SUMMARY OF MEETING #13

Summary of East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting #13
Thursday, December 5, 2013, 6:30 PM
Pleasanton Operations Service Center ● 3333 Busch Road

Task Force Members in Attendance:

Jennifer Pearce, Planning Commissioner
Brad Hottle, Parks & Recreation Commissioner
Colleen Winey, Zone 7 Water Agency
Patrick Costanzo, Kiewit
Steve Dunn, Lionstone Group/Legacy Partners
Kellene Cousins, Mohr/Martin
Jay Galvin, Stoneridge Park
Robert Gonella, Danbury Park
Erin Kvistad, Ironwood
Bob Russman, Village at Ironwood
Kay Ayala, At-Large Representative
Ken Mercer, At-Large Representative
Mark Emerson, At-Large Representative
Brock Roby, At-Large Representative
Robert Silva, At-Large Representative

Staff Present:
Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development
Janice Stern, Planning Manager
Shweta Bonn, Associate Planner
Pamela Ott, Economic Development Director

Consultants Present:
Wayne Rasmussen, Rasmussen Planning, Inc.
David Gates, Gates + Associates
Gail Donaldson, Gates + Associates

I. Welcome and Prior Meeting Summary Notes

A. Welcome and Agenda Overview – Jennifer Pearce called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and welcomed the audience. She also briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.

B. Action Regarding Meeting #12 Summary Notes – The Task Force meeting summary of the November 7, 2013 meeting was unanimously approved as submitted.

II. Meeting Open to the Public

Carol Cohen voiced her opposition to the planning process. She felt that the citizens were being ignored and disrespected, and are becoming disenfranchised. The citizens do not want the "preferred plan." She also commented that the process was being managed in the interests of development. More citizen input is needed prior moving forward.

Linda Garbarino voiced concern that the Downtown streets are not adequate to accommodate traffic generated by future EPSP Area development traffic. She asked that this be addressed in the project EIR. She also felt that growth in the EPSP Area should not be allowed to progress too quickly.

Chris Bourg did not support expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. She was concerned about the proposed number of housing units, loss of open space, and especially the additional traffic. She felt that expanded bus service to the Plan Area will be important.

Discussion regarding the public comments then ensued by Task Force members.

Kellene Cousins felt that the planning process was being spear-headed by the developers and the City's RHNA needs. Infrastructure costs and RHNA needs should not drive the process. The feelings of the community have not been addressed. The planning process is going too fast. She and her neighbors are concerned that the number of housing units in the preferred plan is too high. She supported a collaborative planning process rather than a contentious one.

Kay Ayala was interested in getting a show of hands from the audience regarding those who support versus oppose the preferred plan.

Discussion continued on this topic, with varied opinions expressed.

III. Planning Process Update

A. Status Update Regarding EPSP Planning Process – Brian Dolan reviewed the EPSP process to date. He noted that some of the Plan Area neighbors were expressing concern that the planning process was proceeding too quickly, and suggested a community outreach expansion. Mr. Dolan further suggested that meetings be conducted by staff with the outlying neighborhoods to discuss areas of concern. Meetings might be organized by members of the Task Force living in these neighborhoods. The meetings could occur over a period of several months following preparation of the preliminary draft EPSP document. This would also allow for:

- An economic feasibility analysis to be completed for the Plan

- Potential resolution of the school site matter
- More information about the County request for Stanley Boulevard improvement funding
- More study regarding the physical size of future housing within the Plan Area.

Bob Russman noted that the developers were part of the Task Force and had the right to express themselves and try to convince other members regarding their views.

Ken Mercer requested that the Task Force be provided a primer about how public facilities are funded and how growth pays for itself.

Brian Dolan asked for a show of hands from Task Force members regarding his suggestion to conduct neighborhood meetings and slow down the planning process, and all indicated their support.

Mr. Dolan indicated that neighborhood meeting notes will be recorded, and that the EIR preparation process will continue during the neighborhood meeting process.

IV. Design Character Workshop

A. Residential Development Character – Responses to the November 7, 2013 Meeting Input – Brian Dolan noted that sample design guideline responses to residential design character input received at the November 7, 2013 meeting were included in the meeting packet for informational purposes.

B. Non-Residential Development Character – David Gates provided a brief overview of examples of non-residential development in Pleasanton. He then asked the Task Force for input on aspects of the development designs that might work in the EPSP Area and aspects that would not work.

C. Task Force Group Discussions – Task Force members divided into three small groups to discuss and respond to the workbook images regarding non-residential design that were developed by staff and consultants for the meeting.

D. Task Force Input – Each of the three discussion groups presented their input as follows:

GROUP 1 (Jay Galvin, presenter)

- Gateway Shopping Center parking lot does not work. There is not enough parking, especially for larger vehicles (e.g. SUVs). Make sure retail has sufficient parking.
- Need to be cognizant of Zone 7 groundwater protection when considering land uses, avoid gas stations.
- Need adequate setbacks from El Charro Road.
- Transfer Station should be relocated outside the current Urban Growth Boundary.
- Concern over potential truck cut-through traffic – need to address this.

GROUP 2 (Kellene Cousins, presenter)

- Retail - the Piazza Rubino is a good example of retail scale. Need generous setbacks, variations in height, generous setbacks and vegetation, no big signs. Don't want to look like a typical strip mall.
- Campus Office - Hacienda Lakes is a good example, nice water feature, but too much parking.
- Distribution Use - Unisource has good setbacks and landscaping.
- Discourage through truck traffic.
- Protect groundwater.
- Liked floor area ratio of the FedEx facility.

GROUP 3 (Erin Kvistad, presenter)

- Retail - like the way the Gateway Shopping Center hides parking, but the parking circulation is difficult. Piazza Rubino is a good size and layout, but the architecture does not feel like Pleasanton. Danville Livery nice but no feasible.
- Campus Office - Signature Building does well with landscaping, courtyard, and drive areas are well screened. Bernal office campus is a very good example, with lots of open green space.
- Business Park – Boulder Court is ok, nothing to get excited about, but might fit next to the Transfer Station relocation site.
- Distribution Use – Livermore Greenville Road is a very good example. Unisource is good because it is well hidden and adequately screened from the streets.

Brian Dolan asked if there were any public comments regarding non-residential design matters, and there were none.

Task Force members discussed the desire for staff to provide the density of the following Pleasanton housing developments: Birdland, Ironwood, Ponderosa, Valley Avenue to Santa Rita Road, and Verona.

V. Task Force and Staff Brief Announcements

There was no discussion on this item.

VI. Summary and Next Steps

The next Task Force meeting was scheduled for February 6, 2014.

Close

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 PM.

For further information please contact Janice Stern at (925) 931-5606 or jstern@cityofpleasantonca.gov