



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, May 10, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission meeting of May 10, 2006, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Arkin.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Donna Decker, Principal Planner; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Wes Jost, Development Services Manager; Steve Cusenza, Utility Planning Manager; Terry Snyder, Recording Secretary, and Cory Emberson, Recording Secretary.

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

Commissioners Absent: None.

Chairperson Arkin welcomed new Planning Commissioners Arne Olson and Greg O'Connor.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 19, 2006.

The minutes of April 19, 2006, were approved as presented.

b. April 26, 2006.

Commissioner Pearce requested that the sentence on paragraph 4 on page 9 be changed to read as follows: "Commissioner Pearce suggested that equestrian trails be connected with *existing equestrian trails on the west side of Pleasanton* ~~pedestrian trails.~~"

Former Commissioner Mary Roberts requested that the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 1 be deleted as follows: "~~She thanked Wayne Rasmussen for encouraging her to join the Planning Commission.~~"

Commissioner Fox stated that she would like the minutes to show how each Commissioner voted in the straw votes for Item 5.a., Consideration of the Draft Bernal Property Phase II Specific Plan, Draft Bernal Community Park Master Plan, and the Combined Final Environmental Impact Report for Both Plans. She noted that she voted "no" in most of them and would like to add the following comment: "Commissioner Fox did not support adding additional amenities at this late stage of the planning process prior to the approval of the EIR, and hence, voted No on most of the additions of amenities."

Chairperson Arkin agreed with Commissioner Fox's opinion that the voters should be identified in the straw votes.

Commissioner Fox noted that with regard to the swimming pool, the Commission discussed whether it would be an indoor swimming pool for the potential Youth Community Center facility or a YMCA.

Chairperson Arkin believed it would be more appropriate to call it a Youth Center, Teen Center, or Family Center.

Commissioner Fox believed the vote was whether to have a nonprofit group such as YMCA added to the possibilities for the pool.

Chairperson Arkin requested that the audiotape be consulted to confirm what was said. He added that the minutes would be re-examined at the end of the meeting to allow Commissioner Fox time to read them through more thoroughly.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

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 requested that Item 6.a., PUD-51, Generations Healthcare, Inc., be continued to June 14, 2006. Ms. Decker further advised that with regard to Item 6.c., PUD-90-19-11M/PADR-1481, Richard Ragsdale, the resident who had expressed concern about the application had withdrawn his request for a hearing. She indicated that the item would be removed from the agenda and forwarded to the City Council as a minor modification.

Ms. Decker requested that Item 6.f., PUD-50/PTR-7721, Ponderosa Homes, be heard as the second item on the agenda and that Item 6.d., PUD-54, Threehand, LP/Reznick Property, and Item 6.e., PDR-520/PCUP-162, City of Pleasanton, be heard together as the third item.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. PCUP-167, Sherri Sweetnam, Jazz-N-Taps Dance Studio

Application for a conditional use permit to operate a dance studio at 1270 Quarry Lane, within the Valley Business Park. Zoning for this property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

b. PCUP-166, Pleasanton Community Church/Fountain Community Church

Application for a conditional use permit to expand Church-related services during weekdays within the existing buildings located at 4439 and 4455 Stoneridge Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

Commissioner Fox inquired whether revising the conditional use permit to have more hours would require community care licensing from the State as a day care facility.

Ms. Decker replied that was not the case and that the expansion of the facility was to memorialize the operations of the existing Church. The intent was also to expressly state the hours of operation for church-related activities, which had been limited to ten persons but now number 40.

Commissioner Blank moved to approve the Consent Calendar items, as recommended by staff.

Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolutions Nos. PC-2006-24 and PC-2006-25, approving PCUP-167 and PCUP-166, respectively, were entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. PUD-51, Generations Healthcare

Application for PUD rezoning of a 0.49-acre open area from P (Public and Institutional) District to PUD-MDR (Planned Unit Development – Medium Density Residential) District and for development plan approval for a two-lot single-family residential project to be located in the front of the existing convalescent facility located at 300 Neal Street. Zoning for the property is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

This item was continued to the June 14, 2006 meeting.

b. PUD-77-08-1M/PADR-1490, Laurence Callait

Application for: (1) a major modification to an approved PUD development plan to reduce the side yard setback from the approved eight feet to five feet and; (2) administrative design review approval for the construction of single-story additional totaling 637 square feet to the existing two-story residence located at 5745 Northway Road. Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) District.

Ms. Decker summarized the staff report and described the proposed project. She recommended that the Commission recommend approval of this item and forward it to the City Council for final action.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding the effects on the CC&R's of a homeowners association becoming inactive, Ms. Harryman replied that she would need to read the actual CC&R's of that association as these vary from association to association.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Arkin regarding whether the homeowners who objected to this project actually lived in Walnut Creek, Ms. Decker confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Pearce believed the objection was not with regard to this particular property but to the overall changes in the neighborhood. Ms. Decker confirmed that was correct.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Laurence Callait, applicant, wished to respond to Commissioner Blank's question regarding the homeowners association and noted that she had been told that there was no homeowners association when they purchased the home. It was her understanding from a

neighbor that the City Codes and regulations took precedence when the CC&R's became inactive. She noted that the existing yard line at the back would be a continuation of only two feet, ten inches and that the garage would be moved towards the street by eight feet.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

**Commissioner Fox moved to recommend approval to the City Council of Case PUD-77-08-1M and to approve Case PADR-1490, contingent on the City Council's approval of Case PUD-77-08-1M, both subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit B of the staff report, as recommended by staff.
Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

Resolution No. PC-2006-26 was entered and adopted as motioned.

- c. **PUD-90-19-11M/PADR-1481, Richard Ragsdale**
Application for: (1) a major modification to an approved PUD development plan to reduce the rear-yard setback from the approved 25 feet to 17 feet and to increase the floor area ration (FAR) from the maximum allowable 35 percent to 36.8 percent; and (2) administrative design review approval for the construction of an approximate 133-square-foot sunroom in the rear of the existing residence located at 8242 Moller Ranch Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-RURAL/LDR/A (Planned Unit Development – Rural/Low Density Residential/Agriculture) District.

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

Item 6.f., PUD-50/PTR-7721, Ponderosa Homes was scheduled to be heard at this time. However, because the applicants for this item were not yet in the audience, the Commission proceeded to consider other agenda items.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Delays in Planning Commission Agenda

Following the delay in the agenda due to the applicants not being in attendance at their estimated time, Commissioner Blank noted that while there was an informal rule that no item be started after 11:00 p.m., there was 30 minutes of dead time until the applicants

arrived. He did not believe it was wise to advise the public of the approximate time their items might be heard.

Conditional Use Permits in Commercial Districts

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Arkin regarding staff's work in changing the rules within the City as far as conditional use permits, Ms. Decker replied that an administrative in-house draft was being reviewed, which would be brought before the Planning Commission. In the past, a Code amendment would be brought before interested parties prior to coming to the Commission; it was suggested that the issue be brought before the Commission first, and then to the business associations, and back again to the Commission for direction as a workshop item.

Staff Resource Allocation

Ms. Decker informed the Planning Commission that the request by the Commission to have the authority to allocate staff resources to pursue special projects was under consideration by the City Manager, and staff will continue to report back to the Planning Commission.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

a. Future Planning Calendar

Ms. Decker noted that there would be a presentation by the Fire Chief and the Fire Marshall related to sprinklers in new residential construction at the May 24, 2006, meeting. She added that a memo was distributed in April requesting that questions or issues be emailed to her or Mr. Eric Carlson, who would be pleased to include them in the presentation made before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Blank thanked staff for bringing that item forward and believed it was a very important long-term initiative for the health and safety of Pleasanton residents.

b. Actions of the City Council

There were none.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

9. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Harryman noted that with respect to the 11:00 p.m. time brought up by Commissioner Blank, page 37 of the Commissioners' Handbook discussed what happens at that time: "Items Considered After 11:00 p.m.: By 11 p.m., the Commission shall determine by vote which agenda items, if any, it will take up that evening, with the intent of completing those items by 11:30 p.m. At 11:30 p.m., the Commission shall determine

by vote whether it will complete action on the current agenda items and any other items.” She noted that the Commission may want to consider that process with the addition of the new Commissioners.

10. REFERRALS

There were none.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION’S INFORMATION

There were none.

Because the applicants for Item 6.f. still had not arrived, the Commission proceeded to consider Item 6.e., PDR-520/PCUP-162, City of Pleasanton.

e. PDR-520/PCUP-162, City of Pleasanton

Application for: (1) design review approval for a City water tank to be constructed on a portion of a 20-acre site located at 5 Windy Oaks Drive (formerly 1680 Vineyard Avenue) in the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan Area; and (2) conditional use permit approval to allow the temporary stockpiling of approximately 14,000 cubic yards of excess soil from the City water tank project on the upper portions of 5 Windy Oaks Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-HR/OS (Planned Unit Development – Hillside Residential/Open Space) District.

Ms. Decker summarized the staff report and provided the Planning Commission with a synopsis of the direction provided to staff at the workshop held on March 8, 2006. She noted that the Planning Commission had directed that the project be considered together with PUD-54, Threehand, LP/Reznick Property. Both projects share the proposed private driveway which would be widened to a 20-foot wide road; 18-foot paved with a one-foot shoulder on each side. She indicated that the City water tank project was constrained by construction timing for award of contracts. She noted that the proposed road alignment, grading, and placement were not very flexible; however, the pad grades were and. Therefore, requested that the Planning Commission consider acting on the project knowing that the pad grading could be designed to accommodate or mitigate concerns the Planning Commission may have.

Steve Cusenza, Utility Planning Manager, presented information on the Specific Plan Corridor Plan and the water system. He noted that the original capacity of the tank in 1999 was 800,000 gallons and it was increased to one million gallons. The City has since increased the storage capacity to 1.4 million gallons to complete the buildout of the water pressure zone.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding when the tank would go online, Mr. Cusenza replied that it should be on line by Summer 2007.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding whether Pleasanton would experience a water shortage if the tank activation did not go as planned, Mr. Cusenza said no. Commissioner Blank inquired whether that contradicted staff's earlier assessments; Mr. Cusenza replied that was not the case. He noted that the possibility of a Pleasanton water shortage was unlikely because that was a separate part of the water supply formula and criteria used by staff. The City receives 80 percent of its water from Zone 7, and the City owns ground water to supply the other 20 percent. The tank's supply was independent of the pumping and storage in each zone. This facility would get the water from Zone 7 into the reservoirs to meet emergency, fire, and daily demands.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether an evacuation map would be required in the event of a breach during an earthquake, Mr. Cusenza replied that all of the tanks were designed for significant seismic loading in the San Francisco Bay Area. A catastrophic failure has not been experienced; he noted that the buried concrete water tanks would crack and leak, and the steel tanks would bulge at the bottom without rupturing. He displayed the site plan on the overhead screen and described the grading of the site.

Mr. Cusenza noted that this project was budgeted in 2001, and the tank portion of the project was sited on the best location available. Staff was concerned that the construction season would be missed if the project is not sent out to bid soon. He added that it would take approximately nine to twelve months to construct.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding whether approval of the tank did not lock the Commission into a specific configuration regarding the placement of the road and the lots, Ms. Decker replied that the original plan was to have the approval of the road along with the tank. She noted that the construction of the road provided some assurance regarding the agreement between Mr. Reznick and the City to move forward with the construction of the tank itself. At the workshop, the Planning Commission felt somewhat reticent in terms of moving forward without knowing how the grading of the road and the pads would be affected. The City did have some concerns about being locked into a road alignment with the pads placed. After further investigation and with the City engineers having spoken with the developers' engineers, two designs created for the site had been joined into what staff believed was the best alternative regarding the road alignment and grading.

With respect to the issue related to the grading of the pads, Ms. Decker noted that the two affected neighbors, Mr. Brozosky and Ms. Roberts, had made their concerns known regarding the amount of fill. The current design showed the pads being level with the road at some particular point, which would allow a level driveway to the front of the house, and it would be an opportunity to place some of the off-haul on the site. Staff would be able to bring this information back to the Commission if a comfort level cannot be reached with respect to the grading.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding whether the Commission was being locked into a road design, Mr. Jost replied that there was still an ongoing

business agreement for the property between the City and the private property developer, which would probably exist until the project was put out to bid. He believed the cooperative efforts would not be impacted significantly following the decisions made at this meeting.

Ms. Decker added that that portion of the project approval for the road could be pulled from the Reznick PUD if necessary.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Mary Roberts, 1666 Frog Hill Lane, noted that she did not object to the moving of the water tank or to the tank itself. She was concerned about Commissioner Blank's question and noted that when items are moved around within a Specific Plan, a finding might be made that it was an environmentally superior place to put the tank, not just the most attractive place to put it. She did not object to the alignment of the road and noted that it was narrow and in poor repair. She noted that in hillside development, the driveways did not need to be level.

Steve Brozosky, 1 Brozosky Hill Lane, noted that he did not have any issues with the tank; however, he expressed concern with the hours of construction provided by Condition No. 19 allowing construction work from Monday through Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He noted that the Specific Plan did allow for Monday through Saturday but that PUD approvals have limited the hours to Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. due to noise issues. He requested that the hours of approval be limited to weekdays only.

The applicants for Item 6.f. arrived at this point.

Chairperson Arkin called a five-minute recess at 8:30 p.m. He indicated that Item 6.f. would be heard after the recess and that the public hearing for Item 6.e. would remain open for continued discussion later in the evening.

Chairperson Arkin reconvened the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

f. PUD-50/PTR-7721, Ponderosa Homes

Work session to review and receive comment on an application to subdivide an approximately 19.83-acre site into 28 lots and to construct 26 new, one- and two-story single-family detached homes ranging in size from 3,908 square feet to 4,595 square feet located at 3157 Trenery Drive and 2313 Martin Avenue. Zoning for the property is PUD-LDR (Planned Unit Development – Low Density Residential) District.

Ms. Decker summarized the staff report and described the history, layout, and scope of this project. She noted that traffic calming was a significant issue, and staff had been directed to request that the developer look into providing a curvilinear alignment along Cameron Avenue. Staff did not support creating a double frontage lot that would take

traffic off of Cameron Avenue, which would connect to Martin Avenue. She displayed and described several alternatives for the curvilinear alignments. Ponderosa Homes had been particularly receptive to staff's proposal of separating the sidewalk with a deeper parkway, although staff did not object to the more common parkway depth.

Pamela Hardy, Ponderosa Homes, noted that they had taken feedback from the neighbors for the past year. She noted that the number of homes had been reduced from 28 to 25, and the square footage of the homes had been reduced by 200 to 400 square feet. She noted that architectural changes had been made and that the setbacks around the perimeters had been increased. A template conveyance along the westbound property had been offered in recognition of the modest rear yard setbacks, which would triple the setback from the new property boundary. The single-family homes were plotted around the perimeters, and the number of lots around Cameron Avenue was reduced from five to four lots. A customized design along Cameron was created, providing garage access from the internal loop road and minimizing the appearance of the garage doors. Ms. Hardy then displayed and described the different architectural styles and choices. She noted that the neighbors found the original French Country style to have too much mass, and it had been replaced with a cottage elevation.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Arkin regarding the sidewalk in front of the properties and the easement, Ms. Decker replied that after the first workshop, the 28-foot wide road street section precluded the opportunity to place a sidewalk along the Ketell property frontage. After direction from the Department of Public Works, Traffic Safety, and Planning Department, staff felt it was important to have a sidewalk and looked at a reasonable road width to determine whether a sidewalk would fit. Alternative 4 proposed a sidewalk but reduced the width of Cameron Avenue.

Wes Jost noted that the street was currently 28 feet wide, and the existing subdivision to the south had dedications to the current street. He noted that there was a 2.5-3-foot wide strip that was a public right-of-way. The sidewalk would be placed in a combination where the current asphalt and landowner's landscaping were located.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Pearce regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety on the 26-foot wide street, Mr. Jost replied that it would allow for two 13-foot wide lanes. He noted that bicycle lanes were not typically striped in residential neighborhoods, and he did not believe that would be a problem on this street. If it did become an issue, a bike lane would require a six-foot wide lane, which would not leave enough width on the street.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding a bike lane on only one side, Mr. Jost believed that would not be desirable.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether the Municipal Code prohibited bike riding on a sidewalk, Mr. Jost replied it was his experience that was not correct and that bikes can use a sidewalk.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Arkin regarding parking on a narrowed street, Mr. Jost replied that parking was generally allowed on one side of a 28-foot wide street.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding allowing sidewalk materials that met ADA requirements, Ms. Harryman replied that a public sidewalk must be ADA compliant.

Mr. Jost added that the sidewalk would have to be a hard surface; decomposed gravel would be fine in the summer when it was dry, but it was not generally accessible in the winter because wheelchairs would sink into the softer, wet surface.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox whether Ponderosa would bear the cost of utilities such as the overhead and utility lines, Mr. Jost replied that normally, over 600 feet of frontage would be required to make undergrounding feasible. Ponderosa did not intend to add more poles, which PG&E was reluctant to do.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Fox regarding whether there was a danger of sinkholes forming in the Lehman property in addition to Lake I, Mr. Jost replied that they were not aware of any sinkholes in the buffer area. There was some settlement because of the large storm drain installed, but he was not aware of any sinkholes resulting from groundwater in Lake I.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Blank regarding the concern about cut-through traffic resulting from the creation of a road through the Selway property to Martin Avenue, Ms. Decker replied that staff did not believe that design was a preferred alternative in that it would create double frontage lots and three intersections in close proximity which would present a safety issue as well.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner O'Connor regarding why a walkway for pedestrians could not be installed through the Selway property, Ms. Decker replied that staff had considered that alternative. The Police Department had stated that pedestrian access would be limited to ten feet in width, with fencing on both sides, creating a tunnel effect. The Police Department did not like the concept of pedestrians and children going through a small, narrow, visually obstructed path.

Commissioner Fox disclosed that she communicated with Pam Hardy and one of the Selway family members and had provided the principal of Mohr Elementary with the staff report and the alternative plans prepared by Pam Hardy and staff.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Matt Lawer, 3750 Cameron Avenue, did not want to live by a four-way intersection and believed there should be the same standards for alignment of all the streets. He believed there was a way to include a path and believed that the developer should share responsibility for the traffic generated. He would like to see a speed table in action

before he could support it as a traffic-calming measure; he was concerned about the car noise before and after the speed table.

Steve Grimes, 3722 Cameron Avenue, noted that it did not matter to him whether the street was straight or curvilinear. He did not want to see a sidewalk on Cameron Avenue and believed there could be an alternative for children to walk. He did not believe narrowing the street to 26 feet would be a good idea.

Shirley Lauer, 2221 Martin, noted that she generally supported the plan as well as giving an additional ten feet of land to the Palmer Avenue residents, increasing the size of their backyards. She also liked the new placement and orientation of the new homes. She believed the undergrounding of utilities on Martin Avenue had been overlooked. She noted that the entire Selway property was included in the proposed PUD, and there was about 300 feet of frontage on Martin Avenue. She believed that Ponderosa Homes would pay into a fund because the amount of frontage was less than 600 feet; Ponderosa would prefer to pay into the fund rather than underground the utilities on Martin Avenue. However, Ponderosa Homes agreed with undergrounding in front of the Selway property. She doubted she would see the completion of Martin Avenue in her lifetime. She believed the poles would be a safety hazard to traffic and would like them to be removed. She did not believe they should be allowed to build the last commercial development area without providing minimum infrastructure such as underground utilities. She believed that Ponderosa Homes should be required to underground the utilities in front of the Selway property, north to the end of Martin Avenue and potentially on Trenergy Drive as well.

In response to an inquiry by Commission Olson regarding PG&E funding the undergrounding process, Mr. Jost replied that they were not interested in funding the undergrounding at this time.

A discussion of the technical and economic aspects of the utility undergrounding process ensued related to Rule 20A PG funding, City matching funds, and the City Council prioritization process for public projects.

Commissioner Blank questioned whether the Martin Avenue residents would be able to obtain the undergrounding because the Rule 20A funds had already been allocated for City projects for Fiscal Year 2005-2006.

Greg Jetter, 3618 Cameron Avenue, noted that he and other residents had met with Ponderosa Homes the previous Monday to look at the alternative development plans. He appreciated Ponderosa Home's willingness to make concessions and address their concerns throughout the process. The group's consensus was that Alternative 3 was the best and that it had greater offsets benefiting front yard enhancements, allowing for greater curvature of the road; that would also allow slower speeds and would be in character with the neighborhood. Their consensus was that traffic-calming measures should be implemented and that some mitigation issues be developed, such as the double curve ends of the roads. The neighbors believed that speed tables would be better than

speed bumps or stop signs. They believed that a permanent speed-monitoring device would be desirable on Martin Avenue. They did not want sidewalks on Cameron Avenue, which they believed would endanger bicyclists. He noted that there were more bike riders than pedestrians on that street, and it would be a safety issue during school hours. He noted that there was an alternative route to Mohr Elementary School using sidewalks. He submitted a letter signed by 25 neighbors agreeing to these issues.

Kelly Cousins, Cameron Avenue, distributed a follow-up letter to the Commissioners and stated that she would prefer street tables to stop signs. She was concerned about the issues not addressed in the staff report regarding the road inside the development. She would prefer pathways that might include an emergency vehicle access road and would like traffic to be dispersed throughout the neighborhood rather than just on Cameron Avenue. She appreciated staff's interest in the amount of traffic that would be generated and the considerable amount of fill. She noted that there were more homes per acre than the surrounding Bass Homes, by a ratio of 2:1. She inquired whether the City had given any vested or guaranteed rights to the property owners as to the number of homes to be developed.

Ms. Decker advised that there were no vested rights in terms of the density. The development as proposed meets the density requirements that would be anticipated for this site.

A discussion of density as it relates to gross acreage ensued. Ms. Harryman stated that she would provide clarification of this issue at the next meeting.

Gregory Ketell, 3611 Cameron Avenue, did not want a sidewalk on Cameron Avenue and did not believe it would be needed if the road remained at its current width. He liked the speed sign as a traffic-calming measure but requested that it be turned off at night so young drivers did not use the street as a drag strip. He noted that the street table he saw on Second Street was noisy and rough because it was made of cobblestone and that he would like a steeper speed table that was the length of a car to give the biggest jolt if a driver went too fast.

Commissioner Olson agreed with Mr. Ketell's concerns about the cobblestone speed tables generating a lot of noise.

Natalie Herb, 3708 Cameron Avenue, noted that she was an original owner on Cameron Avenue and that she bought on the street because it was very quiet. She noted that the quality of life on her street had decreased since the barrier had been removed and that cars drove very fast down the street. She noted that her dog had been hit and killed on the street at the end of April, and she was very concerned about the safety on the street. She requested that the barrier be replaced on the street.

Edward Reedy, 2101 Palmer Drive, noted that he represented six of the seven neighbors who concurred that they liked the plan and that they were very happy about receiving the

additional ten feet to their back yards. He believed there should be a sidewalk going to the school and noted a sidewalk had been needed for sometime.

Ms. Hardy noted that the internal circulation as proposed was consistent with City standards. She added that the second point of access was carefully designed to be least impacting, being approximately opposite a flag lot and a side yard. She noted that Ponderosa Homes did not support introducing a new public street across the Selway property and that discussions had been held with the Police Department, who did not support the pedestrian access either. The Police Department would not be able to provide surveillance and protection for children on a 600-foot long walkway. She was pleased to receive feedback on the Alternative 3 scenario. She was aware of the existing speeding problem on the street and believed the project was an opportunity to help in that regard, with the curved streets and landscaping. She understood the undergrounding issue would go back to staff and stated that Ponderosa Homes would be willing to participate in Rule 20A funds for the Selway frontage. A trench would be placed across the frontage on the Lehman piece to the closest pole. She noted that the overall density was 1.4 units per acre and that many speakers supported feathered density in the Mohr/Martin; the density plans were consistent with the feathering plan. The lot sizes were consistent with the neighborhood, with the minimum lot size being 20,000 square feet and the largest lot 33,000 square feet.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Olson regarding a barrier being placed at the Palmer Drive end of Cameron Avenue, Ms. Hardy replied that was a larger issue than just the project.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Fox had forwarded a message from the Principal of Mohr Elementary School, who had supported including a sidewalk plan with the project and was very concerned for the children's safety. She inquired whether Ms. Hardy would be willing to meet with the Principal and the School District regarding the safety concerns.

Commissioner Blank noted that the Principal's letter stated that issues concerning the school were generally brought through the School District and assumed that the Principal wished the issue to go through the District and not through him personally.

Commissioner Fox would like the District to be notified of pertinent issues.

Chairperson Arkin noted that staff handled the notifications and did not believe that was within Ms. Hardy's purview.

Commissioner Blank believed the District should be notified as part of the staff's general efforts.

Ms. Decker noted that staff typically sent a packet to the School Districts and the County regarding projects that are in close proximity to them in order to obtain feedback. She would determine whether that had been done in this case.

Commissioner Olson believed the barrier might mitigate the traffic concerns expressed by the residents and inquired about staff's opinion of the possibility of the barrier being reinstalled.

Chairperson Arkin noted that staff would have that information when the issue came back as a PUD application. He suggested that the noticing include that discussion.

Ms. Decker agreed with Ms. Hardy's assessment that the barrier was a larger issue than this application but that traffic-related issues could be brought before City Council. She noted that this information could be brought before the Planning Commission as part of this discussion.

Commissioner Pearce appreciated the rural character of the neighborhood and believed that a walkable neighborhood included a sidewalk. She anticipated the Ketell's concerns about the sidewalk on their property and favored the staff alternative of a meandering sidewalk, which was in character with the rural feel of the neighborhood. She wanted to be very sensitive to the concerns of the neighborhood. She did not favor a walkway and would want the houses to face the public walkway for visibility and safety. She believed removing the two lots would keep the project within the low-density definition. She liked the models and appreciated the redesign of the French Country option. She was more interested in unobstrusive traffic-calming measures instead of a stop sign. She would support the speed sign during the day if the neighbors wanted it supported, she would support it, but did not believe it was in keeping with the rural character of the neighborhood. She understood the need to discuss all traffic calming methods, but was unsure whether the barrier fell within the developer's purview.

Commissioner Blank requested the minutes of the discussions during the late 1980s and early 1990s be made available. He would like more analysis of the underground utility issue and requested that the aerial views be consistent in terms of orientation. He would like to see the sketch views with the names and addresses of the neighbors. He disagreed with Commissioner Pearce's comments about the path and believed it could be done properly through the Selway area; it should be done safely, perhaps with visibility towards Martin Avenue.

Commissioner Fox supported staff's recommendations that there should be a sidewalk. She agreed with Commissioner Pearce's comments that from a walkability and safety standpoint, a sidewalk was necessary. She noted that the City Council approved the sidewalk on Cameron Avenue in conjunction with when the bike path on Martin Avenue was approved in 1997. She believed that from a project perspective, Ponderosa had bent over backwards to be sensitive to the neighbors' concerns. She believed it was time to move forward with the project, with wide notification. She noted that most parents drove their children to school because they were not comfortable having the children walk

without sidewalks. She noted that with respect to the barrier, she had done research that revealed that Cameron Avenue had been straight for a long time. She agreed with traffic-calming measures within reason and believed that a curvy road with no sidewalk would be more dangerous for pedestrians since children would be hidden in the bend of the curves. She believed the City should look into shifting CIP funds to support an underground utility plan. She was comfortable with the density of the project and liked the architecture. She believed the project should move forward.

Commissioner Olson disagreed with using cobblestone speed tables and believed that a curvilinear street without a barrier would be a danger to pedestrians. He complimented the developer in effecting a good compromise with the neighborhood.

Commissioner O'Connor agreed that safety should be a priority with this project and that he was torn on the sidewalk issue. He would like to study a walkway out of the development in more detail and suggested that it be made wider than a normal path. He supported traffic calming but believed it should be agreeable to the neighborhood. He would like Jeff Knowles, the City Traffic Engineer, to do a traffic study and simulation to see if a barrier would work. He believed that lighted speed signs might be good for daytime use only. He complimented Ponderosa Homes on working with the residents and accommodating as many concerns as possible.

Chairperson Arkin complimented Ponderosa Homes on its responsiveness to the neighborhood concerns. He believed that either a sidewalk or another pathway should be included. He would like to hear more information from the Police Department regarding the safety of the path. He cited the Pathway Project being undertaken by the City of Los Altos Hills. If a sidewalk were to be included, he would like to see Alternative 4 used. He suggested using vegetation and colored pavers for a more interesting design presentation. He complimented the developer on the quality of the models. He would like more information on the cost and scope of undergrounding the utilities. He would like to see the density calculation without the Lehman and Selway properties in the formula.

Commissioner Fox liked Alternative 4 alongside staff's recommendation. She emphasized that the children should be visible on the sidewalk. She did not support a pathway through the Selway property.

Ms. Decker noted that the Selways were reticent to have a pathway through their property. She would provide materials regarding visibility and walkability of pathways.

Commissioner Blank believed that a pathway could be done well if safely designed and implemented; he was pleased that the street was patrolled actively.

Ms. Decker summarized the issues brought forward at the first workshop and noted that grading and utility plans must show everything that was approved.

Chairperson Arkin suggested taking a straw vote on whether to request staff or the applicant to invest more time in looking at some kind of path leading out of the project, such as along Trenery Drive or Martin Avenue, as an alternative to Cameron Avenue.

Commissioner Pearce indicated that she would be in favor of investing time to design a path that would go along the fronts of houses. She noted, however, that she did not think this was a possibility. Ms. Decker requested Commissioner Pearce to confirm that she did not wish to have an analysis done for a path through the Selway property as this would be a backyard tunnel. Commissioner Pearce said yes.

Commissioner Blank stated that he concurred with Commissioner Pearce's comment and supported it. He added that if the Commission wished to invest more time in evaluating a pedestrian walkway, it would make sense to look at Trenery Drive should there be a way to make that pathway safe and effective.

Chairperson Arkin indicated that he would like some investigation done on the Trenery Drive alternative.

Commissioner Fox did not want to spend any staff time on a pathway through the Selway property or Trenery Drive. She would like staff and the applicant to spend their time exclusively on the Cameron Avenue alignment and the sidewalk on Cameron Avenue.

Commissioner Olson agreed with Commissioner Fox's comments and did not want to ask Ponderosa Homes to do any extensive studies. He indicated that he was not in favor of going through the Selway property.

Ms. Decker summarized the discussion, indicating that Commissioners Fox and Olson did not wish to have any further studies; Commissioners Pearce and Blank are in favor of looking into designs that would put a pathway in front of houses, with Commissioner Blank favoring an evaluation of Trenery Drive as an alternative; and Chairperson Arkin also favored looking at Trenery Drive.

Commissioner Pearce pointed out that walkability and the perception of safety are two different matters. She noted that what is being addressed here is the perception of safety rather than actual safety, and this would be alleviated if the path runs along the fronts of houses. She reiterated that she did not think it was a possibility to have a path along the house frontage, but if it is, she would like to see more information on it.

Commissioner Blank commented that the only place this would be possible is on Trenery Drive. He added that he was willing to forego further studies on the Selway property. Chairperson Arkin concurred with Commission Blank on both matters.

Commissioner O'Connor commented that he did not think it was possible to have a pathway that faces the fronts of houses, even on Trenery Drive.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Decker regarding the Commission's preference for a street design, the Commission unanimously agreed on Option 4, a curvilinear street with a sidewalk. Ms. Decker further asked if the Commission preferred a separated sidewalk and if so, what would separate the sidewalk. Commissioner Blank and Chairperson Arkin indicated they wanted it separated.

Commissioner Fox liked Option 4 with the sidewalk or the staff recommendation of the meandering sidewalk as a second choice. With respect to the separation, she indicated that she would be in favor of what would go with a curvilinear street, as long as it is safe and acceptable to the neighbors.

Ms. Decker indicated that a traffic analysis would accompany the PUD application when it comes back for Commission consideration.

No action was taken.

At this point, Ms. Harryman suggested that the Commission determine if it would like to address the remaining items, considering the lateness of the hour. She further suggested that should the Commission decide to continue the items, people in the audience who came to speak on the two items be allowed to speak.

Commissioner Pearce did not believe the remaining items should be rushed.

Commissioner Fox preferred that the remaining items be continued.

Commissioner Pearce believed the speakers for the continued items should be allowed to speak first at the next meeting and that they should devote sufficient time to the issue.

d. PUD-54, Threehand, LP/Reznick Property

Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) development plan approval to subdivide an approximately 20-acre site into eight-lots, consisting of seven single-family lots for custom homes and one lot for a City water tank. The property is located at 5 Windy Oaks Drive (formerly 1680 Vineyard Avenue) in the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan Area and is zoned PUD-HR/OS (Planned Unit Development - Hillside Residential/Open Space) District.

Chairperson Arkin inquired whether there were any speakers in the audience who could not appear at the next meeting.

Mr. Steve Brozosky requested to speak.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Steve Brozosky, 1 Brozosky Hill Way, requested to speak regarding Item 6.d. He indicated that he had submitted an email to the Commission and noted that most of the items had been resolved with the developers during the course of the meeting,

particularly with respect to the EVA. He did not believe sports courts should be placed in the hills, which he believed would produce noise and light impacts. The staff cleared up the disclosures and suggested that the disclosure regarding his pigs be included. He noted that the pigs were not there year-round, and some owners may not be aware that they were there. He was satisfied with the visuals. He would like the building heights to remain as they are. He preferred putting trees in, instead of putting money into a forestry fund. He had not had a chance to review the design guidelines and suggested tying it to the tentative map.

Greg Reznick, applicant for Item 6.d., noted that the road alignment matters because the manner in which the property on which the water tank will sit gets paid for is by building the road to a specification that allowed him to do his development. He noted that they could not do the water tank until there is enough specs to trade documents and that the road design must be addressed so the property to install the tank could be obtained.

Commissioner Arkin moved to continue Item 6.d., PUD-54, Threehand, LP/Reznick Property, and Item 6.e., PDR-520/PCUP-162, City of Pleasanton, to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Fox seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The motion passed. Both public hearing items remained open.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Arkin adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 11:24 p.m.

Respectfully,

DONNA DECKER
Secretary