



---

## ITEM 1: SUMMARY OF MEETING #13

---

### Summary of Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force Meeting #13 Tuesday, April 24, 2018

#### ***Task Force Members Present***

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

#### ***Task Force Members Absent***

1	Dirk Christiansen, Pleasanton Downtown Association
---	--

#### ***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		

## **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 #12 Summary.**

The Task Force voted to approve the Meeting #12 Summary with the following amendment on page 4 of 5:

"Staff explained, the City Council ~~endorsed~~ 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."

*Approved unanimously.*

## **2. Public Comments**

### **A. Correspondence.**

The Task Force acknowledged correspondence was received. A Task Force member inquired about why the letters submitted regarding the EIR scoping meeting were not included as part of public comment. Staff explained that these comments are posted on the project website.

Staff agreed to provide a copy of Knut Ojermark's presentation as requested by the Task Force.

### **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. Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 2 and Provide Direction**

### **A. Begin Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 2 and Provide Direction**

Staff introduced the draft redlined plan, Part 2 as described in the agenda report. The key points outlined in the Land Use chapter were: (1) building height; (2) ground floor residential uses; (3) uses in the Mixed Use – Transitional district; (4) existing single family residences; and (5) active ground floor uses. Other topics included in the agenda report included the Downtown Design chapter and other recommended revisions.

### **B. Task Force Direction, Comments, and Questions**

There was a question regarding 377 St. Mary/377 Peters Ave. Staff clarified that it was processed as one horizontal mixed-use project (commercial and residential component). The project is 38-feet from grade to the peak.

The Task Force inquired if the heights identified in the Attachment 3 for Item 3 are actual height (grade to peak or as clarified in table). Staff clarified that the heights shown in Attachment 3 are the actual height.

In response to a question from the Task Force, staff clarified that the proposed building height maximums are to the midpoint of the roof (not the peak). This allows roof forms to change.

A Task Force member asked about the project at 273 Spring Street and its associated height, and staff clarified that the height is to the peak, that the building is on a hill, and that it has yet to be clad with exterior building materials.

The Task Force asked if there has been feedback from landowners who will be affected by the potential height change in the RM District. Staff clarified that notification related to the land use discrepancies was sent, but not related to modifying height standards since the policy is in the current specific plan, and recent projects have not approached the current 40-foot height limit.

In response to a question from the Task Force, staff clarified that towers and other architectural elements are not allowed to cover more than 10 percent of the ground area covered by the structure, and that with the proposed code amendment, building-mounted flagpoles would be permitted to a height up to 15 feet above the height limit prescribed by the code, and that freestanding flagpoles could still be 25 feet taller than the height limit for the district in which its proposed.

In response to a question, staff clarified that the State defers to local government in terms of measuring height. One of the key factors in considering height is simplification of measurement, and to encourage good design and maintain interesting architecture without punishing owners. Typically, the community will recognize good design and a sense of scale and character (rather than a specific height calculation). Overall aesthetic is what people appreciate in downtown (e.g., roof pitch, size of roof, design details). Currently, the City has both maximum stories and maximum feet measurements for height and staff proposes to use maximum feet instead of stories.

#### Questions for Task Force

1. Does the Task Force agree with the proposed specific plan text amendments related to height, including elimination of stories as a measure of building height in the specific plan?

Agreed unanimously

2. Does the Task Force agree with the proposed municipal code text amendments related to height, including modification of the measurement methodology and height exceptions as outlined in Attachment 4?

Agreed unanimously

3. Does the Task Force agree not to further pursue the community benefits discussions as it pertains to the specific plan?

Agreed unanimously

4. Does the Task Force agree with the proposed height maximums for the *Mixed Use – Transitional* and *Mixed Use – Downtown* districts?

Some Task Force members expressed concern with the 46-foot maximum height in the *Mixed Use – Downtown* district. Staff noted that a 46-foot maximum would allow more flexibility and there is a design process that all of these projects would need to go through. Discussion included allowing portions of the site to be 46-feet in height or specific elements, such as the parking structure to be taller than a 40-foot height limit. Some Task Force members expressed interest in including a separate policy regarding height of parking structures that would allow it to exceed the height maximum.

Public comments were provided which included suggestions on height exceptions for parking, limiting height to 3-story limits, and potential TOD development/high-density affordable housing that may be allowed by pending legislation.

A majority (7 members) of the Task Force is in favor of a 40-foot limit in the *Mixed Use – Downtown* district instead of 46 feet, and there was general support for a 36-foot height limit for the *Mixed Use – Transitional* district.

5. Does the Task Force agree with the approach to allow ground-floor residential in the *Downtown Commercial, Mixed Use – Transitional, and Mixed Use – Downtown* districts if located behind an existing or proposed building?

And

6. Does the Task Force desire to allow an entrance to a residential unit or corridor/stairway to be street fronting?

Public comments were provided which noted that commercial doesn't always hide residential and that there should not be doors/stairways/entrances on Main Street.

Staff noted that it may be beneficial to allow doors on Main Street to allow versatility to potential design.

Task force members noted to support vitality they support entrances on Main and others supported entrances on the side streets (but not on Main Street).

Unanimous support from the Task Force to not allow ground-floor residential downtown.

In addition, the Task Force voted to allow street fronting residential entries in the *Mixed Use – Transitional* district and the *Mixed Use – Downtown* district, not but not Downtown Commercial (5 Task Force members supported this and 4 were opposed).

The Task Force unanimously agreed to remove the last sentence (in regards to allowing live/work on the ground floor on Main Street in the Downtown Commercial district) on page 7 of the Land Use Chapter since it difficult to regulate the residential use within the commercial space.

7. Does the Task Force agree that restaurants with indoor dining be permitted, restaurants with outdoor dining be subject to a Minor Conditional Use permit, and that bars be subject to a Conditional Use Permit in the *Mixed Use – Transitional* district?

And

8. If so, should outdoor dining be subject to both Minor Conditional Use and Outdoor dining permits?

The Task Force unanimously indicated that no bars should be located in the *Mixed Use – Transitional* district, especially if open past 11 pm.

9. Does the Task Force agree that owners of existing single family homes in the *Mixed Use – Transitional* district should be able to alter or enlarge the home, and that an implementation action to amend municipal code section 18.20.030(A), *Nonconforming Uses – Alteration and Addition*, should be added to the specific plan such that the *Mixed Use – Transitional* is added to the list of districts that allow a residential use to be altered or enlarged?

The Task Force unanimously agreed.

Public comments included ensuring the proposed language is very clear to avoid conflict or interpretation.

10. Does the Task Force find the text related to multiple tenants within a single space acceptable?

The Task Force provided unanimous support.

11. Does the Task Force find the exceptions to the active ground floor use requirement acceptable?

The Task Force discussed potentially allowing an exception for vacancy of six months and a public comment suggested potentially longer than six months, and a suggestion to combine criteria #1 (a minimum of 6-month vacancy) and #2 (there is not a similar use within the same block of a designated active street, although the language should be clarified that a block applies to a “block face,” or one side of the street since that is what influences the pedestrian experience). The Task Force also discussed allowing/not allowing exceptions to persist if a non-active business goes out of business, and that the non-conforming standard should not apply, and that the space be required to lease to an active use.

Majority Task Force support for an exception to active uses if vacant for six months (no longer), to combine criteria #1 and #2 (with clarification to whether the requirement applies to both sides of the street or only one), and if a non-active business goes out of business, and that the non-conforming standard should not apply, and that the space be required to lease to an active use.

12. Does the Task Force find the modification to the definition of “active ground floor use” acceptable?

The Task Force also discussed uses such as gyms and retail frontage on Main Street. The Task Force recommended removing “catering” and unanimously accepts the definition otherwise.

13. Does the Task Force agree with the downtown gateway locations?

Staff clarified that a gateway is an entry feature/sign/marker/identifier that you’re entering/exiting a place. Staff clarified the locations- one at Old Bernal Avenue, one at Main Street, and one at First Street/Sunol Boulevard.

Unanimous support for gateway locations, with the understanding that the southern gateways locations would be modified to be located at: Old Bernal Avenue/Bernal Avenue, Main Street/Bernal Avenue, and the third at the Main Street/First Street/Sunol Boulevard intersection.

14. Does the Task Force have any comments on the Downtown Design chapter?

Task Force members provided the following comments:

- Should Division Street get “public” designation even though it is public right-of-way?
- Scattering of special needs housing through the downtown area (page 11 of clean version #24) seems to be strangely wording and should be reworked
- Side streets should be extension of Main Street in terms of streetscape, visual cues, etc. and the language in the specific plan should be strengthened
- Reference historic neighborhood signs in historic neighborhoods

- On Figure 10-1, Streetscape enhancements are noted off Rose and W. Angela but not other streets.
- On Figure 10-1, residential tree planting program unclear what is new and what has occurred
- In terms of lighting, ensure we build a safe pedestrian environment as some streets (such as St. Mary's) are very dark, and the specific plan should acknowledge lighting and safety in the policies
- Consider adding substantial barriers to protect people at farmers' market and other events

Staff acknowledged language related to parklets may be modified pending upcoming discussion with City Council.

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

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

No comments.

#### **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 8:55 p.m.