



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Thursday, November 5, 2009

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

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Special Meeting of November 5, 2009, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Pearce.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Steven Bocian, Assistant City Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Robin Giffin, Associate Planner; Mike Fulford, City Landscape Architect; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Chair Jennifer Pearce, Commissioners Phil Blank, Kathy Narum, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, and Jerry Pentin

Commissioners Absent: None

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No comments were received.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

- a. **PUD-70/PCUP-234, San Jose Arena Management**
Application for Planned Unit Development approval to establish allowed uses and the construction of community park-related improvements including an approximately 141,679-square-foot two-story ice skating center with a pro shop, restaurant with a bar, and related site improvements on 17 acres; and Conditional Use Permit approval to allow a bar in a proposed restaurant (in the

proposed ice skating center) located at the southwest intersection of I-580 and El Charro Road (Staples Ranch).

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Stoneridge Drive Specific Plan Amendment/Staples Ranch project evaluated the impacts of the proposed Ice Center at approximately 138,500 square feet in size. The Ice Center is currently proposed to be approximately 141,679 square feet in size due to a design modification. Based on a review of the potential environmental impacts of the increased size of the Ice Center, the Director of Community Development has directed that an EIR Addendum be prepared. A copy of this document is available for review at the City of Pleasanton Planning Division, 200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton.

- b. PUD-80, City of Pleasanton
Application for Planned Unit Development approval to establish allowed uses and the construction of neighborhood park related improvements including a storm water detention basin on approximately five acres located at the southwest intersection of I-580 and El Charro Road (Staples Ranch).**

Chair Pearce advised that the presentation and discussion for the two public hearing items would be combined.

Steve Bocian presented the format staff would follow in presenting the items. He indicated that staff would first present an overview of both the Neighborhood and Community Parks and the Ice Center, followed by a question-and-answer period and Commission actions on both items.

Mr. Bocian then displayed slides of the Staples Ranch property pointing out the location of both parks, the approved land use map for the project, a conceptual site plan showing the 47-acre Continuing Life Communities (CLC) project, the 37-acre Hendricks Automotive project, the 11-acre retail site, the 17-acre Community Park site with the Ice Center, and the 5-acre Neighborhood Park site.

Mr. Bocian indicated that the approval of PUD-70 and PUD-80 will complete the active PUDs for the Staples Ranch project, which would then be forwarded to the City Council. He stated that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is currently being circulated and would come before the Commission as a public hearing at the December 9, 2009 meeting. He noted that the scope of the SEIR is limited and would not impede actions on these two PUDs. He added that the final review of the PUDs by the City Council will take place at the time it adopts the SEIR.

Mr. Bocian stated that work is currently being done on the design of El Charro Road in the City of Livermore as part of this project and includes a storm water basin. He noted that staff has reviewed the plans for the basin and that a meeting will be held in two

weeks to review a more complete design of the road. He indicated that the City of Livermore will be responsible for the construction of the road and preparation of storm improvements required for the Staples Ranch project.

With respect to the history of the two parks, Mr. Bocian stated that the City Council had indicated its interest in purchasing the five-acre Neighborhood Park, and the 17-acre Community Park is being dedicated to the City by the Alameda County Surplus Property Authority. He indicated that the City Council approved the Staples Ranch Community Park Master Plan in June 2008 and that all the designs presented at this meeting was based upon that Master Plan. He added that the Neighborhood Park Master Plan, which is fundamentally consistent with the Staples Ranch Community Park Master Plan, was approved by the Parks and Recreation Commission in August 2009 and was subsequently approved by the Council.

With respect to the Staples Ranch Neighborhood Park planning process, Mr. Bocian indicated that staff utilized and developed the elements of the park, which were approved as part of the Community Park Master Plan, and forwarded them to the Parks and Recreation Commission who in turn approved the plan. He noted that when the Council approved the Community Park Master Plan, staff did not have a refined concept of how the stormwater detention basin would look, and the idea brought forward to the Parks and Recreation Commission was that it be a natural California landscape design, which the Commission supported through to the final approval of the Plan.

Mr. Bocian explained that when the Community Park Master Plan was approved, there was an emergency vehicle access (EVA) on Stoneridge Drive, which was not intended to go through to El Charro Road. He added that some changes were made to the entryway of the Ice Center to accommodate the extension of the road, thereby altering the vehicle flow throughout the parking lot. He then presented the dog exercise area, noting that its location was ultimately decided to be in the Neighborhood Park with the potential of having a large exercise area inside the stormwater detention basin. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Commission expressed concern about the lack of a firm dog exercise area and recommended that the Council discuss the potential of relocating the dog exercise area to the Community Park. He added that there are areas where the dog park can be accommodated should the Council ultimately decide to have one; however, staff's recommendation will be to look at what is the best location within the community in general rather than just on the Staples Ranch site.

Mr. Bocian then displayed the relocation site of the tennis courts to the northwest corner of the site. He noted that there are now ten parallel parking spaces, which is a positive improvement endorsed by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

With respect to the operation of both Parks, Mr. Bocian stated that these are City parks, designed and operated by City staff and intended to serve the community in general. He indicated that the Neighborhood Park was not initially part of the Staples Ranch process at the time the Memorandum of Understanding was approved. He noted that staff felt there was a lot of opportunity to have synergy with the Community Park and

decided to purchase the property. He stated that the actual details of the land transaction have not been finalized, but the basic concepts are that the City and all the developers will contribute towards the purchase of the land, the detention area, and improvements. He indicated that the City will purchase the non-detention areas of the Park, and the City anticipates working with CLC, the owner/operator of the Continuing Care Community, to make improvements on that Park. He added that the City will operate and maintain the entire Park, including the detention basin.

Mr. Bocian stated that the City anticipates ground leasing about eight acres of the 17-acre Community Park to San Jose Area Management, LP (SJAM) to operate the Ice Center. He added that the City expects SJAM to construct the entire Park, make financial contributions to the non-ground leased areas of the Park, and assume the responsibilities for the leased areas of the Park. He noted that staff is still working out the details of the ground lease and that staff expects the ground lease area to come with a development agreement. He stated that this development, which will come before the Planning Commission at a future meeting, has not yet been finalized because it is linked to the ground lease. Finally, he indicated that the City will be responsible for maintaining the non-leased ground area and that the Sharks will maintain the leased area.

Mr. Bocian then turned over the presentation to Mike Fulford, City Landscape Architect, to discuss the elements in the Parks.

Mike Fulford stated that staff, CLC, and SJAM worked collaboratively together on the Parks, adding that they are pleased with the way the Parks have turned out given some on-site obstacles and constraints. He noted that both Parks conform to the Bay Friendly guidelines. He indicated that the Community Park is a nice blend of active recreation areas, a children's play apparatus area, a wet play area, and an open turf meadow. He stated that the very active recreation area consists of a children's play area which is divided for two age groups, 2-5 years and 6-12 years, and separated by a wet play area.

Mr. Fulford then described an open meadow and a passive area of the park with a meandering pathway, located to the south. He stated that there will be a mix of indigenous plantings and food plants for song birds, and that the landscaping will transition into a riparian area. He indicated that the park is bounded on its west side by a double row of shade trees which reinforce the edge of the active recreation area, even though the turf will visually seem to continue on into the parking lot.

Mr. Fulford stated that all the elements are very durable; while the site furnishings for both parks share materials and a look, the Community Park and the Neighborhood Park will have their own identities. He noted that the relocation of the tennis courts, which are completely fenced and lighted, was supported by players and that the parking lot consists of ten parallel spaces along the edge which should be more than enough for players using the courts.

Mr. Fulford stated that the site has a perimeter of decomposed granite pathway eight feet wide going all the way around and narrowing to two feet when it parallels the City sidewalk along Stoneridge Drive. He referred to a node identified as a future boardwalk and observation deck. He concluded that both the Neighborhood Park and Community Park have extensive plant pallets which are layered one upon the other.

Robin Giffin then provided an overview of the Ice Center lease area, noting that it is approximately 3,000 square feet larger in size than anticipated in the EIR approved by the City Council. She explained that the increase in size is due to a design modification of the entry portion of the Ice Center. She advised that a Draft EIR Addendum was prepared and is attached in the Planning Commission's packet as Exhibit D.

Ms. Giffin stated that the Ice Center lease area generally wrapped around the parking lot and does not include the parking lot to the east or access road south of the Ice Center. She indicated that a total of 398 parking spaces are proposed for the community park, 360 of which are intended to primarily serve the Ice Center. She noted that the Ice Center is estimated to have a parking demand of 326 spaced during a peak day on Saturday. She added that 34 extra spaces are proposed to help ease vehicle movement in the drive isles, and 38 additional spaces are proposed east of the Ice Center to serve the playground, picnic areas, and other park amenities proposed east of the site.

Ms. Giffin then presented a colored rendering of the Ice Center's front entrance, indicating that a detailed architectural and landscaping presentation will be made by SJAM. She stated that, as conditioned, the Park would have two standard City of Pleasanton Park signs, a monument sign primarily for the Ice Center, and one building sign. She presented two graphics on the proposed Ice Center monument sign as seen during the daytime and in the evening. She indicated that the sign is proposed to be five feet, three inches in height, and the building sign lettering is approximately three feet, six inches tall.

Ms. Giffin stated that a sports bar is proposed on the second floor of the Ice Center. She noted that a full service and food menu will be available at the bar, and employees will undergo a training program designed to prevent intoxication, under age drinking, and drunk driving. She added that if the operation of the bar results in negative impacts, the permit may be brought back to the Planning Commission for review and possible modification of the conditions or revocation of the permit.

Ms. Giffin stated that the roof of the Ice Center will be photovoltaic-ready and will include 35 panels. She added that the rear building elevation will be substantially screened with landscaping to deter graffiti tagging, and, except as otherwise conditioned, the project will adhere to the City's noise standard of 70 dBA maximum at a distance of 25 feet from the noise source, with emergency generators being exempt.

Ms. Giffin stated that the front entrance detail shall generally match the front entrance details of the signage plan, which will be shown in SJAM's presentation. She indicated

that enhancement to the building wall by the entrance will occur potentially with texture or landscaping, and wrapping of the glass windows on the corner of the Ice Center would be required.

Ms. Giffin stated that staff received two comments in support of the Ice Center and two comments in opposition. She added that a comment was also made that the Neighborhood Park should be labeled “storm water detention,” “miscellaneous,” or “adjunct to commercial” since such a large portion of the basin is dedicated to hydro modification. She noted that detailed public comments were provided to the Planning Commission.

Jon Gustafson, General Manager, Sharks Ice, representing SJAM and the San Jose Sharks, noted that he oversees all of the public recreational ice facilities that the company manages and that he is currently managing three properties in San Jose, Fremont, and Oakland. He introduced Wayne Rasmussen, Lead Consultant; Peter Petruzzi, Project Architect; David Gates, Landscape Architect; and Pat Kernan, Legal Advisor. He discussed the Sharks’ overall operating philosophy and described the Ice Center as a state-of-the-art and efficient facility that will achieve LEED standards and will be used by both young and old, abled and disabled. He then presented the facility’s floor plan, describing its different features on each level. He thanked staff for their hard work and indicated his agreement with the staff report recommendation. He added that he looks forward to a long partnership with the City.

David Gates, Landscape Architect, spoke of linkages, the connection to the future development, and the relationship between the active zone and entry plaza of the facility. He indicated that parking is secondary to the nature of the park and that tried to let the landscape work with the building with large oaks and large trees. He then described the different landscape features, circulation, and seating elements of the facility.

Peter Petruzzi, Project Architect, stated that the building has a very unique character and definition because it needs to provide requisite and adequate facilities in an architectural style and form that encourages community participation and respects the context of the neighborhood. He noted that the building creates a solar challenge which provides an opportunity for energy conservation. He explained that with a plan area of over 15,000 square feet and a total floor area of over 141,000 square feet, the complexities and the scale of the building and the need to reconcile them in a park led to an approach that allows the building to act as a backdrop, visually connecting its context and contributing to a sense of place.

Mr. Petruzzi stated that the form of the building basically follows the functions within. He discussed the formation of the rinks, the minimization of floor area, and the reduction in the amount of air that needs to be conditioned by bringing the sloped roof down as much as possible. He explained that by taking the second floor and putting it on top of the core that serves the rinks, they have been able to keep the footprint lower in size. He indicated that they added clerestory windows to bring light into the interior at the

stands which breaks the horizontal line created by the roof ridge and further enhances the silhouette and removes the industrial appearance of the building. He then described the front entry, glass lobby, expansive stairway, transition of the landing, and views from the inside. He noted that the exterior elements have been strengthened with windows and shading canopies in the front and the rear, adding depth and character to the façade and breaking up the mass on the sides.

Mr. Petruzzi presented color alternatives of brick red, green, and blue. He stated that the standard retail box is basically 45 feet high to the top of the wall, but the walls at the eaves are 25 feet, with the highest point on the roof just slightly over 38 feet.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the dog exercise area has been designed in terms of its layout of the area rather than its location.

Mr. Bocian said no. He stated that one of the issues was the dimensions of a dog park, noting that there are some national standards. He noted that the Master Plan was approved by the Parks and Recreation Commission and that the dog park area was very small in terms of the Master Plan and was not large enough to have any type of meaningful interaction for dogs. He indicated that the idea was to somehow link it to the detention basin. He stated that Staff will need to look at the entire issue and review its size and scope.

Commissioner Blank pointed out that he visited a great dog park in Prescott, Arizona.

Commissioner Blank referred to the development agreement and indicated that he wanted to ensure on the record that this strictly addressed financial arrangements. He noted that the City has had situations in the past where conditions of approval put in place by the Planning Commission have been undone in a development agreement.

Mr. Bocian stated that the development agreement would include fundamental financial arrangements and issues related to the period where the City will expect construction to take place. He added that there will be language relative to the operations of the facility and that it does not include language relative to the architecture of the building.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the Commission will be able to discuss the development agreement before it was signed.

Mr. Bocian confirmed that would be the case.

Commissioner Blank stated that there is a discussion about high quality amenities for the Park. He wanted to ensure that the bathrooms would not look like those at the sports park, which are very similar to what he sees in Alcatraz. He suggested the use of porcelain light fixtures rather than stainless steel, similar to what was done in the bathrooms at Delucchi Park in Downtown.

Mr. Bocian confirmed that there will be high quality fixtures for the bathrooms. He indicated that porcelain was used for Delucchi Park but stainless steel for the Bernal Park bathrooms, not so much to save money as for the ease of maintenance and how well the fixtures hold up.

Commissioner Blank inquired if 35 photovoltaic panels were enough to make the building energy neutral during the day.

Ms. Griffin replied that the applicants are proposing the panels primarily to provide energy for the scoreboards, for the fountain, and for the electric vehicle charging stations and that the 35 panels would address these items. She added that there is a condition of approval requiring the roof to be photovoltaic-ready and another condition that additional panels may be added and would not need to return for the Commission's review and approval if they are flat-mounted.

Commissioner Blank noted that there will be four pre-wired stations for electrical and inquired how staff arrived at this number.

Ms. Giffin replied that most of the requirements shown for bike racks and carpool spaces come from LEED guidelines, based off of a percentage of the maximum peak number of people anticipated to participate in activities at the Center.

Commissioner Blank inquired whether sprinklers in areas of the park will be radio-controlled with GPS monitoring.

Mr. Fulford replied that the City currently has a very efficient central irrigation control system that includes weather stations in three locations in town that monitor wind speed and rain. He added that it is a very efficient system and that the Park will be part of that system.

Commissioner Blank noted that one of the conditions of approval mentions the Airport Protection Area and the Airport General Plan. He indicated that language be included disclosing the proposed Airport Safety Area as well

Commissioner Olson noted that Ms. Giffin indicated that staff received two comments in support of and two comments in opposition to the project. He pointed out that the last time the Commission reviewed the project, the room was packed and there was overwhelming support in the community for this facility. He stated that he was surprised and did not realize there was so much interest for hockey in the community. He requested clarification regarding the condition relating to the sports bar that alcohol would not be served between 1:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. unless otherwise allowed in the park lease.

Mr. Bocian indicated that no discussion has been made regarding this condition other than there would be no alcohol service during those hours.

Commissioner Olson inquired if this was the standard in the community.

Mr. Dolan replied that the City has been criticized for being inconsistent, which is accurate. He noted the language is consistent with some of the more liberal hours granted recently.

Mr. Bocian agreed, stating that there is a high demand for ice rinks in the evening. He added that staff looked at the proposed scheduling for the building and agreed that those hours support the condition.

Commissioner Olson stated that he does not have any problem with 1:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. but that the condition appears to be open-ended.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if it would be possible to have the restaurant bar open without the ice rink being open.

Mr. Bocian said no.

Commissioner Blank stated that he like the concept overall but that it struck him that there were no international-size hockey rinks in the facility. He indicated that he thought there would be one or two international-size rinks and two NHL-size rinks so that if the Olympics were to come to the area, that City could serve as host.

Mr. Fulford stated that Olympic-size rinks were being phased out. He noted that today's newspaper reported that HP Pavilion, which cannot be converted to Olympic-size, recently got the 2012 National U.S. Figure-Skating Championships. He added the upcoming Olympics in Vancouver, British Columbia, will be played in an NHL-size rink.

Commissioner Narum noted that page 6 of the staff report states that the floor area ratio is 19 percent. She inquired if this figure is based on the entire 17-acre community park land.

Ms. Giffin said yes.

Commissioner Narum referred to signage on page 7 of the staff report and requested confirmation that the two normal Pleasanton park signs would be located at the Park entry and the two Sharks signs would be are on the leased land.

Ms. Giffin said yes. She stated that there is a condition of approval requiring the monument sign to be relocated within the lease area, or the lease area to be expanded out around the sign.

Commissioner Narum inquired if the Sharks will be responsible for maintaining those signs.

Ms. Giffin said yes.

Commissioner Narum referred to the hours of the sports bar and noted that a recent application was approved for 6:00 a.m. She inquired why the applicant is proposing 6:00 a.m. as opposed to possibly 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Gustafson replied that this was what was stated in the staff report, to which they agreed. He added that they were amenable to changing it if necessary.

Commissioner Narum referred to page 13 of Conditions of Approval A.1. which states that the lease area shall be modified prior to the issuance of a building permit, and continues to list some conditions. She inquired if this would be part of the approval.

Ms. Giffin replied that as shown on the plans, the monument sign is slightly out of the lease area. She indicated that the City would like SJAM to maintain that sign which is why staff is recommending it be pulled within the lease area. She noted that carpool spaces are proposed east of the Ice Center and that staff would like those relocated closer to the front entrance instead of in the area outside the lease area. She added that the delivery area will also need to be modified as it is also outside the lease area on the east side of the Ice Center.

Commissioner Narum inquired whether these items should be worked out before the Commission recommends approval to the City Council.

Ms. Giffin replied that typically a final set of plans will come in before the building permit is issued and that the lease area will be adjusted on that final set.

Commissioner Narum noted that the deed disclosures on page 14 lists items but does not include the Airport Protection Area, which is listed on page 34. She recommended that all the disclosures be listed together in one area.

Ms. Giffin replied that the deed disclosures in the other section are those required in the EIR, which has specific airport disclosure requirements.

Commissioner Narum inquired if they were required to be separated out.

Ms. Giffin replied the conditions have been organized in different sections, and staff has included the conditions in the sections they apply to. She added that the Specific Plan conditions as well as the EIR conditions are all in one section.

Commissioner Blank referred to the Stoneridge Drive Extension arguments where people said certain items were disclosed but they were in a separate document. He indicated that the Commission wants to be absolutely sure that this is understood and disclosed where it needs to be.

Mr. Bocian explained that it is somewhat different than what has been done in the past in that the City has executed the agreements that include the deed disclosure. He

noted that the City is party to those agreements and that the property owners within the Staples Ranch area will be notified and are aware of the situation.

Commissioner O'Connor supported Commissioner Narum's recommendation that all the disclosures be put together in one place.

Mr. Bocian stated that this is an organization issue and that they can be moved together.

Commissioner Narum stated that she liked how the EIR mitigations were organized but that the airport disclosure on page 14 was glaring. She indicated that she was not opposed to duplicating the disclosures in another section.

Commissioner Narum noted that page 7 of the staff report refers to a seven-foot tall stucco wall north and east of the basin. She stated that she recalled when the Hendricks Automotive project was discussed that Commissioner Pentin had asked that the wall not be stucco but open-fencing with landscaping.

Mr. Bocian stated that it is proposed to be a stucco wall with proposed landscaping and that the wall will not be visible.

Commissioner Pentin stated that when Hendricks Automotive was approved, the Commission asked to have that wall redesigned to be a vine trellis-type climbing wall with enough landscaping around it.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the idea was that in the event the vines do not cover the walls, the mass would not be visible.

Commissioner Pentin stated that the Commission was trying to stay away from a stucco wall and that with the right landscaping, the type of vines would grow and fill the open space.

Mr. Fulford stated that it would be possible to install a green screen.

Mr. Bocian noted that this could also be done with the wall.

Commissioner Pentin stated that he recalls the discussion to be that the Commission did not like the idea of a big stucco wall, as there is a landscaped berm behind Hendricks Automotive and then the natural park. He noted that the Commission did not like to have a stucco wall between the berm and the park to deter graffiti, and the idea was to have open fencing that would encourage vine growth.

Commissioner Narum referred Section 1, Temporary Events and Uses, on page 7 of the Neighborhood Park conditions. She inquired what temporary sales events related to an on-site permitted use.

Ms. Giffin replied that this condition is more flexible than what staff would normally propose in that these events would be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Parks and Community Services in the event some type of event were to occur. She noted that temporary events usually require use permits, and this condition acknowledges that these events can occur without a formal review if approved by the Director.

Commissioner Narum inquired if this condition applied to both parks.

Ms. Giffin said yes.

Commissioner Pentin stated that he spent time with both Mr. Gustafson and Ms. Giffin regarding the Ice Center. He referred to the lighting and indicated that there is a request to move the hour lighting to 85 to 100 feet. He noted that it is already 1.1 or 1.2 foot candles in some places and inquired if this would drop them below 1 foot candle.

Mr. Fulford replied that there is a group called the Society of Illuminating Engineers and they recommend a minimum of 1 foot candle for pathway lighting for easy traverse. He indicated that virtually none of the City's parks have that level of lighting but have an average of it. He noted that in most parks, pathway lighting are placed 80-85 feet apart and provides pools of light. He added that in high light areas, those pathway lights are placed fairly close together, and that light fixtures are spaced farther apart farther away in the park so as not to be glaring but comfortable.

Commissioner Pentin referred to the emergency generators to be placed at the back of the building. He expressed concern that there is just so much space before the arroyo and inquired how they would be placed and what steps could be taken to ensure they are closed or covered so that the arroyo is still protected.

Ms. Giffin replied that the location for the generators has not been decided at this time and that it is anticipated that there will be at least one emergency generator. She noted that the Code exempts generators from the noise regulations but that the Commission could add a condition either stating that a masonry wall be put around the generator or requiring the generator to meet the same noise requirement required for any other use on the park property.

Commissioner Pentin noted that in the general conditions on page 3, the approved building colors and materials are to be indicated in the final building permit plans and that substitutions will not be allowed unless otherwise approved by the Director of Parks and Community Services. He indicated that he would think this would come back to Planning rather than Parks.

Ms. Giffin replied that this could be changed as recommended by the Commission.

Commissioner Pentin referred to the general conditions on the LEED requirements that if the project meets the bicycle rack requirements for the LEED points, there would be a

bicycle rack that holds 60 bicycles. He indicated that he is an avid bicyclist but as bike-friendly as he wants Pleasanton to be, he stated that he has a difficult time believing 60 bicycle racks would be utilized.

Ms. Giffin replied that she had double-checked this figure and that it is the requirement.

Commissioner O'Connor referred to the elevations of the building and indicated that it is difficult to tell exactly what the materials are and inquired if most of the siding was a metal type.

Mr. Petruzzi replied that it is a pre-fabricated metal system that has foam insulation built into it. He explained that the inside and exterior have metal, which increases energy efficiency, as opposed to standard panel construction with insulation on the inside.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if this was material similar to the building in Fremont.

Mr. Gustafson replied that it was similar to the building in San Jose and that Fremont is an old retrofitted warehouse.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that a letter received on the site layout indicating that the building appears to be located closer to the arroyo than in the original, but that on the plans it looks like it has been moved back closer to the arroyo.

Mr. Bocian replied that the letter refers to when they did the initial conceptual plan for the site. He noted that the ice rink was actually located closer to Stoneridge Drive and the park was to the south, as compared to the current plan where most of the park is located north of the building itself. He indicated that the concern of the individual who prepared the letter is that he was opposed to the rink moving from the initial conceptual plan, thinking that it worked better closer to Stoneridge Drive than to the arroyo. He noted that this was changed during the Master Plan process.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there were other government agencies outside the City that limit how close they can get to the arroyo and if the City was limited as to how close it can get.

Ms. Giffin replied that the EIR does have a requirement that the building itself needs to be set back at least 20 feet from the top of bank for geotechnical reasons in case of a seismically induced bank failure. She added that Zone 7 occasionally has a requirement but that its comments on the project throughout the process did not include a request for additional setbacks.

Commissioner O'Connor commented that the parking that comes around the building appears to stop around Stoneridge Drive. He inquired if it connects all the way around.

Ms. Giffin replied that the parking connects all the way around the building. She stated that there is a decorative paving, which is a walkway connection to the sidewalk by Stoneridge Drive, which can be driven over.

Chair Pearce stated that her son has friends who play on hockey teams and noted the vast number of people who attend tournaments. She inquired what the parking plan was in terms of overflow parking for events.

Mr. Petruzzi replied that they worked with the City beforehand to ensure a proper plan is in place. He indicated that they have ten years of experience in San Jose where they have hosted the largest tournaments in the United States and are comfortable with their experiences in the past in terms of parking requirements.

Chair Pearce stated that in the LEED Exhibit B, credit is given for bike lockers but the LEED response letter dated December 15, 2008 talks about bike racks, which are two different things.

Ms. Giffin replied that the intent is that they be bike racks and that lockers are proposed inside the facility for clothes, not for bikes.

Commissioner Pentin noted that the same report mentions access to lockers and showers, and he inquired if the intent was for people not using the facility to be able to shower.

Mr. Petruzzi replied that customers who ride to the center and utilize the facilities would have the ability to use the showers as well; however, the showers are not available for use by individual not using the facility.

Ms. Giffin clarified that the LEED credit for lockers is for employees only.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he did not see any indications on the plans for bike racks.

Ms. Giffin noted that on Sheet A.0.1, the bike racks are located generally east of the entrance and identified as "Bicycle Parking."

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if it would be more aesthetically pleasing to spread the bike racks out instead of putting them all in one location.

Commissioner Pentin agreed and recommended that the final plans reflect the placement of bike racks in a variety of areas to maximize their use.

Ms. Giffin replied that the plans could reflect this.

Chair Pearce noted that in the park plans and in the Sharks facility plans, there are men's and women's restroom but no family restrooms. She stated that many people

with young children use these facilities and inquired if thought had been given to this idea.

Mr. Bocian replied that staff did think about this, particularly for the Neighborhood Park, because it is a very small restroom, but that there are none. He noted that staff also thought about it for the Community Park and felt it was not necessary. He added that outside of the practicality for the patron who may want to use the restroom, staff has experienced significant maintenance issues with family restrooms, and maintenance and parks staff have encouraged against them. He stated that most of those types of restrooms lock from the inside and that the City has had issues with this. He indicated that the Sharks facility is right next door to the Community Park and that staff is hoping to get a synergy from the recreational amenity that the Sharks provide in the Park so there would be access to a lot of restrooms.

Chair Pearce inquired if direction was needed on the color of the building.

Mr. Petruzzi replied that their favorite color is brick.

Commissioner Blank stated that they did not look very Pleasanton-like to him. He indicated that he realizes there is a marketing brand for the Sharks but requested that it be of a higher quality. He noted the big blue Shark sign and the small Pleasanton sign and inquired if there was a way to make the building look a little more like Pleasanton.

Wayne Rasmussen stated that they have discussed colors with staff, reviewed many color schemes, and have submitted four different schemes for consideration. He indicated that the Sharks' preferred option is the brick in the PUD plan and that a green color that is also acceptable to them; the darker brown color, however, was dismissed. He noted that staff brought up the idea of a blue color as well, which was actually suggested by the architectural consultant who reviewed this building and felt that it captures the ice or interior use look a lot. Mr. Rasmussen stated that he felt any of those three colors would be appropriate. He added that they could not go with any darker colors due to the size of the building so they went with the lighter colors and explored the basic ones that could be used.

With respect to signage, Mr. Rasmussen stated that there has not been any attempt in the colors, other than the Sharks logo. He indicated that in past plans, there were larger graphics for the Sharks and smaller for the City and they were reminded that this is a City park; they, therefore, reduced a portion of the Sharks sign and increased the size of the City's sign. He concluded that they were open to achieving what the City is looking for.

Commissioner Blank stated that he did not want to dictate colors and felt it was symbolic of the Sharks' blue, but noted that when he looked at the renderings of the buildings, the combination of the color and form do not look Pleasanton-like.

Commissioner Olson agreed that there is no "Pleasanton look" but that he liked the Sharks sign.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that another option might be that the signs for the park on the west end and northeast end of the site could relate more to City parks and they would keep the Sharks Ice signs the same.

Commissioner Blank said he did not want to remove the Sharks' branding and thinks continuity of the theme is important; however, when he saw the night view of the sign with the City of Pleasanton being blue, it did not seem consistent. He noted that it might work when he sees the more detailed rendering.

Commissioner Narum noted that the park entry signs at the west and east end will be the standard monument signs that are in all City parks, and the signs for the Sharks' facility will be in the center.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the one with the reader board along the top is at the entry way to the Sharks' parking lot. He confirmed they were proposing to have the signs developed at the two park entries and that if the City's expectation was to have more of the traditional park sign design there, they could do that. He indicated that the Commission could add a condition to bring back the standard sign; otherwise, the sign Chair Pearce presented would be used twice, and the reader board sign would be located at the entryway to the parks.

Ms. Giffin stated that this is not how the project is conditioned and that if these signs were changed to the other signs shown in the sign package, they would be outside of the lease area and would then have to be maintained by the City. She indicated that as proposed and the way it is conditioned, all Sharks signs would be in the lease area and not in the other areas of the Park. She added that it would be awkward to extend the lease area for the signs, but that theoretically, the signs could be brought somewhere else within the leased area.

Chair Pearce referred to the preliminary materials pallet, specifically the picnic table. She indicated that she uses the picnic tables at Valle Vista Park and they have umbrella holders. She inquired if it would be possible to substitute tables that have umbrella holders as some of the tables proposed are not under the shade.

Mr. Fulford replied that this could be done.

Chair Pearce stated that the users would provide their own umbrellas.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Scott Raty, Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce, referred to the mural in the back of the Chamber and inquired if it was any more or less Pleasanton colors than anything proposed by the applicant tonight. He urged the Commission to allow the private sector

to do what it does best to drive traffic into the facility. He indicated that he thinks they do this well and asked the Commission not to micro-manage the project. He congratulated the City for the thoroughness of its work on the project and also the San Jose Sharks and the Silicon Valley Sports and Entertainment Group for their persistence and patience. He stated that he thinks there were many upsides to the project and asked not to lose sight of the fact that the Sharks are an exceptional organization.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Pentin stated that in his meeting with the applicant and staff, he discussed the use of the sports bar and access to the sports bar. He voiced concern about times when there may be a large crowd, noting that access to the bleachers is completely through the sports bar and the egress out is through the sports bar. He inquired if there could be plans for access to the bleachers without going through the sports bar.

Mr. Petruzzi stated that the bleachers can be access from the ground floor.

Chair Pearce inquired what the purpose of the LED reader strip on the rink entry sign is.

Mr. Petruzzi replied that it would display such announcements as “Public session at 7:30” or “Now taking enrollment for class sessions” and other listings to advertise their product to others.

Commissioner Olson added that it could announce scores when the Sharks get to the Stanley Cup finals.

Commissioner Blank moved to make the PUD findings for the proposed development as listed in the staff report, make the Conditional Use Permit findings for the proposed sports bar as listed in staff report, recommend approval of the Draft EIR Addendum as shown in Exhibit D of the staff report, and recommend approval of Cases PUD-70 and PCUP-234, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibits A-1 and A-2, respectively, of the staff report, with the following amendments:

- **Add a condition that the generator shall meet the same requirements listed in the City noise ordinance;**
- **Replace “Director of Parks and Community Services” with “Director of Community Development” for review and approval of all design details of structures outside the Lease Area;**
- **Add a condition that bike racks be installed at strategic locations throughout the facility;**
- **Add a condition that the same picnic tables as used at Valle Vista Park with holes for umbrella be utilized.**

Commissioner Pentin seconded the motion.

Commissioner O'Connor requested a modification to include the four conditions added by staff.

Commissioner Blank agreed and added that all deed restrictions be placed together in the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Narum proposed that the hours for non-service of alcohol be changed from 1:00 a.m.-6:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m-10:00 a.m.

Commissioners Blank and Pentin accepted the proposed amendments.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Olson, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

RECUSED: None.

ABSENT: None.

Resolutions Nos. PC-2009-39 recommending approval of the Addendum to the EIR, PC-2009-40 recommending approval of Case PUD-70, and PC-2009-41 recommending approval of Case PCUP-234 were entered and approved as motioned.

Commissioner Narum also requested that a recommendation be forwarded to the City Council strongly encouraging that a dog park be included in one of the parks on this site.

The Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Dolan recommended that Commission to make a motion to that effect.

Commissioner Narum moved that the Planning Commission strongly encourage the City Council to include a dog park in either the Community Park or the Neighborhood Park plans.

Commissioner Pentin seconded the motion, and accepted the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Blank proposed an amendment that the City examine other successful dog parks in other localities.

Commissioners Narum and Pentin accepted the proposed amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Olson, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Commissioner Blank moved to make the PUD findings for the proposed development as listed in the staff report and to recommend approval of Case PUD-80, subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Narum seconded the motion and accepted the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Pentin requested an amendment that the stucco wall be as was approved for the Hendrick Automotive project.

Commissioners Blank and Narum accepted the proposed amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Olson, Narum, Pearce, and Pentin.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

Resolution No. PC-2009-42 recommending approval of Case PUD-80 was entered and adopted as motioned.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Pearce adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary