



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

**APPROVED**

**Wednesday, October 10, 2012**

*(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings  
and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)*

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of October 10, 2012, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Jerry Pentin.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Jennifer Pearce.

### **1. ROLL CALL**

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Jenny Soo, Associate Planner; Rosalind Rondash, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Chair Jerry Pentin, and Commissioners Phil Blank, Kathy Narum, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, and Jennifer Pearce

Commissioners Absent: None

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **a. September 12, 2012**

**Commissioner Narum moved to approve the Minutes of September 12, 2012.  
Commissioner Blank seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Blank noted that the Minutes were very well done and thanked staff. The Commissioners agreed.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce, and Pentin  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**RECUSED:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

The Minutes of the September 12, 2012 meeting were approved as submitted.

**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 Planning Commission.

**4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA**

Janice Stern advised that there were no changes to the agenda.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**a. P12-0848, Steve and Susan Suchon**

**Application for a Conditional Use Permit to park and store a trailer over 25 feet long at the existing residence located at 4501 Denker Drive. Zoning for the property is R-1-6500 (One-Family Residential) District.**

**Commissioner Pearce moved to make the required conditional use findings as described in the staff report and to approve Case P12-0848, subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A of the staff report. Commissioner Blank seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Blank noted that the Commission received a memo this evening regarding a condition that should be added. **He proposed an amendment to the motion to add the condition as requested by staff.**

**Commissioner Pearce accepted the amendment.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce, and Pentin  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**RECUSED:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

Resolution No. PC-2012-44 approving Case P12-0848 was entered and adopted as motioned.

## **6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS**

### **a. PUD-88, Sherman and Cheryl Balch**

**Application for Planned Unit Development (PUD) Development Plan approval to subdivide an approximately ten-acre lot into two single-family residential lots: (1) an approximately 3.5-acre parcel containing the existing residence, detached garage, and sport court; and (2) an approximately 6.5-acre lot which would include the construction of an approximately 4,000-square-foot single-story home and attached garage, a 1,200-square-foot detached second living unit, and two detached garages. The property is located at 6010 Alisal Street in unincorporated Alameda County.**

Rosalind Rondash presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key components of the proposal.

Commissioner Olson stated that on page 1 of the staff report, reference is made to an approximately 4,000-square-foot single-story home, and on page 3 of the same report, reference is made to a new 4,000-square-foot two-story, single-family residence. He inquired if the proposed home is a single-story or two-story structure.

Ms. Rondash replied that it is a single-story house. She apologized that she noticed the error earlier in the afternoon while she was preparing for tonight's presentation.

Commissioner Blank complimented staff for the fourth staff recommendation on page 21 of the staff report and commented that this is the longest English sentence he has seen all year. He then noted that there are two "Fire" sections in the Conditions of Approval: Conditions 75 through 78 and Conditions 89 through 91. He stated that it seems odd that they would be separated like that and inquired why those are not consolidated into one global area and whether that was done intentionally or was a cut-and-paste work gone wild.

Ms. Rondash replied that a few years ago staff reformatted the Conditions of Approval such that the first part would include special conditions specific to the project, the middle section would be standard conditions, and the final part would be Code conditions. She continued that the standard Fire conditions would be in the middle section, and the Code Fire conditions would be in the final section.

Commissioner Blank stated that he would like to revisit that under Matters Initiated by Commission Members.

Chair Pentin agreed.

**THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Sherman Balch, Applicant, stated that Ms. Rondash did a very thorough job and that the project arrived at a good conclusion. He noted that he started the project a couple of years ago with a Preliminary Review, which helped in the design to meet the requirements, and he then got sidetracked by some of his other projects.

**THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Commissioner Blank stated that he likes the project and thinks it is a great project.

**Commissioner Blank moved to find that there are no new or changed circumstances or information which require additional CEQA review of the project and that the proposed PUD development plan is consistent with the General Plan and Happy Valley Specific Plan; to make the PUD findings for the proposed development plan as listed in the staff report; and to recommend approval to the City Council of Case PUD -88, subject to the Conditions of Approval listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.**

**Commissioner Narum seconded the motion.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce, and Pentin**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSTAIN: None**  
**RECUSED: None**  
**ABSENT: None**

Resolution No. PC-2012-45 recommending approval to the City Council of Case PUD-88 was entered and adopted as motioned.

**b. P12-1220, Pleasant Partners, LLC/RREEF America, LLC**

**Work Session to review and receive comments on a preliminary application to construct 305 apartment units, two retail buildings totaling approximately 7,520 square feet, new surface parking and a parking garage to serve the existing office uses, and related site improvements at the California Center property at 4400-4460 Rosewood Drive. Zoning for the property is PUD-HDR (Planned Unit Development – High Density Residential) and PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development – Industrial/Commercial-Office) Districts.**

Steve Otto presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired what the parking ratio came out to with the addition of the one additional parking space.

Mr. Otto replied that the Standards require 1.5 spaces per unit for the residences, and 1 guest space per 10 units.

Commissioner Blank inquired what a Class I bikeway is as opposed to a Class II.

Mr. Otto explained that the Class I bikeway that was approved in the Pleasanton Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan is a ten-foot paved bikeway, with four feet of decomposed granite on the side.

Chair Pentin added that would be two feet on each side.

Commissioner Blank noted that the design is a little weak on the Pleasanton look.

### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Martin Inderbitzen, representing the Applicant, stated that the property owner is represented tonight by Mark English. He thanked Mr. Otto for doing a very complete and thorough job describing the project and that his team, who is also present tonight, will try not to repeat any of it as they present additional information to get more flavor for the project.

Mr. Inderbitzen stated that, as mentioned by Mr. Otto, this site was originally one of the sites of the PacBell break-ups and became AT&T about 25 years ago, pretty much with the beginning of the Hacienda Business Park. He noted that Hacienda Business Park's design during those early years was really kind of internal-faced, and as an office/campus site, this site fits that mold with big thoroughfares going through the Business Park and big setbacks around the perimeter of the site.

Mr. Inderbitzen stated that the owners of this project acquired the site about seven years ago, and they would like to bring it up to date, more into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. He continued that this dovetailed with the City's Housing Element Update and the Transit-Oriented Program that Hacienda went through just before the Housing Element Update, and the 8.4-acre site was identified as a potential housing site. He indicated that the concept they kicked this project off with was, first, to update and reinvigorate the site; and second, to kind of reverse the trend from an internal-facing site to an external-facing, more inviting site which presents its own challenges not only within the Hacienda Business Park Design Guidelines and the CC&R's but also with the rest of the PUD overlay.

Mr. Inderbitzen stated that the other challenge which Mr. Dolan had set out for them right from the outset was that if they were going to put 8.4 acres of residential on this site with 300 apartment units or 305 units and a retail site, they do not want to have a segregated site from the existing campus office such that they would be turning their back on it with a sound wall or something similar that might eventually happen. He noted that their challenge was to fully integrate the retail and the residential into the

campus office so they relate together in a nice, cohesive way, and their design team did a pretty good job of that.

Mr. Inderbitzen stated that they have spent quite a bit of time with Mr. Dolan and his staff, who were very insightful, very helpful, and very cooperative in identifying issues and working through those issues with them. He added that it was a pretty expeditious process, and what took time was the City's process, including the updating of the Housing Element.

Mr. Inderbitzen indicated that they are pretty much in agreement with just about everything that staff has said about the project. He noted that they have worked through virtually everything, including a good understanding of what the requested exceptions are. He noted that he did not hear staff's support for the garage setbacks but believes staff likes the way they dealt with that treatment.

Mr. Inderbitzen then introduced Padru Kang, Project Architect, from Dahlin Group; David Gates, Landscape Architect, from Gates + Associates; Brock Roby, Project Engineer, from BKF Engineers; and Todd Regonini and Brett Leon, Development Managers from the Sares Regis Group.

Chair Pentin disclosed that he met with Mr. Inderbitzen regarding this project.

Commissioners Olson and Narum indicated that they have also met with Mr. Inderbitzen.

John Thatch, Design Partner for Dahlin Group located at 5865 Owens Drive in Pleasanton, stated that this site has been very important to them for several years. He noted that working with Mr. Dolan Brian and his staff has gone far in really creating a pedestrian atmosphere for the project. He indicated that the key on this site is that it is in the middle of everything with apartments around it, parks such as the Paseo Park that goes along the creek, a hospital, and all types of different retail and schools, making it an ideal spot to create a mixed-use project and change the scale of Owens Drive to make it more inviting and more pedestrian.

Mr. Thatch stated that what they have achieved and are doing on the site is creating connections back to the center, to the office park, to the retail, and the creek. He added that the 1.5-mile trail surrounding the whole site will also make connections to the parks and the paseos and will enhance the project. He indicated that creating the corner plaza can engage more pedestrian activities so that it is more people-activated on that edge. He continued that coming down the street, they created the architecture that brings the entries closer to the street to make it more interesting as well as an interesting drive street line that relates back to the center and makes the connection to the corporate center.

Mr. Thatch stated that they have the taller building, the podium building, farther down, which is set a little bit farther back. He added that they have also created a plaza and

garden areas in front of those units as well as stoops and front porches to activate it and bring people to the street and create a more pedestrian environment in the architecture and the character of the land plan. With respect to the retail area, he indicated that they have broken the buildings in order to create this energy and connection back to the center of the project, the residence, the retail, the office building, and the plaza area out there.

Mr. Thatch stated that their buildings around the retail have three- and four-sided architecture with entries on both sides from the parking lot and the street, making it a very engaging building to the street and to the neighborhood. He added that they are working with the trees and some of the landscape elements from Bishop Ranch, but this will be a little bit smaller than before in order to create the plaza behind it for a little more security away from the street while still being able to activate it to have a pleasant place for people to sit and see things going by. He continued that the architecture is more contemporary in nature, and the retail area is eclectic with a residential mix to it.

Mr. Thatch stated that the main entry into the residential in the middle block off of Owens Drive presents some character with a variety of different scales and some strong geometric forms. He noted that some roof forms are more residential in character with a lot of up-and-down movement in architecture, and the windows utilizes a lot of glazing that will bring a lot of light, creating contemporary floor plans.

Mr. Thatch stated that the project will include a very nice clubhouse and lounge for multipurpose use of residents for yoga, recreation, and a bike shop with all the tools where people can work on their bikes. He added that the area also has connections to bike trails, along with a pool that is big enough for laps, and a business leasing and conference center which can be used by residents who will hopefully choose to work at home. He noted that along with this synergy of a village center is the creation of a pavilion building and lounge that is part of the podium, an outdoor living room and kitchen area, and an outdoor pavilion that will be a really nice entertainment and recreation area for residents.

Mr. Thatch stated that the big thing about the amenities of the project in the community area is the contemporary floor plan, which connects the site to shops and plaza and everything around it. He indicated that they are looking at the community center as a country club with club rooms, a pool and a spa, fitness and yoga, pool tables and bocce ball courts, an internet café, and outdoor kitchen and outdoor dining.

Mr. Thatch stated that their sustainable features are key, with buildings that are LEED Silver as far as reuse in materials and different things. He noted that the big thing about being sustainable in this project is that one can walk to work, to restaurants, to BART, to almost anywhere in the Bay Area without a car. He added that Wi-Fi and the business center will make it possible for people to work more at home and not have to use their car; it will be bike-friendly with secure bicycle parking and a repair shop. He noted that electrical vehicle charging stations will be part of this design, and storm water will be integrated and will be a big part of the design in water and energy efficiency.

Mr. Thatch stated that he believes they are conforming to the guidelines in intent but that Padru Kang would talk a little bit more in detail about what they are doing in that regard.

Commissioner Blank asked what types of retail will be included in the project.

Mr. Thatch replied that they are looking at a coffee shop and smaller service-related retail, such as dry cleaners, that will also work with the residents around the site.

Commissioner Blank commented that the idea that someone would sit in the plaza and watch the traffic between Owens and Rosewood Drives does not seem like something the residents would like to do.

Mr. Thatch replied that it is a place where residents can see people walking by and things going by. He added that he thinks it is an interesting outdoor space that faces southwest as far as getting the sun. He noted that while it is not perfect, it will be of interest because right now, there is really no outdoor dining area down Owens Drive except across the street to the little deli place, which has an outdoor space that actually faces the parking lot, while this space will be landscaped and would be more interesting.

Commissioner Blank commented that he wondered if there could be a different physical arrangement but realizes that it is kind of constrained, based on what they have to work with.

Mr. Thatch replied that he thinks it is constrained but that they would fine-tune the area with landscaping, trellises, and different elements.

Commissioner Blank asked Mr. Thatch if they have given any thought to the ratio of how many charging stations there will be.

Mr. Thatch replied that they have not gotten into that level of detail yet but that it will be a significant number.

Commissioner Olson inquired if the parking structure is only for the corporate offices.

Mr. Thatch said yes. He added that there will be a parking structure under the podium building; otherwise, there is tuck-under parking, garage spaces on the apartment buildings, and then surface and carport spaces.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that there was some talk about shared parking between office and residential and believes that the proposal was for 40 spaces.

Mr. Thatch replied that they talked about that but that they are just getting into more of the details about exactly how that will work as far as numbers, the buildings and locations of residents, and the proximity of where the office is.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if those 40 spaces would be in addition to the 1.5 minimum required for the residential or if they would be used to meet that minimum requirement.

Mr. Thatch replied that it would be part of the number to meet the requirement. He indicated that he looks at how much parking there is and how they can really double up parking so they can to have less asphalt. He added that they are being sustainable as far as their approach to parking is concerned.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he knew what the standard is. He asked Mr. Thatch what would happen in some of the properties, if those 40 are used to meet that standard, if the residents in the complex had two cars. He noted that there would be a lot of extra parking here that is really office parking, and inquired if there would be any way some of the parking could be utilized in the evenings or overnight if a residential parking problem arose down the road.

Mr. Thatch replied that he sees possibilities but that it is a question that Mr. Inderbitzen and the owners should respond to.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she is not aware if the City has ever done a shared residential/office parking before and asked Mr. Thatch how this works and if they have done one of this before.

Mr. Thatch replied that they have done one in Concord; however, the project is on hold and did not get built, but basically there were parking spaces that were available. He explained that it was more like a practical situation that those spaces farthest away from office were going to be available.

Chair Pentin inquired who would have priority for these parking spaces if push comes to shove; for example, if a major corporate client comes in to California Center and the apartment buildings are filled up, who would have the priority, the residents or the corporate building.

Mr. Thatch replied that Mr. Inderbitzen or the owners would have to answer that question.

Mr. Dolan stated that from staff's perspective, residential/office sharing is probably the ideal situation and this opportunity does not come around often. He indicated that it makes a lot of common sense that during the work day, the offices are going to be filled up and the people who live in the place are going to be gone. He added that it would be a good idea in this location. He noted that somebody mentioned it back in the design standards because right now, there are lots of spaces, and this is really formalizing what might occur anyway even if a shared arrangement is not approved. He pointed out that he cannot really predict a circumstance where there would be a conflict because on that big day when they will have a conference with everybody visiting, it would still be a work

day and most residents would be gone. He noted that the last people coming back home to the apartment building will be there well after the office has cleared out. He added that if the applicant would have asked for more shared parking, staff would have considered it because this is a good opportunity to take advantage of that concept.

Padru Kang, Project Architect, Dahlin Group, stated that at a higher density of 35 units versus a minimum of 30 for the other eight sites, this project has a unique opportunity to actually share the parking just north of the site. He noted that, as Mr. Dolan mentioned, it does make sense when it is shared with office, and they would never propose to do any kind of shared parking with retail.

Mr. Kang then briefly went through some of the items staff had mentioned in the report. He indicated that staff did a great job and that he enjoyed working with staff as well. He noted that the Design Guidelines is a great document and that they understand that the intent is to really try and maintain the high quality standards that the existing Pleasanton neighborhoods have, which is difficult with a high-density workforce housing.

Mr. Kang stated that what they are trying to do is put parking where it is really needed. He noted that they really do not have any other opportunities than trying to park around the central hub, and they have taken staff's consideration to widen the roadway from the standard 21 feet to 24 feet, consistent with what is on the back side of the alley. He added that they looked at doing some enhanced paving there to make it feel less like a parking lot and more like an auto plaza.

Mr. Kang stated that they would like a bit of flexibility with the exception regarding setting the garage door two feet back to enable them to carry some of the design around. He indicated that that are focusing on 360-design elements and want to wrap that around to the back side where they have opportunities to really play with some articulation and the alleyways are not highly visible. He added that the retail is also designed to be 360 in terms of architecture, out on the corner of the street near the intersection, with the driveway and circulation on one side. He noted that there is a higher tower element with storefront essentially on all four sides and that visibility is not necessarily a factor with the design as it is a stand-alone retail.

Mr. Inderbitzen offered one specific comment regarding the retail plaza area. He indicated that he hears Commissioner Blank's concern about somebody going to sit out there and drink coffee, and his response to that is to drive by Peet's Coffee at the corner of Hopyard Road and Valley Avenue where people are not loathed to sit out and drink coffee while cars are going by. He noted that this could not be any worse as it is a much bigger plaza and much more protected, even though it is on the corner. He added that there is a right-turn opportunity there which opens up the plaza area, and they have separated the retail buildings so people can pass through there, making it much more useful and much more of an opportunity to activate that retail area and make it much more inviting.

Commissioner Blank stated that he was not suggesting eliminating it but finding some way to make it more curvy and envelop it more without losing the plaza.

Mr. Inderbitzen replied that Hacienda Business Park is very proprietary about corner treatments. He stated that they spent a lot of time with James Paxson discussing eliminating that wall to make the plaza bigger, and the answer was no. He added that had to spend a lot of time with the landscape architect and the architect designing that wall into the plaza so that it was more integrated.

Commissioner Blank inquired if there is any way to integrate the plaza better with the retail buildings such as making it more curvy around the corner. He noted that people will naturally drift in and out of the retail.

Mr. Inderbitzen replied that they can work on that as there is quite a bit of room there. He pointed out that even though it is roughly only 7,400 square feet of retail, it is very important to the project and they are committed to it. He added that it is real retail, legitimate retail that they want to be successful, attract really good tenants, make it as open and attractive as possible for people to come in there and use it. He noted that most of the retail around Hacienda Business Park turns its back on the street, and it is kind of offensive for someone driving by and not being able to see the stores in there; people will need to get into that plaza to know who the retailers are, and they do not want that scenario here.

James Paxson, General Manager of Hacienda Business Park, stated that they are incredibly pleased to be working on this project with Sares Regis, and they are very excited with the high level of design and architecture for this site. He reiterated what was said earlier about how this has been integrated not only within the existing project but within the Park. He indicated that this is an outstanding project and is about three-fourths of the way through the review process, with just a couple more things that need to be done to wrap up. He added that they anticipate providing their approval to the City within the next couple of weeks.

#### **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

The Commission then discussed the Work Session topics:

A. *Would the Planning Commission support the requested exceptions if the project were to move forward as proposed?*

Commissioner Olson stated that he would. He added that he did not like the word "if" as this is a great project that ought to go forward as soon as possible.

Commissioner Narum agreed. She stated that she can support the exceptions that are being requested. She added that she likes the way it looks and can support it even if it is not necessarily consistent with the guidelines. With respect to the retail depths of 47 feet and 57 feet, she commented that she assumes the developer has people who

are experts in leasing and who feel they can get these spaces leased at those varying depths.

Commissioner Blank said yes.

Commissioner Pearce agreed with Commissioner Narum's comments. She noted that the sole goal is to get retail in here, and if the applicant believes this kind of depth can support the retail, she is all for it.

Commissioner O'Connor said yes.

Chair Pentin said yes too. He indicated that he loves the 360 retail and recalls that when Tully's was built Downtown, he thought it would be a busy corner, and it is now the drawing point Downtown. He added that he thinks the plaza on that corner may end up with the same thing, with the residential and the corporate.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he does not believe the Commission has seen the actual detail of the "James Paxson" wall and hopes that it does not block any visibility of the retail.

Commissioner Narum noted that she did not see any comment on the kind of trees.

Chair Pentin indicated that the Landscape Architect will be up in a minute.

Topics B and C were considered together.

*B. Are the on-site circulation, parking layout, and positioning of the buildings acceptable?*

*C. Does the Planning Commission support the use of shared office/residential spaces to meet some of the required residential parking*

Chair Pentin said absolutely yes for shared spaces.

Commissioner Pearce stated that given what staff and the applicant have said, she is in support of shared parking. She noted she is comfortable with the 360 retail positioning, the buildings are great, the parking layout looks good, and there is sufficient circulation.

Commissioner Blank stated that he was fine with both questions. He noted that his only comments are relatively minor ones that he has already made regarding finding some way to enhance the tie between the retail and the plaza. He reiterated that he is not looking to eliminate the plaza or suggesting that it is a bad thing. He indicated that he has seen this kind of approach in southern California and it is very successful. He added that this could be a great amenity and a really big hit.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that his only concern is flexibility in the shared parking. He indicated that he would rather see more than less; not that it is going to be required, but just a concern for the future in the event it is required and knowing that there is something there; and if it is not needed, then it is not needed.

Commissioner Olson stated that he is fine with both questions. He added that Mr. Dolan's comments regarding shared parking were spot on and hopes that the project gets there on shared parking.

Commissioner Narum echoed all that has been said and added that she would much rather have the shared parking and allow more open space here than adding in its own parking and having to give up some of the open space in the center of that podium building. She noted that it is a good concept and she is fine with it.

Chair Pentin concurred with Commissioner Narum. He stated that if it goes the shared parking route, and if the shared parking were to be increased to create more open space with the idea that if it ever came to that point, some of that may be reduced, he is good with that.

*D. Are the proposed on-site recreation facilities and amenities acceptable?*

Commissioner O'Connor said he was fine with them.

Commissioners Olson, Narum, and Pearce said yes.

Commissioner Blank stated that he thinks they are pretty good. He commented that he saw only one tot lot in the area, and that seemed a little light to him. He noted that there might be an opportunity in Building P where there is that big area, not necessarily to put in a play structure but to have a recreational area where kids could play. He pointed out that residents living in Building P would have to go all the way over to the other side to where Building C is.

Chair Pentin stated he was fine with the on-site recreational facilities and amenities, with the addition of Commissioner Blank's comments.

*E. Are the building designs, colors and materials, and heights acceptable?*

Commissioner Blank stated that, as everyone knows, he is really big on the Pleasanton look, but people also know that he backed away from that with the Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD) because obviously, it is different than the Pleasanton look. He stated that overall, he is generally fine with this. He requested that when the project comes back to the Commission for the hearing, he would like to actually get to see visuals. He noted that Safeway had great visuals where they actually had people driving around the parking lots so the Commission could see how the buildings look and what the viewscapes were. He noted that it really helps the Commission and the public to get a good handle of what it is going to look like.

Commissioner Pearce stated that preliminarily, she thinks everything looks great. She indicated that the color palette looks fine but that she would love to see some actual colors which the Commission can look at under their day light lamps.

Commissioner Blank requested that the size of the color palettes be about 10 x 10, as opposed to the one-inch square ones, so the Commission can get a sense of the colors.

Commissioner Pearce agreed.

Commissioner Narum stated that she was fine overall, with one comment. She referred to page A2-14 of the plans and noted that the colors of the amenity buildings, specifically the mustard color, appear to be conflicting when put alongside the podium.

Commissioner Blank noted that it could be the color from the printer.

Commissioner Narum commented that she was pleased with the simplified towers which have that Pleasanton look.

Commissioner Blank agreed and added that he saw a little bit of that in there, and he always wants more.

Commissioner Pearce noted that she was looking at the same buildings when she asked for actual colors.

Mr. Inderbitzen stated that he will bring a color and materials board.

Commissioner Olson stated that he loves the architecture and that the design, the materials that have been described, and the heights are just outstanding. He commented that he has been on the Commission for over six years and he still does not know what the Pleasanton look is. He added that the Commission will need a separate workshop to inform the Commissioners on what the Pleasanton look is.

Commissioner Blank commented that staff knows what the Pleasanton look is.

Commissioner O'Connor commented that he thinks the Pleasanton look is on page A2-5, how some of the roofing elements are brought in. He noted that there is none of that on page A2-1, which has more of a modern look and which he likes. He added that if they all looked the same, they would all blend in and not stand out; but he would like to bring attention to the retail, so he likes the way it is. He stated that the mustard color was acceptable.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Chair Pentin stated that he also likes the way it is. He noted that he loves the architecture, the look, and the way they broke it up. He added that even on the exception for the garages with two feet and one foot moving in and out just broke it up and he really likes the looks of it. He noted that a mustard color was fine with him as long as it was not too bright.

Commissioner Blank asked staff if they got what they needed.

The staff said yes.

Commissioner Pearce left the meeting at this point.

## **7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS**

### Code Enforcement and the Police Department

Commissioner Blank stated that at the last meeting, there was an item for follow-up on Code enforcement with the Pleasanton Police Department. He inquired if staff had an update on that.

Ms. Stern stated that staff looked into that and indicated that the Police have copies of the Conditional Use Permits available to them on their on-board computers. She added that she would forward the Police Department's email on this to the Commission.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the Police know how to access that and stated that he trusted staff would handle that.

### PowerPoint Presentations

Commissioner Blank then suggested that for future presentations, it would be really helpful if staff could indicate on the PowerPoint slides the index page on the Exhibits that the slides are coming from.

### Conditions of Approval

Finally, with respect to the grouping on the different kinds of categories for Conditions of Approval, Commissioner Blank suggested that rather than have two separate areas for "Fire" and the other areas, staff could put it all under an area called "Fire" and use different fonts, italics, underline, or indent, or some other way of showing what the source of the regulation is. He noted that this sounds like what is being done, but having them in separate sections can be a bit disorienting.

Mr. Dolan responded that he sees that point and that it is one of the choices. He noted that staff has put a lot of effort into redoing the conditions, which was actually one of the requests of the Customer Service Review Team (CSRT) that had just completed its work when he started working for the City.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the CSRT preferred separate sections.

Mr. Dolan replied that they did not get into it in that level of detail; they wanted some order to the massive quantities of conditions they were opposed to, and this was something he had been confronted with before in different cities. He indicated that he thinks the key is to keep the conditions separate and labeled. He added that what staff wanted to be able to do was to instantly provide them with the unique substantive conditions that were created because of something about this project, the real conditions of approval; then there would be the standard conditions which are used over and over that most of the regular applicants understand are coming and would apply; and the third is really something that is not a condition of approval at all but a piece of the Code that they are subject to regardless of whether or not it is put in, but if they are not put in, staff could sometimes be accused of not notifying them of that requirement.

Commissioner Blank stated that it is human nature that people would look at the fire conditions and believe they have done all of them, and then when they call staff for inspection and are told they need to install automatic sprinklers, they will say they looked at the conditions and did not see that; and staff will say they're in the very end.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff can put the conditions sequentially but that they will still be in the three categories.

Commissioner Blank stated that he is not objecting to the three categories at all but that they should be grouped together from a subject matter perspective so that all engineering conditions would be together, all building and safety together, all drainage together, all landscaping together, etc.

Mr. Dolan stated that he understands that and added that once that is done, staff will likely hear that they just want a simple list of the real conditions, the ones that are unique to the project.

Commissioner Narum stated that she hears what Commissioner Blank is saying and thinks that it is a matter of taking each set and calling them out for what they are: here is the unique conditions of approval, here is the Code, and here is the standard conditions.

Commissioner Blank stated that it just seemed off to him that the conditions would be listed that way.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff will give that some thought and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if under "Fire," there could be Section A as standard and Section B as unique.

Mr. Dolan replied that is the option Commissioner Blank is suggesting. He indicated that the downside to this is that there will not be a single Building condition until 40 pages in. He added that there are pro's and con's to each.

Commissioner Narum commented that it really should come down to what is best for the applicant to expedite and not necessarily for the Commission.

Commissioner Blank stated that he is worried somebody will miss something that is buried at the back of the conditions.

Chair Pentin suggested that a subparagraph be included saying something like "see page 41 for additional conditions for Fire," which would give them a heads-up that there are other Fire conditions.

Commissioner Blank commented that is another idea.

## **8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION**

No discussion was held or action taken.

### **a. Future Planning Calendar**

Commissioner Blank stated that he will not be available on Thursday, November 8<sup>th</sup>, for the Historic Preservation Task Force meeting.

Mr. Dolan stated that he is not sure the meeting for November has actually been set.

Commissioner Blank indicated that he was responding to a query on availability and he just wanted to let staff know he was not available then.

### **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**

#### Heritage Tree Board of Appeals

Commissioner Narum stated that the Heritage Tree Board of Appeals met earlier this evening and the Board voted to uphold the appeal to cut down the tree with the condition that one of four trees has to be planted within six months.

### East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force

Commissioner Narum stated that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force met and reviewed opportunities and constraints of the land and the area. She noted that the most interesting part was the discussion by Zone 7 about how the Chain of Lakes will work in the scheme of providing drinking water as well as what it is willing to allow with those lakes but mostly not allowing at this point. She added that she does not think is going to be any water scheme.

Commissioner Olson inquired if there will be any fishing.

Commissioner Narum replied that she did not think there will be any fishing allowed.

Commissioner Narum stated that this was the first meeting of substance and it was a good meeting. She noted that there was a lot of discussion, a lot of interest in the community, and that there will probably be more people actually attending the meetings than members of the Task Force.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there will be no public access to any of the water in that Chain of Lakes.

Commissioner Narum replied that was sort of the indication they got from Zone 7 but that they did say they were interested in ideas, uses for the community that the Task Force might want to take a look at. She added that Lakes H and I appear to be basically for groundwater recharge for drinking water.

### Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Committee

Chair Pentin stated that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails Committee approved the trail at Valley Avenue and Sunol Boulevard that moves down to the Alameda Transportation Corridor. He indicated that the trail is currently next door to Richert Lumber but will be moved across the canal along Valley Avenue because of a bank problem. He added that it will cost about \$110,000 and that there were some Measure B funds available for that.

Chair Pentin then stated that the funds that is not being used for the bicycle undercrossing at I-580/I-680 will be used to pave different sections of the Arroyo Mocho at Stoneridge Drive towards Staples Ranch, using different composites and crushed aggregates that is actually quite nice, or a type of a aerated concrete that drains that looks very promising, to test to see what might work better.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Pentin adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN  
Secretary