



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

DRAFT

Wednesday, January 13, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of January 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; Jennifer Hagen, Associate Planner; and Kendall Rose, Recording Secretary

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

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 9, 2015

Commissioner Balch moved to approve the Minutes of the December 9, 2015 Meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: Nagler

The Minutes of the December 9, 2015 Meeting were approved, as submitted.

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

Johnson Drive Economic Development Zone

Carrie Cox: My father could not be here tonight so he asked that I deliver our family message about the proposed Costco at Johnson Drive and Stoneridge Drive. Our family business is in its 40th year. I was not very old when it started but I love it. My brother and I work 7 days a week. My daughter and my son also work in the business. Changing zoning to allow big box club retail such as a Costco would be devastating to our family business and to many other small family retailers in Pleasanton. I urge the Planning Commission to consider this effect. Small businesses have always been important to the City of Pleasanton. Much of the tax revenue and job creation you seek to gain from Costco or a project like a big box Costco will likely be offset by a loss in revenue from hard working, loyal retailers, retailers who have provided goods and services to the community for many years. You should care about this. It should matter to you. In our entire history we have never spoken against another business entering the market. Competition will come and go. Our objective is just to be the best that we can be. Actually, we love Costco and spend a great deal of money there monthly. Many citizens of Pleasanton love Costco, but the majority of the Pleasanton residents that we have surveyed do not think this is a good location for Costco. They are afraid of increased traffic in an already highly congested area, undetermined costs to taxpayers for infrastructure costs, pollution which exceeds City guidelines. We of this community will help in any way possible to see that they get a say in this decision. Thank you.

Katelyn Theobald: I'm the third generation of Cox Family Stores. My name is Katelyn and Carl Cox is my grandfather. He started our family business in 1976 and began retail in Pleasanton 33 years ago in 1982. Pleasanton is unique. I've worked here since I was 15 years old. I've talked with citizens. There's a certain pride that is hard to describe. It's the neighborhoods, the community feeling, the small business owners, the Downtown, the County Fair—it's many things. I am now a senior in college and I'm learning that there has to be a balance between the City's needs for increased revenue to pay for services and the right to citizens to help make those decisions. I understand the balance that you face, but please listen to the people. I have, and they tell me, not at this location. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

William Wheeler: I'm Bill Wheeler, owner of Black Tie Transportation on the corner of Commerce Drive in Pleasanton. As always, I appreciate this opportunity to express my concerns about the proposed use of the former Clorox Company for a big box retailer on Johnson Drive, likely Costco, who I understand now, has formally signed a letter of intent with the City. First, I'd like to clear up a misconception of why I am opposing this project. The loss of public parking for my employees and other employees and

customers of businesses in the area is a minor point and one that I could easily mitigate for my people. I'm actually in favor of widening Johnson Drive to accommodate alternate retail solutions that will likely occupy this prime space. The reason I'm opposing Costco here is because of the eagerly anticipated potential tax revenue increase associated with a big box addition is blatantly outweighed by unacceptable traffic congestion which cannot be mitigated properly according to the EIR, additional pollution, extreme cost to the road building infrastructure and the negative impacts on local small businesses. Traffic is my biggest concern. Yes, it will be costly to my business. More than this, it will adversely affect all community members by significantly increasing travel delays on all roads surrounding this area including Hopyard, Stoneridge, Owens, ultimately I-580 and I-680. Despite all of these drawbacks, the program continues to move forward to the benefit of the land owner, Nearon, and the City without the approval of people of Pleasanton. Public safety, quality of life and the stability of our local businesses are all being disregarded in the hope for more tax revenue and minor convenience for Costco club members, many of which will come from outside of Pleasanton.

I promote the responsible growth of commerce in this City. I'd like to propose a mixed use retail in the EDZ, limiting building size to 50,000 square feet with small to medium sized businesses. This could be local businesses who have contributed to Pleasanton over the years a much needed boost and additional visibility in a high traffic area. I use Costco; I think it's a great company. This just isn't the right place for one. If a Costco is approved here, it will speak loudly to the future direction of Pleasanton. Outside the undoubtable issues it will cause, it will also put a welcome mat for more big box retail in our City. At what point will enough be enough? I urge you to re-examine the General Plan and the EIR while considering what is best for the general public and present your findings and determinations in an effective manner that welcomes equitable input from our residents. Thank you.

Chair Ritter requested Mr. Weinstein provide an update on the matter.

Weinstein: The comment period on the Draft Supplemental EIR (DSEIR) ended in November and so we've spent time since then compiling the large number of comments we got from the public and from government agencies and are organizing them and responding to them. So we're in the middle of the Response to Comments process right now. As part of that Response to Comments process, we will be responding to all of the individual comments that we've received. We'll also be undertaking and we are undertaking enhanced additional technical studies on the project, including additional air quality work, additional traffic work and an expanded economic study that will look at impacts to small businesses among other things, and we're anticipating that the Response to Comments document and FEIR will be published in the next couple of months. Then following that we'll have a joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting where the City Council and you can sit down together to talk about the project with the information in the FEIR in front of you. Then after that there would be Planning Commission and City Council meetings on the project, all of which will have opportunities for public input.

Chair Ritter: Great, thank you so much. Also, Mr. Nagler arrived at 7:10 p.m. so it's in the record.

Noted Present:

Commissioner Nagler arrived at 7:10 p.m.

4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

Adam Weinstein clarified that Item 6a is tentatively continued to the second meeting in February, the February 24th meeting and not February 10th as written on 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. P15-0741, Vijay Kumar

Application for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 4,225-square-foot single-family residence with an attached approximately 623-square-foot garage at 5967 Kolb Ranch Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-LDR/C/PHS/WO (Planned Unit Development - Low Density Residential/Commercial/Public Health & Safety/Wildland Overlay) District.

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve Case P15-0741, subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.
Commissioner Balch 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-2016-01 approving Case P15-0741 was entered and adopted, as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS

a. UP-77-13, City of Pleasanton

Consideration of possible modification or revocation of a Conditional Use Permit for the operation of the Pleasanton Masonic Center located at 3370 Hopyard Road. Zoning for the property is RM-2,500 (Multi-Family Residential) District.

This item has been continued to the February 24, 2016 meeting.

b. PUD-114/P15-0597/P15-0598/P15-0603, Guy Houston

Work session to consider the following applications for the property located at 11300 Dublin Canyon Road: (1) General Plan Amendment and PUD Rezoning and Development Plan to construct five new single-family residences; (2) Tentative Map approval to subdivide the existing 16-acre parcel into six parcels (one parcel for the existing church and five parcels for the new single-family residences); and (3) Growth Management allocation for the project. Zoning for the property is A (Agriculture) District.

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

Guy Houston, Applicant: Thank you Mr. Chair and members for allowing me to come here and talk about Dublin Canyon Road and our work with the Pleasant View Church of Christ. We've been working on this project for about a year and one half and have worked with staff for about a year on this, and we're very proud of what we're presenting you and want to get your feedback and input. What I'm going to be talking about is, one, the evolution of the site plan, where they started over a year ago, then talk about how this is really an infill project in the Dublin Canyon area, Pleasant View Church of Christ and their interest in this and their future, then talk about the project details and elevations, and then staff-identified issues, some of which have been spoken of, then outstanding issues that we'd like to get some feedback from you.

So the evolution of this when we were talking about a year and one half ago, we were looking at more lots, smaller lots, so we we're at 15 lots. Then we went to 12 lots and then 9 lots and then here we are today where we think this is the most appropriate where we have 5 lots to present to you. The issue of the frontage road—we thought it would be more dangerous and difficult to navigate if you were to have individual driveways off of Dublin Canyon and that's why we think this is the ideal point that we should work with, having the road.

This is an infill project. Staff said there is a lot of development in that area; a wide variety of development and this is kind of a little donut hole right in the middle down the hill from the Church of Christ. It is a secondary gateway into the City of Pleasanton. We know a lot of people use it to get to their residences, commuters, etc., especially when the freeway is backed up. But it is a secondary gateway so it's very important. The country setting is important and that's something we value very much and that we want to talk to you about. So we have a photo-montage of a bird's eye view really high and as you get down low, a roofline.

So this is looking west on the property. This is how you see some of the historical homes in the area, the Lesters in the back, two others that are closer. As you start moving around towards the freeway, of course you have Canyon Meadows. I believe it's 240+ units off of Dublin Canyon Road. The Church of Christ is the owner. Then of course you have the I-580 freeway and wrapping around you have a couple more of the historic homes and here you see Kolb Ranch on the left and then you have the Preserve on the right and the Preserve wraps around much, much further to the right. Then what we want to do is bring it down to a 30-foot level because one of the homes is

30 feet. The list of heights that we have scheduled for these homes is 24 feet, 24 feet, 26 feet, 26 feet and 30 feet, but this is at the highest level so it would be at 30 feet. It is kind of interesting where you're completely surrounded by development and yet the visual impacts on others around the area are very, very minimal.

So looking to the west you have one home; our neighbor, who has signed on in support of the project, is obviously visible to the project, and then as you start going around north, you see over the tops of the trees on the left you see Canyon Meadows, the tip tops of their roofs and on the right there you see the Church of Christ and the top of their roof. So we're not going to see them and they're not going to see us. You don't have this visual clutter that can happen in an infill situation.

Going to the east and all the way around you see right across the street, you have the Young property; Barbara Young. She is going to have the most impact as far as visual with this project. She is a supporter of this project. And then you see on the left that from the Preserve, there's really no line of sight from the Preserve, but at the Kolb Ranch project you have two homes that have some visibility there. So it's kind of in a secluded place and we think that's a benefit to this; that you're not having visual issues with others. This wraps around to the actual Dublin Canyon and you can't really see it, but one of the benefits that we are trying to offer here is the power lines across here that run the stretch of the property, we would like to get rid of the power lines and underground those. We think that adds to visual clutter and that would be of benefit to get those out of the way.

A lot of the vegetation there is something like tumbleweeds. Most of the base property has no trees on it at all and the trees that we have are on the periphery of the property and the creek which we think adds a lot to the beauty of the project, and then on Dublin Canyon Road. We'll talk a little more about that in detail in a little bit.

So, we're kind of in a donut hole. We're in the middle. We think this is an infill project of an area that kind of needs some help. Historically it was an equestrian type of center 20 or 30 years ago and has fallen in disrepair and hasn't been used in many, many years. Our project partner on this is the Pleasant View Church of Christ. They were established in 1979 and I'd like to ask John Wieland, the chairman of their corporation to talk real briefly about why this is important for the church.

John Wieland, Owner: Thank you, good evening. I'm John Wieland and as mentioned, I am speaking tonight for our congregation. We were established here in the community in 1979; a little bit before my time actually, and our building was constructed by our own membership back then. It is our desire to stay in Pleasanton. We don't want to sell, leave, or move to a less costly location. We've been serving this community for over 40 years and we'd like to continue to do that.

I'd like to show you briefly what our vision is for the church portion of the property because there's a considerable amount of work that needs to be done on it. First and one of our more major problems is that we've been on a septic tank system all of these years. That's not worked the greatest for us and we need to hook up to the City of Pleasanton's sewer system. That's going to cost about \$95,000. The landscaping has been pretty minimal and we'd like to put into effect a comprehensive plan to landscape

the property, make it really nice, and that's going to cost about \$550,000. We've costed that out. We have a very nice plan for doing that. We have a partially paved parking lot, a partial gravel pit, and even the partially paved lot is breaking down a bit and that's going to cost about \$75,000 to get that paved and up to a nice standard. The building itself, being constructed in 1979 on self-help architecture, we need some improvements in there and we've mapped that out and will cost about \$280,000. And finally, it was built to code at the time. It was unincorporated land. It was up to code at the time, but we would like to bring it up to code now at a cost of about \$320,000.

The plan that we've been working with Mr. Houston on is going to give us the kind of revenue that we need to make the church attractive, to make it continue to be functional as a place of worship. It's going to allow us to continue our mission. We have the resources to go on as we have been, but some of these things are catching up with us and in order to really have the cash to make these larger expenditures, we need a project such as this. I don't want to take any more time, but I would like to recognize the members that we have here tonight in support of the project and just ask them to stand for a moment. Thank you.

Guy Houston, Applicant: Thank you John. Now I wanted to talk about the project details in particular. In summary, we have 5 lots. We think that's a low impact on the local community there. They are one-story homes. It's a country character trying to keep with that neighborhood. They are primarily Craftsmen style homes. The scenic neighborhood improvements—there will be bike lanes and by undergrounding the power lines we think we can take a lot of the visual clutter out of there.

One thing they've been doing in our work with the neighbors and talking with them about what would be a real benefit is they talked about people speeding through that area and whether they're Pleasanton residents or not doesn't really matter. But, the idea came about of the pedestrian flashing signals, and so we would like to propose to pay for two of the flashing signals with locations to be determined and I would assume one in each direction that could try to help calm those. I know that they're in the City of Pleasanton. My parents live over in the Highland Oaks area and there's one right on Foothill Road as you approach Highland Oaks and it seems to be very effective. So that's something we would like to propose because that's something the neighbors were very interested in.

Ritter: Could you wrap it up and then we'll maybe have the public comment and let you come back and answer some more questions.

Houston: Okay, real quick then—the visuals on the homes themselves; we did some 3-D versions of the homes so you can see what they look like. That's Lot 3, Lot 4 and then Lot 5. The outstanding issues and the discussion points I would like to bring up. I think these are really the important things. Staff identified issues and there's been some outstanding issues. The one that staff talked about before was that no development shall occur within the 20-foot setback or within 20 feet of the riparian vegetation. We frankly did not know of the riparian vegetation requirement that was in the City of Pleasanton. That was something we didn't know once we submitted, and staff responded back to us. What our solution to that is and this is something you haven't seen yet and is different from what you have is we have adjusted all of our lots and the

placement of the buildings to be able to accommodate what staff wants. Actually, I think staff's done a great job because it's made the project a little bit better. Lots 3 and 4 are the problem and if you look, there's a large oak tree in the middle of the property and that riparian vegetation extended. We had what you're seeing with your staff report, you had House 4 flip so that the tail end of that extends into that tree line. We're able to flip that so we're within the compliance with the regulation. A couple of other things you really can't see is we've adjusted Lot 5 by five feet to the right, Lot 2 by one foot so we've made those adjustments and we think that's made for a better project.

Another actually important issue is the issue of emergency protection of the creek and when we first started the project, we submitted to staff a letter from the Church of Christ that said historically we have accessed the creek from the north side. There's a flat spot. We can actually drive a vehicle down there so we're able to access the creek that way and staff came back and said no, that's not adequate and we want to have access from both sides of the creek from the church. When we start noodling on that more and more we thought really if there is a blockage in that creek and there's a real problem, then the people who are really going to be more interested in this are those homeowners. The church is 50 feet higher in the air and they're not going to be affected as much.

So we thought it was important for the church to be able to access from our side, but conversely it's important for the homeowners to be able to access their creek in the time of an emergency, for any type of maintenance or issues that come up with the creek. So what we devised is a reciprocal easement for both parties so that we can access their creek in these events and then we have a spot where going up Lot 2, the church can have access to that easement and then there's a 20-foot easement throughout the project. So, again, we think that was an improvement that staff brought up and we're able to have a rational solution to this that gets everybody involved in the event of an emergency.

This is an outstanding issue that I think is real important. It was mentioned in the staff report that we're going to be taking out trees for this development. In fact, two trees are going to be taken out because of the buildings. The majority of the trees are going to be taken out because of the sidewalk requirement that we have. This is a copy that you should have in front of you from the arborist's report. On page 2 it says "10 trees are planned for removal solely due to conflict with the proposed sidewalk parallel to Dublin Canyon Road." If you see here on the lower left hand side, most of the trees are on the periphery of the property and so you have eight down there and then two on Dublin Canyon Road as you go east. All of those are going to be taken out because of the requirement for the sidewalk. Our position is that we would rather not have that sidewalk there because it begins and ends with our property. It's kind of a highway to nowhere. The utility is not high, plus all of the neighbors are saying this kind of takes away from the type of country atmosphere that we all want; having a 6-foot wide sidewalk. And then the third thing is that these are all oak trees and we think that that is something we would rather not do.

A secondary comment on Lot 1 from staff was that the placement of the garage faces Dublin Canyon Road and we all know that that's in planning now and we would rather not have garages face on any roads. Well, when we devised this plan, we thought we

would have coverage from these oak trees and so right now, the garage is about 14-feet tall. These trees are about 30-feet tall so this would be what the view of that garage would be if those oak trees are retained and we think that having those trees there provides that buffer, provides the country feel and so far from wanting to get rid of the country feel and the landscaping, we think this is a huge asset that we should keep.

Ritter: (Buzzer) The reason I'm going to let you go is because I think we're going to ask you all these questions.

Houston: Then I defer to the buzzer. I'm sorry. Thank you.

Ritter: Thank you. We just have one speaker card. Does anybody else want to speak on this? If so, bring it on up and we'll open it up for speakers and then we'll bring the applicant back and we can start asking you questions. Is that okay?

THE PUBLIC HEARING IS OPENED.

Diane Kolb: I live at 1102 Dublin Canyon Road. My mother Mable and brother Myron live at 11033 Dublin Canyon Road. We've been there since 1953. My great-grandparents were on the land since 1916. I'm speaking for my family and we see no problem with the project from Pleasant View Church of Christ at 11300 Dublin Canyon Road on the lower portion. We think the project will improve and upgrade the appearance in our country community. We are very interested in the improvements that would be a benefit to the area such as the underground power lines and installation of the GPS traffic flashing light signals. We cannot see why you would want to remove 10 trees for a sidewalk to nowhere. We say, save the trees and make it look like country. We are all for a left-hand turn lane into this project. On behalf of my family which has lived on the property for 63 years, please vote yes on the PUD-114. Thank you.

Brad Ingram: I live in the Preserve community which is just south of the proposed property across Dublin Canyon Road and I think there's a fine line between country rural setting and an overgrown weedy old horse property where people are throwing trash out of their cars. I've seen furniture, bags of kitchen trash and all kinds of stuff there. I think that this project would be a great improvement over what we have now there. Guy spoke to the dangers of traffic on Dublin Canyon Road. I mean that road is dangerous, especially at night because it's dark. It provides access to our community from kind of a dark, rural setting and I don't know if you guys are familiar with all of the criminal activity that goes on up in the Preserve, but it provides a great mechanism for people to access the community and then leave it in the dark and I think that this project would provide kind of a buttress to the community from the dark, rural setting that's now out there. I would hope that you guys would support this proposal because I think it does not impede on anybody else around it and it provides the area with a development in a last piece of open space that doesn't look real nice right now. It is not only an eyesore, but darkness. So thank you.

Barb Young: I'm at 11249 Dublin Canyon Road and directly across the street from the project they're all talking about. We've had the property over 55 years and I too feel and agree with what everybody else has said; that it would be a nice enhancement to our

neighborhood. Like the others have said, people coming down that road are going way too fast and it would be great to have the little flashing light to make people realize they're going a little too fast along there. But I've been looking at that empty lot for 50 years and with the outbuildings and the shrubs, it would be real nice to have something that looks really good there. So, I'm just kind of in agreement and I hope you'll consider that and that you'll go along with the project because it's going to be great.

Ritter: Okay, we'll close the public hearing and bring it back to the applicant. Do you have any more comments or maybe we'll just ask you questions?

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Houston: Surely you can ask questions, but I did want to talk about some of the outreach that we have done and that was another thing that staff told us from day one; that you've got to go out in the community and talk to people. So to that end, a lot of our local neighbors have signed on support; Ms. Young and the Lesters, Mr. Raman who is next door, the Pleasant View Church of Christ. The Preserve Board of Directors support the project. The Kolb Ranch Board of Directors support the project. We're going to be meeting with the Canyon Meadows HOA Board later this month. They couldn't schedule a meeting any earlier. Last night, we were at the Pleasanton Unified School District. They have approved a negotiated mitigation agreement. The project will support Pleasanton schools to the tune of \$159,000 and the District will accommodate our students from this development. So we've made a real effort to get out into the community and talk to people. The general consensus is that this is an under-utilized, and I prefer to call it an unpolished gem. A lot of other people are not quite so charitable. There is a garbage dump there. It's overgrown. It hasn't been used as an equestrian center for 20-30 years and so it is an eyesore in the middle of an area. We think that we can make it something a lot better and at least our local community seems to think that we should give it a change. So, I can answer any questions that you have and I appreciate your feedback.

Nagler: Thank you for all this and it is a very interesting project. I appreciate all of the work you've put into it. Clearly staff is less supportive of it than what we would like them to be and I think it might be helpful before making direct comments for us to get a little more detail about some of the specific points that you raise in the staff report and why you have responded the way you have and in many instances, not making changes that apparently that staff is recommending, not only in the number of homes but some other items as well.

So, just to start, as is pointed out in the staff report, the density or the number of lots to be allowed per acre on this parcel has been the subject of several General Plan updates and reviews and notwithstanding all of that and notwithstanding that the property could be put to a better use, the density is what it is after those reviews. Jennifer do you mind explaining a little bit of the rationale behind that and why staff isn't supportive of this PUD to alter that density?

Hagen: Well, at this time this particular property has been looked at various times through the Housing Element updates as well as the comprehensive General Plan update that we did. The majority of the area, except for the two residential

developments which do have large setbacks, are largely rural residential areas. The Preserve does have a low density residential area but that was basically to get the lot sizes. The Preserve did incorporate a vast amount of open space that is required to be open space as part of that project. In this particular area, just because of the rural density and the minimum lot sizes, staff at this time is not inclined to recommend approval for a General Plan zone change amendment when the actual current designations do allow for residential development with the current designations. We feel that a better project could be designed at the current designation and it is basically just not needed at this time. Three units we think is very appropriate for that size area of approximately four acres and we would like to keep it that way and just go with a straight development plan PUD and set a development standard for keeping it rural residential, maintaining only three lots.

Nagler: And your response presumably has to do with the project having to downsize several times, right?

Houston: Well, originally yes, we had visions and then it quickly became apparent that it wouldn't be appropriate. You know, having a lot more lots backing up to Dublin Canyon Road, in working with my partner, that wasn't going to work. Staff was not supportive of that and that was the first thing they said was, we don't want anything backing up on Dublin Canyon Road. We think that there's some infrastructure cost of putting that road in and undergrounding the power lines and it necessitates having this change from three to five units. If you were to go with three units, then there would be no other choice than to just have three driveways off of Dublin Canyon Road. And when we talked with our civil engineering team the way that the road is constructed, we don't think that would be the safest thing. So I think it's much safer for all of the homeowners, whether there are three, four or five to have this one entrance, and the spot that was chosen was chosen very carefully to get the largest distance of driving for safety on both directions so that was done on purpose, and having three different driveways on there wouldn't serve the area very well. So that's the major reason for the difference between I guess the three and the five.

Are the overall site plan, lot locations and street design layout acceptable?

Nagler: All right, the next question has to do with the visibility from the street and the fact that on the one hand, a sidewalk is being required of you to install which you explained necessitates removing trees which would block the visibility, and the neighbors who testified this evening and otherwise communicated with the Planning Commission have talked about how the general area would be improved by having the visibility or the presence of these residences at nighttime. My question is, it's a little bit of a catch-22 isn't it? If those trees aren't removed and therefore the homes aren't visible from the street, that benefit that's been discussed would be absent, wouldn't it?

Houston: Well, Lot 1 which is where all of the trees would be removed, and that was very on purpose—we wanted that barrier and that shape because we all know that getting rid of oak trees is something that nobody typically wants and in fact, only two have to be taken out because of the actual construction. So that would be for Lot 1 and that is really for the visibility of the garage and it is the closest one.

Another direction we had from staff was, we don't want to back up to Dublin Canyon Road but also we want those homes as far away from Dublin Canyon Road as possible very similar to Ms. Young's house, very similar to the Lesters, very similar to the all the other homes, they are not right on Dublin Canyon Road. And so yes, even though we wanted to cover the garage and that portion, I think that there would be light and activity on all the other lots, particularly the two middle lots (3 and 4). And yet it's very appropriate with the Craftsmen style, one-story home that's not going to be a "McMansion" in the middle of these other country type of homes. So there will be some light and activity and kind of the consensus is that just the fact that there's something there will have people caution a little bit as they are speeding down that road. Of course, if we put in those flashers and other things that may be effective, that could help as well.

So keeping the country feel is important and when you look at other parts of the City, we kind of compare this mostly to south of Bernal on Foothill Road and you don't see sidewalks down there and actually in some of them, some of the small communities, they only have sidewalks in their streets. When you go into Oak Tree Farm, Dorothea, there's a couple of them down there but they don't even have sidewalks inside the street to keep that country feel.

The second thing that I wanted to bring up and this is a very small thing, is in our internal street, staff wants to have concrete sidewalks and we don't want that. We'd rather have the DG, the decomposed granite. It helps us with our impervious for the soil and we think that would be a better look for a small community that's trying to strive to be country instead of having white gleaming sidewalks. So that was a small thing, but nonetheless, we think it's important. And if the Planning Commission would so direct, we would love to get rid of that sidewalk internally as well. That would be more area for landscaping. That would be better to turn for vehicles, emergency vehicles or for residents, so you don't have to have those sidewalks especially if you're in a 5-lot development in a country area.

Nagler: Another question—as you know, when the City approves zoning changes and a PUD and densities are higher than were previously allowed, a public amenity is required. As I understand it, you have not yet proposed a public amenity as part of this zoning change request. Do you have ideas about that or you don't think it's appropriate for the project? What are your thoughts?

Houston: I think it's very appropriate and so I think that's part of this discussion. The one thing I think is a benefit to everybody is undergrounding these power lines. We don't have to do that but we think it's better for the residents of that small court which we're calling Walter Court, and we think that's better for all residents in the area and for the people of Pleasanton. It's not a small number to do that, especially for that land. But up and above that, it is only 5 lots and so we would look forward to working with either the City Manager or whoever that may be as to what an appropriate contribution might be, but trying to get credit for some of the amenities that we are putting out there, the pedestrian flashers as we proposed, and again, this is to be fair to staff, that's not something that they have heard of yet. It's just that the neighbors in the last week and a half have been excited about that because traffic is an issue. So, we're obviously open

to that but it's not 500 units so we're not going to be building the civic center over again, but we want to do what we need to do in order to be good corporate citizens.

Hagen: Can I also make the clarification that it is a requirement that all new developments underground utilities so it is not that the applicant is proposing it. It would be required as part of the project no matter what.

Balch: Even under three units?

Hagen: Yes.

Nagler: So if there are three units on there the agriculture zoning stays the same?

Hagen: Yes.

Houston: And that's why the numbers as far as trying to provide those amenities, undergrounding being a large one, that's why we came forward with these five units. We also think that the traffic is better than having three access points off of Dublin Canyon Road.

Ritter: Any more questions for the applicant? We can close that and ask staff some questions.

Balch: No questions.

Allen: Just one as a curiosity question. In thinking about the fact that the zoning is one home per five acres, what was the thinking on why we didn't subdivide this such that let's say the housing area was 15 acres of 16.23 acres which would at least entitle you following zoning for three units. So I'm just wondering what the thinking was in only utilizing 4 acres and not 15?

Houston: If you go out there, it's an interesting piece of property in that the church would be very visible from the freeway. As you drive down from Castro Valley coming into Pleasanton the church is literally the first thing you see, and that's why the church is interested in utilizing these resources to upgrade their facility. It drops down dramatically so kind of the natural dividing point is the creek and the church is not interested in having any homes. They have 12 acres up above not counting the creek and then we have 4 acres. Ours is perfectly flat; flat as a board, so that also makes it more attractive to build on. We know there are issues with building on hillsides everywhere and certainly in Pleasanton so the topography over where the church is wouldn't really lend to it and the church doesn't want it. The church wants to be there and have their mission fulfilled in that site like they've been since 1979 and they want to improve it and make it better. They don't want to increase the footprint. They just want to make it better and hook up to the City's sewer among those things. So that's why the dividing line is for the 4 acres because the natural boundary is the creek. And even if you look at Canyon Meadows, the reason why they have the trees and things along Dublin Canyon Road is because that's where the creek goes. They didn't put in any of that stuff. It was there. So we're following the line. Our attractive part and benefit is the creek on the back of the properties instead of the front because that's where the creek is.

Allen: Just one follow up—how many acres just technically does the church need for the church property and their parking lot and the trees that would be around that?

Houston: I don't have a topo but they have their 12 acres and I would say maybe one-third of it is flat and so where the church is, and even if they wanted to expand to a larger footprint, there may be 2 acres of that up there that is of reasonableness where they could actually build something more on it. But they are primarily interested, and we had some slides of what their vision is, which is to upgrade their facility on the flat part, the parking lot and upgrading their current facility to make it something better.

Ritter: I just had one question. Are there any natural hiking trails up there from the church down into the city or bike trails that you could see on any of the lots?

Houston: From the church? The upper part?

Ritter: Or even down through the residents' area. It doesn't sound like it.

Houston: The creek is the huge barrier and frankly, neighbors don't want people going in the creek. But the barrier is the creek and it's actually a pretty steep creek and prevents any type of real interaction. In past history, the church had come down and there was a small picnic area back there, but really it wasn't feasible because it's a steep climb down.

Ritter: Okay, thank you. So we'll close it and go to staff questions. Thank you. I guess while we're on that, are there any road bikers that use that trail, so instead of a sidewalk, put in a road biking lane option or is there not enough space?

Hagen: In addition to the bike lane?

Ritter: Instead of a sidewalk. I mean, as they start undergrounding with wires, like Foothill Road, you stop a bike trail and start again.

Beaudin: Yeah, there's stopping and starting on Dublin Canyon as well and we've been requiring bike lanes to be installed with projects as they come on line. So that would be a requirement of this project. So there would be a road improvement and a pedestrian improvement that would be separate consistent with the Complete Streets standards that we have for the community. So, I guess what I would say in terms of the sidewalk and tree removal, there's nothing that says that something like that couldn't meander or there are other public access easements that could be designed to create the tree preservation objectives that we might have for this project. So there are ways to accommodate both the bike and pedestrian improvements that are required for development applications.

Ritter: Okay, we'll get back to that. All right, so any more questions for staff? We'll just go down the list.

O'Connor: So on this map--I don't know if you have a pointer, can you kind of trace for us where the creek actually runs? I understand it's behind Lots 2, 3 and 4, but I don't know how it turns and where it goes.

Hagen: Right here is the creek setback line. On this diagram the red line is the top of the bank. So the creek would run just north of the red line that goes through here.

O'Connor: So I guess I'm more concerned with where it goes from here. Does it come down Dublin Canyon Road?

Hagen: It goes across the adjacent properties and then crosses underneath Dublin Canyon Road.

O'Connor: So it goes across their property....

Hagen: Yes, it's right there. So it comes over here and runs along the frontage there and there's actually a little bridge right here where it crosses underneath Dublin Canyon and then it goes this way. So it crosses on their other part of Pleasant View Church.

Ritter: Okay, questions for staff and then maybe we'll just go down the list and give us a bullet so we can get something concise for staff and the applicant to get some feedback. They're going to come back with something. The first question is:

Does the Commission support a General Plan Land Use Amendment to increase the density of the subject parcel?

Allen: I don't think there should be more than 2-3 homes on the parcel and I spent quite a while biking over there today and as I think about the country setting and what we want to preserve, I just think that's the maximum. Secondly, to do it, what I would like is to do it with the General Plan. I'd like to have the homes done in a way towards the General Plan that we have and what's been in place and has been validated over the years. To me what that means is that the subdividing would be different. So the church might have 1 ½ or 2 acres, let's call it 1 ½ acres that they would keep and then the rest of the property would be subdivided in some way that it would go with the homes. And my reason for wanting to do it that way is I think about Centerpoint Church and the Ponderosa project that we all encountered a few months ago, and we all know that churches over time, financially there are challenges. I mean, who knows what will happen over time with this property and it could be that in 5-10 years the church is looking to sell the property and when they sell it, they're going to find the highest land use and to the degree we allow the subdivision as it exists today, which means there would be, what, 11 acres associated with the church. That makes it, potentially a much larger residential development if you had 11 acres. I realize that some of it is not usable, but I'm just saying it's there as a much larger project in the future for that area that we may or may not want. In contrast, if we subdivide it properly and it fits within the General Plan categories and the church only has one or two acres left, then it is what it is. That's what it is and that fits the General Plan and that would be the property they would be thinking of. So that's my reason for wanting to try to work this within the General Plan and I think if it could work in the General Plan zoning and we could still end up with two and maybe fudge and go to three homes on that site, I think that could be done in a way that preserves the country character, as well.

Balch: Could I just ask a staff clarification to that? So Commissioner Allen points out that there would be a subdivision map that would grant more land, let's just say. As I

read the staff report, it sounded like that might not even be necessary. They could do the three homes without any further changes, is that...?

Hagen: They would still be required to do a subdivision.

Balch: But they could just carve off the three similar to what they've done here. If they developed it just into three lots similar to what was presented, in theory that would work because each lot would be greater than an acre is what I thought I heard.

Hagen: Correct.

Nagler: And it wouldn't require a change in zoning.

Hagen: What we would typically require is we would still request a zone change where each of the lots would be over an acre, but that we would have some stipulation that on the church parcel that maybe 2 acres of that would remain at the current designation and then the other designation still on the church parcel would have an open space designation. A single parcel can have more than one designation. So by doing that, if you had the church parcel still at the 12 acres, you could have two that were available to add that the church could expand on and the other 10 would be open space. So if they did sell in the future, somebody couldn't come in and try to....well, I guess potentially they could come for another zone change, but with stipulations and conditions of approval, have designations within that open space that it couldn't be future residential.

Balch: So following up on that element, given the slope of this and our extensive knowledge of the slope, given Lund Ranch, are we really concerned that they might develop on that slope? Because I will tell you I think they are at the top of the ridgeline already, right? I mean, that being I-580.

Weinstein: So if it's less than 10 units, its exempt from PP and so it's hard to imagine that greater than 10 units could be developed on the site. Again, just to restate what Jennifer conveyed in her presentation, we feel like this is a really constrained site. From an environmental standpoint in particular, there's not only steep slopes but a creek running right in the middle of the site and that's why I think on the staff level that the existing General Plan designation for this site is intentional. One of the great things about our City is that there are sort of strips of or interjections of open space on the edges of the City and you see that in Happy Valley, you see that along Sycamore, you see that on Foothill and you see it up here as well. So, we do think that this isn't necessarily an infill site that needs to be filled with development but that this General Plan designation of Rural Residential might be intentional and we think that's the case because the General Plan designation for this site among lots of other sites in this City has been reviewed a couple of times by the City to determine whether it should be changed and during each of those reviews, the designation has been static.

So the number of units currently allowed under the existing General Plan designation is three. If you look at the entire project site, what you need is 15 acres for three units. So if you can give the church an acre and a half or so for itself and you can get 15 acres for other development you could get three units according to the existing General Plan designation.

Ritter: Three additional units.

Weinstein: Yes.

Balch: Well the church qualifies as a unit right?

Weinstein: Three units total—three residential units total.

Balch: Each at 5 acres is what you're saying?

Weinstein: Yes.

Nagler: So if that were to occur, the homes would then need to be spread out across the 15 acres, right?

Weinstein: The units don't have to be on 5 acre lots. The density is one unit per 5 acres, but the General Plan actually encourages clustering of homes on 1 acre lots. So there could be three homes on one acre lots and the rest would effectively be open space.

Balch: Designated open space to meet the requirement of the zoning then.

O'Connor: The question is, would the 15 acres all be owned by the three homeowners or could you cluster three homes separately and leave the other 12 acres with the church.

Hagen: The other 12 acres could be with the church and that parcel would have multiple designations. The remaining property with the remaining acreage within that 15 would have to be designated somehow as open space or maintained as an open space easement, but it could be maintained by the church.

O'Connor: So on number 1, I also feel the same way as Commissioner Allen. I'm not a fan of changing the General Plan to increase the number of units. I know that the City has looked at this property a few times. I've also been out there and I do think if we can get to one acre lots or even larger, I think it would be feasible to put three homes out there. And, I hadn't really looked at it before. Mr. Houston had said they picked this driveway specifically because of how you can see traffic in both direction so it's kind of a safety thing. But when I looked at this, if we use the same driveway they have today, and I'm not trying to plan this for you, I'm just throwing out a suggestion. But, if we use the same driveway to access two homes on an acre or acre-plus in that area, a third home I thought could go down by the church entrance which has quite a large area between the adjacent property and the church driveway. I think we could get an acre-plus lot over on that side as well and I just think that's one option.

But again, I'm not in favor of increasing density. We hear all the time from the people who come to see us that we have too many homes already. We have too much traffic already. We don't have enough water. The schools are over-crowded. We keep hearing this, and I agree and again, I know we lost a lawsuit a few years ago but we used to have a housing cap and I know the majority of people in Pleasanton would rather have

kept that housing cap and we're already beyond it. So, again, I'm not looking to increase density.

Balch: Well I actually probably will take the other side. I am supportive of the increase of density primarily for a few reasons and maybe I'll be on the short end but I'll just say I do see it as infill but I also see it as exactly how staff is saying; that it is on the periphery and we've got to be careful with that because where does the periphery start and where does it not? I can see the patchwork of rural coming in. And the reason I can support in particular is because it's two more units and maybe that's what I'm comfortable with is the two additional units versus as in the presentation by Mr. Houston many more. So I could support five as proposed density, and I have to say I really can do it because I see such significant high density just slightly up the road. I mean the next property is extremely dense. I mean, I drove through that several times and so if we're saying this is the edge of Pleasanton, then go five more feet because that seems a lot. They consider themselves in Pleasanton as well and that density is extremely high and would have of course never made it into today's world, but I do see this as a good way to do it. I respect exactly what prior Commissioners have said; that the three or the two, but I don't see three versus five as a deal-breaker for me. I don't, so I would support a higher increase in density.

That being said, there are other issues to address but we kind of got past that. And I personally think the density Mr. Houston has suggested of five seems to be much more in line in keeping with what we want, like we can achieve a lot from the rural nature of it with what he's proposing.

Nagler: Thank you. I'm not in favor of the five homes. I am supportive of maintaining the General Plan. I don't think....I'll make a general point and then a specific point. In general, I think it's appropriate for us in a planning capacity to respect a process that is long and deliberative and involves a lot of community input and looks at the sort of layout of the community and has pockets of high density, low density, open space, bike trails and so forth as a serious endeavor. And if we get into a pattern of sort of hopscotch and based on the creativity of people willing to take risks on projects and do damage to that overall rationale, I don't think that's serving the community. And so I think Commissioner Balch's point could be very well made about the density of this project, but again, I don't know that it is appropriate with sort of the weight of an application as opposed to the weight of a deliberative process to be the reason that we should look beyond supporting, to the extent we can, the General Plan. So that's primary.

And then secondarily, it's a little bit of, you sort of know it when you see it. Having also spent time across the street on the property, driving up the hill, there is an aesthetic difference between an acre lot there and not and it does have the feel more of a subdivision in sort of a more practical application of the word with five homes on that four-acre lot than three. So, I could absolutely be fine with the three. I think it's totally appropriate to cluster them on this parcel we're talking about on this side of the creek and designate the rest of the church property open space.

Balch: Could I rebut. So my issue under your premise that the General Plan process is deliberate, we wouldn't be here because everything we're doing is doing a General Plan

amendment. We wouldn't have approved any zoning change because zoning would have been set in the General Plan process, correct?

Hagen: The zoning is agriculture which does permit three units.

Balch: I meant the Planning Commission's purpose is to look at changes or modifications on a more specific level, to evaluate them against the General Plan which is, in my opinion, more of a paint brush over a much broader area.

Hagen: Correct, and that's why we're having this work session tonight, is to get your input whether you think this is appropriate.

Balch: We moved it to a more educational debate I think more so than no, but my premise to the idea that a General Plan is deliberate, I understand that, but a General Plan in my opinion is your general concept of planning for a general city and then when you get to uniqueness of the site, you have to evaluate that application's request in light of the General Plan and specific plan, and no specific plan has been done in this case.

Beaudin: Let me jump in a little bit. So the General Plan should not be...I mean, there was a time when General Plans were done as blob diagrams. Those days are largely gone. In 2009, the City did take a comprehensive look at the City of Pleasanton's long range planning document and the policies that exist in the document are thoughtful and the mapping that was done has been carefully done. What happens is then the zoning is informed to the General Plan. So you get this layer underneath that does deal with the intricate details which is what you see with the agricultural or rural agricultural zoning that is on this particular parcel. So there's a policy level and a General Land use application for the General Plan and then there's this implementation layer with the zoning. And I think what happens in Pleasanton is that a lot of the residential standards and the rural standards do need to be adjusted when you get the specific development application, and if you were to support a three-unit project in this case, you'll still see the PUD application because they are having to cluster development and that's a little unique. There isn't a straight solution to that cluster development that's encouraged in the General Plan. But the General Plan was fairly detailed in this particular instance with the policies that Jennifer highlighted earlier this evening and some of the conversation that we've had around the process and thought that went into this site specific to the riparian areas and the open space requirements that are included in this rural area of the community, where the rural aesthetic has been identified as a priority.

O'Connor: And even prior to that General Plan update, I can say that over the last 10 years I've been sitting on this Commission, we will generally make changes to zoning but it's fairly rare that we make a change to the General Plan. It's pretty rare. I can only remember two.

Beaudin: And it's typically during a housing element process or that housing element process requires the City to look at those kinds of changes more frequently than you would do a comprehensive General Plan update. And so this site was evaluated and was left as is in the current General Plan designation.

Ritter: I'll just add my two cents. I always say if a plan is wrong change it, but just don't tweak it all the time. But I am in favor of supporting the General Plan. It's been updated as of January 2015 so it actually has been constantly reviewed, but I'm not totally opposed to maybe going to four homes to maybe get some extra amenities that they might need to make this work on this land's location, but I really don't want to visualize three driveways coming out on that road. That's kind of my big feeling and I'll just go right into the next one and start there unless you guys finish, but I would love to see one entrance and access off of that road versus three and that's why I go to the five homes because it is kind of a busy road and I like the flasher light idea. I just don't want to see three driveways coming out onto that road, so that's my thought. Let's go this way.

O'Connor: Well, you know, I'll agree with you. I don't want to see three driveways either so there's already an existing one. They're proposing a second one and I think we can get three homes in here with only two driveways. And I do see that as the problem with the layout. I think the lots do need to be bigger and I think we can do that with the existing driveway more.

Balch: Maybe a point of clarification than a question. This driveway is right up against Dublin Canyon Road which was a point of contention, a question earlier in the staff report, is that there is only a 20-foot buffer and it was going to be for a bioswale I believe for a bit of it. So I kind of wanted to ask, you know, in light of your comments, do you want to see the road move deeper into the lot?

O'Connor: No, so I don't envision this road, this court being here. I envision only a driveway coming in to access two lots, yes, and the other driveway existing for the church we could come off of that to access the other lots. So no, I'm looking at this entire road going away.

Ritter: I would just love to have just one road come out.

O'Connor: Well, we're going to have at least two.

Ritter: Well, you're not counting the current access road.

O'Connor: Yes, that's the second one.

Balch: Okay, so I'll follow-up. So, obviously losing the other comment element, going with three, I fully agree with prior comments that I don't want to see three driveways or four with the existing, so I would like to see some consolidation into a singular primary driveway off of Dublin Canyon and then some spoking of some nature off of that. If it is this or something similar to this in light of three, I'd like to see it set back further from Dublin Canyon Road because the rural nature is exactly what it sounds like this body is supporting. So unfortunately, I think you're going to be pushing towards the creek enough to have this noticeable buffer. And primarily my comment, and I'm going to pick up on something that's going to go later one, primarily my reasoning would be so you could meander the sidewalk if this City's going to require it so as not to remove the heritage trees that are on this particular access.

Nagler: I agree with you. I think there should be only one access point to the homes off of Dublin Canyon Road. And I don't think those sitting here know if the plan is for three houses how that could be configured, but it is totally configurable. So I think as guidance, I would like the Commission to say there needs to be one access road.

Allen: And I'm in complete agreement with one access road and the road should be as far back as possible; the entrance way, and not next to a frontage kind of road.

Ritter: Let's next go to landscaping:

Is the proposed landscaping and planter depth along Dublin Canyon Road appropriate?

Allen: Okay, so I think we should keep the trees on the front and not have the sidewalk so we can retain the trees as screening to the homes and I think that's really critical. And I would like to see, if we have three homes, I would like to see more trees put in the middle section of this property where it's pretty barren on Dublin Canyon Road right now to create even more screening; some trees that would grow large because you know that section in the middle? It's like you can see everything there. It's the corners that are really protected and screened, especially the western corner, so I'd like to see even more screening.

O'Connor: So I had originally thought no because I thought all the trees were coming out, but if we can meander the sidewalk so we can maintain those trees, then I'm okay with it adding some additional screening as well.

Balch: Yeah, I don't know. I'm thinking of what they're saying but in light of the question, it's kind of like we've gone into a tangent.

Ritter: We're on number 3.

Balch: No, I see it right in front of me too, that's the whole problem. In terms of the trees I think this is a different issue now because we're talking about the existing oak trees and removing heritage trees and the meandering sidewalk element and not so much the question of the crepe myrtles and the 20-foot setback because I know we kind of addressed it, so I'll just start with that.

Ritter: I'm in favor of keeping it as natural as we can too. So I'll just go onto 4a.:

Does the Planning Commission support the proposed building setbacks, building positioning, home designs, massing, number of stories, heights, and colors and materials?

Ritter: I like keeping the setback away from Dublin Canyon Road, as close to the creek without interfering with that positioning. I like the design layout. It looks fairly elegant I think for a country setting. I know the neighbor across the street has expressed to the applicant to copy it or keep something similar which I think is a compliment. The number of stories-I think it is appropriate what he has proposed, so I'm pretty easy on that one.

Balch: So in theory, if history holds true, reducing the number of homes will probably mean the homes come back a little bit bigger. So assuming that, generally I would like to see rural homes maintain a single level which the applicant has done. I think the massing is fine. I noted as he presented that one was going to be 30 feet and the rest were going to be around 24-26 feet. I think all of that works from what I get and the screening that's there. So I have no problem with that. Personally, I think the renderings look really nice. The colors blend and so I'm supportive of actually what the applicant has designed and hope they can keep the general design as they look to redesign the project.

Nagler: Ditto.

O'Connor: I will ditto with the addition that I do expect that if it is three homes they could be larger and if that helps the church; and I don't know who's building them or what's being sold as, but if that helps in getting more revenue for the church, I'm all for that too. There's plenty of room to do a larger home than what we have if there's three.

Allen: And ditto for me on all of the comments of fellow Commissioners.

Nagler: And if I could add, I didn't say but it really is an interesting point that the homes could be larger and the applicant could accept it.

O'Connor: I would like to see them single stories.

Nagler: Yes, single stories. I agree with that; the rural look.

Ritter: Yes, the rural look. The ranch look. All right, 4b.:

A visual analysis with photomontages will be required if the project moves forward. Are there any specific viewpoints that should be analyzed?

Nagler: I don't know. I think every possible view from every possible angle so that we can get a sense of it.

Balch: So I think one of the views or two that we need are specifically from the center point of Dublin Canyon Road looking at the site both on kind of the western and eastern side so that you're basically looking around the bend if you will up and down the street, and I don't know if I'm describing that appropriately, but you know we kind of want to see the rendering showing that the look while driving up or down the road is going to be the rural look. I have to say, if you look to the south and you see the Preserve Community Association's green lawn entrance to their driveway, it really doesn't look rural to me in the City of Pleasanton. That being said, nor does the higher density stuff slightly more to the west. Perhaps it's not a rural look. It doesn't grow in California naturally by the way. So, that being said, that's one viewpoint. The second viewpoint is obviously a straight shot, I'll call it across the view from, I believe, Ms. Young's property would be my read.

Allen: So I agree with Commissioner Balch and just the only add would be a bicyclist's view which I think is your point about just the view from someone driving down. But that

is a very active bike route. It's the primary one from Pleasanton and Castro Valley. There's a bike lane and large shoulders in most of the areas, so I think it's important because bicyclists enjoy it because it feels like one of the last places that's still in the country.

O'Connor: So the only other area I would suggest is I'm thinking of the views from where people live now; the ones that are flat down on the other side of Dublin Canyon Road. I think we're going to get a picture of what they're going to see just by getting a picture from the road. But I think we should go up the hill to the Preserve area or what's the other one; Kolb Ranch, and I think that if there's any homes up there that can see the site, I think we should take a shot from there or even take a shot where nothing can be seen. I think it's important to make sure....from the road up there I'm sure we'll see something. I'm not too concerned about the road up there. I'm more concerned about the residents.

Balch: So if I may suggest then, the Laurel Creek Drive is the entrance which is almost directly across. Maybe that's your other vantage point.

O'Connor: That's why I say I'm not too concerned if I'm driving in a car coming down Laurel Creek, but if from the home sites you could see, I'd be more concerned from the home sites.

Ritter: I will echo those comments. I like the drone shots. I'd like to see a Photoshop of what the house will look like from those shots just so you get an idea of how it fits in. I just think that helps with the decision-making in going through the process. But, does that help staff and the applicant?

Houston: Can the applicant ask questions?

Balch: Before he does, can I just ask staff; one of the things when we've had workshops in the past is sometimes we've not been too terribly clear in our comments. Staff, do you believe you are fairly clear on our consensus comments? And, should we clarify anything for you?

Weinstein: Yes, I have a clarification and a question relating to a clarification. So as we all know, the southern part of the site right now where the homes are proposed is fairly constrained. It is constrained by the creek on the north and the road on the south, and so based on the guidance that we've got from you tonight obviously the riparian zone around the creek is pretty sacred. We're looking at more of a buffer on the south side of the creek—I'm sorry, more of a buffer adjacent to Dublin Canyon Road, so that further constrains the development footprint on the south side of the creek.

So I guess the clarification that I am seeking is, in going back and working with the applicant team on looking at different alternatives for development on the larger, 16 acre site, do you also support us working with them looking at a development scenario that might include two houses south of the creek and one north of the creek? We feel like there might be some opportunities north of the creek that would help us better achieve the objective of creating a buffer area along Dublin Canyon Road. That was a question for you.

O'Connor: I wouldn't be opposed to that, but are you now inviting the Army Corps to come in if we're going to be crossing the creek and have other governmental issues?

Balch: Or you could access through the existing driveway though.

Weinstein: Yeah, we hoped that the access would be from the existing driveway and not touch the riparian area at all.

O'Connor: Okay.

Balch: If I may, I fear that that would do away with the clustering element that we were trying to achieve, or at least that I was initially trying to achieve. I didn't think of the permutation that you're suggesting but I wouldn't be opposed to it if that's what the applicant ultimately decided to do or would like to do. That's my position on it.

Nagler: Of course I support having any conversations with the applicant that are interesting and potentially make for a good project, I personally would prefer the properties to be clustered and to be basically 1 point something acre sites and actually have the view of the hillside be an open hillside up to the church. I think that's as a view, preferred. So, sure, if you could agree on something that includes the parcel above the creek, of course, but I wouldn't prefer it.

Beaudin: I'm just going to generalize the various points. So on the GP density increase, I heard a 3-1-1 straw poll with three folks in favor of not making that change, one person okay with amending the General Plan, and one person saying they would consider three or four which would still be a GP amendment. So the 3-1-1 which means we're going to go ahead and work with the applicant on a 3-unit project based on the majority straw poll of three. I just want to make sure everyone's clear on that approach with the applicant.

Balch: It's a significant change.

Beaudin: Yeah, it's a 3-unit project moving forward without a General Plan Amendment which is consistent with what staff is recommending. I just want to make sure that is clear to the Commission.

The other items we talked about this evening, I heard consensus on all of those so it's 5-0 across the board, so I want to state that for the record as well and make sure everyone is aware of that from staff's notes.

Ritter: It's a workshop so typically, I guess ask staff your question.

Allen: Before that, I just wanted to respond to the previous question quickly. I agree with Commissioner Nagler's comment about the house being on the north side of the creek. Generally, I'd like to see the clustering and not see the house; however, if there could be a house on the north side of the creek that was filtered and one wouldn't see it, then as far as I'm concerned, that's fine. So the issue is just if it is highly visible though that doesn't feel so good.

Balch: But at the same time when looking at the plan, there are 3.7 acres in the subject area that is evaluated. So even after 1.2 acre lots, you've accomplished—and I think to your point Adam about whether you're squishing that pinch point, yes, I think that particular pinch point is there but maybe you're putting two on one side and one on the other to accommodate that element. I don't know.

Nagler: And candidly, I was not trying to get into the economics of the project but presumably, given that we've reduced a number of home sites, it's got to be more economical to cluster the homes than not.

Houston: If I could ask staff these questions and maybe make sure I'm interpreting...there was discussion about the driveway. From the lower parcels there is no other driveway, so the driveway being discussed was the driveway going up to the church?

Hagen: Yes.

Houston: Okay, all right. For the five-unit project, the reason why we had designed the long court was to have a single point of entrance which we do think is safer, but also it got us there, to the other end of the parcel. With the testimony I heard, I heard some discussion about more than one entrance and there was one idea of having one entrance where they're more like that so it would basically serve two lots and there may be another entrance would conserve that third lot. So, did you hear where we could maybe have two entrances? We think one entrance with the five lots makes sense and it can pay for itself, but I could see a way you could have two entrances and one entrance would serve two of the lots and the other entrance would be the third because building that entire street for three lots is not feasible.

Beaudin: So Mr. Houston, if I could jump in. I understand the question. I think that there's a couple of comments that I'll make and then I'll maybe make a proposal. The idea of the cost of the driveway isn't really going to factor into my ultimate design proposal for you, but what I'll say is that the design proposal that I have in mind shrinks the length of that court or that cul-de-sac pretty significantly and I think that with the three-unit design we can certainly shorten that up and still get you one access with up to three lots on it and it pretty much maintains your existing parcel configuration.

Houston: Do you think it would move it from that location there?

Beaudin: No.

Houston: Okay, all right, so then it may not be essential to have more than one access.

Beaudin: I think we can find a design that still gets you three lots. It's just not going to be as long a cul-de-sac. There still would be a court created and it would still be one point of access. It would be roughly the same position that you currently have it.

Ritter: Thank you. I think we've got enough good info and I think staff will be able to work with you on it. Is that okay, Mr. Houston?

Houston: Yes, that was the one and also just a comment, it would be the desire in working with my partner that it's just going to be on these four acres on the south side of the creek. Really it's a non-starter to go on the entrance of their current driveway. One, the entrance driveway...is not I think up to standards if you were to include a residential unit. It would be very visible from the freeway and frankly not very desirable.

Beaudin: Understood. I think we can find a way to work in the roughly four acre parcel or almost five acre parcel closer to the street.

Ritter: Great. Thank you so much. I appreciate the input. It's a workshop so I'm sure we'll figure out the best solution.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No discussion was held or action taken.

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

a. Future Planning Calendar

No discussion was held or action taken.

b. Actions of the City Council

No discussion was held or action taken.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Matters for Commission's Information

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ritter adjourned the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Weinstein
Secretary