




---

## ITEM 1: SUMMARY OF MEETING #11

---

### Summary of Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force Meeting #11 Tuesday, January 23, 2018

***Task Force Members Present***

<b>1</b> Kathy Narum, City Council (Chair)	<b>2</b> Jerry Pentin, City Council Alternate
<b>3</b> Justin Brown, Planning Commission	<b>4</b> Herb Ritter, Planning Commission
<b>5</b> Laura Olson, Pleasanton Downtown Association	<b>6</b> Dirk Christiansen, Pleasanton Downtown Association
<b>7</b> Steve Baker, Economic Vitality Committee	<b>8</b> Jan Batcheller, At-Large
<b>9</b> Jim Merryman, At-Large	<b>10</b> Teri Pohl, At-large

***City of Pleasanton Staff***

<b>1</b> Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development	<b>2</b> Ellen Clark, Planning Manager
<b>3</b> Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner	<b>4</b> Brian Dolan, Assistant City Manager
<b>5</b> Pam Ott, Director of Economic Development	<b>6</b> Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer
<b>7</b> Megan Canales, Assistant Planner	

## **1. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes**

**A. Welcome and Agenda Overview.** The meeting was called to order and the meeting agenda was discussed.

### **B. Review and Approval of Meeting #10 Summary.**

The Task Force voted to approve the Meeting #10 Summary. *Ten in favor; zero opposed.*

## **2. Public Comment**

**A. Correspondence.** The Task Force acknowledged correspondence was received.

**B. Meeting Open to the Public.** Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment on items not on the agenda. Topics raised included:

- Recommendation to hear a presentation on successful walkable streets

## **3. December 2017 City Council Meeting**

The Senior Planner provided a summary of the City Council meeting on December 19, 2017. Staff presented the Civic Center plan to the Council, as modified by the Task Force to include a larger town square, parking on block three, retention of the hotel, and no residential on the ground floor. In addition to comments that related to parking, autonomous vehicles, building height, and rooftop dining, the City Council provided the following feedback:

- Include a phasing plan for redevelopment of the Civic Center as it pertains to the Downtown Specific Plan Update,
- Retain the library building, and
- Provide an extension of retail and restaurant uses.

The City Council also authorized staff to proceed with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. The Director of Community Development clarified that any movement of Civic Center will first necessitate vote of the people.

Staff presented the modified Civic Center Plan to the Task Force which incorporated the Council's comments and potential phasing for the project.

Staff asked the Task Force if the Civic Center Plan is acceptable such that it may be used as the basis for the technical analysis and CEQA review. The Task Force and staff clarified/commented on the following:

- The City Council intended the library building to remain, but not necessarily the use within the building.
- Phase one would be the area geographically closest to Main Street and the rest would follow.
- A sub consultant can provide market viability and economic reality check. This data point can be used in the larger conversation of what the community values and what they want to see in the Civic Center/Downtown Extension plan.

- A CEQA analysis was not completed for the Civic Center master plan so environmental review would be needed.
- Prefer more imaginative/creative transportation proposals like the Civic Center as circular area. Would this affect CEQA?
  - Staff clarified this may not affect CEQA as that will be focused more on a framework and can analyze specific numbers within that framework for environmental purposes. However, main intersections may not be able to move as that may significantly impact the CEQA analysis. We may need an update to the CEQA analysis if major changes are made.
- It may be too early for CEQA. If the voters choose to leave the civic center uses in their current location, then CEQA may not be necessary.
  - Staff clarified that within the CEQA analysis, a “no project” alternative will be evaluated so we will understand the environmental impacts if the current civic center uses remain in their current location.
- While it may seem early to do CEQA, prior to the vote, we are committed to doing a planning effort and evaluating the plan. That includes CEQA and we would need to know the opportunities and impacts prior to the vote occurring.
- The non-residential parking supply will be shared amongst the uses.

Members of the public were also given the opportunity to provide comments on Civic Center Plan. Comments included:

- Explore Main St. as closed to vehicles or one-way to allow more shared use of restaurants.
- Concern with the amount of focus throughout the Downtown Specific Plan update on the Civic Center Plan and not all aspects of the plan.
- Concern with moving forward with CEQA when don't know if the voters will approve the civic center relocation.
- Concern with the location of the hotel.
- We are creating a vision for future and encourage the Task Force to look past the short term and look at 20 years and beyond.
- Consider changes to market conditions instead of just focusing on today's market conditions.

The Task Force determined that it needs to understand the full scope of the potential project including the potential cost, benefit, environmental impact, and land uses detailed in the Civic Center Plan before it goes to the voters. The Task Force noted that it is ready to move forward with CEQA as long as other road configurations may potentially be designed. The Task Force requested a scoping session where they would have the opportunity to hear public input and provide input on topics that will be analyzed in the CEQA review. The scoping meeting could also include some alternative transportation network ideas.

#### **4. Review Existing and Proposed Land Use Designations**

The Senior Planner noted that property owners of 309 Neal Street would like the Task Force to discuss their property at a future meeting. In addition, staff will present discrepancies between the General Plan, Specific Plan, and Zoning districts at a future

meeting with targeted outreach to those property owners. The Senior Planner presented an overview of potential land use designations modifications:

- A new *Mixed Use Downtown* designation
  - This would be located in the area of the current Civic Center.
  - Uses allowed would be retail on the ground floor with residential or office on upper floors or office on the ground floor with residential on upper floors.
  - Staff provided clarification that restaurants and food hall could be added.
  - The General Plan and zoning code definitions may need to be adjusted with this new designation as the current Mixed Use designation and definition allows industrial (which is not a use desirable in the downtown).
- A new *Mixed Use Transitional* designation
  - This would essentially replace the existing Office land use designation in the Downtown Specific Plan area.
  - This area could create a transition between the downtown core and adjacent residential areas.
  - In some locations where this designation is proposed, there is currently an inconsistency between the Specific Plan (Office) and zoning district (Central-Commercial).
  - This designation is intended to expand the range of uses allowed in the Office land use designation with an emphasis on uses that have lower intensity than those allowed in the Central-Commercial zoning district and *Mixed Use Downtown* District. For example, it may allow food establishments but require a Conditional Use Permit for bars.
- Active Ground Floor Uses Overlay
- Designation for the Arroyo
- Irby Ranch Boundary and Service Station at 4212 First Street
  - Boundary change to include the entirety of the approved Irby Ranch project site.
  - The owners of 4212 First Street have requested a modification in the land use designation from commercial to residential.

The Task Force provided comments which included:

- Would any industrial in downtown that will be affected?
- The active ground floor overlay should be on more than one block of civic center.
- “Light retail” should be allowed if possible in *Mixed Use Transitional* zone.
- There should not be ground floor housing in the Mixed Use zones.
- Is there a benefit to split railroad and the Arroyo designations aside from clarity?

Members of the public were also given the opportunity to provide comments on the land use designation modifications. Comments included:

- Consider adding active ground floor uses to Civic Center site.

- Desire to not see residential permitted on the ground floor.
- Clarification that the property on First Street is just asking for the same designation as neighboring residential properties.

The Task Force took the following actions:

- Move forward with the *Mixed Use Downtown* designation with the modification to add active ground floor uses around the town square and clarify that retail is allowed on upper floors not just ground floors.
- Move forward with the *Mixed Use Transitional* designation and potentially include “light retail” and exclude ground floor housing.
- Move forward with the Active Ground Floor overlay. (9 in favor, 1 opposed)
- Accept the new designation for the Arroyo so there is distinction between the Arroyo and the Railroad.
- Accept the modified Irby Ranch designation.
- Accept the modified 4212 First Street designation. (9 in favor, 1 opposed)

## **5. Context Sensitive Infill**

The Planning Manager presented background on context sensitive infill indicating there are some existing policies and guidelines related to this topic, but there have been concerns that some recent infill projects are not meeting community expectations for appropriate design, scale, and compatibility with neighboring development. Three options were presented:

- Strengthen existing policies,
- Add design guidelines,
- Add development standards.

The Task Force discussed the topic providing the following feedback:

- Is this part of the scope of work for the Downtown Specific Plan?
- How would this be affected by the historic district?
- It has worked well with guidelines that we have which allow flexibility.
- There is room for improvement and would like staff to study examples of options moving forward on ways to enhance the standards and guidelines.
- There have been recent cases where there was not enough clarity in the existing guidelines and standards and we may have ended up with projects that do not fit their context.

Members of the public were also given the opportunity to provide comments. Comments included:

- The existing guidelines seem to provide too many loop holes, are too broad, and are too ambiguous.
- Standards should be developed/explored.
- We have guidelines and standards already and additional restrictions/complications are not needed.

- The market is looking for the maximum density right now, so it would be helpful to be better prepared.
- The guidelines are too vague right now, but we don't want to go overboard and take away all of the developer's flexibility.

The Task force asked that the review of the guidelines be added as a policy to the Downtown Specific Plan. The policy can note that staff should update, refine, and clarify guidelines.

## **6. Task Force Check-In**

**A. Task Force Members Comment on Planning Process To-date.** One Task Force member noted that they would like to see an alternative transportation network around the Civic Center.

## **7. Brief Announcements from Task Force and Staff, Summary and Next Steps**

**A. Summary of the Meeting and Review of Next Meeting Topics.** City staff provided an overview of the Task Force's progress and upcoming schedule.