



Date: September 23, 2013

To: Historic Preservation Task Force

From: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development

Subject: Final Task Force Package

Hello Task Force,

I'm pleased to provide you with what I hope is the final Task Force package. Please review it and provide your comments to Steve Otto at sotto@cityofpleasantonca.gov by 5:00 pm September 30, 2013. Please also indicate whether you think we need to have another Task Force meeting.

Below is a list of the items in the package with a description of any changes were made since the last time they were reviewed by the Task Force:

[Draft Minutes of the August 29, 2013, Task Force Meeting](#)

- Please let us know if you would like any changes.

[Demolition Definition](#)

- Per the discussion from the last meeting, we added the word “residential” and clarification regarding replacement construction.

[Demolition by Neglect](#)

- No changes were made to the definition that was previously selected by the Task Force.

[Story Pole Code Amendment](#)

- At the suggestion of Phil Blank, language was added to clarify that the Planning Commission also has the authority to request story poles.

[Downtown Specific Plan](#)

- Pages 4 of 12 and 5 of 12 – As suggested at the last Task Force meeting, the photographs on these pages were replaced.
- #2 on page 8 of 12 – Per the discussion from the last meeting, we added clarification regarding replacement construction to the demolition definition.
- #3 on page 8 of 12 – At the suggestion of Brad Hirst at the last Task Force meeting, we clarified the first sentence by replacing “with regard to” with “based on.”

- #8 on page 9 of 12 – Several changes were made to the compatibility section. Regarding the 200 ft. distance to be used for calculating the immediate neighborhood, Phil Blank questioned whether the 200 ft. distance was too far and had requested examples showing a 100 ft., 150 ft., and 200 ft. radius around a few properties, including properties near the boundary line. Staff prepared several examples ([attached](#)). Based on the results of these, staff believes that the 200 ft. radius generally results in too large of an area and suggests that 150 ft. be utilized. For some properties, a representative FAR sample might not result using a 150 ft. (or even 200 ft.) radius (e.g., if a property is near several multi-family and/or commercial properties, if a property is located on the Specific Plan Area boundary, etc.). Therefore, staff added language to the exception section to address such a case.

Staff also added language to this section to clarify several items: 1) that only single-family detached homes in both PUD and non-PUD zones are to be used in averaging the FAR; 2) that homes outside of the Specific Plan Area are not to be counted towards the average FAR; and 3) that the FAR limitation does not apply to new single-family homes or additions proposed in PUD zoning districts.

The attachment shows a “clean” version of the section with the changes incorporated. Staff is also providing a redline/strikeout version below showing the changes to the version that was provided at the last meeting.

8. Compatibility of new single-family homes or modifications to existing single-family homes with the immediate neighborhood (i.e., single-family homes on lots within ~~200~~ 150 feet of the subject lot) relative to mass and bulk shall be assumed if the proposed FAR does not exceed the average FAR of the single-family homes in the immediate neighborhood by more than 25 percent. In computing the average FAR, only single-family detached homes in PUD and non-PUD zoning districts in the Downtown Specific Plan Area shall be used. The above compatibility standard does not apply to new single-family homes in PUD zoning districts or modifications to existing single-family homes in PUD zoning districts.

Exceptions can be granted to this compatibility standard if the specific house design is determined to offset issues created by FAR above this standard or if a representative sample of the neighborhood cannot be obtained using the 150 ft. distance, as determined by the Director of Community Development. In no case shall exceptions be granted to exceed zoning restrictions on FAR. However, variances may be granted subject to required findings and established processes.

- #20 on page 12 of 12, “Design and Beautification” Section. As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, the garage sections in the Downtown Design Guidelines and the Downtown Specific Plan were revised to have consistent language and make it a requirement.

Downtown Design Guidelines

- Page 35, “Siting” section and page 38, “Garages and Second Units” section. As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, the garage sections in the Downtown Design Guidelines and the Downtown Specific Plan were revised to have consistent language and to make it a requirement.
- Page 40, “First, Second, and Third Streets” section. As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, staff revised the language of the replacement window section to make it consistent with the Windows section on page 36.

Flow Charts

- The flow charts have been revised to include information on timelines and I have set up a meeting with Jerry Hodnefield to discuss.

Stanley Boulevard Heritage Neighborhood Expansion

- As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, staff contacted the property owners of the five properties in question to see if they were supportive of being added to the Stanley Blvd. Heritage Neighborhood. Rosemary Westfall, who owns two properties at 3987 and 4017 Stanley Boulevard, said she is not interested in being added. Cheryl Willis, owner of 3963 Stanley Boulevard, indicated she did not want to be added. The Bottarinis, owners of 4073 Stanley Boulevard, indicated that they did not wish be added. Darryl Walterson, owner of 4151 Stanley Boulevard, indicated that he would be interested as long as there would be no new regulations.

Since all of the property owners do not wish to be added to the neighborhood and/or do not want additional regulations imposed on their property, staff recommends that this item not be pursued by the Task Force any further. Accordingly, staff removed the draft amendments in the General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan, and Downtown Design Guidelines that were previously shown for this item.

General Plan Amendments

- As noted above, staff removed the Stanley Boulevard Neighborhood amendments that were presented at the last Task Force meeting.