



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, May 28, 2008

*(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 28, 2008, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Blank.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Planning and Community Development; Donna Decker, Principal Planner; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Marion Pavan, Associate Planner; and Cory Emberson, Recording Secretary.

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Phil Blank, Anne Fox, Kathy Narum, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, and Jennifer Pearce.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Commissioner Narum was absent from roll call and arrived at 7:13 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Blank noted that the minutes would be considered after Commissioner Narum's arrival.

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 none.

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

There were none.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

a. **PCUP-216, C. Kent Young**

Application for conditional use permit to establish a fitness and training facility at 3950 Valley Avenue in the Valley Business Park. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

Ms. Decker noted that staff would like to modify Condition No. 5 in order to clarify a difference between the narrative that was given and the information in the staff report. She noted that the condition contained a sentence after the “Operation Hours” which states, “The training facility shall not be open to the public on a drop-in basis.” Staff would like to add the following language to that sentence: “...*and shall operate by individual appointments for one-on-one sessions.*” Ms. Decker noted that addition was acceptable to the applicant.

b. **PCUP-221, Lazze Jansson**

Application for conditional use permit to operate an adult trade school for metal-shaping classes at 1051 Serpentine Lane, Suite 500, in the Valley Business Park. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

Commissioner Fox moved to make the required conditional use permit findings for PCUP-216 and PCUP-221 as listed in the staff reports and to approve the projects subject to the Conditions of Approval as listed in Exhibit B of the staff reports, as amended.

Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolutions Nos. PC-2008-23 approving PCUP-216 and PC-2008-24 approving PCUP-221 were entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

- a. **PSPA-02/PUD-02-07M/PCUP-210, Scott Trobbe, Pleasanton Gateway, LLC**
Work session to review and provide comment for a proposal to modify the Bernal Property Phase I Specific Plan and the approved PUD development plan and for a conditional use permit for a commercial/office development on an approximately 39.22-acre property located on the southwest corner of Bernal Avenue and Valley Avenue, between Valley Avenue, and I-680. Zoning for the property is PUD (Planned Unit Development) District.

Mr. Pavan summarized the staff report and described the background, scope, and layout of the proposed project.

Commissioner Fox noted that the staff report stated the City's peer review consultant, Larry Cannon, Cannon Design Group, had recommended moving Buildings 4 and 5 so they would not be so close to Valley Avenue. She understood the applicant's statement in the staff report that they would not move them per Mr. Cannon's suggestion and inquired whether she had interpreted it correctly. She noted that it referred to the previous application and inquired whether the applicant would be allowed to move the buildings if the previous application had been approved.

Mr. Pavan advised that the site plan could be modified to move those buildings if they chose, adding that Buildings 4 and 5 were placed close to Valley Avenue and considered to be a fundamental concept of the original proposal. The project as presented to the City would exhibit traditional design and planning principles to its best effort. He noted that the location of the office buildings, as evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report for the Bernal Park Specific Plan, would provide a measure of noise mitigation for those houses. He noted that there were very strict criteria established in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) with respect to the location of the buildings as a means of shielding houses from the noise from I-680.

Commissioner Blank noted that the building numbering changed slightly from the existing plan site to the proposed plan site. He noted that Buildings 4 and 5 in the existing plan site were now labeled Buildings 1 and 2. Mr. Pavan acknowledged that there were some changes in the building numbering due to the site development plan modifications.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether the buildings close to Valley Avenue needed to be four stories to mitigate noise or whether they could be three stories, Mr. Pavan replied that he did not have that information at this time and would look into it and get back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fox noted that Larry Cannon had recommended the use of something other than faux stone and had strongly recommended that the applicant use another method, such as the use of brick. She noted that Mr. Cannon stated that the applicants did not make those changes and inquired whether staff concurred with Mr. Cannon's recommendations.

Mr. Pavan noted that at this time, the work session was intended to look at the broad, general design concepts. He noted that the detailing items would come back at a later time. He added that the City had been working with the applicant to design a center that would incorporate the elements of the residential, the new retail , and the office buildings.

Commissioner Fox inquired whether staff recommended the elimination of the gas station, and if so, what staff recommended to be placed in that area instead. Mr. Pavan confirmed that staff recommended the elimination of the gas station and that the area could be substituted as a landscape area or provide additional retail space. Staff has not evaluated other uses for the area that could be incorporated.

Commissioner Pearce inquired how tall the existing buildings were in the Bernal Corporate Park complex across Bernal Avenue. Mr. Pavan replied that he did not have that answer at this time but would provide it at a future date.

Commissioner Olson noted that he would wait to make his comments.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the parking numbers were in the neighborhood of five per 1,000 square feet. He requested a breakdown of what was required for the actual office space versus retail use. Mr. Pavan replied that the minimum Code requirements would be three per 1,000 for office, as well as retail. He noted that the applicant had proposed parking ratios that exceed the office and retail standards and that the adequacy of on-site parking would be evaluated in conjunction with a traffic analysis to be done with this development. He stated that in that context, staff had proposed a number of parking spaces but would look to the consultant to ensure that it would be adequate for the proposed uses anticipated for this property.

Chairperson Blank wished to confirm that there would be no drive-through restaurants or services of any kind. Mr. Pavan confirmed that was true and noted that a fast food restaurant could locate in this area but would be a sit-down restaurant only.

Chairperson Blank requested clarification that the second gas station referenced was on the Bernal Property site, and that the first one was the Shell station at Bernal Corners. Mr. Pavan stated that was correct.

In addition to the traffic study, Chairperson Blank inquired whether it was staff's intent to perform a traffic safety analysis as well. Mr. Pavan replied that the scope of the traffic analysis had not been worked out in detail. He added that staff generally looked at traffic safety questions in conjunction with the applications.

Commissioner Fox noted that she was looking at the traffic circles on Valley Avenue on the Master Site Plan and inquired whether what appeared to be a second traffic circle was actually a plaza. Mr. Pavan believed they were enhanced paving and noted that the applicant's designer could clarify that information. Commissioner Fox further inquired whether that was true in the center as well and whether the circulation within the complex

did not include any more traffic circles. Mr. Pavan stated that he did not believe that was the case and noted that the applicant's architect could answer those questions.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Scott Trobbe, South Bay Development Co., applicant, displayed a PowerPoint presentation of the location map and the site plan and described the background of this proposed project, which had originally involved KB Homes and Greenbriar Homes Communities. He noted that many changes had occurred with tenants from the early 2000's. He acknowledged that initially, amenities and services were an important component, and this site was amenity-challenged. He noted that although they had invested a great deal of money in the architectural aspect of this project, they had been compelled to re-evaluate the project in order to create a successful project. He noted that they did not wish to create a bad project and had, therefore, looked at alternatives. He stated that they were pleased that Safeway was open to the changes as well, and they had reached an agreement for Safeway to bring their lifestyle concept to the site, including a 65,000 square foot unique lifestyle store along with a fuel center. He added that this would be augmented with 50,000 square feet of other retail projects and that they had made changes to the balance of this site.

Mr. Trobbe noted that they wanted to make the project a mixed-use project that was pedestrian-friendly and user-friendly; he believed they had accomplished those goal with the help of staff and the comments from Larry Cannon. He added that they believed they had a project that would be beneficial to the community of Pleasanton, particularly in that area. He stated that they believed the architecture and the size of the project would overcome any one structure they may anticipate building, including the fuel center. He noted the concern about the fuel center being at a critical "gateway" to the City and stated that he believed that offsetting it on the corner of Bernal and I-680, away from Valley and Bernal, would be beneficial for the project and the community.

Mr. Trobbe noted that the other 50,000 square feet of retail space would be leased. He added that he had owned property in the Hacienda Business Park since 2000 and understood there was a great deal of emphasis on the Downtown area. He stated that they purposely did not lease any of that space, even though they had a great deal of interest, because they wished to be sensitive to the needs of Downtown. He noted that he had met with Christine Saldivar of the Pleasanton Downtown Association to keep the lines of communication open. He stated that he believed this project would be a good amenity at the Downtown gateway. He added that he had spoken to the Board of Directors of Canyon Oaks and another complex during a pre-development meeting.

Ken Rodriguez, FAIA, project architect, noted that they looked at the project in context with previous approvals on the site and how amenities could be added. He noted that they also examined the overall Bernal area and worked to master plan a project that would complement the area providing additional retail and office. He noted that the amenities would help the office complex as well as the existing residential component. He noted that adjacent open space, residential, as well as the future office complex and

retail environment, would be a benefit. He noted that the office users looked for amenities such as food service, dry cleaners, and other services that would capture trips in such a way that additional trips would not be generated during the noon hour. He stated that he believed this project interfaced with the open space better than the previous project. He displayed a slide presentation that showed the architectural details of the proposed project. He noted that the materials and colors were very warm and rich, including stone, wood, exterior plaster, and larger glass elements that would make the entry elements very open. He added that the interior spaces would be light and airy. He noted that Safeway wished to make this their flagship store. He noted that over 36 percent of the site would be landscaped, with a number of outdoor dining and pedestrian areas.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired why the brick elements were not used instead of stone. He stated that the brick elements would tie the two projects closer together, as opposed to being so different in look. Mr. Rodriguez replied that they had both materials and that he believed the stone and brick worked well together. He noted that if the Commission believed that one material would be better, he would entertain that idea. He added that he liked the idea of adding both brick and stone and that they were both integrated into the retail center and the office building because it was a very large site. He noted that the Downtown area had a large variety of finishes. He stated that they proposed both materials to address the issues of scale. He expressed concern that using only one material may diminish the integrity of the design since it was so large.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he had not noticed both materials and had observed a lot of stone in the office and a lot of brick in the retail.

Commissioner Narum inquired whether she would see a lot of parking if she were to look from the open space south of the project toward the project. Mr. Rodriguez replied that she would not and that they changed the parking scheme in order to screen the parking. He noted that the walkway paths in the previous parking area would be heavily landscaped, acting as a transition buffer. He noted that there was a lot of green as compared to the previous project and that there would be some glimpses of asphalt and cars. He noted that there must be adequate parking and that by increasing the landscaping buffer, the screening would be increased.

Commissioner Olson inquired whether a representative from Safeway was present. Mr. Trobbe replied that they were originally scheduled for April and that the Safeway representatives had planned to attend at that time. He noted that they had a conflict for this hearing but would attend in the future.

Commissioner Olson inquired about the fuel station and noted that every new Safeway he had seen recently had a fuel station. He believed that was a key part of their retail equation in order for the project to be economically viable. He noted that grocery stores were extremely low-margin businesses and that it would make sense for them to sell fuel. He noted that he was a bit put off when he received the package and saw the massing of the buildings. He noted that the color renderings showing the barriers were well done.

He expressed concern that if Safeway would not be able to have the fuel station, they may not locate in the project. He indicated that he did not want to condition the project in such a way that it would not pay for Safeway to do the project.

Mr. Trobbe noted that the staff report was explicit that staff did not want to have a fuel station in the project; the fuel station would be an important and critical piece of the Safeway lifestyle center.

Commissioner Olson asked about the typical traffic pattern in the Safeway area, whether it be a shopper using the store or a car exiting the freeway to buy fuel. He wanted to ensure that the flow of traffic would be considered. He believed the retail would pull pedestrian traffic from the immediate housing area, which would be a positive aspect of the project.

Commissioner Pearce inquired about the nature of a lifestyle store. Mr. Trobbe replied that the lifestyle concept was a result of the changing, more active consumer who would want to buy more healthful prepared meals; the first grocer to grasp that concept was Whole Foods. Safeway intended to provide a similar shopping experience, including walk-in wine rooms, bread hearth, pizza ovens, and fresh entrées; he noted that the Livermore store was a good example of this kind of store. He noted that this store would be unique as Safeway's flagship store; they would have the space to roll out different concepts that would not be possible in other stores. He added that there would be components similar to other lifestyle stores.

Commissioner Fox noted the master site plan and the retail tenant list and inquired what pedestrian path would be taken from Valley Avenue to the retail tenant. She pointed out what appeared to be the end of the path. Mr. Rodriguez pointed out the pedestrian path on the overhead screen and described the route. He noted that they had worked closely with staff and Larry Cannon to enhance the pedestrian walkways and connections.

Commissioner Fox noted that the project looked close to I-680 and inquired what would happen if CalTrans added lanes to I-680. She inquired what the distance was to the I-680 right-of-way. Mr. Rodriguez replied that he would have to look at the dimension site plan and noted that there was a large landscape buffer all along the entire I-680 area, which met the setbacks for the site. He noted that a ring road connected the parking elements; Safeway would have an additional 25 feet of landscape. He noted that the off-ramp was already improved and that there were no plans to widen it. He noted that the landscape setbacks would be similar.

Commissioner Fox inquired whether the blue notation between the buildings was a water feature. Mr. Rodriguez replied that it was a large two-story glass connection which would enable people to see through the entire building to the open space.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether water features would be included in the pedestrian area, Mr. Rodriguez replied they planned to include water features.

With respect to the view from the site to Pleasanton ridge, Commissioner Fox asked whether the viewer would be able to see the ridge or four-story buildings. Mr. Rodriguez noted that was a good question, and that he would bring that back at the public hearing stage. He would like to take a photograph of that spot and drop a building in visually. Commissioner Fox believed that would be useful to the Commission if the visuals could be created from multiple places on the property. She requested that the street view from Downtown towards I-680 and Bernal Avenue be included in the presentation. She noted that she did not want the buildings to obscure the view of the ridge, in the same way that she did not want the lighted sports fields to do the same. She added that she believed that may be a condition and requested staff to verify.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that it was valuable to re-evaluate these aspects of the project and added that had been done significantly since 2000. He noted that none of the building heights had been changed since 2000.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether the developer was tied into Safeway as a tenant or whether it could be Whole Foods, Mr. Trobbe noted that when they started to re-evaluate the project from a retail perspective and considered modifying the site, they believed that only two grocers would be capable of bringing the quality and style to the site: Safeway and Whole Foods. He noted that Whole Foods was focused on a deal in Dublin and would not come to Pleasanton. He noted that he had not been able to persuade Whole Foods to come to Pleasanton. He noted that there would be no other grocers on the balance of the property.

With respect to the office buildings on the south side, Commissioner Fox inquired whether the applicants anticipated having eating establishments within walking distance or whether they would have to drive. Mr. Trobbe replied that he did not know the answer to that question. He added that with the assistance of staff and Larry Cannon, they tried to make the pedestrian connections as inviting as possible, utilizing shade trees and benches and creating sitting areas; they hoped to encourage people to stay on foot instead of using their cars.

Commissioner Fox suggested moving the offices to the corner and inquired whether that would be a good idea. Mr. Rodriguez replied that he believed it would be critical to the retail use to hold a corner and noted that the ease of access would be critical with a corner location. He added that a central location would segment the project enough that there would be three projects and that from a marketing perspective, that would not move the goals of the project forward.

Chairperson Blank noted that the original project had eight buildings and that this project had eight buildings, since one turned into a Safeway. He noted that the layout, square footage, and some of the uses had changed. Mr. Trobbe noted that he believed Chairperson Blank's assessment was correct and that they kept the two buildings along Valley Avenue and the two buildings that fronted I-680. He added that they did not alter

those buildings at all and that two buildings at the south end would be broken up into three smaller buildings, which would allow more flexibility.

Mr. Trobbe noted that he appreciated the valuable comments from the Commission and that they looked forward to working with staff as they move forward with this project.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chairperson Blank noted that staff provided seven questions for the Commission's comments.

- 1. Does the Planning Commission believe that the proposed project implements the applicable goals and policies of the Bernal Property Specific Plan for this proposed project?*

Commissioner Fox noted that she did not believe the gas station conformed to the Bernal Property Specific Plan and did not like the fuel station and wanted it to be removed from the project. She stated that she believed the project looked pretty good and would like to see more connection to the Bernal property, with more of a transition to the rest of the Bernal property. She stated that she was unsure of the gateway and arch at the entrance, although she did not dislike it. She added that she would like to see, in place of the fuel station, a plaza with more green area, possibly a pedestrian-only plaza similar to Main Street Green with the retail shops across the way. She would like it to be an eye-catching, heavily landscaped area going into Pleasanton, perhaps including a water feature, that would set the tone for getting off of Bernal Avenue and going into Pleasanton.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she believed the proposed project implemented the applicable goals and policies of the Specific Plan. She expressed concern about light and glare and would like those issues further addressed in the application. She noted that it was very pedestrian-friendly and that she believed they had done everything possible to encourage pedestrians to use it. She indicated that she would like to see some bike parking.

Commissioner Olson noted that the proposed project implemented the applicable goals and policies of the Specific Plan. He stated that he believed it was a reasonable approach.

Commissioner Narum stated that the proposed project implemented the applicable goals and policies of the Specific Plan, with the exception of whether the development should create a community focal point and gathering place. She expressed concern about the gathering place and stated that she would like to see a plaza with a fountain and seating area separate from a restaurant. She added that she did not believe restaurant seating provided a comparable amenity. She disclosed that she was on at least two Bernal property task forces, and was involved with the writing and visioning process.

Commissioner O'Connor indicated that he believed the proposed project implemented the applicable goals and policies of the Specific Plan.

Chairperson Blank noted that he agreed with Commissioner Olson's comments and that it fit into the Specific Plan. He agreed with Commissioner Pearce's concern about light and glare, as well as noise. He agreed that bike parking would be a good idea. He acknowledged that the Commission did not have many details because this was a workshop. He strongly encouraged the applicant to have accurate viewscales, large color and materials boards. He noted that the visuals recently presented for the Staples Ranch project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) discussion were excellent and recommended that the applicant model their visuals after those visuals. He noted that this was a very strong project in terms of fitting in with the Specific Plan. He agreed with Commissioner Narum's comments to include more of a gathering point, which he noted would fit easily into this project.

2. Does the Planning Commission wish to comment on the type of uses that would be allowed for the commercial and office portions of this development?

Commissioner O'Connor noted that Questions 2 and 4 were enmeshed because one of the uses was a gas station.

Chairperson Blank suggested that Question 4 be addressed at this time as well:

4. Does the Planning Commission support a second service station at this gateway intersection?

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he did not have a problem with the service station and believed it would be an integral part of Safeway's business plan. He indicated that he understood why they wanted and needed it there. He would like to pull the project away from the street on Bernal Avenue and would like to landscape it more heavily so it would not be as visible at the gateway. He was concerned with the sheer square footage of retail being added, excluding the Safeway store. He inquired whether other businesses would be affected by the number of sales and suggested that a lesser square footage of retail may provide the opportunity to move things around and screen the fuel station. He noted that more open space would be provided as well. He indicated that he was pleased that there would not be convenience markets or drive-through restaurants.

Commissioner Narum stated that she had looked at the list of uses and inquired whether they were limited to known businesses. Chairperson Blank noted that the language referred to an example of retail tenants. He agreed with the applicant's desire to not detract from retail. She noted that having the gas station would be acceptable and suggested rotating it 90 degrees so that only one bay was visible from the street instead of five. She requested that they do a better job of stacking than the one in Dublin.

With respect to Question 2, Commissioner Olson noted that he was originally put off by the building massing but noted that they looked great on the overhead screen. He noted

that was a convincing argument that the mass worked to reduce freeway noise into the housing area. He indicated that four stories was reasonable in the middle section. He noted that Exhibit F included an In 'N Out Burger and had never seen one that was not a drive-through; he suggested that it be stricken from the list.

With respect to Question 4, Commissioner Olson stated that he supported the fuel station and noted that the possibility of rotating it was a good idea, possibly in conjunction with re-examining the amount of retail space in the project, with the exception of Safeway.

Commissioner Pearce agreed that convenience markets should not be allowed as well as with staff's recommendation regarding medical facilities. With respect to the concept of the Safeway lifestyle center at the City's gateway, she stated that she could not support a gas station. She noted that there was already a gas station at the Jack in the Box restaurant and that having a great number of gas stations may not be necessary. She noted that this store would compete with uses similar to Whole Foods and that she had not seen a gas station at Whole Foods. She added that she did not see how it would be an integral part to her idea of an appropriate gateway. She noted that it would be counterproductive to have a gas station in a center that tried to promote alternative energy and transportation modes. She stated that the uses were good.

Commissioner Fox agreed with Commissioner Pearce that the gas station should not be there. She stated that she did not believe the City Council would support a gas station there as well. She inquired what kind of alternate retail could be placed there if Safeway was not in the plan. She suggested that it may be an appropriate place for a Target. She recalled Commissioner O'Connor's comment about additional retail on Bernal Avenue and inquired whether the additional retail would cause blight and empty stores in a portion of town closer to Downtown. She stated that this should be carefully examined as well as the effect on existing businesses. She suggested having several options, including mixing the retail uses at Bernal Avenue and Valley Avenue such as senior housing. She indicated that she was not convinced that the retail at the corner of Valley Avenue and Bernal Avenue would be anything other than commercial freeway-oriented businesses. She noted the fuel station may become a draw from the freeway for people who just want to buy fuel and was concerned that the intersection would end up with retail that was commercial freeway-oriented. She expressed her preference that it remain a neighborhood-serving retail development.

Chairperson Blank did not object to most of the uses that were indicated and noted there was a shortage of nice sit-down restaurants in Pleasanton. He would not want to see an In 'n Out Burger with no drive-through in that it would still be a fast food restaurant. He had no issue with the fuel station and stated that it could be rotated 90 degrees and be shielded properly. He noted that a condition could be added to disallow "Fuel Next Exit" signs to discourage freeway traffic. He stated that the Commission should support Safeway, which was a Pleasanton company.

3. *Is the Planning Commission satisfied with the measures shown on the plans to screen/buffer the view of the Safeway service area from the Bernal Avenue off-ramp?*

Commissioner Fox indicated that she was unsure of the answer to this question and expressed concern about the project's proximity to the freeway. She stated that she believed the whole project should have more of a buffer from the freeway and should be moved 20 feet or so away from the freeway with more screening for the back of Safeway. She believed the back of Safeway would be an eyesore without screening.

Commissioner Pearce would like to see visuals and a landscaping plan, which would enable her to determine the answer to this question. She noted that visuals of Bernal Avenue from I-680 and the future park would help her determine this issue.

Commissioner Olson agreed with Chairperson Blank's comments about ample use of landscaping as a good start in screening the service area. He noted that more landscaping would be needed.

Commissioner Narum agreed with Commissioner Olson's comments regarding screening.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that more detailed visuals would be needed to determine the amount of screening. He agreed that rotating the service station, increasing setbacks, and increasing screening should be shown in the visuals.

Chair Blank agreed with the previous comments and would like drivers coming off the freeway to see this project as a park-like environment with more screening from the freeway perspective.

5. *Is the Planning Commission satisfied with the overall architectural design of the office and retail buildings?*

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he would like to see more detail and noted that contemporary metal overhangs were used. He suggested maintaining a "Pleasanton look" and noted that using a more modern look would not detract from that. He noted that canvas awnings and wooden beams were good but was concerned about the metal elements.

Commissioner Narum liked the architecture on the office buildings but was concerned with the visual along Bernal on the last page of the staff report. She suggested that it have a more open look to appear more like a village or a park to draw people in. She suggested rotating the gas station 90 degrees and adding a water feature with some greenery. She was concerned about the streetscape with tower elements and would like to see fewer towers and more articulation and detail on them as well as on the building façades. She indicated that the gateway could be showcased better. She stated that she liked the concept of the paths and would like to see more attention to the retail building along Bernal Avenue.

Commissioner Olson noted that the Pleasanton look was eclectic, including the Hacienda look, with large office buildings. He stated that he liked these buildings as shown on the screen and believed they made a statement about the City. He stated that the plaza may pull from Downtown, which would not be helpful for Downtown. He noted that plazas should be located Downtown with the foot traffic and shoppers as well. He stated that he would not be opposed to taking a hard look at the retail part of the architecture.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with the previous comments and would like to see the use of natural materials to blend with the natural environment surrounding the site. She cited Northstar Village, which blended into the natural elements without a lot of massing. She liked the pedestrian areas and would like to keep people from driving up and down Bernal Avenue during the noon hour.

Commissioner Fox stated that she believed the office buildings looked like cookie-cutter rectangles to her and thought they were boring. She noted that a lot of effort was put into the fire station at Bernal Corners, which was attractive. She hoped that something more cutting edge could be done to the office buildings to make them look more like the fire station or the old Netscape complex in Mountain View along Middlefield Road or perhaps the Google complex. She agreed with Commissioner Narum's comments regarding the street elevation. She noted that a green space or plaza could be placed where the gas station is planned. She indicated that she did not believe the plaza would detract from Downtown. She noted that the three sets of retail looked almost identical and that better elements, such as pitched roofs, could be used instead of a tower element near a flat-strip shopping center. She noted that she had hoped for a more creative appearance. She noted that the office buildings closest to Valley Avenue should be reduced to three stories. She stated that she would like to buffer the uses on the other side and believed it would be beneficial to look at noise-absorbing materials. She did not want the project to become an echo chamber and would like to ensure that the materials mitigated the noise.

Chairperson Blank would like to see the visuals for four stories and decide what impact it would have on the ridgeline. He noted that the office buildings needed more articulation, and liked the see-through feature. He believed the office buildings were somewhat cookie-cutter and suggested that the applicant work with Ms. Decker to explain the "Pleasanton look." He stated that color renderings and a landscape plan could improve the appearance of the project and noted that the black-and-white drawings resembled either a strip mall or a prison.

6. Does the Planning Commission support the design of the site utilizing low water use plant materials that support the water efficiency standards?

Commissioner Fox stated that she would like to see more turf areas where the gas station is currently located. She would like to see more aesthetically pleasing elements, such as water features and a plan showing where they will be. She was more concerned about proper landscaping and transitions than low water. She would like the signs and

monument signs to be softened with plantings and did not want to see cacti at the gateway.

Commissioner Pearce supported low-water use plant materials and ideally would like to see California native plant species, particularly since EBMUD had requested lower water usage. She would like to see less grass and more creative use of cobblestones.

Commissioner Olson echoed Commissioner Pearce's comments and pointed out that the area immediately around a fuel station will not require any irrigation.

Commissioner Narum supported low-water use plant materials as well as the use of native plants and low water usage. She noted that Livermore had a native plant garden, which was beautiful.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed with the plan utilizing low water usage. He stated that there were grasses and ground cover that require very little water and noted that this was a 40-acre site that would have a lot of parking and hardscape. He indicated that the hardscape should be softened with low water-consuming vegetation.

Chairperson Blank agreed with Commissioner O'Connor's comments and stated that low water usage was very important. He stated that grasses should be chosen carefully to avoid over-watering. He indicated that he hoped that as the applicant designed the buildings, they kept energy efficiency and LEED standards in mind. He encouraged the applicant to exceed the minimum number of points in their total energy profile.

7. Regarding monument signs, would the Planning Commission prefer to see photomontages for a 6-, 8- and 12-foot tall proposal?

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he would like to see the photomontages. He would not be interested in seeing a 12-foot-tall monument sign but would need to see the proposed visual.

Commissioner Narum would like to see photomontages for anything above six feet.

Commissioner Olson agreed with Commissioner Narum's comments. He inquired what Safeway's anticipated freeway signage plan would be and noted that it was a sensitive point.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she always wanted to see photomontages and did not want Pleasanton to look like a truck stop.

Commissioner Fox wanted to see photomontages and noted that the signs should be shorter. She stated that she did not want to see 8- or 12-foot signs and would like to implement a sign program for this project. She recalled the gas station and Jack in the Box project and the sensitivity of their signage. She would like the signs to be tasteful and did not want to see light pollution, given the proposed 24-hour operation.

Chairperson Blank wanted to see photomontages and noted that 12 feet seemed too high for a monument sign. He believed the applicant should be very sensitive to the Commission's strong desire not to have this use look like a truck stop.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Olson regarding whether there was a current development agreement, Mr. Pavan replied that there was. Commissioner Olson requested that staff bring the agreement and its modifications to the next hearing. Mr. Pavan stated that he would.

Commissioner Narum requested feedback from the Parks and Recreation Commission or the Trails Ad Hoc Committee to ensure the trails would be tied to the pedestrian walkways as well as whether the half-circle was properly placed. She stated that the Trails Ad Hoc Committee meetings were better attended than the Parks and Recreation Commission meetings because of the community interest.

The Commissioners concurred with that suggestion and indicated that they would like to have that happen before the project came back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Pearce would like more information on cities that have two Safeway's as well as cities of a similar size that can support eight grocery stores. She stated that she believed Safeway had performed its research and economic analysis.

With respect to Commissioner Olson's question about the development agreement, Ms. Decker stated that as part of the entitlements, the applicant had requested an extension of the existing development agreement, which will include language updating the document. The document will expire in 2010, and the applicant has requested an extension to 2015. She noted that staff would discuss the office structures with the applicant and added that the office buildings were part of the development agreement, with the architecture as shown. She noted that with respect to Commissioner Pearce's request for a market analysis, Safeway has performed such an analysis. She added that staff will return with several fiscal analyses, including the impact of this development on other businesses, as well as what other revenues would likely be. She added that color samples and renderings would be presented as well.

No action was taken.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(Note: Staff confirms any proposed changes by reviewing the recorded proceedings prior to finalizing the Minutes.)

Chairperson Blank noted that the second and third sentences under Section 3.2, Air Quality on page 11 be modified to read as follows: "He indicated that he knows the concentrations of carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons would be addressed but that not a lot of people know that *leaded fuel is used in general aviation aircraft* ~~diesel powered airplanes use a lot of fuel~~. He stated that he would like to make sure that the

recommendations for health assessment not be limited to diesel particulates but also address all the health hazards, *including lead*, that might be potentially involved....”

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the Minutes of May 14, 2008, as amended. Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum and Pearce.
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: Commissioners Fox, O’Connor, and Olson.
RECUSED: None.
ABSENT: None.

The motion passed.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

- a. Discussion of the types of projects to be placed on the Consent Calendar.

No discussion was held or action taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

- a. **Future Planning Calendar**

PCUP-208, Pleasanton Community Church

Commissioner Fox noted that on page 2, it states that Pleasanton Community Church sought to relocate the after-school childcare facility. She noted that she had discussed this issue with Ms. Decker and believed that the original uses approved as a tutoring facility had become more of a childcare facility. She noted that she had visited this location and noted that there were two vans picking up children at elementary school sites and inquired whether the operation could be clarified prior to taking action or processing the proposed application. She requested staff to verify that the use was in conformance with the existing use permit.

Ms. Decker noted that staff would look into whether the applicant was operating in accordance with their use permit. She noted that this use permit was requested because the Church is relocating to a different building on-site.

Commissioner Fox stated that she would appreciate a determination as to whether it is in conformance with its current use permit at the existing location before they move.

PDRW-6, Jacob Reeves, T-Mobile

Chairperson Blank inquired whether PDRW-6 would return to the Commission. Ms. Decker noted that PDRW-6 had not been withdrawn, but the proposal to increase the tower height had been withdrawn. They were looking at a different design solution.

Commissioner Fox requested that staff determined whether this site would be within 300 feet of the Beth Emek Pre-School and noted that the wireless ordinance stated a wireless facility would be at least 300 feet from a licensed childcare facility. Ms. Decker noted that staff would return with that information.

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.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

- a. Brief report on conferences, seminars, and meetings attended by Commission Members

No discussion was held or action taken.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Blank adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary