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

DRAFT

Wednesday, April 13, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of April 13, 2016, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Ritter.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Ritter.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development; Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Larissa Seto, Assistant City Attorney; Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; and Kendall Rose, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, David Nagler, Greg O'Connor, and Chair Ritter

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 23, 2016

Chair Ritter requested that the sentence on page 45 be modified to read as follows: "The moral of the story is its okay to keep the thing moving, not to say you have to have a final unanimous vote."

Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Minutes of the March 23, 2016 Meeting, as amended.

Commissioner Balch seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the March 23, 2016 Meeting were approved, as amended.

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

Carrie Cox: My name is Carrie Cox. Last night's meeting was very encouraging. There was a broad base of support from the community for Bill Wheeler's initiative to allow the citizens to decide on Costco. There were a number of people within the community who did not want Costco. We will continue to support his efforts and believe the City should pause and let the people decide this issue. Commissioner Allen was the only Commissioner who supported the idea. Why would you continue to waste money and resources? We will collect the signatures. The people want to decide, yet except for Commissioner Allen and Councilmember Brown, the rest are intent on moving forward.

There was much misinformation given by staff last night which contradicted the SEIR. It will take us days to analyze each point, but we will, point by point. Information on traffic, pollution, tax revenue, the effect on existing businesses, etc. There was also much information which was in our favor such as the funding of the infrastructure; \$5 million of existing funds to be used, \$6 million plus in borrowing for 30-40 years at a higher interest rate, Caltrans has not approved the improvements to the interchanges, there is still no answer given to concessions being negotiated, yet Costco has signed a lease. Are we to believe that they would sign a lease and not know what the City is giving? No analysis of break even. The City has a surplus. There is no desperate need for a Costco. I could go on and on but it is yours and the Council's decision to continue to move forward. It is a bad decision. Bill Wheeler's group will prevail. They now have more information to dispute, more costs to criticize and the knowledge that these tax dollars are not necessary especially at these high costs. You have given us a gift. Thank you.

Josh Hanna: My name is Josh Hanna. As you know, I was at the meeting last night and I spoke. In just a few short months I have learned a lot about politics. I have learned how numbers can be manipulated and I've learned a lot about deception. I've learned that elected politicians sometimes do not consider the will of the people who elected them. They make decisions without considering consequences to future generations. I have also learned there is no regard for spending money that you do not have; borrow and let the next generation pay. It is sad. I hope my generation is more responsible, more considerate of the people and of the future generations. We will win this initiative. It's for a good cause. People should decide this issue. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Bill Wheeler: Good evening Planning Commission members and staff. I'm Bill Wheeler, owner of Black Tie Transportation, still on the corner of Commerce and Johnson Drive in lovely Pleasanton. Great meeting last night—I want to commend all of you for taking the time to be there, present the information and listening to the comments. I especially want to thank Gerry for his great performance. The presentation gave a lot of good information, although some of the data plans we had not heard before and the questions were good, but I hope some weren't intended to confuse the public more than clarify things. For example, I was particularly concerned about the idea of the City sponsoring a ballot for the initiative in November which could cloud up an already complex situation. I would hope that you wouldn't insult the Pleasanton voters by trying to do that.

Let me also clarify something that came up in the questions. Our big box initiative would open the way for one or several retail stores of less than 50,000 square feet which could attract businesses that would complement the planned hotels. By building an attractive, lively venue with interesting stores, restaurants and possibly a movie theater, you could create a place where guests in the 3 hotels as well as residents from around the region would want to spend time and money and enjoy a true Pleasanton experience. We have a great opportunity here to create something new and unique and at the same time bring revenue, jobs and new regional focus to the City of Pleasanton. I look forward to working with you over the next few months to create a plan that everyone can endorse and anticipate great results. Thank you very much for your time.

Chair Ritter: As most people know, this is a time where you can talk about things that are not on the agenda. We, the Planning Commission cannot talk about them or address them until they become an agenda item, so I just wanted to let everybody know. Gerry, would you mind giving a brief summary of last night's Johnson Drive EDZ meeting and what is next for those that were not here last night.

Gerry Beaudin: We presented an update last night at the Joint Planning Commission and City Council workshop. There was no formal action requested or taken last night. Staff received direction to continue moving forward with our analysis of the Johnson Drive Economic Development Zone. We heard some questions last night that we will have to do some additional analysis to respond to. We're going to do that work and then we're going to move into the hearing phases when we have that analysis complete. So that is the status quo. What that leaves open is the possibility for a vote of the people for an action that's taken by the City as well.

4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Adam Weinstein advised that the applicant of PUD-112 has requested the item be pulled from the Consent Calendar.

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. **PUD-112, Amanda Gagliardi**

Application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan for a four-lot single-family residential development and related improvements at 1027 Rose Avenue which includes the retention of the existing single-family residence, the construction of an approximately 3,443-square-foot, one-story, single-family residence, and two future custom homes. Zoning for the property is PUD-MDR (Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential) District.

This item was pulled from the Consent Calendar.

Jenny Soo presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Chair Ritter: Great, we'll have questions for staff and I have three speaker cards on this topic. One question I have is, did the applicant and staff agree on everything but the porch?

Soo: Yes.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Chair Ritter: All right, the first speaker is Franco Gagliardi.

Franco Gagliardi – Applicant: Thank you for putting that presentation together and taking the time to hear us tonight. We have been looking forward to this day for a long time so thank you. The reason we ask that this be pulled from Consent is because of the front porch. The architecture of the house would be greatly affected by the addition of a front porch. We feel that the plans we have had been in staff's hands since last July and there have been dozens of opportunities to notify us about the need for a front porch. Only last Thursday night at 5:15 p.m. did we find out that there was going to be this requirement for an additional front porch. That was very frustrating to us because it came so late in the game; over eight months after they had the initial drawings that showed the front porch as it stands right now.

We want to make it known that we are in favor of front porches in general. We spent many joyful hours at my wife's grandma's house next door, Ms. Nolan, the owner of Nolan Farms and so we're very much in favor of porches in general. One of the issues why we don't want an additional front porch on our house is because we have a child who is autistic and he has very little, if any, impulse control. We would never use a front porch like the other porches in the neighborhood. We have the benefit of Ms. Nolan's front yard having a gate around it so he can be out there and if he decides to get up and run around to try and see the horses, he is enclosed in a fence so he is not likely to run out in the middle of the street. With the design of our front yard, there is no fence around it so there is not that same protection for him. The architectural changes and our family situation make it so we would request that you strike the requirement for an extension of the as-designed front porch.

Commissioner Nagler: If I could sir, just so I'm clear, the home you would like to build is as presented to us, right?

Gagliardi: Yes sir.

Commissioner Nagler: And staff is suggesting that the front door be set back, right?

Gagliardi: Currently the front door is set back over seven feet and there is a covered porch there that is 50 square feet. What they are saying is they want the porch to extend more over the front of the house laterally. So they are saying the covered porch as it stands is not sufficient and they would like to see it expanded. So we've talked to our architects to see if there is a way we could compromise by extending the existing front porch a few feet out. Staff replied that was insufficient and they would prefer a more lateral front porch.

Commissioner Balch: Looking at the design, the laundry room is of one of those windows we see on the left and then next to that looks to be a powder room. So you're saying that area is not available to extend a porch laterally?

Gagliardi: Not without getting rid of the powder room.

Commissioner Balch: I apologize. Maybe I'm not being clear. If you come out towards the street five feet and extend to the left, is that a possibility?

Gagliardi: We talked through that with our architect and he is one of the speakers who can describe that in more detail about why that would not work with the way the roof is aligned, but we have looked at that option.

Chair Ritter: Staff, can you explain?

Weinstein: Yes, let me clarify. We're absolutely not looking for any sort of change to the square footage or the configuration of the interior of the house or any changes to the backyard. We're simply asking for a porch to be extended out from the front of the house. Mr. Gagliardi is correct—there is an existing entryway that is covered, it comprises about 50 square feet. Because of its orientation, it's sort of a long, narrow corridor; it's substantially less square footage than a compact parking space for instance. So we're looking for a porch similar to those in the vicinity that extend out to the front of the house. The development guidelines that are proposed which staff is very comfortable with, allow for a porch to extend into the front setback without, again, affecting any of the rest of the house, so no changes to interior space and no changes to the backyard would be necessary.

Commissioner O'Connor: So you want the porch to come out from where the front door is across the living room?

Beaudin: If we look at this area right here, anywhere in this vicinity, we think that a porch is entirely appropriate and you could even imagine it wrapping slightly around here. That's typical in this neighborhood. The porch would be south facing and it actually helps with solar heat gain for the den space. It's an amenity that belongs in the character of this neighborhood.

Gagliardi: That would completely change the architecture of the front of the house also.

Beaudin: It doesn't actually.

Gagliardi: Could we have the architect speak to that?

Beaudin: The existing columns that are on the front of the house and the framing around the windows provide a great opportunity for three posts to carry that roof element.

Chair Ritter: We'll bring the next speaker up. Thank you. I have two more speakers; Amanda Gagliardi and then Terry Townsend will be last.

Amanda Gagliardi: I'll pass.

Chair Ritter: Okay, Terry?

Terry Townsend – Architect: Good evening, we're here to talk about porches. As a background, basically there are two types of porches. There's a projecting porch and there's an engaged porch. So a projecting porch traditionally would be the foremost portion of a façade. It could be open on three sides and would have this whole roof element. That's more or less what staff is suggesting. What we have is an engaged porch. An engaged porch uses parts of the front of the façade to wrap around and create a covered space. So if you look at the diagram, from the outside column to this wall is nine-feet wide, the depth of this is seven feet, six inches. That's what we currently have. If you can see in the shaded area here, it's a recessed porch. This is considered an element where they are engaging the porch.

It was suggested that we include a porch on the front façade. One suggestion was actually in front of the laundry room, in front of the existing porch and in front of the den, and the end result of that would be this. So, I would lose the shed dormer, I would lose the gable at the end which we are calling a living room, and the height of the main ridge would increase by about two-to-three feet. So we lose these important elements that are on the façade right now. We are losing these elements that are very special to my clients as far as this engaged porch.

The other alternative was to have the porch extended in front of the laundry room and powder room, and again what happens in this scenario, again I'm losing that dormer and it is in front of the façade of the den so now I'm crushing this side of the gable and again the ridge goes up two-to-three feet. So we are losing that element. We have a nice balanced facade. We have two gable ends. We have this central element in the front.

The third option, and I actually took a picture, would be just columns in front of the den and the existing porch, and this is what you have around the corner and that's a tract house. And again, I lose all of these custom features I presented on the current façade and they do not want what's around the corner. They want their own design. So that's where we're meeting the issue of, well, it can be worked out later with staff. Well, there's all of these are options, but it actually drastically changes the façade.

We did propose that we would extend the den and the column forward so that we can retain the gabled element exactly as it is presented in here, but it is brought forward so

you have a larger porch. And I thought we had reached an agreement on that, but we were told that is not what they were looking for.

Chair Ritter: Your time is up but we might have questions for you.

Commissioner O'Connor: Before you start with questions, can you put those last two drawings up?

Commissioner Balch: So the last one that you showed, I think it's where the gable is coming out? Not the tract home; the one you were saying you proposed to staff and they said that wasn't what they were looking for? Having that side brought out and making that into a covered porch of some element is not what staff's asking?

Townsend: It would be the same element, including this room brought forward.

Commissioner Balch: But if the room stayed where it is and you just brought the roof element out?

Townsend: Then I would drop a column and it would look more like this.

Commissioner Balch: Not as much as you support ...

Townsend: Because you're going to have a column, column, this gets set back and all of a sudden you have a prominent....you no longer have this working as a unit. You have this heavy gable sitting over this space.

Chair Ritter: Put it on the overhead and it will show up here. We have a video here. Can you please point to where you're talking about?

Townsend: We were proposing that this entire element be brought forward including this space.

Commissioner O'Connor: I think the suggestion is that you maintain the roofline as it is but extend it out more towards the street and you keep the wall of the den where it is but under the extended roofline towards the street you put a porch.

Townsend: I follow what you're saying but that would require another column here or a third column. This element is projected; this element stays where it is, so now you have this heavy gable end that's basically over the space. That again, is going contrary to this façade acting as one, and that's the direction that they want to go. They don't want this large open space in front of this window.

Commissioner Balch: So a large open space is a porch, right? So they don't want a porch.

Townsend: We have a porch right here.

Commissioner Balch: How about a porch as defined by staff?

Townsend: Look at the definition of porch and what is a porch. It is a covered space.

Chair Ritter: Staff, are there any other porches similar to this design in the neighborhood? Like Mr. Townsend said, there's one around the corner?

Weinstein: Yes, so there's a mixture of housing in the area; a mixture of old homes and a mixture of new homes. The vast majority of the homes, I think all of the homes built in the last 15 years or so, have really good sized porches. There are some houses further down Rose and there are some multi-family residences as well if you go all the way down Rose, and if you go down Fair towards Division Street, there are also some mid-century, maybe 1960s-era houses and some of them have good sized porches and some of them don't; but in the immediate vicinity of this house, every single house has a porch and they're pretty substantial as well.

Chair Ritter: This porch is in the vicinity, correct? And this is a porch you didn't like?

Townsend: This is what the Commissioner was talking about where you're projecting it in front of itself.

Chair Ritter: And that's not what you like.

Townsend: Correct.

Chair Ritter: But this is in the neighborhood.

Townsend: This is the tract house around the corner and this is what we don't want to see and this is what you're going to end up approving.

Weinstein: So we're actually okay with that porch. It's not the most amazing porch in the world probably, but it fits into the character of the neighborhood. Again, you're just seeing lots and lots of porches in this neighborhood and I don't want to come across as an ideologue about porches because it's not something we universally require for new residences throughout the City. We absolutely don't do that, but when we find neighborhoods that have a preponderance of porches that have a certain neighborly character, we really try to be sensitive in designing infill projects that are inserted into those neighborhoods. So when we see a predominant architectural feature in a neighborhood, we're really sensitive about seeing if that can be referenced in new construction and that's exactly what we're trying to do here.

Chair Ritter: Are there any more questions for Mr. Townsend? Then we'll close the public hearing and bring it back to staff.

Commissioner Nagler: I have one more. This is more of a theoretical question. As an architect, as you view this neighborhood, do you understand why staff is asking for a porch?

Townsend: Yes, like I said, we have a porch.

Commissioner Nagler: The point I'm trying to get at is there is no porch like this in the neighborhood. The porches in the neighborhood are much more traditional porches and so I'm just asking, do you think that the request is inappropriate as an architect or do you understand the reason for the porch?

Townsend: I understand the request and I also understand that the language is very vague. It doesn't say in the guidelines anything about size, projection, engaged... It's just a porch and we have a porch. We proposed a porch. The house next door—I did that—that has a five-foot porch. Now we're talking 10 foot, eight foot, it's all these numbers that are very vague that are being circulated. By the way, we have over 600 square feet of covered porch on this house already where they are going to do their primary living.

Chair Ritter: All right, thank you. Our last speaker is Gloria Maceiko?

Gloria Maceiko – Neighbor: Thank you. First of all, I'm super happy to hear that the family members are moving into the neighborhood. We are right behind you on Creek Trail Drive. One of the main reasons we bought this house is because of the beautiful view we get from our house of the Pleasanton Ridge and I didn't see any pictures that project the house against the houses in the neighborhood to see what views would be blocked along the surrounding homes. So that is my request.

Chair Ritter: Okay, thanks for your feedback. Any other comments? Okay, we'll close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission and staff.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Allen: I have a question for Gerry because he started to talk about what this design might look like and I'm wondering if we could just hear your perspective given this discussion about a porch and, I think you were ready to design a porch that would be compatible.

Beaudin: I think Mr. Townsend touched on it. I'm talking about extending the gable much like Commissioner Nagler was discussing, with 3 columns on the front of the home. He has already established with the style of architecture that the kind of porch that we're talking about is not out of character. I met with these folks three months or so ago and we talked about the streetscape and front yard character and we did discuss porches, and we didn't require a porch at the time. We talked about that as an architectural detail that's important for the neighborhood. So our request for a porch has been out there. I haven't seen the plans a lot since then, but I do think that is an appropriate architectural feature for the streetscape in this area.

Commissioner Allen: Thank you.

Chair Ritter: Any more questions? This is just proposed for Lot 4. Have they presented anything on Lot 2 or Lot 1? Or, is it just future zoning?

Weinstein: Future zoning.

Chair Ritter: Okay. Comments?

Commissioner Balch: So my initial comment is that a home that doesn't fit within the neighborhood has to be looked at pretty carefully. I think it does behoove us to retain the character of the neighborhood so I'm generally supportive of the idea of adding or requiring a porch. I'm also trying to find a compromise because I think it is pretty heavy

handed for a governmental body, in my opinion, to dictate that a porch is required. I have difficulty with that. I would be fine if it was even a porch that had the white picket fence in front of it, that extended 12 feet across the front gable, and 5 feet out, and was uncovered but had the look of a porch being there. So in that regard, I've learned to not try to design from the dais, so I'd like to either continue the matter so they can design a porch that would be satisfactory or I'm supportive of staff's requirement.

Commissioner Nagler: I very much agree with Commissioner Balch. I used to attend Planning Commission meetings and watch the Planning Commission require applicants to do things and I would think, how is it that the Planning Commission gets to do that? It was before I understood actually and honestly the role of the Planning Commission. In matters like this it seems to me that the role is to apply planning standards and architectural standards in a uniform way so that the character of the City from neighborhood to neighborhood is maintained. It's not really to have an opinion about architecture or an opinion about paint colors, but it is relevant when we are asked to ensure that the character of the community is maintained. And I've come to better appreciate that that is the role of the Planning Commission.

That being said, I've actually, just by chance, walked in this neighborhood dozens of times. It's a terrific little neighborhood. I have a dog I constantly walk and we walk through this neighborhood, and long before this matter came up, it occurred to me that it's a really terrific, quaint neighborhood and I've often looked at your home wondering what's ever going to happen with this terrific surrounding property. And part of the charm of the neighborhood is that sense that people come out of their homes into the front and whether it happens or not, you get the sense that it's a neighborhood where neighbors connect and that the architecture contributes to that. That's made possible in fact because there are spaces in the front of the house for those connections to be made. Again, whether it happens or not, I don't know, but that's certainly the character of the neighborhood and just to say, you're moving into a terrific neighborhood as you well know.

So that's obviously a long way of saying that I too concur that even with the terrific design that you have and the location that you obviously are devoted to, that there is a way, there's always a way, to really be creative and build a home that in this element does conform with literally every other home in the neighborhood, and that it maintains that character. And, as Commissioner Balch said, certainly we don't want to suggest what it ought to look like, and we are asking questions hoping to move the suggestion, but I would support you guys being creative and building a home with some sort of a front porch.

Chair Ritter: Could you just put the other pictures of the porches up on that and then we'll hear Commissioner O'Connor's thoughts.

Commissioner O'Connor: I'm a bit conflicted here. I do think that if we extended the same roofline, didn't change any of your roofline but just extended it out and use the three columns to have a porch in front, I actually think, in my own opinion, that it would be more attractive and fit the neighborhood better. But, where I'm a bit conflicted here is it's been nine months that you've been working with the City and to have this condition placed on this family with only six days' notice after I think they must have felt this was going to be approved, and again, I'm only hearing what the applicant says so I'm hoping

the City can clarify a bit, but it seems like a six day notice is hard to take even though we, as a Planning Commission, have given people no notice and had to change design. But maybe staff could clarify the 6 day notice. Has the applicant known about this a little longer than six days out?

Weinstein: The design guidelines that are one of the drivers of our request for inclusion of a porch on this house are something that's been around for a long time actually. Those design guidelines were proposed by these applicants. The language that required the porch or suggested the inclusion of a porch in these new houses on this site was a little bit loose and it didn't absolutely require an inclusion of a porch. So it was initially not a requirement that needed to be included as part of this design and we worked with the applicant team, including Terry Townsend, very long on this project and they made lots of adjustment in response to our comments and worked really collaboratively with us, so I want to emphasize that as well, and made lots of really positive changes to get to the project we see before us tonight.

In going through our final review of projects before or even days after the Planning Commission staff report is published we sometimes look at projects again with a slightly new perspective, taking into account all the conditions of approval that are identified for a project, and it's sort of our last chance to take one big holistic look at the project. 95 percent of the time we don't find anything else we think should be changed, but there are certain times that we take that big picture look and there are things that we see which we think are missing from a project and that's what happened this time. Our suggestion to add the porch did happen at a later point in the process than we desired and we regret that. To address that, we didn't of course require the applicant team to re-design their project immediately and bring revised plans to the Planning Commission. We crafted a condition such that the plans could be supplemented with a porch and then brought to us at the building permit stage so that the applicant team would not have to invest time and money in refining these plans in advance of the Planning Commission meeting.

Admittedly, the suggestion to incorporate the porch was later than we desired but it's just something that sometimes happens with a project that has relatively complex architectural features with lots of elements that drive the design of the project.

Beaudin: If I could just add, just for context and perspective, we're at the planning stages of a project and if a neighbor came tonight and said they had a serious concern, we would address that at this hearing. I am sympathetic to the situation that we're in right now and I'm not all that pleased about it to be quite honest, but the reality for me of not addressing a situation like this is that we're putting a house down for 50-80-100 years, meaning that the final approved design will be in existence for a long time. I just want people to put that into perspective as we're thinking about the character of this neighborhood and the lofty architectural ambition that we have for our community.

Commissioner Balch: I just have to say though that if you're the applicant that has gone through that process, it's not going to feel good, so to my comment, I appreciate all the work that staff does, but as we know the communication, probably to them, should be as soon as possible.

Beaudin: Commissioner Balch, I'll reiterate. I did sit down with these folks personally to talk about the importance of the character aspects of this neighborhood and we did talk about the front porch and front yard design as an important aspect.

Commissioner Balch: But the applicant contends that the front porch element in their mind is covered with the kind of recessed....

Beaudin: ...and I think that's the nuance here and people can try to thread the needle, but that's a departure from the architectural character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner O'Connor: I understand everything that's been said. I also just wanted to note that the three pictures we have in front of us now show these front porches which I don't think are in the same style as these homes. This is a true Craftsman, we have Victorian and more modern-looking, but I can support having the porch because I think it will either improve or it won't worsen the look of the house. I think it will be a better flow with the rest of the neighborhood. I just, again, wish it had been started earlier in the process, but I think it's the right thing to do.

Commissioner Allen: And I too wish it had started earlier in the process because this is never how any of us want something to come down. I agree with what all of you have said, I think a porch is an important part of the character of this community, and it's part of the development standards that we have for the community which is identified here. So for that reason, I think it's important. I'm also open to Commissioner Balch's idea about a picket fence. I would be open to that potentially because I think this came up late; I would be willing to have some flexibility. With that said, Gerry, I appreciate your comment that if a neighbor came here and brought an issue to us today that we need to address, that's our job now. We are in the planning stage. We're not in the building stage, so this is the time when something important like this comes up where we need to ensure consistency to support the character of the neighborhood and we need to deal with it. And we do it and I think it's appropriate to do it in this case.

Commissioner Balch: Can I just mention though a point of clarification, we haven't actually addressed the last speaker's question about height, but just to circle back for me, the height element wasn't an issue for me and I'll just say that in looking at the design standards around the area, this house fit all of our height requirements so I just want to acknowledge that was brought up tonight in talking about this, but it is well within the envelope provided for the guidelines we have for downtown infill projects.

Commissioner O'Connor: It's the shortest of all the neighboring houses.

Commissioner Allen: I agree.

Chair Ritter: I'm feeling a little frustrated that it just came out at the end, but part of the process is to go through that, and as Gerry said earlier, we do make changes at this stage of the process. I'm more inclined...this is the longest Consent item I've ever experienced....it sounds like staff and the applicant have some more discussions to do and I'm not inclined to continue it, I'm actually inclined to approve it with the condition that they get the Director of Community Development in agreement upon a re-design and as you heard, we don't want to make it a major re-design. It seems like little bits

would work so we can keep the process going, so that's kind of my thought, to approve it with a condition, and I don't know if any of you are in support of that?

Commissioner Allen: I would support that.

Commissioner Balch: I'd support it also.

Commissioner Balch moved to approve Case PUD-112, 1027 Rose Avenue, subject to the Conditions of Approval as shown in Exhibit A of the staff report, and with the modification of Condition No. 38 as presented to the Commission in the staff memo dated April 13, 2016.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

Resolution No. PC-2016-08 approving Case PUD-112 was entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

a. P16-0006, Frank Berlogar

Application for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 6,486-square-foot single-family residence at 39 Silver Oaks Court. Zoning for the property is PUD-HR (Planned Unit Development – Hillside Residential) District.

Jenny Soo presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Chair Ritter: Okay, any questions before we have speakers?

Commissioner Balch: The filled area or driveway area, is all of that fill within the building envelope area?

Soo: Yes.

Commissioner Balch: I thought so, I just wanted to clarify, so it does stick within that area?

Soo: It's here, yes.

Commissioner Balch: Okay that's what I wanted to ask. Thank you.

Chair Ritter: And then the applicant has agreed with the special conditions that you've stated?

Soo: We talked about it. The architect suggested he did.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED

Chair Ritter: Okay, we'll hear from the applicant first. Thanks for coming.

Frank Berlogar, Applicant: My name's Frank Berlogar. Chairman Ritter and members of the Commission, thank you for the chance to talk with you tonight. You know, I actually think the design is a great design and has a lot of pluses and I don't see any negatives, but let me walk you through my line of reasoning about the design guidelines and the architect who wrote those who has reviewed the plans and approved the design, and his comment was he liked this design better than the other one because he felt this one really got it right.

The size of the house is 25 percent smaller than allowed. The height of the house is only 32 feet with 40 feet allowed. In the staff report they indicated 40 feet, but the height is 32 feet, so the house is smaller visually and eight feet lower than required by the design guidelines. The house has 400 feet of private drive behind the gate that the City requires. The closest neighbor is 300 feet away. The only traffic that goes by this house is people going to the upper house. There is no public access, nobody gets close, and so the impact is all from a distance. The driveway serving the two homes is 16-foot wide so with the circular driveway, there is the opportunity for guests and visitors to this house to drive up, park in that circular driveway and then exit. But with the 30-foot configuration, one car pretty much blocks the garage area and the access in and out for other vehicles. So that means by-and-large all guests must park down on the 16-foot private drive and then the cars line up broadside to my neighbors. The point that is not well understood is that without the additional fill and retaining walls, that portion of the house will be visible. So that landscape element actually blocks most of the two-story element of the house.

And then the other point I want to make is that I went online and pulled up an aerial photo of the part of Ruby Hill showing all kinds of big driveways and I could go to other parts of Pleasanton and find them as well, but there's a real precedent for it. I think the design is very tasteful and that landscape element that hides most of the two-story element and view from my neighbors is a real plus I think.

Chair Ritter: Your time is up but we might have a question. Does anybody have a question? Thank you. I guess my only question is that grading is the issue of the neighbor. To meet what they want, is that a big undertaking of design?

Berlogar: Is that a big design undertaking?

Chair Ritter: Yes.

Berlogar: It's not a big design change but it has a big negative impact to the homeowner and my neighbors.

Chair Ritter: Okay, all right, thank you. Next is Gevan Reeves?

Gevan Reeves, Neighbor: Well, thank you Commissioners and staff for my few minutes here. I bought a home in 2011 with the views and the space off of the vineyard. We were here in 2014 in front of the Planning Commission and City Council and I was trying to restrict what I view as the expansion rights under the vineyard corridor specific plan and unfortunately I lost in that battle of trying to preserve my views. And here we are again. Mr. Berlogar broke ground last July. We've been under heavy haul and construction for over nine months. As staff mentioned, one of the houses has already been approved and this one seems to be a rather unnecessary expansion in my view. We're not talking about a couple of feet. We're talking about 36 feet and 36 feet doesn't mean a lot. In my golfing paces (he walked across the room)...36 feet is how far he is trying to come closer to my house, and the visual simulations when I see those, I think, am I looking at the same development projects because that looks like nothing to me.

So this is a view from my backyard. The pool shot—this was my early argument. I built this house and didn't know this development was going on and I spent a lot of money on the backyard and now I have a home staring down at me. It's not 300 feet from the fence line. It's maybe 200 feet. I apologize for the 2-D view here. The blue arrows, this 470-foot line, that's the upper pad. The 460-foot line is down here so that's about a 10-foot difference right there. I thought it was 40 feet when I met with staff. I'd like to check on the height of the house. I thought it was 40 feet and not 32 feet, but I could be wrong there. But that's 10 feet and 40 feet is going to encapsulate this whole area. So this is a direct impact on my backyard.

The blue lines, they look like they're down...that's meant to come toward me, so what the developer is trying to do is bring the upper pad 36 feet directly toward me. When we met again with the City Council and City Manager, there was a lot of discussion around the split pad that was supposed to blend this into the hillside. Actually bring the 470 foot pad up and bringing it forward does not blend into the hillside. It actually makes it steeper, makes it more sphered and more impactful to me. I don't think it blocks the view other than having a sheer cliff behind me. It doesn't block the view of the home especially if we continue with the landscaping. So 36 feet, again, it's not a couple of feet. It nearly doubles what's allowed in this area. It's contrary to the purpose of this pad and it's not necessitated by the building. Mr. Berlogar could have designed around the building.

If you could flip—again, this just shows at the other angle that's coming right on me. Could you flip to the last view? And this is my living room, my kitchen, my dining room. This development is severe in my backyard and bringing it 36 feet forward is unnecessary. Its magnitude is severe and it immediately impacts me more than anybody else so I don't think it's necessary for this development.

Chair Ritter: Thank you for your comments. The next speaker is Adam Gardner, Architect.

Adam Gardner, Architect: I just wanted to touch on a couple of points that Frank mentioned and then clarify a couple of things that were brought up. It's not so much a grading issue as was just discussed. It is more of a visual issue it sounds like. Granted we are asking for additional grading which is allowable within this development at the

discretion of the Board and Planning. So what we're proposing is extending a portion of the buildable area through additional grading and a secured system of walls. We're actually allowed up to five-foot retaining walls and we're asking for a staggered two- and three-foot wall system with a slope bank between. It wasn't really strongly discussed tonight, but there will be a very robust landscape plan, conditional Live Oak trees, Myrtle trees and a transitional planting palette that will effectively screen these walls. The walls will also be required to be faced in stone so they are attractive walls too which complement the house.

We did the calculation and depending on where you measure, but from the property line of the nearest neighbor to the center of the auto court as proposed which is 25 feet from the front of the garage, is 270 feet, so the garage is an additional 25 feet or 295 feet to the property line of the adjacent closest neighbor.

An additional 20 feet from what we are requesting, staff is requesting a 20-foot reduction of this auto court. 20 feet or a 300-foot distance is less than 10 percent so it's really a nominal change from a visual aspect. The sight line is not affected, the walls are screened, they are planted and they are also attractive walls. The other thing that we have to stress that the client brought up is staff's contention that we only need 25 feet to make this work. The fact that that requires every car to be in the garage at all times in case a guest comes up is not reasonable or practical on a hillside lot like this, particularly with a long driveway. 16 feet is really not adequate for off-street parking. There is potential for blockage, particularly if there's a fire or something like that. There's a fire truck turnaround at the end of Lot 2 that needs to be clear and maintained at all times.

So I think we have to look at it from a planning point of view of what's appropriate and what's reasonable for a home this size in this kind of development, so I just wanted to bring those points up. And if you have any other questions, I can answer them. We do have on our cross section on one of the sheets the height measured from the lowest point of the grade to the highest point of the house which is 32 feet. So I just wanted to clarify that too.

Commissioner Balch: So Mr. Gardner, do you know what the radius of the auto circle is off-hand?

Gardner: 25 feet.

Commissioner Balch: I'm sorry, I should have clarified—the radius of the interior, call it, turnaround element or design element that's going to be in the center; a water feature or whatever it is. And is that able to be reduced or is that at its minimum size?

Gardner: Well, that's actually designed to be a planted area. It could also be something that in a final plan can be something you can drive on. So it is not intended necessarily to block traffic or form a visual element. A 25-foot radius is really the minimum you need to make a full turn with a sedan. So the thought being that rather than creating a situation where you have multi-point turns for a standard size car, a court of this size works.

Chair Ritter: Mr. Berlogar, would you like to respond to any of these comments?

Berlogar: The additional 36 feet is not directly towards Mr. Reeves' property. It is almost 90 degrees. Mr. Reeves' property is on that angle and the increase is perpendicular to that, so it's not 36 feet closer to his property.

Commissioner Nagler: But you can see the retaining walls at least from his property, right?

Berlogar: Yes, and without the retaining wall you would see the two-story element of the house.

Chair Ritter: Right, the retaining walls block the view.

Berlogar: Yes, to that red zone.

Chair Ritter: Thank you. I'll bring it back; comments, questions for staff?

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Allen: My question is a 'what if' and that is, if you were starting this from scratch with the goal of no additional grading and building within the footprint, could this be designed such that there could be a round driveway area and it would be done in a way that would not require any additional grading?

Weinstein: As you can imagine, there's lots of different ways to design this project if you were starting from a blank slate which is essentially what happened at the very beginning of the planning process. Just think of an extreme example of re-designing this project where the house is 1,000 square feet and this is a two-car garage, you could absolutely fit those project elements within the existing split pad and grading as originally contemplated. So that's sort of what could happen. Just to be really clear, yes, the project could be completely re-designed to fit within the grading envelope.

I think our thought process in terms of accepting what was currently proposed was based on a couple of different issues, and they all have been raised, but one is that when you look at it from a visual perspective, especially with the retaining walls and especially with the vegetation that is being proposed in front of the retaining walls, the visual impact is relatively minor. So, that's sort of one key issue. Yes, it can absolutely be seen from off-site from various viewpoints, but the adverse effects of the additional grading are relatively minimized.

Number two, we actually think that our proposal which reduces the grading sort of increases the visual compatibility of the grading even further. So, we're taking what was originally proposed which was 100 cubic yards of grading and reducing that by....we haven't actually done the calculations, but maybe 30 percent or 40 percent. So that 100 cubic yards of grading is not an absolutely huge amount to begin with but it is further reduced.

The third point of course is that the original approval for this project didn't say that under any circumstances additional grading could not be permitted. It said additional grading can be permitted as long as the City determines it is consistent with the existing topography and does not have an adverse effect. And, we came to the conclusion, in

our analysis, that with the measures that were talked about, especially vegetation, that there wouldn't be an adverse effect.

Commissioner Allen: Thank you.

Commissioner O'Connor: So a question for staff: where they are expanding this 36 feet for the roundabout driveway, if the home had been designed differently, this is within the building area so they could have actually built a stepdown and a two-story element in that whole area, correct? Which would have been much more visually undesirable I would assume, to the other neighbors. I'm not sure I quite understand why staff would suggest this compromise of pulling it back so much. The way I was looking at this is more from a parking view because of the street that goes up to this home and the driveway itself; that unless we expand the driveway a lot more, I'm wondering where the parking is going to be for guests. This is a fairly large home. I guess there could be fairly large parties if you will, and I'm just wondering what else is available for parking in this area. It looks to me like the streets are too narrow to have parking in front of the fire turnaround area. Is it wider than I'm thinking?

Soo: You cannot park along the private driveway. That is a fire access road, no parking.

Commissioner O'Connor: On the access road up to the driveway?

Soo: Yes.

Commissioner Balch: That's the one we see looking like a snake on the plans here.

Soo: Yes.

Commissioner O'Connor: So it is no parking?

Soo: Yes.

Commissioner O'Connor: That was one of my concerns.

Chair Ritter: The only parking is in the driveway. And how many cars can they fit in the driveway?

Commissioner O'Connor: Well, that was my concern. If we shorten it, it's getting in and out.

Soo: It's 50 feet across and 9 feet wide.

Commissioner O'Connor: No, I'm saying certainly you can stack cars in there but they may have to move and since there's no street parking...

Weinstein: Yes, I mean absolutely, it's certainly a trade-off in terms of providing parking on the site and reducing grading. Just to be completely frank on what this is, this is a compromise that we tried to strike between the desires of Mr. Reeves who for good reasons is very, very sensitive to changes in the topography, and the desire of the applicant to have a really nice project that works well for people who live there in the

future. So it's simply a compromise. I don't think there's a clear right answer or wrong answer in this case, but again, we're just trying to strike a balance between preserving the existing topography per the original approval but also allowing the project to be built as proposed.

Commissioner O'Connor: Thank you for reminding me of my other question. When you were looking at landscaping, was there any discussion with the neighbors? And the reason I ask is, whether this retaining wall goes in or not, I think a retaining wall is great, but I'm more worried about large trees. Is there going to be a neighbor who now has blue sky who's going to be worried about 30-, 40-, or 50-foot tall tree species blocking that? Could that compromise have been in the area of landscaping where we put shrubbery on those high walls where it won't necessarily block the sky, or trees that grow to a smaller height...was any of that discussed with any of the neighbors? Were they concerned about any of that?

Soo: A second person contacted staff regarding this application. The other homeowner lives on the opposite side so he is basically just concerned about the elevation he's going to see from his backyard, but after conversation with Mr. Reeves, he indicated he didn't really want to see the retaining wall portion. So for that, staff had discussions with the landscape architect to pick a species which would have a proper height, nice spread, and then also be evergreen. So that's why the species is recommended.

Commissioner O'Connor: So designed to cover the walls.

Soo: Yes, and then you can just draw a line of sight and it would go up farther so you don't see the garage doors and the entire building from there.

Beaudin: The other thing that is happening Commissioner O'Connor is the area behind some of the lower lots are being planted, so it took a little longer than it should have to get those trees in the ground out there but there is going to be additional tree canopy cover with trees planted in the backs of these properties and the view that folks are looking at tonight with this project. So there was an understanding that there would be an additional buffer between the properties over time.

Commissioner O'Connor: That was approved in the past?

Beaudin: Correct.

Commissioner O'Connor: Thank you.

Commissioner Nagler: I understand that this particular PUD is relatively new, but how long have homes been anticipated on this property?

Weinstein: Homes on the site were anticipated as far back as the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan, and we're trying to find the date for that, but we think it was in the early 2000's perhaps. I'm guessing there was some thought behind developing that area in accordance with something like this even before the existence of the specific plan, so quite a while.

Commissioner Nagler: When the home of the neighbors down below were constructed, it was either disclosed or certainly discussed that there were going to be homes visually up the hillside, right?

Weinstein: Yes, that's right, so somebody buying a house or living in this area would have likely known about the existence of the specific plan, but in all fairness, the devil's in the details here right? If you look at the specific plan and the map that shows where housing might go in the specific plan, there are little blobs that show where housing can be built. It might be difficult for somebody on the street to translate that into an actual impact.

Commissioner Nagler: I'm just trying to put it into context what was anticipated. So to your point specifically, maybe I'm missing it, but I just don't see there to be a visual difference between what the applicant is asking for and what staff is recommending as it is viewed from down below. It sounds like, and as I've read it, and am hearing it this evening, it's the same retaining walls, the same hedging that would be required as a condition of approval, so I'm not sure how the view changes between what staff is suggesting is a compromise and what the applicant is requesting.

Weinstein: You're right; it's sort of a side view from Mr. Reeves' house of the proposed grading, but it's still visible. I believe from his backyard you could actually see this reduction compared to the original proposal. Again, with the retaining walls and with the vegetation that's being proposed, there's not a huge visual impact either way, but we think that this does reduce the perception of grading and actual apparent grading that's happening on this site even if it's viewed not straight on or viewed from an angle. Again, not a huge difference, but we think it's noticeable and was worth exploring.

Commissioner Nagler: But noticeable only to the period that the vegetation is growing, right, until it matures? It's that interim period, right?

Weinstein: Yes.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Balch: I agree with Commissioner Nagler's comment. I initially thought I was supportive of staff's recommendation to reduce, but after hearing the applicant and kind of thinking about it and obviously looking at the circular drive and hearing the comment about no off-street parking or no off-property parking, I'm tending to lean in support of the applicant, as designed. My only comment to that or to try to help address concerns would be that we look at the sizes of the boxes of the three trees that are going to be planted on the front there and maybe we upsize those.

Chair Ritter: I'm hearing a lot of give and take. You've worked with the applicant and worked with the neighbor, have done some tweaks here and there, and I'm in favor of recommending approval and I like what Commissioner Balch suggested. I'm more concerned about the vegetation and visual trees that the neighbor looks at straight out of their window. I'm not sure if that's part of the conditions of approval, or we just make sure that's included if a motion is made?

Commissioner Balch: Well, if I may, I had one other quick note which was that I did not see in the conditions any requirement for recycled water to be used during the construction period. I don't know if that's a standard request of staff nowadays or not, but given the size of the grading, I would suggest making that a condition as well. We had a condition on the prior item. I think it was Condition No. 19 that we could lift the language off. From my view, I don't know the box size of the trees being proposed, but I would maybe leave the upsizing to the Director of Community Development, and then add the condition regarding the use of recycled water during construction.

Commissioner Balch moved to approve P16-0006, 39 Silver Oaks Court, subject to the Conditions of Approval as shown in Exhibit A of the Staff Report, with the addition of a condition that recycled water be used during the construction process as coordinated by the Director of Community Development, a modification of Condition No. 7 to say that the three trees located in front of the retaining wall be upsized at the direction and determination of the Director of Community Development, and to strike Condition No. 5 with reduction to a 30-foot area and go with 'as proposed.'

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: None

Resolution No. PC-2016-09 approving Case P16-0006 was entered and adopted as motioned.

b. P16-0826, City of Pleasanton

Proposal to consider an amendment to the Pleasanton Municipal Code to allow for concurrent processing of Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning Requests and/or PUD Development Plans with Tentative Subdivision Map applications.

Shweta Bonn presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Ritter: I'll just make a little comment. Thank you staff for getting into this. I know we've been doing a lot of process adjustments over the past 10 years and we're trying to be more efficient. Those are just my comments. Does anyone have anything to add? Do we have a motion?

Commissioner Allen moved to approve P16-0826 and find that the proposed amendment to the Municipal Code is statutorily exempt from CEQA and adopt the resolution to approve it.

Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution No. PC-2016-10 approving Case P16-0006 was entered and adopted as motioned.

c. PUD-104-01M/PUD-81-22-15M, Workday, Inc.

Applications for Planned Unit Development Major Modifications to construct a six-story, approximately 410,000-square-foot office building, parking garage, and related site improvements at 6110 and 6120-6160 Stoneridge Mall Road. The proposed modifications would replace the previously-approved plans to construct a six-story, approximately 430,000-square-foot office building, two parking garages, and related site improvements. Zoning for 6110 Stoneridge Mall Road is Planned Unit Development – Mixed Use (PUD-MU) District and zoning for 6120-6160 Stoneridge Mall Road is Planned Unit Development – Commercial-Office (PUD-C-O) District.

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

Commissioner Allen: First of all, I love the design of the plaza and the improved bike and pedestrian access. It makes this feel like a community. The question I have is regarding new traffic data. It looks like in this traffic report we're seeing for the very first time much higher overall trips because we now know the number of employees. So when we received the first report in March, the consultant didn't know the maximum number of employees and they had some estimates on trip rates. Now that we're seeing this, and I'm referring to Table 2 on page 5 of 13. If I'm reading this right, we're now seeing that the net new trips daily are 5,790. Is that correct?

Otto: Yes, that's correct. Normally in traffic studies they rely on The Institute of Transportation Engineers to estimate the number of trips based on square footage. That is usually the standard that is used. In this case, the applicant happened to indicate it could have up to 2,200 employees in the building which is a higher ratio than you would normally see, so we had that analyzed in the traffic study to see whether that would cause any additional things that would be required. There are a higher number of trips when you use the number of employees but the study indicates that the mitigations are still adequate.

Commissioner Allen: Right, so by the way, I'm not holding this up but I think it's an area important to look at. As I think about our meeting last night on the Johnson Drive EDZ, we were talking about what traffic that area would generate which I think was 13,000 daily trip rates if they had a big box store. And I'm looking at this new number which talks about the magnitude of this project which is close to 6,000 daily trips, so it's roughly half the number of daily trips as the EDZ. So it just makes me think there's a lot

more traffic that will come into this area and be using the same freeway system that we heard from a lot of folks last night is of concern. It just makes me want to ask questions, now that I'm seeing this for the first time and we have an opportunity to look at it. It's making me want to look at traffic and really validate traffic impact fees and other aspects that we may not have looked at when we saw the project a number of months ago when we were looking at a daily traffic rate of 3,800 or so. My question for staff is, how much in traffic impact fees are we expecting to get from this project and is this something we should continue to look at?

Beaudin: So there are a couple of layers to the question that you have. I'll start where I think the start is and try to answer all of your questions. So this is not the way we prefer to do traffic impact analysis. We don't want to try and estimate the number of employees that are going to be sitting in a building. Our preferred methodology is to use our zoning code and use ITE. This is valuable data because what it lets us do is check the circumstances that Workday thinks they will have for this building, but the reality is, Workday could build that building and never occupy it. So what we try and do is build for the ITE standard and what's interesting about this site is, they are projecting a lot of employees coming this way. We think that their transportation demand management program really needs to be stronger than it is. What I would imagine us doing as we get the TDM a little more formal is that we would see some of these trips come out of this pile. But again, I wouldn't want to be looking at employee estimates to generate trip rates and calculate traffic impact fees because just like they have estimated a big number, someone might come to us and give us a small number and then we're still coming back to ITE. That's our standard. The infrastructure that we anticipated in the General Plan uses those numbers as well based on the different office categories, and that's how we calculate our traffic impact fees so we look at where General Plan buildout will take us, and those improvements then go into a bucket, a big list. We tally it up and then assess a fee based on that and the Council has the ability to adjust that before they adopt it.

So we're in the process of updating our fees at this point in time and we have a long list of traffic improvements we know need to be paid for and we're looking at them with a pretty consistent methodology not one by one. I don't have the number for you. There is a development agreement though for this project and that's not being opened up with this. Because it's a Major Modification but it's actually less square footage, I believe the traffic impact fees are actually locked in based on the prior development. This is an interesting circumstance because it's considered a Major Modification but there are a number of other agreements already in place for this project.

Commissioner O'Connor: Gerry, correct me if I'm wrong too, but the analysis here on trips really doesn't take into account their proximity to BART, does it? I mean, our code is by building size and it doesn't matter if it's next to BART or if it's someplace else.

Beaudin: That's right and we typically try and adjust for that with our analysis, but for traffic impact fee calculation purposes and things like that, we're using our standard methodology.

Commissioner Nagler: As I understand the number of parking spaces that are being planned there are almost one-to-one as one form of relationship between the number of employees that Workday anticipates in these buildings and the number of parking

spaces being created, right? So in other words, the plan doesn't anticipate people using public transportation and bicycling and walking and carpooling and whatever else, right?

Otto: The parking for the site is using our normal code as the guide which is based on square footage and not employees, which is 1 per 300, so that is what the project is providing. It provides 1 space per 304 square feet, but when proposing that, we did factor in the proximity to the BART station, the bus stop, and all the traffic demand program measures that the applicant is going to implement and we were comfortable with the parking ratio of 1:304.

Commissioner Nagler: Just in the raw numbers of it, the number of employees' Workday projects having on the site when the project is completed as compared to the actual number of parking spaces that will exist. It's almost a one-to-one relationship, isn't it?

Otto: Workday, in their building can anticipate potentially up to 2,200 employees but we have five other buildings that are also using the overall parking that we're talking about—the roughly 3,800 spaces that are being proposed.

Commissioner Nagler: So once this project is built and all of the buildings are occupied, using the company's numbers because you can't know, right, so just taking their number as the number, over the entire campus of Workday, how many parking spaces will there be relative to what we believe to be the number of employees?

Otto: We don't know the number of employees that are in the five Stoneridge Corporate Plaza buildings because those are multi-tenant buildings with different tenants in them. Workday's in a lot of them but they don't take up all of the buildings and we don't track, as Gerry was saying. For purposes of our traffic impact fee as well as our parking, we don't look at number of employees for the office requirements.

Commissioner Nagler: How many parking spaces will there be in total; underground parking, six-story parking garage, surface parking, how many spaces will be on the entire campus when this is done?

Otto: 3,214.

Commissioner Nagler: All right, okay, thanks.

Beaudin: And Workday should be able to answer the employee question.

Commissioner Nagler: Thank you.

Ritter: All right. Thank you staff. Thank you Workday for sticking around here this long. We have two speaker cards. Greg Thurman, the applicant. Thanks for coming back.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Greg Thurman, Applicant: On behalf of Workday, thank you for considering this design modification to the PUD here this evening. My name is Greg Thurman. I'm with Terrasset Management Group. My firm has been retained by Workday as the

development project and construction manager for the Workday development center. Key project team members here this evening are Gensler our architect for the project, Studio Five Design landscape architecture, Kier & Wright civil engineers, and DPR our general contractor, all of whom that I've mentioned in attendance tonight are under the leadership and direction of Michelle Spengler Hodge, Senior Director of Real Estate in the Workplace. Also attending this evening is our strategic partner and landlord, John Rennels, representing BART.

As you are aware and as Steve Otto just mentioned, this PUD was approved a couple of years ago in 2014. Shortly thereafter, Workday's leadership took a close look at the project and there were about five or six key areas that the leadership challenged the team to look at. Number one is how it related to its surroundings in the Stoneridge Corporate Plaza. Number two, is it possible to reduce or eliminate the above-ground parking structure south of the project. Number three, how would it function for its employees, and in keeping with Workday's position as the forefront of one of the best places to work in the Bay Area. Number four; is it in line with Workday's sustainability goals; and number five, how could we increase the bicycle and vehicle access strategies, and lastly, could we improve the accessibility to and from BART.

So as a result of this analysis, Workday challenged consultants to make a design modification and enhancements to incorporate the aforementioned items if they could, so we were pleased to share that the design team was able to eliminate one of the entire five-story parking structures by incorporating it under the building and to change a substantial sustainability mission for the project from LEED Gold to LEED Platinum.

Workday and its project team have worked thoughtfully with the adjacent property owners. Additionally, all of what has been presented tonight has been carefully coordinated with and met the lease requirements of our landlord, BART. So finally I would like to thank the City staff for their work in reviewing this project for well over a year as we prepared to bring this major modification application to you. We value and appreciate their efforts in assuring that what is before you is a project that we believe the City of Pleasanton can be very proud of.

Chair Ritter: Thank you so much. Are there any questions for the applicant?

Ritter: The next speaker is John Rennels.

John Rennels, BART: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, staff, I'm John Rennels. I'm project manager at BART's real estate and property development department. In one month I will have been doing TOD at BART for 24 years and I'd be remiss if I didn't first acknowledge your City Manager and professional staff for how creative they have been throughout this process. Secondly, you can understand why Workday is perennially rated as the best place in the Bay Area to work. The team that they have amassed is probably best of class. I was fortunate to be the project manager on our transit village in Pleasant Hill that received the National Award for Implementation by the American Planning Association. I contend that this collaboration tonight of Workday's world development center incorporating the BART station and incorporating the greater Stoneridge area will exceed that in the way of awards probably with the Urban Land Institute as well. This has really been an outstanding collaborative process that is certainly transit-based. Workday gets it, the City of Pleasanton gets it, and Workday's

team gets it. The enhancements that will accrue to the public in the way of the BART station and the way of attractiveness of access, opening of the fairway that has been closed-I negotiated the original public/private partnership and we made that with a champagne taste on a beer budget knowing that some of the improvements were going to come later with our private development partner, never expecting that it ultimately would end up with Workday and exceeding expectations. The shared police facility, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle access, and when it's all done, this will be the first major heavy rail commuter station embedded in a world class technology center. I'm just proud to be part of it and as my agency BART is as well for the benefit of the public who owns this system. Thank you very much.

Chair Ritter: Questions?

Commissioner Nagler: Thank you very much. The result of this redesign is really impressive and the changes that are included in the BART station are significant and you know, to lead into the question I'm about to ask, and also for full disclosure, I'll tell you I'm very familiar with that parking garage and with that walk from the Stoneridge parking lot across the street because sometimes I'm forced to park over there. So the access that's going to be improved in all this is terrific.

Having said that, my question is, a lot of parking is being constructed here, and improvements to the BART parking garage are part of the project, all of which are improvements. I'm wondering where in the conversation was included the inadequacy of the number of parking stalls that currently exist at this BART station?

Rennels: That's a good question and when we first embarked upon this public/private partnership to bring the station out of the ground, my original development partners understood the importance of parking and that, in fact, they paid for and allowed us to put an additional half level on the parking garage beyond what was required by the EIR. So at the front end, we extended the parking over what was required for the EIR and as you probably know then, this parking garage is larger than the one that's on the Dublin side. Again, that was based upon the EIR assessment as well.

We're doing some other things collaboratively in conjunction with the City and our neighbors, Stoneridge Mall, to look at the possibility of some shared parking arrangement there, as well. However, the bottom line is that in the Bay Area we have close to about 60,000 parking spaces as you have probably read in the press. The demand ridership keeps going through the roof and we are not adding more parking, so the bottom line is the way of looking at alternative ways of access which Workday is developing as a transit demand management program. That's something that needs to be pervasive throughout the BART system, looking at bicycling, looking at pedestrian opportunities, looking at shuttles, looking at bus and that's the reality. I wish I could say my pockets are full of cash and we could expand, but that really is not the reality.

Commissioner Nagler: Well, let me just ask you this question. As a matter of policy and strategic priorities for the BART system, which has admitted inadequacy of parking at literally every station because you park at any BART station and you realize that BART riders are taking up neighborhood streets, shopping center parking lots, and certainly elsewhere and it's a real problem throughout the system, right?

Rennels: Yes.

Commissioner Nagler: So as a matter of priority, which is a higher priority to BART? To properly serve or adequately serve, at least in this context, the existing and growing BART ridership or is it to execute these public/private partnerships as is being presented here this evening? Which is a higher priority to the system?

Rennels: Let's talk about the context of this. The reality is that we had one opportunity to build this station and this one opportunity was predicated on value capture and creating value to enable us to pay for the bonds that we issued to pay for this station. It was a public/private partnership. The City of Pleasanton participated. The City of Dublin participated. Alameda County Surplus Property Authority participated and my private sector development partners participated. So the reality, sir, was that if in fact we did not have the opportunity to do this public/private partnership, this station would never have come out of the ground.

Commissioner Nagler: You're not really answering my question.

Rennels: The reality is, without doing what we are doing, we couldn't have built the station so it's not like this parcel we're talking about tonight which is Workday it could not have all been put in parking.

Commissioner Nagler: No, I appreciate that. I guess I'm asking system-wide, as a matter....

Chair Ritter: Let's bring it back....

Commissioner Nagler: Okay, okay, fine. I'm just trying to figure out what the perspective of the system is. Okay, so as it relates to this specific project, was it part of the conversation in figuring out how to build out the Workday garage site to try and address the inadequacy of parking for BART customers at this site? Was that ever part of the conversation?

Rennels: It was discussed from the standpoint of enhanced access to this station and that was how it was discussed. Given the magnitude of their contributions I want to call it exactions that they are paying for the shared police facility, the opening of the stairway, the payment of the plaza, the payment along the westerly side to allow for pedestrian/bicycle access there. The bottom line is that in allowing our substation to continue to be there, that's a critical element, and building over that and the cost associated with building over a 35 KV high utility line has cost and allowing for us to have 24/7 access. The magnitude of what Workday has incurred to be able to build this at some point in time having done this for 24 years as I indicated at BART, there is a limit as to how much you can expect before they say, 'maybe we'll go elsewhere.'

Commissioner Nagler: No, it's a great project. It is a great project. I'm just trying to address this one issue. So let me just ask you a final question and then I'm done. Can you give me a sense of what the timing is on resolving or coming to some fruition the conversation you're having with the Stoneridge Mall?

Rennels: That's separate from this transaction and it's in the initial stages of discussion.

Commissioner Nagler: Okay, thank you.

Chair Ritter: Okay, any more speaker cards? All right, I'll bring it back to Planning Commission and staff. Thank you for your service to BART. If any Commissioners have questions, or do we want to make a motion?

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Ritter: And remember, this is a modification. We're not going to rehash old issues.

Commissioner Balch: So my general comment is that I think the modification is outstanding. The redesign of the parking structure is outstanding. It looks a lot more presentable. It obviously allows for more billboard space for Workday but not being too egregious or imposing upon the traffic on 580. So in my opinion, I think all of the design changes are really nice and new amphitheater/plaza area being created I think is an extreme enhancement over the one that was proposed initially.

So I do have a few minor things though probably in light of the grand comments before me, they seem small so I apologize for the minutia that I'm in. And these are not to say we have to change anything. They are just for comments for the designer. Working at one of these larger companies in the past that had a parking structure, I was always shocked that there was never a covered walkway between the parking garage and the actual building itself. So I just want to point that out; that while rain is a scarce resource or reality around here, it does happen, so I'll just say that. I know that people can go below ground and traverse the lower basement to get across and that leads me to my next comment which is, the lower section of the parking area only has elevator A and D providing access for it all the way up to the building so you only have two elevators out of a six elevator bank providing that access. It looks like it could be changed, but it looks like there is a storage room in the basement garage parking area that will prohibit additional banks of elevators coming on line. So as I mentioned to staff, given the large underground parking area, and I mean I understand it's all EV on this side, but given the large area, I would encourage you to consider if you have enough elevator access to that access well.

My next element is similar to what I was saying about covered walkways. I noticed the bridge for BART which I think is an extremely good enhancement; I'm actually impressed that Workday was willing to grant that public right-of-way, and I want to mention that's outstanding. A lot of companies don't. They close their campus rather than open it, so I really appreciate that personally. I just notice it's not covered but it doesn't necessarily have to be.

In terms of the options on signage, I know there's a question of which ones to go with and I think staff's recommendation is for Option 3 and I do support that option. I think that's definitely a very nice option.

And my last comment which staff knows about but I'll try to be gentle on is I'm not too sure I'm supportive of the whole heritage tree change, and here's what I mean by that. So under the prior plan, 130 heritage trees were going to be removed and under the revised plan, 195 heritage trees are going to be removed. So 65 additional heritage trees will be removed, but only 34 additional trees will be planted. So, we're going to

lose 31 net trees. Let's say we're all planting heritage and we're getting like-for-like. So staff knows that one of my elements, just in general, is typically I like to see greater than a one-to-one replacement on heritage trees coming out and the premise is that I understand we need to remove them from the BART area and the garage area. I understand that and I'm going to talk a little bit further, but the premise is that those odometers have been running a lot longer than any of us per se in the 200 year old Redwood. You can't get ahead of that again. You're going to reset when you remove and plant with a 5-gallon or 10-gallon pot.

So my comment to that is that I would encourage as we move forward that you just consider which trees you're removing and I'll go into that a little bit, and then your ratio of replanting if you can mitigate back to that. It might not be possible as staff and I talked about today. It's a tight lot and I really like the improvements being made so I'm not really sure if we'd like to have our magic wand of things, but that's one of mine. And specifically, I didn't understand exactly why the trees were being removed. I think staff was saying it might have been the alignment of the parking garage. This might be a comment to Steve, but it is on the tree disposition plan and it's basically L-3.02. It's the area; call it the northeast, where the existing Stoneridge Corporate Plaza is. There's several leaning trees that are in the middle of the rows that are marked for removal and it does look like there's going to be replantings in this area. Interestingly enough the plan wisely, as I would do it myself, they denote what heritage trees are staying but they do not note which heritage trees are being removed so I cannot see if any of these are heritage.

But, that's my comment. That being said, I think the additional LEED standard is by far outstanding and to me mitigates this comment. I just want to make it so that it's known that those are something we have to balance, but I think in general, I really like the design changes.

Commissioner O'Connor: I do think there's a lot of a benefit to the new design and I don't have any problems with any of it, but I am going to miss the original building design that was in the center. I really liked that shape of that building. But otherwise, I think it's great.

Commissioner Allen: And I think it's great too and granted, it creates something more of a community and connection with the neighboring areas and BART and I really like the design. I like it better. I think Commissioner Balch's comments are right on. I note that traffic is probably off of the table, but to the degree we can look at any of the updated numbers based on employees because that is a real number versus an average that comes out of the ITE. So to the degree there are any implications for traffic that we haven't thought about, I'd ask that we just retest that.

Chair Ritter: And I'll just say that traffic, trees and BART parking are key issues. Those seem like the three topics we brought up, but you had some final comments. I'll speak and then you can go last and make a motion, but I just want to thank Workday. I think they're a great company and appreciate you working with the City of Pleasanton in developing this site and working with BART. I think it's a real enhancement to our community to have such a top end company in our community, so those are just my comments.

Commissioner Nagler: I happened to be the one up here who wasn't here for the first discussion so I'm coming to this new and I think it's a terrific project and I think the buildings are handsome and will be a real statement about not only the company but what this City can allow to be created. Truly, the enhancements to the entrance and access points and usability of the BART station and BART parking lot are truly valuable improvements. On a personal note I happen to be a real fan of Workday because I professionally am in the human resources business and I think Workday is a terrific company and has a great product and has a proud history coming up in the ashes of PeopleSoft, so I think it's just a terrific story and I think this project has value from beginning to end. I am a person amongst many who were disadvantaged by the choices BART has made, not that anything was done incorrectly in the beginning of the design of this station or any other station, but as time goes on and ridership changes and at this particular station, there is a significant problem in parking. We as a Planning Commission and we as a City are addressing parking in the downtown core and in every project that we deliberate. Parking is a central issue, and I'm disappointed that BART and its partnership with Workday couldn't address in this opportunity a clearly present issue. We can talk about what happened in the past and what might happen in the future, but here was an opportunity and it's missed for all of the terrific things about this project. So overwhelmingly, it's a good project and with that, I unfortunately can't make the motion.

Commissioner Balch moved that the Planning Commission: (1) find that the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposed modified campus project are adequately evaluated in the Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the previously approved project (PUD-104/PUD-81-22-14M) and that none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for the preparation of subsequent environmental review have occurred; (2) make the PUD findings for the modified development plan as discussed in the staff report; and (3) adopt a resolution recommending approval of Cases PUD-104-01M/PUD-81-22-15M, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A of the Staff Report and forward the applications to the City Council for public hearing and review. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution No. PC-2016-11 approving Case PUD-104-01M and PUD-81-22-15M was entered and adopted as motioned.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No discussion was held or action taken.

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

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

Commissioner Balch: The groundbreaking for the Kottinger Gardens/Kottinger Place is coming up and they are having a ceremony. Do you have the date?

Weinstein: I don't have the date, but it is coming up pretty soon I think. We can send an email out to the Commission with the date and time.

Commissioner Balch: I served on that.

Chair Ritter: Yes, I did too.

Commissioner Balch: I just want to mention that they are underway and people have moved and the housing that's going to be added to Pleasanton for senior housing is just outstanding.

Chair Ritter: I know there's a task force that's coming for the Downtown Specific Plan. Do we need to assign anybody for those yet?

Weinstein: The Downtown Specific Plan process is getting started. We already have been thinking conceptually about the scope of work for the DSP, but we'll be sort of diving into that in a lot more detail in the coming weeks. That said, we're still in the embryonic stage of getting the DSP up and running. I don't think we've identified for sure that there will be a task force, but there's a really good chance that there will be. It's hard to contemplate moving a DSP update forward without a task force. Originally the DSP update was intended to be relatively focused, yet the more people we talk to and the more we think about the DSP, the broader the scope of work is. So it's sort of morphing into a bigger project than we originally thought and because it's a bigger project that the City Council will probably want a task force to work on it. We will report back to you. There's a really good chance that we'll be asking for volunteers from this Commission.

Chair Ritter: Would you mind, this is the staff report of March 23rd, Item 8.e. where I read all this from. If you could on the next report just put who is the primary and who is the alternate next to each one of those so we can just keep track of it. It helps on the report.

Weinstein: Sure.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Ritter: I just want to make a note, if you know you're going to be missing a meeting in the near future, just let staff know so we make sure we have a quorum.

Weinstein: And just really quickly, what's up for the next Planning Commission meeting. We have three items and the first is consideration of a new process for looking at projects that require legislative changes, like General Plan Amendments or Rezoning's. We're calling it the 'gatekeeper process' right now, but it's sort of a new proposal for a

preliminary evaluation of major changes for planning policies in the City, so you'll be seeing a staff report for that pretty soon. The second project is one that you've heard about before, the Irby Ranch project where Stanley and First meet, so about 100 residential units on about a 15-acre site with a non-profit residential component for Sunflower Hill. And then the third project is a Conditional Use Permit for a day care facility on Hopyard at Stoneridge.

Commissioner Balch: For staff, I have to check my participation on the Irby Ranch project. I may need to recuse.

c. Actions of the City Council

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

e. Matters for Commission's Information

No discussion was held or action taken.

f. Matters for Commission's Action

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ritter adjourned the meeting at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein
Secretary