



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, May 30, 2007 **Special Meeting**

(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 30, 2007 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Fox.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Donna Decker, Principal Planner; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Otto, 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.

Chairperson Fox thanked staff and all the Commissioners for the extra time and effort put forth during the four weeks of consecutive meetings.

Chairperson Fox suggested that Approval of the Minutes be deferred to the end of the meeting.

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**

Ms. Decker noted that staff would like to move Item 5.b., PDR-602, Michael O'Callaghan, to be heard as the first item in Public Hearings.

Chairperson Fox noted that Item 5.a., PAUP-4, Jennifer Hosterman, was continued to a future meeting.

Chairperson Fox noted that Item 6.a., PCUP-185, Generations Healthcare, was continued to a future meeting.

Chairperson Fox noted that Item 6.b., PUD-55, Michael Carey, was continued to June 27 2007.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

a. **PAUP-4, Jennifer A. Hosterman**

Application for an animal use permit to allow a red-tailed hawk to be kept in the rear yard accessory structure of an existing residence located at 2922 Chardonnay Drive. Zoning for the property is R-1-6,500 (Single-Family Residential) District.

This item was continued to a future meeting.

b. **PDR-602, Michael O'Callaghan**

Application for design review approval to demolish the existing building (former Union Jack Pub) located at 725 Main Street and construct a two-story commercial building in its place. Zoning for the property is C-C (Central Commercial) District, Downtown Revitalization District, and Core Area Overlay District.

Steve Otto presented the staff report and described the background, scope, color palette, and layout of this proposed project.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding fire sprinkler systems, Mr. Otto confirmed that Condition No. 71 would require the entire building to be sprinklered.

Commissioner Blank noted that he was surprised to read in Condition No. 46 that demolition and construction would be allowed on Saturdays. Mr. Otto noted that the standard construction language was used and added that in some Downtown projects, the applicant was allowed to start working an hour earlier during the week when Saturday hours were excluded, at the discretion of the Commission.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding the kind of restaurant allowed, Mr. Otto replied that any restaurant was allowed by right but that if it chose to serve alcohol, that service must stop at 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Narum noted that she met with the applicant on Memorial Day.

Commissioner Olsen noted that he met with the applicant on Memorial Day and added that the package the Commissioners were sent had a picture of a building with a dormer that had been removed. He had since received a new picture, and while he did not like the colors shown on the picture, he liked the dormer effect very much. He inquired why that picture was not in the packet. Mr. Otto replied that he had not seen that picture before and that it had not been submitted to staff.

Chairperson Fox disclosed that she had met with applicant together with Commissioner O'Connor.

Commissioner Blank believed the CUP for the Union Jack Pub was done in the late 1980s and that it was very broad at that time, leading to difficulties in defining possible revocation circumstances. Mr. Otto noted that the Union Jack Pub conditions had been modified to be tightened to reflect the Planning Commission's recent approvals of bars. He noted that he had copies of the Union Jack Pub's modified conditions for the Commissioners' review.

Ms. Decker summarized the revisions made by the Planning Commission and City Council on the original use permit conditions for the Union Jack Pub (UP-88-17) as follows: Condition No. 3 regarding the hours of operations; Condition No. 6 regarding the maintenance of the area surrounding the restaurant/bar; Condition No. 8 regarding the fencing between the restaurant/bar and the adjacent properties; and Condition No. 11 regarding the six-month review of the use permit.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Michael O'Callaghan, applicant, introduced project architect Charles Huff.

Charles Huff, project architect, described the architectural changes of the project and noted that they wished to introduce the first outdoor eating second-floor deck over a sidewalk on Main Street. The approach to the glass area in front would enable them to open the doors up on nice summer evenings. He noted that they would be able to include the gable if desired by the Commission. He noted that the decisions to be made entailed the color, roof, and gable/no gable.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding the possibility of using stained glass, Mr. Huff replied that may be used for a sign, if desired. He noted that there were many buildings that were white or beige, and they designed the building to be less nondescript, using a rust color similar to the Casa Del Roso restaurant in Dublin and Livermore. He noted that they could also use more of an adobe color.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that he would not want to see the same white/tan color palette repeated in this building as the rest along Main Street and added that it would look like a tract of homes of the same color.

Commissioner Blank agreed with Commissioner O'Connor's concerns regarding the color palette.

Mr. O'Callaghan noted that he intended to have an authentic color and that the West Coast Mission style was white and off-white; Southwest styles utilized a pastel/rust palette. He noted that the Pleasanton Downtown Association liked the rust color and noted that if the Planning Commission desired white, he could enliven the building with flowers and foliage. He noted that he had worked with staff for over a year. He did not know how the dormer had been removed from the elevations that staff had and added that he liked it and would provide staff with copies. He noted that they intended to maximize the outdoor dining element, and when the doors were opened, the 75 indoor seats could be considered outdoor dining. He believed the second-floor outdoor dining deck would be a great success and noted that it could stay open longer than the downstairs element. He noted that they had considered using the split-faced block, that they had a more contemporary building than when they switched to the Spanish style, and that using a slumpstone was discussed. He noted that slumpstone could be made in any color and added that he also considered stuccoing the entire building. However, he would rather invest in the front of the building, and use masonry slumpstone on the sides of the building, which would be less visually prominent. He noted that they would work with staff to make the building as attractive as possible. He noted that the front doors and upper transoms would have stained glass, designed for the building or for a tenant; the doors would open completely downstairs. He had agreed to work with staff with respect to the planting, and if the Commission had a specific interest in a particular kind of vine, he would be amenable to that. Mr. O'Callaghan noted that the walkways would be an inviting area rather than a dark hazard.

Commissioner O'Connor expressed concern about the hanging planter baskets possibly obscuring the stained glass. Mr. O'Callaghan agreed that it was important not to overdo the landscaping elements and noted that they would work with the landscape architect to enhance and not overdecorate the building.

Commissioner Blank stated that he would like to see a landscaping plan.

Commissioner Narum indicated that staff had a legitimate concern about the landscaping pots at the base making the walkway less accessible. She would like a condition to guarantee that landscaping would be included.

Mr. O'Callaghan stated that he would be happy with some climbing vines, hanging baskets on wrought iron brackets, or both.

Al Bronzini, 719 Main Street, noted that he was the next-door neighbor to the former Union Jack Pub and owned the antique furniture market. He believed the buildings were between six to ten inches apart. He noted that he liked the appearance of the dormer and that he was not concerned that the new building would be substantially taller than his building. He expressed concern about the proximity of the construction to his new roof;

he did not want workers to walk on his new roof. He requested that the construction workers of this building, which he favored, not use his roof as a working platform.

Peter MacDonald noted that he had a Downtown business and was very happy to see this project move forward. He believed the applicant had worked well with the neighbors and encouraged the Planning Commission to approve the project.

Mr. O'Callaghan stated that he agreed with all of the conditions except one, Condition No. 71, which was the requirement to place automatic fire sprinklers in the building. He noted that the proposed size was much smaller than the 8,000-square-foot threshold the current Code requires.

Mr. O'Callaghan noted that in every case, insurance companies charged substantially more for buildings with sprinkler systems because the insurance companies pay out significantly more for water damage resulting from the activation of the sprinkler system than the cost of saving the structure. He wished to emphasize that the Uniform Building Code, Uniform Fire Code, the California Building and Fire Codes, and the Pleasanton Building and Fire Codes all covered new construction and added that people complained about the cost of construction, development, and the price of the buildings and homes. He noted that this was one reason for that occurrence. He added that he could make an equally good case for a building with or without fire sprinkler systems. He noted that there were very few fires now because people were so savvy and that he was unsure whether it would be dollars wisely spent.

With respect to the fire sprinklers, Ms. Decker noted that there had been recent concern by the Planning Commission as far as having new commercial construction under the 8,000-square-foot threshold along with single-family residential developments. As a result of the continuing conversations related to revising the Code to require fire protection sprinklers for all new construction, staff had been regularly conditioning all commercial and residential projects for sprinkler requirements. She advised that this has become the standard condition embraced by the City on all projects. She also noted where staff had not included the condition, it had been added by the Commission.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding the nature of slumpstone, Mr. Huff replied that slumpstone was designed to replicate adobe block and described the fabrication process. He noted that if the stucco finish were to be chosen, they would need to set up a staging area on the Bronzini property. He noted that the slumpstone was not inexpensive and served as a one- to three-hour firewall as well.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that there were many detailed conditions in the application that required returning to the Planning Director and inquired whether the applicant would rather work on those items first.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS RE-OPENED.

Mr. Huff noted that they would like to move ahead, and he had no problems working with staff. He noted that he would be willing to work the issues out at staff level.

Commissioner Pearce inquired how the building would look nice with the use of the slumpstone only on the front façade. Mr. Huff noted that the use of the slumpstone was architecturally correct and noted that there were many buildings in town that used additional architectural elements on the front elevation to enhance the appearance. He noted that slumpstone was used as a general wall surface.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Ms. Decker addressed this project's requirements to return to the Planning Director, which staff supported. She noted that staff appreciated flexibility and that various architectural facades had been presented. She stated that Condition No. 1 indicated that minor changes to the plans may be made subject to the approval of the Planning Director and that if the Commission would like a dormer, that would not be considered a minor change and would need to come back. She encouraged the Commissioners to consider carefully the features that they were discussing in order to have enhanced flexibility.

A discussion of the parapet and the HVAC units on the roof ensued.

Chairperson Fox moved to approve PDR-602 as recommended by staff, with a modification to add language to Condition No. 1 to indicate that the Commission approves the flat roof with a dormer and the rust color and that removal of the dormer or substantial changes to the roof line will be approved by the Zoning Administrator and appealable to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Blank noted that he could not support that motion.

Commissioner Narum added that she could not support the motion.

Chairperson Fox modified the motion, deleting the phrase that allows the removal of the dormer or changes to the roofline to be approved by the Zoning Administrator and be appealable to the Commission.

The modification was acceptable to Commissioner Blank and Commissioner Narum.

Chairperson Fox proposed a modification to the first sentence of Condition No. 19 to indicate that stucco finish will be utilized on two elevations of the building and slumpstone on the side elevations of the building.

Commissioner Blank noted that he could not support that addition and believed that the slumpstone should be subject to the approval of the Planning Director throughout the building; otherwise, stucco could be utilized.

Commissioner Narum added that she could not support the addition.

Commissioner Blank suggested the following modification: “The stucco finish will be utilized on two elevations of the building, and slumpstone, with color, quality, and finish, subject to the approval of the Planning Director, shall be on side elevations of the building.”

Chairperson Fox proposed to modify Condition No. 30 to include support posts or the addition of vines on columns to provide flexibility.

Commissioners Blank, Narum, and Pearce advised they could not support that addition.

Chairperson Fox proposed to modify Condition No. 43 to indicate that the restaurant tenant will be able to have a business that complies with the conditions for PAP-76/UP-88-17, but any changes will require obtaining a conditional use permit for those changes as required by the Municipal Code.

Commissioner Blank believed that would be redundant because the conditional use permit went with the land.

Chairperson Fox noted that was the boilerplate for an applicant wishing to serve alcohol past 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Harryman suggested that the condition be struck as this was an application for design review approval.

Chairperson Fox would like to add a condition to allow construction on Saturdays as the site is not near a residential area.

Commissioner O’Connor noted that it would allow the construction to be completed sooner.

Chairperson Fox proposed the deletion of Condition No. 71 regarding the installation of an automatic fire sprinkler system as the building is less than 8,000 square feet, and the applicant indicated it would be cost an additional \$100,000.

Commissioner Blank noted that he would not support that proposal for the following reasons: there were no data regarding the applicant’s statement regarding the cost of water damage versus saving a structure; the applicant’s data contradicted the data received during the consideration of the Fire Sprinkler Ordinance; the Planning Commission requested the Sprinkler Ordinance to be prioritized by the City Council on their work plan; it was suggested that the Planning Commission condition sprinklers in lieu of the ordinance; and he believed it was terribly unfair and inconsistent to not condition certain projects. He noted further that the Commission had conditioned all residential projects and commercial buildings, regardless of size, with sprinklers.

Commissioner Narum stated that she could not support the withdrawal of the condition of approval and wanted the sprinklers left in the plan.

Commissioner Olsen agreed, and noted that the crowding of the buildings made it important to require that this building be sprinklered.

Commissioner O'Connor believed it would be inconsistent to not require sprinklers.

Chairperson Fox noted that she would withdraw that part of the motion.

Commissioner Blank proposed the addition of a condition requiring that prior to the start of construction or access by the applicant to the roof of the 719 Main Street building, a roof inspection by a professional, independent third party be completed and documented in a written report with photographs, at the cost to the applicant, and that upon completion of the construction of building at 725 Main Street, a re-inspection of the roof be done and any noted defects would be corrected by the applicant, at the cost to the applicant and to the neighbors' satisfaction.

Commissioner Narum believed that should take place prior to demolition.

Commissioner Blank was agreeable to that change.

Ms. Decker noted that should occur prior to demolition or issuance of a building permit.

Commissioner Narum would like the pavers extended to the north property line but not including the small alleyway.

**Chairperson Fox moved to reopen the public hearing.
Commissioner Olsen seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Blank indicated that he was amenable to reopening the public hearing to get clarification, but he did not want to reopen the debate of subjects already addressed.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The motion passed.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS RE-OPENED.

Mr. O’Callaghan noted that he would like Planning and Engineering to look at the site and agreed that the pavers should come to the north. He appreciated the effort by staff and the Commission and indicated that he was ready to start work. He again appealed to the Commissioners to not require fire protection sprinklers and to delete Condition No. 71.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chairperson Fox noted that staff would determine the dividing line with respect to the pavers.

Ms. Decker summarized the modifications to the motion:

- 1. Modify Condition No. 1 to indicate that the Commission shall approve the flat roof with the dormer and the rust color, as approved by the Planning Director and shall have color swatches placed on the building for review and approval by the Planning Director.**
- 2. Modify Condition No. 19 to indicate that the east and west elevation shall be stucco, and the north and south shall be of slumpstone, with color, quality, and finish subject to review and approval by the Planning Director, and including grouting techniques and color.**
- 4. Delete Condition No. 43 regarding alcoholic beverage service after 10:00 p.m.**
- 5. Add a new condition that prior to issuance of a demolition or building permit, the roof at the adjacent property at 719 Main Street be inspected by an independent third-party consultant chosen by the Planning Director or his designee, and a written report with photographs be prepared by the consultant, at the cost to the applicant. At the completion of the project, another inspection shall be completed, and any noted defects shall be repaired at the applicant’s expense and to the satisfaction of the Planning Director, such that the roof is returned to its original condition prior to the construction of the building at 725 Main Street.**
- 6. Pavers shall be placed in front of the building to a north edge or north limit along with the building, as reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.**

Condition No. 30 regarding the planters, and Condition No. 71 regarding the automatic fire sprinkler system, remain unchanged.

Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution No. PC-2007-28 approving PDR-602 was entered and adopted as motioned.

Chairperson Fox called for a recess at 8:40 p.m.

The hearing reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

Commissioner O'Connor left the meeting during the recess.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

- a. PCUP-185, Steve Black, Generations HealthCare of Pleasanton, LLC**
Applications for: (1) a modification to a previously approved conditional use permit (UP-71-13, Pleasanton Convalescent Hospital) to increase the number of beds from 129 to 139 at the existing convalescent hospital; and (2) a variance from the Pleasanton Municipal Code to reduce the required parking from 125 spaces to the existing 99 spaces. The property is located at 300 Neal Street and is zoned P (Public & Institutional) District.

This item was continued to a future meeting.

- b. PUD-55, Michael Carey and Steve Maestas**
Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning of an approximately 0.24-acre parcel from RM-15 (Multiple-Family Residential) District and Core Area Overlay District to PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District and Core Area Overlay District; and development plan approval to demolish two existing residential units, renovate one existing residential unit, and construct four new single-family homes for a total of five residential units, at the property located at 225 West Angela Street.

This item was continued to June 27, 2007.

- c. PREV-656, CarrAmerica**
Work Session to review and receive comments on an application for preliminary review to expand the existing CarrAmerica Corporate Center to include:
- two (2) 165,000-square-foot six-story office buildings with orientation toward I-580;
 - one (1) 150,271-square-foot six-story office building with orientation toward Owens Drive;
 - a 93,000-square-foot five-story 130-room hotel with a 10,000-square-foot retail space on the ground floor; and
 - three (3) four- to five-story parking structures with a building profile of three to four stories (with roof-deck parking).

The project site is located at 4400-4460 Rosewood Drive in Hacienda Business Park and is zoned PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial-Office) District.

Commissioner Blank disclosed that he worked in an office in the Hacienda Business Park but that it was not located near the subject site; he had no involvement with real estate or facilities.

Chairperson Fox disclosed that she had worked in this complex ten years ago and that she had attended a charrette five years ago to discuss modifications to the Hacienda Business Park.

Ms. Decker introduced the applicants who would provide the presentation of the conceptual designs. She wished to clarify that the Hacienda Business Park was comprised of two phases: Phase I comprised 5.25 million square feet; and Phase II, containing this development, was approximately 4.63 million square feet of development. The Park consists of a total of approximately 9.89 million square feet. She noted they were under two different PUD approvals: Phase I was approved under PUD-81-30, and Phase II under PUD-85-05. She noted that retail use was not allowed in the zoning, which would require a PUD rezone. She added that Hacienda Business Park had ample parking of 1:250 spaces where the Code requires 1:300, although there was no issue with the difference. Ms. Decker noted that page 6 contained a discussion, asking the Planning Commission to consider whether the building height was acceptable. The Hacienda Design Guidelines allow a maximum of six stories and 85.5 feet of building height; therefore, staff would like to retract that question because it was allowed.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Matt Edwards, Director Development, CarrAmerica, noted that John Gold, Vice President, CarrAmerica, could not attend this hearing. He noted that the corporate campus in an underutilized business park had the potential to house the next large employer in Pleasanton and be an economic driver for the community. They believed the mixed-use concept would benefit the City and the existing conference center and will create a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Doug Dahlin, Dahlin Group, project architect, displayed a PowerPoint presentation to describe the overview of the proposed project. He noted that they intended to move away from the previous standard of acres of surface parking in business parks and that the structured parking would allow for greater use of the land. He stated that they would like to create buildings that would address the street in a different manner with more steps and pedestrian linkage from the street to the building. He described the features of the proposed project and displayed the screening of the parking decks. He believed the additional hotel would be an appropriate and valuable use at that site. He displayed and described the different design approaches of the various buildings and the proposed hotel as well as the strong gateway elements of the project. He noted that they intended to

utilize green building techniques, and that the buildings would be more appropriately designed.

At the request of Commissioner Narum, Mr. Dahlin commented on the sign, stating that they had discussed hotel operators and felt strongly that the best spot for the hotel was on Owens Drive and Rosewood Drive from a planning and hotelier standpoint. He noted that in addition to the CarrAmerica sign, they would like some kind of identification on I-580 that their hotel was available.

Commissioner Blank did not believe the hotel should be placed right next to the freeway. He inquired that if all the approvals and financing were in place by January 1, 2008, the applicants had given any thought to construction phases and approximate durations for each phase.

Mr. Edwards noted that would be a market-driven scenario and added that the rates in the area did not support new construction. He added that they had been approached by several very large users who cannot find a site else that would be interested in doing a pre-lease and pay-over market. He noted that they were not hotel developers but that he could speak of the demand studies in the area. He added that the more office space they had, the more demand the hotel would have. He estimated that the construction period may be 18 months if all the leasing were to be in place; the individual buildings may take 14 months, and the parking structure would need to be built concurrently.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Pearce regarding whether there were any concerns related to the glare from the east/west-facing glazing near a street, Mr. Dahlin replied that there would be concerns and believed that was a good point. He added that they would likely use a non-reflective material.

Martin Interbitzen, CarrAmerica, 4218 Casterson Court, wished to clarify a point in the staff report on page 4 regarding land use. He noted that they would like to be very respectful of the entitlements that the existing property owners in Hacienda Business Park have. He believed the staff report stated that the 1.6 million square feet that was not built was approved and that various property owners were entitled to that 1.6 million square feet. He noted that they were currently in discussions with those property owners and hoped that by the time an application was made, they would be able to present an approach to the Commission regarding where the additional square footage for this corporate center will come from. It was not their intent to focus on that issue as part of this design review study session.

Peter MacDonald, 400 Main Street, noted that he was working with BRE and that these projects generally had PUDs or development agreements. The unbuilt 1.6 million square feet was all square footage owned by other property owners who paid for the North Pleasanton Improvement District, including the five freeway interchanges and the other North Pleasanton improvements. He believed it was premature to have a discussion regarding the disposition of the square footage and suggested following Mr. Interbitzen's guidance with respect to that issue, especially prior to a more detailed traffic discussion.

James Paxson, General Manager of Hacienda Business Park, noted that they were very excited about the project and believed it would be a great opportunity. He echoed the earlier comments about what a good fit the buildings would be within Hacienda Business Park and how it contributed to the future maturation of the Park. He noted that the design had not yet come before the Park's design review committee and added that the Commission's input would be very important to them.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Narum regarding whether the Business Park would be amenable to a hotel, which was not currently a permitted use on the site, Mr. Paxson replied that they would be amenable to a hotel. He noted that there was a process to change uses on-site and that he believed there would be support for it. He noted that the current hotels are clustered on the other side of the park and believed that a hotel in this location would be a valuable amenity. He noted that with the influx of new tenants, the Business Park was approaching the employment levels of mid-2001.

Commissioner Blank noted that he would rather keep the hotel tax revenue in Pleasanton rather than sending it to one of Pleasanton's sister cities.

A discussion of the type and location of the current hotels in Pleasanton ensued.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Olson regarding the distance of the planned BART station from the proposed site, Mr. Paxson replied that it was within a mile.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chairperson Fox noted that she had received Commissioner O'Connor's notes prior to his departure from the meeting. She invited comment from each Commissioner regarding the project and then the Commission would address each section separately.

Commissioner Pearce believed this project was a good one and that a hotel was sorely needed in this area. She believed that utilizing this area more effectively would be a great idea.

Commissioner Blank agreed with Commissioner Pearce's comments and liked the hotel very much as well as the first-floor retail. He would like to see a bigger hotel because hotel rooms were scarce in the area.

Commissioner Olson suggested building the hotel first and was pleased to see the number of potential large pre-lease tenants. He complimented the applicants for designing the parking garage that is totally surrounded by trees. He had inquired about BART because it would be possible that the addition of busing would bring a more transit-oriented flavor to the development and would help the traffic.

Commissioner Narum noted that she liked the hotel and its location in another part of town. She was very pleased to hear that the berming on Owens Drive would stay and

would like to address that with respect to the parking garage on Rosewood Drive. She liked the idea of using the land and filling in, as opposed to having a continual sprawl.

Chairperson Fox noted that she liked the design of the two buildings next to the freeway but would like to see them moved back a little. She noted that she would like there to be room to accommodate a possible widening of I-580. She believed there were some opportunities for underground parking, similar to those in Mountain View and Palo Alto.

The Commissioners then presented their comments on the different areas.

Land Use

Is the proposed hotel use acceptable? Should the proposed square footage be part of the remaining 1.6 million square feet, or should it be in addition to the originally approved 9.5 million square feet?

Ms. Decker echoed the applicant's comments that this question should not be considered at this time and that there was not enough information to receive comment from the Planning Commission.

Site Plan

Is the positioning of the building acceptable, and is the locations of the parking garages acceptable?

Commissioner Narum believed that generally, the locations of the building were acceptable. She liked the hotel where it is, as opposed to closer to the freeway; she did not like staying in a hotel room next to a freeway. She liked having the two large parking garages up against the arroyo and out of sight. She would like to discuss the four-story parking structure on Rosewood Drive. She noted that many people did not use the parking structure on the corner of Hopyard Road and Stoneridge Drive because it was set low and screened behind the berming. She would like berming to be utilized for the four-story structure to minimize the view from Rosewood Drive.

Commissioner Olson echoed Commissioner Narum's comments relative to the location of the hotel. Regarding the parking structure, he believed that grading the site to bring the structure down would drive the cost up. He noted that there would be the potential for I-580 to be widened to the point where it may encroach on Rosewood Drive. He generally favored the locations.

Chairperson Fox would like to see the four-story parking garage next to the retail area on Rosewood Drive eliminated; she would like that area to remain landscaped. She believed the four-story parking garage next to the arroyo could be increased by one story to make up for the loss of the other garage, and she believed there were too many parking garages. She would like to see a better mix between parking and office uses and did not want to see the entire office complex paved over, such as in San Jose. She would like the office

building next to Owens Drive to be set back somewhat so it did not cross into the residential area. She would like the design to avoid placing windows that would face into the residential area. She liked the office buildings that serve as the two connections to the freeway, but she would like them to be placed farther to the inside of the site in the event that a potential BART track to Livermore required more right-of-way to be taken.

Commissioner Blank believed the positioning of the buildings were acceptable and assumed that the developer has examined the easements and taken possible transit easements into consideration. He supported putting the office buildings where they should be off of I-580. He stated that if they were on top of an easement, it would be extremely expensive to be moved later by BART.

Ms. Decker noted that staff was sure the applicant has looked at any potential conflicts with easements.

Commissioner Blank believed the parking garages were acceptable and was in favor of the four-story parking structure because there will be a lot of people working in these buildings. He supported the addition of more trees, greenery, and other landscaping.

Commissioner Pearce liked the location of the parking garages and that they were spread out somewhat. She supported sheltering the garages with a lot of trees.

Are the vehicular access points acceptable?

Commissioner Narum noted that it would make sense to have many different points to access and exit the buildings. She suggested shielding the structure with trees.

Chairperson Fox expressed concern that the curve on Rosewood Drive by Borders Bookstore was the site of a fatality; if people were not familiar with the area, they may drive faster, thinking they were entering the freeway. She would like a mitigation done to Rosewood Drive to avoid that situation.

Commissioner Blank believed the vehicular access points were acceptable.

Commissioner Pearce believed the vehicle access points were good.

Is the layout of the parking areas acceptable?

Commissioner Blank believed the layout of the parking areas were acceptable.

Commissioner Olson suggested deleting the proposed four-story parking structure and adding its parking spaces to the proposed parking garage to be located up against the arroyo. He acknowledged that it would be a longer walk to the office building, but the view would be improved. He understood Chairperson Fox's point in wanting to eliminate the four-story parking structure, but he would rather move it than eliminate it.

Chairperson Fox noted that Commissioner O'Connor did not have any comments on those points.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Pearce's inquiry about the standards for parking ratios, Mr. Paxson noted that there were two different parking standards within the park dependent on whether they were built prior to or after 1993. This project was built before 1993 and held to the parking standard of 1:250 space to square footage ratio; every project since 1993 has been parked at a 3.33:1,000 ratio. They had found the 1:250 ratio to be more than adequate because the office densities have not gone as high as 250 square feet per person. They would be very comfortable in looking at a parking requirement of 3.33:1,000 ratio for the office, possibly even less when taking the transit orientation into account. He noted that they had a free shuttle bus to the BART station with a high percentage of users.

Is the amount of parking acceptable?

Commissioner Pearce noted that since the parking exceeds the parking ordinance requirement, and since Hacienda Business Park was comfortable with the numbers, she was comfortable with it. She did have concerns about reducing the parking for the hotel.

Commissioner Blank believed the amount for parking was acceptable and was comfortable with the reduction for retail. He was less concerned about the parking for the hotel because it was not uncommon for groups coming in from out of town to have one rental car.

Chairperson Fox noted that Commissioner O'Connor did not comment on the amount of parking but that the amount of retail parking should not be reduced.

Chairperson Fox believed the parking could be consolidated and would rather see fewer parking garages that were taller. She noted that when she drove through Hacienda Business Park, she rarely saw a full parking lot, and requested observations from Mr. Paxson.

Mr. Paxson concurred that was the case and noted that the Park has peak-hour traffic spread throughout the Park during the day, which meant that drivers did not all come in at 8:00 a.m. and leave at 5:00 p.m. He noted that created a distribution of the demand on parking within the projects. He noted that they examined office densities in the park, which were much less dense than many other office environments; he acknowledged that they over-planned for parking. He had observed higher use of transit.

Chairperson Fox noted that she would like to see a lot of parking spaces reduced if the utilization would be 40 percent at peak. She wanted to ensure the project was not overbuilt with respect to parking.

Commissioner Olson agreed with Commissioner Blank's comments regarding parking for the hotel and that he was in favor of reducing the overall amount of parking.

Commissioner Narum concurred with the other Commissioners' comments and would not add any parking. She would also like to evaluate the real need for parking.

Building Design/Green Building/Landscaping/Signage

Chairperson Fox noted that she liked the two buildings but wanted to ensure they were safe with respect to possible window glare onto the roads. She liked the design and noted that the swooping glass lines were quite striking. She did not like the other buildings quite as much and would like to see more articulation in the architecture if the hotel was meant to accommodate more upscale clientele.

Mr. Dahlin noted that was more of a business decision than an architectural decision and that they would need to look for an operator of the hotel. He believed this was an excellent site for a hotel. He believed that the building design was somewhat nondescript because they knew the hotel operator would come in with its own brand and design standards.

Chairperson Fox suggested that the office building on Owens Drive feature some of the rounded edges that were included in the building near the freeway.

Commissioner Blank noted that it was difficult to address building design in detail before the tenants were selected. He liked the glass elements in the freeway buildings and was confident that they would be done safely. He agreed with the comments about the generic nature of the hotel design at this point. He would need more detail before commenting on proposed building colors and materials. He supported making the buildings as green as possible and noted that when the LEED point totals exceed 100, approvals were easier to come by. He would like to see more trees and landscaping and believed the hotel signage must be addressed with renderings compared to the existing sign. He would like to see a covered walkway to the BART station.

Commissioner Pearce concurred with Commissioner Blank's comments and liked the buildings by the freeway, particularly the blue color element of the glass. She would like to see that element echoed in the rest of the buildings on the site, which she believed would synthesize the complex and pull the buildings together. She liked the parking garage and the trees and would need to see more detail with respect to colors and materials. She believed the streetscape was good and would like to see the sign in more detail. She echoed Commissioner Blank's comments regarding green building and would like to see as many LEED points as possible.

Commissioner Olson echoed the comments made by Commissioners Blank and Pearce and supported Commissioner Blank's covered walkway idea.

Commissioner Narum concurred with the previous comments. She liked the stair-stepped levels on the office building on Owens Drive and the dramatic appearance of the buildings by the freeway. She believed the character of Pleasanton should be kept in

mind as the buildings on Owens Drive and the hotel are designed in further detail. She reiterated that the four-story parking structure on Rosewood Drive was needed and would like to see it lowered and bermed somewhat to reduce visibility. She could support a second sign along Rosewood Drive for the hotel. She agreed with Commissioner Blank's comments regarding the green points.

Chairperson Fox read Commissioner O'Connor's comments, which inquired whether the signage could have one pylon and be near the Hacienda exit, as opposed to the Santa Rita exit, to allow sufficient time to take the closer exit.

Mr. Edwards thanked the Commissioners for their input and comments.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Fox regarding whether there would be a phasing plan, Mr. Edwards replied that it would be market-dependent; they may build one phase at a time or all three at once. He added that they did not want to have lingering construction as tenants begin to move in so they can be operational.

No action was taken.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. May 16, 2007

Commissioner Olson noted that in the references to 139 rooms in the last two paragraphs on page 6, the term "rooms" should be changed to "beds."

Ms. Harryman suggested listening to the tape to confirm the wording; if the speaker said "rooms," it should be retained although they meant "beds."

**Commissioner Narum moved to approve the minutes as presented.
Commissioner Blank seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The motion passed, and the minutes of May 16, 2007 were approved as amended.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Public Comment after a Motion

Commissioner Blank wished to read a section from the Commissioners' Handbook about permitting public comment after a motion has been made and believed the Commission was in procedural error earlier. He noted that page 40 read:

“4(a): After a motion has been made and seconded, the presiding officer may permit further public comment on the motion, provided no Commissioner objects. The purpose of this opportunity shall be for the public, including the applicant and the appellant to address matters specific to the motion, and not to restate prior testimony.”

He noted that it was not an item that required a majority vote of the Commission.

Fifth-Wheel Application

Commissioner Narum inquired whether there was any further information on the conditional use permit for the fifth-wheel trailer. Ms. Decker noted that nothing further had occurred and that no appeal to the Planning Commission's decision has been submitted to date.

El Balazo Restaurant

Chairperson Fox noted that a meeting had been scheduled in January to review the conditional use permit for El Balazo and recalled that staff would try to ensure they adhered to the use permit. She inquired whether a further hearing would be necessary.

Ms. Decker replied that there had been several meetings with the management, and they are now in conformity with their use permit. She noted that calls out to the site had diminished substantially and that they were working with the City when an infrequent issue arose. Staff did not believe it would be necessary to bring the item before the Planning Commission at this time.

Commissioner Blank noted that he had visited the site and was very impressed with the positive change in the environment. He added that a full menu was available after 10:00 p.m.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

a. Future Planning Calendar

Commissioner Blank inquired when the application for 300 Neal Street would be heard. Ms. Decker anticipated that the use permit would come to the Commission at the first meeting in July because staff was returning to the community to hold a neighborhood

meeting on June 14, 2007. She added that the Oak Grove item, the CIP and another consent item would be heard on June 13, 2007. She noted that the agenda for June 27, 2007, was fairly full.

With regard to the Oak Grove hearing on June 13, Commissioner Pearce inquired whether it would be possible to request that a representative from the Fire Department be present for the hearing. Ms. Decker confirmed that they would be in attendance.

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.

10. REFERRALS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

No discussion was held or action taken.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Fox adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 10:21 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary