



ITEM 1: SUMMARY OF MEETING #15

Summary of Downtown Specific Plan Update Task Force Meeting #15 Tuesday, June 26, 2018

Task Force Members Present

1	Jerry Thorne, Mayor (Chair)	2	Kathy Narum, City Council
3	Herb Ritter, Planning Commission	4	Justin Brown, Planning Commission
5	Laura Olsen, Pleasanton Downtown Association	6	Steve Baker, Economic Vitality Committee
7	Jim Merryman, At-large	8	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	Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer	6	Megan Campbell, Assistant Planner
7	Amy Statham, 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 #14 Summary.

Approved unanimously.

2. Public Comments

A. Correspondence.

Staff summarized the comments received referencing the proposed zoning designation changes which will be discussed tonight. The Task Force also acknowledged the correspondence and asked it to be made clear that the plan is somewhat flexible and the final buildout may be slightly modified as Staff moves forward preparing the plan.

The Task Force highlighted the necessity of noting that elements within the Civic Center plan can be flexible and potentially rearranged.

B. Meeting Open to the Public.

Members of the public were given the opportunity to comment on items not on the agenda. There was a public comment spoke to the focus of the Task Force meetings to date being on the Civic Center and there has not been enough discussion about the current downtown nor parking. Parking is needed for the vitality of downtown. A parking structure was requested on an existing parking lot and to ensure the replacement of parking when spaces are removed.

Another public comment questioned the location of the hotel as shown on the draft plan, in a prime location, and urged the Task Force to review the location in further detail before the Plan gets too far along in the process. In addition, there was a desire for the Town Square to be combined with the park across the street.

3. Land Use Changes

- A. Staff noted that in January, the Task Force reviewed the concept of new land use designations, Mixed Use Downtown, and Mixed Use Transitional land uses. In March, staff introduced discrepancies between land use designations. These inconsistencies can create confusion for the property owners and neighbors, and result in staff and the Planning Commission making piecemeal interpretations regarding the intended land uses. The overall objective with this effort is to reconcile inconsistencies between the General Plan, Specific Plan, and zoning designations.

In March, there were two maps shared at that time: Map A that shows properties to be adopted with the specific plan update, and Map B that shows properties that would be evaluated further and are an implementation action of the specific plan. This map has been updated for the meeting tonight in that 309 Neal Street and the Irby Site were added to Map A and 4230 Vervais Avenue was moved to Map B.

Notification letters were sent to property owners in preparation for the March meeting, and again in preparation for this meeting. Staff has heard from a few owners as follows:

- **374 St. Mary Street**
 - The property owner contacted staff about the proposed changes which includes changing the land use designations in the General Plan, specific plan, and the zoning to Mixed Use – Transitional, and specifically inquired if office uses would continue to be a permitted use.

- Staff provided an excerpt of the Land Use chapter where offices are identified as an intended use in the Mixed Use – Transitional district.
- **1056 Division Street**
 - The property at 1056 Division Street has generated public comment from both neighboring property owners and the owner of the subject property, primarily related to a massage use proposed at this location. Staff noted that the General Plan and Specific Plan both designate this property as Medium Density Residential, but the zoning is Office, and therefore the map is shown to modify the zoning to R-1-6,500, to be consistent with the other two designations.
 - The property owner has communicated concerns about changing the zoning from Office District to One-Family Residential, in that a change to residential would require substantial investment and improvements.
 - Staff indicated that in response to concerns raised regarding the massage use at this location, and separate from the Task Force's scope of review, staff is preparing to bring an urgency ordinance to the City Council in July for consideration, which, if approved would pause issuance of approvals for new massage businesses in the downtown.
- **938 Division Street**
 - The property owner indicated he would prefer to have his property identified on Map B (for future implementation) instead of Map A.
 - The General Plan land use designation for the subject property is High Density Residential, the specific plan land use designation is Medium Density Residential, and the zoning is One-Family Residential District (R-1-6,500).
 - The change proposed for this property was to the General Plan land use designation, but the property owner indicated that if 907 Rose Avenue were to redevelop as multi-family, he would like to be able to develop his property as part of that multi-family development.
- **4230 Vervais Avenue**
 - A representative of the owner of the property at 4230 Vervais Avenue contacted staff to request that any immediate changes to land use designations for the property at 4230 Vervais Avenue be postponed.
 - The property has been identified in City planning documents as the site of a future expansion of adjacent Rotary Park, is designated in the General Plan and Specific Plan as Parks and Recreation, and Park, respectively, but is zoned Service Commercial (C-S).
 - Since the subject property is currently not on the market for sale, staff agreed that it is premature to make any zoning change; therefore, the attached maps have been modified to show 4230 Vervais on Map B (future implementation), rather than Map A.

The Task Force asked about when these changes would go into effect. Staff clarified that if the use has lapsed for 90-days any new use would need to conform to the updated zoning district. Another question from the Task Force asked to describe the difference between the Mixed Use and Mixed Use Transitional zoning/land use designations. Staff noted that in all three districts you can have mixed uses in either zone, but in the transitional zone, the uses allowed would be slightly less extensive, to eliminate those potentially impactful to the adjacent residential district (e.g., bars).

Staff noted that normally the General Plan trumps when there is an inconsistency with General Plan, Specific Plan, and Zoning. However, sometimes, in the proposed "clean-up" some of the changes are being made to be consistent with the Specific Plan or Zoning instead. Staff noted that in some cases, staff felt that the General Plan allowed more intensity or density than the

Specific Plan or Zoning and the potential impacts would be lessened if following Specific Plan/Zoning instead of General Plan.

The Task Force commented on the low response from property owners and asked for some clarity on the noticing process. Staff remarked that two rounds of noticing were done in anticipation of this effort so staff is fairly certain there were opportunities for property owners to become aware of this process. Staff also reminded the Task Force that more mailings would be done as this process continues (including to future Planning Commission and City Council meetings) which may include a certified letter or affirmative confirmation request.

There was a question about reclassification of properties being tied to title changes. Staff commented that there are a number of ways to deal with these changes and recommend that if there are any concerns from the public on specific uses, we move them to Map B so that they can be included in the implementation plan and that transition can be discussed in more detail.

The Task Force questioned if review of these land use changes in relation to the historical context information and staff noted that was not done yet. Lastly, there was a comment about 4212 First Street and how that property should be reviewed in more detail and what uses are best for that site. Staff confirmed that property can be moved to Map B and the Task Force unanimously agreed.

The Task Force opened the item up to the public. The following public comments were provided:

- Clarification on the uses allowed in the Mixed Use Transitional Zone and if first floor residential would be restricted in that zone. Staff clarified Mixed Use Transitional is meant to accommodate a range of lower intensity commercial uses compatible with residential uses such as retail, personal services, offices, financial institutions, and food establishments. It does not permit ground floor residential and bars or late night entertainment.
- The property owner at 938 Division asked that the land use change be deferred to Map B as detailed in the written correspondence received. The Task Force confirmed this can be done.
- The property owner at 1056 Division commented that she has deep ties to Pleasanton and indicated all of the modifications and improvements done to 1056 Division when they purchased the building. The property owner asked that this property not be changed to residential as the cost to modify this building to residential would be extremely high. The property owner is willing to limit operation hours, always provides adequate parking, and the tenants over the years have always been good neighbors. A neighbor of 1056 Division indicated that generally her tenants have been good and the property has been well maintained. The neighbor noted that if the house is removed, a multi-family building could be built so she would support the property remaining commercial. The Task Force confirmed that this property can be moved to Map B and during the implementation plan, the hours be visited at this site or commercial uses.
- The property owner 455 Bernal Court requested clarification for 455 and 471 Bernal Court if the residential uses at these properties could remain. Staff clarified that the properties could remain residential.

4. Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 4

A. Begin Review Draft Redlined Plan, Part 4 and Provide Direction

Staff introduced the Public Facilities and Services chapter. The Public Facilities and Services chapter identifies infrastructure such as water supply, sewage treatment and export capacity, storm drainage, utilities, and services (e.g., fire services) for properties within the Downtown Specific Plan area. The civic center site currently has a sewer line,

water line, and storm drain line as described on this slide that would need to be factored into new development. The revisions to the chapters are based on the updated evaluation of existing conditions that was prepared in 2017. Additional analysis and assessment of public facilities and services for the proposed “base plan” will be conducted, and any additional infrastructure improvements (if needed) will be identified and incorporated into the public review draft specific plan.

Staff also introduced the Implementation chapter which identifies programs and financing measures necessary to carry out the specific plan, and incorporates a summary of all of the programs identified in other chapters, consolidated in a table. A significant source of funding for major public improvement projects is likely to be the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The City Council priorities the City’s funding of such CIP projects in conjunction with priority setting, and review of the City’s budget. Since downtown Pleasanton is largely built-out, implementing the specific plan’s policies and programs will in most cases involve partnerships between the City and private parties. Other sources of funding would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, usually as part of the City’s budget cycle, and in most instances would require action by the City Council to initiate or implement. Also as noted, the specific plan is a long-term document, and as the source of funding is expected to come from a variety of sources, and implementation will be phased over the life of the plan.

Also introduced at this time were the General Plan Relationship to the Specific Plan, the Introduction, and the Executive Summary chapters. The Introduction provides an overview, information on specific plans and California state law, and outlines the specific plan’s history and update process. The Introduction also indicates a brief overview of each of the twelve chapters of the specific plan. The Executive Summary provides a broad overview of the specific plan and an abbreviated summary of process the Task Force undertook for its update. Also featured in the Executive Summary (and in the Introduction) is the Vision Statement, which the Task Force will recall it accepted a working draft of subsequent to considering drafts.

B. Task Force Direction, Comments, and Questions

The Task Force had a number of comments including:

- Wireless should be included in the Public Facilities and Services chapter.
- Questioned the first versus second priority to the gateways in the Implementation chapter.
- Asked staff to look into the wording around projecting signs.
- The language in the Implementation Plan be expanded as to clarify that the Civic Center relocation is not a “done deal.”
- In the transportation corridors, discussion about parking should be added.
- Asked staff to confirm it is consistent with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
- On Historic Preservation, add note about adding plaques to significant buildings.
- Asked if there should be a notation about a policy on signage on side streets in regards to sandwich board signs.
- In Economic Vitality, there should be something to encourage mobility from various areas downtown, to the theatre, and to the railroad corridor.
- Should we include private sector ride sharing in Mobility.
- The vision statement is currently in a couple chapters so this should be reconciled moving forward.

C. Public Comments and Questions

There were no public comments.

5. Task Force Check-In

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

The Task Force has previously reviewed seven redlined chapters, and at this meeting has reviewed five additional chapters. Staff and the professional services team will be working on the next iteration of the plan, with the objective of releasing the public review draft later in 2018. Before this work commences, staff would like to ask the Task Force if there is consensus regarding the chapters that have been provided to the Task Force.

6. 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 8:25 p.m.