Commissioner Balch moved to make findings for the proposed PUD rezoning and development plan and Vesting Tentative Map and CEQA determination as listed in the staff report; and adopt a resolution recommending approval of (1) rezoning the three parcels totaling approximately 31,798 square feet from RM-1,500 (Multi-Family Residential) to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District; (2) the PUD Development Plan to retain and relocate the existing single-family residence on-site and construct 10 two-story townhomes and related site improvements, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A with the modification to Condition No. 2 to allow the size of the garage to be approved by the Director of Community Development, and with the recommendation to staff and the applicant to consider architectural enhancements to the roof; and (3) Vesting Tentative Map 8326 to allow the subdivision of the three parcels into 11 residential parcels plus one common area parcel, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A.1, and forward the applications to the City Council for public hearing and action. Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

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

Resolution PC-2016-29 recommending approval of Cases PUD-120, P16-1201, and Vesting Tentative Map 8326 was entered and adopted as motioned.

New Item:

**b. P16-0331, Tri-Valley Korean Parents Association**

Application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a private, non-commercial club and lodge (Tri-Valley Korean Parents Association) at 3958 Valley Avenue, Suite A. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

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

Jay Lee presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Chair Ritter: You're moving the music inside? Is there any extra insulation that they needed or had to put in to support, for example, violin lessons Thursdays between 3:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m.; that's during work hours. Is that causing grief?

Lee: Ms. Raymond brought that up specifically and she wanted to check in with the adjacent neighbor because there's only one shared wall for the multi-purpose room but we haven't heard back from them at this point. If they had concerns we could have explored the option of having a typical condition of sheetrock for insulation, but we didn't discuss that because we never heard back.

Chair Ritter: Most of the louder times are on the weekends it looks like and not during the weekdays so I just saw that one there which may cause some concern.

Commissioner Nagler: I just want to make sure I understand, the substantial impact or difference between what the club currently does and what's being requested are the weekend activities, right? Is that the substantial change?

Lee: They currently do these activities, all of the activities actually but they never went through the PUD Mod and the CUP process.

Commissioner Nagler: So the weekend activities are currently occurring?

Lee: Yes, but once we talked to them about the outdoor activities, they stopped doing that. I don't think we've heard any other complaints about any activities on the

weekends, but this came up when they submitted the application and then we realized, okay, they are doing weekend activities.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Brown: The comments from Cheri Raymond with her title as property manager for a Commercial Management Group. Is Commercial Management Group the company that runs this unit or are they a tenant?

Lee: They are not a tenant. I know there's the Valley Business Park Association, and then there are several sub-associations within the business park so I believe they are one of the sub-associations for this property.

Commissioner Brown: The reason I ask is obviously, I saw a comment that two of the units aren't currently rented but the view was that if they did get rented later they wouldn't produce a lot of demand on the spots unless you said you had 50 to 60 spots available. I'm just wondering whether the property management company or property owner that currently leases this to the Tri-Valley Korean Parent's Association whether they've signed off on the CUP.

Lee: We received a signoff from the Valley Business Park Association, the larger one. I don't think the applicant went through a formal submittal process with the sub-association.

Weinstein: Correct me if I'm wrong but the property owner signs applications as well when they're submitted to the Planning Division so the property owner signed off on this application when it was submitted.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, because I sort of read through the emails when they said they expressed concerns but the staff report said those were addressed, and I apologize for saying this is 6b or when I saw the emails was when I was talking about evidence for those relating to 6b. So my apologies to staff there.

So I guess the final question is I didn't see a comment there that the Fire Marshal has signed off on the maximum of 30 within that 1150 square feet. I presume the Fire Marshal signed off on that?

Lee: We did route the CUP and we didn't receive a comment on that issue.

Commissioner Brown: Thank you. Good presentation given this is your first one.

Chair Ritter: Any questions? I didn't get a speaker card from the applicant. Does the applicant want to say anything?

### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Hun Key: My name is Hun Key and I'm the founder of the association. When we rented an office we didn't know that a CUP existed, so obviously we didn't know anything until

the City came up and said you need it, and what is it. Thank you so much for this opportunity.

Chair Ritter: Well, thank you and thanks for coming and going through the process.

**THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

**Commissioner Brown moved to make the CUP findings as listed in the staff report and to adopt a resolution approving case P16-0331, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report. Commissioner Nagler seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioner Brown, Nagler, O'Connor, and Chair Ritter**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**RECUSED: Commissioner Balch**

**ABSENT: Commissioner Allen**

Resolution PC-2016-30 approving Case P16-0331 was entered and adopted as motioned.

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Commissioner Nagler: I just have one quick item. I actually have asked Gerry about this, but just again for all of our edification, when are we going to have the discussion about the Commission representatives to Downtown Specific Plan Task Force?

Shweta Bonn: That's expected to happen at the next meeting on August 31<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Balch: Do you know when that the first meeting will occur?

Beaudin: We actually haven't selected the consultants yet so we'll have that information better identified once we select a consultant and make that recommendation public and get the Council to authorize the contract.

Commissioner Balch: So when do you think that will be?

Beaudin: Fall.

Commissioner Balch: Aren't we almost at fall?

Weinstein: We're looking at maybe the October timeframe, but there's still work to be done before we start with this.



Commissioner O'Connor: So with that in mind, could I suggest that we agendaize that item for the first meeting in September when we can have everyone here? August 31<sup>st</sup> is a special meeting.

Weinstein: So Greg, you're out on the 31<sup>st</sup>? Is that right?

Commissioner O'Connor: Right.

Weinstein: We'll revisit the schedule to see if we can move it to the first meeting in September. That's a really good point. We'll also look to see what schedule we're up against for finalizing the task force appointments and then I think it was also looking like that first meeting in September was going to be fairly light for our Planning Commission which is odd because we've had such heavy meetings in the last several weeks. So we'll revisit the schedule. Our aim will be to move it to the first meeting in September if we can but we need to check on the overall schedule.

Commissioner O'Connor: That type of item doesn't usually take long does it?

Weinstein: No. We're looking at a really light agenda and maybe a possibility for cancellation so....

Chair Ritter: I'm not necessarily in favor of canceling just because they are open to the public and we've even had two minute Planning Commission meetings before.

Commissioner O'Connor: ...especially if it's going to roll us to the next one and all of a sudden we're buried.

Chair Ritter: I just wanted to say that. I like keeping us every twice a month if we can even if it's a short one just to keep us available for public comments.

Beaudin: Can we commit to getting back to you all on the date for that? I think there are a couple of other schedules we're trying to keep. I think the Planning Commission will actually be one of the last groups to select their Downtown Task Force representatives and ultimately the City Council will be selecting members at large from the community, so we just want to make sure we don't run against a "everyone's waiting on the Planning Commission" scenario as well.

Chair Ritter: Great.

Commissioner O'Connor: If it turns out to be a problem, if I can't make that meeting I can always submit something.

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

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

Chair Ritter: I went to the Bicycle/Pedestrian and Economic Vitality Committee meeting and Commissioner Balch was there so you want to tell us what happened with that?

Commissioner Balch: I went for Commissioner Allen`. So I won't comment too heavily, but Bike/Ped has seen the Downtown Parking Plan which is on our informational item now and on our 8/31 agenda item and just some general comments is that they are not necessarily enthusiastic about the cost of a parking spot compared to a bike corral probably being communicated up to Mike Tassano.

The other thing that did come up and just as an agenda item on that item was the collision data and I didn't realize it but Bike/Ped or Mike Tassano's team does look at collision data. Collision data is unfortunately pretty steady at approximately 102 collisions between pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle over a 3 year period. They've looked every 3 years or call it a rolling 3. It's 103 and approximately 38 percent are involving children and children is defined as someone less than age 18. So I would say they are laser focused on that which is nice to see because obviously they are working on that. Their update to the Bike/Ped Master Plan is something else they discussed and in that update they've had a few workshops. They are having a third workshop coming up pretty soon and I would encourage everyone to attend because they're trying to get not only enthusiasts of the bike world there to understand their desires but also the 60 percent who don't bike because they're fearful of the streets they'd be biking on; so how to get them to say what could be the things we could do to help you feel comfortable enough to bike in the city. So I don't have the date on that but maybe staff does.

Beaudin: September 13<sup>th</sup> is a City Council workshop on this topic and there will be a final workshop with a draft plan released later this year. We don't have a final date for that yet, but the next big milestone for that effort is September 13<sup>th</sup>, a City Council workshop. We expect it to be a pretty meaty bike and pedestrian conversation going over everything from the progress that has been made so far and prioritization for improvements in the bike plan to a couple of potential projects that would be funded at least for design. So it'll be a big meeting and we've got Council direction to make that happen.

I will say the interesting thing about bike and pedestrian collision data just so folks are aware, 103 sounds like a lot. If someone doesn't clip out of their pedal and tips over, it can be reported as an accident. So there's everything from really, really serious things to you know, somebody fell off of their bike which can be serious but it also might not be. Just keep that in perspective when looking at those collision numbers.

Commissioner Balch: And I have the map showing that if you'd like to see it. On a quick note, the three major streets are Hopyard, Stoneridge and Santa Rita as you probably would expect. As part of their master plan, they're prioritizing which ones are their top priorities for allocating time and money, attention, etc.

The other quick thing on the workshop I just wanted to mention was that between that and the collision data, Mr. Tassano and I discussed how when we're looking at traffic counts and which way a person is going to turn, we were looking at how many cars are turning left, how many cars are turning right, etc. You know, we could definitely easily overlay the bike/ped collision data map and you would be able to see I think correlation that might provide more depth to that conversation.

I will say as my closing is that, in my opinion, they have greatly identified that safe bike riding for children to school, so school routes around schools, is going to be a category in and of itself to have a priority which I applaud. I think they wisely saw that. Back to school probably highlighted it, but it was a great thing. So they are going to cut it from the herd of several indicators and make it in its own right which is commendable.

Chair Ritter: That's good and I concur. You did a great job representing as an alternate! Anybody attend the Civic Arts Commission? The Library Task Force is no longer. I attended the Economic Vitality Committee meeting and they heard what we're going to hear about in a few weeks or so which is the zoning code update/permits center and it looks like it's a lot more user-friendly for residents and people who are making projects so I'm looking forward to seeing that.

Anybody go to the Heritage Tree Board Appeals?

Commissioner Nagler: It never happened.

Chair Ritter: I also went to the Housing Commission and I'm on the learning tour. They talked a lot about the grants for affordable housing and the shortage that we have. You have to go to Stockton to get a one bedroom, one bath for \$700 a month, so there's a huge shortage of workforce housing in Pleasanton and the Housing Commission is looking into analyzing that.

Commissioner Balch: I'll just mention that you probably saw on the website, if you would like to put your.....almost everyone here is excluded (it's not allowed for City staff, Commissioners, family members of Commissioners, employees, etc.), but they're trying to get a name for the new dog park located at the end of Marilyn Murphy King Trail. From my understanding there are only a few applications or names in the hat at this point so maybe you could encourage your youth in the neighborhood to put it in. You will be featured on that website, City Council meetings, some ceremony, etc. Applications must be turned in by the 31<sup>st</sup> of August.

Commissioner Nagler: But nobody in this room can do it.

Commissioner Balch: Maybe these two people but I don't know who they are.

## **b. Future Planning Calendar**

Weinstein: So Chair Ritter put in a plug for one of the items which is the Zoning Code Update. Shweta to my left has been working really, really hard on that over the last couple of months and it's part of our overall objective of bringing zoning to the people and part of that is OpenCounter which makes it easy for people to learn whether their businesses are permitted or conditionally permitted, and it also streamlines the permitting process a little bit. But another part of it is the Zoning Code Update which looks at our zoning code which hasn't really been touched in a long time in a comprehensive way and looks at reorganizing it so that it's a lot more navigable and transparent and easy to use, so we're really looking forward to your comments. Greg, we'd love to get some written comments from you if you're not going to be at the meeting.

And then there's the workshop on the Valley Trails/Ponderosa project as well, so those are the two big items at the next meeting.

Commissioner Brown: I was just going to say I've already played with both of those tools. I really liked the zoning one and appreciate the zoning maps.

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm sorry, on the 31<sup>st</sup> it's going to be Ponderosa as well as Zoning Code Update?

Weinstein: Yes.

Commissioner O'Connor: Is it also going to be OpenCounter or is that...?

Weinstein: Yeah, that's right, OpenCounter is also an informational item similar to how we're doing the parking plan tonight.

### **c. Actions of the City Council**

Chair Ritter: Okay, Actions of City Council. It looks like they approved the Dublin Canyon Road and accepted the report for the Costco initiative.

### **d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator**

No discussion was held or action taken.

### **e. Matters for Commission's Information**

#### (1) Accept an update of the Downtown Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan

Beaudin: Last December the City Council directed staff to get to work on a Downtown Parking Strategy and Implementation Plan. We went ahead and started that effort. In the meantime, so everybody knows, we created, identified, or otherwise improved about 150 parking spaces downtown. That includes the 46 spaces in the St. Mary's lot (previously known as the Demolay lot), we've restriped 52 spaces on First Street, and we put down the parking tees, we also paved and striped spaces within the transportation corridor between Neal Street and West Angela.

We've been working on the management strategy side of things, working with the PDA, to help make sure employees use the lesser-used spaces in the downtown, we've increased parking enforcement. We started and then stopped putting in wayfinding signs in the downtown. We received feedback on the signs that were very similar to the other signs in downtown and didn't provide the visual cue people were looking for, and so we are now moving towards the CalTrans style blue sign with a white "P" to really clearly identify public parking in downtown.

Commissioner O'Connor: One clarification, the employee parking on St. Mary's, is that still open to the public?

Beaudin: It sure is, and what we'll talk a little about that is as a management strategy when we get into it. There are a lot of communities that have employee permit parking and we have not identified permit parking lots or have gone down that path yet. What we've done is ask the PDA because that lot and the Firehouse Arts Center lot are fairly under-utilized as parking locations. So we've asked the PDA to help or to remind and help their downtown business owners, especially employees, to use those lots if at all possible. It really hasn't taken off but we can talk more about that and how we need to put some emphasis on strategies.

Parking demand is a really good thing for downtown commercial districts. When you have people complaining about parking it means there are a lot of people in your downtown, especially in one like ours where there's over 3,100 public and private parking spaces available, so when people are telling us that they feel like there's not enough parking spaces I think that's a good thing. I think what you'll find and what our data shows is there's a demand for key locations for parking and a lot of our parking spaces are towards the edges or maybe not as obvious or not well-used. Our specific plan does dictate the kinds of parking requirements that come with development in downtown and we all know we're just about to get started with a specific plan update. We've acknowledged that some of these requirements may be out of date or at least need to be looked at again, so we'll do that as part of the specific plan update. Also, like I mentioned, the confusion between public and private parking lots, is something that we want to look at. So, here are study areas, the area outlined in red is the entire Downtown Specific Plan boundary area; the area in blue is the parking management plan, it's our area of influence essentially; and the area in black is the area we really focused on, it's kind of the heart of downtown, the commercial area where we hear the most concerns about parking.

Commissioner Balch: This is the best slide right here.

Chair Ritter: It tells you where to park.

Beaudin: It does tell you where to park. That's a very good point. So on street parking is functionally at or over capacity. And over capacity in parking terms, in peak times, means 85 percent occupied. What that means is you're always looking for 15 percent to be available and the turn-over that comes with that. Main Street often exceeds 90 percent capacity. We see vehicles circling, its not good for visitors that come to downtown, or for air quality, there's a whole host of problems, but the main thing is it causes frustration and people will not come downtown as often. We want to make sure people know there are spots available such as in the Firehouse Arts lot or St. Mary's Street lot. St. Mary's Street is a great example, it's not shown here because when we did this study it didn't exist, but that is a lot that's often vacant, 100 percent vacant at this point in time. The only time we see it really occupied is Barone's Thursdays. Please take note of that, it's on St. Mary's close to the railroad track.

Commissioner O'Connor: How many of the prime parking spaces are taken up by employees who aren't going to the lots?

Beaudin: So the anecdotes are out there and it's certainly a concern both for PDA, for staff, and for some business owners. And you can see it, it'll often be the same car

there and you know who owns the car, but we're not naming names or pointing people out but we do understand it is an issue.

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm just trying to quantify it, if it's a big issue.

Beaudin: I'd say it's prevalent. I don't want to quantify it percentage-wise because we haven't done that analysis. But the anecdotes are suggesting that it's a problem, that it's taking up enough parking on Main Street. What we did when we started managing through enforcement, it has, there is more vehicle turnover on Main Street, so that suggests that there were people parking for extended periods of time quite often. And we've noticed through enforcement that there is more turnover.

Chair Ritter: How often is the enforcement occurring?

Beaudin: We're going out all the time, chalking tires and checking the time limits.

Commissioner O'Connor: Have you noticed anything happening with enforcement of the private parking? For example, you can't park in a spot unless you're going to a certain business.

Beaudin: I was talking with Judy Wheeler about this, just after the DVC meeting, she often sees other folks parking in her lot and you can kind of tell if it's an employee or if it's a shopper. The way she approaches it, if it's somebody's shopping she's not giving them a hard time for parking in her parking space, however, she noticed employees of a recently opened business downtown parking in her lot and she did have to encourage them to move along and find somewhere else. I think people are taking that community of character approach to things and letting things ebb and flow in downtown when it comes to their parking lots. There are other folks who have come to the City and asked us to enforce their parking lots. The response we've given is that's a private asset and if you want to manage it, that's up to you. If we were to get into a discussion of shared parking agreements and public use then that conversation could be had. It's a legal issue as well, having public police officers on private parking doing enforcement.

Chair Ritter: Could a private parking owner put a solar credit card meter on their lot?

Beaudin: I'd have to look at our DSP has any restrictions on paid parking.

Chair Ritter: Okay, there was that one meeting where the bank parking behind Peet's could be used during off-hours...

Beaudin: I like that you're already calling it "Peet's." Ha ha.

Chair Ritter: I saw a sign there today.

Beaudin: So, the idea of using those private lots, there is no agreement for the public to use those spaces so it's at the mercy of the parking lot owner.

Weinstein: So I'm looking at Steve for confirmation, but I had the understanding that 8 or 9 spaces right behind Peet's are available for public parking.

Otto: All of the parking behind Peet's.

Ott: Not the Bank of America lot, but the lot directly behind the Peet's building.

Weinstein: Correct, those are available to the public.

Commissioner Balch: So the St. Mary's lot is not in the zoned area, right?

Beaudin: It's just outside of the downtown core but it is in the area of influence that we identified. You'll also notice that the SFPUC site and Ace Train are outside of our study area. Full disclosure, we're working separately with San Mateo County and the Fairgrounds as well as Ace to address the overflow parking issues that come in robust economic times, when there are a lot of people commuting. We're working with PD and the neighbors to deter people from parking there. To answer your question, the St. Mary lot is outside, but it's an easy 5 minute walk to Main Street.

Commissioner Balch: The Bank of the America lot, that is private property as well as some of these other potential---I know I'm getting ahead....so these big "reds" we'll just call them on both sides, I think there's like four we see here, those are all private property as I recall, right?

Bonn: That's right.

Commissioner Balch: Okay, thank you very much.

Beaudin: I'll talk about those in a little more detail. So, for just for a little bit of context around the analysis we did, 85 percent of the trips to our downtown come from folks within the tri-valley. Weekday trips from Hacienda are about 16 percent of all trips that we see downtown, and that decreases on the weekends for obvious reasons, with fewer employees in Hacienda. And what we see on the weekend are the trips from Dublin and San Ramon, those areas go up to about 22 percent of all the trips to our downtown, so folks in those communities are coming to our quaint downtown. The main way people get into our downtown is Bernal Avenue, 27 percent of trips, so that's important for us to be able to efficiently put up signs and get people parked and out walking and shopping and eating as efficiently as possible.

Commissioner Brown: The trips coming from Hacienda to Downtown, is that during the lunch hour period?

Beaudin: Yes, that's what we're assuming. It's aggregated data but we're expecting this to be the lunch crowd.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, and then obviously the challenge with Bernal to your other comment, especially on weekends, events are happening at the Fairgrounds then it backs up on the highway. Is there any other route that you'd want to encourage or opt for people coming from San Ramon/Dublin to use other than Bernal?

Beaudin: Del Valle and Santa Rita also have close to 20 percent kind of coming through those ways and on those event weekends, our downtown is essentially overwhelmed.

So where people come from becomes less of an issue on those days because they're likely spending some time in our downtown and over at the fairgrounds, whether it's a car show, a fair or anything else going on over there. So, this information is really kind of a normal situation averaged over the course of the year. It's not meant to be a point in time even.

Commissioner Brown: Okay.

Beaudin: Main Street is operating at greater than functional capacity so we have strategies to encourage long-term customers and employees to find alternative locations and we're looking primarily at the periphery. Some areas we know we can restripe on street to get additional spaces. We're looking for ways to use red curbs appropriately. We have pretty generous parallel parking compared to other downtowns. We have that four-foot buffer, so to maximize parking we could reduce that but we think that it's functioning now, there is an opportunity for additional supply within the existing areas.

Commissioner Brown: So quick clarification, I was pleased to see they kind of picked up on that because sometimes some of the parking spaces are a little too generous. You get some spaces back from that, but you also said that....where was it....in some cases that there's some difficulty getting out of spaces because they're too tight. Is the amount where it's too tight far less than the gain you get by putting everything to more of a standard?

Beaudin: So I don't think we have any spaces that are under-sized in downtown currently and if they are, they may be close to an intersection or something like that. I can think of Spring Street and places like that where it's quite narrow.

Commissioner Brown: On page 9 of the Strategy and Implementation Plan it said "Typically the preferred length of on-street parking stalls is 20 to 22 feet. This provides adequate maneuvering space for drivers of all skill levels to safely park. Field measurements indicate some marked stalls are less than the 20-foot recommended minimum length for parallel parking spaces, and during field observations, vehicles attempting to navigate into the smaller length stall took longer to complete the parking maneuver, blocking traffic for longer periods of time." I was just kind of curious ...

Beaudin: So Pamela is telling me that she's had this conversation with Mike Tassano and that there are very few of those spaces, and those would be the areas we would look to adjust. The parallel parking option gives us the ability to make use of the street a little bit better so we want people to get in and out as efficiently as possible. So if we see those, we'll get them fixed as part of this effort. They will be low hanging fruit for us.

Okay, so increasing supply is expensive, I'm going to talk a little bit more about that. I just wanted to also say we're looking at implementing parking demand solutions that will create a better experience for folks downtown and we'll talk a little bit more on the strategies. We have three buckets of action items and we've assigned responsibility in three areas. So we have City strategies that will focus on the public right-of-way, public lots, the wayfinding signs we talked about, increasing bike parking, increasing supply within the existing transportation corridor (the City spent \$7 million purchasing that



property), the employer strategy of getting employees to use parking lots, employee parking permit program and dedicated lots (that's a discussion item, we're not figuring that out tonight but it's in the menu), we also looked at subsidies for alternative transit for employees to get downtown. So those are on the table. We are from a policy perspective, we're looking at the DSP, it currently has some specific language, it has parking requirements but it also talks about public parking availability and not using meters and things like that. To let you all know, City Council did see meter parking in the menu and they did not like that as an option for our downtown. So, we were encouraged, possibly even directed, to remove meters from the menu of ways to address parking in downtown. So, we'll be doing that with the next version.

Chair Ritter: On Figure 9 in your book here, on page 22, it's a little disheartening that they show all of these bike stops but there's nothing at the Pleasanton Library or City Hall and that was brought up at the Bike/Ped meeting, as Commissioner Balch knows. But it is a little embarrassing that we don't have a dot on there. Just a comment.

Beaudin: We do need to address this at City Hall. It has been addressed at the Library.

Commissioner Balch: I'd also like to mention Delucchi and Wayside because I mentioned that when I was on Park and Rec when you were still with us and primarily from the farmer's market and concerts in the park.

Beaudin: We'll make sure we get it accurate and we make it the priority that it needs to be.

Commissioner Brown: Before you move off of those strategy slides, in the staff report on page 6 you mentioned, and I must admit I didn't get through the entire implementation plan in detail, but in the staff report it said "install digital parking occupancy signs to display the number of vacant spaces which were potential parking specific wayfinding signage." I thought that was good. When I go on business trips and so on, the parking garage at SFO has sensors, etc. Was there any thought that eventually Pleasanton would have a City owned app to show you where a parking space is? People could find that on their phone and you can find in real time one of those rare parking spaces?

Beaudin: Yeah, we get contacted pretty regularly by companies who are doing that. The City of Redwood City, the City of San Mateo, there are apps for a lot of downtown, particularly on the peninsula and it is something we will consider.

Commissioner Brown: Okay. I just didn't see it in the report. Thank you.

Chair Ritter: Great idea.

Beaudin: Okay, so this slide does show the location of parking structures, and I'll say they're hypothetical parking structures, we chose these sites because they're commonly identified as potential parking sites and in our downtown. They are privately owned, we've discussed this with the property owners to give an order of magnitude assessment to give them an overview of what it costs to build a parking structure in today's numbers. Estimated cost, option 1, the True Value site, 636 Main Street, we're looking at a parking structure that could yield 135 spaces, it'd be a \$3.8 million cost

without land acquisition, design services, or permitting. That's \$74,000 per parking space on a site like that. So that's kind of the high-end. At the low-end is the Bank of America site and the range here is quite large in terms of the number of spaces and it really depends on how much of the site you use. \$34,000-\$39,000 per space depending on the size of the garage. The reason we put this in here is really to highlight the cost that comes with structured parking and to maybe remind folks that we have a lot of management strategies we haven't tried yet in addition to adding supply in the transportation corridor. Doing things like shared parking allow us to better leverage the 3,000 plus spaces we have in the downtown. If this same Bank of America site were willing to enter into a shared parking agreement with us, the number of spaces at this end of downtown would greatly increase. We need to consider those options before we push down the path of a parking structure. Then at the other end of downtown we're finishing up the other end of the transportation corridor, and that seems like a pretty good option when you stack it up against an option like this in terms of the dollars we would need to invest.

Commissioner Balch: What's our in-lieu fee cost?

Beaudin: \$19,000 for surface parking spaces and we haven't done a calculation for structured parking spaces so we're charging \$19,000 across the board.

Commissioner Balch: Okay. How is that set or determined and how annually?

Beaudin: It's built into the code. Basically, it's something we really haven't tried to update.

Commissioner Balch: Is a dollar amount set? Is it escalated in the code? So it's at CPI?

Bonn: Yes, it's adjusted by engineering.

Beaudin: It's set to a construction index that goes up with but it's a small percentage annually. It's not like it goes with market cycles. It could decrease theoretically, but rarely does.

Commissioner O'Connor: So what's the true cost of a surface parking spot?

Beaudin: Well, that's what we were trying to ascertain here. Again, without the land cost in it, we were trying to get a ballpark for what it would cost in Pleasanton at this point in time and the lowest number we came back to was \$34,000 without land.

Commissioner Nagler: We will recall that at one point in the context of a particular application we questioned the \$19,000 and suggested that when we got to this project and tried to determine a true cost of filling a surface parking spot, that we might agendize the discussion for ourselves with an eye towards recommending to the City Council an adjustment of that in-lieu fee.

Commissioner Balch: It sounds like we were insightful and I agree.

Beaudin: Okay, so let me keep moving and then we'll come back to comments, because if you all are going to direct us to do more work, we need to talk. Okay, how to implement. So we've got the implementation section that has both management and supply approaches over different time horizons. This slide has just a few examples, what I want to say is this is just a snapshot of the menu for implementation and what I want to make even clearer here is we did it on kind of timeline with these buckets, these three categories, what we heard from Council is they'd like to see us prioritize the list a bit more rather than leave them in these broad buckets. So the idea is actually trying to identify what we should be doing sooner rather than later. So any help you want to give us in the implementation plan, there's a summary table of the parking strategies, page 4 of 8 in Appendix C. If you want to help us at all this evening, that would be good. If you have bike parking in the park as a priority, per Commissioner Balch, then we want to hear about those things tonight. We're on tour with this now, we're here tonight at the Planning Commission, and we're continuing to collect feedback.

Commissioner Balch: Could I say a quick question because I see bike/ped on this. Were they going to get another bite at this apple or did their bite already pass and I picked up after that?

Beaudin: Their bite happened. It's still a public document. People can send me, Shweta, Adam, Pamela, Mike Tassano, I mean anyone at the City, and you can send comments at any time. I don't mean to be flippant about that. We did make a presentation there and they did give us comments and feedback. I think the challenge that folks had was a lot of people were focused on other things at the time with some of the other issues that bike and ped are looking into and there's also this question about whether the DSP or the Ped/Bike Master Plan or the Parking Plan is the right place to talk about things. So what I've encouraged people to do is just send us your feedback because there's a lot of stuff that touches the downtown right now happening and we want to make sure ultimately these documents are going to feed into the DSP so it's not too late even after this is done to get things like parking locations for bicyclists into the DSP which is how we're going to implement things.

Commissioner Balch: So if I may, maybe I can just make sure it's out of respect, but I'll pass on comments that I received from that meeting Monday to just voice their concerns and not my own and if everyone's okay, we'll go to ours. I'm not trying to usurp the process here. So their major comment was based on the estimated cost as you presented here that you look at the cost of a parking spot and the cost of a bike corral which is basically a spot designated now for bike parking is obviously much less in their view and that it parks 12 bikes to 1 car. So if you're parking 12 bikes, and the gentleman gave that information to Mr. Tassano, so I don't have that for your reference but the concept is you're getting 12 people out of their car and onto a bike.

The other thing they mentioned in looking at the presentation and maybe I don't know if it was on target, but they mention there is no bike parking where you can see your bike and be visible on Main Street. When I look at this map, maybe it appears misplaced. It didn't seem like there was a lot so I don't know the context. And then one of the other things they were mentioning was, I guess it is similar to what you're saying, that basically the transportation corridor into the downtown that will allow connections

between....I'm sorry, not the transportation corridor—that's my last one, but the....what do you call it? The connecting corridors between, for example if you're over here on Bernal, is there bike/ped paths to sort of get you so you can walk to the downtown and the network for bike and ped to get downtown so the people within the 1.5 or 2 miles are not driving. They would conceivably walk easier, safer, etc.

And then lastly, the new transportation corridor in the area behind Cole's for the future, one of the questions came up as to the Firehouse Arts Center parking lot and they didn't seem terribly happy with that design, but when I did press on hey that design has DG, then it has the sidewalk and then it has the parking, and I presume and I said I don't know for sure but I presume the City's going to do a copy exact and carry it right in behind Cole's, they seemed to say that was sufficient and they were more interested in the connection than to Wayside on that side. So those are more of their comments which might refer more to Mike Tassano.

Beaudin: Thank you, they have.

Commissioner Nagler: I would like at some point to come back to this question about having discussion on in-lieu fees because the fact is at some point we are going to have to prioritize supply and new supply and it is obviously going to cost money and it just isn't appropriate for us to allow projects to be constructed without providing parking and instead paying an in-lieu fee that actually isn't an in-lieu fee. It doesn't get us a parking space technically.

Beaudin: Can I make a request through the Chair and I really want to support the Commission, so what I would ask is that when we get to work planning discussions for the next two-year cycle, that we add this study to the mix. We're currently doing the Downtown Parking Plan. Any time you're dealing with impact fees or other kinds of assessments that will go toward the development community, I don't want to try and address that at this point in time. It would be additional analysis and work that we would have to do. In talking with the City Manager about the items we're going to be taking on in the next year to two years, we've started making a list of work plan items that will come from the Planning Commission, that will come from staff, and other Commissions and that ultimately the City Council will decide on. I'd like to ask that you table the item for now and bring it up for that point in time.

Commissioner Nagler: I guess I want to be sensitive to your perspective about what you have the capacity to do when, but I guess I'm a little bit confused. What work needs to be done in addition to the study that you're undertaking that would allow us to have a discussion and potentially make a recommendation to the Council about the specific matter of the dollar amount of the in-lieu fee?

Beaudin: It's a code amendment and we would want to look at other surface parking costs for the area. We basically have to do a study because this is going to be an assessment against developers. It's a, "if you can't make your parking requirement on site", so we want it to be a legally defensible fee and so we have to do a specific kind of study to do that. It is an in-lieu fee and not an impact fee so there's a difference there so we would want to make sure we're really clear at how we arrived at the number. We've done the number for structure parking and I think the methodology we used—I don't

know the last time we did it whether we tried to incorporate land costs or not or whether it was just an improvement cost. So here's where it starts to get more technical than I've been able to dig into. This is the kind of research I would want to know answers to. You know, is the \$19,000 literally improving a lot? You know, the stormwater, the lighting, the landscaping that goes with the pavement, the paint, or is that all of that plus the land and the approval process that you have to go through, and I just have not done that kind of analysis up to this point. So it would be a separate planning effort. It would be something we would have to assign staff resources to and ultimately when we're talking about adjusting numbers in the code that relate to development costs, I think it is a policy discussion and a decision that should come from the City Council.

Commissioner Nagler: That's my point, recommending it to the Council.

Beaudin: Yeah, and they're not changing the work plan at this point in time and something would have to come off if something were to come on. We're nearing the end of the two year window. Essentially we will be talking about the work plan starting early 2017 and getting it finalized by February. That's where I'm at with it.

Chair Ritter: Okay and it seems like what you're asking from us is to help prioritize Table 1 or just to see what's most important.

Beaudin: What page are you on Pamela?

Pamela Ott: I'm on page 57. Table 17, Section 6 which is the Implementation Plan. It seems like a logical place to be.

Beaudin: It is page 57/58. It's Chapter 6; the implementation plan and Table 17 is the managing the existing parking supply table, but there are also parking supply tables on the following pages in Table 17 and 18. So if you see something in there that you think that's just doesn't work for me, we'd love to know that. It's a task, right? To create a criteria list and a methodology to prioritize these things is something we're all working on right now. I wouldn't expect you to do that at the dais tonight, but if you have specific concerns about anything you see or if you think something is in a near term bucket that should be in an immediate bucket, those would be the kinds of things like bike parking in the park.

Commissioner Balch: I happened to notice that in the non-page numbered version, it's Exhibit C, which was mentioned earlier, I happened to notice they had several suggestions and one of the suggestions was that "in-lieu parking fees are agreements and exceptions where public parking is provided on private sites." So in light of Commissioner Nagler's comment, I also support the in-lieu parking being looked at in a reasonably timely manner because I think the iron is hot. I'll leave it as something I do support. I think the other things they've mentioned and that I've mentioned earlier with them, the bike racks at opportune spots and timing to that, we understand those are easy, low hanging fruit fixes and I think you guys are doing a great job trying to figure out anything to get....

Beaudin: So can I do this a different way then? If you all think that, if there's a consensus that we should evaluate in-lieu parking fees, than make it an immediate or

near term action item to do the study. Then it goes to Council in that fashion and they can decide if they want to bump something from the work plan at this time or if they want to talk about it in 2017 with the new work plan.

Commissioner Balch: If I may say Commissioner Nagler's position differently? The problem is from my view on the in-lieu fees if I may just say is that our boat moves. We can't stop the boat of planning. You know, we don't know what the applications come in at any time in the future, how many in-lieu they may have and so by not necessarily addressing it, in my opinion, we don't get started on trying to eventually mitigate the loss of each and every parking spot in lieu we grant or require. And so, I don't mean disrespect, I know you guys are extremely busy with not only these items but also Johnson Drive. I get it. So yes, I think it needs to be something of a high priority. High, in terms of immediate near, you know, I'm not sufficiently qualified I think to say that, and I don't want to step on the toes, but every day we say you owe two in-lieu, we are digging potentially \$10,000 deeper in the hole.

Commissioner O'Connor: \$30,000. We've been complaining about this number maybe not to you. I and about eight other Planning Commissioners before you that I can remember have been complaining about this in-lieu fee for 8, 9, 10 years and every year we let it go by. How many in-lieu fees have we collected in the last 12 months? I mean, if you start adding it up it's a lot. When development's hot and things are happening, we're losing dollars. So I'm glad you brought that up because I think we should at least ask the Council if there's something that's a little less important that we could bump to make room for this.

Commissioner Balch: Or ask them their priority on it.

Commissioner Nagler: Yeah, the fact is, again, just on the priorities, it isn't possible to have growth continue downtown, both residential and commercial, and I'm saying the obvious right? It's not possible to have the growth continue, to have economic development efforts of the City be potentially effective without at some point increasing the number of spaces to stock, right? And all of the yeomen's efforts you're putting forward obviously trying to do within the confines of existing pavement of what you can do has limited returns and so we're all saying this because we are convinced we're going to have to build something at some time. And when that time comes, we're also going to want to build a Library and a Civic Center and we're also going to want to build something, right? Another park or something, and so if we're not doing our part to ask developers to contribute literally their fair share in addressing a problem that their economic opportunity is creating, then in a particular way, we aren't helping balance out the choices that need to be made between a library and a parking space, right?

Commissioner Brown: So I'm just going to add quickly to everything. I agree with all of the comments made. I think it should include land as well because your point is an economic equation. It's land plus improvements because you're making up the.....it can't just be City land and so I would agree with that. One question I had was, do in-lieu fees go into a separate account as they relate to parking improvements?

Beaudin: Yes, they're set aside for these purposes.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, so again, if you wanted to build a war chest so to speak associated with building a parking structure, it would make sense to make sure those in-lieu fees are reflecting and representative of the money you will have to spend to build that parking structure. So I agree with everyone else that I think it should be put to the question as to what is the relative priority compared to the other things on the docket.

Commissioner Balch: You know, boy, you know one of the things I want to, maybe for myself without necessarily knowing where everyone is at, I apologize because when this was separated I didn't realize, and I started picking this up in detail just a few days ago, but you know, in terms of the transportation corridor parking behind Cole's, I think lower hanging fruit and that type of stuff in terms of where you're focusing on, you know, unfortunately it's not this or that. It's not a serial process. It can be a parallel process. You know, that and some bike racks plus....I think you guys when I read this, you've got a lot of great stuff. I don't want to necessarily usurp what you've prioritized and what you can accomplish right away with low dollars and get good bang for the time and energy. What I think I'm at with in-lieu is like I mentioned, when would ever be the time you would start? In light of the reference around this topic, I think now is good personally.

Bonn: So maybe in recognition of some of the discussion and in recognition that this isn't necessarily going to address fully the discussion you'd like to have for in-lieu fees, just for reference purposes, the costs that were assumed for the parking structures assume \$23,000 for an above ground space and \$39,000 for the subterranean spaces. So I'm just throwing that out there in case that puts the \$19,000 into perspective.

Commissioner Brown: It doesn't include land then.

Bonn: Right, it doesn't include the land or any other costs.

Commissioner Brown: That's what I mean. There's a term we use in my business which is fully loaded cost. When we talk about head counts and benefits and so on, it needs to be fully loaded costs because you're choosing to approve a project that allows more residential in favor of a parking spot, so it needs to be fully loaded costs including parking, the land and business.

Commissioner Balch: You're probably preaching to the choir on this one as I'm thinking about it more.

Beaudin: I don't think we're opposed at all to the idea of studying that number. I just need to get that into the plan and into the overall policy guidance from the City Council and you know we've got a majority of the team here tonight and we all have projects going.

Chair Ritter: I think you have nearly 100 percent of the team, but so we know that, other priority that I think Commissioner Balch brought up was I think the corridor. That's huge and would get an instant bang for the buck and its right down at the south end of the Main Street so you get a lot of people walking across for concerts in the park.

Commissioner Brown: Are we talking about a Class I trail?

Chair Ritter: No, it's along the ditch.

Commissioner Balch: Along Cole's Market. It's like five corridors at the Firehouse parking lot.

Beaudin: It's a transportation corridor.....

Ott: You're talking behind Cole's market behind Pleasanton Plaza. That's termed Spring to Ray Street; it's the north end.

Chair Ritter: I'm in favor of moving a priority up to get it done quicker than something taking longer. If there's something we could get done quicker, than I'm in favor of it.

Commissioner Brown: So I was referencing Figure 9 which shows the Class 1 trail; I'm sorry, page 22. Yeah, I mean I was referencing this proposed Class 1 being Class 3 and I think that runs along the same line.

Commissioner Balch: The new plan for Delucchi, Lions, Wayside, the master plan for that park has the trail just so everyone knows veering to First Street and then it would run along First and veer back to resume the plotted path hash marked green just as an FYI.

Commissioner Nagler: This is not our content area? You know why that park's delayed, right?

Chair Ritter: It's the creek.

Commissioner Balch: It's to fill a ditch.

Commissioner Brown: So back to Herb's comment, I view that walking/biking corridor through downtown and the parking; it needs to be done in concert. Parking is done in concert with the bike and connection corridor so that you can not only park but you could transit along the downtown and get to the businesses in the downtown. Just as a side comment by the way, Figure 7 of the report, I really felt that was pretty....pretty...I liked the fact that the report was not just a report, but actually had the implementation plans. Figure 7 in the report was very actionable when it started talking about "get transiting from parking to the streets" and that was the comment I was making talking about that Class 1 trail, which is that whole corridor and the transiting to and from the parking to the trail to get across is pretty key.

Commissioner Balch: I would like a page number on every page.

Chair Ritter: You pay extra for that.

Commissioner O'Connor: I would have to say that one of the things we probably skipped over here is when we talk about some corridor parking which is certainly cheaper, we already have the money and all we have to do is start paving....

Beaudin: We have a fair amount of some cleanup too.

Commissioner O'Connor: When people complain to me about parking I always tell them, have you looked at this and have you looked at that? One of them I always direct



them to is the railroad corridor because every time I go down there, there's always plenty of space. The complaint I get from people parking too far away from where they're going downtown is that the sidewalks are not very walkable because every restaurant comes so far out that only one person can pass. They have to go around a tree or around another person, and I keep saying if the City keeps doing this, we won't be able to walk on the sidewalk. We're going to be walking next to the parked car. So that's their problem with parking too far away, is they don't really have a sidewalk to jog down.

Beaudin: So we're working with the Bike/Ped Master Plan folks to do that kind of walk analysis in the downtown. We'll look at it again with the Downtown Master Plan, but in the meantime, I have my code enforcement and building folks looking at all those locations. People tend to creep when it comes to outdoor seating, so we're trying to find a way to fix, either by identifying it with markings on the sidewalk or potentially even trying to put a peg into the ground to lock in the location to make sure people are maintaining the required accessibility separation between the trees and the bikes. There are all kinds of obstacles and things in the sidewalk but we want to make sure we're not creating those pinch points. We're trying at least to try and maintain the ADA requirement and if we can be more generous, we're going to work toward that as well.

Commissioner O'Connor: It seemed like when I first moved to town 15 years ago that all the restaurants had enough room for one table outside and now I start to see they're paired up, they have two tables and a walkway between them.

Chair Ritter: Isn't it great to be outside?

Commissioner O'Connor: It's great if you're eating there but not if you're trying to get some place.

Beaudin: Yes, ADA or in my case, a stroller.

Commissioner Balch: The area that I'll mention that it seems particularly....I want to mention that the first comment he made that I jumped on was the, the signage you're doing to direct people away, call it exterior or periphery parking lots, I think it's great. I think that's actually been helping a lot. My comment is, between them and the downtown Main Street, making sure the access is adequate, it's kept up so that when they are going further away, they can traverse. And I do mention the Firehouse. Division Street is not a great street to walk down. I know we're pushing people down it, but...

Beaudin: It's on the list.

Commissioner Balch: It's on the list because Firehouse dumps right out there. It's a beautiful street. You can walk on the street, but for a good 50 feet towards downtown, the sidewalk is questionable.

Beaudin: There is none on one side.

Commissioner Balch: The same question. Just like Spring Street only has parking on one side, but it's on the map as....but the same thing to Greg's comment specifically

about restaurants, I've mentioned it to staff before, the area between basically Café on Main and now the new Starbucks, that section, if you're on the northern side so Pasta's, Alberto's, Lokanta, you know between the area that they are at, the tree that's planted beautifully and the bike lock thing, there is only one abreast. It is very pinch point and frankly we may need to relocate where the bike racks are to facilitate that as well and maybe that could be an option.

Chair Ritter: Be careful because the biker will say I want to see it from where I'm sitting in the restaurant and that's why a lot of them are not in favor of corrals.

Commissioner Balch: But I do know there's a study out there that says not all bike racks are used in the downtown, so....

Commissioner Brown: Yeah, but having been on the bike/ped, the answer to that is that you're not putting them where they can see their \$1,000 bikes, right?

Commissioner Balch: I want to mention that when I actually got to the page, it does have the parking in lieu fee as an item and it says, "Effectiveness high, etc., etc." so it is a strategy identified by the consultants and it is on page 40. So you know, we're probably not helping you out.

Beaudin: You're having the kinds of conversations that the groups who are looking at this are having and especially when they overlap with some of the other planning efforts that we're doing, I think it's consistent with what we've heard. Folks want to see some supply. They want to see us planning for supply. They want to see us adding some supply in the near term. People generally understand there is a perceived parking issue if you consider all of the capacity. But, what I heard loud and clear from folks who are running businesses downtown is, even though it is perceived and there is supply elsewhere, folks just don't want to walk those longer distances and they don't want to circle for spaces. So we're hearing that so we want to use management tools. We talked about duration of parking times on Main Street. There are people who are for that because it helps the turnover. There are people who hate that because it only really allows you to do one thing rather than maybe lunch and shopping or nails, it's just lunch unless you park on a side street. We heard that as a specific example when we were talking with business owners' downtown. So we're going to have to grapple with all of these things and prioritize the list. That's our job so we appreciate the feedback and touching on some of these topic areas. I think it's perfect. Somebody's talking about removing the bike parking at this location, keep the bike parking for this, I've heard all from different folks so it's exactly the conversation that's happening in the community about these issues.

Commissioner Balch: I commend you because it's about time.

Chair Ritter: It looks like a good study. We've used them before haven't we?

Beaudin: Yes, Fehr and Peers helps us out with...they do traffic analysis, they do bike and pedestrian planning and they've helped us out quite a bit. They're working on it right now.

Chair Ritter: They did our last one, didn't they?

Beaudin: We use other consultants too though. Just to be clear, they're popular but they're not the only ones.

Chair Ritter: They did the Dublin one and I believe....they know our area.

Beaudin: They worked in Walnut Creek. They did the parking plan for downtown Walnut Creek which is a different animal than our downtown, but they've got a lot of experience with this work.

Commissioner Brown: Yes, on the current revision of the Bike/Ped Plan, they were the only ones who provided a full response and part of the answer from the other is that they figured Fehr and Peers would put it in. One other comment I was going to make is Figure 10—if you overlay that on the proposed locations for a parking structure, the Bank of America one looks like a candidate in that all three of those from a five minute walk perspective it targets whereas the Hardware site would be outside of the main treatment at Bernal. So it seemed to strike a good compromise, but in general, I'm really impressed with the report, the thoroughness of it, and I was quite pleased. I think it's more to Jack's point, Figure 11 actually shows that effective walkway that we were talking about, although I would challenge whether or not the yellow line Main Street is actually accurate. I would say that's probably red based on personal experiences.

Commissioner Balch: I had one other additional comment which was the transportation corridor where we actually already have parking built out, specifically behind McKay's, possibly as you say a business establishment, I noticed the parking lot of the neighbor has a back curve, but it stops significantly shy—in fact there's a grade change—let's say a 15 feet grade change, then the parking we're actually utilizing on DG or gravel on that site, there's a very wide section where it appears where the owners are parking. Is that part of the transportation corridor that could be tapped into?

Beaudin: I don't know exactly the location of the corridor but its 75 feet wide so it very well could extend beyond the top of the bank that's there and that slope. I would imagine that some of that is our property for the corridor.

Commissioner Balch: And I understand we have the cleanup issue which is why I tread lightly about doing that, but you know, doing that, that corridor approximately from behind McKay's and where you have to make the right onto Bernal, it's only single wide where you've got...

Beaudin: ...a perpendicular bar, and I think the plan does show having perpendicular parking on both sides, and my concern is I think they have not left us room for bike/ped improvements so we do need to look at that area a little more carefully as we refine the plan and finalize it, but there's likely supply to be had there as well.

Commissioner Balch: Probably more simply than some of these other things we were so frown on.

Beaudin: Yeah, I think the transportation corridor in general we're just having a hard look at.

Commissioner Balch: It appears to be utilized in this area, I'll just say that and without any environmental issues in this area, it seems like it might be an initial one to take a crack at.

Commissioner O'Connor: And some too we could better access into the Main Street so you don't have to walk two blocks down to get to a street to where....

Beaudin: ...are you talking about a pedestrian cut through?

Commissioner O'Connor: Well, because of the grade elevation change, that we put in some kind of a staircase.

Commissioner Balch: Well, there is one actually. That's what actually drew my attention to it. The staircase is there. It's a concrete stair. It's got truncated domes and it's ready to go and it's great. You're on one grade in gravel, you go on a very freshly poured concrete staircase, you get to the bottom and you end up on gravel again for another 15 feet or 10 feet and you walk into the parking lot. It puts you right into the back parking lot of that establishment next to McKay's where you step over a curb.

Beaudin: It's not accessible, so there would have to be a ramp system and a whole other level of investment if we made it an official public path. But yes, the idea of getting people to Main Street and getting people out of the parking lot, understood.

Commissioner Nagler: Just out of curiosity, this staircase that Commissioner Balch so articulately described, who built it? It's only 3 or 4 years old.

Beaudin: So the property owner of Fleet Feet, Craig Semmelmeier, he approached us. He wanted to build a staircase and that is part of the City property transportation corridor including the flat part down below. So we went out and worked with him on putting that in there. We have a downtown trails master plan that shows how we want to put parking in the corridor including the regional trail and it has a series of those stairs in the plan. So this was one of those staircases in the plan that he approached us to install. It's not ADA, so when our building folks were out there, they said as long as you put appropriate signage that says you can get to Abbey Street for your ADA access that would be acceptable.

Commissioner Nagler: Is the sign there?

Beaudin: There should be a sign on the staircase.

Commissioner Balch: Is the ADA requirement consistent with all of the parking requirements in the downtown because when I've been through the St. Mary's lot, I didn't think there was any ADA there.

Beaudin: I'm not talking about ADA parking spaces, I'm talking about ADA access because of the staircase. It wasn't ramped, so you have to provide alternative means to get to the point, like if you wanted to get to Main Street. The arrows point you to take Abbey Street.

Commissioner Balch: So someone who knows better than me should look at grading necessary so you can access and park on both elevations. I would just say that.

Beaudin: Okay and I know Mike's been looking at that, including a connection closer to Bernal where the park is. There's some additional land there as it flattens out as well and kind of making those grade changes work and possibly getting parking closer. You know, when we've talked about this in the past, Mike's noted the engineering challenges and I have some aesthetic concerns as well, you know, the place where everyone enters our downtown or 27 percent of people are coming from Bernal and to have a parking lot on the entrance, I think the park really has to be the feature and maybe the parking can live behind it, but Mike hasn't figured out the engineering part of it yet and either has Steve Kirkpatrick, so I think if we can make it work, we will.

Chair Ritter: Great.

Commissioner Brown: I just want to say a comment, I know you changed your parking sign and you've got a new ornament for your office, on this page it was kind of interesting the emphasis on the free parking. It was nice, especially since the Council's direction but maybe that's something you consider only if you go to a mix of private and public.

Beaudin: Yeah, there has to be an information and marketing campaign around some of this as well, and having the big blue "P" is pretty universal and we will not have, at least for the foreseeable future, any meters or numbered parking spaces or any of that stuff that would convince people they had to look around to figure out how to pay for their parking. So hopefully, that's enough. There's part of me that is cautious about the electronic signs that tell people how many spaces are available, I think parking structures in big areas that works well, but just sign clutter and pollution for me in our Downtown is a concern so we'll find the balance there and make sure we're not going too far.

Commissioner Brown: And I didn't see anything here. Was there anything here on EV parking?

Beaudin: We just added it to a list of things we want to explore on the Council work plan for the next year. We did not include EV parking because it's not a supply or management issue. It's a service and theoretically it takes away from what a majority of people are doing, although it's the right thing to do. So just like you all have the in-lieu issue, I have the EV issue. There are a couple of EV spaces at City Hall. We don't really have others that I know of in downtown.

Commissioner Brown: There's one at the Museum on Main I know because I used it once, and the reason I brought it up is I read an interesting article that talked about the disappearing of gas stations in San Francisco because of the high land cost. You can't make money in San Francisco anymore and pretty soon there won't be any gas stations in San Francisco. I know we're not there yet, but it was just a thought.

Beaudin: I think it's a direction we need to move as a community so in talking with Mike Tassano literally last week we were talking about EV charging and the possibility to do

the study to figure out where they should go and start working with the PDA. It's one of those things that is its own effort and will need to get prioritized and into the work plan so we can get the resources to do that work.

Commissioner Brown: One other thought was that I had jury duty on Monday and I had to drive to Oakland. In the parking garage there on the second level almost like when you came in, they had what you called low energy chargers that would minimize the drain on the grid and then higher capacity ones on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of this parking garage, with the premise being that if you're going to park in there all day, you probably want the convenience of parking on the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and you can charge at a lower rate. If you really want to create charge, you will need to go further for that, so something just to consider.

Commissioner Balch: I'd like a variable so and then I can adjust for the person on the fly.

Commissioner O'Connor: That's what I was going to say. Where could you put it downtown if it takes 5 hours to charge and you're in a 3 hour parking space?

Commissioner Brown: That was my point. If you were to consider it, maybe put the chargers on the edge of town to encourage people to use those under-utilized lots versus downtown. Anyway, that's the only reason I mentioned that. It sounds like it's your challenge right now.

Beaudin: It's coming.

Chair Ritter: I just want to say I enjoyed this part of the Commission meeting the most! I think I honestly like it when we can all just ask questions and we're upfront and we're not voting on anything and I think we're in the learning mode. I didn't know it's even conceivable or thought we might want to have parts on slow meetings where we might get an informational update maybe from Pleasanton Unified or the Police and Fire or an ADA update, or traffic update. I don't know, that's not a discussion thing, but more just to educate the Commission on what's going on in other parts of the City? Just a thought. I don't know if you guys are anti that or for it, but I thought this was real good to ask questions.

Commissioner Brown: My only thought was that I hope these are not verbatim minutes because I'm not sure I was succinct.

Chair Ritter: I thought I would bring that up later, but is there a way we can ever get rid of verbatim and get back to summary minutes?

Beaudin: It's something that we've talked about. There are definitely folks who appreciate being able to see everything that we've talked about said as they go ahead and make their decisions at the next level, so it's a conversation I can have.

Commissioner O'Connor: They're not verbatim going through the entire staff report.

Chair Ritter: We don't need to decide on any of that right now, but it's a discussion we'll talk about. All right, meeting adjourned.

**f. Future Planning Calendar**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Ritter adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein  
Secretary