PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

DRAFT

Wednesday, September 25, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of September 25, 2013, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Pearce.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Pearce.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Larissa Seto, Assistant City Attorney; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Greg O'Connor, Jennifer Pearce, Mark Posson, and Herb Ritter

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Arne Olson

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. September 11, 2013

Chair Pearce proposed that the consideration of the September 11, 2013 Minutes be continued as Commissioner Olson is absent. She asked the Commissioners if they were fine with that and Brian Dolan if there were any time-sensitive matters in the Minutes. The Commissioners and Mr. Dolan replied that continuing the item was fine. Chair Pearce advised that the item would be continued to the October 9, 2013 meeting.

3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

There were no members of the audience wishing to address the Commission.

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

Janice Stern advised that there were no revisions or omissions to the Agenda.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Commission or a member of the public by submitting a speaker card for that item.

There were no items for consideration under the Consent Calendar.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. P13-0336, Michael Roseberry
Work Session to review and receive comments on a Preliminary Review application to: (1) replace the existing auto service use with a 24-hour 7-Eleven convenience market and a drive-through carwash; (2) add approximately 700-square feet to the existing building; and (3) modify the existing site improvements at the existing Valero service station located at 3192 Santa Rita Road. Zoning for the property is C-N (Neighborhood Commercial) District.

Jenny Soo presented the staff report and briefly described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Ms. Soo informed the Commission that staff is striking out Discussion Point No. 3 regarding on-site parking. She explained that the California Fire Code states that a self-serve gas station that meets the parking requirements is not required to have any attendants on-site. She noted that the proposed application meets the required parking, and, therefore, no parking spaces would be required for the gas station.

Commissioner Ritter asked for typical examples of other commercial buildings in a C-N (Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District in Pleasanton that might be a gas station or car repair shop.

Ms. Soo replied that gas stations are allowed in a C-N District. She added that it would also be typical to see a restaurant or a retail business that fits into a residential

DRAFT

neighborhood, such as a stationary store, a hair salon, a music instrument shop, or a dry cleaner. She noted that these stores would not be open for 24 hours.

Ms. Stern asked Commissioner Ritter to clarify if what he is asking is whether there were other gas stations in C-N Districts in the City.

Commissioner Ritter said yes and inquired if the Shell Service Station on West Las Positas Boulevard and Hopyard Road is located in a C-N District.

Ms. Soo stated that the gas station on Santa Rita Road and Valley Avenue by Safeway might be in a C-N District.

Ms. Stern agreed and indicated that staff can provide additional information on the matter.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there are other Neighborhood Commercial sites that have actually been rezoned for a similar use, such as a carwash or a 24-hour convenience market or alcoholic beverage sales.

Ms. Stern replied that she does not remember that happening within the last several years.

Commissioner Posson requested verification from staff that there are no other service stations in the City with convenience stores that sell alcohol.

Ms. Soo replied that there are existing service stations that sell alcohol but they are pretty much in the PUD zoning district. She added that the Zoning Code does not allow the sale of alcoholic beverage in conjunction with a service station in a straight-zoned district.

Commissioner Posson inquired if there are similar establishments in Pleasanton.

Ms. Soo said yes.

Commissioner Allen stated that her understanding of the definition of the C-N District is not only that it should serve the local residents but also that anything that is developed needs to have a minimal impact on that neighborhood. She asked staff to verify that she understood it correctly.

Ms. Soo replied that was correct. She noted that the staff report includes a table on page 9 which lists the purposes of the various zoning districts.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Brad Hirst, representing Mike Roseberry, Applicant, stated as a point of clarification that they had submitted to staff a survey of the gasoline/24-hour/ parking/convenience stores, and there are nine other service stations with various zonings. He added that they did not check to see if any or all of them are in the C-N District but that he is sure the ones on

DRAFT

Hopyard Road and Valley Avenue and on Bernal Avenue near Stanley Boulevard are in the C-N District.

Mr. Hirst stated that the project has been an existing gasoline and automotive service facility for 41 years and that the existing station was rebuilt in 1989. He indicated that Mike Roseberry is the dealer and has been in business, running the automotive service, for 13 years and the gasoline and snack shop operation for the last eight years. He noted that the proposed business will have the same property owner, the same dealer, and the same businessman who has proven to be established and has operated a successful business at that location for a number of years.

Mr. Hirst stated that Mr. Roseberry will be the convenience store operator. He indicated that it is kind of popular to beat up on 7-Eleven or any other corporation, and he wanted to make it clear that this is not a 7-Eleven corporate store; that Mr. Roseberry is the owner and operator and 7-Eleven is the supplier; and Mr. Roseberry does have a supply agreement with 7-Eleven. Mr. Hirst explained that the purpose of his modernization and upgrade is to increase the sales to each customer. He noted that in this day and age, automotive service has become more and more technical; it is becoming difficult to hire qualified people, and remuneration that he can afford is no longer profitable. He added that by converting to a convenience store and carwash, Mr. Roseberry's goal is to increase the sales, increase the ticket size to each of the existing customers. He indicated that they are expecting only a three- to five-percent increase in the number of customers coming into the station. He explained that it is sort of a defensive maneuver where Mr. Roseberry will be offering two services: a 24-hour convenience store and carwash that do not now exist at a major intersection. He noted that the intersection has 42,000 cars going through it daily and that it is more than just a neighborhood.

Mr. Hirst stated that they have done quite a bit of outreach over the last several months. He noted that they have started a support petition on-site, and the 125 to 135 customers who have signed it are now asking when this is going to happen. He stated that he asked Mr. Roseberry why they got only 125 to 130 people, and the answer was that at this point, most people buy their gasoline with their credit card outside and do not come into the store. He indicated that they are trying to get them into the store. He noted that most of those who come into the store are those who come in the early mornings between 5:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m., such as construction workers who buy things in the convenience store.

Mr. Hirst stated that he has talked to every single merchant in the two adjoining shopping centers, and not one has objected; in fact, most of them liked it because they know that this store will have better coffee than they get. He indicated that he has knocked on about 200 doors in the immediate neighborhood and that they had supplied them with a letter, a site plan, and a simulation of the interior of the store. He added that he has given Ms. Soo a copy of the letter and a map of the doors. He noted that of the 200, they found about 100 people at home, two of whom asked about the 24-hour operation. He indicated that they now have more people who have commented since.

DRAFT

With respect to parking, Mr. Hirst stated that they have 17 parking stalls on site. He indicated that staff initially was not going to give them credit for the 12 spaces at the pump island, but the survey that they submitted shows that of the 13 stores in Pleasanton in a similar operation, only three have more parking than is proposed for this property; and if the 12 at the pump island are allowed, only two exceed that. He stated that he does not believe parking is going to be an issue in any way.

Mr. Hirst stated that the carwash hours will be from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. He indicated that he knows they could open earlier and do more commercial business, but they are trying to be respectful of the neighbors on West Las Positas Blvd. that are located 250 feet north of the carwash. He indicated that the noise emitted will be minimal at the entrance to the carwash on the north side and will be louder on the south end where the blower to dry the cars is located. He noted that the sound study that they submitted shows that the decibel level at the residence, both at West Las Positas Blvd. and Santa Rita Road, is below that allowed by the City ordinance. He indicated that it exceeds it a little bit to the south, but the people at Pacific Dental Care are all for the increased business, the carwash, and the longer hours.

Mr. Hirst stated that they are gradually and consistently reducing their energy consumption over the last several years. He noted that the new facility will have LED lights and that Mr. Roseberry is trying to finalize a solar program for all four stations.

Mr. Hirst stated that they can certainly understand and empathize with anyone's concern over security, loss prevention, and crime, as they are directly impacted even more than anybody living there. He noted that in addition to the inconvenience caused by crime, they are concerned with employee safety, with loss of inventory, and loss of cash. He indicated that the cash register will never have more than $50 at a time in it; every ten minutes, there will be a drop of $20 bills into a safe that cannot be opened by an employee. He added that there will be a minimum of two people on duty throughout the night at all times, and there will be at least three and sometimes as many as six people during the day. He pointed out that the recent robbery at Wells Fargo Bank and other robberies all happened in broad daylight. He noted that nobody wants crime; it can happen anywhere at any time, and he thinks anybody would be hard pressed to believe that this operation is going to attract any crime. He further noted that there was a recent burglary, the first one in eight years, and the culprits were caught on camera, both in the exterior before they put on their masks, and the interior when they did have the mask; the police do have that film and are proceeding with the case.

Mr. Hirst stated that the beer doors will be locked at 11:00 p.m., a security measure to prevent "grab and go's." He noted that if anyone wanted to buy a beer between 11:00 p.m. and 2:00 a.m., an employee will have to unlock the refrigerator door and then lock it again. He added that signs and decals will be firmly displayed indicating cameras. He stated that there are currently nine cameras functioning on-site and that after the conversion, there will be 18 to 20 cameras functioning on-site, both interior and exterior. He indicated that no alcohol sales to anyone under 21 years will be allowed obviously, and decals will be posted.

Mr. Hirst stated that there have been zero robberies at the property since 2009, there has been one burglary that happened last week that he mentioned earlier, and there have been zero grand thefts. He indicated that they have submitted police reports to the staff which show that at the Valero Station on Santa Rita Road and Valley Avenue, which Mr. Roseberry also owns, there have been zero burglaries since 2009 except for the one last week, and zero grand thefts. He continued that the 7-Eleven store on Hopyard Road near West Las Positas Blvd. had one burglary in 2010 and zero grand thefts; the 7-Eleven on Valley Avenue near Santa Rita Road had one robbery last week, the first since before 2009, and one grand theft in 2011; the 24-hour Chevron station on Santa Rita Road and Valley Avenue had zero burglaries and one grand theft in 2012; the Chevron station on Valley Avenue and Bernal Avenue had one burglary in 2011 and zero grand thefts; and the Shell station on I-580 and Hopyard Road had one burglary in 2010 and zero grand thefts. He stated that he thinks the Pleasanton Police Department is not only doing a good job but their official reports indicate that crime is really not an issue at these types of businesses.

Mr. Hirst stated that Fire Station 3 reports that 15 percent of its total service calls are between 10:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m., a total of 170 in the past years. He noted that Valley Care Emergency Room reports that in a year, it has had 5,824 service visits between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m.; 511, or 17 per night, in June. He commented that this location is a 24-hour corner, the police route to Interstate 580.

Commissioner O'Connor noted Mr. Hirst's comment that it is important to be open at 5:00 a.m. as this is a big selling claim in the morning for that great coffee they have there. He further noted the neighbors' letters expressing concerned for the 24-hour operation. He asked Mr. Hirst to comment on the late night, between 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m.

Mr. Hirst replied that they are projecting ten percent of the total volume, which is expected to be between $1.3 million and $1.6 million per year. He noted that this is not a tiny, tiny operation, and at $1.5 million, that amounts to $150,000 per year between 10:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. He explained that one of the things that happens is when those construction workers come in the early morning, and there can be anywhere from three to six people in a vehicle, they buy not only coffee, but also the five-hour energy drinks and the Redbull. He noted that this is a big factor, in addition to the tons of coffee that they sell.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if there is anything the applicant is doing to give back to the community, such as supporting the neighborhoods or the schools with any of this PUD.

Mr. Hirst replied that he has done some support, although it has not been a major thing, but it can be done.

Referring to Mr. Hirst's statement that only two people of the neighbors' doors they knocked on mentioned the 24-hour operation, Chair Pearce asked Mr. Hirst if that might be due to the fact that there was no mention of the proposal for a 24-hour operation in their letter.

DRAFT

Mr. Hirst replied that it could have been but that 24 hours is really not a big deal. He noted that H&R Block is open 24 hours during the tax season, and Macy's and the big department stores are now open 24 hours during Thanksgiving. He added that there was a 24-hour convenience market and gasoline station in Farmington.

Sharon Piekarski stated that she has a number of objections but will limit her comments to traffic issues that she sees could happen here. She indicated that she finds it hard to believe there will not be a significant increase in traffic. She noted that when they are trying to sell coffee and $2 slurpees, there should be a lot of foot traffic through there in order to cover their costs and have a profit. She indicated that as was mentioned earlier, there are only three driveways to this property: on Santa Rita Road and one on West Las Positas Blvd. She noted that people entering from the north going southbound through the pumps and through the carwash would logically be exiting from the south end. She continued that exiting from there onto a very busy Santa Rita Road, with 42,000 cars going through this intersection a day, and continuing north to the freeway, vehicles will have to go across three lanes of traffic and get into a left-hand turn lane. She indicated that this is the least of her concerns and that it is doable and similar to other intersections in town.

Ms. Piekarski stated that those coming in from the south driveway and going north through the pumps, or those parked for the convenience store, would logically exit on the northern one on Santa Rita Road and the West Las Positas Blvd. exit. She indicated that she measured the northern Santa Rita Road exit, and it is 32 feet from the crosswalk, which is about two car lengths. She noted that there are either traffic going at least 45 miles per hour through a green light or people backed up at the stoplight. She stated that she has observed that people pull out onto the right-hand turn lane, thus blocking the lane for those trying to get into the traffic going north on Santa Rita Road. She indicated that it is her opinion that this exit should be blocked and that cars should exit on West Las Positas Blvd.

Ms. Piekarski stated that she is most concerned about those exiting from the Valero station onto West Las Positas Blvd., which is a divided street; cars will have to turn right and make a U-Turn at Fairlands Drive, approximately 300 feet from Santa Rita Road. She noted that this is a very short distance, with two lanes of traffic moving eastbound across Santa Rita Road on West Las Positas Blvd., two left-hand turn lanes on southbound Santa Rita Road going east on West Las Positas Blvd. where cars must start to merge into a single lane Immediately after they clear that intersection. She noted that one of the merge arrows is directly in front of the exit of the Valero station. She continued that in addition to the people exiting the Valero station and the possible future 7-Eleven, there will be people leaving the shopping area. She indicated that she observed for ten minutes a couple of days ago and saw 18 cars leave that driveway, 72 percent of which made a left turn. She added that there is also traffic coming from the neighborhood, a large neighborhood, where West Las Positas Blvd. is a major way to get to other parts of the City. She further added that Fairlands Drive right there is the main exit for all the people living along Fairlands and Churchill Drives and all the cul-de-sacs that enter into those streets, and there are no traffic signals there; the only traffic control is the stop sign at Fairlands Drive. She noted that she avoids this intersection during busy times of the day, and it will become even busier than it already is.

Ms. Piekarski stated that one other issue is Fairlands Elementary School, which is only about a block to the east. She indicated that this school serves residents in the townhomes and the apartments on the west side of Santa Rita Road, and many of those elementary students walk to and from school. She noted that they cannot walk on the north side of West Las Positas Blvd. and cross Santa Rita Road because there is no crosswalk there in order to facilitate traffic leaving Hacienda Business Park. She stated that what these children typically do is cross West Las Positas Blvd. where there is a stop sign and crossing guards, then walk on the south side of West Las Positas Blvd. toward Santa Rita Road. She noted that they will have to cross two residential streets, this exit from the shopping center, and the exit at this proposed 7-Eleven before they can get to Santa Rita Road and cross the street. She stated that she believes a significant increase in traffic causes a danger to these young children as well as to the residents who live in the area. She indicated that she strongly opposes this proposal and hopes that the Commission will reject the proposed 7-Eleven.

Tiffany Driscoll stated that she has lived in the neighborhood directly behind the shopping center and the gas station since 1975 and is very aware of the original property agreement for that premises. She indicated that she knew there was a rebuild to the gas station in 1989 and that she believes they either wanted to sell liquor or go 24 hours at that time, but were not allowed to do either. She stated that it seems to her that Roseberry is a corporation and not a mom-and-pop store that the gas station used to be that represented their neighborhood of Pleasanton Meadows. She added that it seems that Mr. Hirst is only an investor and does not take the interest of Pleasanton residents into consideration. She noted that it was mentioned that the notice that was passed out to the neighborhood went to 200 residences. She indicated that she received the notice, but people she talked to around the neighborhood did not receive notices or there were sporadic notices. She added that the notices failed to notify the neighborhood that they intended to put in a 24-hour store, which would be an amendment to the original agreement.

Ms. Driscoll stated that having a 7-eleven store at the entrance to a neighborhood is rather tacky and that she does not think that is the image that Pleasanton is trying to portray. She noted that there was a 7-Eleven also proposed for a gas station on First Street, and that proposal was turned down. She indicated that she was sure that had everything to do with property values of the Heritage neighborhood that was very close to there. She added that if that was rejected in the Heritage neighborhood, she believes it should be the same all the way across the board in Pleasanton and not just where the older Heritage homes are.

Ms. Driscoll stated that entering into Pleasanton off of I-580 coming in on Santa Rita Road has no welcome to Pleasanton; there is no quaint little Main Street image that everyone loves so much. She noted that they are the actual first neighborhood that is encountered coming into Pleasanton from that side, and they just do not feel that having a 7-Eleven at the entrance to their neighborhood is a very appealing way for visitors of the wine country hoping to get to Pleasanton Main Street. She stated that they are a quiet neighborhood, full of small children and a lot of homes with seniors and people who have lived there since the 1970's who have chosen to retire there; and these people do not want a 7-Eleven.

Ms. Driscoll stated that carwashes are loud and that Mr. Hirst mentioned they want to start the carwash at 7:00 a.m. She stated that there is a noise ordinance in this City that she thinks does not allow loud noises until 8:30 in the morning, Monday through Friday, or 9:00 a.m. on weekends. She noted that they are a nice, quiet neighborhood, and the carwash is not something they want to hear at 7:00 in the morning, especially on a weekend.

Ms. Driscoll stated that it was mentioned that the 7-Eleven on Valley Avenue and Santa Rita Road was robbed recently for the first time since before 2012. She indicated that that is twice in 17 months and that the robbery did take place at 3:00 a.m. in the morning. She noted that on numerous occasions, the Pleasanton Meadows Shopping Center has encountered burglars during business hours, and twice she has personally chased burglars down her street, on the phone to the police, because they have robbed either the Chinese restaurant or the cleaners or one of the pizza places behind her house.

Ms. Driscoll stated that they have had a lot of experience from living in the area from the 1970's. She indicated that back in the day for about 30 years, anybody who got out of Santa Rita Jail would walk towards Downtown Pleasanton because they were looking for a bus stop. She noted that they still have people that come from Santa Rita Jail towards the center of Pleasanton where they will likely find a bus stop. She added that they would not a 24-hour location where people are dropping off or picking up people that may have just stumbled out of Santa Rita Jail.

Lastly, Ms. Driscoll stated that there is an elementary school very, very close to this location. She noted that the traffic coming from two lanes down to one coming down West Las Positas Blvd. is already a nightmare. She indicated that it will not work if that is going to be the main exit.

Maurice Turner stated that he has lived in the area for a number of years. He indicated that he takes an early morning walk around the area most days and sees all these children going to school, a lot of them with parents but some without parents. He indicated that the Santa Rita Road and West Las Positas Blvd. intersection is really busy with traffic every day, with people coming out of Pleasanton Meadows and people coming along Santa Rita Road for all sorts of reasons, some cutting off the big bend on I-680 and I-580. He stated that this is one of his concerns and endorsed everything that the two previous speakers have.

Mr. Turner stated that he remembers a few years ago when the gasoline station was cut in at the Pimlico Drive and Santa Rita Road, the people wanted to sell alcohol, and there was a big furor about no alcohol sales near the freeway and there are enough accidents on the freeway. He recalled that someone came up and said that Long's Drugs was selling alcohol; however, Long's Drugs closes at 9:00 p.m. and does not sell it really late at night. He indicated that most accidents that happen are because people are buying alcohol late at night, and this is not good for anyone, neither for those who buy them or for those on the road, walking or driving.

DRAFT

Mr. Hirst expressed his appreciation for the people who came down and added that starting next week, he will reach out individually to all those who spoke, who sent in emails, and who called Ms. Soo.

Mr. Hirst stated that most of the objections that were stated by the three speakers are for conditions that already exist. He indicated that the children walk to school now; they do not walk on the north side of West Las Positas Blvd. because there is no crosswalk on the north side of the intersection. He noted that the children walk on the south side of Las Positas because there is a crosswalk. He pointed out that some of those children are customers of this business because this business sells candy and children buy candy. He noted that children buy candy across from Hap's off of Main Street, particularly on Friday afternoons, and that does not seem to be a major problem.

Mr. Hirst stated that the ingress and egress traffic issues that were alluded to have been the ingress and egress for 41 years. He added that the stop signs have been there; maybe a couple of ones on West Las Positas Blvd. have not been there for 41 years, but they have been there for as long as he could remember.

With respect to the traffic accidents in that vicinity, Mr. Hirst stated that the record speaks for itself, and he asked the Commission to inquire of the City's Police Department if those are traffic accidents. He agreed that Fairlands School is within a short distance, a long block, and stated that he went to the Principal's Office at Fairlands Elementary twice, left a letter with the Principal and received no comment from the Principal at all. He noted that he did reach out to the neighborhood behind the service station, and he stated unequivocally that he left a letter or spoke to every single resident there. He also stated unequivocally that he is more than a little offended that somebody would say that he does not have the interest of this community, noting that that what he has been doing for 45 years speaks for itself and that he does not intend to even acknowledge that any further.

Mr. Hirst acknowledged that there was a 7-Eleven application on First Street which was withdrawn, and another convenience store operation has been approved at that location. He noted that there is alcohol being sold near the freeway now; the Shell Station at Hopyard Road and I-580 sells beer and wine. He noted that it is pretty easy to buy beer anywhere and get on the freeway and that beer sales and freeway access is no big deal. He stated that he happened to walk through the new Walmart store one day just to look. and he saw some young people loading up all their beer. He stated that he asked what they were doing, and they said they were going camping at Yosemite. He noted that at his count, they had eighteen 30-packs of beer, and they were getting on the freeway to drive to Yosemite.

Commissioner Posson disclosed that he met with Mr. Hirst, who briefed him on the project. He noted that he heard a number of comments from the community objecting to the proposal and asked Mr. Hirst why he feels this is good for the community.

Mr. Hirst replied that first of all, as he has mentioned, this is a defensive business maneuver because the automobile service business is no longer profitable, and they are projecting that this is going to be profitable. He noted that it is going to be good for the community because it will offer some services in that neighborhood that do not yet exist, such as the convenience store and the carwash. He added that it will provide services for an intersection that now has 42,000 cars a day going through it every day.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Allen noted that Mr. Hirst mentioned a noise study, but none is included in the staff report. She indicated that understanding noise is certainly a prerequisite to a carwash proposal and inquired what the status of that study is.

Ms. Soo replied that a noise study was prepared but it does not conform to the noise ordinance requirement. She indicated that it needs to be revised, and the final noise study will be included in the staff report when the item comes back to the Commission as an official application.

Commissioner Allen confirmed with staff that the Commission will not know the noise impact tonight.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the list of police call outs states that it is for 3192 Santa Rita Road and surrounding area. He inquired how far out this goes.

Ms. Stern replied that it was for the two shopping centers: Santa Rita Square, the shopping center immediately surrounding the gas station, and Pleasanton Meadows Shopping Center, the shopping center where the new WalMart Neighborhood Market is located.

Commissioner O'Connor confirmed with staff that it would not include any call outs to any of the residential areas behind or across the street from the project site.

Ms. Stern replied that that was correct; it would not include those areas.

Commissioner Posson noted that there are a lot of data on the report regarding the police response, but he did not see that pulled together with any statement or conclusion being reached. He indicated that when the application comes back, it would be helpful to have either the applicant or staff pull the data together and indicate what the conclusions area.

Commissioner Ritter noted that WalMart closes at 11:00 p.m. and inquired if there are many places in Pleasanton that sell alcohol after 11:00 p.m. and if all of the convenience stores operate and sell alcohol after 11:00 p.m.

Ms. Stern replied that Exhibit B of the staff report includes a list of places that sell beer and wine and if they are open 24 hours, which assumes that those places also sell alcohol during those hours and that they can do so up to 2:00 a.m. and after 6:00 a.m.

DRAFT

Commissioner Ritter inquired if beer and wine would include hard liquor as well.

Ms. Stern replied that she does not know what every license allows but that staff can get that information for the Commission.

Chair Pearce reminded the audience that this is a Work Session to provide feedback to staff and the applicant, and the Commission will not be making a decision on this project tonight. She then indicated that the Commission will now go through the Discussion Points.

Discussion Points No. 1 and No. 2 were considered together.

1. ***Would it be appropriate to rezone the site from the current C-N District to a PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial) District in order to allow a 24-hour convenience market with the sale of alcoholic beverages and a drive-through carwash in conjunction with the existing gas station?***

2. ***Would a 24-hour operation for the convenience market and a 7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. operation for the drive-through carwash be appropriate for this location?***

Commissioner Ritter stated that when he looks at the existing building, he sees that something has to change with it. He indicated that he is not sure what it is, and that is the reason why he was asking what other uses are for a C-N District. He noted that this is a prime location, and a convenience market is all about convenience nowadays and it makes good sense. He indicated that his concern is more with alcohol being sold after 11:00 p.m. and agreed that nothing good comes from somebody buying alcohol after 11:00 p.m. With regard to the carwash, he noted that the applicant is thinking of having the dryer on the south side with the nearest neighbor being 200 feet away. He agreed with the comments that the dryer is pretty loud and it might be of concern as long as it is on the residential side.

Ms. Stern stated that she was not sure if the nearest neighbor on the south side was 200 feet away. She indicated that she believes the applicant was saying that they were looking at Weymouth Court, but she does not know if it is closer across the other side of the street. She stated that staff can certainly calculate that.

Commissioner O'Connor disclosed that he also met with Mr. Hirst and went over the property. He stated that when he first looked at the property, located at a major commercial intersection with as many cars as go through there today, his first take was that he really did think this was appropriate. He indicated that he did not expect to see so much opposition in the way of letters and showing up here tonight. He added that he was not aware at the time that he visited the site that there was actually residential close to the site. He noted that he realized there is a little bit in the back and then it opens up beyond the school; and on the opposite side of the street were apartment buildings and maybe condominiums and townhomes.

Commissioner O'Connor indicated that he, too, is more concerned with alcohol being sold until 2:00 a.m. He stated that he reads the police blotter every week and it seems like there is a lot of activity that happens between midnight and 2:30 a.m. He noted that there are neighborhoods here that have been here for a long time. He further noted that this gas station needs an update: it is looking old and tired and needs a facelift. He added that there is currently a convenience store located inside as small as it is, and the number of sales he got from Mr. Hirst is pretty high for such a small space. He stated that he can see the desire to make this bigger, and he knows it would be profitable. He added, however, that he is having second thoughts about the 24-hour operations and is questioning how much can be gained by staying open beyond 11:00 p.m. until the 5:00 a.m. rush for coffee.

Commissioner Posson stated that as far as the rezoning, he thinks that if the Commission does not find this to be an acceptable proposal, then moving to a PUD seems consistent with the adjacent shopping center. With respect to the 24-hour convenience store, he noted that there are other operations within the City that are very similar to a 24-hour operation; however, there would be more discussion about the hours of the sale of alcohol. Regarding the drive-through carwash, he stated that he would be interested in the hours of operation for Pleasanton Carwash located right up on Pimlico Drive, as there are residences in that same area right across the street, so that would provide the Commission with good information. He added that the noise study would also give the Commission more information on what impacts the carwash might have.

Commissioner Allen noted that the goal of the current C-N zoning is to serve the local community and do it in a way that minimizes any adverse impacts on the local community. She further noted that she was also surprised about how residential this area really was. She indicated that she actually walked on three of the streets and talked to 15 residents who were in the park, by the school, and on the streets. She noted that it really is a residential neighborhood, quiet, low key, and a lot of children around. She stated that she heard the same thing of the 15 residents she talked to: 14 of them were absolutely opposed to this project; several did not know it was a 24-hour operation; a couple of them said that what they thought when they first got the applicant's letter was that "7-Eleven" meant it was open from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

Commissioner Allen stated that she was concerned about alcohol sales, the hours of operation, and a little bit of the loitering aspect that can happen. She noted that she cannot even comment on the carwash until she sees a noise study. She indicated that she did go to Pleasanton Carwash on Pimlico Drive a couple days ago, drove her car through it, and listened to other cars drive through it. She stated that she went on both sides of the blowers, the front and the back sides, and she was about 200 feet, almost on the street side in one case, and was at the end of the shopping center by some of the stores in the other case. She noted that she could clearly hear the blower from both sides and was surprised that there was not that much of a difference. She stated that maybe new technology has blowers that are not nearly as loud, and she would be interested in what the noise study says.

DRAFT

Commissioner Allen stated that the next question she had was whether these fears are really justified. She noted that crime is crime but questioned if they are justified. She added that she looked at the OSHA report that actually has a list of highest risk establishments, and it lists gas stations, liquor stores, and convenience stores as three of the top five high-risk establishments, actually, twice as risky as late night bars. She noted that those are national statistics and that they would certainly be better in Pleasanton.

Finally, Commissioner Allen stated that she looked at what benefit the City is getting from this business. She noted that the applicant had shared that there is not a big tax impact because food is not taxed. She continued that she then looked at the survey that was in the staff report that was discussed earlier and had all the different locations and the crime reports. She indicated that she looked at the crime incidents a little differently than the applicant did, looking for total incidents that were occurring at these operations that were cited as somewhat comparable. She stated that she took the total incidents and averaged them, including the applicant's location, and it averaged around eight incidents per month, which is close to 100 per year. She indicated that she does not know what 100 incidents per year for the Police Department costs, but if it is, say, $1,000, which amount could be way off, that would be $ 100,000 per year in City costs. She indicated that this concerns her too.

In summary, Commissioner Allen stated that she does not feel like this is the right fit for this neighborhood. She indicated, however, that it does leave the question of what should be done to make this more vital. She emphasized that she does think other things need to be looked at and that she is concerned about this for this neighborhood.

Chair Pearce stated that she agrees in part with what Commissioner Allen said. She indicated that she looked at the zoning, and it talks about minimizing adverse impacts on adjoining residential uses; and given the concern of the neighborhood, it raises some red flags for her. She noted that the Planning Commission has dealt with this a number of different ways: there have been 24-hour requests that the Commission has denied, and there have been requests that the Commission has modified. She added that she wants to be sensitive to the neighbors and their concerns because this is a big jump, but she also wants to know if there is a way to have less hours and not go 24-hours right away; have more hours than they have if there is a concern, but pare it down to serve alcohol at earlier times. She indicated that she does not want to say all the way yes, and she does not want to say all the way no either. She stated that there may be a way, in conversations that Mr. Hirst is going to have with the neighbors, to find a middle ground where everyone is a little bit happy and try it for a while. She noted that there have been some situations in the past where the Commission has allowed a business to do something for a while, and then, if the Commission's concern was crime, ask for Police Reports to come back in a year or six months, see what this looks like and what the neighbors' concerns are.

DRAFT

Chair Pearce also agreed with Commission Allen that she would like to see a noise study on the carwash. She stated that a carwash would obviously have to comply with the Noise Ordinance and the Municipal Code, but she is interested in seeing what the decibels are for something like that, especially since the proposal is to start at 7:00 a.m. and to go until 10:00 p.m. She noted the concern with the 7:00 a.m. start time, but she is concerned with the 10:00 p.m., given that this is a neighborhood full of children.

Chair Pearce concluded that she understood the desire to upgrade this facility, and she would love to see if there is a way to do that while taking into account the neighborhood concerns.

3. Would it be acceptable to provide a total of 17 on-site parking spaces where a total of 18 on-site parking spaces would be required based on PMC?

Chair Pearce noted that Discussion Point No. 3 does not need to be considered.

Discussion Points No. 4 and No. 5 were considered together.

4. Are the proposed site plan, circulation, and parking layout acceptable?

5. Is the proposed building design acceptable?

Commissioner Allen stated that she thinks traffic is challenging here not matter how it is dealt with, and she does not have any idea for improving circulation. She indicated that the parking layout seemed fine to her. She noted that the biggest question she has in relation to the carwash is whether it is better to place it at the front of the building close to the residents who are right across West Las Positas Blvd., or in the back. She stated that she does not know about carwashes, what the design is and where the interior cleaning is placed, where the money is put in and cleaning the inside of the car. She added that what she is really looking for when this comes back to the Commission is some real expert design guidance specific to carwashes and noise and how to maximize it while minimizing the noise. She noted that in reading through and googling about carwashes and the issues that come up in communities, it sounds like there are certain types of blowers that are much better than others in terms of noise and that some carwashes actually had to get insulated and have wood barriers around them.

Regarding the building design, Commissioner Allen noted that one of the letters received by staff mentioned that the building design really fit the character of that shopping center. She stated that when she looks at that shopping center, she comes away with the question of whether it does have a character. She indicated that it is hard to nail, but she thinks that to the degree that there is a character, the orange and the higher building height in one area did not seem to fit there; however, she does not know if there is a way to make it better. She added that she would like the building design to be looked at a little more to see if it could complement the shopping center a little more.

DRAFT

Commissioner Posson stated that he is generally fine with the site plan. Regarding circulation, he indicated that he frankly does not know how much can be done with that intersection. He noted that he understands what the residents were saying about the egress from that area, but he does not know how much of the traffic is contributed from the shopping center and how much from the gas station. He stated that Mr. Hirst had mentioned that it would be a three- to four-percent increase in volume and inquired what that really means in relation to that intersection.

As it relates to the building design, Commissioner Posson stated that he would like to see a little bit more from the applicant on what they are doing in the area of energy efficiency. He noted that there were some residents who were talking about building heights in relation to other buildings in the area. He added that he would like to see what types of heights are being dealt with and would like to see a comparison with the heights of the fire station, the apartment buildings, and the shopping center to get a sense of that intersection.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he did not really look that closely at the color scheme of the new WalMart Neighborhood Market, but thinks that because this is such a small area, anything that is done here will improve the teal that is there now. He indicated that he thinks it would be good if this small piece on the corner would blend with the larger shopping center next door. He noted that the biggest concern here is going to be circulation, and if it is really only a three,-, four-, or five-percent increase in traffic volume, he does not see it as a much larger impact than what is already there. He further noted that this is a very busy intersection, and it has been there for a long time. He indicated that he would like to improve it, but he does not know if that is within the Commission's purview.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that, assuming the carwash does actually meet the sound study and the City's Code, he thinks the way it has been proposed is going in the right direction because exiting on the south side of the building brings the traffic closer to that southernmost driveway, and that is the easiest driveway to go out for multiple options such as making a left on West Las Positas Blvd. or going north on Santa Rita Road. He agreed that the sound study is needed before any decision can be made.

Commissioner Ritter noted that everyone said pretty much everything. He stated that one thing he does like is the trees that they have around the carwash that might be helping with the noise factor. As far as the circulation and flow, he stated that it is going to be way better than the gas station at Bernal Avenue and I-680. He noted that this really beautify that corner as it needs an upgrade of some sort, without the teal, as others have said. He indicated that one thing he would caution on the entrance and exits is to make sure that the shrubbery that is installed does not block the view of oncoming traffic so there is not any obstruction especially along the sidewalk area where children will be walking.

Chair Pearce stated that she would agree with most of what has been said. She noted that the neighborhood has concerns about traffic, but it sounds like the City Traffic

DRAFT

Engineer is comfortable with the circulation on-site. She indicated that she has driven in and out of that shopping center a lot, and making that flip around to take a right out of the shopping center is challenging at best. She agreed with what has been said that she does not know if this is the time or place to have that conversation but maybe that is a conversation the Commission can have at another time.

Chair Pearce stated that she is comfortable with the architecture, and she would like to see it blend in, although this is a stand-alone structure so it does not have to exactly match the shopping center. She noted that it looks nice and is an improvement. She added that if Phil Black were around, he would say that the tower looks like Pleasanton, so she will say that for him.

Chair Pearce then asked staff if they have the information they need for the project.

Ms. Stern said yes.

Commissioner Posson stated that he had one other comment. He noted that there seems to be a difference of opinion about the amount and effectiveness of the communication between the applicant and the community. He strongly suggested that the applicant meet with the public, not just with those who have responded tonight but with the neighborhood as a whole, because there is a sense that the outreach initially was not as thorough as it should be. He added that having discussions between the residents and the applicant would be very helpful in getting the concerns out and coming back with a refined proposal.

Chair Pearce agreed. She indicated that the Planning Commission has certainly had many applications come through successfully when the applicant has made significant outreach. She gave an example of an application that came before the Commission recently, which had a lot of neighborhood concern at first, and then when it finally came to the actual application, there was only one resident who came, and he spoke in support of the project. She noted that this is always nice for the Commission to see.

No action was taken.

b. <u>P13-1858, City of Pleasanton, East Pleasanton Specific Plan</u>
Consideration of a Draft Preferred Land Use and Circulation Plan for the purposes of preparing an Environmental Impact Report and a Draft Specific Plan.

Brian Dolan stated that he, Wayne Rasmussen of Rasmussen Planning, Inc., Project Consultant, and Janice Stern would present the staff report.

Mr. Dolan stated that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to get a recommendation from the Planning Commission on the work that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force has done to date. He indicated that the Task Force started in August 2012 and has met 11 times. He indicated that the Task Force has been going through a process

DRAFT

and that it is at the point where the analysis of the alternatives that it has come up with in the Environmental Impact Report has to be continued in a more detailed way so it can dig a little deeper into some of the areas that it has been exploring to provide more information for the public and the Commission, and for the City Council as decision makers.

Mr. Dolan stated that the Task Force has been exploring a number of alternatives, and at its last meeting, the Task Force was able to get a majority of its members to agree to one alternative which, for the purposes of CEQA, would be referred to as the Preferred Plan. He indicated that he would like to talk a little bit more about what that really means, but before doing that, he would like to go through the process and the immediate time line as the Task Force moves forward and how tonight fits into the overall process.

Mr. Dolan then described the process:

- The Task Force started with Background Information-Gathering, gathering data to try and educate the Task Force about the site and the various issues that everyone involved in the planning for this planning area is faced with.

- The Task Force had an Opportunities and Constraints Analysis which really started to dig in at a fairly conceptual or broader level, exactly what are the things about this particular part of town that prevent opportunities for connectivity, view preservation, how much land is really being dealt with, and what are the potential connection points; all the things about the physical part of the land and the regulatory climate that limit those choices such as soil conditions, land ownership, property owner intentions, other regulatory things being some of the restrictions on the land because of its proximity to the airport and those kinds of things, and the railroad that is obviously a big constraint that the Commission considered the last time this was before the Commission.

- The Task Force went through a Visioning exercise and was asked to try and identify what is it that it really wants to see out there. The Task Force spent a number of meetings talking about that and trying to narrow that focus as much as it could, dealing in this broader dialogue that it had.

- The Task Force then dove into something that it has been dealing with for several meetings now: the evolution of a certain number of Plan Alternatives. This has really been an iterative process. It started with some alternatives, and each of them has evolved to a certain extent, some of them quite dramatically. The Task Force reached a point where, it felt for the most part like somewhere in these alternatives is the answer. The Task Force does not necessarily have the right one just yet, but every possibility of the outcome on a particular issue is probably represented within them. The people feel comfortable that the Task Force put some parentheses around the choices at least and they are on the table.

- The specific task right now is to Select One Alternative to be kind of a frontrunner in the evaluation provided in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). An EIR evaluates the so-called project, but a reasonable range of alternatives also need to be analyzed. Those alternatives have to meet the project objectives, and some of the environmental impacts that may be identified through that evaluation process have to be mitigated in some ways. The reason for the alternatives is not just for CEQA purposes; it is also because the City, as a community, is still trying to decide exactly what the land use pattern is and what the level of intensity of development out here is; hence, it needs to continue to drill down on the various choices that are being presented.

- Once this alternative has been selected, the Environmental Review Process can be started, and at the same time, the smaller components of the plan, site development standards, and design guidelines will be further evolved.

- Once these are done, the more normal, typical, public review process starts, back here at the Planning Commission and then on to the City Council with whatever number of public hearings that process requires.

Mr. Dolan then presented the timeline:

- In the short term, the Planning Commission will provide its input tonight on the Preferred Plan

- The same question is then brought before the City Council on October 15th.

- Once a Preferred Plan has been identified, the Draft EIR can be started; the other Alternatives still need to be evaluated. The way CEQA works is that an environmental clearance for a certain amount of development is basically being provided. A policy decision can always come down to a lesser intensity from what has been evaluated. The choices are not being eliminated to some of the maybe less intense alternatives as it moves forward because a more intense alternative is included in the EIR analysis. The Planning Commission should not be concerned about this. There was a certain amount of concern by some of the Task Force members, and a similar explanation was provided to them. Most of the members went along, some of them reluctantly because they were afraid of the larger alternatives. The City Council understands that issue and, in fact, at the last check in, during the conversation on how big of an alternative the Commission would be comfortable with, the Council basically provided direction then to include one at the higher end because the Council knew that the Commission could always knock it down and would have evaluated a worst-case alternative.

- Once the EIR evaluation starts with the selected consultants, the Task Force will move on to set the land use and circulation component aside and start talking

DRAFT

about development standards. The Task Force will prepare some of those documents that are very similar to the Housing Sites Development Standards and Design Guidelines that some of the Commissions have seen before in more recent planning processes. The Task Force will most likely borrow heavily from those since it has currently had a dialogue on what should certain types of development look like, what should the setbacks be, and what should the parking requirements be.

- The Draft EIR and the Draft Specific Plan is projected to be done in the first quarter of next year, at which point it will start going through the regular public review process.

Mr. Dolan stated that he would be happy to answer more questions and anticipates that some of them would be particularly on this idea of a Preferred Plan and what it means tonight. He indicated that he has spoken to a few of the Commissioners who have expressed concerns about that. He stated that he would be happy to get into it a little bit more deeply, but for the time being, he would like Wayne Rasmussen. Project Consultant, to run through the final Alternatives, starting with what the Task Force labeled the "Preferred Plan." He added that the Commission will hopefully be able to discuss these and come up with a recommendation to the City Council as to whether or not it agrees with the Task Force's recommendation on the Preferred Plan or if it has something different that it would like to recommend to the City Council.

Wayne Rasmussen displayed a site map, noting that the planning area is 1,110 acres located just to the north of Stanley Blvd and to the east of Valley Avenue, with the I-580 freeway to the north and El Charro Road extending down from top end of the plan area to Stanley Blvd. at the bottom.

Mr. Rasmussen then presented a slide of the Preferred Plan. He stated that this Plan calls for a total of 1,759 housing units and proposes a mix of 65-percent single-family and 35-percent multi-family housing. He noted that this Plan is similar in many ways to the Alternatives that was presented to the Commission a couple of months ago, as are the other Alternatives. He indicated that some aspects of the site are pretty much fixed as far as the lake area, for example; 704 acres of the site consists of Zone 7 Water Agency or lake areas, two of which Lake I and Cope Lake are owned by Zone 7 Water Agency and the third lake, Lake H, is currently owned by the Pleasanton Gravel Company but is scheduled to be dedicated upon completion of reclamation to Zone 7 sometime later next year.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that, as he had indicated earlier, there are a number of features of the plan area that are pretty much fixed and show up similarly in all of the options. He indicated that some office, business uses and potentially lake front retail areas such as restaurants are being proposed to the north at the top boundary of the plan area. He stated that there is a three-acre site located at the crossing of the lakes which is being called a destination use area that might accommodate some sort of conference facility or special restaurant or some sort of use that would be unique to this area in this

DRAFT

location with the views out in all directions that are really quite nice. He continued that going down through the plan area, non-residential uses are being proposed in two areas which are both in the Airport Protection Area (APA) which does not allow for residential use. He indicated that these would primarily be business uses as well as a park and a school area. He stated that APA deals with noise and single-family residences and people sleeping at night. Continuing down the proposed extension of El Charro Road, Mr. Rasmussen noted a community park site to the east that is shown on all the plans. He indicated that a leisure park site is currently proposed and has great views on out toward the lakes. He added that it is a fairly rich habitat area from the standpoint of existing vegetation and provides some really good opportunities for trails and vistas and such. He added that also to the east of El Charro Road, all the plans show industrial land because it really does not provide an opportunity for residential, and there is not a demand for retail or more demand for office; additionally, right next to it is the Vulcan quarry plant that has some fairly substantial impacts on the surrounding areas.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the rest of the site narrowed down quite a bit to the southern end of the area west of the proposed El Charro Road extension. He noted that within that area, all the plans call for an extension of Busch Road through to connect to the new El Charro Road. He noted that there was a lot of concern by the neighbors, the Task Force, staff, and consultants about the amount of traffic that could potentially come through Busch Road, so fortunately, there is an opportunity for a connection down at Boulder Street with an existing traffic signal at its intersection with Valley Avenue. He indicated that on this plan, Boulder Street extends through and connects up to Busch Road so that it could bring in traffic from take it on out without having to go down Busch Road next to the existing neighborhoods.. He noted that this is a good opportunity to help out with the traffic situation.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the unique characteristics of the Preferred Plan that sets it apart from the other plans is that it has a “dispersed multi-family” where there are several areas of multi-family dwellings at both 30 units per acre and at 23 units per acre; and a variation of single-family development at 4 units per acre in the outlying areas, next to the existing residential neighborhood, and extending over into another area lower down, some at 8 dwelling units per acre above and tending to surround the multi-family area and all through down to the south of the project, and some at 11 units per acre immediately next to the multi-family. He noted that the low-density units are fanned out to keep the densities as low as possible next to the residential areas.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that in most of the plans, the Operations Services Center (OSC) site is no longer shown as “Residential” but is being left alone and is shown either as “Industrial” or as “Public & Institutional” use. He then showed a slide of the Preferred Plan’s Land Use Inventory, which includes the breakdown of the 1,759 housing units into the different density categories.

Mr. Rasmussen then displayed the Option 1 Plan, which is quite similar to the Option 1 that was presented to the Commission once before. He indicated that this Plan allows for the least of all the Options at 1,000 housing units with a housing mix of 50-percent

DRAFT

single-family and 50-percent multi-family. He stated that this Plan is distinguished primarily by a private green belt that extends to the middle of the site, with the multi-family housing located to the far edges of the site. He noted that one of the considerations in locating the multi-family is that there are primarily two different property owners, the Kiewit Property, and the Lionstone Property, and the amount of densities to be utilized by each of the two property owners are being balanced from the standpoint of fairness; this Plan allows for a lot of flexibility on the site to do that. Mr. Rasmussen stated that this Plan is the only one that has a school located at the OSC site at the current time; it also has the least amount of low-density residential, all at 4 units per acre.

Mr. Rasmussen then presented Option 4, again similar to the previous Option 4 that the Commission previously saw, which has 1,283 units and a 50/50 mix of single-family and multi-family. He indicated that the key characteristic of this Plan is that it keeps the Transfer Station in its current location where all the other plans assume it is going to move over east of El Charro Road, and also keeps the OSC in its current location. He noted that this Plan includes quite a bit more Industrial land, the reason being to minimize noise and odor impacts with the Transfer Station in place and the wind blowing toward the east. He added that since it takes a lot more industrial, it leaves less land for residential with all being 8 units per acre as opposed to some of the others that have 11, 8, and 4 units per acre.

Mr. Rasmussen then showed Option 5A, again similar to what the Commission saw earlier, with the same amount of units as the Preferred Plan but with a 55-percent single-family unit to 45-percent multi-family unit mix. He indicated that this Plan is distinguished by its centralized community focus area in that the multi-family housing of 30 units per acre and 23 units per acre are centralized with an area of 11 units per acre next to them. He stated that the purpose for this is the efficiencies of design, of being able to bring people together so that it allows for an opportunity for shared facilities, for extra use of things like the two open space “spines” going in a north/south direction, and with the potential school or an active recreation park in the upper area where residents could simply walk up to. He pointed out that this would be surrounded by lower densities of residential in a feathering-out approach that sometimes is a desirable way to go. He noted that there is more land in this Plan than some for single-family housing of 4 units per acre, which are located at the entry next to the existing residences and wraps around and basically takes up a good portion of the northern residential, with the southern portion including 8 units per acre and the 11 unit per acre in the higher density area.

Mr. Rasmussen then presented Option 5B, which is similar to the Preferred Plan in many ways with the exception that it proposes a 50/50 mix of single-family to multi-family for the 1,759 units. He indicated that the main difference between this and the Preferred Plan is that this Plan calls for more single-family residential and less multi-family so it frees up quite a bit of acreage for the low density 4 units per acre.

DRAFT

Finally, Mr. Rasmussen presented Option 6, which is the most intensive of all the Options, proposing 2,279 units and a mix of 58-percent single-family and 42-percent multi-family. He indicated that is similar to the Plan presented to the Commission a few months ago, and its distinguishing characteristics are that it has all the multi-family centered on the spine and along the southern side of Busch Road, with the single-family bringing in a lot more 11 units per acre and a limited amount of 8 units per acre and 4 units per acre at the entry and next to the existing residents.

Mr. Dolan stated that he would like to have some concluding comments and talk about the Preferred Plan and a little bit more summary of what really drove the thinking of the Task Force. He indicated that first of all, the Task Force spent a lot of time talking about the total number of units, with the Options having a range of alternatives from 1,000 up to 2,279. He noted that the Preferred Plan was the Alternative that, based on the available information to date, was the one that was sort of in the middle and that early indications showed was going to be financially feasible. He further noted that there is enough value created here with these land uses to pay for all the things that need to be paid for. He indicated that at this time, not all the information are available that may eventually be, and probably not all the costs are in either. He added that there are a few inputs that have not really been considered since the Task Force did a lot of this work, including some of the “Asks” from the School District, which made some decisions about land and buildings at its most recent meeting but which have not really been worked through. He noted that there are also costs, which very, very recently includes a number for contribution to the County Stanley Boulevard Project, where the County says that the City has been assuming a smaller number than the County was expecting, and so the City needs to work that through the financial process as well. He pointed out that he is bringing this out now because these things are going to continue to evolve and not all the inputs are included yet.

Mr. Dolan continued that the next thing that the Task Force considered that was very important to the Task Force members and something they really valued a lot was that they want this part of town to look like the rest of the town in terms of the percentage of single-family versus higher density. He indicated that staff had presented that to the Commission earlier and has also talked about it with the City Council; and even though the Council said that it would consider something up to 50 percent, the Task Force, after a lot of dialogue, came back and said it wanted something closer to the balance that exists in town, which is closer to 65/35 and which is what the Preferred Plan is.

Mr. Dolan stated that the Task Force also had a fair amount of dialogue as to where the land uses go and whether the density should be all collected in one spot to create a dynamic high activity area or should it be dispersed so that someone driving through this whole planning area will not be as impacted by a concentration of a higher density project, as opposed to seeing one and then something more low density and then something else farther down. He indicated that the Task Force ended with the dispersed area, and so that is what the Preferred Plan shows that some of the other Alternative do not show.

DRAFT

Mr. Dolan stated that the Task Force's decision had some implications, and staff would like to talk to the Commission about those before it makes its recommendation. He indicated that Ms. Stern will discuss these implications, a lot of which have to do with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers that staff has talked to the Commission about several times.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he wanted to ask Mr. Rasmussen a question before moving on. He noted that Mr. Rasmussen had talked a little bit about having some campus office and a park and a school site just below Lake I and that those were placed in there because of its proximity to the airport. He inquired about the appropriateness of having a school in the APA where residential is not allowed.

Mr. Rasmussen replied that the restriction does not have to do with safety but with sound and noise. He indicated that the concern that was presented way back in the 1990's dealt particularly with aircraft taking off and landing at night and disturbing the residents in Pleasanton. He further indicated that there are a number of different APA zones that deal with safety, and these are farther up, closer to the airport. He noted that all the Plans propose something very special in this area, and they all have the park as well as a little town square, and the retail over where there would be access off of Busch and El Charro Roads. He added that this area is kind of a special place unique to this site, and it has some opportunities to do something very nice, such as a lake front sort of retail area and a park or a school with a lake front setting.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff also prepared a table outlining all the various comparative land use inventories which the Commission can refer to during its discussion.

Ms. Stern then presented the table below that the Commission had seen previously, showing the City's RHNA numbers that was part of the Housing Element Update process. She indicated that the City will be embarking on the fifth update of its Housing Element very shortly and this will mean going back and reviewing what the City's RHNA numbers are and the ways the City will meet those numbers through various sites within the City and potentially East Pleasanton as well.

Estimate of RHNA to Year 2030 and Acreage Needed to Accommodate Housing Needs

	2014-2022 RHNA	Estimated 2014 Inventory	Additional units to be planned for 2014-2022 RHNA	Estimate of 2022-2030 RHNA	Estimate of units to be planned for 2014-2030	Additional Acreage Needed
Very Low Income Low Income	1,102	991	111	1,102	1,213	40
Moderate Income	405	0	405	405	810	35
Above Moderate Income	551	270	281	551	832	111
Total	2,058	1,261	797	2,058	2,855	186

DRAFT

Ms. Stern explained that the second column represents the City's RHNA allocation for the 2014-2022 Planning Period, which adds up to just over 2,000 with about 1,100 of those units in what they term in income levels as Very-Low- and Low-Income, and what the City looks at in terms of density levels. She continued that what the State has allowed the City to do is to indicate where it plans for housing or to zone for housing within a particular density level and then allocate that to a particular income level that the State provides. She indicated that what the City is looking at are 30 units plus per acre that Mr. Rasmussen was pointing out in those smaller areas of multi-family residential, and that is what the City can allocate for its Very-Low- and Low-Income residential; the Moderate-Income households have to have a zoning of around 23 units per acre, and the Above-Moderate-Income would be any kind of lower density than the Moderate-Income.

Ms. Stern continued that what will be subtracted from those numbers is what the City has in terms of its current vacant land inventory. She noted that this is a bit of a moving target because as projects are approved, those sites will drop off of this list, so the numbers could potentially be smaller as the City move through and will need to find more sites at a later date. She indicated that the numbers currently add up to about 1,261 units, and then the City will need to look at that within the individual categories.

Ms. Stern stated that if the City were just looking at this RHNA planning period coming up, it would be in pretty good shape for High Density, but it would need to find over 400 units for its Moderate-Income stack of units and almost 300 units for Above-Moderate. She noted that when staff went to the City Council the last time, staff talked about this idea of looking forward for this housing period and for the next housing period that extends up to 2030, and there seemed to be the idea that this was a long-range plan and that the East Pleasanton area should really be looking at what could be accommodated in the next two housing cycles.

Ms. Stern explained that bearing that in mind and then making an assumption as to what the City's next RHNA numbers will look as shown in the sixth column, the number of units that the City needs to plan for adds up to over 2,800 and includes over 1,200 of the higher density of 30 units plus per acre and about 800 of the Moderate-Income or the 23-units-per-acre category.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired, for clarification, that the 2,800 units does not include the East Pleasanton numbers.

Ms. Stern replied that was correct.

Commissioner O'Connor further inquired if everything that the City has already zoned for is already included in that number, even if the projects have not yet been approved.

Ms. Stern said yes and pointed to the third column as the existing inventory. She noted that those numbers include everything that has already been zoned. She further noted that this number was bigger a year and a half ago, and then the Auf der Maur and the

Pleasanton Gateway projects were approved, plus the other projects that are already moving through the process; so this number, as it stands right now, could potentially be smaller as more projects are approved.

Chair Pearce inquired if it matters that approved properties do not get built before 2014 and if they then do not go into the 2014-2022 planning period.

Ms. Stern replied that once projects are approved and even if they are not built during that housing period, they are off the table unless they lose their approval, in which case the City can approve them again.

Ms. Stern then presented the second table below which looks at how the Preferred Plan and the different Options meet some of those requirements that outlined in the first table.

Percent of RNHA provided by Preferred Plan and Options

Plan	Percent of 2014 – 2030 RHNA Need		
	Low/Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
RHNA Need	1,213 Units	810 Units	832 Units
Preferred Plan 1,759 units	375 units/ 31%	241 units/ 30%	1,143 units/ 137%
Option 1 1,000 units	305 units/ 25%	195 units/ 24%	500 units/ 60%
Option 4 1,283 units	393 units/ 33%	250 units/ 31%	641 units/ 77%
Option 5A 1,759 units	510 units/ 42%	276 units/ 34%	973 units/ 117%
Option 5B 1,759 units	570 units/ 47%	299 units/ 37%	890 units/ 107%
Option 6 2,279 units	574 units/ 47%	383 units/ 47%	1,322 units/ 159%

Ms. Stern noted that the first row shows the estimate of the units to be planned for, which is basically about 1,200 Very-Low- and Low; 810 units in the Moderate category which is 23 units per acre; and 832 units of Above-Moderate which is anything less than 23 units per acre and basically all of the single-family that Mr. Rasmussen has shown on the various Options.

Ms. Stern stated that she has to correct a mistake made in the staff report that implied that the Low and Moderate units that were zoned for those densities in the Preferred Plan met 50 percent of the City's requirement. She noted that they actually meet only 30-31 percent of the remaining need in the Preferred Plan for both the 30 units per acre

and the 23 units per acre categories, as shown in the second row of the table. She added that the City is over and above what it needs for Above-Moderate single-family homes.

With respect to the other Options, Ms. Stern stated that the Very-Low vary between 25 percent to about 47 percent of the need, in terms of how much of the City's remaining RHNA need they could potentially meet. She continued that in the Moderate category, the range is up to about 24 percent to 47 percent of the City's remaining need for land that is zoned around 23 units per acre; and finally, the Above-Moderate generally meet the City's need.

Mr. Dolan stated that the real take-away from it is that none of the Alternatives achieve the objective that we started out with in the beginning, which was to plan for two RHNA cycles for this higher density and total units. He noted, though, that the Preferred Alternative is on the lower end of all the Options in achieving that objective, with only Option 1 being less, and the reason why it does not do as well is because some of the other Options that have the same total number of units are at that 65/35 split. He pointed out that what is basically being said is that 65 percent are going to be single-family and there are enough of those, but the City does not have enough of the higher density. He noted, however, that that is the preference of the Task Force, and this is just one more input that the Commission should consider when it looks at those Alternatives.

Chair Pearce called for a break at 8:50 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Chair Pearce asked Mr. Dolan why CEQA requires a Preferred Plan to be identified as opposed to all of them just be Alternatives.

Mr. Dolan replied that the typical use of CEQA is a project, and it is typical to identify a project and then look at alternatives to that specific proposal. He indicated that he has seen EIRs that evaluate each alternative equally, but it is not very cost-effective because the same conclusion can be reached by using one alternative as the base case and then the analysis compares the other alternatives to it. He noted that it is a little more efficient that rewriting the whole thing over and over and over again for each alternative.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired it if does not give more emphasis to the Preferred Plan but just uses that as the base.

Mr. Dolan replied that there is definitely more text to it. He noted that the analysis starts with the one alternative, but then there is an alternative section which basically states what is different between this particular alternative and the other one. He added that it would then identify, for example, that this one alternative is not going to have that impact or that other alternative will have an additional impact; those impacts will have to be identified as well as potential mitigations for the differences.

Chair Pearce commented that she thinks people get caught up on the language of a "Preferred Plan."

Commissioner Ritter inquired if the City can go through and do the EIR for the Preferred Plan but then choose, say, Option 6, and would the City have the information in the Preferred Plan EIR to cover Option 6.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

O'Connor stated that he thought Option 6 would not be used for comparison because the number of units was higher than those on the Preferred Plan.

Mr. Dolan replied that there is an analysis for Option 6, which is the worst case, and the City can then select anything below that. He acknowledged the concern that calling an alternative a "Preferred Plan" can cause some people to say that it gives it some sort of a special status and some momentum to go forward. He added that he understands that people might feel that way about that terminology, but it is not legally binding to do it that way.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if it can be called the "EIR Plan" instead of the "Preferred Plan."

Mr. Dolan explained that ultimately, the people who would be poking holes or evaluating or analyzing whether or not the EIR is adequate would be attorneys, and no matter what it is called, they will know that it is the Preferred Plan in normal CEQA terminology. He indicated that he thinks it does not matter what it is called and recommended that if the Commission wanted a suggestion for something different than "Preferred Plan," it be called it the "Base Project" because it implies then that it is what the other Alternatives are being compared to. He indicated that he is open to other suggestions as well.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that based on some of the letters received from the public on this matter, people put a lot of emphasis on wanting a certain plan to be the Preferred Plan when this really is just the basis for studying the EIR and it is not a decision to accept.

Mr. Dolan stated that the Task Force has recommended that that Plan be the lead project as the Task Force moves forward, and it does have a certain amount of status. He added that staff had the Task Force pick a plan to be the focal one, and that is the one it selected. He indicated that he did not want to diminish that either.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired, for purposes of clarification, that if this came back later, if it would matter which one was picked. He stated that all the Alternatives are studied, and then one is picked. He inquired if the option is to be able to pick any one of these listed Alternatives that get studied; and what would happen if the Commission wanted something in between two of them, for example, if the Commission wanted 1,500 units and that does not exist in any of the Alternatives; and can Alternatives be

DRAFT

blended or are is the Commission limited to picking one of these six options that are listed.

Mr. Dolan replied that the Commission can amend anything and create something less than the highest one that it has evaluated.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if it would be really comparing the six Alternatives if what is picked is one that has not been specifically studied in the EIR.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct. He indicated that what will be approved is something that is an amended version of one of the Alternatives. He acknowledged that it would be easier to do the finding and all the other things if what is approved is very close to one of the Alternatives; a whole different approved project can be crafted and still use that environmental analysis.

Commissioner O'Connor commented that that might be harder to do.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if the Plans can possibly be changed based on the analysis and as feedback is received.

Mr. Dolan said yes.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Julie Testa noted Mr. Dolan's brief statement about "Asks" that have recently come from the Pleasanton Unified School District (PUSD) and stated that she actually commended PUSD for finally being honest and waving a red flag saying that Pleasanton needs multiple schools and that it does not have the ability to build them. She indicated that PUSD has come right out and said that there is going to be a school attached to the East Pleasanton Specific Plan and that someone is going to have to give PUSD the land and build the school. She added that PUSD has accepted the demographers report, confirming that every campus in Pleasanton is over capacity on several different levels and exceeds the General Plan recommendations.

Ms. Testa stated that the Planning Commission has an obligation to take seriously what is in the General Plan. She indicated that 1,500 additional units have been approved, and the City is looking at another 1,759 units with the Preferred Plan; yet every campus in Pleasanton exceeds the Pleasanton General Plan recommendations, and there is no plan whatsoever to mitigate the growth in the schools. She added that this does not even address the severe impact to the middle schools and the high schools. She reiterated that PUSD has finally said that this is a problem and that it cannot continue to move forward and ignore this huge problem. She stated that lovely neighborhoods are an asset and that it would be nice if growth is mitigated before it becomes a crisis.

Ms. Testa stated that the Planning Commission knows that SB50 says not being able to mitigate school growth cannot be taken as a consideration if this Plan gets so far along

DRAFT

that industrial land is rezoned to residential. She added that if this is allowed to get so far down the line that there is no longer any way of mitigating this crisis, she would hope that the Commission is looking at this crisis in other projects it is considering as well. She indicated that a Preferred Plan is not needed right now; this land is not zoned residential right now, and the City is not forced to build houses on it that the schools do not have room to address.

Ms. Testa stated that at the last Planning Commission Work Session, she was really impressed with the constant comments that kept coming regarding how this project benefits this neighborhood and Pleasanton. She indicated that right now, any of these residential projects are going to dramatically hurt Pleasanton. She noted that growth should pay for itself, and right now, all of these children are coming to Pleasanton schools, and there is no way of addressing that mitigation without the community coming back as property owners and tax payers and once again being demanded to pay for the mitigation of growth to the schools. She indicated that there is no way PUSD can get the new schools with the fees that are currently being collected. She emphasized that PUSD's capital funding is in crisis, and it cannot be continually ignored.

Heather Liang, President of the Homeowners Association for the Ironwood community and speaking on the community's behalf, expressed the community's concerns about the Preferred Plan and what will be put on the East Pleasanton Specific Plan area. She indicated that they have a fairly large community here and the residents are concerned about the different percentages that Ms. Stern has presented. She stated that the Preferred Plan, as it is written today, has a very high percentage of taking on the overall RHNA percentages, including a very high percentage of multi-family housing. She questioned why East Pleasanton should have to be over-burdened with this big percentage of RHNA numbers and that there should be a balanced distribution that was mentioned as the goal of this Plan. She indicated that East Pleasanton taking more than 50 percent of the share is not very balanced, and the Plan should look at Pleasanton overall and not focus on East Pleasanton alone. She noted that the recently approved Auf der Maur project, combined with this Preferred Plan, will add more than 2,000 units in a very concentrated area in East Pleasanton that already has unacceptable levels of traffic. She stated that she cannot even imagine what it will look like with that many units right there, as well as over 1,000 units of high-density.

Ms. Liang stated that her community is definitely asking the Commission to look at a Plan that is more evenly distributed around Pleasanton and not have it all fall on East Pleasanton. She indicated that they are interested to hear how the City could help fund this Plan and the infrastructure costs to support the least amount of units, instead of having the builders be primarily responsible for those costs. She noted that the Preferred Plan has come down to a more acceptable 1,700-unit Plan, but it could go a little bit further down. She indicated that it is good for the community to have this built out and have El Charro Road extended as it is going to help the residents of all of Pleasanton to distribute the traffic. She questioned, then, why it is the responsibility of the developers of the East Pleasanton Plan if it helps all of Pleasanton, and if there is

some other way to help pay for that infrastructure so that (1) the developers do not have to have too many units to say this is financially feasible to pay for all this infrastructure; (2) the developers might not have to build as fast so that to meet those financial constraints; and (3) with the whole issue of the School District, there are already other costs starting to come to fruition. She stated that she is concerned with the types of units that the City will have to accept if this is left to the responsibility of the builders.

Ms. Liang concluded by saying that she understands the need to pick a Preferred Plan to get this analysis, and she was appreciative of Commissioner O'Connor's comment to have a Plan for 1,500 units or for 1,400 or 1,200 units, even if they are not specifically marked in those Alternatives. She added that she hopes the traffic plan is well documented.

Ganping Ju stated that he feels like part of the Ironwood Community's voice has been heard and they appreciate it. He indicated that one of the particular things that they have heard is the ratio of single-family vs. multi-family, and they do not want this overburden to be concentrated in a certain area as that area would stand out quite differently from other areas. He stated that everyone wants all of Pleasanton to be beautiful, and he expressed concern about isolating East Pleasanton with the total number of units. He further stated that the City should consider that there are already a lot of high-density units in the areas close by, including the plan across Stanley Boulevard. He added that the area will become known as the concentrated area and will affect schools and traffic.

Mr. Ju stated that he thinks the Preferred Plan is not quite right. He stated that the original Option 5 with about 1,530 units at a 50/50 ratio was considered not financially feasible. He noted that single-family units are more profitable, and at a 65/35 ratio, there would be much more single-family units, and something like 1,750 units would be financially feasible. He indicated that he is very concerned that there is no other lower alternative to 1759 and that he would be much more comfortable starting about 1,400 or 1,500 and keeping the ratio where there would be enough single-family to make it financially feasible, with additional public funding supporting some of the different sections so not so many units will have to be built. He added that schools and traffic are other concerns they have. He asked the Commissioners to consider all of Pleasanton and have the high-density housing evenly distributed. He agreed that East Pleasanton has the most open land, but the entire burden should not be put in a localized area.

Ashish Ahluwalia stated that he and his family moved to Pleasanton 6 ½ years ago because Pleasanton had the community feeling they wanted to have. He stated that they drove around and saw the nice neighborhoods and said this is where they want to bring up their two kids. He indicated that their younger child goes to middle school and the older one goes to high school. He stated that he does not want to talk about the school situation as everyone already knows about that, but he would like to say that his point is about balance. He stated that his neighbors and friends have talked about this multi-unit development and the requirement that the City needs to meet. He indicated

DRAFT

that he knows Danville is also fighting that requirement, so he encourages that both become as one community and fight this requirement as much as possible, but at the same time have a balanced approach looking at the entire Pleasanton as a city and not just looking at East Pleasanton. He noted that it was mentioned that going through the East Pleasanton neighborhood should not look like it the multi-family units are concentrated in one area, and he would like to extend that same thought to the entire Pleasanton, such that when he drives through Pleasanton, he should not see only multi-unit homes concentrated in one area. He requested the Planning Commission to consider that.

Mr. Ahluwalia stated that he has similar concerns that his neighbors and friends have already mentioned, the biggest of which is traffic. He recalled that when the Ironwood community was approved, people living on the north side objected to their community saying it would increase the traffic on Mohr Avenue, even though now their community has two parts, Ironwood Classics and Ironwood Estates, and Ironwood Classics cannot use Mohr Avenue even though some of the children go to Mohr Elementary School and have to go around because there are blocks in the middle of the road. He questioned the Planning experts about how 2,000 homes cannot create a traffic problem on Stanley Blvd. and Valley Avenue if the 100+ homes in the Ironwood Classics create a traffic problem.

Mr. Ahluwalia stated that schools is a very big concern for him and for everyone else. He noted that as Ms. Testa mentioned, people live here because they have children and want good schools, such that even if he has to drive 42 miles to work in Palo Alto, he prefers living here because it is a good community and the schools are good. He noted that everyone knows the budget is shrinking as class sizes are increasing, and with the 2,000 homes here plus another 500 approved somewhere else and with no plan to increase school funding, the Pleasanton that was envisioned before will be lost; it may become like Dublin, and no one wants that to happen to Pleasanton. He stated that he and his wife are looking at more houses here so they can retire here, and if these are the kinds of developments that will happen, he thinks that they will have to move out of here.
‘
Mr. Ahluwalia also expressed concern about vandalism in their common areas, especially the pool. He indicated that the police reports will show how many times they have called the police because there are people inside the pool after 9:00 p.m. when it closes. He noted that with this additional 2,000 homes being built around here, he is really concerned about that too.

Finally, Mr. Ahluwalia stated that he was listening to the discussion about the 7-Eleven project and he heard the Planning Commission suggest that the owner reach out to the community. He encouraged the Commission to think about some kind of outreach for their community as well, because they get these yellow notification cards in the mail and he thinks 99 percent of the people just do not read it and do not know what is going on. He stated that he walked on their street to ten different homes and asked them if they read this and they said no, and when he told them about the letter that was sent to the

DRAFT

Commission, they all actually signed and agreed that this was a concern. He suggested that the City should maybe need to think about something more than just sending this yellow card.

Mary Switzer stated that her first question is why the rush on East Pleasanton when the City already got the 1,500 units approved, and all of a sudden this has to be done right now. She indicated that it may not be built out, and she has no idea what the build-out time is, and inquired if there is a time that this all has to be approved and gotten through. She noted that people have not had a chance to assimilate all the units that have been approved around Hacienda and Stoneridge Mall. She inquired how all this would impact traffic, noting that one cannot get out on I-580 on Fridays, and El Charro Road is going to be like Isabel Avenue, another cut-through but coming into Stanley Blvd. She added that there is also the concern about schools.

Ms. Switzer stated that her second question is, if the City Council gives final approval to those other units, if they would have to be built and what the timeframe would be; if all of them will have to be built once they are approved.

Darrin Lounds, Executive Director for the Housing Consortium of the East Bay, stated that they are thrilled to be working with Sunflower Hill to create a vibrant, supportive, affordable community for young adults with autism and developmental delays. He indicated that they are encouraged by the work of the Planning staff in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force and are glad that affordable multi-family is included in the Preferred Plan. He requested that as the Commission thinks about affordable housing in the East Pleasanton Specific Plan, it consider an affordable housing community that will meet the needs of their friends and neighbors with developmental delays. He noted that there is a significant housing need for adults, especially young adults, with developmental delays, and that 600 affordable homes will be needed in the Tri-Valley region over the next ten years.

Mr. Lounds stated that, as the Commission may be aware, SB812 requires local jurisdictions to account for the housing needs of adults with developmental delays in the next Housing Element realm. He indicated that housing like Sunflower Hill will help Pleasanton address this requirement. He noted that affordable housing developments for people with developmental delays have very low parking demands, and similar projects across the region have successfully earned parking variances allowing for more green open space and amenities adjacent to the housing, creating a very nice community especially if transit is available. He added that these developments also have minimal impact on the K-12 school system; knowing that that is a big concern and they feel that Sunflower Hill feel has a solution. He indicated that lastly, Sunflower Hill is looking to presenting at the November 7, 2013 East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting and look forward to seeing the Commission members and staff there.

Blair Wolfinger stated that he supports most of the things that Ms. Liang mentioned and that he is encouraged by all the people that have come out from their development. He expressed concern that the Option for the 1,430 units was completely removed from

consideration and the 1,759 units and 1,000 units were proposed with nothing really in the middle other than the 1,283 units that includes the Transfer Station area. He asked if it was possible to put that Option back on the table.

With respect to traffic, Mr. Wolfinger stated that he drives by every day and cannot go through their development because the road is blocked off due to traffic concerns. He indicated that he was also encouraged that Busch Road and Boulder Street are being extended because this will help a bit as once the vehicles get to Valley Avenue, they will be stopped by traffic. He noted that his community mentioned controlled growth in their letter, and while he is not that is a theme that needs to be in the Plan, they really encourage that as there is concern that to support all the infrastructure, the housing will have to go above and beyond what the controlled growth called for. He inquired if, as the City moves forward and approves the different developments, the City will only build the number of units required by RHNA at that time period even if the units are already approved. He further inquired if the City is approving numbers that would come back into this time period or if they are being approved for the 2022-2030 period, and if it is possible that the numbers will be pushed in before the requirement are even there.

Robert Gonella stated that he is a member of the Board of Directors at Danbury Park and also a member of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force, taking over for Commissioner Allen when she became a Planning Commissioner. He indicated that although the Task Force has come up with a Preferred Plan, he wishes to state that as a representative of Danbury Park, he does not agree with that Plan because it is too dense. He stated that he thinks Option 1 is the Plan that should be eventually considered and approved, if there is going to be one approved, as it is the least dense and has the most 4-dwelling-units-per-acre housing. He indicated that Option 1 is in keeping with the general character of the City of Pleasanton and that Option 1 was what most of the residential representatives on the Task Force wanted, but they kept being told that Option 1 was not economically feasible, and each Plan had to pay for itself; and Option 1 would not work without City participation, whether through financial districts or fee waivers or something else.

Mr. Gonella stated that he thinks the Commission should take a good look at Option 1, as it would make East Pleasanton look like the rest of Pleasanton. He added that the City should do what is necessary to make that happen, whether through some creative financing or fee waivers or City participation of some sort, as it would make the area desirable and consistent with the characteristics of the rest of the City. He requested the Commission to ultimately take a good look at and consider Option 1.

Don Kahler, Pleasanton Gravel Company, stated that they own the property that Vulcan Materials Company is mining as well as Lake H. He then read into the record the following letter he wrote to Brian Dolan on September 10, 2013 and which he also read to the Task Force at its last meeting:

"Dear Brian, as you know I have been involved with the operations operated by Vulcan for decades. I have no doubt that building housing adjacent to these operations and adjacent to the lakes would be unwise. The operation imposes inherent dangers, particularly to children, for the following reasons. First, the water and fish in Lake I and Lake H have tempted trespassers for many years. Holes in the fence must be constantly repaired. These lakes are slippery 2-to-1 slopes, meaning that while easy to go down, may be very difficult to get back up. Drowning is a real risk. Second, the outlet mall, horse ranch, golf course, and airport all tempt children to cross El Charro Road. This is a very dangerous road, used by heavy trucks with very limited ability to stop. Third, the Arroyo Mocho can be dangerous in rainy weather and is a hidden pathway to the Vulcan Processing Plan that has dangerous equipment, heavy truck traffic, and unstable piles of gravel. Kay Ayala stated that the EPSP plan is not next to mass transit. There are many other sites located next to mass transit such as the East Pleasanton and West Pleasanton BART and also the ACE train. I have added an attachment showing those sites. My bottom line is that children and gravel operations are inherently a dangerous combination. I urge Pleasanton to locate housing in a safe location. Thank you for your consideration."

Pat Costanzo, Jr., representing Kiewit and also a member of the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force, thanked staff and the consultants, Wayne Rasmussen and David Gates of Gates and Associates, and the others who have worked so diligently in the past year on the Task Force. He noted that they really have taken into consideration the constraints and opportunities of the Plan, and there have been some really detailed deliberations on what is best for the community.

Mr. Costanzo stated that trying to weigh the factors of how much RHNA to provide, what kind of infrastructure to provide, and what kind of mix to take within the City is represented by the Preferred Plan very well. He noted that the fact that the Task Force voted to go with a lower RHNA than what Council had recommended shows that those considerations were taken to heart, and he asked for the Commission's support to move the Preferred Plan forward. He stated that there will be a lot more information generated through the EIR plan, and once that information becomes available, everyone involved will be able to work collectively as a group to solve all of the issues that come out of that and hopefully create a Plan that is a win-win for the community and that can support all the infrastructure that is coming out.

Mr. Costanzo stated that the phrase "financially feasible" keeps coming up, and this is a serious issue because there is a new cost at every turn. He indicated that they want to be able to provide what the community needs, but everything takes money. He stated that Kiewit sent a letter to the Commission yesterday raising a couple points to take into consideration: (1) The way the land use is currently in Option 6 does not necessarily maximize the value. He indicated that they have worked hard to maximize it, and if they are going to go into an EIR, they felt that to have the maximum land use value in there to make sure those constraints were studied was valuable. (2) This decision does not necessarily need to be made now, but a big part of the ultimate Plan and as the project

DRAFT

moves to the EIR is going through the Specific Plan Design Guidelines and the actual Specific Plan, and the Transfer Station is a subject of a lot of deliberation in the Task Force meeting. He stated that what they have asked for and what was recommended through several members of the Task Force was to give the underlying zoning to the Transfer Station but not have it count towards the total units because, right now, when they are counting all the units as they do the financial feasible studies, and taking away 83 of those units for the Transfer Station would mean less money to pay for all the needed infrastructure. He noted that, as the developers of the project, if they had the extra units, they are willing to say that they will not contribute to the infrastructure as an incentive for them to get more money to sell the property, and they will then offset the cost of the move or cover it. He further noted that they do not know yet what the total cost for doing that is. He asked the Commission to consider those two points as additional recommendations to what staff has.

Mr. Constanzo stated that there was some discussion about throwing in another Plan, taking out one of the Plan 5's. He asked that Plan 5A be kept over Plan 5B if that is being considered, because Plan 5A has more land use value.

Lastly, Mr. Costanzo stated that everyone gets focused on the numbers and he thinks Mr. Dolan did a very good job of making everyone understand that these are not the final numbers. He indicated that the higher limit was quoted by the Council so that when all the EIR information comes in and all the costs are piled in, whatever is needed will be there; and if it is not needed, he is sure this community will not go to that level. He pointed out that the Preferred Plan, as Mr. Rasmussen described it, has some great points. He indicated that they are looking forward to working with the community, the neighbors in Ironwood, and everybody else to create a Plan that ultimately everyone will like.

Patricia Mitchell complimented the Commission as well as the previous Commissioners and staff, for doing a good job. She stated that she knows this is not an easy job, and the Commission is faced with some very difficult decisions here.

Ms. Mitchell stated that she is wearing a dual hat here because she is a resident of Ironwood as well as a Pleasanton Unified School District employee. She expressed concern about retail space that was mentioned earlier and asked that how much vacant retail space currently exists in Pleasanton. She stated that she used to have a business in the Vintage Hill Shopping Center, and they struggled for many years to keep that center going; she noted that it was a total eyesore and would not want to see something like that take place again.

As far as traffic is concerned, Ms. Mitchell stated that coming out of Ironwood to get onto Valley Avenue is very difficult and challenging at best. She noted that looking at a school in the Hacienda Business Park, even with certain restrictions that have been placed on Hart Middle School, traffic is a nightmare. She indicated that she knows a lot of the businesses around there and how they feel about having a school in the area for the safety of the kids. She stated that there have fortunately not been any major

DRAFT

catastrophes, and she thinks that some in Hacienda are requesting to start school at a different time because children are children, and they are going to do things without thinking about the weight of a car. She requested the Commission to consider all points about putting a school where you might locate it so it's safe for everyone because it will create a lot of traffic.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Allen stated that the Commission has heard a lot about traffic and she is interested in confirming her understanding of what the real traffic impact would be. She indicated that she had a chance the other day to sit down with Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, and the vision she ended up leaving with is that this area of residential, the big picture of what we are building out, is about the size of Hacienda. She stated that she had not really thought of that but it really helped her think about how huge this project is and how huge its impact will be in community with a lot more cars. She indicated that she wants to go through the numbers so everyone is upfront about what the impact of the Preferred Plan at this stage looks like. She stated that her understanding is that this project would add about 31,000 new car trips a day during the workweek, and of those car trips, about 70-80 percent are going to be using existing roadways; many will be using Valley Avenue, and only about 20-30 percent will be diverted to and benefit from El Charro Road. She asked Mr. Tassano if that was correct.

Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer, said yes. He stated that those are definitely pre-model input but when Commissioner Allen asked yesterday what the percentages were, he noted that roughly 70 percent probably heading west and south and about 30 percent heading east seemed a decent conservative guess for these purposes.

Commissioner Allen stated that the second area that Mr. Tassano and she talked about was the weekend because weekends are down time and the time things would be a little more relaxed. She indicated that she got the understanding that with 1,759 new units, weekends will add about an average of about 27,000 new trips per day. She noted that that is what the morning peak hours on Valley Avenue look like today, and that is what Valley Avenue would be looking like on weekends, and it would turn the noontime hour, which is the peak for weekends, like the PM peak hour in the weekend evening. She indicated that it is not a right or wrong thing; it is just what it will be like. In that respect, she stated that she just wants to acknowledge that the community has a valid concern about traffic. She again asked Mr. Tassano if she got that right.

Mr. Tassano said yes. He stated that he thinks what the Planning Commission and the public want to do is to get a real sense of this large vacant piece of land and the traffic that it is going to add. He noted that he gets asked all the time, for example, about what the traffic going to look like or on weekends. He indicated that he had to drive out here on a Saturday to see what it looked like, and the easiest tool to use is to try and add some of that volume and say this is what it looks like now, and everybody knows what it looks like at 8:00 a.m. when school is going into Hacienda , or at 5:00 p.m. when

everyone is going out of there. He noted that this is something that is going to be more typical when this is completely built out, and just to qualify the two and to be fair, some of the congestion at Santa Rita Road and Valley Avenue is due to the fact that that level of service is failing. He further noted that there are improvements that are planned, and as soon as the City Council approves constructing those, a lot of that congestion will go away. He added that what looks really bad right now would not be so bad Santa Rita Road and Valley Avenue were not backed up all the way down past Busch Road. He stated that everyone that drives down that road, sees that every day, and that is because of an intersection failure and not because that volume is on the roadways. He pointed out that the volume question is right when one stands and look at the side of the street, and that is the number of cars that should be expected there.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Tassano if he is talking about a development or a developer funding most of the intersection improvement when he said the Council has to approve the construction.

Mr. Tassano replied that the improvement for Santa Rita Road at Valley Avenue is actually already approved and in the City's Traffic Improvement Fees. He noted that every developer pays for the improvements identified in the Traffic Impact Fees, and all the developers have already paid for the improvement at that intersection.

Commissioner Allen then inquired what can be done about this. She noted that everyone wants to come up with an option that pays for itself and has the minimal number of units possible, so she was looking at the question of what it means for every single-family home that might be reduced against the 1,759 of the Preferred Plan. She indicated that she just wants to confirm her understanding that for every house unit that is reduced against the 1,759 total units, there will be creative financing options or tighter assumptions that might not be as conservative. She noted that the other side might get some costs that are not expected but it would save about ten trips a day for a single-family home, and six trips a day for a multi-family home.

Mr. Tassano confirmed that there will be fewer trips but he cannot say where there will be some savings.

Commissioner Allen stated that her final question is one that has come out of the Task Force and which the Commission has talked about before regarding senior housing, the same concept as Sunflower Hills. She noted that there are certain types of specialty housing that do not have as much of an impact on schools and on traffic to the degree that those are specified within the development. She asked Mr. Tassano if she understood it correctly that senior housing has only about one-quarter the impact of a single-family home or about two trips a day or so.

Mr. Tassano replied that the trips per day is about 3.5, but for the peak hour, which is what Commissioner Allen is probably referring to, it is about .25 per unit where a single-family home is 1.

Commissioner Allen asked Mr. Tassano to comment on what would be the expected impact on traffic to the degree that there is senior housing, and what it means to the community from a traffic perspective.

Mr. Tassano replied that senior housing takes fewer trips during the peak hours, even for 55-and-older communities, where sometimes only one of the two people are working, which means fewer peak-hour trips. He indicated that the data just shows that seniors do not make as many trips. He noted that that was the assumption made on the new senior community up on Stoneridge Drive which is not yet constructed. He added that the City has existing senior facilities that produce fewer trips.

Commissioner Posson referred to the issue of schools and inquired if the impact on schools is one of the impacts evaluated in the EIR process.

Mr. Dolan replied that there will be an analysis but that it is pretty simple and is really already accomplished. He indicated that the School District knows what kind of child yield it gets out of every unit, and that factor is used to identify how many children there are per household and at what level. He added that that information in included, but CEQA law basically says that mitigation shall be payment of the State impact fees. He indicated that the City has been very fortunate that the School District has been able to negotiate higher payment, but there is some acknowledgment among almost all the parties that it is not necessarily adequate. He added that it is a dilemma, but the reality is the RHNA numbers keep coming; the City tried to fight them and lost, and that is how the City got in this deficit and how the City ended up losing so much rezoning and so much land recently, and why the new cycle is upon the City so quickly because the City did not do the last time in a timely fashion.

Referring to the fiscal feasibility reports, Commissioner Posson Ritter noted that they were a draft and that it is his understanding that that is because of the uncertainties and it was just to get us within the ballpark.

Mr. Dolan said that is correct.

Commissioner Posson noted that Mr. Dolan mentioned that the School District came back with its “Asks” and what they want to see as far as the overall program. He inquired if that significantly skews the draft fiscal analysis or if that is still in the ballpark of feasibility with the new data.

Mr. Dolan replied that it is a big “Ask,” and the Council has to decide what it is going to do about it, and if it says yes, then the City will burden this development with all those costs, and it will be a game changer.

Commissioner O’Connor asked Mr. Dolan if he can enlighten the Commission as to what all those “Asks” are.

Mr. Dolan replied that the District asked for free land and someone to build the school.

Commissioner Allen inquired what the cost t to build a school roughly is.

Mr. Dolan replied that he believed he heard $23 million.

Chair Pearce commented that it's a lot.

Commissioner O'Connor ask who the "someone" was the School District wanted to build the school, if they are talking about asking to impose fees or if they are just asking for the developers to build the school themselves.

Chair Pearce replied that the District is asking the developers to build it.

Commissioner Posson asked the question from one of the speakers on why the City is on the schedule that it is on.

Mr. Dolan replied that he tried to allude to that in his last answer. He stated that the City is so far behind on its last RHNA round, and it got its Housing Element to address RHNA in the final year of an eight-year planning period. He noted that a year has gone by, and now the City has to have another Housing Element done and complete all the rezonings, accomplished and annexations if necessary, and going to LACO by the end of next year. He indicated that the City cannot really do the Housing Element without really knowing what is going on in East Pleasanton since this area is going to be one of the areas the City is getting the units from.

Commissioner Allen stated that there was one other question asked as to what the time frame was for building out this Plan if the plans were approved and how that fit with the Growth Management Plan.

Mr. Dolan replied that that is a big question, and he does not have the answer to it yet. He stated that one of the big tasks in front of the City now is how to figure out how to finance this, and obviously, the pace of growth has a lot to do with that. He reiterated that it is a big challenge but the City has not gotten there yet.

Commissioner Ritter stated that one of the questions asked was about whether Table 2, the estimated RHNA numbers, includes all of Pleasanton and not just East Pleasanton.

Mr. Dolan replied that it includes all of Pleasanton.

Commissioner Ritter referred to the estimated RHNA number of 2,058 high density for the 2022-2030 Planning Period and inquired if, basically this would be incorporated if the Option that is approved is over 2,058, and conversely, if the Preferred Option that has 1,759 is approved, it will just be short of that 2,058 number.

Mr. Dolan replied that for this first round, the City will do fine with any of the Alternatives on the Very Low, but it does not do very well going to the next round. He noted that the

DRAFT

only place that the City will really be short on any of the Alternatives is the Moderate, which the City will have to find some of.

Commissioner Ritter requested confirmation that that is for all of Pleasanton and not just East Pleasanton.

Mr. Dolan stated that was correct, although the City might have a little extra 30-units-per-acre that the City could say is Moderate, but the City might not want to waste that on the Moderate.

Chair Pearce stated that there are some discussion points but noted that she feels the Commission has already answered them. She asked Mr. Dolan if staff wanted the Commission to go over these.

Mr. Dolan replied that all that is really needed is for the Commission to come to a consensus on a Preferred Alternative or if it has some suggestions on one or more of the other Alternatives.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that as he mentioned earlier, he remembers a smaller plan with somewhere between 1,400 and 1,500 units, possibly the 1,430-unit Plan that was brought up by a couple of speakers. He indicated that he would actually like to see that Plan brought back so it could be studied in the EIR. He pointed out that the reason he is asking for that is because right now, there are three variations of Options 5, and they all have the same number of units but tweaked a bit differently. He stated that he thinks it would be easier if the Option 5 came back looking like the Preferred Plan, and it would be easier to have something tweaked out of it and coming up with a third Plan if there were only two in the study. He indicated that he does not care if all three are kept in the study, but he thinks it is harder to jump back and try and find a midpoint where that mix or numbers have to be changed. He added that he would like to get the 1,430-unit Plan that was presented at the last Work Session dropped back in as an Option so it could be looked at, either as a seventh Plan or as an Option replacing Option 5A or Option 5B. He added that he thinks it would add more value if there were a Plan that 1,000 units, 1,300 units, 1,400 plus, then jump to 1,700 and then to 2,200.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff anticipated that comment and actually has a previous Alternative, although with a twist on it, created tonight. He indicated that this was done back when staff was still working with a 50/50 single-family vs. multi-family.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the Commission did talk at that Work Session about going as far as 65/35.

Mr. Dolan replied that was correct. He added that what he was saying is that staff grabbed this at the last minute because staff heard some rumblings about this desire today. He noted that staff did not adjust it to a different unit mix, and if the Commission wants a 1,430 staff needs to know if the Commission wants that done at 65/35 like the Task Force's ratio.

DRAFT

Commissioner O'Connor replied that he thinks that in order to create the value, it needs to be at 65 percent; otherwise, it may not be financially feasibility.

Mr. Dolan stated that the only down side of including this at all is that it adds a little more to track and it is going to be a little more expensive and will add some cost to the EIR, which would be the property owner's burden. He indicated that staff is not opposed to including it and was something that was brought up at the Task Force. He explained that there used to be different Plans with equidistant steps, but one was taken out, and the Task Force members were ultimately fine with it because he convinced them that this number could be moved wherever they wanted as long as they have the high end covered, and they were satisfied with that. He acknowledged, even then, that it is more convenient to have the steps and so he is not opposed to putting it back in.

Chair Pearce inquired if it is more convenient and more efficient because it is already in the EIR.

Mr. Dolan replied that if it turns out that this is what is approved, land the numbers do not need to be manipulated; but that is only in that one circumstance.

Chair Pearce agreed with Mr. Dolan.

Commissioner Allen agreed on the 65/35.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if that is all staff needs from the Commission.

Mr. Dolan replied that it would be great if the Commission supports its selection of the Preferred Plan, and it can be called whatever the Commission wants, and add the 1,430 Plan, and that would be one outcome that would be fine with staff.

Commissioner Allen stated that that was a great suggestion and she supports adding the other Plan. She indicated that she would like to propose, if there is support for this, that the Preferred Plan be reduced slightly. She stated that at the last Task Force meeting, and it is actually in the financial report here too, the Option 5C, 1,759 units, was a 50/50 mix, and everyone at the table was happy with that in terms of economic feasibility, including the developer. She noted that at the Task Force meeting, everyone agreed to shift the mix to 65/35 because that made more sense, more developer profit, and a better balance for the community so it was a win-win. She added that it did shift the developer economics to make that project that was previously feasible even more feasible, maybe by five or ten percent. She indicated that what she would like to propose is that the Preferred Plan which right now is carrying 1,759 units, be reduced to exactly the same profitability and feasibility margin it had when it was at 50/50 which everyone was happy with. She stated that she does not know what that lower number is but is guessing that it could be 50 or 100 units, and get it to that level that nets that feasibility test that everybody was happy with. She noted that she had heard from a

number of people, both on the Task Force and in the audience tonight, that it would start off with a level playing field.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if it would be a 65/35 mix.

Commissioner Allen said yes.

Chair Pearce asked Commissioner Allen if she is talking about at a 50/50 mix with an option for 1,759 units. She noted that Option 5B seems to have that.

Commissioner Allen replied that it is really Option 7: a variation of Option 5B turned into the Preferred Plan by shifting the mix. She noted that it would really be at a higher feasibility with more units than are required.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that 50/50 is there, but what Commissioner Allen is saying is to look at Option 5C and leave it at 65/35, but reduce the number of units so the feasibility probability is the same as Option 5B.

Commissioner Allen agreed and stated that that is a simpler way of saying it.

Mr. Dolan stated that he understands the concept but that it makes things a little more complicated, and he cannot tell the Commission what that reduction should be.

Chair Pearce asked how that could be figured out.

Mr. Dolan stated that it also begs the question. He asked if it is just swapped out for the point that Mr. Costanzo raised about the value underneath the Transfer Station. He suggested leaving the numbers the same and moving forward, but carrying that concept forward as a part of the Commission's recommendation. He noted that the Commission has a desire to reduce the number, and that can be figured out as it moves forward when the numbers are real.

Chair Pearce agreed.

Mr. Dolan stated that there is this sort of imaginary level of confidence in the work that is being done.

Commissioner Allen stated that she hears what is being said and that she is fine with that as long as the notes also say that the assumption is it is covering the Transfer Station. She indicated that she gets really nervous when this discussion comes up about this number and then the Transfer Station is 80 or 90 on top of it. She stated that the last thing she want for the City and the community is to have two different sets of numbers so that it does not result in approving one and then another set of numbers has to be added when everyone knows that the plan that is being developed is for the entire East Pleasanton and the Transfer Station is part of that. She added that she wants to make sure the number covers it all.

DRAFT

Commissioner Ritter noted that that is what is being proposed with this Preferred Plan, and parts of each of these Options can be extracted to cover everything. He asked why the Commission cannot approve what is being proposed.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that the reason he would like to do it that way is so that when the Commission gets all those pieces back and becomes the Preferred Plan, the Commission might have the option to reuse some of the units; or if one of these Preferred Plans came out and there was excess profitability or feasibility, the industrial site could potentially be eliminated. He indicated that he does not know what that profitability brings to the total, but it is outside the Urban Growth Boundary right now. He added that he would like to have that as an option when the Commission looks at what the feasibility of the whole Plan is.

Chair Pearce stated that she thinks Mr. Dolan's suggestion makes a lot of sense and that she is much more comfortable doing that than adding another Option/Alternative to look at. She indicated that she sees where Commissioner O'Connor is going but she would rather go in this direction than add another Alternative now.

Commissioner Allen stated that she is comfortable with that.

Chair Pearce summarized that the Planning Commission is comfortable at this point with accepting the Task Force's Preferred Plan while adding another option with the 1,430 units. She asked the Commissioners if they are comfortable with that.

Commissioners O'Connor and Allen said yes.

Commissioner Posson asked Chair Pearce if she is saying the Preferred Plan plus the Alternative.

Chair Pearce said yes.

Commissioner Posson indicated that a number of Alternatives have already been identified.

Chair Pearce agreed, but the Commission is adding one other Alternative which has not been included, which is the 1,430 units. She noted that there are more Alternatives now. She asked Mr. Dolan if the Commission needs to vote.

Mr. Dolan replied that he would like a vote.

Commissioner Posson moved to recommend that the Preferred Plan, with the addition of Option 5 (1,430 total housing units), be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report and to give strong consideration to a Preferred Plan if subsequent analysis indicates that a reduced Plan is financially feasible.
Commissioner Ritter seconded the motion.

DRAFT

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: **Commissioners Allen, O'Connor, Pearce, Posson, and Ritter.**
NOES: **None.**
ABSTAIN: **None.**
RECUSED: **None.**
ABSENT: **Commissioner Olson.**

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No discussion was held or action taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION

a. Future Planning Calendar

No discussion was held or action taken.

b. Actions of the City Council

No discussion was held or action taken.

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Matters for Commission's Information

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Pearce adjourned the Planning Commission meeting 10:17 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN
Secretary

DRAFT