THE CITY OF
PLEASANTON
P. O. Box 520, Pleasanton, California 94566-0802

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue
Pleasanton, California

Wednesday, March 12, 2014
7:00 p.m.

****

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURE

Each of the items listed will be heard as shown on the agenda unless the Planning Commission chooses to change the order. As each item is called, the hearing will proceed as follows:

- A Planning Division staff member will make a presentation on each case and answer Planning Commission questions, as needed.
- The applicant will be asked to make a presentation, if desired, or answer questions. Applicant presentations should be no longer than ten minutes.
- The Chair then calls on anyone desiring to speak on the item. Speakers are requested to state their names for the public record and to keep their testimony to no more than five minutes each, with minimum repetition of points made by previous speakers and by being as brief as possible in making their testimony.
- Following public testimony, the applicant will be given the opportunity to respond to issues raised by the public. The response should be limited to five minutes.

The public hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commissioners then discuss among themselves the application under consideration and act on the item. Planning Commission actions may be appealed to the City Council. Appeals must be filed with the City Clerk's Office within 15 days of the Planning Commission's action.

The Planning Commission Chair may enforce other rules as may further the fair and efficient running of the meeting, such as reducing the amount of testimony time allotted to the applicant and all those who wish to speak when the meeting agenda is lengthy or when there are numerous speakers for any specific item. The audience is requested to respect and extend courtesy to all those wishing to testify on all cases by being quiet while others are speaking.

****

Next Resolution No. is PC-2014-12

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. February 26, 2014

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

4. REVISIONS 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 are no Consent Calendar Items.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. P14-0010, P14-0011, and PUD-101, MidPen Housing
Work Session to review and receive comments on applications for General Plan Amendment and Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning and Development Plan to demolish the 90 existing senior apartments at Pleasanton Gardens and Kottinger Place, demolish the Regalia House, and construct a 185-unit senior apartment project (Kottinger Gardens) on an approximately 6.43-acre site located at 240 and 251 Kottinger Drive, 4138 Vineyard Avenue, and 4133 Regalia Court. Zoning for the properties is RM-2,500 and RM-4,000 (Multi-Family Residential) Districts and R-1-6,500 (One-Family Residential) District.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

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

a. Future Planning Calendar

b. Actions of the City Council

c. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

d. Matters for Commission's Information

e. Matters for Commission's Action

(1) Request to name the private street "Rogers Lane" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a ten-lot single-family development (PUD-71) located at 3835 Vineyard Avenue.

(2) Request to name the private street "Emmett Place" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUD-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Notice

Any documents that were provided to the Planning Commission after the Agenda packet was distributed are available for public review during normal business hours at the Planning Division 200 Old Bernal Ave., Pleasanton.

Accessible Public Meetings

The City of Pleasanton will provide special assistance for citizens with disability to participate in public meetings upon reasonable advance notice. If you need an auxiliary hearing aid, sign language assistance, or other accommodation, please contact the following staff at least two working days before the meeting date: Maria L. Hoey, Office Manager, (925) 931-5602; mhoey@cityofpleasantonca.gov.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

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

APPROVED

Wednesday, March 12, 2014
(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 March 12, 2014, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice Chair O'Connor.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Commission Pearce.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present:	Brian Dolan, Director of Community Development; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Bocian, Assistant City Manager; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; and Maria L. Hoey, Recording Secretary
Commissioners Present:	Chair Arne Olson (arrived after the Pledge of Allegiance); Commissioners Nancy Allen, Greg O'Connor, Jennifer Pearce, Mark Posson, and Herb Ritter
Commissioners Absent:	None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. February 26, 2014

Commissioner Ritter stated that his name appears on both the "Ayes" and the "Absent" on page 19 for the Roll Call Vote for P14-0001, City of Pleasanton. He indicated that he

was present for the discussion and voted on the item, and requested that his name be deleted under "Absent."

Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Minutes of the February 26, 2014, as amended.
Commissioner Pearce seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The Minutes of the February 26, 2014 Meeting were approved, as amended.

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 indicated that there were no revisions or omissions to the Agenda.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Calendar items for consideration.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

a. P14-0010, P14-0011, and PUD-101, MidPen Housing
Work Session to review and receive comments on applications for General Plan Amendment and Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning and Development Plan to demolish the 90 existing senior apartments at Pleasanton Gardens and Kottinger Place, demolish the Regalia House, and construct a 185-unit senior apartment project (Kottinger Gardens) on an approximately 6.43-acre site located at 240 and 251 Kottinger Drive, 4138 Vineyard Avenue, and 4133 Regalia Court. Zoning for the properties is RM-2,500 and RM-4,000 (Multi-Family Residential) Districts and R-1-6,500 (One-Family Residential) District.

Eric Luchini stated that there will be a three-part presentation for the project: Assistant City Manager Steve Bocian will provide the background and ownership elements related to the

project, followed by his presentation of an overview of the preliminary project merits as detailed in the staff report, and finally Abigail Goldware from MidPen Housing Corporation will cover the outreach and development processes.

Mr. Bocian stated that he will touch on three things: (1) the ownership structure of both of the existing developments; (2) the milestones of the project from the start to this point; and (3) the next big steps in the future.

Mr. Bocian presented the ownership structure, indicating that there are two projects involved here, both of which provide low-income housing to seniors.

1. Kottinger Place. This is owned by the City of Pleasanton's Housing Authority since the early 1970's and is basically comprised of a Board of Directors that includes the City Council. It is a separate legal entity and the only project the Housing Authority owns and is involved with in its real course of business. The project is linked to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through an Annual Contributions contract, which sets the requirements and standards for this project. The HUD has a significant say in how the development is operated and actually provides funding for it. It is a public housing project and has been operated as one from the start. The Housing Authority, through the City, contracts out the management of the project, and it is currently managed by Barcelon Associates Management Corporation.

2. Pleasanton Gardens. This is owned by Pleasanton Gardens, Inc., a not-for-profit community-based organization [501(c)3]. The City does not have an ownership stake in this project and agreed many years ago to work with its Board cooperatively towards trying to redevelop both of these sites. It operates as a Section 8 project, and a Memorandum of Understanding in place sets forth the relationship between the City and the Board.

Mr. Bocian then presented the project milestones:

- 2001: Study was done to determine expansion feasibility. The City began work on this development when Mr. Howard Nealy, one of the City's Housing Commissioners at that time and who is now on the Task Force and has been on the Task Force since the start, brought up the idea of the potential of trying to add more units to the Kottinger Place site, maximizing the values and the opportunity of the Kottinger Place site towards trying to provide more low-income housing for Pleasanton seniors.

- 2004: Kottinger Place Task Force was formed. The City Council formed a broad-based resident Task Force that includes members of the public, members of the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Housing Commission, and residents from both of the developments and the community at large.

- 2006: Christian Church Homes was retained to study options.

- 2010: The Task Force submitted preliminary predevelopment report.

- 2011: the City Council approved the purchase of 4138 Vineyard Avenue. The site included a single-family residence, which would be removed and the property used as part of this project.

- 2012: The City entered into a relationship with MidPen Housing to direct this project and work with the City on various aspects of the project. Following a number of community-based meetings, the Task Force presented the City Council with a Predevelopment Analysis Report that looked at a whole range of things including the potential for trying to rehabilitate the project and various types of development opportunities. The Task Force membership was expanded to include a City Councilmember and additional neighborhood representation. This basically led to the project that the Commission will be reviewing this evening.

- 2012: The City Council adopted the Predevelopment Analysis Report and took action to commit $8 Million towards the project from the City's Low-Income Housing Fund. It authorized MidPen Housing staff to work through a specific project site and development plan that it would bring back to the City Council. It also directed staff to work to prepare legal agreements: a Disposition and Development Agreement/ Predevelopment Loan Agreement (DDA) between the City and MidPen Housing and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and Pleasanton Gardens.

- November 2013: The City Council approved the site plan and the development plan, the DDA with MidPen Housing and the MOU with Pleasanton Gardens; increased its financial support to $10 Million; and authorized MidPen Housing to begin the PUD process and to begin the HUD Demolition and Disposition application process, which is basically getting HUD approval to move on with the project to actually remove the existing assets.

- 2013: The Pleasanton Gardens Board approved the MOU, which would deed its improvements and its financial resources to the City for one dollar for the purpose of this new development. Additionally, financially, Pleasanton Gardens has some Section 8 entitlements which would be transferred over to the new development as well.

- February 2014: The Housing Commission recommended approval of the PUD and Development Plan.

Mr. Bocian then proceeded to the next big steps:

- The next major step is the PUD approval by both the Planning Commission and the City Council. Through all of the agreements and all of the actions that the City Council has taken to date on this project, specifically those back in 2012 and 2013,

it was very clear that the project depended upon working its way through the normal planning process. It did not want to cut any corners on that process; it wanted to make sure it was open and typical of what the City does. MidPen Housing has been working very closely with Planning staff as any other developer would. While the Council has seen the project and likes the project, it still wants the project to go through this process.

- HUD approval of the Demolition and Disposition application process, which is currently in the pre-application process. MidPen Housing expects to submit the formal application within 30 days, and it takes about 30-45 days to get an answer. This is the most critical step in the process. If HUD's answer could be: "Yes, move ahead, and here is some potential financing" or "No, we want to keep the asset." MidPen Housing has put together a very solid preliminary application, and all of the work that has been done with the community to date supports moving towards a new development.

- Project financing. This is basically a 9-percent tax-credit project, and what that means is that it will be a very competitive process. All the players involved – staff, MidPen Housing, and the Task Force – think that there is a very good chance to get approved.

- Approval of the Ground Lease. The City will enter into a long-term ground lease identifying MidPen Housing as the Lessee, who will own the site improvements and also act as the property manager and operate it in accordance with the terms the City sets forth in the ground lease. The ground lease has not yet been negotiated, but the DDA has an outline; and the most critical element and most important focus is that the City will have a quality development that provides low-income units to those individuals who need them.

Commissioner Ritter inquired if, after the projects are consolidated, the 501(c)3 will end up being owned by the City.

Mr. Bocian replied that the 501(c)3 will most likely go away or be put to another use, but that site will be owned by the City.

Commissioner Ritter further inquired if it will eventually be one entity.

Mr. Bocian said yes; the ownership will be transferred to the City. He explained that through the process, the Housing Authority will be moved out and both of the parcels will be owned by the City.

Commissioner Allen inquired if her understanding is correct that the City will not have any on-going financial obligations.

Mr. Bocian replied that was correct.

Commissioner Posson inquired, since this has been going on since 2001, how the City engaged the expertise of the Planning staff to ensure the best development possible.

Mr. Bocian replied that throughout the years, they have worked closely with Planning staff, and most recently, they received input on the site plan that was reviewed by the City Council back in November of 2013, and then engaged through the typical review process of the City's Staff Review Board. He added that they have also received feedback from the City's Parks and Recreation Commission as well as Housing Commission.

Commissioner Allen noted that there appears to be no community feedback here, possibly because this has been going on so long, and inquired if there are any issues out there in the neighborhoods regarding this project or of they really have all been settled.

Mr. Bocian replied that from his perspective and that of the Task Force and those individuals who attended the Task Force meeting, there had been a lot of community input over the years, and the issues have been addressed. He noted that at the last Task Force meeting, there was a general agreement regarding the site plan and all of the deal points. He pointed out that the Task Force action was not unanimous; there was one individual representing the neighborhood who supported the project and the design of the project, but still raised some concerns about the portion of the three-story building. He indicated that he thinks this Task Force member had the perspective from the beginning and through the process of trying to get a development that did not include a third story. He added that there were also people who thought that here is a three-story building moving into the neighborhood and how will that affect them on a long-term basis. He noted that there was a lot of moving around on the site plan and a whole lot of interaction; and the work that MidPen Housing and the Task Force did has alleviated all of the neighborhood concerns relative to that. He indicated that he can say pretty confidently that there is general acceptance now.

Commissioner Pearce inquired what the status of the Task Force is and if there are future meetings planned.

Mr. Bocian said yes. He explained that the Task Force has not been meeting as they are working through this process now, but it will meet again, probably when the project moves into the financing stage, and then re-engage when they move to the relocation stage. He stated that, assuming everything gets approved, the development of the project will be phased, and there will be some relocation that has to take place. He indicated that MidPen Housing, under its DDA, is required to prepare a relocation plan that will be reviewed by staff as well as the Task Force. He added that, as is typical with other projects the City has been involved with, there are certain key things that come up throughout the process, and the Task Force will be re-engaged.

Chair Olson inquired if the current residents of the two projects all know this is coming.

Mr. Bocian said yes. He stated that from his perspective as a City staff person, MidPen Housing did a tremendous job of reaching out to the residents, meeting with every single

resident, talking to them in one-on-one meetings. He indicated that they had meetings on-site, group meetings with translators on-site. He noted that they really got the word out and that was really important to the City Council back when it looked at the project in 2011. He added that the Task Force and staff had to do more to really get the word out, and everyone is satisfied with that process.

Commissioner Posson noted that several weeks ago, the Planning Commission recommended some changes in the Downtown development ordinance and inquired if this falls within the sphere of that ordinance.

Ms. Stern said no.

Mr. Luchini then presented an overview of the preliminary project merits, including the scope, layout, and key elements of the project.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that the percentage of covered parking spaces seems really low and inquired why more are not provided.

Mr. Luchini replied that staff actually asked that question of the applicant and the initial reaction was that they had done their best to try and keep open paths and lines of sight to the buildings from the parking lot as well as from the buildings out to the parking lot. He added that the only way additional covered parking could be accommodated would be to eliminate those views from the buildings and lines of sight by putting carports right up against the building.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if all of the covered spaces are on the perimeter.

Mr. Luchini replied that was correct.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he has not gone through and actually counted them but that there seems to be significantly more than the 64 spaces mentioned in the staff report along the perimeter between both sides of Kottinger Drive.

Mr. Luchini replied that 64 spaces along Kottinger Drive was correct.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that on page 9 of the staff report, it talks about the landscape design that provides a hierarchy of outdoor spaces ranging from public to private. He inquired if that meant the public can actually enter and come onto the property to use the open space like a park.

Mr. Luchini said no, not in the most formal sense. He noted that there has always been somewhat of a symbiotic relationship between the residents of the units and the park itself, but he does not believe there is any intention of opening up the private areas of the development to park users.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the Kottinger Place site, as opposed to the Pleasanton Gardens site, has only one entrance and one exit from the parking lot off of Kottinger Drive, and none on the Vineyard Avenue side.

Mr. Luchini replied that there is actually an existing ingress and egress off of Vineyard Avenue, which will actually be shifted slightly for this development, in addition to that on the Kottinger Drive side. He then pointed it out on the displayed site plan.

With respect to the location of the parking lot, Commissioner Ritter inquired if the residents at the bottom corner of the site as shown on the site plan would be parking out at the top of the site.

Mr. Luchini said yes.

Mr. Ritter noted that some these residents would be in their 80's and 90's, and they would be carrying groceries. He stated that his parents were in their 80's when they passed, and they always wanted to be close to the elevator and close to the entrance so they could bring their groceries in easily. He indicated that it just seems like a long walk and inquired if there would be a shuttle bus. He further inquired if the guest parking is also out there.

Mr. Luchini replied that the guest parking would also be in the same lot, and there would not be any shuttle bus.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Abby Goldware, Project Manager, MidPen Housing, stated that she wanted to focus on a few of the goals they were trying to meet here, the first being the demand and the need for affordable senior housing. She noted that both Kottinger Place and Pleasanton Gardens currently have wait lists that are closed, which means that they have so many people on the wait list that they cannot continue to accept more. She added that the property manager at Kottinger Place once told her that she receives calls daily asking if there are units available. She stated that MidPen Housing has been around for over 40 years; a non-profit developer that owns and manages over 6,500 units, about 25 percent of which are for seniors. She pointed out that all of their properties have wait lists that are similar to that at Kottinger Place.

Ms. Goldware then discussed the existing site character, which is very special because of the open space and the cottage feel. She indicated that MidPen Housing is balancing and trying to increase the supply of housing on these sites while retaining that character, and she felt that they have really been able to achieve that through this plan. She pointed out that because they are part of an existing neighborhood and a community, it was really important to them to incorporate as much neighbor feedback as possible. She indicated that all of the Task Force meetings were open to the neighbors, and they also held a neighborhood meeting this past summer to continue to get feedback.

Regarding stakeholder feedback, Ms. Goldware stated there are 90 existing households between the two sites and that she met with almost every single one of them that she could, mostly in their homes, and with translators. She indicated that she just spoke with them and asked them questions such as what they like and did not like about where they live, how they spend time outside, if they own a car or use the bus, and if they would be willing to cross the street if there was an activity that they really wanted to attend across the street. She noted that the residents living there are really happy where they are and want to be able to live there and independently for as long as possible; but the current homes are not accessible. She added that there comes a point where they might have surgery and end up in a wheelchair only for a few weeks, but it might mean having to leave because the wheelchairs cannot get into the kitchen area or the bathroom.

Ms. Goldware stated that another driving force is that there are many studio units currently at both sites with couples living in them, and there is just not enough space; so they are adjusting the units to one bedroom's, with some two-bedroom units, with the right amount of storage space and living space for a one- or two-person household.

As regards parking, Ms. Goldware stated that in addition to the individual interviews, they also provided written surveys out to residents, and one of the questions was about parking and if they own a car. She indicated that out of the 66 persons who responded, 40 replied that they owned a car. She noted that this is pretty representative of most of the senior properties that MidPen owns and manages, and it is in everybody's best interest to have the right amount of parking. She added that they feel the .8-to-1 parking ratio really is something they can stand by and have seen to be effective in locations similar to Kottinger Gardens.

Ms. Goldware stated that they also spent a lot of time getting feedback from neighbors, and as was mentioned earlier, the location of the multi-story component of the building was something that they heard a lot about, and the project architect will address that shortly. She noted that there was also a lot of interest about the landscaping treatment on the perimeter, that there are plenty of trees and nice things to look at from various neighbors' houses and the view corridor through the site. She added that they also received some feedback on the pedestrian crossing, which will be discussed later in the presentation.

In response to questions regarding meeting with City staff, Ms. Goldware stated that they went through the Planning Division's preliminary review process back in June and received feedback through that process, and then met with the Fire Department and the Engineering Division as well.

Lauri Moffett-Fehlberg, Dahlin Group, stated that, as Mr. Luchini had made a comprehensive presentation, she will just talk about a few concepts. She indicated that she understands the foundation of where some of these components came from, and the optimal word that they have to keep coming back to is balance: taking the Task Force objectives, balancing them with the residents' desires and needs, with the neighborhood concerns, and with this overriding need to just provide more affordable senior housing in town.

Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg displayed the site plan and pointed to the cottages, which are single story and are intended to be mixed and matched to combine both back-to-back and in a linear fashion. She then pointed to the two-story units on the garden side and on the Kottinger Place side along this edge; and the three-story component set back into the center of the site. She indicated that they worked very closely with the neighbors down in this area to provide view corridors so houses are not just lined-up across the back of that site, and preserving existing trees around the perimeter of the site to help buffer the neighborhood.

With respect to the carports, Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg stated that they are on the outer edges of the parking areas as opposed to up against the buildings as they felt it was really important to see into that parking area for safety and security and not have the carports too close to the buildings. She added that it is not lined up exactly for every parking stall to avoid having one big long carport; they wanted to break it up so they can get some trees in there.

Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg stated that the site plan is a balance between private and public outdoor space, leaving community open space areas between the homes, linking the community together in shared gardens, butterfly gardens, and gardens that have memory points so they can go from place to place and feel like they went someplace different within the community. She noted that each of the cottages in particular are designed to have a front porch which gives that layering of public to private realm as they go into their homes. She added that each of the homes in the multi-story buildings have their own balcony.

Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg stated that the access through the site from Vineyard Avenue to Kottinger Drive is an in-and-out loop, and the Kottinger Place side has a through-connection. She indicated that they want to create a scenario where there was not cut-through traffic but there was a smooth connection through for easy delivery to a centralized point where the common facilities, the common spaces, the multi-purpose room, and MidPen Housing's offices are located, which would provide a sense of arrival and security, and then a turnaround that serves also as a plaza adjacent to the multi-purpose area on the Gardens side. With respect to the crossing between the two sites, she stated that it was very important that this have a feel of one integrated community so people feel like this is their neighborhood, as opposed to two separate communities. She indicated that they studied this connection across Kottinger Drive and felt that it was the safest and most conducive to everyone crossing, whether it be residents or neighbors within the community, to create a scenario where the vehicular access is split away from each other with one centralized pedestrian crossing in the center, with the paved, accented, raised table top and the flashing signal similar to the hand-activated pedestrian signals in the Downtown at the Farmer's Market, some traffic calming by pulling the curb out to create a little slow/heads-up location along the street, to give not only the residents but the community at large the ability to cross in a safe manner.

Ms. Moffett- Fehlberg stated that the project is a mix of cottage and farmhouse architecture that speaks to the Downtown with architectural components that could translate from single-story to multi-story buildings to give a feeling of one community: the cottages with very simple roof lines, simple gables, porches, each with a slightly different elevation character that could be mixed and matched to break them up and give them their own personality. She added that with respect to cross ventilation, they have windows not just in the front but also around the side.

On the Kottinger Place side, Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg stated that the building steps down at the edge to a two-story building facing the park with layered gabled components, color blocking, individual balconies for residents, all helping break up that façade and give residents their own personalized outdoor spaces as well.

As regards sustainable design and construction, Ms. Moffett-Fehlberg stated that they are using very long-term, low maintenance, long longevity construction techniques, looking at a hardy siding which is a cementitious siding product that does not degrade over time.

Ms. Goldware stated that another big component of their work with the Task Force was understanding what kind of services they will be providing. She indicated that their standard senior program consists of a pretty comprehensive set of services including everything from social events to connecting seniors with resources in the community, health screens, assessments of daily living, really helping to aid that goal of staying in their apartment and living independently for as long as possible. She added that the next steps would be to secure some additional financing, and if all other things fell into place and they receive their approvals, the first phase of construction would start in 2015.

Chair Olson noted that one of the slides showed a picture of carports with solar panels. He inquired if there be solar panels on the buildings as well.

Ms. Goldware said yes.

Chair Olson inquired if the units would be separately metered.

Ms. Goldware replied that as currently planned, the solar would offset a majority of the common area load of electrical load and would not be powering the units.

Chair Olson inquired if the water would be separately metered.

Ms. Goldware replied that there is a house meter for water. She stated that she does not know if that has been fully designed. She noted that for their senior properties, they generally have a single meter for water partly because the water use is a lot lower than for family properties, where they are generally sub-metered. She added that this is something they could look to the Planning Commission for direction.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired what the age requirement is for seniors.

Ms. Goldware replied that the age requirement would be 62 years and over.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if there any variations from that such as accommodations for disabled.

Ms. Goldware replied that a requirement of their financing is that they be for 62 years and over.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Ms. Goldware to walk through the process of what they will do with the existing tenants during construction.

Chair Olson asked where the residents will go.

Ms. Goldware stated that they will be phasing the construction to minimize the number of residents who would need to temporarily relocate off-site during construction. She indicated that MidPen Housing will work with a qualified relocation consultant to make sure everything is done according to all relocation laws, and all residents will be helped throughout that process. She noted that moving is not easy for anyone and is more challenging for seniors, so they will work with the residents directly many, many months in advance of when they would actually need to move. She indicated that they would find them off-site housing if necessary and pay for all of their moving expenses and rent. She further indicated that they will be able to minimize moving off-site and multiple moves by phasing, starting construction on the vacant 4183 Vineyard Avenue and 4133 Regalia Court sites which would have the most units; subsequently moving the Kottinger Place residents to these new units upon completion; and then constructing the cottages, relocating the Pleasanton Garden residents; then constructing the Pleasanton Garden side.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if current residents of either of these projects would have a space if they wanted to remain.

Ms. Goldware said yes and added that the current rent they are paying would not change.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he sees how the movement is going. He noted that the first development will be the three-story building, and a current resident in a cottage-style home will be moved into that building so the next construction phase can be started. He inquired if the move to the three-story building would be a temporary should the resident want to stay in a one-story cottage style.

Ms. Goldware said yes, and they could also move back to their side of the street if they wanted to, and MidPen Housing would cover that move again. She added, however, that she feels confident that once they move into a brand new unit, they might find that that works for them and decide to stay.

Commissioner Ritter requested clarification that this is independent living and not assisted living.

Ms. Goldware said yes. She stated that they provide certain services on-site, but not meals; however, they might connect residents to a meal program at the Senior Center. She added that some of their properties have representatives from the Second Harvest Food Bank who come in and do a brown bag program in their community rooms.

Commissioner Ritter inquired where the community center is located.

Ms. Goldware pointed to the shared common area space on the site plan, which included the offices for MidPen Housing's onsite property manager and a resident services program; a larger gathering room where they could have a Thanksgiving pot luck or a social event or a meeting, or people could rent out the space or reserve the space; some smaller spaces where they could have smaller group meetings or health screenings.

Jay Maille stated that he participated a little bit in the Task Force meetings and thanked MidPen Housing for the attempt to outreach to all of them in the neighborhood. He indicated that something occurred to him tonight that he should have thought about earlier, that anything that can be done to conserve, better manage water, even in the construction of the buildings or on the property landscaping, is probably going to be a good idea, particularly since drought is probably going to be more common. He added that he knows there are going to be 100 trees planted. He noted that this could be a minor thing, but the kind of tree matters, especially for elderly folks. He proposed that the trees not be the liquid ambers that drop those hard seed balls on the sidewalk or anything that drops fruit like that, as elderly people will be struggling with that.

Wayne Couto stated that he is a neighbor, and he is a Task Force member for about four years now, mostly because the residents in the cottages are his neighbors; he has conversations with them, and they share vegetables over the back fence and the creek. He indicated that, first of all, he wants to make sure that their living situation is safe and comfortable and better than what they currently have now, and, secondly, he also wants his view and his backyard to be as good as it possibly can be. He noted that he knows it is going to change, and he is comfortable with that, but anything they can do now to help that process would be beneficial to everyone involved.

Mr. Couto expressed concern about the parking issue. He stated that he works out of his house and he gets to see the comings and goings of both pedestrians and vehicles on Kottinger Drive all day long, and on a typical day, this road is heavily used by both strollers, joggers, bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic. He noted that on a typical day, parking is not an issue; but when there are meetings or voting there, or when there are community events Downtown, parking becomes constant, and cars are parked all the way up Kottinger Drive. He stated that with a new development, the folks that get to move in here at 62 years would probably have cars, so there will probably be more cars than currently is represented by the statistics offered of 40 cars out of 66 respondents. He urged them to look at this with a close eye to see if there is any way of increasing more parking. He added that pedestrian calming is also critical because there are cars that race up the street at about 50 miles per hour, and if the pedestrian crossing is not somehow designed with different treatments on the pavement or bulb-outs or something to slow and

calm traffic, an accident could eventually occur, and the seniors or children using that path will be the ones who get hurt.

Mr. Couto stated that another big issue for him is the potential for cut-through traffic. He noted that during morning and evening rush hour, traffic backs up on First Street, and Vineyard Avenue/Kottinger Drive is a potential for cut-through traffic. He requested that anything that can be done to potentially restrict that or choke it or somehow make it less attractive for someone to drive through will be beneficial not just for the neighbors but most importantly for residents using this site.

With respect to the parking lot, Mr. Couto stated that the folks who will live in the cottages at the bottom of the site would have a long way to go for parking. He indicated that from his personal perspective, he likes this parking scenario because the cars are all farthest away from his property, but it does not do much for the folks living in those cottages. He noted that what happens now to some extent is when people move in or move out or ambulances come, vehicles traverse the concrete or asphalt pathway that goes around the perimeter of the site and divides Kottinger Park to unload or load or for emergency access. He expressed concern that when these buildings are constructed, those opportunities to use that pathway will become more common, and there will be more desire to use that path or develop something and that will impact the neighbors to the south.

Mr. Couto then stated that during the winter rainy season, Kottinger Creek gets a tremendous amount of water and is dangerous. He recommended that the City or MidPen Housing address that issue with either protection or re-landscaping because a lot of water goes into the culvert which then goes underneath the other portion of the development on the other side of Kottinger Drive.

Mr. Couto stated that in relation to the construction of the cottages on the southern portion (the “peninsula”), if any attempt is used to stage from the park and potentially damage the Redwoods or the Live Coastal Oak in that area, there will be some outcries from both the neighbors and tree lovers in the area.

Finally, Mr. Couto stated that the area to the south of Kottinger Park has become sort of a de facto dog park. He indicated that there are currently only 50 residents on that side, but every afternoon there are at least five residents in the neighborhood who come and use that park to let their dogs run free and play catch. He noted that there have been numerous altercations between folks who walk dogs on leashes and children on bicycles or strollers, and it does not seem to have any impact on either the City, which has a law that dogs have to be on a leash, or on the residents of the development itself. He indicated that going forward, with a whole lot more residents here, potentially frail folks walking out there with walkers, this can become even a bigger issue.

Brad Hirst, Treasurer of Pleasanton Gardens Incorporated, stated that in the ten years that the City has been massaging this project, the need for senior housing has quadrupled, and by combining the projects and having twice as many living units as we now have in the two projects, the City will be able to offer many more services and a higher level of quality of life

for the residents who are there. He pointed out that the mission is to provide housing and make the independent living quality of life as high as possible. He noted that MidPen Housing has done a phenomenal job of planning, of adjusting, of outreach; dealing with individual residents of that number is not an easy chore, and they have accomplished it and have done a terrific job. He pointed out that the City has a great partner in MidPen Housing and their team with Gates & Associates and the Dahlin Group.

Mr. Hirst stated that Pleasanton Gardens is now going to put its money where its mouth is, and contribute to this project free and clear land, Section 8 housing, and over a quarter of a million dollars in cash, a substantial contribution because they see the need with the City's residents. Having said all of that, he stated that he would like to show a little impatience, and to put the ten years that the City has been massaging this project in perspective, none of the Planning Commissioners were on board then; three of the four City staff did not work for the City; Mr. Bocian's son was in junior high school; Commissioner O'Connor had dark hair; and Commissioner Ritter's son was a Cub Scout instead of the Eagle Scout he is now. He stated that 90 percent of the progress has been accomplished in the last 2½ years since MidPen Housing came on, and the City has really gotten on board. He noted that the whole project was stymied for 7½ years, and these are dwelling units with single-pane windows, asbestos, leaking water pipes, leaking roofs, all kinds of things. He thanked Chair Olson for raising the energy issue and noted that this project is going to be an improvement in energy consumption, an improvement in quality of life for residents, and twice as many residents will be served. He noted that there will be some people opposing this, but nothing is perfect; five percent will be against any more housing, and ten percent will be against any affordable housing. He stated that ten years should be enough to get this project right and urged the Commission to move forward with it.

Charles Whites stated that he is a new resident to Pleasanton and that one thing that really drew him and his family to Pleasanton was the Downtown kind of historic feel, the sense of community, and the great view out of their backyard. He indicated that his only concern with this project is the tree removal. He noted that about 85 percent of the trees that are currently on the property will be lost, and 60 of those are heritage trees. He further noted that while they will be replaced by another 100 trees, he will never see those trees grow to fruition probably during his lifetime. He also inquired if the overall height of the three-story building has been addressed.

Brian Ross stated that he has been to several meetings the past two years and has a few general concerns, the first of which is the crosswalk. He noted that there is a bend right there on Kottinger Drive and he is concerned that no matter what is put up there, people are still going to be driving very fast and will not see pedestrians crossing there. He indicated that he has two small girls who love going to the park across the street. He added that a lot of people use Kottinger Drive to go to Valley View Elementary School in the morning, and sometimes those moms are late and they drive really fast. He stated that with twice as many residents who do not have access to cars, there will probably be more pedestrians on that road. He suggested that any kind of education or safety classes be provided to make sure people who use that area and the people that live there stay safe.

Mr. Ross also expressed concern about the two-story buildings that are going across from his property. He noted that they seem to have shifted a little bit farther, and he requested a sight line from his property, which is elevated and from where he can get a really nice view over that property of the foothills, and would like some feedback on his request. He added that the plans also do not state what the elevation is on the shared common areas, and he would like to get some clarification on that as well. He then stated that about two years ago, a Parks and Recreation Commissioner talked about improvements to the Kottinger Park, one which is heavily used but probably receives the least amount of money from the City, and he would like to see or hear if there are any plans for improving this park.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Olson inquired if everyone on the waiting list is a Section 8 holder.

Mr. Bocian said no. He explained that Kottinger Place is not a Section 8 development; it is based on income. He added that the majority of the units at Pleasanton Gardens are Section 8, but not all.

Chair Olson inquired, if two people, aged 65 years and 85 years, are on the waiting list, if the 85-year applicant would take precedent.

Mr. Bocian replied that it would not for Kottinger Place. He stated that Kottinger Place has preference criteria which include individuals who are veterans. He explained that for both developments, everyone has to meet the income requirements first; but as it relates to Kottinger Place, the first on the list is veterans. He indicated that it was modified about ten years ago, and HUD requires that residents who live there be involved, and HUD wanted to have a preference for veterans. He continued that there is then the residency requirement, those who either live or work in Pleasanton. He stated that for the new development, the preference criteria would be part of what the City will work with MidPen Housing on, and the City will be freer to address it in a way that meets the City's needs and interests.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Bocian if he knew the height of the common buildings.

Mr. Luchini replied that the tallest building is 36 feet high.

Ms. Goldware pointed to the different buildings in the common area and identified which were single-story, two-story, and three-story. She noted that the three-story building would be 36 feet high.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Ms. Goldware to confirm that part of that common area in the Kottinger side is three stories, that those are units above the common area.

Ms. Goldware replied that there are units that are two stories, and the actual community room is single-story with a raised ceiling, a nice big gathering space.

Commissioner Ritter asked what the average age of the residents right now is.

Mr. Bocian replied that it would probably be early 80's for Kottinger Place.

Commissioner Ritter asked in there are many 65-year-olds there.

Mr. Bocian replied that there are some. He added that over at the Ridgeview Commons project which the City owns, there is a little bit of movement towards a younger population than it has had in the past, but generally it is an older population.

Commissioner Allen asked Mr. Bocian to comment on a statement made by one of the neighbors with respect to parking that possibly the wait-list people who would come on board would be younger and therefore, there might be additional parking requirements.

Mr. Bocian replied that first of all, there was a lot of discussion by the Task Force about the parking, and the City has been very concerned about that, so staff looked at what it currently operates and is involved with. He stated that the parking ratio at Kottinger Place right now seems pretty good. He noted that while there were problems a few years ago, the parking issue was resolved with the addition of a few spaces. He added that at the Ridgeview Commons project, the parking ratio is good and there are no parking issues, even though the population tends to be younger and there are guests there quite a bit.

Commissioner O'Connor inquired if the ratio is also .eight space per unit.

Mr. Bocian replied that Ridgeview Commons has a little more than that, and Kottinger is at .8 now.

Ms. Goldware confirmed that Kottinger Place is at .8 and Ridgeview Commons is actually a little more than 1, with 133 of the 218 spaces assigned, which means that basically, 133 residents there have a car and then at any given time, including peak times, about 25 percent is not used; it is just extra parking. She noted that there are some other properties in the City that are maybe a little under-parked, and so they are trying to get into where that happy medium is. She further noted that they found that at their new construction of senior developments where they are implementing a .8 ratio, it has been very successful. She added that it is not a guarantee that everyone who moves in is 62 years old and will stay for 30 years; it really will depend on the wait list preference we set with the City. She indicated that they expect to receive 3,000 applications for these units; that she is already getting calls as to when this is going to be complete. She stated that they will have to do a lottery process for those units once everyone applies, and everyone remains on the wait list.

The Commission then considered the Discussion Points.

A. Is the proposed General Plan land use change, density, and PUD rezoning acceptable?

All the Commissioners said yes.

B. Is the proposed positioning of the buildings, on-site circulation, parking location, parking ratio, private open space, common open space, and on-site amenities acceptable?

Commissioner Posson said yes.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he has two concerns: (1) People living on the "peninsula" have a long way to walk, and as the average age maybe comes down, there will probably be more parking needed. (2) As people get older, they will probably have a lot of visits from paramedics, and they should make it easy for ambulances to come in and out with the driveway access. He added another comment regarding the buildings, stating that he remembers that his father used to like to leave the apartment and go down the elevator to the lobby area and have a space to go and read the newspaper. He stated that it would be nice if the residents had that in the buildings. He then apologized, noting that his comment should fall under Discussion Point C.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that his only concern was the distance to those "peninsula" units on the Kottinger side and that he does not know if there is a solution to that or if there is a service that can be provided, such as golf carts. He indicated that he was not that concerned about the .8 parking spaces per unit until the discussion on how many parking spaces there were in other sites. He stated that that is going to be important and would like to make sure that the developers take a good look at that because if it will be an issue if there is not enough parking, particularly since street parking is not available there.

Chair Olson stated that the comment about possible pass-through traffic was a good comment. He noted that the area is either for residents leaving the facility or residents coming back to the facility and should not be for pass-through. He indicated that the MidPen Housing should do something to try to prevent that. He stated that he is fine with the rest.

Commissioner Allen stated that the comment on the pass-through traffic is a very good point, and it should be looked into. She added that it would be really nice if there is anything to be done about making the parking more available to the folks on the "peninsula." She stated that she is aware that MidPen Housing has looked at this, and there may be nothing that can be done, but it would be great if there is anything creative that can be done.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she can only echo what everyone has said. She agreed with Chair Olson on the cut- through, and she agreed with the concerns about the location of the parking. She indicated that she is not concerned with the parking ratio because she believes that the research has been done and thoroughly vetted, and everyone has an interest in making sure there is adequate parking.

C. Are the building designs, massing, heights, and colors and materials acceptable and compatible with the surrounding area?

Commissioner Pearce stated that she thinks this has really been thoughtfully done and is compatible. She noted that she likes the colors and the architecture.

Commissioner Allen concurred that it was thoughtfully done and that she likes it as well.

Commissioner Olson agreed.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he knows there are concerns about three stories, but the City is trying to provide the units that are needed, and this is the only way to do it with a beautiful garden-style look. He noted that that was the biggest concern with the Pleasanton Gardens area, keeping that "cottage" look. He stated that it was been done with a lot of thought and that he think it is beautiful.

Commissioner Ritter concurred and added that the lobby area for social gatherings is a thought.

Commissioner Posson stated that it is very nicely done.

D. Is the proposed tree removal/replacement plan acceptable?

Commissioner Posson stated he thinks it is fine. He indicated that the development needs to be accommodated, and he does not see any other alternatives at this point.

Commissioner Ritter agreed and added that the type of trees should be thoroughly thought out so residents do not stumble.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that mention was made about the possibility of saving a couple more heritage trees if something were done with the roundabout. He noted that if someone made the wrong entrance and did not want to be at this particular place, the roundabout can certainly help in getting turned around. He added that he does not know if there is also a use for parking along that roundabout, particularly as it leads to the common area building and to MidPen Housing's offices. He suggested that the developer take another look if there is any way to save additional heritage trees.

Chair Olson stated that he is fine with the tree plan.

Commissioner Allen stated that she is also fine with the plan but would like the developer to take a look at whether there is a way to save a couple more heritage trees.

Commissioner Pearce agreed, stating that she always hate taking out trees, but she thinks it is necessary. She noted, however, that the staff report did indicate that trees 165 and 164, which are Coast Live Oaks, could be preserved, and she supports that.

She added that the comment about the type of trees was a good point and one she had not thought about. She asked the developer to make sure the trees are senior-friendly.

E. Are the proposed Green Building measures and Climate Action Plan (CAP) measures acceptable?

Commissioner Pearce stated that she thinks they are great, that 128 points is outstanding. She indicated that she liked staff's recommendations, especially the discounted transit passes, considering that the Commission just had this conversation regarding transit passes. She added that she would like to see gradations of discount if possible, depending upon what kind of affordability each of the units has.

Commissioner Allen stated that she also liked staff's recommendations on the CAP programs. She indicated that the only other concern she is on water conservation, which is becoming a more and more important issue, and so she would like to get really creative there. She stated that she personally believes that having some kind of individual metering makes a lot of sense. She noted that in other places where there has been personal metering, people have taken more care about water conservation. She commented that there may be other trends going on that can help to get even more creative with water conservation.

Chair Olson stated that he is delighted to see the amount of solar on this project. He indicated that he agreed with all of staff's recommendations except the last one on water collection. He added that would be great in the Mid-West or in Hawaii, but in this climate, in this area of the country, it does not make a lot of sense. He noted that he actually did some checking on this with private engineers, and the problem is that the underground tank is filled up and people start using it; but by May it is gone and empty because there is not enough rain even in a good year. He stated that it adds a lot to the cost of the project, and he would rather see that cost go into solar and separate water metering as opposed to collection.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that he was fine with it and also impressed with 128 points. He inquired about the possibility of bringing in recycled water for landscaping, adding that he knows the City was installing, or had planned to install, something like this.

Ms. Stern stated that she did not know when that is going to happen. She added that a standard condition can be added that recycled water be used for landscaping when it becomes available.

Commissioner Ritter stated that he loves the green measures they are doing. He indicated that he is in the electrical industry, and Title 24 is coming. He added that this is all about metering, and so from a power and water standpoint, this is going to be huge. He noted that he thinks they have done a good job.

Commissioner Posson stated that he also likes what they have done but believes that they should incorporate staff's recommended measures for the CAP. He indicated that with respect to the issue of reclaimed water and rain water, they need to look at its economic feasibility and incorporate it where they can.

F. What other information would the Planning Commission wish to see to assist its decision on the proposals (i.e., color and material board, photosimulations, etc.)?

Commissioner Pearce stated that she normally asks for all kinds of things, but there is not a lot she needs to see here. She noted that a material board is always nice, and assuming they will provide one for Council, she would like them to provide one for the Commission as well. She added that otherwise, she thought the packet was great and the materials thus far are super.

Commissioner Allen concurred all the way and that a material board would be all she needed.

Chair Olson stated that he is fine and wants to just also indicate that he agrees with the speaker who talked about speeding on Kottinger Drive. He indicated that his wife and he walk that road quite a bit, and it is a speedway. He stated that he was concerned when he saw the package and saw that there was going to be a crosswalk right there. He stated that he does not know what we can do about it, that it would probably be too expensive to put an underground passage-way there. He added that he believes doing something about speeding on that road is the City's problem rather than MidPen Housing's. He further added that he shares the concern that this has been in the making for ten years and encouraged the City to get this done.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that there were a few things that were mentioned in Discussion Points A through E which the developer can take a quick look. He agreed that ten years is long enough and this needs to move on. He indicated that they have looked at all of these items, there are still a few that were brought up tonight; but they have done the best job they can, and it is time to move on.

Commissioner Ritter stated that the only thing he would like to see next time it comes to the Commission is a target completion date.

Commissioner Posson stated that he also thought it was a good package and agreed with Chair Olson about looking at other alternatives in crossing Kottinger Drive because the elderly population that will be crossing there will be increasing. He stated that he also agrees that it is a City issue and not just the developer's.

Chair Olson asked staff if they have any other questions.

Ms. Stern replied that staff has everything they need.

No action was taken.

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

East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force Meeting

Commissioner Pearce stated that the East Pleasanton Specific Plan Task Force met last week and received an update on the City Council's direction. She noted that the Task Force also received the Preliminary Draft Specific Plan and added that the Task Force contemplated adding another EIR alternative which included no multi-family housing, but ended up not doing that. She indicated that the Task Force will have one more meeting in April; they ought to get the economic analysis and the draft EIR, and then disperse for a little while to have community and neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Dolan stated that staff has had several internal meetings since the Task Force meeting and have had a few more days to digest the feedback that they got from the City Council. He noted that while he does not know that staff has figured out exactly how this will be done or at which particular meeting, they are definitely going to ask the Task Force to help staff explore some options that are not as RHNA-driven, although the reality is that the current ones are not that RHNA-driven because even though staff kept asking the Task Force to consider some higher-density options, ultimately the majority of the alternatives include single-family versus multi-family, and the same ratios in the rest of the City are very close. He noted, however, that there is no pressure in the shorter term to have the high density, so staff will be looking at options and figuring out or asking the Task Force to help staff fold them in. He added that staff does not have it all worked out yet, but the Task Force members will probably be getting more work than they thought when the members left the meeting the other night.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Dolan if anyone is thinking around the terms of planning the area, that if it is not constructed before the City receives its additional RHNA numbers that it needs to provide, that if the construction did not take place until after or close to 2022 and the City then found out that it did have a need for more high density, if those units could be added then; or is the City thinking of actually constructing something sooner than that and eliminating that possibility.

Mr. Dolan replied that he thinks it is a possibility, but the City is just not there yet because the economic analysis has not yet been done. He stated that it could be changed at the end if it was decided that the units are needed and people have thrown out the concept of holding something in reserve. He noted, however, that enough CEQA should be done to anticipate something worse, and this has to be kept in mind or there can be trouble later. He indicated that he does not think the City Council has dismissed the idea of holding something in reserve. He added that when the Councilmembers voted to move forward, they made it pretty clear that they did not need to talk about a particular phasing or reserve plan because they just felt that is part of moving forward. He stated that that still can happen, but the City is just not there yet to make those decisions.

Commissioner Pearce stated that there will be another meeting in April and that it is really going to be great.

Mr. Dolan added that staff also has their work cut out for picking the right day. He noted that it is not completely out of the question for a number of reasons that April does not happen.

Commissioner Allen asked if there might be a potential additional option that might be considered that backs the City into a number that assumes the City is never given an additional RHNA allocation and has a Growth Management plan.

Commissioner Pearce commented that she thinks the Commission needs to be cognizant about not talking about the substance, given that this is not agendized.

Commissioner Allen stated that she is totally fine and that she can talk to Brian later.

e. Matters for Commission's Action

(1) Request to name the private street "Rogers Lane" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a ten-lot single-family development (PUD-71) located at 3835 Vineyard Avenue.

Chair Olson recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the private street name of "Rogers Lane" for Vesting Tentative Tract Map 7981.
Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The private street name of "Rogers Lane" was approved for Vesting Tentative Tract Map 7981.

Chair Olson returned to the dais.

(2) Request to name the private street "Emmett Place" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUD-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street.

Commissioner Pearce moved to approve the private street name of "Emmett Place" for the previously approved Planned Unit Development plan for a six-lot single-family development (PUD-72) located at 4693 and 4715 Augustine Street. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

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

The private street name of "Emmett Place" was approved for PUD-72.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Olson adjourned the Planning Commission 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN
Secretary