

MINUTES  
OF THE  
JOINT WORKSHOP  
OF THE  
CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

October 11, 2005

1. CALL TO ORDER

The joint workshop was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Vice Mayor Steve Brozosky.

Those in attendance were: City Councilmembers Steve Brozosky, Cindy McGovern, Matthew Sullivan, and Jerry Thorne; Planning Commissioners Brian Arkin, Philip Blank, Ann Fox, Trish Maas, Mary Roberts, and Jennifer Pearce. Staff members present were: Nelson Fialho, City Manager; Michael Roush, City Attorney; Jerry Iserson, Director of Planning and Community Services; Janice Stern, Principal Planner; William Cody, Fire Chief; Eric Carlson, Fire Marshall; and Pamela Ott, Economic Development Manager.

Mayor Jennifer Hosterman was absent.

2. STAPLES RANCH

Presentation of the potential future development of Staples Ranch, an approximately 120-acre site located south of the I-580 Freeway, west of the El Charro Road interchange (SR 05:283)

Jerry Iserson presented the staff report regarding the proposed project elements.

Janice Stern presented the portion of the staff report regarding housing units in relation to the housing cap and General Plan build out.

Stuart Cook, Project Planner, Alameda County Community Development Agency, Surplus Property Authority, 224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 110, Hayward, presented the proposal for the Staples Ranch property.

Ronald Tye, Regional Financial Officer, Hendrick Automotive Group, 4345 Rosewood Drive, Pleasanton, presented the proposal for an automotive center on the Staples Ranch site.

Richard Ashenbrenner, Chief Executive Officer, Continuing Life Communities, 1940 Levante Street, Carlsbad, California, presented the proposal for a continuing care retirement community on the Staples Ranch location.

Mr. Iserson presented a summation and requested direction and feedback.

Mr. Brozosky thanked staff for the binders presented and encouraged the Planning Commissioners to present comments or questions.

Brian Arkin indicated he had a variety of questions. He asked if the 1% sales tax received from auto dealers would have to be shared with Alameda County when the dealers move to Staples Ranch?

Mr. Fialho indicated the sales tax agreement would remain the same since the property would be annexed to the City of Pleasanton.

Mr. Arkin asked if there were any current agreements obligating the city to allow specific development of this land?

Mr. Fialho said there was no obligation to develop this property.

Mr. Arkin expressed concerns about noise emanating from the auto dealer next to residential areas for seniors.

Mr. Cook responded that Hendrick Automotive Group is technologically ahead of the other dealers in that they use Blackberries and no public address system or music on loudspeakers. The carwash, service bay and lighting issues have all been considered and the design will address those potential issues.

Mr. Arkin inquired about adding affordability to the development and whether that would raise the rates of regular units?

Mr. Aschenbrenner said this has been raised in other cities and most cities do not apply affordable ordinances to the development because it is a commercial project and also because it is difficult to measure the affordability of the housing. If one figured the cost of all the components, the housing is inexpensive, but the service costs cannot be separated from the housing. In one case, fees were paid as if for a commercial project and at a very low rate. He acknowledged that if the project must carry additional costs, the entire program would be more expensive for others. This program operates like a self-insured pool. There is a range of sizes of residences and internally there is already a tremendous subsidy going on for the people at the low end of the price range. Many of those people already qualify as low income.

Mr. Arkin inquired if there was a concern about the project being close to the airport? He suggested discussions be held with the airport authority.

Mr. Aschenbrenner said that has been studied at great length and other facilities in a comparable location near an airport have been reviewed. He said they were not concerned about it.

Ann Fox asked if the residents in the Meadows Park area were notified of this meeting?

Mr. Iserson said people within 1,000 feet of the site were notified.

Ms. Fox referred to the Airport Protection Area. The current environment impact report for the airport expansion refers to increasing the area by one mile in an unspecified direction. She wondered if that is still going to happen. She then referred to the plan, which shows that the proposed buildings closer to the airport will be taller (three to four stories). She asked if staff was concerned about this?

Mr. Iserson said there was no concern. The entire site is outside the Airport Protection Area. He believed there is no discussion of increasing that at this time. The developer was trying to be sensitive to the homes in the west by putting the higher buildings away from existing residences.

Mr. Cook indicated the airport has a height referral area, which is basically for every one hundred feet from the end of the runway; a building can go up one foot. The edge of the APA (Airport Protection Area) is 7,100 feet from the end of the nearest runway. These buildings would be well below that.

Ms. Fox asked if this was a congregate care facility licensed by the Community Care Licensing Division? She asked how many units would have kitchens?

Mr. Aschenbrenner said it was licensed under that division as well as others. He said 690 units (or all) would have kitchens.

Ms. Fox referred to the proposed park, which was shown as nearly thirty acres in the General Plan, but is only seventeen acres in this proposed plan. She asked if the Carlsbad facility had properties nearby that provided public amenities, such as libraries, or whether the residential experience was confined to the property? She felt the park should be expanded to 22 acres.

Mr. Aschenbrenner believed the concern was whether the residents needed or would use other public facilities. He said the residents mostly use facilities inside the property. There are organized activities to go out to plays, etc. The residents don't use libraries or parks very much. Most of the residents provide a lot of volunteer services to the community.

Philip Blank referred to the housing cap and wanted clarification on whether it was existing plus approved (25,459 and 559) or built, under construction and approved?

Ms. Stern explained the cap figure in the report represented the housing cap minus built, under construction and approved.

Mr. Blank said he was concerned about noise from the airport and asked if there were noise attenuation elements in the construction.

Mr. Cook understood there were requirements in that regard and they would comply with whatever requirements existed. The units are solidly built to a higher standard than regular residential units.

Mr. Blank asked about the skilled nursing care element.

Mr. Cook said there is 24-hour skilled nursing care available and they can perform whatever functions necessary.

Mary Roberts asked about the previous proposal for a baseball diamond and why it is not in this plan?

Mr. Iserson said the Little League has lost interest in this site and Mr. Cook indicated the group has gone to the Las Positas site in Livermore.

Ms. Roberts referred to the 568 senior rental units and asked how many of those were affordable?

Ms. Stern said all of the first five (Kottinger Place, Ridgeview Commons, Division Street, Stanley Junction and Pleasanton Gardens) are affordable on some level; either moderate, low or very low. The Gardens at Ironwood have 138 affordable units.

Jennifer Pearce asked about the substantial entrance fee for the proposed development.

Mr. Cook said people pay two ways, an entrance fee and a monthly fee. The entrance fees range from \$200,000 to \$800,000. Most people will sell a house and use a portion of the proceeds for the entrance fee. There are many things being provided. Most people who come to this development either cannot get long term care insurance or it is very expensive.

Ms. Pearce asked about the length of the emergency vehicle access road. She thought it was about 900 feet.

Mr. Cook said it was actually about 800 feet. That has not yet been designed and is dependent upon the requirements of the emergency vehicles and the surrounding development of the auto mall.

Trish Maas asked how closely the senior facility and car dealership is tied in the application?

Mr. Iserson said these are tied very closely.

Mr. Cook explained that the property is unincorporated and there must be an application to LAFCO (Local Agency Formation Commission). LAFCO's rules indicated a property must be rezoned before annexation and the zoning must stay in place for two years. The developers want to go into the city knowing what is going to happen and from a physical standpoint it is very difficult to plan unless it is known what will happen to the majority of the property.

Ms. Maas asked who will decide whether these are considered housing units or not?

Mr. Iserson said it is the City Council's decision with input from the Planning Commission.

Ms. Maas said if these units are not considered housing units then they do not apply to the goals that are to be met under the Housing Element.

Mr. Iserson said staff would work with the developer and the County to try to get some affordability into the project. It would not have to follow the inclusionary zoning ordinance, but the Housing Element has identified 79 affordable housing units on this site. It is the city's position to use any opportunity possible to find affordable units for seniors.

Ms. Maas said if these were considered as housing units then it would apply to the housing cap and would be in competition with other units in the city.

Mr. Iserson said that was correct.

Jerry Thorne felt this project seemed isolated and wondered if thought had been given to how to evacuate this many seniors in the event of an emergency. He wanted to see a specific plan prepared.

Mr. Cook said if there were some kind of disaster, he felt the problem would not be getting people out, but rather keeping others from coming in because this facility is so well built and well

stocked with supplies and support personnel. He believed if evacuation were necessary, there are at least three ways out of the area.

Mr. Thorne asked if the site for the bridge across the arroyo had been set?

Mr. Cook said as of three years ago the bridge site was set and would be an expensive bridge. He also noted Staples Ranch Drive dead ends into the property and would be another EVA.

Mr. Thorne asked how specific the planning for this proposal had to be before moving forward?

Mr. Iserson said the Memorandum of Understanding is expected to come back in November, which would set forth the process and timeline. Then the plan would move into the EIR phase. A development plan would come before the Planning Commission and City Council with specific details, a Development Agreement and the annexation process would commence. Within a year there would be a definite plan for review with flexibility for parks and other amenities.

Mr. Thorne understood that Livermore is planning a shopping center across the street from the auto mall.

Mr. Cook said it is not official, but a large retail outlet project is being considered for fifty acres in the area.

Mr. Thorne had heard it would include attractive retail outlets, such as Nordstrom's, etc. It sounds like something that will generate a lot of traffic.

Matt Sullivan referred to the housing numbers and believed the 871 units is to get to build out of the 1996 General Plan at midpoint densities for residential zoning. He believed 1,683 units are what is left under the cap if that happens. If the slate is wiped clean, then that figure is the 2,554 units available. He asked if the senior facility would be subject to the inclusionary housing ordinance?

Mr. Iserson said if the decision is made not to consider them as housing units, then they would not be subject to the inclusionary zoning ordinance.

Mr. Sullivan believed the other assisted living facility was subject to the inclusionary ordinance.

Mr. Iserson said that was the decision at the time. Through the development agreement, planned unit development plan, or other options there are many opportunities to get affordability included.

Mr. Sullivan believed staff could work with the applicant to get some affordability options. He referred to the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) and wondered what level of commitment is the city locked into? Does the Council still have full discretionary approval of any project?

Mr. Fialho said that was correct. The MOU is basically a road map for the County. Because there are two outside parties and the land use process is fairly involved, staff believed the MOU would spell out a timeline and road map on how to get to the end product. The discretionary approval is in the PUD process and that is subject to Planning Commission and City Council review and approval.

Mr. Sullivan reiterated that EIR findings, numbers of units, affordability, size of the park, etc. are not locked in by the MOU but could be worked on through the PUD process.

Mr. Fialho said that was true except for the issue of the park. Staff recommends that it stays at 17 acres because it meets the needs of the development and adjacent neighborhoods.

Cindy McGovern asked when the community care facility would actually be opened?

Mr. Aschenbrenner said that was a hard question to answer. It needs Council approval and to meet state requirements, which include pre-selling 50% of what is to be built. It is done in phases, but takes time. If it were approved today and pre-selling commenced today, it would be at least a year before construction would start and would take 18 months to build the first phase. He estimated at least two and a half years, maybe more.

Ms. McGovern asked how staff envisioned the park being financed? Would it be by agreement with developers?

Mr. Iserson said the parkland would be donated from the County and staff is exploring different ways to fund improvements.

Ms. McGovern wanted to know if the park would be built before the senior residence is complete?

Mr. Iserson said that was the goal.

Ms. McGovern expressed concern about how the senior residents would have access to the park and wanted to make certain the design of the project included that. She noted the desire at the meeting is to get approval of the concept for land use on Staples Ranch and approval of an MOU for that land use. The plan would still go through all regular review processes.

Mr. Iserson said staff is not asking for approval of the MOU at this meeting. It would come back at another time when there is an opportunity to understand the components and discuss them. The actual development plans for the auto mall and senior facility will come through the normal review process.

Ms. McGovern asked if that was the time when a decision would be made on whether these units count as housing units or not?

Mr. Iserson hoped that would come earlier than that. He suggested that could be discussed at the General Plan workshop in November.

Ms. McGovern also had concerns about the design of the EVA before she approved any type of development. She liked the idea of having more than one emergency vehicle access point. She asked if the bridge shown at the bottom of the community park towards El Charro was built at this time and whether it connected to the trail to Livermore?

Mr. Iserson said yes, it has been constructed, but it does not connect to the trail. The trail would come from Stoneridge Drive on another bridge.

Mr. Cook explained that as part of the arroyo realignment, it was necessary to construct two new private bridges. One connects to the Hansen property at El Charro Road and was designed to public standards with the intention to become a public road if and when El Charro is extended to

Stanley. There is room to build a second bridge adjacent to it to make a four-lane road. The bridge to the right of that is what they call the Vulcan Bridge, which will always be a private road. In between those two bridges is where the Arroyo Mocho comes out from the south. There is a Zone 7 maintenance road along the northerly side of the arroyo which dips down under those two bridges and is designed to be a regional trail so people don't have to walk across the heavily traveled quarry property. That is also in Livermore's plans and has been reviewed by regional trail groups.

Ms. McGovern asked that the proposed trail be designated on any future plan drawings.

Mr. Brozosky asked if the senior care facility would be constructed in phases? He did not think the first occupants would necessarily need the skilled nursing facilities right away.

Mr. Aschenbrenner said people who move into units with kitchens wanted to know that the skilled nursing is available as soon as possible. The plan is to have them not later than six months after the kitchen units are occupied. That will be built in the first phase, however it is sized to meet the actuarially determined needs of the entire population. Until that need is realized, those assisted living and skilled nursing facilities would be available to the public. He believed it would take four phases to build out the kitchen units.

Mr. Brozosky asked how ABAG counted these units. Were they counted as housing units toward the regional needs goals?

Mr. Iserson said there are state criteria and definitions and as long as they are met the assisted living units can be applied toward Pleasanton's fair share housing needs; even though the city may not count them as part of its housing towards the housing cap.

Mr. Brozosky clarified that it would be possible to have a 29,000 housing unit cap, but the state would see more units than 29,000 the way they count all the units.

Mr. Iserson said that was correct.

Mr. Brozosky then referred to the number of units left to reach the housing cap. 871 units are left in the General Plan and if they are not built to the mid point of density, then some properties would have to be down zoned and units moved to another location.

Ms. Stern said that was correct because under new state laws if density is reduced, the units must be moved to another location rather than eliminated entirely.

Mr. Sullivan referred to the EVA and wanted to make certain the location could be moved.

Mr. Iserson said that was correct. When the actual proposal is presented with roads and driveways, a review would be done by the fire department to make certain the equipment can negotiate the various EVA.

Mr. Sullivan referred to the idea of taking this property out of the General Plan update process and moving it along on a parallel track. He noted the decision on whether Stoneridge Drive is extended is still in the General Plan update process and is separate from the approvals on these properties.

Mr. Iserson firmly agreed. The Circulation Element will be finalized after conclusion of the land use review and this project is not dependent on it at all. Discussions on Stoneridge will continue as the General Plan update is completed.

Mr. Arkin asked if Council could decide to approve this project in such a way that it does not allow the Stoneridge extension. That was done with the Madden hotel. The General Plan was amended at the same time as the hotel approval.

Mr. Iserson said the Specific Plan was amended. He believed the intent is to proceed independently with the General Plan update and not have project specific updates.

Mr. Roush explained that the environmental impact report that would be necessary for the project would have to include that analysis that is otherwise being done with the General Plan update in order to do that. Technically, it could happen, but it would encompass a great deal more environmental work than is currently being contemplated for this project.

Mr. Iserson said the staff recommendation is to move forward with the plan, deferring the issue of the Stoneridge extension through the General Plan update process.

Mr. Brozosky referred to the comment about the Livermore shopping center and noted he had a meeting with the Mayor of Livermore. That project is fairly far along. The developers have owned the property for two years and he expected newspaper announcements soon. He also noted the access road would also provided access to the church and would allow that project to move along.

Mr. Arkin had concerns about there being no visual separation between Livermore and Pleasanton when seen from Highway 580.

Vice Mayor Brozosky invited public comments.

### 3. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

David Bouchard, 777 Peters Avenue, representing the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce, supported the development of the auto mall project on the Staples Ranch property. This will provide many jobs and substantial sales tax dollars to the city. He also believed the dealership advertising would promote the community in a positive way.

Vanessa Kawaihau, 871 Sycamore Road, questioned the number of houses designated for the flat area of the Spotorno property. He has 16 homes and is entitled to an extra six homes if he provides an open space dedication. There are also five at the top of the Minnie Road area. He does not have 27 units. She referred to the EVA for the Staples property and believed the people on that side of town would like to have something in writing. In the south Pleasanton area, an EVA in Happy Valley is now being used for golf course traffic and one in the Independence area is being used for traffic and will not be closed until the Lund Ranch property is developed. She related the experience of her relatives who moved into a similar senior facility in the Napa area. As one parent's health diminished, they were moved to the skilled nursing facility, while the other remained in the residence area. It was nice to be able to visit both parents in one facility.

Doug Reynolds, Vulcan Materials Company, 501 El Charro Road, indicated there have been discussions regarding the auto mall and commercial development on the Pleasanton side as well as the outlet mall on the Livermore side. Also discussed was the proposal to extend El Charro to connect

with Stanley Boulevard. Each of these has a traffic impact on El Charro Road and he wanted Council to take this into consideration during the EIR and traffic study process. Since Livermore is doing the same thing, he suggested that this be done as one process rather than two, since we all have to talk about all these projects.

Stephanie Yue, 3091 Staples Ranch Drive, supported the senior housing development and auto mall. She was concerned about using Staples Ranch Drive as an EVA. She felt it was not wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic. She would not want it used as an evacuation route and she did not want to hear the sound of a fire engine driving by her house. She was opposed to the airport expansion and was concerned that the developers of the senior project had not discussed what Livermore may have planned for the area.

John Carroll, 2981 Moreno Avenue, indicated his major concern was the position of the EVA and not making it into a thoroughfare. He wanted the commercial property to be on El Charro and have the park about the residential portion of the assisted living facility. He liked the fact that there is a green belt between Pleasanton and Livermore and wanted to preserve that with some kind of linear park between the commercial area and the residential units. He suggested biking trails through that area as well.

Greg Visscher, 2508 Wilde Avenue, also had concerns about the EVA. He felt this could be a phased approach to extend Stoneridge Drive all the way to El Charro. He encouraged Council not to approve this plan without changes that would preclude any expansion of Stoneridge Drive. He did not know whether it would be a General Plan change or putting buildings on each side of the EVA to prevent connection to Stoneridge, but he wanted some method to keep that as an EVA and not an expansion of Stoneridge Drive.

Amy Moellering, 3019 Staples Ranch Drive, expressed concern about using Staples Ranch Road as a second evacuation route. It is very narrow and not suitable for fire engines or two-way traffic. She said there is a lot of freeway and airport noise in that area. She did not oppose the residential plan, but did not feel an auto mall was a good neighbor for residences and it was awfully large compared to the rest of the plan. She supported an extended park adjacent to the residential development and felt it made more sense than a commercial development.

Yalin Lai, 3007 Staples Ranch Drive, supported the comments of previous speakers. Staples Ranch is a quiet street and children play in the area. She was also concerned about the privacy of the residents with the new units close to existing residents.

Kurt Kummer, 4456 Clovewood Lane, indicated this was a wonderful site for an auto mall and the senior facility looks terrific. He liked having a break between Livermore and Pleasanton and it looks like that is going away. He agreed with the previous suggestion to shift the location of the park in order to keep a separation between the two cities. Regarding trails, he said the Arroyo Mocho trail goes along the south side of the Arroyo across Pleasanton to the north/south Alamo Canal trail alongside I-680. A person could walk from this site and never get on a city street or sidewalk. He was baffled as to why this proposal puts the trail on the north side to Livermore where it would have to cross the arroyo again to connect to the Livermore trail. He then referred to the plan for the senior facility and how it is designed to reduce freeway noise, but no mention of airport noise. He felt it was a bad idea to put a residential facility in the flight path from the airport.

Chris Lawton, 3350 Vermont Place, expressed concern about the separation between the senior facility and existing houses. Will it be a fence, sound wall or other type of barrier?

Judith Geiselman, 2602 Glen Isle Avenue, said she has enjoyed all the discussion and presentations on this matter. She has supported the residential senior development since she first heard of the proposal. However, she was concerned about freeway noise and wanted to make certain there was a buffer for freeway noise as well as airport noise. She would like the developer to talk to officials at the Livermore airport. She loved the idea of putting the park in the middle of the residential and commercial properties. It would be a wonderful way to symbolize where Pleasanton is ending, even though the auto mall is on the Livermore side, but it also would truly be a definite barrier between commercial and residential and a good way to end Stoneridge Drive. It appears from the proposed plan that it is a short step to make Stoneridge Drive a thoroughfare unless it is changed. A park would help do that. She did not want Stoneridge Drive extended. She reminded people that the last traffic model showed that by extending Stoneridge Drive it would alleviate in a minor way traffic issues in some places, but would escalate traffic issues in other areas, so it did not make much difference if Stoneridge Drive were extended.

There were no other speakers.

Vice Mayor Brozosky asked staff to answer the questions on the EVA and proximity of the houses to existing residences.

Mr. Iserson said this is a conceptual plan and Staples Ranch Road is only a suggested option for an EVA.

#### 4. NEXT STEPS AND MATTERS INITIATED BY COUNCIL OR COMMISSION

Trish Maas wanted to make certain people do not lose sight of the whole picture of Pleasanton. This development has an effect on the city. She agreed the tax revenue from the Hendrick automotive development was an important consideration and did not want to lose that development. If this is a package, then so be it. When it comes to the Planning Commission it will make whatever changes necessary to make it right for the city.

Brian Arkin was concerned about the speed at which the developers want to process this project. This is a major project for the city and should be reviewed carefully. He was also concerned about the amount of staff time it would take. He suggested an additional fee be paid by the developer to hire staff to process the application, so time is not taken away from completing the General Plan. It seems the General Plan update is taking longer and longer. He felt if these units were not included in the housing cap, the issue should be taken to the voters. This looks like an apartment complex and he did not feel it was different than other senior apartments, except for the option of having meals provided and that exists at other places in the city like Ridgeview Commons. He wanted to go to the voters and ask for an extension of the housing cap. He wanted the project configured in such a way that it would not allow Stoneridge Drive to be extended. If not, the whole east side of Pleasanton will fight the project. If that means a little more money is spent to do the EIR in such a way that the Stoneridge extension is removed from the General Plan, so be it. He was concerned that when driving along I-580, one would see contiguous structures between Livermore and Pleasanton. That looks more and more like Hayward, Milpitas, etc. He felt that separation made the Tri-Valley special. This proposal appears to be urban sprawl.

Mary Roberts indicated the map was the same or similar to one presented in 2004 and the EVA was the same as proposed then. She felt it should be rearranged and she urged the residents not to panic because it would be changed. She liked John Carroll's suggestion of rotating the park. That

would solve many problems and would allow businesses with access along El Charro. She would like a nice entrance to Pleasanton at the exit from I-580 to El Charro. There have been many problems with Santa Rita Road and how it looks. She agreed with the Hendrick Group moving to that site and did not want to lose them. She said this is not a company that puts up big gorilla balloons. The auto mall on the Pleasanton side of the freeway has always look distinguished as compared to that across the freeway. The continuing care facility is a different animal and she did not feel people were looking at in that way. She knows people in Pleasanton who are putting the same kind of payment down on facilities out of state. People who own houses in the Pleasanton area have no place to go. They go to the mountains or move elsewhere. She did not see how affordability could be integrated into this development because it is not that kind of project. It would be nice to keep seniors in the city. This is independent living that can move to assisted then skilled care. This is a wonderful thing to have close by. She was uncertain how to deal with the housing cap.

Philip Blank liked the idea of rotating the park. There may be other options to the Stoneridge Drive question, such as "de-aligning" the road from Jack London or putting structures in the way without having to go through an EIR. He was concerned about the proximity to the airport and the noise. He strongly encouraged the developers to work with the airport officials. He also felt there should be substantial noise attenuation incorporated into the design of the facility.

Ann Fox supported the senior facility, but had concerns about the EVA. She wanted it to be similar to the one between Martin Avenue and Dennis Drive. That is not paved like a road, but instead a vehicle would have to drive over a curb onto something that looks like a sidewalk. It does not look like a road extension. She wanted assurances that if there is commercial use on the five acres on the plan that there be no parking lot in the middle, where a person could cut through a parking lot in order to get from one side to the other. She referred to the necessary 50% presale of units before this project could go forward. She wanted to make certain there is a disclosure about the airport to potential buyers. She also wanted a berm at I-580 to reduce the noise and a buffer area of green space between the auto mall and the continuing care community similar to the buffer zone along Martin Avenue that buffers residents from the quarry area by 50 feet. She wanted to make certain the light and glare would be mitigated from the mall for the senior facility. She referred to the existing west side community parks of Muirwood and Val Vista and the discussion to reduce the size of the Staples park based on the larger size of the Bernal Park. She would like staff to review acreage in community parks on the west side compared to the east side and think about whether it would make sense to reorient it vertically or to make it 22 acres. She wanted to look at the desired amenities for this facility because when the community park was originally proposed, this type of configuration was not envisioned. She felt it may make sense to make it larger. She also wanted some guarantee that if the EVA ever becomes more than an EVA, that the community would have an opportunity to referend that. The decision should be by rezoning instead of conditional use permit.

Jennifer Pearce said members of the Planning Commission had made a lot of good points. She agreed with shifting the park by 90 degrees because it gives the seniors better access to the park because they don't have to cross what could be a major thoroughfare. It also gives existing residents peace of mind concerning the EVA possibly becoming a major thoroughfare. It gives good access to the businesses from El Charro. She agreed with Ms. Roberts that this continuing care facility is a different animal but she would like to find some way to make it more affordable.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the workshop was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Abrahamson  
City Clerk