

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

**DRAFT**

**Wednesday, May 28, 2014**

Before calling the meeting to order, Chair O'Connor announced that the Planning Commission is commending the three outgoing Commissioners for their years of service on the Commission. Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development, presented the commendations to Commissioner Mark Posson who served one year on the Commission, Chair Arne Olson who served eight years, and Commissioner Jennifer Pearce who served nine years.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of May 14, 2014 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair O'Connor.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair O'Connor.

**1. ROLL CALL**

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Jennifer Wallis, Associate Planner, and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Jack Balch, Greg O'Connor, Gina Piper, and Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: None

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a. May 14, 2014**

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Minutes of the May 14, 2014 Meeting, as submitted.**

**Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.**

## ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the May 14, 2014 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**

Councilmembers Jerry Pentin and Kathy Narum thanked outgoing Planning Commissioners Olson, Pearce, and Posson for their work and commitment to the City of Pleasanton, and welcomed new Commissioners Gina Piper and Jack Balch.

### 4. **REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Janice Stern advised that there were no revisions or omissions to the Agenda.

### 5. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Commission or a member of the public by submitting a speaker card for that item.*

There were no items for consideration under the Consent Calendar.

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

#### a. **P14-0029, SLP Properties II LLC**

**Applications for a certificate of appropriateness to demolish the existing 2,340-square-foot single-story building at 511 Main Street (Pastime Pool) and for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,659-square-foot two-story commercial building with an approximately 667-square-foot public mini-plaza. Zoning for the property is Central Commercial (C-C) District, Downtown Revitalization District, and Core Area Overlay District.**

Jennifer Wallis presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the application.

Commissioner Allen requested staff to provide a little bit more information about the outdoor plaza area in terms of how many seats it could accommodate, what it really looks and feels like.

Ms. Wallis displayed a slide of the plaza elevation to be located along the corner of Main Street and Rose Avenue. She stated that the thinking behind the plaza is to have a central gathering place along Main Street. She pointed out the “L”-shaped outdoor planter treatment on the right-hand side with seating and decorative trellis feature, and the exterior façade facing the street as well as the interior facing the inside of the plaza. She added that there would also be seating below the proposed historical art display on the building wall within the plaza as well as adjacent to the storefront. She noted that these are permanent on-site seating areas. She added that tables and chairs can be placed outside if the applicant or the owner desired, but it is not required at this time.

Commissioner Allen inquired roughly how many people the plaza would support, estimating that it would be about ten seats.

Ms. Wallis replied that was probably accurate, maybe a little bit more.

Commissioner Ritter inquired how this plaza would compare to that at Tully’s. He noted that this is approximately 667 square feet, and Tully’s would probably be double that.

Ms. Wallis replied that Tully’s would be around 2,000 square feet.

Commissioner Ritter commented that it could probably accommodate no more than two or three tables.

Ms. Wallis said yes.

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

Tim Ward, Ward-Young Architects, Project Architect, together with Scott Sherwood, SLP Properties, property owner, stated that they have worked over the last five or six months with Planning staff refining this project prior to coming before the Commission, including details such as materials that reflect some of the other buildings Downtown.

Mr. Sherwood stated that a couple of years ago, he talked to Pamela Ott, the City’s Economic Development Director, and came up with this idea. He indicated that they had challenges along the way, but it has been great. He noted that he is involved in the racing industry and has a lot of history with Pleasanton, where he has been looking for opportunities. He added that he is basically just looking forward to completing this project.

Commissioner Allen stated it is great to see this project, whose design is really first class. She noted, however, that she wanted to probe a little bit regarding the outdoor plaza, hoping it would be a little more, especially with the in-lieu parking fee that had been given up in its place. She indicated that she would like to see a little more of a plaza with additional seating and maybe a stone table or two. She added that she is also concerned about the potential for damage from skateboarders who love open spaces. She asked Mr. Sherwood if there is anything more that could potentially be done in terms of those two aspects.

Mr. Sherwood stated that he was planning on putting tables out there, not a totally permanent type but something that was of a heavier weight and better quality, and as many as they could put in. He indicated that when they did some rough designs, anchoring the corner and having brick and trellises and some other things did shrink the plaza a bit. He noted, however, that his idea was always to have seating of a higher quality nature that was just open to the public.

Mr. Ward indicated that having a larger space for the plaza will mean redesigning part of the building to make that space bigger.

Mr. Sherwood stated that they talked a lot about it and negotiated purchasing the property next door. He indicated that he wished he had more land, but noted that in terms of property value, capitalizing and developing that corner and then selling it would be worth a lot more than those in-lieu parking fees; and that does not even include the second floor. He stated that the plaza actually started smaller, and after conversations with Mr. Dolan who voiced the same concerns, the plaza actually increased in size up to 660 square feet.

Referring to putting out some tables that are more permanent, Chair O'Connor inquired, if the ground-floor tenant were a restaurant, if it would not use that public plaza area as part of the restaurant.

Mr. Sherwood replied that part of the agreement he made with the City is that the plaza would be open to the public, and as such, it would be open to a restaurant customer who might want to go sit down there; however, there can be no table service.

Mr. Dolan stated that they did have a fair amount of internal discussion about the size of the plaza, and one of the things to remember about Tully's is that there are quite a few more tenants in that bigger building, so there is more retail space that is conducive to buying something and bringing it outside. He added that one of the spaces in the proposed building is designed as a sit-down restaurant, where the customers would not necessarily go outside to eat, as they would with a Tully's coffee and muffin or a burrito or fancy ice cream. He noted that it is unknown at this time exactly who the users will be and so they did not get into requiring any furniture in that space. He added, however, that staff is certainly open to the idea.

Mr. Ward stated that when they first looked at this space, part of it obviously was that there would be dining maybe in both the lower floor and the plaza. He indicated that one of the concerns was that they wanted people to be able to sit by the graphic on the interior of the structure, along the "L"-shaped planter on the corner, and along the brick planter on the far side to the left. He noted that the trellis clearly was to get some shade in the corner. He added that they did not want to take up all the space in the plaza with necessarily chairs and tables, especially if they were like those light aluminum chairs that can move all over the place. He stated that from their perspective, they just saw this as a gathering space that may be a little more informal, clearly a place where people can sit. He added that if they have furniture that could stay in one spot, they might have more activity out there with people being able to sit.

Mr. Sherwood stated that Mr. Dolan wanted a bigger plaza, but if the plaza were twice its size, it would look like a giant plaza with a really small building. He indicated that he thinks the proportions make a lot of sense.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he loves the concept, and buying the building next door would be awesome because that could be part of the plaza. He asked the applicant, in that respect, if he would consider designing the west side of the building and the east on the Main Street side in such a way that should the next-door property open up, the building could wrap around the side of the other building and integrate it into the structure.

Commissioner Ritter stated that the other thing he wanted to point out is that the Main Street side is not really the building's primary side; it is the Rose Avenue side. He suggested that the Main Street side include a little more such as a picture of the theater or some representation of what it used to be since that has always been the main side. He added that it would be a nice thing to see coming into town down Main Street.

Mr. Sherwood stated that they did talk about it a little bit more and thought there might have been some interest. He indicated that Mr. Mike Carey reached out to the property owner, but nothing really happened. He noted that from that point in time, they did spend a lot on architectural costs and other related costs. He noted that the property is narrow and deep, and they had some rough ideas for that type of space to kind of create a little corner piece.

Commissioner Piper stated that she thinks the project looks so amazing but was concerned about parking issues.

Mr. Dolan stated that in the retail area of the Downtown, if the property owner or developer cannot provide additional parking, and hardly anybody can, then they have to pay an in-lieu parking fee. He stated that in this case, the applicant has negotiated the dedication of the public plaza in exchange for that parking in-lieu fee. He noted that it is a fairly unique situation with the Downtown because the City wants the businesses to line up very tightly and have a very walkable experience rather than have buildings and a parking lot.

Chair O'Connor inquired if the exchange of the in-lieu parking fee with a public plaza is in perpetuity, that the plaza would actually be a public amenity which would not be allowed to ever change, such that if the tenant were to change over time, the new tenant would not be allowed to encroach on that area.

Mr. Dolan replied that he thinks the new tenant could re-negotiate and give the City the parking in-lieu fee. He stated that the City Council could choose to do something different but the City would have to get the in-lieu parking fee money back down the road.

Ms. Wallis stated that there is a draft agreement between the City and the property owner which would be recorded and would run with the land. She noted that the exhibit to that agreement would show that the plaza area is supposed to be open to the public and not be associated with a tenant. She added, however, that the agreement could be re-negotiated by the City if there were any changes.

Commissioner Allen noted that the shingles should on the elevations are real stark, but on the materials list, it looks more like a slate and a soft gray, which are more representative than black.

Mr. Ward replied that was correct. He added that only the upper roof would have them.

Commissioner Allen stated that this is the first project the City has since the adoption of the new Downtown ordinance, and an amenity for the public is being created in lieu of parking. She added that taking off on this idea, she would really love to see just a little bit more space, where maybe people can sit down and play cards if they wanted, or read the newspaper and have a little permanent table to put the newspaper down, but without creating too much space. She then reiterated her concern about skateboarders in a small space like that.

Mr. Sherwood replied that he is coming from a different angle or thought process. He indicated that he did not want to end up throwing a couple of lightweight aluminum chairs and then having them scattered all over. He stated that he did not want that look for that corner; he wants it to be beautiful, neat, and organized. He noted that that would require something with more weight and of a higher quality. He added that he would think everybody would want to use it and maybe provide more places to sit down. He stated that he thinks there is space to put tables and that he is open to the Commission's recommendation.

Chair O'Connor inquired if staff can work with the applicant on such a plan.

Mr. Dolan said yes. He stated that if the Commission wishes, it could add a condition that says that the applicant shall work with staff to provide additional seating in the plaza area of a more permanent nature or heavier weight.

Mr. Sherwood commented that he thought it would be heavier and something that could be bolted down, but not so heavy so they could be moved in case there was some public event or could be used for something else.

Chair O'Connor stated that he is trying to envision something that would be difficult to steal or move, but not so big and bulky that it looks like it belongs in a very large open park.

Mr. Sherwood stated that he is trying to find that "in-between" thing and that there are a couple of them that he thinks will work. He added that they actually have a designer with whom they worked on some of the materials, the lighting, and the finishes, and this would be right up her alley.

Mr. Ward stated that they could come up with a couple of schemes with Planning staff and sort through it. He indicated that they are pretty open to doing whatever the City really wants to do. He added that they had a huge sculpture on the corner that he loved but it did not fly with staff.

Commissioner Balch inquired if the two-percent slope denoted on the public parking measures out and if it will be noticeable while walking across the plaza. He further inquired if that would continue from there to Main Street.

Mr. Ward replied that most sidewalks are two-percent slopes, which is the maximum crosswalk required on any place that affords access, and noted that Main Street is already two percent. He added that it would be two percent across the entire distance to the curb and along Rose Avenue.

Commissioner Balch inquired if the riser at the bottom of the elevation is existing.

Ms. Wallis said yes.

Commissioner Balch inquired what the question mark on the right side of the trellis represents.

Ms. Wallis replied that it is an existing underground vault.

Mr. Sherwood replied that there is an underground vault there and one right at the corner.

Ms. Wallis stated that it is not certain if the underground vault is a City vault, a traffic vault, or PG&E.

Commissioner Balch stated that from his view of the public plaza, the one thing he is concerned about is actually the entry to the plaza because one will have to go farther up or down Rose Avenue or Main Street to enter the public plaza, as opposed to having an arch or something that would just let people go in and sit down instead of having to go around to get in. He added that it lends more to exclusivity for the businesses actually versus if the seating was separated and pushed farther towards the edges of the plaza.

Chair O'Connor inquired if the metal trellis cuts that corner and provides it some shape.

Mr. Sherwood replied that it created an anchor and provides the seating. He added that Mr. Dolan could explain it better.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff actually asked for that component to anchor the corner, although he understood Commissioner Balch's issue about feeling welcomed. He noted that it is at the same location that the corner of a building would be if there were no plaza, so staff felt fine with it. He added that he thinks there is enough of an opening on the side that staff thought anchoring the corner was more important than that concern.

Mary Simmons, a resident of Pleasanton and the first cousin of the business owner adjacent to the proposed project, stated that she was shocked and dismayed that there was nobody else present to speak at the sadness of this project happening in Pleasanton. She noted that there is no more Downtown Pleasanton two-and-a-quarter beers, and this is important to her so she wanted that to be recognized. She added that she is glad to hear the owner, who seems to have a big heart, say that he wants the best for the building and for that corner. She indicated that this makes her feel a lot better and is glad she came to the meeting tonight.

Elizabeth Clausen stated that she owned the building at 515, 519, and 521 Main Street for many, many years. She noted that the proposed building is beautiful and that she has some people who may want to rent space there, but her only concern is the parking. She indicated that parking in Downtown Pleasanton is very bad and inquired if people are going to be able to park in the lot next to the former Round Table Pizza, or where they should park. She further inquired if the City will own the plaza and stated that she would like an answer to her question about parking.

Frank Hamilton stated that he and his son own the property at 233 Rose Avenue, right behind the building, and the two houses in between. He indicated that they have no objection to this proposal and inquired if their understanding is correct that where the pool hall and parking lot are now will become some sort of a seating place and an eating spot. He further inquired if the tree is going to be taken down.

Chair O'Connor pointed to the display and indicated that part of it is the public area on the corner, and part of it is where the building is located. He confirmed that the tree will be taken down.

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

Commissioner Piper stated that her question is still where people are going to park.

Mr. Dolan replied that the approach is very similar to what a lot of downtowns do when they are lucky enough to have a nice traditional or walkable Main Street. He indicated that there is obviously street parking and that there are a number of public lots that are scattered throughout Downtown. He noted that a lot of people feel the Downtown does not have sufficient parking, but that all depends on how far they are willing to walk. He continued that when the City collects these in-lieu parking fees from projects to make improvements, the idea is that there will be the amenity of public lots such as the over 100 spaces by the Fire House Arts Center. He added that there is also a plan to expand that, and there are people who feel that the City should go even beyond that and build parking structures, which can be very expensive per space. He indicated that the Downtown Specific Plan identifies a few locations where there is the potential for future public lots; however, there has not been any decision to move forward on any of those beyond what has already been done in the railroad right-of-way.

Ms. Stern stated that some of the Planning Commissioners will remember that when the City moved forward with the text amendment to formalize this process for other properties in the Downtown, it included a parking survey of the Downtown which looked



at all of the streets, including the side streets in addition to Main Street, at various times of the day and various days of the week. She noted that staff identified a good number of vacant areas where the space is not necessarily adjacent to businesses, not necessarily on Main Street or on the cross streets close to Main Street, but within a block of Main Street.

Chair O'Connor asked Mr. Dolan how many spaces could be accommodated with the improvement of what is left and not built-out on the railroad right-of-way.

Mr. Dolan replied that he thinks the lot is at least as big as the other one that the City just did, and his recollection is that is in the vicinity of 100 spaces.

Commissioner Allen inquired if these 100 spaces are ones that people do not use today or if people do use them and the City would just improve it.

Mr. Dolan replied that the spaces are near the service station on Ray and First Streets and that they are not being used. He added that there is actually some clean-up that needs to be done on the soils before the City can convert it to parking spaces.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he thinks it is important to re-emphasize that the in-lieu parking fees do not mean that the City is necessarily giving up the space but is actually using the money to put more spaces in other locations.

Mr. Dolan confirmed that that is the idea.

Commissioner Ritter stated that at a prior meeting, there was a big chart, and one of the past Minutes indicated there was a parking study which showed that the City did have a lot of vacant spaces. He noted that anybody who was at that meeting knows that.

Commissioner Balch requested confirmation that instead of in-lieu parking fees, the City is getting the public plaza, that there is no in-lieu parking fee on this one.

Commissioner Ritter asked Mr. Dolan to confirm that other projects are paying in-lieu parking fees to the City.

Mr. Dolan replied that this project is not paying in-lieu parking fees but is providing a public plaza, and the applicant also got credit for the square footage that is there.

Commissioner Balch noted that the first floor tenants are likely going to be restaurant-based and the second floor will be occupied by commercial/retail or office uses as has been laid out in the staff report. He indicated that parking for the first-floor versus second-floor businesses would be different, with people parking at late hours of the day for the second-floor businesses, and on the first-floor people might be on a shift or more of a standard retail type of hours. He inquired if parking in this area would be limited by a certain number of hours people can park there or if it is just free and open.

Mr. Dolan replied that there are signs on Main Street limiting parking to three hours.

Commissioner Balch inquired if there is no such restriction on Rose Avenue.

Mr. Dolan replied that he is not certain that the signs turn that corner.

Commissioner Balch inquired that assuming it does not, if staff would foresee that it would be needed now in light of these uses, when the City evaluates that through its standard processes.

Mr. Dolan replied that it is in a very localized area. He stated that they are two different questions. He pointed out that in general, this is a very small amount but adds some demand, but it does not add so much that it is the straw that breaks the camel's back. He continued, however, that if this particular situation results in a situation right on that street for other people, it's something staff would consider on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Dolan stated that maybe some of the Commissioners are aware that there has been a lot of discussion about what is next after the East Pleasanton Specific Plan project is completed, and the Pleasanton Downtown Association (PDA) has been advocating that the City actually re-visit the Downtown Specific Plan, particularly the issue of comprehensive parking. He indicated that the City will have a discussion on two different questions: whether the City is really going to build a parking structure or if it can get practical and focus on where additional public parking might go; the first is the overall approach, and the second is on a case-by-case basis. He added that signs can be installed around the corner, if necessary.

Commissioner Balch stated that he personally believes the parking demand would increase primarily because approximately ten existing parking spaces on the site will be lost.

Mr. Dolan replied that the lot is gated half of the time and noted that they are not real parking spaces as they do not meet any dimensional requirements. He added that they are actually unsafe because the vehicle backs out onto the street.

Commissioner Balch stated that he agreed, based on what Mr. Dolan pointed out.

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve Case P14-0029, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report, with the addition of a condition that the applicant work with the Director of Community Development to install tables and chairs in the public plaza.**

**Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Balch inquired if the owner would have to replace the seating furniture if they were stolen.

Mr. Dolan stated that his interpretation of the dialogue is that the furniture would be something permanent enough that it would be very unlikely they would be stolen, and if they ultimately are stolen, it would be a condition of approval that the applicant/owner would have to replace them.

Commissioner Balch stated that he will not support the motion for that reason only because he foresees the plaza as being something where somebody may have a poetry reading, and this is something that should be considered. He reiterated that he thinks the seating is appropriate and should be there, but who provides them, he does not know, and he would leave it broad and let staff decide how permanent they should be. He added that there might be a need for some type of maintenance, but he would hate to write it in that the applicant would have to provide seating in perpetuity.

Commissioner Ritter asked Commissioner Balch if he is thinking of leaving it up to staff's discretion.

Mr. Dolan stated that he understands the discretion given to staff would be to have furniture of a semi-permanent nature that could be moved, but they are not going to be light aluminum chairs.

Commissioner Balch stated that if the furniture gets stolen anytime in the future 50 years from now, someone will have to pay for them to be put back. He indicated that he is open to saying that could be worked out and could move forward personally; however, that is his hiccup, and the condition could be only for the initial seating.

Mr. Dolan stated that he thinks, as a practical matter, that if the furniture were stolen, staff would probably want to revisit the issue within his discretion, or bring it back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Balch stated that he was fine with having the Director of Community Development work it out; he just does not personally want a condition that makes it the owner's responsibility.

Commissioner Ritter stated that everything always could come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Allen stated that she is fine with staff working it out. She added that personally, she does not agree with Commissioner Balch's position and is on the opposite end. She indicated that she would not want a condition that says it is not the owner's responsibility because the City is giving the owner an amenity to that by waiving the in-lieu parking fee. She added that she is fine with having staff work with the applicant on the design parameters and what would happen if that design does not work or if the furniture are stolen so that it is a win/win situation for both the applicant and the City.

Mr. Sherwood commented that he would not want a plaza sitting there with no furniture and that he would be willing to replace them if they were stolen or if they have marks on them as he wants the plaza to look good.

Chair O'Connor commented that the applicant could work with staff to redesign the furniture should they be stolen twice within several months.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Allen, Balch, O'Connor, Olson, and Piper  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**RECUSED:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

Resolution No. PC-2014-26 approving Case P14-0152 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. 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**

Mr. Dolan stated that tonight is officially Ms. Stern's last Planning Commission meeting and he wanted to thank her again for all of her hard work for the City of Pleasanton.

Commissioner Ritter noted that the Commission really never did publicly thank former Commissioners Olson and Pearce. He wanted to publicly recognize and acknowledge their support, noting that, personally, they gave him good leadership when he came onto the Planning Commission and showed him how to work within the system and make things work.

Chair O'Connor indicated that he worked with both of them for eight years and commended them for a great job.

Commissioner Allen stated that she also wanted to recognize them, noting that they were great mentors and good role models for her.

**e. Matters for Commission's Action**

**(1) Selection of one Commissioner to replace Commissioner Pearce on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force**

Commissioner Allen stated that she was on this Task Force before that that she thinks it would be best if another member were on it as she has a potential conflict of interest with her earlier involvement earlier.

Commissioner Ritter asked Commissioner Balch if he was the Alternate for the Parks and Recreation Commission representative.

Commissioner Balch said yes but that he has not attended many meetings.

**Commissioner Ritter moved to nominate Commissioner Balch to replace Commissioner Pearce on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

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

Commissioner Balch was appointed to replace Commissioner Pearce on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force.

**(2) Selection of one Commissioner to replace Commissioner Olson on the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Committee**

Commissioner Ritter stated that he was a past Chair on that Committee but that he would gladly ask other Commissioners if they are interested.

Commissioner Balch inquired how often the Committee meets.

Commissioner Ritter replied that it met once a month on a Monday.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he would do it if none of the other four would.

Commissioner Allen stated that she would be a back-up if one was needed. She noted that she has a scheduling issue on the times of the meetings; however, if no one else was willing or able to, she would be willing to do it.

Commissioner Ritter noted that Commissioner Piper would be a great representative to the Committee.

Commissioner Piper stated that she is new to the Commission and was a bit nervous.

Chair O'Connor stated that he would step up but he actually has something on Mondays that is really taking up a lot of his time.

Commissioner Allen stated that she would do it.

**Chair O'Connor moved to nominate Commissioner Allen to replace Commissioner Olson on the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Committee. Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

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

Commissioner Allen was appointed to replace Commissioner Olson on the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Committee.

**(3) Selection of one Commissioner to replace Commissioner Posson as Alternate on the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals**  
*(Chair O'Connor and Commissioner Allen are the Commission representatives for 2014)*

Chair O'Connor stated that he and Commissioner Allen are already on the Committee, and they just need an Alternate. He noted that if two Commissioners do not show, the Committee would be down to only one person, and two Committee members are needed to make a quorum. He indicated that the Board of Appeals really meets only about once a year, although two or three of those appeals have popped up in the past few months.

**Commissioner Ritter moved to nominate Commissioner Piper to replace Commissioner Posson as Alternate on the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals. Commissioner Balch seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

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

Commissioner Piper was appointed to replace Commissioner Posson on the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair O'Connor adjourned the Planning Commission 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN  
Secretary

DRAFT