



ITEM 1: SUMMARY OF MEETING #12

Summary of Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force Meeting #12 Tuesday, March 27, 2018

Task Force Members Present

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

City of Pleasanton Staff

1	Gerry Beaudin, Director of Community Development	2	Ellen Clark, Planning Manager
3	Shweta Bonn, Senior Planner	4	Brian Dolan, Assistant City Manager
5	Pamela Ott, Director of Economic Development	6	Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer
7	Kendall Granucci, Office Manager		

Professional Staff

1	Andrew Hill, Dyett & Bhatia	2	Katharine Pan, Dyett & Bhatia
---	-----------------------------	---	-------------------------------

1. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview.

The Mayor called the meeting to order and staff provided an overview of the agenda.

B. Review and Approval of Meeting #11 Summary.

The Task Force voted to approve the Meeting #11 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. There were no comments at this time.

3. Introduction to Proposed Land Use Designation Modifications

A. Presentation and Preliminary Discussion of Proposed Land Use Designations

Staff introduced the proposed land use designation modifications as described in the agenda report. The key points outlined were: PUD Zoning, Office specific plan land use designation, and non-conforming uses and structures. Staff described the proposed land use designation modifications and boundaries as shown on the maps provided in the agenda report.

B. Task Force Direction, Comments, and Questions

The Task Force asked clarifying questions regarding the proposed land use designations. Staff responded:

- The goal of the exercise is to bring the general plan, specific plan, and zoning into conformance, using the general plan for guidance.
- Individual conversations with property owners subject to the legal non-conforming designation have not taken place but widespread outreach has occurred.
- Provided a definition of “legal non-conforming” and clarified that legal non-conforming uses would be allowed to operate as such until it is discontinued, when a conforming use would need to occupy the space.
- Clarified that the current residential zoning areas would not be rezoned to a different use (i.e. retail), but rather the residential zoning density may change. For example, the zoning may change to support higher density as allowed in the General Plan. Neighborhood outreach will be conducted for properties identified on Map B prior to making changes, and thus these modifications are implementation items.

Task Force members expressed opposition to leaving the Office zoning designation in the plan for only three properties. It was suggested the zoning be amended whereby those properties would become legal non-conforming uses. Staff elaborated on its rationale for the three buildings to retain the Office specific plan land use designation because they are new buildings, therefore not likely to change in the lifecycle of this specific plan, and the Office designation would allow them to

make changes such as an addition which would otherwise trigger them to come into conformance if they were legal non-conforming.

C. Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment on items not on the agenda. There were no comments at this time.

4. Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 1 and Provide Direction

A. Begin Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 1 and Provide Direction

Staff introduced the initial set of redline chapters from the Specific Plan, inclusive of the Planning Area Context and Historic Preservation chapters, as described in the agenda report. The current chapters are inconsistent when it comes to goals, organization of policies, and implementation measures. The Historic Preservation chapter was updated most recently, and while only limited changes to the Historic Preservation chapter are proposed, it was reorganized to include goals, policies, and implementation programs. Furthermore, staff recognized the chapters are being individually reviewed at this time, but that they may be combined when the final draft is reviewed.

Key changes included:

- In the Planning Area chapter remove reference to Alameda County ownership of the transportation corridor;
- In the Historic Preservation chapter, review for accuracy the suggested changes received from a member of the public related to the history of the city in the introductory text.

B. Task Force Direction, Comments, and Questions

In response to a question from the Task Force, staff clarified: the word “program” was removed from the specific plan; “policies” are outlined within the specific plan document; and “guidelines” are provided as stand-alone documents. Policies usually include more directive requirements, whereas guidelines offer more general guidance on how to achieve a desired objective or outcome.

The Task Force questioned the commitment to the Historic Preservation Implementation Program No. 5 and whether it should remain in the plan. Staff requested the Task Force provide guidance, noting City Council will ultimately decide if the program is retained because it relies on the General Fund.

C. Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment. No comments were made.

5. Public Scoping Session and Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report

A. Public Scoping Session and Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report

Staff provided opening remarks, explaining the purpose of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), to address environmental impacts; and the reason for the EIR, to address changes in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) rules, regulations, and standards which have changed since the last EIR was prepared in 2002. Staff recognized comments from Task Force members and members of the public concerned with the timing and scope of the EIR analysis, specifically with regard to the Bernal property/Civic Center Master Plan. Staff explained that the City Council accepted the concept of the Civic Center Master Plan on the premise the Downtown Specific Plan Update (showing the preferred alternative land use for the existing Civic Center site) and EIR for both sites would be made available to the public prior to a vote on the relocation of the Civic Center. The EIR for the Downtown Specific Plan Update will include environmental review of the Bernal site in the cumulative scenario.

Andrew Hill, Dyett and Bhatia, outlined the CEQA process, scope, and alternatives, as described in the agenda report.

B. Task Force Direction, Comments, and Questions

In response to questions from the Task Force, staff explained the concept of the “tent” or envelope of development analyzed in the program EIR, wherein the environmental impacts across the specific plan area as a whole will be analyzed on a program level rather than a detailed, project-specific level. Staff clarified, individual projects within the scope of the overall program are subsequently submitted and reviewed using the program-level EIR; if the project is significantly different than the EIR anticipated, or new significant impacts would result, then a supplemental environmental analysis or technical studies (i.e. traffic study) would be required. Furthermore, if after the EIR is certified the City Council makes a substantial change to the specific plan, a supplemental environmental review or addendum may be required.

The Task Force requested the following be taken into consideration for the EIR:

- ACE expansion and/or relocation and parking, including moving the ACE station to Bernal property
- - *Staff replied ACE projects are not in the City’s purview and no projects are proposed at this time. If ACE proposes a project, such as relocation, they will conduct their own EIR and the City will have an opportunity to comment on that document.*
- Noise and vibration from railroad/quiet train crossings
- Parking/transportation network
 - *Staff informed Task Force that parking is not an environmental impact as defined by CEQA. Parking is being addressed by staff as a City*

Council work plan priority item, and can be considered as a policy item as part of the approval of the Specific Plan update.

- Sunol train to downtown (supported by one member, strongly opposed by two members)
 - *Staff responded, the Downtown Specific Plan contains policy language removing the Sunol train from consideration.*
- Support for alternative which considers Peters Avenue connecting to Bernal Avenue.
- Support for alternatives that consider additional/alternative parking locations

C. Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment. Comments included:

- Resident offered support for comments regarding ACE train parking and noise
- Resident asked how many alternatives would be considered. Staff responded: no project, project, and two alternatives.

6. Task Force Check-In

A. Task Force Members Comment on Planning Process To-date

In response to questions regarding timing from the Task Force, staff offered to provide an updated schedule; generally speaking, staff anticipates a draft of the Downtown Specific Plan will be ready by the end of 2018 allowing for adoption in early 2019, and for the Civic Center Master Plan to be placed on the November 2019 ballot.

Staff responded to a question from a Task Force member related to traffic cameras on First Street.

In response to a question from the Task Force about public/private partnerships, staff clarified no discussions have taken place regarding the land use designations, however, staff is discussing such partnerships with regard to the Downtown Parking Strategy.

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

A. Summary of the Meeting and Review of Next Meeting Topics

Staff provided an overview of the Task Force's progress and upcoming schedule.

The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.