



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

---

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

**APPROVED**

**Wednesday, May 22, 2013**

*(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)*

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of May 22, 2013, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Phil Blank.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner 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; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; Erica Fraser, Contract Planner; Marion Pavan, Associate Planner; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, Jennifer Pearce, and Mark Posson

Commissioners Absent: None.

Chair Blank noted that Maria Hoey was actually on vacation and wanted to thank her on the record for being at the Planning Commission meeting.

## **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **a. May 8, 2013**

Commissioner Pearce noted a minor typographical error on the last sentence of the seventh paragraph on page 22 and requested that it be modified to read as follows: “She indicated that people were looking at her, wondering why † she was watching the gas station.”

Chair Blank requested that “Chair Black” be changed to “*Chair Blank*” on the first sentence of the second paragraph following “The public hearing was opened.”

Commissioner Pearce noted another typographical error on the first sentence of the first paragraph under “Matters Initiated by Commission Members” and requested that it be modified to read as follows: “Chair Blank advised that his my term on the Planning Commission is technically up....”

**Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the Minutes of May 8, 2013, as amended. Commissioner O’Connor seconded the motion.**

### **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Blank, O’Connor, Pearce, and Posson.**  
**NOES: None.**  
**ABSTAIN: Commissioner Olson.**  
**RECUSED: None.**  
**ABSENT: None.**

The Minutes of the May 8, 2013 meeting were approved as amended.

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

There were no members of the audience wishing to address the Planning Commission.

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

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

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**a. P13-0455, Team Glass**

**Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a warehouse for a glass-installation business at 2134 Rheem Drive, Suite 200. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Industrial) District.**

**b. P13-0218, Beverly Kuo, Tri-Valley Chinese Bible Church**

**Application for a modification to an approved Conditional Use Permit to operate a summer school program at the approved State-registered Heritage School located within the existing building at the Tri-Valley Chinese Bible Church located at 1055 Serpentine Lane. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.**

**Commissioner Pearce moved to make the Conditional Use Permit findings as listed in the staff reports and to approve Cases P13-0455 and P13-0218, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the respective staff reports. Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Blank, O'Connor, Olson, Pearce, and Posson.**

**NOES: None.**

**ABSTAIN: None.**

**RECUSED: None.**

**ABSENT: None.**

Resolutions Nos. PC-2013-25 approving Case P13-0455 and PC-2013-26 approving Case P13-0218 were entered and adopted as motioned.

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS**

**a. P13-1858, City of Pleasanton, East Pleasanton Specific Plan**

**Project update and discussion of four working draft specific plan alternatives for an approximately 1,100 acre area east of Martin Avenue and Valley Avenue, north of Stanley Boulevard, and south of Arroyo Mocho. Zoning for the approximately 235 acres of this property that is within the City of Pleasanton is P (Public and Institutional) and I-G-40 (General Industrial, 40,000 square foot minimum lot size).**

Janice Stern introduced the item by presenting a brief update of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force activities, noting that the Task Force is now at the point where four Working Draft Alternative Plans have been developed that are probably among many different types of alternatives that could be developed consistent with the Task Force Vision Statement. She noted that these four Alternatives have been brought before various City Committees and Commissions over the last month for feedback and input and are now before the Planning Commission for the same purpose.

Ms. Stern then introduced Wayne Rasmussen, lead of the team of consultant for this project, which includes David Gates of David Gates and Associates, landscape architect; Jason Moody of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), project economist; and traffic consultants and environmental consultants, who will be presenting the Draft Alternatives. She added that she will be providing the information about housing partway through that presentation.

Chair Blank requested Ms. Stern to give some information on Mr. Rasmussen's background for the benefit of those who do not know him.

Ms. Stern stated that Mr. Rasmussen worked with the City of Pleasanton for many years as Principal Planner up to about 2005 and was a consultant on some other projects, including the Bernal Property. She noted that Mr. Rasmussen knows a lot about the East Pleasanton area and is assisting the City with this project.

Chair Blank welcomed Mr. Rasmussen, noting that he looked remarkably relaxed.

Wayne Rasmussen thanked Chair Blank, stating that it certainly was good to be back and see everyone again. He started his PowerPoint presentation and gave a brief overview of the East Pleasanton site and the planning process and alternatives that have been developed to date.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the site is located just to the south of I-580 and just to the north of Stanley Boulevard, with Valley Avenue to the east and Busch Road extending into the project area, a 1,100-acre site of which about 700 acres consist of lakes and some habitat area that are either owned or will soon be owned by Zone 7. He noted that the land has been dedicated over time and will continue to be by the quarry operators who mine it. He added that other important land holdings within the plan area include the City of Pleasanton's Operations Services Center (OSC) and the Pleasanton Garbage Service (PGS) transfer station, both located off of Busch Road; Kiewit, which owns about 50 acres; 314 acres of the remaining potentially developable area owned mostly by the Lionstone Group; and 17 acres owned by Legacy Partners. He pointed out the location of Vulcan Materials Company's quarry site, which is important from the standpoint of the potential impacts it might create on development in this area. He noted that one of the studies that has been completed for the Task Force is an Opportunities and Constraints Analysis.

Mr. Rasmussen continued that the important thing to point out again at tonight's meeting are the lakes and open space areas, consisting of about 700 acres with the exception of three acres which are privately owned. He noted that because this is all public property, no real planning is being done for that area other than the extension of El Charro Road through the area, as called for by the General Plan, and an attempt to get some potential use of the lakes and the habitat area around them for limited recreational use such as trails. He pointed out a sensitive plant area, shown in dark

brown on the site map, a lot of which is on Zone 7 land, some of which may be used as a possible community park site.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the site presents some geotechnical issues that will need to be engineered and that has to do with soil subsidence. He noted that these areas were mined at one time and then refilled with the soil but was not necessarily properly compacted for development. He added that these engineering issues are a bit costly and will need to be addressed as the planning gets more specific in the future.

Mr. Rasmussen then pointed out the location of the Livermore Airport and the Airport Protection Area (APA) on the site map. He noted that the key issue presented by the APA, consisting of a total of approximately 43 acres in different locations within the site, is that residential development is not allowed within it; therefore, there is a need to look for different types of uses for those areas. He then pointed to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line located in a straight line right down along El Charro Road, noting that the planning area to the east of the line is outside the UGB, and the area to the west is inside the UGB.

With respect to the process, Mr. Rasmussen stated that the Task Force, so far, has completed the Background Information gathering phase, the Opportunities and Constraints Analysis, and the Working Vision Statement for the property, and is now in the process of preparing and evaluating a series of land use alternatives. He indicated that the Task Force has most recently prepared four Working Draft Alternatives, which have been presented to five City Commissions and Committees, including the Planning Commission, for their comments and input. He added that all these comments will be taken back to the Task Force for integration into the Alternatives, and then presented to the City Council for its direction to proceed with the detailed analysis of these Alternatives, including engineering, traffic, and environmental reports. He stated that after the Alternatives are analyzed, a Preferred Plan will be selected; the Draft Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project will then be prepared and will go through the public review process to provide the opportunity for the community to respond.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that available on line on the City's website are documents that the Task Force has developed over the past six months, including an extensive Preliminary Background Report on the site and the planning issues that impact it, Opportunities and Constraints Report, Existing Transportation Conditions Assessment Report, and a series of four Economic Market Assessments that track the different alternatives as they have evolved in order to make sure that the Task Force's proposal is going to be within the ballpark of something that can be built, but without overbuilding. He added that an Environmental Conditions Report that talks about existing conditions has also been prepared, which is about one third of an Environmental Impact Report.

Mr. Rasmussen then referred back to Ms. Stern to present information on housing and housing numbers.

Chair Blank stated that he is very interested in the campus office designation located in the APA and asked Mr. Rasmussen if he has any thoughts with respect to what would specifically be there, such as if the thought is to make them single story.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that he will discuss that when he presents the plans.

Ms. Stern stated that housing and how much housing should be in East Pleasanton has become a very central part of the discussion at the Task Force level, the understanding of which would be helpful as the City looks at planning for at least the next two housing cycles. She noted that the City is just about to start its new Housing Element Update for the period 2014 to 2022 and the following period that extends to 2030. She added that it is reasonable to think of a long-range plan that can look at taking a share of housing, especially since East Pleasanton is the largest vacant land within the City and is going to play a vital role in satisfying the City's housing needs. She indicated that broadly, the question is how much of the City's housing needs should be met in east Pleasanton; and then more specifically, how much of that multi-family and lower-density needs should be met there.

Ms. Stern stated that the City's immediate draft housing numbers, which has not yet been adopted by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) but is pretty close, is about 2,000 units all together. She noted that for its purposes to try and satisfy the very-low-income and low-income categories, the City is really looking at a housing density of 30 units per acre or more. She continued that there are also the moderate income and above-moderate-income categories, which are coming up next.

Ms. Stern then presented a map of what parcels within the City were included in the last Housing Element Update which, at that point, did not have current development proposals and a number of which are now off of that inventory. She noted that several of these sites that now have approved plans do not count in the inventory; therefore, new sites will have to be identified when the Housing Element is updated once more. She recalled, for those in the Commission who were involved in the last Housing Element Update process, that it took months to arrive at re-zoning these sites, starting off with about 35 sites, most of which were dropped off the map for various reasons. She noted that there was a lot of discussion during that time, and staff looked at just about anything that could potentially be used as a site.

Ms. Stern stated that staff is not convinced there are a lot of other sites out there. She noted that there could be some in Hacienda Business Park, if the property owners and the City agree to less commercial development than the City anticipated or wants there, but there are not a great deal of other sites in East Pleasanton.

Ms. Stern then displayed a slide of an overview of the updated inventory of housing sites in the City, showing projects that staff believes are going to come off the inventory either because they will have approved projects in the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycle (Auf der Maur, California Center, Nearon, and Pleasanton Gateway) or because it is not certain if the project will move through as a

residential project (CM Capital Properties came in and received approval for some extensive commercial upgrades); and other projects that staff thinks will remain in the City's inventory in the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle (BART, Kaiser, Sheraton, Stoneridge Shopping Center, and Roche Molecular), which is less than 1,000 units to satisfy quite a bit of need over the next 16 years. She then showed on another slide that the City would need to plan for 797 additional units in the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle, subtracting the City's estimated 2014 housing inventory of 1,261 units from the 2014-2022 RHNA cycle need of 2,058 units. She noted that the estimate for the next planning period includes about 111 very-low-income or higher-density units, 405 moderate income such as a garden-apartment style sort of development, and 281 above-moderate units. She further noted that this is an estimate and may vary a bit, based on what gets approved and what does not.

Ms. Stern explained that staff does not really have much to go on in terms of estimating what the RHNA could be for 2022 to 2030. She indicated that staff is working from the assumption that it may be the same as that of the last period, and is aware that the numbers may change and will need refocusing once more information becomes available. She noted that adding in these assumed numbers for the period 2022 to 2030 gives a total of almost 3,000 units, with about 1,200 higher-density units of around 30 units per acre and around 800 of the garden apartment densities. She further noted that this would require quite a bit of an area which, translated into acres, would total approximately 40 acres of 30 units and above, about 35 acres of moderate-income homes, and 111 acres for above-moderate income homes if assumed that some are built at five units per acre, and others at slightly more dense than that.

Ms. Stern stated that this overview sets the scene regarding why the City is looking at East Pleasanton to help satisfy its RNHA numbers. She added that another big issue is the need to look at what that balance would be in terms of how much of this should be developed at a higher density, which would require quite a bit of acreage.

Ms. Stern then displayed a revised map of what was originally prepared during the Housing Element update showing the distribution of and the sites rezoned for higher density development around the City. She pointed out the different locations of high-density units, defined in the General Plan as eight or more units per acre, including small zero-lot-line homes, two mobile home parks, major apartment locations that are the higher-density units, and the senior apartment complexes at Ridge View Commons and Stanley Boulevard.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the Alternatives planning process started with the assistance of David Gates, urban designer, in terms of the structural elements. He explained that these elements are the varied, most basic components of the site that guide how it would ultimately be developed in the future, such as the major constraints, the opportunities, and what the General Plan says ought to be there. He indicated that these consist primarily of the open space, which is primarily undevelopable and owned by Zone 7; the extension of El Charro Road down through the middle of the site and connecting to Stanley Boulevard to the south, as shown in the General Plan; and the

extension of Busch Road to connect to El Charro Road, as also shown in the General Plan. He noted that these two are very important to the outlying City area in the hope of reducing traffic in the neighborhood. He added that the General Plan also provides a list of potential land uses for the potentially developable area, consisting of the major categories of residential of various densities, commercial, industrial, office, and public.

Mr. Rasmussen then displayed a development grid of the area, together with some alternatives, prepared by the designers to illustrate typical large block lengths and widths and give a sense how the street system might begin to look if this area were to be developed with residential and potentially other uses extending into it. He continued that the designers then went into curvilinear streets to give a sense of scale as to where the future major streets within the development would be expected to go, based primarily on distances, and the location for potential major drainage ways. He indicated that there are two major developers involved with this: the property at the lowest portion of the site, right at Valley Avenue and Busch Road, will have to drain to the west, which leads to a discussion about having a detention pond and entry area into the development; and the Lionstone property, which has a contractual approval with Zone 7 in conjunction with the dedication of Cope Lake to Zone 7, and its water would have to drain through a swale or some other drainage facility of that sort before entering into Cope Lake. He stated that envisioning a couple of waterways extending through the site, the scale of the major street systems, and these other givens and constraints really helps to give a sense as to how the land use planning will ultimately, probably need to go.

Mr. Rasmussen then displayed a slide showing where key community components such as parks, buffers, greenways, and such might go. He reiterated that 22 acres are privately owned and in the APA so they could only be used for office, retail, or industrial. He indicated that, given the input from the project economists and all the retail located mostly in Livermore, plus the 11 acres planned in Pleasanton, the thinking has been that this would not be marketable as a large-scale retail use, so that was removed from consideration. He added that as it would not be appropriate to locate industrial right next to the residential, what is left is office; and being close to the freeway, it is considered to be the best office land for the plan area because of that access.

In response to Chair Blank's earlier question regarding the type of campus office being considered, Mr. Rasmussen stated that there has been no conversation about the number of stories, but the thought is maybe a lower-scale type of development, one large campus facility or a series of smaller offices that are arranged in a sort of campus type of environment.

Chair Blank commented that the Commission talked about this matter in relation to the issue down in San Diego, that multi-story buildings and the APA do not mix very well.

Mr. Rasmussen affirmed that there is the airport to consider as well as its requirements. Going back to the community components, he noted that an area to the south, also located within the APA and, therefore, also limited in terms of having retail or residential



use, and in close proximity to Lake I, is being considered for a possible active recreation park. He pointed to another 34-acre area right next to the Cope Lake facility, which is only inundated for a very limited portion of the year during severe rainstorms and which has been narrowed down to being what appears to be an ideal open space park site, with a possibility of trails and boardwalks going out into this major habitat.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that along with other community components such as the park, all of the Alternatives show a two-acre neighborhood retail area down at the intersection of Busch Road and El Charro Road. He pointed out that the project economist feels that is the only location where retail would be viable because it would need to draw from workers and residents in the plan area and is also accessible to others passing through this site. He added that there was not much of a market for that use other than at that small location.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that because the acreage of this site is so great, the plan also begs for an open space to extend through this site as there is really no reason to put a major street in that direction (north-south, parallel to El Charro Road) because it would dead end at the lake and at the railroad tracks. He noted that this fine open space would provide a very good service for children to be able to get to the park or to get to maybe a school that is located along the greenbelt. He added that the last thing in terms of community components would be major open space buffers around the outside of the site to screen it from Stanley Boulevard, the railroad tracks, and the storage area.

Mr. Rasmussen then discussed the Alternatives, stating that he would spend more time on Alternative 1 than on the others because there are similarities among all the Alternatives. He stated that all the Alternatives show the campus office with some element of retail, based on the thinking that it would be just right perhaps for some lakefront restaurants or other retail in this area and then coming on down El Charro Road. He indicated that there are three acres in proximity to Lake H, Cope Lake habitat and water, and Lake I for which no use has yet been listed and which are shown as a destination use that might include something like a restaurant or two, or a conference facility, or some type of interpretive area, something special at that special location. He continued that farther down shows an active recreational facility by the lake, although there would not be any possible use of the lake, except for visual access, because of the steep banks that go all around Lake I and Lake H. He noted that the office is being located within the APA, and the industrial is kept to the east of El Charro Road because of the quarry plant and the noise it creates, as well as the soils situation in the other area. He added that it would not be appropriate for residential because of the cost to extend residential services there and to take care of its soils problems.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that three of the Alternatives show the relocation of the OSC and PGS Transfer Station away from the residential to an area next to the Vulcan Materials Company. He noted that this is particularly true of the Transfer Station so this can become a much better community without the Transfer Station in the middle of it, and leaves a residential and office area, as well as the open space discussed earlier.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that Alternative 1 scatters the multi-family residential near Valley Avenue and over by the future El Charro Road, with the private green belt linking the two. He added that it also provides an extension of Boulder Street, which is in all the Alternatives, except that in Alternative 1, Boulder Street goes up and comes back down and onto El Charro Road, in addition to Busch Road, to allow for development to be able to come down and exit onto Valley Avenue without having to go onto Busch Road and past the neighbors, thereby dispersing traffic and not impacting the neighbors as much.

Mr. Rasmussen noted that all the Alternatives also show a potential school site; although the Pleasanton Unified School District (PUSD) is not sure if there will be a need for a school, it has asked to include a potential area for a school within the Alternatives. He further noted that the Task Force and other City Commissions and Committees very recently have asked that the location of a neighborhood park be considered in conjunction with a school. He then indicated that Alternative 1 has a total of 1,000 housing units, the least of the four Alternatives.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that difference between Alternative 2 and Alternative 1 is that Alternative 2 is a more community-centered Alternative, with the multi-family located farther down and surrounded by single-family, and parks and non-residential areas located farther up. He noted that this Alternative is also the only one that provides for the extension of Boulder Street all the way through to connect to El Charro Road; the other Alternatives only bring it part of the way with the concern that industrial development may tend to use that road in order to go on Valley Avenue, and industrial should not be mixed with residential unless necessary. He continued that this Alternative has the spine with access to the park and has what most of the others do, such as the drainage ways with trails extending on. He indicated that the social area for this Alternative is by the Community Park, with retail and village green all within close proximity. He added that this Alternative also has the most office space and not much industrial; it also has 1,426 units which is 50 percent of the 2,858 units, earlier discussed by Ms. Stern, that would be necessary to meet the two cycles of RHNA numbers within the City.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that Alternative 3 has a total of 1710 units, which is the most of the four Alternatives, and is distinguished by the relocation of the high-density residential to the east of the residential planning area. He noted that it has the same sort of social arrangement with a Community Park and neighborhood shopping, and also potentially provides for the school site between the two multi-family residential sites. He added that if there is no school, the area would be multi-family with a neighborhood park next to it. He indicated that it also has the spine, and in this case, Boulder Street curves back up and does not extend on through the OSC and the PGS.

Mr. Rasmussen then discussed Alternative 4, which provides for 1,283 units and includes 45 percent of the RHNA housing numbers earlier referred to by Ms. Stern. He indicated that this Alternative is distinguished by the fact that it keeps the OSC and PGS in their current locations. He stated that the OSC does not have any major implications

for the rest of the planning area, and residential density could be made up by increasing the density slightly in the single-family residential areas or in other areas the City chooses. He noted, however, that the Transfer Station is much more of a difficult planning matter to design around, and because prevailing winds are in this direction, land to the east of the Transfer Station is designed to be industrial because of the odor, noise, garbage truck traffic, appearance, etc. He added that access to the Transfer Station would be by way of a route along Busch Road and then up to El Charro Road. He indicated that the multi-family units are dispersed on the eastern side, with the same spine and other assortment of land uses previously discussed.

Mr. Rasmussen concluded his presentation by stating that staff and the consultants have a series of questions that they would like to pose to the Planning Commission for comments and input.

Commissioner Olson made an observation that the housing information provided by Ms. Stern is critical information. He indicated that it is clear from the recent election and the emails that have come in on this item that housing is going to be a hot issue here. He noted that he thinks it would be good to include those RHNA housing numbers in what the Commission communicates, both to the other Commissions and to the public.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that El Charro Road is a little differently designed in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 and that he thought the design of El Charro Road followed the UGB, as shown in one of the slides that showed the UGB. He inquired where exactly the UGB is in relation to El Charro Road.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the UGB line extends down El Charro Road in a straight-line projection. He added that Alternative 1 shows all of El Charro Road within the UGB line.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the UGB line shown in Alternative 1 is pretty close to the actual line.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the actual line is just a little way over from where it is shown right now. He noted that the other three plans show the line coming over to the west, and the reason is that this location would connect to the driveway at Shadow Cliffs and there is a median break and traffic signal there. He stated that another alternative is to bring El Charro Road straight down.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that all the Alternatives show some development occurring outside the UGB, and in a lot of cases, it is just parkland or industrial, except where the road curves, which has some of the other uses such as campus office. He inquired what the mechanism is that would allow development outside the UGB, and what would actually have to happen before that could be done.

Mr. Dolan replied that the language that addresses that subject gives guidance, but it is not crystal clear; the UGB was adopted, and then the language was incorporated into the General Plan such that very similar language appears in both places. He indicated that it essentially says that minor adjustments may be made, but it does not define what a minor adjustment is. He added that the General Plan talks a lot about the fact that adjustments will be explored, and the Task Force talked a lot about this, although there has been no resolution.

Mr. Dolan stated that the evolution of his thinking is to determine if the adjustment is minor relative to the immediate plan area or as a percentage of the entire acreage within the UGB, which affects the perspective on whether the adjustment is minor or major. He indicated that his opinion is that under any scenario, this decision will probably ultimately fall to the Council regarding what approach to take. He noted that he believes moving El Charro Road over a little bit to catch a little more area would not be anything more than a minor adjustment of the UGB. He further noted that the Task Force has been pretty consistent, and there is a general consensus, to go all the way out to the edge of the planning area, with the primary reason being to generate enough revenue in the development to fund the improvements; whether or not that expansion is still minor is the question, and staff does not have any answer.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Dolan if he is referring to the actual development where the industrial area is on the map.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Chair Blank inquired what the process would be if it were decided that it is a major adjustment.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would then have to go to the voters.

Chair Blank inquired if it would be in a general election or any election.

Mr. Dolan replied that he was not sure it specified the type of election.

Commissioner Posson noted that the slide on the structural element showed a grid system, but the Alternatives deviated from a true grid system. He inquired if there is any advantage to looking at that grid system from the standpoint of optimizing the developable land or accommodating the property lines, or what is easier for the property owners to develop or even for circulation as a third element.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this does make it easier for the property owners to develop, and it is a matter of working out whether a grid or a curvilinear system would be the most efficient way to organize the plan area to keep costs down. He indicated that a curvilinear system requires a bit more land because the geometry is not as efficient, probably by not a whole lot, but that is a consideration. He added that there has been a lot of discussion lately with regard to sustainability and some of the newer mixed-use

projects and neo-traditional type plans that are based on the old grid system which dispersed traffic so that particular areas of a neighborhood do not bear most of the burden of traffic. He noted that in this case, the grid itself is self contained and does not change the traffic patterns of cars leaving the site because Busch Road and Boulder Street would take that off under all scenarios. He indicated that some people prefer curvilinear to the grid patterns because the latter has straight streets and looks monotonous, but others think that the grid system now may be more of what is happening today, and more of that is coming back.

Mr. Dolan stated that the Alternatives evolved toward a curvilinear pattern at the request of the Task Force; it was not necessarily staff's first choice but there was a consensus that that was what the Task Force wanted and thought it felt more like the rest of the town.

Commissioner Olson commented that the City does have a bunch of curvy streets.

Commissioner Posson asked Mr. Rasmussen how "major" is defined in the reference made to "major open space buffer" along the railroad track. He expressed concern about noise from the railroad tracks and its impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that "major" has not yet been defined and indicated that there will be a significant need for setbacks from the tracks, combined with berming, to solve that noise problem. He noted that Alternative 2 did not maintain the grid system; the others tended to be variations from this and over time evolved out of this.

Commissioner Posson noted that Glen Cove and Ironwood are the two closest residential areas, with Ironwood being adjacent to the project site and Glen Cove being an older neighborhood farther up Valley Avenue. He inquired which of the Alternatives is closest to the density and mix, in the case of Ironwood, of these two neighborhoods

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the density in Alternative 1 is around four units per acre, and referred to staff for the density of Ironwood.

Ms. Stern replied that the density in Ironwood varies among the active community, the classics, the apartments, and so on, but the density of the single-family residential is probably around that density.

Commissioner Posson inquired if the multi-family is about the same as well.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the active seniors are probably eight units per acre.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the current mix of single-family versus all other higher density in the City is about 25 percent to 75 percent or something like that.

Ms. Stern replied that the current mix is about 25-percent multi-family, including units and structures of five or more units, with the rest being single-family.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that all four Alternatives are higher in density, with Alternative 1 being the lowest, but still higher than the current mix. He inquired if it was around 35 percent or 40 percent.

Mr. Rasmussen confirmed that all the Alternatives are higher than the current mix. He noted that one of the primary questions that has come out of the Task Force process is whether the East Pleasanton neighborhood is being developed to be just like the rest of town or if this one major planning area is being used to accommodate the City's future RHNA assignments.

Ms. Stern stated that most of the Alternatives are about 50 percent. She added that it would also depend on whether or not the moderate are also counted.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired what the next step would be if more single-family were added to Alternative 1 to arrive at a 25-percent to 75-percent split, and the City gets RHNA numbers that are higher than what the City currently has zoned for.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the City will have to find sites for whatever RHNA numbers are left over, noting that even at 50 percent, the City would have more sites than what it had at the last Housing Element Update.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that it could involve rezoning within East Pleasanton as well as the rest of the City and inquired if staff is looking at rezoning or upzoning.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that it had never occurred to him to come back and upzone in East Pleasanton after the plan is completed. He added that staff would be comparing that option against other options out in the existing neighborhoods.

Chair Blank stated that he recalls the conversations the Commission had about creating an area where there is nothing but high-density housing and the cautions the Commission received about putting all the high-density housing in one area when it was trying to figure out how to spread this throughout the City.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the Commission even had presentations by nonprofits who cautioned the Commission about putting everything in one spot.

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

Heather Liang stated that she is a six-year resident and a Homeowners Association Board member of the Ironwood community. She indicated that she has been involved with this process for a long time and that she has noted almost all of the same concerns that have been brought up. She indicated that she came from Milpitas, Union City, and Fremont, and made her way up to Pleasanton to find a neighborhood that she wanted for her children who are now four and six years old. She noted that when she bought her house, she was told that the land right across the street from her house was not

going to be zoned for this type of Alternatives, and never in her wildest dreams did she think she would be sitting here right now looking at all these plans. She added that she is very open to making this work best for the City; however, she is also on the side of trying to make this not a scapegoat for putting all the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Liang stated that the City needs to make sure it keeps the community similar in nature to why the residents of Ironwood and surrounding communities bought their houses here. She asked that a balance be kept, a common theme with all the members of the Board today, and make sure all of the opportunities for other areas in the City have been investigated, such as near BART or other rundown areas that were zoned for retail. She indicated that she does not have any idea but believes there has got to be something else out there that maybe has not been looked at. She reiterated that she just really wants to make sure that the City has exhausted all options before saying which Alternative will be selected, that the Commissioners would all be happy with the Alternative if it were in their backyard as well.

Ms. Liang stated that when she tells her my friends that live in other parts of Pleasanton about this East Pleasanton plan and how many units are possibly going to be built next to her house, most of them are clueless because they do not live next to it and will not be affected by it, but say they are glad they did not buy next to me. She stated that it is what it is, but the City needs to make sure that the rest of Pleasanton is aware of what is going on and that her neighborhood is not being used as a scapegoat for this exercise.

Nancy Allen stated that she agreed with the previous speaker and that she is going to say the same thing but in just a little bit of a different way. She indicated that the City has a tremendous opportunity to create a wonderful community on the East side, and she hopes it is done in a way that is best for the community versus as a scapegoat for RHNA needs.

Ms. Allen stated that she would like to address two questions that have been posed: the first is what the mix of single-family versus multi-family housing should be. She stated that in principle, she believes that the neighborhood to be created should be somewhat similar in mix to the rest of Pleasanton, so as not to create some island needing different services, which has a current average percent of single-family homes today of about 75 percent. She added that it is actually 68 percent across the State of California. She indicated that Alternatives 2 and 3 are unhealthy as they create a community just the opposite of the rest of the City, with 67 percent to 72 percent of families living in high-density apartments, a rental type of community which creates a more transient community and where other issues occur because the level of commitment is more rental than ownership. She recommended a minimum of 50 percent single-family homes, closer to Commissioner O'Connor's recommendation and more similar to what Pleasanton currently has. She added that the City may take a little bit of a hit here if necessary, but it should not go all the way to 25 percent of single-family homes and 75 percent of high-density as that would create a whole different community.

Ms. Allen stated that the second question is how much of the RHNA allocation should be met in East Pleasanton, which is somewhat related to the first question. She indicated that she focused on the RHNA allocations specifically for just the affordable housing category, which is a little different from Mr. Dolan's numbers, and looked at low- and moderate-income and what the share is, which makes the percentages look even worse than what Mr. Dolan shared. She stated that she believes, as the past Council did, that balance is critical and that it can include units near BART because that is where transportation is and where jobs are today, it reduces pollution and gets the people where it is easy to get transportation, and it also eliminates traffic issues. She reiterated that Alternatives 2 and 3 really concern her as it puts 50 percent to 60 percent of the RHNA affordable housing in East Pleasanton, which is not balanced; furthermore, East Pleasanton is about as far away from BART as any area in Pleasanton. She recommended that the RHNA affordable housing allocation for East Pleasanton be at no more than 25 percent to 35 percent, which also favors an Alternative 1 scenario.

Ms. Allen stated that this leaves the elephant on the table, which is the challenge that staff has of what to do with the rest; where they go if they are not allocated in East Pleasanton. She indicated that she does not have all the answers, but she thinks it is related to looking, which has never been done yet, at the questions and having a process to look at the question of what Pleasanton will look like in 20 years. She noted that the last Housing Element cycle looked at today but did not look at where the opportunities will be in 20 years. She questioned what would happen if a referendum went on with this project and no housing could be developed there. She noted that she asked that question of Nelson Fialho, City Manager, and his response was that the City would rezone commercial property near BART or elsewhere in the City to residential.

Ms. Allen stated that she hates to put the cart before the horse and just dump this all on East Pleasanton because the City has not thought through a 20-year vision. She reiterated that the City needs to create a neighborhood that is right for the City and not just one for which we need numbers as that would not be healthy. She encouraged the Commission to take a long-term view and to do it really quickly. She stated that she thinks the City has a tremendous opportunity in a beautiful area to serve not only the residents who live here but all Pleasanton residents with bike trails and walking lakes. She encouraged the Commission to treat this prime spot like a treasure and spend the time to look at where else a balance can be created across the City.

Julie Testa stated that she has been attending the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force meetings, and her message is that, while it is a great opportunity to create a new part of our community, everything should be done to mitigate potential traffic or any other quality-of-life issue so that there not be any financial burden on the existing community through additional taxes that might be asked later to mitigate any future impacts. She pointed out that one of the things mentioned was moving the PGS Transfer Station, and stated that the cost of the move should not fall to the ratepayers.



Ms. Testa stated that she does not think there has been proper acknowledgment of the overcrowding in the existing schools. She indicated that it has been a long 20-year mantra of hers to mitigate the overcrowding in schools, which has continued to grow and develop. She noted that PUSD has tried to downplay the severity of the situation in the community, and it says it may not even feel the need for another elementary school in the area when the reality is that every school in the District is significantly over-capacity, even prior to the approval of the 3,000 units in the rezoned sites. She indicated that even one elementary school would not come close to offsetting and correcting the burden of overcrowding that already exists in the schools because the greatest burden of overcrowding is at the high schools, where there no thought or possibility or opportunity of adding additional space.

Ms. Testa stated that in 2011, PUSD put out a school facilities fee justification report which says that the District's current projected enrollment is larger than the pupil capacity, which means that based on State classroom counts, the District, therefore, does not have sufficient capacity to house students generated by future development. She noted that these students will require the District to acquire new school facilities, and PUSD is saying it is not sure it wants to build another school. She indicated that what the community needs to fully understand that this will impact not only the nearby neighborhood but the entire City of Pleasanton, everybody who cares about the schools and about property values, because this will have a serious negative impact on traffic and commuting to schools as well as on the value of and quality of life at these schools. She added that current residents will be asked to pay additional bonds and taxes to offset this, once things hit critical conditions.

Ms. Testa stated that the 2011 report says that PUSD has 1,847 un-housed students, that its student-classroom ratio is at 118 percent over capacity, but what it is not saying is that the situation is so much worse at the student-land ratio, which, for Amador High School, for example, is at 160 percent over capacity today. She indicated that she understands the RHNA numbers; she understands that the District is an independent body and that there is limited authority to tell the District what to do, but the Planning Commission has the General Plan, its guideline, which spells out the expectation and the quality of life for the City's schools and specifically calls out school size. She pointed out that it is the Commission's responsibility to not be like ostriches with their heads in the sand, ignoring this serious condition. She stated that she will give staff, and ask staff to provide a copy to the Commission, a list of all the documents and all the sites for all of the information on every school site size, land size, and current capacity. She added that the reason the District is not asking to build another school is because it has gotten itself into a \$28,000,000 facility debt, and so as many houses are built, overburdening existing campuses will continue, resulting in negatively affecting the quality of life, not only at the campuses but throughout the community.

Chair Blank stated that he has personally known the next speaker, Sherry Barclay, for many, many years and that they have not discussed this matter. He added that he did not know that Ms. Barclay was going to be at the meeting this evening.

Sherry Barclay stated that what brought her here this evening is that she has also been attending some of the Task Force meetings and is concerned about the same thing that the other people have mentioned: the volume of housing intended to be put in this particular area. She stated that she lives in the Ironwood Village, the 55-and-older community that is still being completed, and previous to that, she lived in the Martin Avenue neighborhood for 22 years, so she is very familiar with that side of town. She indicated that what is being proposed here does not fit anything that goes over in that end of the town. She added that that other thing that was really surprising is that, for as long as she has lived here, Valley Avenue has one of the major traffic problems in this town, and yet a big multi-unit project has already been approved on the south side of Stanley Boulevard, and now another 1,000 to 1,700 housing units are being added, all coming out through Busch Road onto Valley Avenue and putting a lot more traffic in that area. She stated that her biggest concern is that she just thinks these numbers are way out of proportion for either the Valley Avenue, Stanley Boulevard, or her neighborhood, in general. She added that it goes without saying that the problem with the schools has been there for a long time.

Sean Sowell stated that from a work-force affordable-housing point of view, he would like to ask that the Planning Commission look at Alternative 3 most closely because he thinks this one does really the best job of including more people in the community who have been excluded from the community due to the high cost of housing here in town. He stated that he already lives in Pleasanton and that his son already goes to school here and will start high school in the fall. He indicated that work force housing and moderately-priced housing for people in the community is a good thing, and he thinks Alternative 3 probably does the job best, although he is not sure that the particular sprinkling of the lower- versus the medium- and higher-density units is really the best way to do it.

Mr. Sowell stated that in regard to this Alternative, he would like the Planning Commission to suggest to the Task Force to set aside a portion of the parcel to the north reserved for retail/office for some housing so the burden of housing is not restricted entirely on that southern portion of the plan area. He added that at the Housing Commission meeting a few weeks back, he had asked the Commission to look at the possibility of reducing some of the industrial in the lower southeast portion for some housing to the west of El Charro Road and the UGB.

Mr. Sowell stated that he does not understand why the Task Force has not looked beyond the impact of the commercial and residential development on the Ace Train system and the BART train system and look at the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA). He requested that a representative from LAVTA, from the Wheels bus system, be given a seat at the table for Task Force meetings going forward. He stated that there are two routes that run East-West, on the north is the RAPID bus route; and on the southern boundary along Stanley Boulevard is the No. 10 bus route. He indicated that he does not believe either of those two routes could be changed to accommodate any development in East Pleasanton here because of the nature of those routes, and as far as he knows, LAVTA has not been involved in any of the discussions

with regard to mass transit in that particular proposed area. He also asked that one of the PUSD Board members or the Trustees from PUSD have a seat at the table as well so PUSD can have a voice and a vote at future Task Force meetings. He noted that the liaison and communication will help address concerns raised by Ms. Testa and some others in the community. He further indicated that he is in favor of leaving the OSC in place, especially considering that it was recently renovated to create the Remillard meeting room.

Mr. Sowell stated that comments that more people coming to live in this community is somehow making this area or some neighborhoods around the border there a "scapegoat," or that residents here in town will be taking a hit by letting more people move here, or that traffic or other things will become worse by having this proceed along any kind of development, trouble him. He stated that Pleasanton is a community, and new people who move here will become a part of this community just like those who already live here, regardless of how long they have lived in town or whether they own or rent. He added that all the children go to the schools here, and all have a say in what goes on in the City. He concluded that he would like to keep things inclusionary rather than exclusionary.

Shelton Liu stated that when he moved into this new neighborhood in Pleasanton, he never thought that one day Pleasanton was going to be divided, just like Germany. He stated that this is not a question about the rich or the poor, but why people moved to Pleasanton. He indicated that this kind of planning is not the future for this person or a small community, but for the future of the whole City, and based on that, the principle to follow when designing this kind of new community is to be fair and use a uniform housing density standard for the whole City, starting from the West side, to the center, and then to the East side.

Mr. Liu expressed concern regarding traffic flow calculation, stating that there are gaps between the Traffic Division's modeling and reality. He indicated that traffic in the City is pretty heavy, and Valley Avenue is an example where the reality will totally change with this new development.

Blair Wolfinger stated that he lives in Ironwood Glen and has been following the Task Force since 2010 with the Housing Element, which has always been balanced. He asked that the Commission be balanced as well in its discussions. He indicated his support for the previous speakers, Ms. Liang, Ms. Allen with 25 percent to 35 percent mix, and Ms. Testa regarding schools. He expressed concern that the maps only include an elementary school and does not mention middle school and high school.

Connie Cox stated that she does not live in Ironwood but in Valley Trails, and for 20 years, she has been dealing with the flood issue in Pleasanton. She indicated that in her neighborhood, a gentleman came up with an idea of getting rid of the Old Bernal Bridge abutments, and they went to the City, and staff said they should have made that a condition of Laguna Oaks when it was built. She noted that through a lot of struggle, they were able to get the City of Pleasanton and the Laguna Oaks developer to split the

cost to get rid of all the bridge abutments, which got the Valley Trails neighborhood out of the flood zone, as well as Val Vista, Ponderosa, and part of the homes off of Pimlico Drive. She added that they were always told that was a temporary fix and that the permanent fix was the chain of lakes, which they should be watching very carefully and be proactive on this issue.

Ms. Cox expressed concern that whatever these plans are, it should include a plan for the 100-year flood that is coming some day, because people's lives and their property are on the line. She indicated that she does not like how all four Alternatives cut into Cope Lake, which would allow water to drift out of the lake. She added that with the 100-year flood, they need the space, the lake, and the retention ponds, and staff needs to work with Zone 7. She stated that at a meeting she attended today, Zone 7 stated that its timing and the City's timing are a little bit off. She added that Zone 7 indicated that they have not finalized their plans; she added that she is not concerned about low-income housing but about people's lives and property. She thanked Ms. Stern and Mr. Rasmussen because she was involved in the housing meetings and she thinks they looked at every square inch in Pleasanton about where to put this low-income housing, and no matter what is done, someone is not going to be happy. She concluded that she thinks the City is out of space to put those homes. She then handed letter to staff that she gave to the Task Force.

Chair Blank stated that he was involved in some disaster recovery planning a few years back and noted that if the Del Valle Reservoir were breached when it was full, there would be three feet of water on Hopyard Road within about four hours.

Ms. Cox stated that this is one of the disclosures she, as a realtor, has to give people.

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

Commissioner Pearce stated that in a past conversation about the relocation of the OSC and the PGS Transfer Station, the Task Force was very clear that it wanted developers to fully foot the bill for these relocations. She inquired if there have been any conversations with developers since the last Task Force meeting regarding the financial feasibility of doing this.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff is aware that there have been conversations among the property owners, but staff does not know the outcome of those conversations.

Chair Blank stated that he does not think it has been a question the Commission has been asked and that he would like to get a sense of what the Planning Commission thinks.

Commissioner Pearce recalled that there were concerns regarding industrial truck traffic going down some of these roads when the Commission looked at circulation particularly about Home Depot, and the Commission talked about restricting the truck routes. She inquired if that is something that is done only for much larger trucks or only with larger

interstate trucking, or if trucks can be restricted on certain roads as long as a route is delineated for them to go down specific roads.

Mr. Dolan replied that if this is industrial, there will be trucks, and there will probably be some cases of this size that you would regulate, so this is something that staff would have to look at. He indicated that for the most part, the fact that El Charro Road will be completed solves most of the problems; but there is no way around it, and there will be trucks on El Charro Road and on Stanley Boulevard, but hopefully this helps get them off of some of the other streets.

Commissioner Pearce stated that the Commission could certainly take a look at that and inquired if it could request that trucks use a variety of routes.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Commissioner Olson inquired if PUSD has a seat at the table or what type of input have they provided into the Task Force.

Mr. Dolan replied that PUSD does not have and was not assigned a spot on the Task Force; however it has had Board members and staff at every meeting. He noted that it is a regular agenda item on the monthly City Council-PUSD Board Liaison Committee that he attends. He added that he is actually speaking to the School Board on Tuesday night. He indicated that there is a lot of back and forth, and ultimately, it is an important and difficult decision for PUSD. He indicated that it would be very helpful if PUSD would decide because there is a fall-back land use if there is no school site, and it would affect the numbers. He noted that everybody is concerned about the numbers, and there is a lot of dialogue; the District is very involved, and so it is something it would have to work through. He added that if PUSD ultimately concludes that it need a school site, there will be one reserved for that.

With respect to the comment on the office in the northern portion of the plan area, Commissioner Olson inquired if that is part of the APA.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Commissioner Olson inquired if the plan area would be accommodating the comment about 100-year flood plan and if that would be considered as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Dolan said that was correct. He indicated that it would be evaluated during the EIR process and any impact on any drainage and flooding would be analyzed.

Commissioner Posson noted that the staff report states that all the Alternatives include approximately 90,000 square feet of retail. He indicated that he is having a problem identifying the retail because the red retail and the red residential on the monitor look pretty close.

Chair Blank stated that it is a little better on the printed copies.

Mr. Rasmussen displayed the Alternative 1 map on the screen and pointed out the two-acre retail to the south, and another four acres up north in conjunction with the office area. He added that there would be some lakefront retail as well, which is not shown but would be part of an overlay for the office area.

Commissioner Pearce asked Mr. Rasmussen to speak to the genesis of the creation of the three units to an acre versus eight or four, and why the variety of low-density designations in the different Alternatives.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that low-density becomes a bit of a left-over category when all the other land uses are taken out. He explained, for example, that he talked about the reasons for locating office and parks and industrial at specific areas, and once that acreage is taken out as not appropriate for residential, and then a certain amount of multi-family is put in a couple of locations, a lot of acreage, in this case, is left over for single family residential. He noted that once the acreage is taken and the numbers are kept down, the density goes way down. He added that it is kind of a strange problem that really low densities are coming up within the single family area because there is a lot of land left over, and yet the overall numbers has to be kept down.

The Commission then discussed the questions in the staff report.

Commissioner Pearce requested that because she is on the Task Force, she be the last with regard to the questions as she would like to get the Commissioners' input first before answering the questions.

**1. Does the Planning Commission support planning for future development beyond the current Urban Growth Boundary?**

Commissioner Posson said yes, noting that he thinks it makes sense, in light of the overall planning area, to look at expanding the UGB.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that if the current UGB is expanded, it would include more acreage now in the City; and if whatever is outside, including the industrial, is moved inside, it leaves acreage for the City to meet the RHNA numbers. He added that moving the UGB farther and farther out would provide more acreage, and the City will continue to get more and more RHNA numbers at some point because the City has more acreage.

Chair Blank stated that he does not know how big a movement that is, so he does not know how much the City would be expanding the UGB or not.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would be less than 140 acres.

Chair Blank indicated that he does not know what impact that would have on the City's numbers.

Mr. Dolan replied that he does not really think it would have any impact. He explained that compared to the size of the area in the UGB now and adding that little bit, available land is a part of the formula, but he did not think there would be a dramatic change.

Chair Blank stated that his view would be that if there were no change, then he does not have a problem one way or the other. He noted that the question is one person's dramatic change might be another person's moderate change; so before he would be able to get a good read, he would need to see the information to know what the impact of that would be.

Mr. Dolan replied that there is no way to provide it. He explained that in terms of predicting what the RHNA numbers are going to be based on that movement, he would just be lying if he said he could tell the Commission what the impact was really going to be with a number.

Mr. Dolan continued that in line with this topic, there were two reasons why the Task Force picked that alternative and went in that direction, and where it pretty much came to a consensus that it could not move out: one was a concern about having enough development to support the infrastructure demands which are significant, and not require that to be all put on the backs of housing because it was concerned about housing numbers; and the second was this area is no garden spot and has a different look to it, leaving basically scarred landscape there and not the same as the rolling hills that surround and add to the beauty of the area.

Mr. Rasmussen added that this area is currently included within the City limits and so even though this is beyond the UGB line, it is also in the City and zoned industrial.

Commissioner Olson stated that based on what Mr. Dolan's said, he agreed with Commissioner Posson that it would be all right to move it, particularly relative to El Charro Road hooking up with the Shadow Cliff entry. He indicated that he feels strongly about doing that.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she agreed with Commissioner Olson. She explained that for all the reasons that Mr. Dolan and Mr. Rasmussen said, and these are all conversations at the Task Force level, she thinks it is a real potential win whether it needs to be done, whether it is minor, or whether it needs to be done by the book. She indicated that she believes it is a good option for this property.

**2. How much of the City's future Regional Housing Needs Allocation should be accommodated in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area?**

**3. What should be the mix of single-family vs. multi-family housing?**

Commissioner Olson stated that he thinks the Commission ought to stick with balance and try to maintain a similar mix as what the rest of the City has. He noted that looking at that relative to the UGB, he is reminded that for years the City had a housing cap and ended up having to do away with that. He further noted that if the City keeps a tight boundary, it will be forced to end up violating the current mix the City has.

Chair Blank agreed with Commission Olson. He stated that his view is that the Commission should not think about this as how much the RHNA should be accommodated but rather, start off with getting the 75/25-percent balance, or push it to 65/35 percent, and whatever that number computes to is the number. He indicated that he would not go below 65 percent and added that as Commission O'Connor pointed out, he does not know how many times, when the Commission was doing that initial housing sites map, people with vested interests with building low-income housing came up in front of the Commission saying, "Do not make this different; do not put it all there; you will be making a huge mistake." He stated that he would rather say, "Let us make it just like the rest of Pleasanton, and whatever numbers drive out of that, those are the numbers. If we have to go elsewhere to find the rest of the numbers, than we go elsewhere to find the rest of the numbers, and that is fine."

Commission Olson agreed.

Commissioner Posson stated that he was thinking that while the rest of the City is currently at about a 75/25-percent split, that could change in the future if the City finds more space within the rest of the City to accommodate any new RHNA numbers the City may have. He indicated that he does not know what the maximum would be, and it would be more problematic, as Mr. Dolan mentioned, to come up with a number today if we went with 25/75 percent today. He questioned whether the City would be able to come back to the East side and start shifting that around in the future. He added that if the City is going to plan it, he would rather plan the East side and not have to come back and touch it. He noted that he would be willing to go with a little more high-density, but he certainly thinks that 50/50 percent is not the right mix; 65 percent would be about where he would want to be on single-family and no more than 35 percent on high-density. He added that he could go less than that for high-density, but he would target it at 35 percent. He stated that again, he does not know about the UGB and whether that block needed to be developed in order to fund the road, and the reason he was looking at it is if the City did not find the room.

Commissioner Olson commented that Commissioner Posson stated it very eloquently. He indicated that his sense is that the mix should be consistent with other areas of the City, and the City should look at the proportional amount to meet the RHNA demands for this development as well as across the entire City.



Commissioner Pearce stated that at the Task Force level, the theme that came up over and over again was balance, and it is not only balance within this development in terms of matching, or at least coming close to, the mix with the rest of the City, but balance with regard to RHNA numbers throughout the City. She indicated that this was a real driving force in the housing element discussions. She noted that she would hate to be perceived as, or actually be, dumping an inordinate amount of high-density housing here, and echoed what the other Commissioners have said, which she thought reflects a significant amount of the Task Force discussions.

**4. Should multi-family housing sites be centrally located to help create a community local point or more disbursed?**

Chair Blank stated that he thinks it is really hard to answer this question without seeing some proposed plans and layouts. He indicated that, again, he would be looking for balance and does not want to see all the multi-family housing units in one location because that unbalances the property. He noted that some multi-family housing is certainly going to form its own unit because of the way it is put together, but it depends on what kind of communities get developed. He added that other than saying that he want a balance, he does not know that he has enough information to really answer that question with specificity.

Mr. Dolan stated that he would like to give a little more background on what the genesis of this question was. He explained that the Task Force had to come up with a land use pattern, and it does not know what the projects will look like. He noted that what really came up in the Task Force dialogue is that when staff and the consultants think about the fact that some density needs to be accommodated out there, and it sounds like they may be headed towards less than more, but you would usually put the higher density together around a central community point where there is walking distance to the retail and easy access to transit, have the park right there, and make a community out of it, the center and together, the reaction of the Task Force was that nobody really wants that much of that, so put a little piece over in the corner and separate it out.

Chair Blank stated that from that perspective, if there is maybe one side where there is a park, you build a community; and maybe there is another area where there is retail, you build a community. He indicated that he tends to agree with the Task Force that he is not really keen on having all of the multi-family housing sites in one specific location. He stated that he understands the problems but he also does not want to get in one of these situations the Commission had up in the hills regarding when a blob is a blob, and where exactly it is located. He added that he thinks this has to be done in a conceptual level, at least at this point.

Mr. Dolan stated that it just occurred to him where the Commission was going with the numbers and that it might be a non-issue because if the Commission will reduce the number of units to 1,000, and it wants only 25-percent multi-family, then the Commission is only talking about one project.

Commissioner Olson stated that he also agrees with the direction of the Task Force. He indicated that he does not understand why a community focal point cannot be created in a mixed situation and why it takes all multi-family to create a community focal point.

Commissioner Posson stated that he likes the type of mix in Ironwood where there is multi-family as well as single-family. With respect to looking at this from a focal point, he indicated that he thinks the closer the larger population is to the focal point, the more focus there will be within that community. He noted that it is not a direct answer of either/ or but a kind of a Ironwood type of mix of multi-family and single-family and trying to get that community atmosphere in the neighborhood especially around retail or some type of transit.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that within the City, he would like it to be more dispersed; but in this particular scenario, because he is a little more interested in Alternative 1, if the Commission is looking at 1,000 units at no more than 35 percent or somewhere between 25 percent and 35 percent, that would be somewhere around 300 units, and he would not have a problem putting that all in one location, which is about the numbers within the rest of the city. He noted that he would be more interested in putting that density of population near a park or near one of the major roads to get that volume of traffic out to the major roads faster, like maybe butting up against El Charro Road but giving them some access. He added that he would rather see the higher density closer to Lake I because it would be people on three- and four-story buildings who are going to be able to take advantage of the views of the lake, and it would also give an extra amenity to someone who is in a higher-density project; whereas very few people from a single-family home would get those views.

Commissioner Pearce stated that what she was actually thinking about what Mr. Dolan said that if the Commission starts decreasing the numbers, this matter becomes kind of moot. She noted that she is a big fan of community focal points and that the density of people in a walk-able community facilitates that. She indicated that she would be in favor of something that puts the denser developments at the core and then spread it out in terms of lower-density on the outside. She noted, however, that with the direction the Commission is going in, she did not think there would be that kind of density to work with.

**5. Comment on the use of land east of El Charro Road as a passive community park and use of land south of Lake I as an active recreational area.**

Chair Blank asked Mr. Dolan what staff is looking for with this question in terms of input, if staff is asking for comments versus something else.

Mr. Dolan replied that what staff is trying to get from the Planning Commission is its feelings about the location and kinds of parks. He noted that all the plans show this area as being a community park, an open space type of passive use type of facility, with

potential extensions out into the habitat area as there would not be any development within any of the Cope Lake area as far as flood concerns go.

Chair Blank stated that if it is the only alternative, then the feedback from him is that it looks great.

Mr. Dolan stated that that it is what staff is looking for, just some kind of concurrence because staff is pinning down major things now in the plan, and as they do and get confidence, then it narrows the planning options and makes it easier.

Chair Blank stated that it cannot go north because of the APA.

Mr. Dolan replied that it could with residential. He indicated that this area is one which staff is looking for concurrence on as they have heard a lot of people say they would like a passive park with trails and leisure facilities, and others say they would like an active park with recreation facilities. He added that there could also be, in some cases, a neighborhood or village green of a couple of acres for people to gather at, and then the question later on, a fourth potential park, that would be for the City to share a neighborhood park with the School District as a park and the school play area.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Rasmussen to describe an active park versus a passive park. He indicated that he thinks he understands a passive park as having walkways and observation areas and that kind of thing and inquired if by active park, he is talking about a swim center or basketball courts with a playground, or something else.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the kind of uses that the Parks and Recreation Commission suggested and felt strongly about included a three- to four- acre dog park, and there was a discussion about tennis courts and a swimming pool, and then neighborhood facilities for the people in that area.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if that would be open to all residents, including the residents west of the development area.

Mr. Rasmussen said yes; there would be public parks and private open space. He added that in this case, the entryway and detention basin would be a major buffer and a private play area essentially to keep residential development away from the Transfer Station. He added that the spine discussed earlier would be private and access horizontally over toward Cope Lake for the drainage swales would also be private.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he is in favor of everything Mr. Rasmussen described.

Commissioner Posson inquired if an HOA would have to be developed for private parks that would be just for the residents.

Mr. Rasmussen said yes.

Commissioner Olson agreed and stated that he is captivated with Commission O'Connor's great idea to put some higher-density in position to have a view of the lake. He added that he does not have any issue with that major park east of El Charro Road.

Chair Blank agreed that it is a great idea but added that the only problem with this is that it puts the higher-density right up against the neighborhood because of the APA, which is restrictive in terms of what can be done there. He added that he likes the parks.

Commissioner Pearce agreed, especially with an active park, given the real limited use of what can be done with the lakes.

Commissioner Olson added that a park for dogs would be great.

**6. Comment on extending Boulder Street into or through the EPSP area to reduce traffic on Busch Road.**

Chair Blank asked Mr. Rasmussen what staff is looking for here.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this is sort of a check-in type question as well, as far as a way to get traffic out of and into the Specific Plan area from the west without having to put it all on Busch Road. He indicated that this discussion really had not taken place to any significant extent until the Specific Plan process started up and, therefore, may be something new to some of the Commissioners.

Chair Blank requested Mr. Rasmussen to put up the slide showing the Boulder Street extension.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that Boulder Street is a new road and does not have major plan implications. He stated that there are several different plans: on one of the plans, it extends right down and connects to Busch Road, and another, it goes all the way through to El Charro Road. He added that staff wants to know if the Commission has any concerns about the extension.

Mr. Dolan stated that it is more about "yes," "no," or "connect Boulder Street," as opposed to "I like it looping in one particular spot."

Chair Blank inquired if the Commission should make any comments with respect to its aesthetics.

Mr. Dolan replied that the Commission may, if it desires.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there have been any traffic analysis done on the extra road where it improves the flow.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff has not done anything near what is going to be done. He noted that Mike Tassano has been doing this long enough, and staff has opinions that that is what it is going to do.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he thinks this will give more options to disperse the traffic.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct.

Chair Blank stated that he does not have any objections with having that road go through but would want to see the traffic study.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks the traffic study will make the determination but that he thinks it should be included in the evaluation. He noted that alignment has been his question about the grid system, that it should provide an optimization for the maximum use of the land and also try to approximate the property lines to the greatest extent possible to make it easier for the developers.

Commissioner Olson indicated that he is in favor of that connection.

Commissioner Pearce said yes; it helps the circulation.

**7. Comment on site planning priorities regarding Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives.**

Chair Blank asked what staff is looking for here and if the Commission is supposed to rank Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives. He noted that priorities usually means there is a list of things, and these all sound very closely related.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that staff is interested in any creative thoughts the Commission might have with regard to these, whether there is anything that should be included in the plan or something that might be violating these principles. He noted that these have been very important topics to the City over the last ten years and are described pretty thoroughly in the General Plan.

Mr. Dolan stated that he was going to give some food for thought: one of the things that is throughout those themes in the General Plan is walkability, and there are all kinds of opportunities here for connectivity between the components. He noted that the clustering of high-density uses together contributes to walkability, but there seems to be less of an interest in that.

Commissioner Posson stated that he cannot give any specifics and thinks that all those aspects should be looked at and kept in mind when the larger land use element is considered: things like walkability, connection of the trails, and parks such that they are adjacent to the neighborhood to allow for maximum use.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the one thing about Smart Growth is how it is going to be developed and there will be different ownership out there. He indicated that he would like to see some infrastructure built, and that it would be nice to finish off the road and get the traffic, at least through El Charro Road; but he does not know the mechanism of how to get multiple acres with multiple developers to contribute to a roadway in advance of developing the land.

Mr. Dolan commented that this is definitely a major challenge and made even more complicated by the fact that Growth Management will be applied with only an annual allotment of homes being built.

Chair Blank stated that for him, Smart Growth, sustainability, and Climate Action Plan objectives are all very important. He indicated that he is very optimistic and would like to make sure, as the planning process goes through, to incorporate bike trails as well as pre-wiring and public parking to accommodate electric vehicles, which he really believes are going to become more and more common over time, especially in the urban areas. He noted that the City has done a lot of work but he thinks it needs to look further out to see what is coming down that horizon.

Commissioner Pearce agreed. She indicated that she has already spoken to the walkability aspect and thinks the Task Force is doing a good job in taking these kinds of things into account.

Commissioner Olson indicated that he is all for Smart Growth and sustainability.

**8. Comment on planning potential school sites in conjunction with City parks.**

Mr. Rasmussen noted that this is a topic that has been coming up repeatedly lately and staff wanted to check in with the Commission on that. He indicated that an example is Mohr Elementary School, where it did develop in that way.

Chair Blank commented that it seems kind of an odd question that someone would say "No, don't put a school near a park."

Mr. Rasmussen replied that this is a situation where there are a lot of parks, a lot of park acreage, and a lot of park maintenance in the plan, with the community park, the sports facility, a neighborhood school park, and a village green, so there may have to be some tradeoffs in the future as far as the kinds of parks.

Commissioner Olson stated that if there has to be a school put in there, it would probably be a good idea to put a park next to it.

Commissioner Posson agreed with Commission Olson, adding that he does not know why a school would not be put near a park.

Mr. Dolan stated that the City has been accused of being too park-heavy; there is a lot of park, which is expensive to build and even more expensive to operate.

Chair Blank noted that it does not mean build a park for the school, but if there is a place where there is going to be a park, then the park could be put next to the school, or the school next to the park. He added that if ten million dollars would be spent to build a special park just for the school, then this should be reconsidered.

Mr. Dolan stated that some of the options for a school site are not necessarily right next to park options and so it would be an extra park.

Commissioner Posson stated that he would modify his comment to say that depending on what the actual layout is, if it is within an economically reasonable thing to do, then it should be done; but if it is going to cost ten million dollars, then it should not be done.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if staff is saying that the school site might be smaller because the City can utilize part of the school site as a public park, or that the City would share those sites so the school could use the public park for part of its recreation needs.

Mr. Dolan replied that that is probably the case but that this has not been worked out completely:

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he thinks all of the Alternatives are pretty close to some type of park, although Alternative 1 is more of a linear park, and the rest seem to be near one or two parks.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks the Commission should look at where there will be the best utilization of the land: if there is a school site and it makes sense from a development standpoint to have a park there, then that would be terrific and the best way to utilize the land.

Commissioner Pearce stated that her children have gone to Walnut Grove Elementary that has a park next to the school, and it is a really good use of the park: it is a park for the City all the time, and the school uses it as an extension of its facility during school hours. She indicated that if at all possible, it should be done that way.

## **9. Others**

Chair Blank asked the Commissioners if they had any opinions on whether the PGS Transfer Station and the OSC should be moved.

Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks it can be accommodated and seems to be the most reasonable land use because those areas would be taken. He indicated that

he probably feels more strongly about the Transfer Station moving just because of the odor and noise, and he does not feel as strongly about moving the OSC. He added that from an efficiency standpoint, he senses that the OSC could be more centrally located, although that is probably improbable based on utilization of land across the City, and that more currently is a probably reasonable location.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed with Commissioner Posson that he is not as focused on the OSC as with moving the Transfer Station out of the residential area. He noted that he thinks it needs to go at least to the perimeter of El Charro Road or on the other side. With respect to the OSC, he indicated that he knows there has been some recent renovations; he does not know how many dollars were put in there, but he would hate to throw that away if major work was done over there. He added that he is fine with where it is if not a lot of dollars were invested there, but he is also fine with moving it as well.

Chair Blank stated that he does not think the OSC poses the same types of problems as the Transfer Station does, and he is really concerned about moving the Transfer Station from a dollar amount and that if it will be moved, it absolutely has to be at zero cost to the ratepayers, taxpayers, and everybody else. He added that he has no idea if that is going to be an EPA mega site when they start taking that thing apart and seeing what is in there. With respect to the OSC, he stated that the citizens of Pleasanton should not be charged for the move.

Commissioner Olson stated that he would leave the OSC where it is and would definitely move the Transfer Station, but it would need to be done without undue burden on the ratepayers. He noted that in his opinion, his garbage rates are not outlandish, and what he pays to have his garbage picked up is a terrific bargain, so some limited rate adjustment would not bother him.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she certainly thinks moving the Transfer Station is more important than moving the OSC. She noted that the Task Force has been pretty adamant that this should be done at no costs to the City or to the ratepayers, and that the property owners who are going to develop this property need to figure out a way to make that happen without passing those costs on.

Chair Blank asked staff if they got what they needed from the Commission.

Mr. Dolan said yes and thanked the Commission.



- b. PUD-96, Pleasanton Gateway, LLC, Commons at Gateway Residential Work Session to review and receive comments on an application for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan to construct 210 apartment units, 97 single-family detached units, and related site improvements on an approximately 26.72-acre site located at 1600 Valley Avenue (south of the Pleasanton Gateway Shopping Center). Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR and MDR (Planned Unit Development-High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential) District.**

Marion Pavan presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the application.

Chair Blank referred to page A0-8 of Exhibit B, View-2: along Interstate 680, and indicated that one of the things he likes to do is look at projects that the Commission has approved and see what they look like after they have been approved. He noted that when the Commission approved Safeway, there was a lot of discussion about the Commission not wanting it to look like an off-ramp in Van Nuys. He further noted that the trees right now have not grown in, and getting down off of I-680, it looks like an off-ramp in Van Nuys and does not even come close to the Pleasanton look. He added that the Commission wanted it to really look like nice as a gateway and not like a place that was inviting people to get off and get on, even though Safeway does since it wants to entice people to use the gas and all the other stuff in that complex.

Chair Blank stated that he was trying to understand why the view from the freeway, as demonstrated in this exhibit, looks the same as before, like the whole complex is going to be exposed to the freeway, and wanted to know if that is that because of the angle it is drawn at and the trees have been eliminated.

Mr. Pavan replied that he thinks it is because the trees were not shown so the Commission and the public could have as clear and unobstructed view of these buildings as possible. He noted that the applicant, Scott Trobbe, is present tonight and respond to the question.

Chair Blank stated that one of the things that might be helpful for when this application comes back is to have a visual of what it really looks like going down I-680 looking laterally as opposed to angularly.

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

Scott Trobbe, Applicant, stated that it was great to be back before the Commission. He indicated that he loves this process and is looking forward to getting some input from the Commission.

Chair Blank asked Mr. Trobbe to excuse him for interrupting but he wanted it to be included in the record that there is somebody who loves this process.

Mr. Trobbe stated that he is not lying because he has been through it. He indicated that he will keep his comments to a minimum as it is a workshop and it is getting late. He stated that he wanted to start off with thanking staff. He noted that the Commission has heard him say before that he deals with a lot of municipalities, and it is always refreshing for him when he works with Mr. Dolan, Ms. Stern, Mr. Pavan, and the other members of the Planning staff. He added that the collaboration that comes through, which was started several months ago, and the dialogue that they have had has always been great. He noted that the City is very fortunate that its Planning staff is very loyal to the City, and it bears repeating.

Mr. Trobbe stated that before he goes into some big picture items, he would like to introduce his team, present here tonight to respond to comments and questions on project specifics: KTGy, Project Architect, who has done a number of deals here in the City; Smith and Smith, Landscape Consultants; and RJA, Civil Engineers, who both have an equally wonderful reputation. He indicated that there is a set of questions that the Commission is being asked to address toward the end of Mr. Pavan's presentation. He added that he can either give a brief description of their vision for the project and how they arrived at where they are, have his team respond to any questions the Commission may have, or take testimony from the public first and then have his team respond to questions.

Chair Blank stated that he would like to hear from the public first, and then have Mr. Trobbe and his team answer any questions that may be raised.

John Moore stated that he is a member of the HOA for Walnut Hills, the subdivision adjacent to this development. He informed the Commission that Mr. Trobbe has reached out to them on multiple occasions, attended multiple HOA meetings, given his presentation, gone over his proposal with the HOA, allowed a dialogue and feedback from the HOA regarding neighborhood concerns, and received some feedback from the residents as well. He indicated that it has been a constant dialogue with Mr. Trobbe, who has given out his cell phone number and business card at meetings to let people know that they could contact him any time they have a question about the property or have a viewpoint they want to share. He added that Mr. Trobbe has taken some of their ideas and feedback into consideration in developing his proposal.

Mr. Moore stated that he wanted the Commission to know how nice the process is where there is open communication, where Mr. Trobbe is open to the ideas and the feedback of the residents, and where the residents have had an opportunity to voice their input.

As a homeowner wearing a different hat from that of an HOA board member, Mr. Moore stated that from what he has seen so far, the proposal looks like a quality development. He noted that they can already see the type of development the developer is able to produce in the Gateway property. He indicated that even though the trees have not yet grown as high as they would like them to, everyone is in agreement that the shopping center is a nice place to do business at. He added that he thinks this development will

also reflect a nice place for someone to live in, and a development like this adjacent to their development can only enhance what they have and the value of their property.

Sean Sowell stated that the project looks really good and nice to see how it unfolds. He indicated that one of the things he noticed on page 18 of Exhibit A is the suggestion to move the bus stop to another location along the boundary between Valley Avenue and the existing development. As he noted in his earlier comments on the previous item, he requested that the need for the mass transit system not be disregarded, as those people who use that system are not present tonight to say anything and because for most people, this is not going to be just one stop but probably two or three. He suggested that these people be involved in the process rather than just moving the bus stop after the fact.

Mr. Sowell stated that he is not familiar with how the negotiation processes work between staff and the developer and noted that with regard to the recently-approved California Center, there was an Option A, Option B, and Option C showing the kinds of units that were going in, but with Options B and C coming later in the process rather than as part of the original packet. He requested that the process be adjusted for this project so that anybody can look at the entire project from the outset as part of the original packet rather than only at the end of the process.

Skip Shieh stated that he lives in Pleasanton and that Pleasanton is the best place in which to live, not only in America but in the whole world. He indicated that he and his wife came to the United States from Taiwan some 55 years ago and lived in a Chicago area called Lake Forest, which is the best place in the Chicago area. He stated that they lived there for about ten years and said noted that America is nice compared to Taiwan. He stated that they then moved to the Miami area and lived in Coral Gable, again the best place in the Miami area, where they bought a house with a pool and said that Miami is better than the Chicago area. He continued that ten year later, they again transferred, this time to Bakersfield, where they built a nice house on a two-acre lot with a modern swimming pool and everything. He indicated that it was hot but doable, so ten years later, they again transferred to Cupertino and looked for a house near the University, but they did not like any of the houses there. He stated that they searched all around from Milpitas to San Ramon and found a two-acre place in Pleasanton and have lived there for about 25 years. He noted that In the meantime, they travelled all around the world and went to almost every country, and by comparison, they have come to the conclusion that Pleasanton is the best place in the world. He indicated that he saw the advertisement for this new development which includes apartment, and he thought the plan was perfect so anyone looking for the best place in which to live, can be guaranteed a place in Pleasanton. He stated that the plan is a balanced approach and commended the developers for doing a good job.

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

The Commission then considered the questions for discussion.

Commissioner Posson stated that he met with Mr. Trobbe and Mr. Sweeney to discuss this project.

Commissioners Pearce and Olson stated that they also met with Mr. Trobbe and Mr. Sweeney.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he was invited to meet with the applicants but was out of town at that time.

Chair Blank stated that he was also invited but unfortunately was not available either. He thanked the applicants for their invitation.

Mr. Shieh inquired when the project was going to start construction.

Chair Blank replied that it would be a while as it needs to be approved first.

### **Questions: Site Design and Open Space**

#### **1. Is the site plan acceptable as to building locations, circulation, parking, and feathering of densities?**

Commissioners Olson and Pearce said yes.

Chair Blank and Commissioner O'Connor stated that they were a definite "yes."

Commissioner Posson stated that he was a "yes" but with a couple of questions. He referred to the third paragraph under "1. Planning Commission Discussion" on page 10 of the staff report which states that staff does not support a continuous wall facing Valley Avenue and prefers that the private yards for the patios face Valley Avenue. He inquired what the rationale for that was.

Mr. Dolan replied that the plans evolved to include a solid wall, and as a matter of fact, staff discussed this with Mr. Trobbe, and he has agreed to go back to the original design. He noted that Mr. Pavan showed the details on one of the slides where it is a very-low-based brick with some wrought iron above it. He noted that it just makes it a little more open, not so closed off from Valley Avenue, but with a clear delineation of space and visually less overwhelming than a wall.

Commissioner Posson stated that with that clarification, he is a "yes."

#### **2. Are the open space areas and amenities acceptable? Should a public park be provided on the project site?**

Commissioner O'Connor stated that when the Commission talks about open space, he always wishes that there was a little more room between the homes as far as yard

space. With respect to a public park being provided, he stated that there is a huge one just outside the development and so he is fine with what is proposed here because of the proximity to the City park.

Commissioner Pearce said “absolutely.” She noted that it is adjacent to the Bernal Property so she does not see the need for an additional public park. She added that given the standards, she thinks the open space options and amenities are acceptable.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Mr. Posson inquired what the future planning or zoning for the area south of this development is.

Mr. Dolan replied that that area is part of the whole Bernal Park.

Commissioner Posson stated that he is in favor of that.

Chair Blank agreed, stating that it is not like it is a long way to the nearest park. He noted that he thinks the open space within the environment is actually pretty good.

### **Questions: Building Designs**

#### **3. Does the Planning Commission support the proposed building architectural designs?**

Commissioner Posson said yes..

Commissioners O'Connor and Olson stated that they love it.

Commissioner Pearce indicated that she thinks it is great.

Chair Blank stated that it actually has a fair amount of the Pleasanton look so he is pretty happy with it, although it could always look more like Pleasanton.

#### **4. Are the house sizes, lot sizes, and floor area ratios for the proposed single-family homes acceptable?**

Commissioner Olson said yes.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she really likes the three-story row houses and thinks that it is an interesting model that Pleasanton does not have. She added that she thinks it is going to be pretty popular.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that, again, he always likes bigger lots, but yes, he likes it.

Commissioner Posson inquired how this compares with the density and lot sizes of the houses in Walnut Hills.

Mr. Pavan replied that the density of Walnut Hills is 5.5 units to the acre, and the density of the single-family detached for the proposed project is 4.9 units to the acre. In terms of lot sizes, he indicated that the minimum lot size adopted for Walnut Hills is 4,000 square feet but really averages about 4,800 square feet. He added that it was comparable to the proposed single-family homes of this project.

Commissioner Posson stated that he is good with it.

Chair Blank stated that they were acceptable.

### **Questions: Exceptions**

#### **5. Does the Planning Commission support granting the exceptions from the Standards:**

***A4.5. Where head-in parking occurs, a landscaped finger with street tree is required an average of every ten spaces.***

***A5.b. Garage doors should be recessed at least two feet from building façade.***

***A8.b Publicly accessible parks, plazas, and/or open spaces are encouraged for all sites greater than five acres, especially those sites not in close proximity to public parks.***

Chair Blank requested confirmation that with respect to parking, the applicant is requesting a landscaped finger every 12 to 14 spaces, and that with respect to the garage doors, the applicant is requesting that recessed garages not be required as they face one another.

Mr. Pavan confirmed that both were correct.

Chair Blank stated that he was confused about the public accessible parks, plazas and open spaces because the project is in close proximity to a public park.

Mr. Pavan replied that since the Commission has already rendered its judgment about the adequacy of the open space, this probably has already been decided.

Chair Blank stated that the Commission will then consider just the first two exceptions.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she is pretty comfortable with these exceptions. She noted that the Commission has granted more exceptions for a variety of developments that have come forward and, quite frankly, if this is all the applicant is asking for, it

seems minor in the grand scheme of things, especially for what they are providing on the site.

Commissioners Posson, Olson, and O'Connor indicated that they are fine with the exceptions.

Chair Blank stated that he was fine as well. He noted that the Commission has granted the exception for garage doors before with other projects, but he thinks the Commission has not done the fingers before. He stated that the only other comment he would make, just generally speaking, is that, when the project come back with the real application, and it is really worth spending the dollars, the applicant get high quality visuals as much as possible. He indicated that the Commission has had some really great visuals where the viewer could actually drive down the streets and see the landscape. He stated that it is really important for the Commissioner to make sure the landscape really does work and that the applicant find trees on steroids. He commented that he wished the Commission had specified trees on steroids for the Safeway development, but the Commission did not know then that such a thing existed. He noted that the better the quality of the visuals, the better the Commission will be equipped to go with the project. He then addressed the applicant saying that he thinks the applicant got a good sense of what the Commission desires.

**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**

No discussion was held or action taken.

- e. Selection of one Commissioner to replace Commissioner Blank on the Historic Preservation Task Force**
- f. Selection of one Commissioner to replace Commissioner Narum on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force**
- g. Selection of two Commissioners to replace Commissioners Blank and Narum on the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals for 2013-2014**

With respect to Items 8.e., 8.f., and 8.g., the appointment of Commissioners to the Historic Preservation and East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Forces and the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals, Commissioner Pearce noted that the Commission will have two new Planning Commissioners shortly, following today's interviews of Planning Commission applicants, and she was contemplating whether or not it would be wise for the Commission to wait for the two additional Planning Commissioners to be on board before have conversations on the appointments to the Task Forces and the Board of Appeals. She further noted that there are no Historic Preservation Task Force or Heritage Tree Board of Appeals meetings scheduled in the coming weeks, and the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2013.

Chair Blank inquired if staff knew when the selection of the new Commissioners will be made and when they will be appointed.

Mr. Dolan replied that he did not have a precise date but that there is a decent chance that they will be appointed by the next Planning Commission meeting. He noted that this is not a process in which staff participates in any way but that he would let the Commission know as soon as he finds out.

Chair Blank inquired when the next City Council meeting was.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would be on June 4, 2013.

Chair Blank noted that the next Planning Commission is on June 12, 2013, and assuming the appointment to the Commission makes the Council agenda on June 4<sup>th</sup>, then it would make sense that the new Commissioners would be on board at the June 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Dolan replied that staff would know by the time the Council Agenda goes out for the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chair Blank stated that, just to be clear, there is no ego to bruise here and that he would not be offended if his replacement on the Historic Preservation Task Force or the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals were selected. He asked Commissioners Olson, O'Connor, and Posson if these were something that they would be interested in



Commissioner Posson stated that he thinks there is a lot of wisdom in waiting until the Commission sees what the full talent pool is.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if staff knew how many applicants were interviewed.

Mr. Dolan replied that he knows there were a lot more applicants than when it was first opened up, when there were only two or three applications received. He added that it appears the Councilmembers were very satisfied with the talent pool.

Chair Blank noted that this is a public record and anyone should be able to find out who applied.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

Commissioner Posson indicated that he liked Commissioner Pearce's idea of tabling the selections until the next meeting when the new Commissioners have been appointed.

Chair Blank inquired if the Commissioner need to do anything procedurally to put it off to the next meeting.

Mr. Dolan replied that if the Commission chooses to hold the selections at the next meeting when the new Commissioners have been appointed, staff will continue the items to that meeting.

Chair Blank advised that the three items will be continued to the next meeting.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Blank adjourned the Planning Commission meeting 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN  
Secretary