



SUMMARY OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION TASK FORCE MEETING #12

Thursday, August 29, 2013
6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
3333 Busch Road

Task Force Members in Attendance

Planning Commissioner Jennifer Pearce (Chair)	Bonnie Krichbaum
Paul Martin	Gerald Hodnefield
Linda Garbarino	

Task Force Members Absent

Phil Blank
Emilie Cruzan

Staff Present

Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development
Steve Otto, Senior Planner

Others Present

Chris Bourg	Teri Pohl
Brian Bourg	Jan Batcheller
Mike Peel	Bob Byrd
Jon Harvey	Brad Hirst

Meeting Purpose

Review and Discuss the Draft Definition of Demolition, Draft Story Pole Code Amendment, and Draft Amendments to the Downtown Specific Plan, Downtown Design Guidelines, and Stanley Boulevard Heritage Neighborhood Map

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pearce. Agenda items were presented and discussed in order.

I. Welcome and Review of Meeting Purpose

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview

Chair Pearce welcomed everyone to the meeting.

B. Review and Approval of the Meeting #11 Summary

The Meeting Summary was accepted and approved by a vote of 5-0-2.

II. Meeting Open to the Public

Mr. Hirst inquired about local standards. Mr. Dolan and Chair Pearce indicated that the Task Force had already decided what it was going to do about local standards at the last Task Force meeting and that it was discussed in the meeting summary. Mr. Dolan indicated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to discuss the remaining items that needed further discussion.

III. Old Business

A. There was none.

IV. Discussion of:

Chair Pearce said she would like to review the items one at a time starting with Task Force questions, comments from the public, and then Task Force discussion. The Task Force indicated that the order was ok.

Mr. Dolan indicated that as a point of clarification the way the agenda was put together tonight is to go over those remaining items that needed to be discussed by the Task Force. He said the presentation might seem a little choppy because he is not presenting the whole package tonight.

A. Draft Definition of Demolition. Mr. Dolan indicated the first item was to continue to refining the definition of demolition. He indicated that everyone was comfortable with the first part, but there was a suggestion that we needed to address the situation when something that has been designated for preservation, but when it is pulled apart during construction it is found to not be stable. Mr. Dolan indicated that staff added the third sentence to address this issue and read the draft language. Mr. Dolan asked if the draft language adequately addressed the issue.

Ms. Krichbaum asked if the Task Force was addressing demolition to all houses that are older than 1942 or just houses with significance.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the draft policy addresses houses that are considered to be historically significant. He indicated that if something is built before 1942, we do the survey and if it is not considered to be significant, then none of the policies regarding demolition would apply and it could be demolished just like any other house in town.

Ms. Garbarino said she thought the phrasing was good in the definition. She felt the last part about the new construction matching the original was a critical phrase.

Mr. Hodnefield agreed.

Mr. Peel indicated he was concerned with the section which included et cetera and questioned about any earthquake problems, what if the original materials do not meet the current code, and any safety issues. He questioned if that would be covered under et cetera. He said he would like to see some wordsmithing put in there. He questioned if the definition should state demolition of a residential building as it doesn't specify that now.

Mr. Dolan indicated that for purposes of this slide, the word residential was not included, but in the actual text the word residential is included. Mr. Dolan indicated that he would be happy to give some thought to Mr. Peel's comments and add any clarification at the end. Mr. Dolan indicated that he's not sure if he would want to word smith it right now.

Chair Pearce agreed that she didn't want Mr. Dolan to have to make the changes right now.

Mr. Dolan indicated that we can't make a definition that addresses 100% of all possibilities.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that he felt most were concerned about the appearance and what people were going to see from the street.

Mr. Martin indicated isn't it the Building Official that is going to say whether the wood is suitable or not for framing.

Mr. Dolan indicated if it was for an historic structure, then he would be involved in the decision, but he would be relying on the Building Official's expertise.

Ms. Garbarino stated that wouldn't the Building Official's input also take into consideration the earthquake issues that Mr. Peel mentioned.

Mr. Dolan indicated that he thinks we can work with the language we have, but he's not opposed to mulling it over a little bit more.

Chair Pearce question if the sentence could end with "determined by the Director of Community Development to be unusable."

Mr. Dolan indicated that he would like to think on how to modify the language.

Ms. Krichbaum questioned if there were separate Building Code standards or exceptions for historic buildings.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that the Task Force talked about that and he's not sure if you want to do that, such as requiring new studs to be 24 inches on center if that is how it is now.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not get that detailed.

Ms. Batcheller asked for confirmation that the demolition definition only applies to structures deemed historical and questioned whether it applies to both residential and commercial structures.

Chair Pearce confirmed it only applies to historical structures and stated it would only apply to residential buildings.

Mr. Bourg indicated that it would be valuable to have a point person from the City to check

on the termite damage to confirm the person is being honest.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the Building Official would look at it.

Mr. Bourg indicated that judging by the past few years many homes that he considers to be extremely important to history and the character of Pleasanton have been disrespected and said they were not historic and, therefore, didn't meet the requirement and didn't have to worry about it. He stated we were missing a huge opportunity to create some local guidelines to preserve what is important to our community. He stated that many beautiful and wonderful homes will not meet the State of California historic guidelines. He said we are missing a big opportunity and kowtowing to the other side which says we want to be able to demolish basically anything we want to.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that the California register standards do make you look at local history, local standards, and local significance, but that doesn't always happen. She said it is important that we make sure that the person doing the review or survey look at the local criteria.

Mr. Dolan indicated that we are going backwards here on things that have already been decided, but the main difference is we now have the tool of the context statement. He indicated that while someone thinks we are missing an opportunity here, it is important to note that we are acting on the direction of the Council from the check in.

Mr. Bourg indicated that it would be valuable to have one company do the survey.

Chari Pearce indicated that we are getting far afield of the topic at hand, but it was her understanding that it will be done by one company.

Mr. Dolan confirmed that the Council was in support of that.

Mr. Harvey suggested that "unsatisfactory construction" be added after termite damage and then finishing the sentence with "the new construction substantially matches the appearance of the original."

Mr. Dolan indicated that he would have a concern with Mr. Harvey's suggestion to use the substantially matching language as he would have to argue with people about what "substantially" means.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that he was able to duplicate the siding on his house by having it specially cut.

Mr. Harvey indicated that the way it was currently written it would allow the purist to say that the tear drop siding had to exactly match the profile even if that meant that you had to have a tool made in order to make the siding. He's suggesting to allow someone to use something that is really close.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that the problem he has with that is that you can get into a lot of subjectivity as to what is close enough. He said he understood Mr. Harvey's point, but he would like to keep it as black and white as possible. He indicated that he did considerable research and you can duplicate virtually anything.

Chair Pearce asked the Task Force if they were ok with the draft definition with the addition of the word "residential" and maybe some wordsmithing that they will leave to Brian for

expansion of dry rot, termite damage, and things that fall under the category of unusable.

The Task Force indicated that was acceptable.

B. Draft Story Pole Code Amendment.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the City runs into this issue a lot at the Planning Commission. He stated that the City doesn't currently have any authority to require story poles and that we try to talk applicants into doing it because it is usually very useful to the Planning Commission. He indicated that many times applicants choose not to install them, mostly because of the added expense or the applicant feels the whole process is ridiculous. He stated that staff is not opposed to adding the requirement and believes that the Council would support it. He indicated that staff prepared two options, with just subtle differences in the language between the two.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that one of the reason for requiring story poles, which as he understands cost between \$700 and \$1,200, is to prevent people from coming back later on and saying that they had no idea it was going to be that tall.

Chair Pearce indicated that story poles, when done properly, can be a very useful tool by the deciding body as well. She questioned whether the Task Force wants to be automatic and require story poles and the applicant could request to have the requirement removed or does the Task Force want to require story poles at Brian's discretion?

Mr. Hodnefield likes Brian's discretion because he can look at each situation from the perspective of what's reasonable.

Chair Pearce said she agrees.

Ms. Krichbaum asked if Brian is the zoning administrator.

Mr. Dolan indicated that it is a responsibility that he designates to another person, but usually the person making a decision like this would run it by him even if they are acting as the zoning administrator.

Mr. Otto indicated the reason why zoning administrator was used in the draft language is because it would be going into an existing list in the code that already uses the zoning administrator.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that this goes hand in hand with the compatibility component in terms of understanding something on a written page verses something you actually see that is visual. She indicated that most major cities that have historic neighborhoods require story poles and she thinks neighbors appreciate it. She indicated that some cities have a kiosk at the site to allow you to take something and make comments to the person that is responsible. She said that story poles save the element of shock and if there is something that can be done to mitigate that, then it is being a good neighbor and being a good community.

Mr. Dolan questioned if there was any preference for whether the story pole requirement is subject to his discretion or just required.

Ms. Krichbaum indicated that she would like them to be automatic.

Ms. Garbarino indicated she liked option two.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that he preferred some discretion.

Chair Pearce indicated that she is happy to have story poles, but she doesn't need them to be automatic. She indicated that she doesn't want anyone to jump through hoops if they don't need to and she trusts the discretion of the Planning Department.

Ms. Krichbaum questioned if it would be decided without neighbors or anybody being brought up to date on what it is going to look like.

Chair Pearce indicated that this is prior to a public hearing and if it came to a public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission or neighbors thought that it needed story poles, then we could still have that conversation.

Mr. Hodnefield stated that if there was a question, then Brian is probably going to go with the story poles.

Mr. Dolan said he agreed.

Ms. Garbarino thought it would streamline the process.

Ms. Krichbaum indicated that they asked for story poles for the house on Third St., but didn't get them and now it is shockingly large.

Mr. Dolan indicated that any new home like that would now get story poles using this new code section.

Chair Pearce indicated that even when Brian or whoever says that they don't think story poles are necessary and it comes before a public hearing, then neighbors can ask for them and there still can be a conversation of whether they are needed or not.

Mr. Harvey indicated that the key to the story poles is that it needs to come very early in the process as a developer has already spent \$20,000, \$50,000, or \$100,000 on plans by the time it reaches a public hearing and if he is told the structure is too big and needs to redesign the plans, then that is much more expensive than the story poles themselves. He said there is also a chicken-egg problem of installing story poles before there are renderings or drawings for people to juxtapose between the poles and drawings to see what the structure will actually look like. He said it is only effective and fair to the property owner if it is done very early in the process. He asked if that could be done.

Mr. Dolan indicated that he's never heard of anyone requiring story poles before an application is submitted. He said that if someone wanted to install story poles in advance to see what the neighbors think, then that is great, but the City can't require them prior to an application being submitted.

Mr. Hirst indicated that having experience with story poles, he would suggest alternative two be selected. He said based on his experience, the sooner you know story poles are going to be required, the better off everybody is including the applicant and staff.

Mr. Peel said he agrees with Mr. Hirst and said the applicant should be allowed the option to

put the story poles up early on, because if someone gets an architect, you're paying \$30,000 or \$40,000 for a set of plans which may need to be revised and revised. He said if you give the applicant the option on when to put the story poles up, then it's the applicant's choice.

Mr. Hirst indicated if you could get them up before the hearing and the height falls within the zoning code, anybody that is going to be upset about the height will be advised that that height is allowed by code. He said for someone who is opposing a project, the sooner they know the better off they are.

Chair Pearce agreed that story poles help everybody.

Mr. Byrd said he didn't see a whole lot of difference between the alternatives and basically we won't know if they are going to go up at all as you can ask to waive the requirement in one option and the zoning administrator waive them in the other option.

Chair Pearce said there still will be some discretion for whether they are required or not, but we will have more ability to require them whereas now we have no ability.

Chair Pearce confirmed that the Task Force is in agreement with option two. All of the Task Force members agreed except Ms. Krichbaum, who indicated that she wasn't sure. Chair Pearce indicated that the consensus is for option two.

Ms. Krichbaum indicated that she felt a requirement is more clarified than a maybe.

C. Draft Amendments to the Downtown Specific Plan

Mr. Dolan indicated that the presentation will seem a bit choppy as he is only going to point out changes from the last Task Force meeting. Mr. Dolan indicated the first change occurs where staff interjected the language about how you determine the historical significance of a residential structure using the 1942 date and the context statement. He indicated that staff added language that Ms. Garbarino had suggested regarding revisiting the 1942 date every 10 years. He indicated for the public notification period, he looked at the wrong Code section at the last meeting and the existing public notification language in the Specific Plan is 45 days so staff put that back. He said the next paragraph regarding the demolition definition was already discussed tonight. He indicated that the next item was a housekeeping item to clean up the existing sections relating to commercial properties, which the Council directed the Task Force not to deal with. He stated that staff had to add some language to distinguish the new sections applicable to residential from the existing sections applicable to commercial. Mr. Dolan indicated that the new residential building design section was modified as directed by the Task Force at the last meeting to indicate that one of the historic architectural styles identified in the Context Statement should be used.

Ms. Garbarino suggested that listing the architectural styles in the flow charts would be useful to someone so they wouldn't have to reference another document.

Mr. Dolan indicated the next item was a compatibility standard. He indicated that the Task Force had agreed with the immediate neighborhood definition at the last meeting. He indicated that there was also agreement on the compatible FAR language. He indicated that there was some discussion about the height compatibility language. He stated at the last meeting, Jerry had felt you would end up with a weird number that would have no relationship to the architecture or number of stories. Mr. Dolan indicated that staff tested it out and found that Jerry was correct.

Mr. Hodnefield suggested putting a number in there such as 40 feet.

Mr. Dolan indicated that would be higher than what the code allows right now, which is 30 feet.

Ms. Garbarino referenced the Third Street house and questioned what compatibility standard could have been used to ensure the height of that building was mitigated to some point without destroying the architecture.

Mr. Dolan indicated that just using the 30 ft. standard wouldn't work because it met that. He indicated that he wasn't sure it was the height that's the problem with it, but it is the size of it.

Mr. Dolan indicated that staff came up with two height compatibility alternatives to the language that was presented last time and he then discussed those alternatives.

Mr. Hodnefield questioned how the standards would affect a situation where a parking garage was half underground below two stories.

Mr. Dolan indicated that there is a methodology to how height is calculated and it would count towards height.

Mr. Otto indicated that height is defined in the municipal code as the average grade that the structure intersects the ground up to the midpoint between the tallest ridge and its corresponding eave. He indicated that you can get structures where the ridge heights are in the high 30's depending on how steep the roof pitch is.

Mr. Hodnefield discussed a property he just purchased on Peters and St. Mary and one of the projects he was contemplating for it includes garages sunk down below and then two stories.

Discussion ensued on which alternative to use or whether to just rely on the municipal code height limit.

Mr. Bourg indicated one of the worries he has in the historic neighborhoods is when someone buys a big lot and then squeezes something in that really doesn't fit, similar to what his neighbor wanted to do.

Mr. Hodnefield said you still have the FAR.

Ms. Bourg questioned where massing and scale was addressed in the document.

Mr. Dolan indicated it was right after this topic.

Mr. Martin clarified it was right before.

Mr. Dolan agreed and said that the Task Force agreed on the language at the last meeting.

Chair Pearce asked if the Task Force could come to a consensus on Alternative 1 or 2.

Ms. Krichbaum questioned about using Alternative 3 that was discussed, which is using the existing municipal code height limit.

Mr. Dolan indicated that if the Task Force is struggling with it, then he would be inclined to

eliminate the height compatibility language and just rely on the existing municipal code height limit.

Chair Pearce said she felt the Task Force should leave the existing municipal code regulation alone and not add any new height regulations. The other Task Force members agreed.

D. Draft Amendments to the Downtown Design Guidelines

Mr. Dolan indicated that the first section that was revised refers to the same architectural styles that were added to the Specific Plan.

Mr. Hodnefield suggested removing the list of architectural styles and just reference the Context Statement.

Ms. Garbarino said that if we are trying to save people time and streamline it, then it would be better to provide them more concrete information without making them go back and do research or check another document.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated that he didn't have an objection one way or the other and that it seemed to already have been outlined in the Context Statement.

Chair Pearce said she has found it useful to be reiterated in several documents.

Mr. Hodnefield said he had no problem then with the way it was presented.

Mr. Dolan said the next item deals with the windows that were discussed at the last meeting. He said the Task Force got hung up a little last time with the example of someone with a 1960's home with original aluminum windows being prevented from replacing the aluminum windows with aluminum. He said staff came up with new language stating that it wasn't necessarily encouraged, but it would be allowed. He said staff also added window language from the Second and Third St. section of the Guidelines to this section as well because it was a general statement.

Mr. Martin indicated that he noticed a few areas where the language was inconsistent in the Guidelines and Specific Plan. He indicated that the window language differed slightly in the Guidelines and they should be consistent.

Mr. Dolan said the intent was to make them the same and it will be corrected.

Mr. Martin said the other area of inconsistency was relating to garages where one says it is encouraged and the other says it has to be.

Mr. Dolan indicated staff will change the sections so they all use the same language.

Mr. Harvey indicated that he mentioned this last time and he still thinks that the 50 ft. lot width threshold for garages is too narrow and feels that 75 or 80 ft. should be used.

Mr. Dolan said it was a fair question, but the Task Force talked about it last time and ended up on 50 ft.

Ms. Krichbaum indicated that there are many homes in this area that have 50 ft. lots with driveways on the side.

Mr. Dolan acknowledged that some of them are tight and that we probably require a wider driveway now than when the homes were originally built. Mr. Dolan indicated that the Task Force could increase it to 60 ft. or something else if they wished.

Discussion ensued over the minimum lot width to use and how it affected the house width.

Chair Pearce indicated that she was comfortable with using 60 ft.

Mr. Hodnefield and Mr. Martin agreed.

Mr. Hirst indicated that the vast majority of lots north of Downtown are 65 to 70 ft. wide.

Mr. Krichbaum agreed, but noted that is not the historic neighborhoods that the Task Force is looking at.

Mr. Peel indicated that many of the lots on Second St. are either 50 ft. wide or 75 ft. wide. He stated that he would like to revisit the FAR requirement after the Task Force concluded its discussion on the lot width.

Ms. Garbarino questioned if the Task Force was creating a problem by going with 60 ft.

Mr. Martin indicated that if Ms. Garbarino wanted to rebuild her garage she wouldn't be able to rebuild it back on the property line.

Mr. Dolan indicated that a variance would be required, but that it would probably be approved.

Mr. Martin indicated that he felt 60 ft. should be used to provide more flexibility to the applicant.

The Task Force agreed to use 60 ft.

E. Stanley Boulevard Heritage Neighborhood Map

Mr. Dolan said the next item was something Emilie has been championing, which is the older homes on the north side of Stanley Boulevard. He said she feels they have been neglected in the current Downtown Specific Plan. He indicated that on the south side of Stanley there is a nice row of older homes, but on the north side it is really hit or miss. He referenced the map and indicated that there are just a few homes that are older. He indicated that staff is indifferent on adding these homes or not. He then showed pictures of the homes, some of which are hidden by vegetation. Mr. Dolan indicated that the homes are not necessarily architectural masterpieces, but they are older homes. Mr. Dolan said if you are in this neighborhood versus not in this neighborhood, the only difference is a paragraph in the Guidelines, which he showed on a slide. He indicated there is not any extra protection provided to this neighborhood.

Ms. Garbarino stated that the whole street used to be a series of beautiful homes and that if the Guidelines were in place 20 years ago, then you wouldn't have the massive multiple dwelling units that are there or the house across the street where two lots were bought, the houses demolished, and a giant strange thing was built.

Mr. Dolan indicated that being in one of the Heritage Neighborhoods doesn't really have any

regulatory punch to it. He said all you get are the guidelines shown on the slide.

Mr. Martin questioned if anyone has spoken to the property owners of the affected lots.

Mr. Dolan said no.

Mr. Martin said that if the property owners are asked and they are fine with it, then adding them would be a no brainer.

The other Task Force members agreed that the property owners should be contacted to see if they are supportive or not before the Task Force makes a decision on this topic.

Mr. Dolan indicated that staff would contact the property owners and if the majority of them favored it, then staff would recommend that all of the lots be added.

Chair Pearce indicated that the consensus of the Task Force was if the owners were in favor of it, then the Task Force was ok with it.

Mr. Dolan asked the Task Force what it would do if only some of the property owners were in favor of it.

Chair Pearce indicated they would see what happens and then have that conversation if necessary.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the last item for tonight he wanted to discuss are clean up items in the General Plan to make sure the language matches the language in the Specific Plan.

Mr. Hodnefield indicated they look like housekeeping items.

Mr. Dolan agreed and said staff didn't want to do these changes without telling the Task Force about it.

The Task Force members did not object to the changes.

V. Matters Initiated by Task Force

There were none.

VI. Summary and Next Steps

- A. Summary of the Meeting, Next Steps, Review of Next Meeting Topics
- B. Future Meeting Dates

Mr. Dolan said what he proposes is taking the direction from tonight and preparing a final package that would be distributed to the Task Force to see what it thought and then decide whether or not the Task Force needs to meet again to ok it.

The Task Force agreed.

Chair Pearce indicated that she forgot to circle back to Mr. Peel's comment.

Mr. Peel asked what is the definition of FAR.

Chair Pearce said she wasn't sure if the Task Force was going to reopen the discussion on FAR tonight because the Task Force already settled it at the last meeting.

Mr. Peel stated he wasn't at the last meeting and wanted to put in his two cents. He said he is looking at one or two houses on Second St. to purchase and the three lots south are 75 ft. wide each so he couldn't count the third home since it is 225 ft. away. He said the language should state lots. He then asked if the house he is looking at is 1,800 sq. ft. and the average of the houses in the definition come up to 1,600 sq. ft., then he could only add on 400 sq. ft.

Mr. Dolan indicated yes.

Mr. Peel indicated that he wouldn't be allowed to build a 3,600 sq. ft. house on a 12,000 sq. ft. lot.

Mr. Dolan indicated that is the whole purpose of the compatibility standard, otherwise you would just be going with 40% FAR which has proved unsatisfactory. He indicated there is an exception process for the compatibility standard.

Mr. Hirst suggested changing "with regard" with "as defined" on item number 3 on page eight of the Specific Plan.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the language already exists, but staff will consider that change.

Mr. Hirst indicated in paragraph five, if you take that literally, you wouldn't have Barone's Restaurant, Rose Hotel, Alberto's, or 608 Main Street.

Mr. Dolan said that is current policy.

Chair Pearce said the Council direction was for the Task Force not to talk about commercial in their conversations of new regulations, only residential. She said the Council did not direct the Task Force to strike existing commercial regulations. She added the Task Force isn't supposed to be rolling back commercial regulations, just not add to what is existing.

Mr. Hirst stated he felt the Council direction was to exclude commercial properties.

Mr. Dolan clarified that Council's direction was to exclude commercial properties from any new regulation.

Mr. Dolan indicated that if it is determined that the Task Force needs a meeting, then September 19th is the day we are shooting for. He asked if the Task Force members had a conflict with that date.

Mr. Martin said he did.

Mr. Dolan indicated that we will wait first to see if a majority of the Task Force feels it needs to meet, and then worry about the date.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that she did have an item for matters initiated by the Task Force. She said that streamlining the process was critical and she wanted to make sure that documents will be created to ensure that people will know what the process is and what the regulations are before they hit the ground running.

Mr. Hodnefield said along those lines, he still feels more work needs to be done on the flow charts and that he would be happy to help.

Mr. Dolan indicated that he would set up a meeting with Mr. Hodnefield to discuss his ideas.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that she had previously mentioned that she would like a flow chart for remodels.

Chair Pearce requested that the flow charts be part of the final documents that the Task Force reviews.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that she would like to go on record to ask that the group that does the survey truly look at local criteria.

Ms. Garbarino indicated that the Task Force had previously talked about expanding the historic neighborhoods on pages 4 and 5 of the Specific Plan.

Mr. Dolan indicated that Council's direction was not to expand.

Ms. Garbarino stated she did not hear that.

Mr. Dolan indicated that is what he walked away with from the Council check in.

Ms. Garbarino said there are other streets than those listed on pages 4 and 5 that have heritage houses on them and questioned if those homes would fall under some level of protection.

Mr. Dolan indicated that they would be covered by the Context Statement. He stated other than Stanley Boulevard that Emilie asked for, we are not proposing any changes to the neighborhoods. He stated as he mentioned earlier, he's not sure what it gets you to be included in one of those neighborhoods.

Mr. Dolan said it wouldn't surprise him if after the survey is done and we bring it forward, there might be some conclusions that sort of inform some remapping. He suggested that we should first get the survey and then talk about it.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:05 p.m.

For further information, contact Steve Otto at (925) 931-5608 or sotto@cityofpleasantonca.gov.