LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

# PLANNING COMMISSION

# AGENDA
# TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2025

# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – 7:00 PM

MEETING PARTICIPATION INFORMATION CAN BE FOUND AT THE END OF THE AGENDA

**IN PERSON INFORMATION:**
CIVIC CENTER MEETING HALL
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1016 S. LIVERMORE AVENUE

Yolanda Fintschenko, Chair
Tracy Kronzak, Vice Chair
Jacob M Anderson, Commissioner
Daniel Leary, Commissioner

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

Commissioner Jacob Anderson
Commissioner Daniel Leary
Vice Chairperson Tracy Kronzak
Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## 2. OPEN FORUM

- In conformance with the Brown Act, no Planning Commission action can occur on items presented during Open Forum.
- To provide public comment, please submit a speaker card. When your name is called, walk to the lectern to address the Planning Commission.
- Comments are limited to a maximum of 3 minutes per person, per item. The Chair may reduce the amount of time based on the number of persons wishing to speak.
- Open Forum will conclude after 30 minutes; however, if there are additional speakers, Open Forum will reconvene after Matters for Consideration.

## 3. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and are acted upon by the Planning Commission with a single action. Members of the audience wishing to provide public input must submit a speaker card.

3.1 Approval of the March 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 03-19-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

3.2 Approval of the July 16, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 07-16-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

3.3 Approval of the August 6, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 08-6-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

3.4 Approval of the November 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 11-19-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

3.5 Approval of the December 17, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 12-17-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

3.6 Approval of the January 7, 2025 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 01-07-2025 - Draft Meeting Minutes

## 4. PROJECT REVIEW

## 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Comprehensive General Plan Update–Policy Topics Infrastructure, Public Services, and Mobility Elements

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

- Receive a presentation on the Infrastructure Element, Public Services Element, and Mobility Element and consider General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) feedback on policy options.
- Recommend policy updates for City Council consideration and direction.

**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. Draft GP Annotated Outline
2. Inf PubServ Policy Options
3. GPAC Input on Inf and Pub Services Policy Options
4. Mobility Element Policy Options
5. GPAC Input on Mobility Policy Options
6. Revised GPAC Policy Input List Format

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

7.1 Planning Staff Responses to Matters Initiated by the Planning Commission.

**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. Planning Staff Response to Matters Initiated By Planning Commission

## 8. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

8.1 Supplemental materials received prior to the meeting.
**Staff Report**
**Attachments:**
1. 03-19-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
2. 07-16-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
3. 08-6-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
4. 11-19-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
5. 12-17-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

To a regular Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, February 18, 2025 at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

## 10. HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING

You can participate in the meeting in a number of ways:

**Open Forum** is an opportunity for the public to speak regarding items not listed on the agenda. Speakers are limited to a maximum of 3 minutes per person. To address the Planning Commission you must submit a speaker card to the Planning Commission Liaison prior to the start of that item. Please note that the Planning Commission is prohibited by State law from taking action on any items that are not listed on the agenda. However, if your item requires action, the Planning Commission l may place it on a future agenda or direct staff to work with you and/or report to the Planning Commission on the issue.

**Public Hearings** - The topic of the hearing is typically summarized by staff, followed by a presentation by the applicant, and then questions from the Planning Commission. The Chair will then open the hearing to the public and offer an opportunity for public comments. Speakers are limited to a maximum of 3 minutes per person. To address the Planning Commission, you must submit a speaker card to the Planning Commission Liaison prior to the start of the presentation of the item.

**Other Agenda Items** are also open for public input including Consent Calendar or Matters for Consideration items. These comments are also subject to the 3-minute limit.

**Special Meetings, Workshops** - The public will have the opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding the item that is the subject of the special meeting or workshop. Public comments are limited to a maximum of 3 minutes per person.

## Submission of Comments Prior to the Meeting:

**Email Comments** may be submitted by the public to the Planning Commission Liaison (planning@LivermoreCA.gov). Items received no later than 12:00 pm on the day of the meeting will be provided to the Commission and available on the City website prior to the meeting. These items will NOT be read into the record.

**eComments** may be submitted by the public using the eComment link here. Comments may be up to 1000 characters in length and will be accepted up until 6:00 pm the day of the meeting. These items will NOT be read into the record and are viewable by the the Commission and the public upon submittal.

## Submission of Comments During the Meeting:

Speakers are limited to a maximum of 3 minutes per person. To submit a comment in person, you must complete a speaker card for each item. Speaker cards are available in the Civic Center Meeting Hall lobby. Indicate on the card the item number you wish to comment on and submit the card directly to the Planning Commission Liaison prior to the start of the item. Please note that the Planning Commission is prohibited by State law from taking action on any items that are not listed on the agenda. However, if your item requires action, the Planning Commission may place it on a future agenda or direct staff to work with you and/or report to the Planning Commission on the issue.

If you would like to deliver written materials to the Commission as part of your public comments, please provide 8 copies of to the Planning Commission Liaison with your speaker card.

The **Planning Commission Agenda and Agenda Reports** are prepared by City staff and are available for public review on Friday evening, three days prior to the Planning Commission meeting at 1016 South Livermore Avenue, Livermore. The Agenda is also available on the City's website, http://livermoreca.gov/agenda.

Under Government Code §54957.5, any supplemental material distributed to the members of the Planning Commission after the posting of this agenda will be available for public review at City Hall, 1052 South Livermore Avenue, Livermore, and included in the agenda packet available on the City's web site at http://livermoreca.gov/agenda.

PURSUANT TO TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (CODIFIED AT 42 UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 12101 AND 28 CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS PART 35), AND SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, THE CITY OF LIVERMORE DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, SEX, DISABILITY, AGE OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION IN THE PROVISION OF ANY SERVICES, PROGRAMS, OR ACTIVITIES. TO ARRANGE AN ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PUBLIC MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE ADA COORDINATOR AT ADACOORDINATOR@LIVERMORECA.GOV OR CALL (925) 960-4170 (VOICE) OR (925) 960-4104 (TDD) AT LEAST THREE (3) BUSINESS

DAYS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.1**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the March 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 03-19-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**MARCH 19, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Jacob Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. OPEN FORUM –**

Chairperson Anderson open and closed the public comment period.

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR - NONE**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider Appeal (APL) 24-001 - Greenville Community Charging Depot, 151 Greenville Road - Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 23-004.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopt a resolution denying Appeal 24-001 and affirming staff's approval of Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 23-004.

**Senior Assistant City Attorney Kim Cilley provided a summary of the process for the appeal hearing for item 5.1 before the Planning Commission.**

**Sustainability Program Manager Tricia Pontau presented the staff report.**

**Kelilah Federman, representing the appellant, summarized the grounds for the appeal.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Bruce Caron,** provided a comment.

**J.P. Ross,** provided a comment.

**Lien Dinh,** provided a comment.

There were no more speakers, and the public comment period was closed.

In response to Commission questions, Sustainability Program Manager Tricia Pontau stated she was unaware of case law related to charging stations triggering an EIR. 38:25 explained the need to refile the notice of exemption.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Ms. Dinh explained that the proposed chargers were for medium and heavy-duty trucks and were higher powered chargers. She discussed the existing charging depot in Long Beach.

Commissioner Kronzak questioned the significant and adverse impact of potential fire risk. Will Mitchell, Executive Vice President of Sales and Operations of Forum Mobility, explained quality control and inspections for the proposed chargers; 24/7 personnel trained to monitor and mitigate emergencies; onsite fire hydrants; nationally rated cells used in vehicles; minimal incidents; and facility design reducing potential for the spread of fire. Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the potential of incidents was no greater or less than home chargers or e-bikes.

Ms. Federman provided a response to the comments.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Ms. Federman stated they were not comparing the proposed project to any other sites, rather had determined health and public safety risk of fire associated with the development.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Ms. Federman stated the evidence presented supported the potential of catastrophic fires from lithium-ion batteries. She stated the scale and number of chargers in the proposed project would result in a public health and safety impact.

In response to Chair Anderson, Ms. Federman confirmed her argument that lithium batteries caught fire creating a health and safety issue and should therefore be discretionary. Chair Anderson stated the Planning Commission was tasked with determining whether lithium-ion batteries should trigger a discretionary decision.

Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko questioned the assessment of safety made by the appellant's experts and indicated she did not see any modeling nor calculations. Ms. Federman stated her team included experts in hazardous materials and air

quality and quantified the level of fire risk associated with the project. She stated it was the City's duty to determine the project was safe, therefore they were requesting and environmental impact report. Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko indicated she did not understand the basis for the safety risk.

Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the appellant was aware that CEQA was a discovery law designed to produce transparency in the environmental reporting process, exempted ministerial projects; and that State law trumped local ordinance. Ms. Federman suggested Government Code Section 65850.7 might require a use permit and stated the appeal only addressed the proposed charging depot. Commissioner Kronzak expressed concern that if the appeal was upheld, every other project would require rereview. Ms. Federman suggested a precedent would not be set.

Assistant City Attorney Cilley summarized the three options before the Commission.

Commissioner Dunbar discussed his familiarity with the electric vehicles and lithium-ion batteries. He stated he could not make the findings for a health and safety impact.

Commissioner Leary concurred that the health and safety impact finding could not be made; discussed Government Code Section 65850.7 indicating EV chargers were administrative and non-discretionary; reiterated CEQA Section 15268 outlining ministerial projects were exempt from requirements of CEQA; and reminded the Commission that the project was conditioned for the installation to be in accordance with Electrical and Building Codes. He indicated support for denying the appeal.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Acting Planning Manager Steve Riley estimated 50 plus staff hours had been expended on the appeal. Commissioner Kronzak expressed appreciation to staff; indicated there were no evidence that health and safety concerns were any greater or lesser than any other EV charger project; that the site plan contained adequate remediation for any event that might take place on the site; and support for denying the appeal.

Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko rejected Appeal Point 4 because the General Plan did not require use of local labor; and stated Point 3 followed the timeline requirements; Point 2 was not subject to CEQA since it was a ministerial decision; and therefore, there was no basis for Appeal Point 1, therefore, the appeal should be denied.

Chair Anderson concurred with his colleagues. He reiterated that Government Code Section 65850.7 stated EV charging stations were to be administratively approved through a non-discretionary permit. He agreed with staff's recommendation and denying the appeal.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY

COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 04-24** finding that the Greenville Community Charging Depot is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Resolution 05-24** denying Appeal APL24-001 and approving Site Plan Design Review SPDR23-004 for the Greenville Community Charging Depot.

**6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE**

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**

Commissioner Kronzak recommended the City consider adopting a resolution stating, in circumstances where Planning Commission and staff were required to exercise quasi-judicial review related to CEQA, that should an appeal be found invalid, the appellant must reimburse the City for the cost of staff time and legal expenses expended in the appeal.

Commissioner Dunbar requested a preview of the Active Transportation Plan.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 8:29pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, April 2, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.2**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the July 16, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 07-16-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**JULY 16, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1 Approval of the March 21, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.3 Approval of the August 15, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.5 Approval of the November 21, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.6 Approval of the December 5, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

3.2 Approval of the June 6, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, COMMISSIONER DUNBAR ABSTAINING, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

Commissioner Dunbar abstainer due to being absent at the June 6, 2023 meeting.

3.4 Approval of the November 7, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO ABSTAINING, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

**4. PROJECT REVIEW – NONE.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing Assisted Living Residential Care Facility at 3646 East Avenue to expand its capacity from six to nine clients.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt resolutions finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) which exempts negligible expansion of use and interior alterations of existing facilities, and approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

**Planning Intern Emily Gnecco presented the staff report.**

**Chairperson Anderson** opened and closed the public comment period.

In response to Commission questions, Planning Intern Gnecco explained the proposed driveway; no concerns regarding runoff; history of ADA parking; onsite parking; parking standards; and condition to retain existing landscaping.

The Commission indicated it could make the required findings.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY

COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 22-24** Finding Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003 for a Residential Care Facility to be exempt from the provisions of The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**Resolution 23-24** Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003 for the Residential Care Facility Project.

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for a Specific Plan Amendment, Planned Development, Site Plan Design Review Modification, and Development Agreement Amendment to modify the 2017 approval for the Arroyo Vista Residential Project to increase the height of the single-family detached units from two stories to three stories, remove a pedestrian bridge requirement, and secure community benefits including pocket parks and a financial contribution.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-002, Planned Development (PD) 24-001, Specific Plan Amendment (SPPA) 24-002 and Development Agreement Amendment (DAA) 24-001, subject to conditions.

**Assistant Planner Kaitlyn Harrison presented the staff report.**

In response to Commission questions, Staff explained the aerial easement and City's maintenance responsibility; cost to maintain the bridge; Las Positas project;

**Chairperson Anderson** opened the public comment period.

**Michael Keaney, Trumark Homes,** concurred with Staff's recommendation and initially proposed conditions of approval. He indicated acceptance of the proposed conditions related to the required bench on the Arroyo Vista Trail on Zone 7 property; accessible path of travel from the new park to the trail, with the addition of a note that it be to the extent feasible. He discussed the intent to build the bridge but challenge with public-private component.

**David Lund** thanked staff for the explanation of the bridge issue.

**Chairperson Anderson** closed the public comment period.

**Commissioner Dunbar** received clarification from staff that the architecture met the design standards; four-foot rail fence and removal of existing fence along the Arroyo; public trail on west side; build out of Las Positas Road; and Social Endowment Fund. He expressed concern with losing the opportunity for community connections and bike infrastructure.

**Commissioner Leary** confirmed that the Ranch style was compliant with Design Standards; neighborhood park requirements; funds for pedestrian bridge; Community Benefit Fund; payment for offsite trail improvements; building height increase; and electric services.

**Commissioner Kronzak** confirmed the affordable housing and in lieu fees; HOA enforcement of garage parking; and indicated the need to notify homeowners of Midtown development.

**Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko** obtained clarification on the transfer of development credit; additional conditions and caveat if unfeasible.

The applicant confirmed they were agreeable to the conditions with the caveat that Conditions 2 and 3 could be waived unless determined to be infeasible by the Community Development Director.

In response to **Commissioner Kronzak**, Staff explained the ability to waive ADA compliant connections.

**Chair Anderson** suggested blocks of consistent styles and discussed the need to articulate the first residence visible from public areas.

The Commission discussed the style, massing and density. The applicant offered to improve the design elements on the entry home.

**Commissioner Dunbar** expressed concern about access to Safeway and the need to protect the bikeway; traffic improvements and bicycle access and trail connection; truck traffic noise; and curb radius and directional curb ramps.

ON THE MOTION OF VICE-CHAIR FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 24-24** Recommending that the City Council adopt the 2024 Addendum to the 2007 Arroyo Vista Neighborhood Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, as amended in 2017 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 25-24** Recommending that the City Council approve Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-002, Development Agreement Amendment (DAA) 24-001, Planned Development Rezoning (PD) 24-001, and Specific Plan Amendment (SPPA) 24-002 for the Arroyo Vista Neighborhood Development

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

**Commissioner Dunbar** requested the trail crossing to Contractors Place be

conditioned to follow the trail design guidelines.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 9:12 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 6, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Library, Community Rooms A & B, 1188 S. Livermore Avenue.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.3**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the August 6, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 08-6-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**AUGUST 6, 2024**

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1188 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1 Approval of the June 18, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DUNBAR AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

3.2 Approval of the July 2, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

**4. PROJECT REVIEW – NONE.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider a request for a Site Plan Design Review and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to develop a vacant lot to the north of the Portola Avenue and Rincon Avenue Intersection. The project will consist of three residential buildings totaling 31 three-story townhouse style condominiums. The project includes six affordable units and four accessible units, a Class 2b bike lane, and related landscaping, parking, stormwater, and frontage improvements.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15182 (c), Projects Pursuant to a Specific Plan, and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning;

2. Adopt a resolution approving Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) 11473 – Subdivision (SUB) 24-001, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-001, together with the requested Density Bonus waiver, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;

3. Direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, subject to project approval.

**Planning Technician Emily LaDue presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Connie Kopps**, provided a comment.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 26-24** Finding that the Planning Commission find that the City Ventures Parkview Development is exempt from the provisions of the California

Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 27-24** Finding that the Planning Commission approve Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) 11473 – Subdivision (SUB) 24-001 And Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-001 for the City Ventures Parkview Development

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

**Commissioner Fintschenko** requested a briefing on legal constraints regarding Senate Bill 33 and density waivers.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 8:59pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 20, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Livermore-Pleasanton Elks Lodge, 940 Larkspur Drive.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.4**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the November 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 11-19-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**November 19, 2024**

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR – NONE.**

**4. PROJECT REVIEW**

4.1 **THE PREVIOUSLY NOTICED ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO THE DECEMBER 3, 2024 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

Review of Site Plan Design Review to redevelop the 85-acre former Springtown Golf Course with recreational, conservation and scenic uses consistent with the provisions of Measure FF approved by the Livermore voters in 2016. The proposed project consists of a community park at the southern end of the project site consisting of a playground, picnic area, shade structures, restrooms and community garden, with the addition of four pickleball courts/two tennis courts, a half-basketball court, and an 18-hole disc golf course at the north end of the project site, the existing Marlin Pound Neighborhood Park.

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider a request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road. The new name will be East Vineyard Avenue. New street numbers and the new street name will be issued to five parcels for

the purpose of improving emergency response time and delivery service along the portion of the subject street.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution recommending the City Council find that the project is exempt under CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3);
2. Adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve Matters Initiated by Staff (MIS) 24-001; and
3. Instruct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption with the Alameda County Recorder's Office.

**Associate Planner Jennifer Ackerman presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Kronzak, Vice Chair Fintschenko and Chair Anderson indicated they could make the required findings.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 38-24** Recommending that the City Council adopt a resolution That the request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road to East Vineyard Avenue is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 39-24** Recommending approval of matters initiated by staff (MIS) 24-001 for the request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road to East Vineyard Avenue

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 24-007) to authorize a family dental and orthodontics office within an existing tenant space in the Republic Square commercial retail center located at the southwest corner of Livermore Outlets Drive and Freisman Road, east of San Francisco Premium Outlets. Address: 4527 Livermore Outlets Drive.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Existing Facilities;
2. Adopt a resolution approving Conditional Use Permit 24-007, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;
3. Direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption with the Alameda County Clerk; and

4. Advise the applicant that the Project approval is subject to a 15-day appeal period.

**Assistant Planner Shannon Pagan presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

Aaron Rondon, applicant, indicated he was available to respond to questions.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Assistant Planner Pagan explained secondary uses in the Regional Commercial Zone.

Commissioner Dunbar thanked the applicant for bringing business to Livermore and indicated he could make the findings.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner Pagan stated the parking spaces were available for general use.

Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed the 10% use to fulfill the intent of the Specific Plan.

Chair Anderson indicated it was a good use for the space and thanked the applicant for growing his business in Livermore.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 40-24** Finding that Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-007 for a dental and orthodontics office in Republic Square is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 41-24** Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-007 to authorize a family dental and orthodontics office within an existing building in Republic Square

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Consideration of General Plan Consistency Determinations for the acquisition of three properties for open space and conservation purposes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt three separate resolutions approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007, Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008, and Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009, finding the City's acquisition of the

following three properties for open space and conservation is consistent with Livermore's 2003 General Plan.

- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007 - 41 acres (Quint Property - APNs: 99B-5300-2-13, 99B-5450-10-3)
- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008 - 86 acres (Collier Canyon Property - APN: 903-10-1)
- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009 - 82 acres (Goecken Road Property - APNs: 99B-5680-14; 99B-5680-18)

**Associate Planner Kam Purewal presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Kronzak announced involvement on the Land Use Advisory for Tri-Valley Conservancy, which had been determined to not be a conflict; indicated findings could be made; and thanked staff.

Commissioner Leary highlighted points in support of the General Plan and indicated the findings could be made.

Commissioner Dunbar indicated the findings could be made.

Vice Chair Fintschenko stated she could make the consistency determination and find with staff's recommendations on all three properties.

Chair Anderson stated he could make the consistency and required findings and thanked Staff for its hard work to preserve the properties.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 42-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007 for the acquisition of approximately 41 acres (Quint Property – APNS: 99B-5300-2-13, 99B-5450-10-3)

**Resolution 43-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008 for the acquisition of approximately 86 acres (Collier Canyon Property – APN: 903-10-1)

**Resolution 44-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009 for the acquisition of approximately 82 acres (Goecken Road Property – APNS: 99B-5680-14 AND 99B-5680-18)

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

**Chair Anderson** requested the lights at Stockmans Park come on at dark.

Vice Chair Fintschenko suggested training on how to use maps and the development code. Planning Manager Riley indicated training could be held when the new commissioner was on board.

Commissioner Dunbar encouraged public education on the new State law regarding parking setbacks from intersections. Planning Manager Riley indicated there had been internal meetings and an update would be provided. Senior Civil Engineer Debbie Salgado stated there had been an inventory of intersections and staff would be rolling out a program soon.

Commissioner Kronzak discussed the City of San Francisco not striping curbs due to cost and congratulated Councilmember Elect Dunbar.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 7:45 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, December 3, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Ave.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.5**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the December 17, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 12-17-2024 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**December 17, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR - NONE**

**4. PROJECT REVIEW - NONE**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 **THE PREVIOUSLY NOTICED ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO THE JANUARY 7, 2025, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**
Hearing to consider a request for a Municipal Code Amendment, Development Code Amendment, Conditional Use Permit Modification, Development Agreement, Site Plan Design Review, and Site Plan Design Review Modification for the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project.

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Site Plan Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, and Consistency Determination to develop vacant land located at the northwest corner of the Collier Canyon Road and Constitution Drive intersection, with a residential project known as Cornerstone.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt Resolutions:

1. Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-010;
2. Recommending the City Council adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65457 and CEQA

Guidelines Section 15182 (c), Projects Pursuant to a Specific Plan, and CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning;

3. Recommending the City Council adopt a resolution approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 8669 – Subdivision (SUB) 22-006, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 22-004, together with the requested Density Bonus waivers and concessions, and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-009, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;
4. Recommending the City Council direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, subject to project approval.

**Assistant Planner Emily LaDue presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

Chris Stockhouse, representing Cornerstone and the landowner, explained the purpose and mission of the church to give back to the community and proposal to build affordable housing.

Michael Keaney, Director of Forward Planning, Trumark Homes, presented an overview of the proposed project including exceedance of required affordable units; completion of infrastructure; and collaboration with Pacific Companies.

Caleb Roope, Pacific Companies, discussed their experience in affordable housing developments and work on other projects with Trumark; and expressed excitement about the project.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner LaDue explained the buffer between development and the riparian basin; confirmed no need to redesignate housing sites in the City's housing sites inventory and the units for this project can be included in RHNA Cycle 6.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

Brandon Evans, IBW Local 595, requested use of local construction workforces.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Leary suggested relocating and reducing the bioretention area; consideration of the location of the bus stop in relation to the pedestrian corridor and bridge; and ensuring appropriate easements for the bridge. He pointed out the requirement to plant trees and charging stations; and commended the developer on the contribution of affordable units above the requirements.

Commissioner Kronzak requested the use of California native trees. In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner LaDue explained the CUP is required due to the project's distance from the creek.

In response to Vice Chair Fintschenko, Assistant Planner LaDue explained podium parking. Planning Manager Riley discussed the findings for the conditional use permit for grading near the creek.

In response to Chair Anderson, Mr. Roope explained the courtyard and outdoor spaces; proposed outdoor space; and bike storage and elevators accommodating bikes. Chair Anderson confirmed the units would be non-smoking and suggested consideration of tying bike parking to density. In response to Chair Anderson, Assistant Planner LaDue explained street design including street parking and bike lanes. Chair Anderson requested shortening of crosswalk distance at Collier Canyon Road and Gateway Avenue, and inclusion of at least pedestrian directional ramps.

Commissioner Kronzak summarized the briefings provided to the Commissioners.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 49-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-010 for the Cornerstone Residential Development

**Resolution 50-24** Recommending the City Council find that the Cornerstone Residential Development is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 51-24** Recommending that the City Council approve Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 8669 – Subdivision (SUB) 22-006, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 22-004, and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-009, and find no net loss for the Cornerstone Development with an

**RECESS**
Chair Anderson called a recess at 8:00 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:05 p.m. with all Commissioners present.

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Comprehensive General Plan Update – Draft Land Use Map and Policy Topics

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

- Review and ask clarifying questions on the Draft Preferred Land
- Use Map
- Receive an overview of the Open Space and Conservation Element, Safety Element, and Noise Element

- Consider General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) feedback on policy options for the Open Space and Conservation, and Safety Elements
- Recommend policy updates for City Council consideration and direction

**Principal Planner Andy Ross presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Mark Thompson** commented on the recommendation that future parks use less grass and suggested the use of artificial turf.

**Connie Kopps** questioned whether -702 was supposed to be listed twice in the land use changes section. She discussed her August 2024 letter and requested additional time for public review.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the owner at 2133 Las Positas requested the zone change from business and commercial park to medium density residential, which was anticipated to be granted; explained the lens through which the list was reviewed; and discussed the briefing on the revised land use map, which had not received much public input, other than the developer community finding it refreshing.

Commissioner Leary expressed appreciation for the public comments; agreed with the positive upgrades to the Land Use Map; support for the addition of Wine Country Commercial, and Mixed Industrial Commercial; and questioned combining Highway Serving and Community Serving Commercial. Principal Planner Ross explained the overlap of uses and areas; and confirmed that East of Greenville was paused.

In response Vice Chair Fintschenko, Principal Planner Ross indicated the issue raised by Ms. Kopps was a typographical error. Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed that the Neighborhood Commercial designation would be more compatible with the existing land uses and indicated the proposed Land Use Designations seemed sensible.

Chair Anderson expressed enthusiasm about the new map; confirmed the City would maintain the current level of control while providing flexibility; indicated support for clarifying Service Commercial and incorporating lite industrial; and expressed appreciation for the Mixed-Use clarification.

The Commission discussed and indicated support to the changes proposed to the General Plan outline.

Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed the intent to switch to a simpler, goal policy

model.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Principal Planner Ross indicated the changes proposed by the GPAC to the Open Space policies were minimal. Commissioner Kronzak indicated Policies A, F and X3 and X4 were most directionally consistent and additive to the General Plan, and the others felt like tactics rather than policies.

Commissioner Leary discussed wildlife connectivity.

Vice Chair Fintschenko reiterated the goal to secure and maintain a green belt outside the Urban Growth Boundary seemed overly prescriptive and suggested the goals not describe the required actions. She questioned whether urban separators were possible around the entire City.

Chair Anderson confirmed that the multifunctional greenbelt was proposed for the edges of the City; suggested encouraging agricultural uses for preservation; indicated support for the GPAC feedback; and suggested ensuring the urban forest was maintained.

Commissioner Kronzak indicated Policy Options B and C were closer to the spirit, but A seemed impossible to accomplish; and suggested restrooms at parks in the definition of equitable park access.

Vice Chair Fintschenko reviewed the proposed policies and GPAC suggestions, indicating support for Policy Option C, and the idea of connectivity in open space, with definitions; and suggested prescribing how to conserve water not be included in the policy.

Principal Planner Ross confirmed the Commissioner direction action and tactically oriented items were not included in the goal and policy level, to ensure the goal and policy could be used to evaluate projects objectively for consistency. He explained unfunded mandates.

The Commission discussed the Noise Element and suggested consideration of the science of urbanized noise and mental health; noise metrics in neighboring cities; determination of a standard for equitable consideration of noise issues; addition of a standard for L Max; frequency component and context of what was generating the noise.

The Commission discussed the Safety Element.

Commissioner Kronzak indicated more specificity was a good thing; energy resilience felt too low; support for agricultural resilience; and consideration of insurability of developments.

Commissioner Ross stated developers would not advance projects without being able to insure.

Vice Chair Fintschenko indicated support for the emergency notification's goal; Policy Option C; ensuring General Plan policies were goal oriented rather than tactical; providing general direction of the goal on drought and moving actions elsewhere; and questioned whether there was agriculture within the City limits. Principal Planner Ross explained the agriculture within the City, sphere of influence and planning area.

Chair Anderson indicated agricultural resilience was important but perhaps should be in Economic Development. Staff indicated the Agricultural Industry could appear in multiple forms throughout the General Plan.

Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Fintschenko discussed the need to consider smoke in relation to walkable developments and transit-oriented communities. Principal Planner Ross discussed strategies on air quality in the Climate Action Plan and consideration of air quality in the General Plan.

Chair Anderson expressed appreciation for planning for a sustainable future.

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Commissioner Kronzak expressed concern about the deteriorating asphalt and flooding on the ramp to east bound 580 at North Livermore. Chair Anderson stated it was Caltrans property.
Chair Anderson requested confirmation that the lights at Stockman Park were on at dark; and expedited processing of directional ramps.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 10:19 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Ave.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 3.6**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the January 7, 2025 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 01-07-2025 - Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

**DRAFT MINUTES**

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**JANUARY 7, 2025**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## 2. OPEN FORUM

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Connie Kopps** asked who authorized the Planning Commission to approve Phase 1 of the Springtown Park; discussed issues raised by the residents that were not addressed; and provided a copy of her letter.

There were no additional speakers and the public comment period was closed.

## 3. CONSENT CALENDAR – NONE.

## 4. PROJECT REVIEW – NONE.

## 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**5.1** Hearing to consider a request for a Municipal Code Amendment, Development Code Amendment, Conditional Use Permit Modification, Development Agreement, Site Plan Design Review, and Site Plan Design Review Modification for the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project and city-wide cardroom operations.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt resolutions recommending the City Council take the following actions:

1. Adopt a resolution certifying the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project, which includes city-wide Municipal Code and Development Code
2. Amendments, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and Adopt a resolution approving Municipal Code Amendment

(MUNI) 24-002; Development Code Amendment (DCA) 24-004; Conditional Use Permit Modification (CUPM) 24-001; Development Agreement (DA) 24-003; Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-010 and Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-024 amending the Livermore Municipal Code including increasing the total number of card tables permitted citywide, increasing the total number of card tables permitted per gambling establishment, increasing allowable hours of operation, increasing the maximum bet limit, permitting limited backline betting, permitting the play of new card games not prohibited by state law, modifying tournament noticing requirements, modifying the number of cardroom licenses permitted per person, and additional miscellaneous amendments made for clarification; and authorizing operational changes at Parkwest Casino 580 including increasing the number of card tables, increasing hours of operation, increasing the maximum bet limit, permitting limited backline betting, and permitting the play of new card games not prohibited by state law; and approve the development of a 230-space surface parking lot for Parkwest Casino 580.

**Senior Planner Ashley Vera** presented the staff report.

In response to Commission questions, **Senior Planner Vera** confirmed the remainder of Lot 12 was owned by the applicant and nothing had been formally proposed; purpose of updating the Code and standards; and maximum card tables at the site and additional availability of card tables in the City that could be used by others including Livermore Casino.

**Chairperson Anderson** opened the public hearing.

**Connie Kopps** expressed concern about the location of the casino in relation to Springtown Park and potential safety issues.

There were no more speakers, and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Leary** indicated support for the proposed parking stalls and size of the parking lot; confirmed the landscaping plans and pedestrian link and walkways; agreement with the stormwater control plan; and concern with the gambling limit.

In response to **Commissioner Kronzak**, **Mike Vasey**, Chief Financial Officer, Park West Casinos, explained bus parking; and **Senior Planner Vera** explained street signage prohibiting parking on streets; enforcement of the Gambling Control Act; and reference in the Municipal Code to non-profit fundraisers.

**RECESS**
**Chairperson Anderson** called a recess at 7:40 p.m. The meeting reconvened at

7:45 p.m. with all Commissioners present.

In response to **Vice Chair Fintschenko**, **Senior Planner Vera** explained the gambling limit set by the jurisdiction. **Captain Boberg** explained crimes centered around casino operations and evaluation of the gambling license.

In response to **Commissioner Kronzak**, **Senior Planner Vera** explained the process of a CUP modification for increasing gambling limit.

**Vice Chair Fintschenko** confirmed the zoning and distant limits from schools and parks. **Senior Planner Vera** explained the City-wide card table limit; and decrease in bioretention planters based on Caltrans comments.

In response to **Chairperson Anderson**, **Senior Planner Vera** explained the bike lane and bike parking plans; and indicated there were no changes to the alcohol license.

**Commissioner Leary** confirmed the bike lane plan, particularly by the bus stop; and sidewalk from the west.

In response to **Commissioner Kronzak**, **Senior Planner Vera** discussed permit requirements for tournaments and special events. **Planning Manager Riley** explained management of people and traffic for special events. **Senior Planner Vera** discussed surveys and mitigation measures to ensure special protected species.

**Chairperson Anderson** indicated the community benefit package outweighed card table uses.

**Vice Chair Fintschenko** indicated the required findings for the project could be made.

ON THE MOTION OF VICE CHAIR FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 01-25** Recommending that the City Council adopt the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

**Resolution 02-25** Recommending that the City Council approve Municipal Code Amendment (MUNI) 24-002, Development Code Amendment (DCA) 24-004, Conditional Use Permit Modification (CUPM) 24-001, Development Agreement (DA) 24-003, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-010, and Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-024 for the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project and Citywide Cardroom Operations

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

**6.1** Election of the 2025 Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission nominate and vote on candidates for the offices of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

ON THE MOTION OF CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LEARY AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, TO NOMINATE VICE CHAIR FINTSCHENKO AS CHAIR AND COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AS VICE CHAIR.

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF –**

**Planning Manger Riley** discussed Planning Commission recruitment and the January 27, 2025 application deadline; training for potential Commissioners on January 21, at 5:30 p.m.; and additional efforts on Matters Initiated.

**Commissioner Kronzak** discussed follow up on Matters Initiated; and encouraged training, adding Key to City training.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 8:19 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, January 21, 2025, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Ave.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 6.1**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Comprehensive General Plan Update–Policy Topics Infrastructure, Public Services, and Mobility Elements

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

- Receive a presentation on the Infrastructure Element, Public Services Element, and Mobility Element and consider General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) feedback on policy options.
- Recommend policy updates for City Council consideration and direction.

## SUMMARY

Following the creation of the Draft land use map, the General Plan Update process has shifted to preparing goals and policies for each General Plan element. Throughout the summer and fall the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) provided input on policy options based on topics the Committee identified as important to the community. The Planning Commission has an opportunity to provide feedback on GPAC's work and recommend new topics or themes for consideration in the General Plan Update. The complete set of draft goals and policies will be published as part of the Draft General Plan in summer 2025, which will start the next phase of community outreach and engagement. Staff recommends Planning Commission review, ask questions, and provide recommendations on policy topics for consideration by the City Council.

## DISCUSSION

### GOALS AND POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The General Plan Update process is currently focused on the goals and policies for all the elements in the City's General Plan Update. The General Plan Update is expected to carry forward the policies in the existing General Plan that are working well for the City. However, there are some important policy topics for which the current General Plan policy language is outdated and no longer responds to current conditions. There are also present-day issues and recent State law requirements that aren't adequately addressed in the General Plan. Attachment 1 provides an annotated outline of the Draft General Plan

and the policy topics covered by each element.

To identify and address policy gaps, the General Plan team is continuing the following process:

- Review existing General Plan goals, objectives, policies, and actions. City staff from all departments have reviewed the existing General Plan goals, policies, and actions and are providing direction on which policies need clarification, improvement, or removal. In addition, the General Plan team will carefully review the goals, objectives, policies, and actions and identify what changes are needed to respond to community input collected throughout the General Plan Update process and State requirements by drawing from best practices used by other California communities.

In February 2023, the GPAC conducted a thorough evaluation of the existing General Plan goals and policies by element, provided feedback, and recommended topic areas the Updated General Plan should consider. In April of 2024, following the Land Use Alternatives Evaluation process, the GPAC reviewed the policy topic list and added to the list of policy topics.

- Draft new and revised goals and policies. The General Plan team has begun preparing preliminary goals and policies for every Element to address policy gaps and respond to community input.

- Collect input and direction on potential goals and policies. The General Plan team shared policy options for specific topics with the GPAC at a series of meetings from July to November 2024. The Planning Commission will review GPAC feedback and will make a recommendation to the City Council for final direction. The General Plan team anticipates sharing GPAC input on General Plan policies over a series of Planning Commission meetings:

1. Meeting #1 (December 17, 2024): Open Space and Conservation Element, Safety Element, and Noise Element.
2. Meeting #2 (February 4, 2025): Infrastructure Element, Public Services Element, and Mobility Element
3. Meeting #3 (February 18, 2025): Land Use Element, Community Identity Element, and Economic Development Element

- Create Draft General Plan document. The General Plan team will use input received to prepare the Draft General Plan, which will then be circulated for public review. The GPAC, Planning Commission, and City Council will have meetings specifically to review the complete Draft General Plan, including updated policy language. GPAC feedback on the Draft General Plan will be summarized and forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council. City Council will provide direction on changes to be incorporated into the final General Plan to be considered for adoption.

INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICES ELEMENT

State law does not require a separate Infrastructure Element or a separate Public Service Element. However, the City recognizes one of the primary functions of a jurisdiction is to provide utility services such as distributing water, collecting wastewater, and managing stormwater to meet the daily needs of the community. Further, Livermore understands the importance of public services and the role they play in fostering community connections and enhancing quality of life.

Attachment 2 presents policy options for Infrastructure Element and Public Services Element topics that the GPAC discussed. The General Plan team received GPAC input on these topics on September 25, 2024 (Attachment 3). (This does not represent the complete set of policy topics that will be covered in the Infrastructure Element; refer to Attachment 1 for an overview of all topics in the Infrastructure and Public Services Elements).

MOBILITY ELEMENT

The Mobility Element is one of the required elements for a General Plan. (It is referred to as a Circulation Element in State law, but cities can tailor the names and organization of Elements to the local context.) The Mobility Element must correlate with the Land Use Element and include information on the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, and terminals. It must cover all "modes" (different types) of transportation, including human-powered transportation (also known as "active" transportation), vehicles, transit, rail, and aviation. This Element must also plan for a circulation network that meets the needs of all users and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, seniors, youth, and people with disabilities.

This update to the Mobility Element will need to reflect several State laws enacted since the last General Plan Update, including:

- The Plan for the Future bill (SB 932, 2022) requires the circulation element of a general plan (made after January 1, 2025) to include specific content related to roadway safety with a goal of eliminating roadway fatalities.
- The Parking Minimums bill (AB 2097, 2022) prohibits a public agency from requiring a minimum number of parking spaces for any development located within one-half mile from a major public transit stop with some exceptions.

Attachment 4 presents the Mobility Element policy options for topics GPAC discussed. GPAC input on these topics from October 9, 2024, is found in Attachment 5. This does not represent the complete set of topics that will be covered in the Mobility Element; refer to Attachment 1 for an overview of the high-level topics to be covered in this element.

PLANNING COMMISSION FEEDBACK

On December 17, 2024, the Planning Commission provided recommendations and feedback on GPAC policy options. Overall, the Planning Commission broadly recommended General Plan policy language for all the elements should remain at a higher level of abstraction and detailed strategies should be incorporated into the appropriate implementation documents (such as the Climate Action Plan). The project team drafted example policy language for the elements being discussed at this time, in response to Planning Commission's earlier feedback as shown in Attachment 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The role of the Planning Commission is to advise the City Council on the adoption and on-going review of the General Plan and serve as an advisory body to the Council on matters related to city growth and development. Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

- Receive an overview of the Infrastructure Element, Public Services Element, and Mobility Element

and consider General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) feedback on policy options.
- Recommend policy updates for City Council consideration and direction.

Following the Planning Commission meetings on all the proposed elements, the project team will present the Planning Commission recommendations to the City Council, finalize the policies per Council direction, and incorporate them into the Draft General Plan. The project team anticipates the Draft General Plan being available for community review and input as part of a thorough engagement campaign in summer of 2025, followed by adoption hearings beginning in Q4 2025 and concluding Q1 2026.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Draft GP Annotated Outline
2. Inf PubServ Policy Options
3. GPAC Input on Inf and Pub Services Policy Options
4. Mobility Element Policy Options
5. GPAC Input on Mobility Policy Options
6. Revised GPAC Policy Input List Format

Prepared by: Andy Ross
Principal Planner

# Draft General Plan Annotated Outline

This attachment identifies the topics that will be covered under each General Plan Element. The bulleted list under each numbered topic indicates the proposed policy issues covered by the Element.

## Land Use Element (LU)

### LU-1 Land Use Designations

### LU-2 Balanced and Efficient Use of Land

- Livermore's Unique Qualities
- Range of Land Uses
- Annexation Before Urbanization
- Transit-Supportive Development
- Sustainable Land Use
- Infill Development
- Density and Parking
- Neighborhood Amenities
- Managed Development
- Balanced Development
- Housing Choices
- Context-Sensitive Development
- Respect for Existing Setting
- Climate Resilience
- Green Building

### LU-3 Urban Growth Boundary

- Permanent Urban Growth Boundary
- No Urban Uses Outside UGB
- Urban Services and the UGB
- Compatible Uses
- South Livermore Open Space Buffer
- Amendments

## LU-4 Residential Land Uses

- Range of Housing Types
- Residential Density
- Maximizing Density
- Multi-Family Designations
- Complete and Walkable Neighborhoods
- Integrated Services
- Safe and Sanitary Homes

## LU-5 Mixed Use

- Mixed Use Near Transit
- Residential in Mixed Use
- Mixed Use Along Arterials

## LU-6 Commercial Land Uses

- Commercial Land Preservation
- Neighborhood Shopping Centers
- Highway Commercial Development
- Strip Commercial Development
- Lodging

## LU-7 Industrial Land Uses

- Industrial Land Preservation
- Employment Impact Evaluation
- Industrial Area Planning
- Industrial Location
- Urban Services for Industrial Land
- Industrial Park Formation
- Truck Traffic
- Industrial Zoning

## LU-8 Agricultural Land Uses

- Land Uses in Alameda County
- Rural Areas
- Agricultural Incentives
- Agricultural Preservation Tools

- Interference with Agriculture
- Right to Farm

## LU-9 Public and Quasi-Public Land Uses

- Publicly-Owned Land
- Surplus Land
- Right of First Refusal
- Public Uses
- Support for Housing
- Gathering Places
- Las Positas Community College
- Appropriate Development
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- Airport Land Use Commission Review
- City Council Overrule
- Residential Near Airport
- Airport Regulations
- Flight Approach Areas

## LU-10 Climate Action and Sustainable Development

- Climate Action Plan Updates
- Climate Action Plan Implementation
- Climate Action Plan Monitoring and Reporting
- Planning for Climate Change
- Impacts of Climate Change
- Climate Action Plan Development Consistency
- Climate Awareness

## LU-11 Special Planning Areas

- Range of Uses Downtown
- Primary Local Commercial Area
- Downtown Destinations
- Quality Design Downtown
- Downtown Activities
- Wineries and Wine-Country Uses
- Small-Scale Commercial Uses

- Crop Diversification
- Agricultural Expansion
- Permanent Protections
- Land Trust
- Easement Priorities
- Development Entitlement Consideration
- Williamson Act Contract Termination
- Grading
- Land Dedication
- Tri-Valley Conservancy Funding
- Annexation Criteria
- Cultivated Agriculture
- Urban Development Criteria
- Viticulture Protection
- Transitional Areas
- Agricultural Mitigation Fees
- Transferred Development Overlay District
- Mixed Uses in Midtown
- Distinct and Integrated Neighborhood
- Future Transit Planning
- Midtown Specific Plan
- New Homes in Midtown
- Job Creation in Midtown
- Public Amenities in Midtown
- Landscaped Buffers
- Parking Management
- Mix of Uses in Vasco Row
- Existing Business Retention
- Maker Spaces
- Activities and Events
- Parking
- Multi-Modal Safety
- New Park
- Triggers For Further Study

### LU-12 Regional Coordination

- Doolan Canyon-North Livermore
- North of I-580
- South Livermore Valley
- Regional Long-Range Plans
- Plan Bay Area
- Climate Coordination and Cooperation
- Planning Area Applications

### LU-13 Implementation

- Commercial and Industrial Land Inventory
- Updates for Consistency
- General Plan EIR
- Tracking Jobs-Housing Balance
- Public Service Capacity

## Community Identity Element (CI)

### CI-1 Civic Life and Governance

- Safe and Welcoming Community
- Cultural and Community Events
- Community-Based Organization Partnerships
- Community Event Funding
- Accessible Community Spaces
- Natural Features
- Civic Spaces Citywide
- Volunteerism
- Outreach Channels
- CBO Partnerships for Outreach
- Civic and Public Facilities Usage
- Feedback
- Periodic Demographics Review

### CI-2 Arts and Culture

- Creative Livermore

- Art Programs
- Art Community
- Art and Parks
- Art Partnerships
- Art and Outreach
- Science in Capital Projects
- Art Implementation
- Livermore Public Arts Program
- Science and Art
- Science in Public Space Design
- Science Museums
- Promotion in Public Events
- City Design Guidelines
- Funding for Science Art
- Farm-to-Table
- Sustainable Agriculture and Food System
- Food Tourism
- Dining and Restaurant Districts

## CI-3 Natural Setting

- Protection of Hills
- Alterations to Topography
- View Preservation
- Preservation of Visual Amenities

## CI-4 Urban Design

- Design Review
- High-Quality Design
- Context and Character
- Sustainable Design Requirements
- Human-Scaled Design
- Traditional Site Design Elements
- Consistent Lot Coverage
- Regular Property Maintenance
- Ordinances and Standards
- Urban Design Guidelines

- Design Standards Updates
- Street Width Standards Review
- Attractive Street Furniture System
- Landscaped Buffers
- Distinguishable Neighborhood Designs
- Missing Middle Housing Typologies
- Infill Design Integration
- Screening Between Multi-Family and Single-Family Residential
- Gated Communities
- Off-Street Parking
- Visually Unattractive Land Uses
- Transition Design Guidance
- Transect and Transition Zoning
- On-Premise and Off-Premise Signage
- Freeway Signage
- Utility Undergrounding Requirement
- Streets Right-of-Way Acreage
- Public Improvement Standards
- Phased Utility Undergrounding Program
- Focused Commercial Development
- Enhanced Architectural Design
- Aesthetically Pleasing Uses
- El Charro Gateway
- Public Landscape and Sculptures
- Gateways and Areas Map
- City Wayfinding System
- Gateway Design Guidance
- Gateway Strategy
- Utility Undergrounding at Gateways
- Downtown Gateways
- Livermore Laboratory Gateways
- South Livermore Gateways

## CI-5 Lighting and Glare

- Nighttime Sky
- Glare from Developments

- Lighting Ordinance

## CI-6 Tribal and Archaeological Resources

- Proper Archaeological and Paleontological Process
- Archaeological Surveys
- Construction Work Suspension
- Archaeological Site Preservation and Education
- Native American Consultation
- Historical Resources
- Historic Preservation Program
- Historic Preservation Integration into City Planning
- Community-Significant Resources
- Original Use and Adaptive Re-Use
- City-Owned Historical Resources
- Protection of Downtown Identity
- Historic Preservation through Specific Plans
- Consistency with General Plan
- Historic Preservation in Development Review Processes
- Historic Resources Inventory and Context Statement
- Local Landmarks
- Historic Preservation Professionals
- Historic Design Guidelines
- Historic Preservation Commission Responsibilities
- City Staff Training
- Public Knowledge of Historic Preservation
- Public Education
- School Curricula and Programs
- Historical and Cultural Organizations
- Historical Awards Program
- Plaques and Markers
- Heritage Tourism
- Information for Historical Resources Owners
- Funding for Historical Preservation and Rehabilitation
- State Historical Building Code
- Financial Incentives
- Incentive Programs Information Base

- Variance Incentives
- Certified Local Government
- Mills Act

## CI-7 Scenic Resources

- Scenic Resource System
- Preservation of Scenic Resources and Views
- Views of the Valley
- I-580 Scenic Corridor Definition
- Development Compatibility with Scenic Areas
- Continuous Trails
- City Maintenance of Scenic Resources
- South Livermore Visual Quality
- Dedicated Community-Based Organizations
- Scenic Resource Assessment
- Development Standard Amendments
- Scenic Route System
- Bicycling, Hiking, and Riding Trails
- Continuous Scenic Route System
- Scenic Route Links
- Variety of Experiences
- Geographic Distribution
- Coordination of Scenic Routes and Recreation Areas
- County Scenic Routes and Recreational Areas
- Landscape Enhancements
- Seamless Scenic Routes
- Truck Traffic
- Landscape Design along Scenic Routes
- Utility Lines along Scenic Routes
- Utility Line Consolidation
- Protection through Design Review
- Livermore Skyline
- I-580 Scenic Corridor View Angles
- Panoramic Views
- Exceptions and Variances
- Midtown Focus Area Accommodation

- Land Alterations
- Water-Adjacent Developments
- Ridgeline Protection
- Public Trail Easements
- Signage Control
- Scenic Route Policy Responsibilities
- Scenic Route Ownership
- Periodic Review
- Jurisdiction and Agency Cooperation
- Scenic Route Ordinance and Legislation

# Mobility Element (MO)

## MO-1 Complete Streets

- Complete Streets Approach
- Complete Streets Incorporation
- Context Sensitive Transportation Design
- Complete Streets Project Review
- Complete Streets Exemptions
- Complete Streets Outreach
- Complete Streets Coordination
- Complete Streets Design Standards
- Transportation Network Performance Measures

## MO-2 Active Transportation

- Transportation Mode Choice
- Transportation Priorities
- Transportation Demand Management for Existing and New Development
- Active Transportation Plan Funding
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity
- Mobility Hubs
- Shared Micromobility
- Traffic Signals
- Transportation Demand Management Ordinance
- Active Transportation Plan
- Ridesharing

- Carbon Fee
- ATP Updates
- ATP Alignment
- Trail Right-of-Way Acquisition
- TDM Ordinance

## MO-3 Transit

- Local Transit Ridership
- Transit Service
- Transit Infrastructure Improvements
- Valley Link Passenger Rail Service
- Future Transit Use
- Park and Ride Sites
- Transit Stop Location and Amenities
- Transit-Supportive Street Design
- Transit-Supportive Infrastructure
- Regional Transportation Improvements

## MO-4 Safe and Efficient Circulation System

- Vision Zero
- Roadway Operations
- Vehicle Level of Service
- Downtown Level of Service Exemption
- North/South I-580 Connections
- Traffic Calming
- Emergency Signal Preemption
- Roadway-Right-of-Way
- Citywide Traffic Model
- Vision Zero Implementation
- Proven Safety Countermeasures
- Speed Limits
- Roadway Linkages
- LOS Improvements
- Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program
- Local Transportation Analysis
- Street Classification Standards

- Transportation Technology Infrastructure
- Coordinated Land Use and Circulation System
- High-Traffic Generating Land Uses
- Cut-Through Traffic
- Roadway System Improvement Considerations
- Residential Traffic
- Rural Roadway Improvements

## MO-5 Downtown Circulation

- Pedestrian-oriented Downtown
- Downtown Roadway Priority Users
- Downtown Active Transportation Modes
- Downtown Truck Traffic
- Downtown Speed Limits
- Downtown Street Closures

## MO-6 Parking and Curbside Management

- Adequate Parking and Enforcement
- Shared Parking
- Developer Provided Parking
- Off-Street Parking
- Intelligent Curb Use
- Bicycle Parking
- Downtown Valet Bicycle Parking
- Parking Standards
- Maximum Allowed Parking
- Additional Bicycle Parking
- Citywide Parking Policy

## MO-7 Air Transportation

- Airport Compatible Land Uses
- Airport Safety
- Residential Uses Near Airport
- Emerging Aviation Technology
- Airport Zoning Districts

### MO-8 Goods Movement

- Goods Movement
- Rail Transportation
- Through Truck Traffic
- Railroad-Crossing Safety

### MO-9 Emerging Transportation Technology

- Emerging Transportation Technologies
- Mobility Data
- Zero Emission Vehicle Education
- Level 3 EV Chargers
- Umbrella Regulations for Modern Mobility
- Future-Ready Infrastructure
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Zero Emission Vehicle Car-share
- Electric Micromobility and Bicycle Chargers

### MO-10 Regional Transportation

- Regional Transportation Planning
- Freeway Interchange Improvements
- I-580 HOV/Toll Lanes
- State Route 84 Improvements
- Subregional Arterial Alignments
- Right-of-way Acquisition
- Isabel Avenue Access Points
- SR 84 Driveway Removal
- Isabel Avenue Longitudinal Utilities
- Regional Traffic Congestion
- Transportation Impact Evaluation
- Transportation Air Quality

## Housing Element

(updated under a separate timeline)

# Infrastructure Element (I)

## INF-1 Asset Management

- Asset Management
- General-Funded Infrastructure
- Infrastructure Studies and Master Plans
- Infrastructure Improvement Coordination
- Infrastructure Improvement Outreach
- Infrastructure Development Fees
- Infrastructure Improvement Decision Process

## INF-2 Water Supply

- Potable Water
- Water Efficiency
- Water Use Reductions
- Water Conservation Improvements
- Recycled Water
- Reclaimed Water in Pressure Zone 1
- Water Service Connection
- Water Service Area
- Water Availability Development Condition
- UWMP Zone 7 Coordination
- Water Pump Monitoring
- Cal Water Coordination
- On-Site Water Reuse
- Water Infrastructure Budgeting
- Water Conservation Incentives
- Recycled Water Expansion
- Water Conservation Measures

## INF-3 Wastewater

- Wastewater System Connections
- Septic Tanks
- Wastewater System Capacity
- Inflow and Infiltration
- Sewer Main Location

- Restaurant Grease Discharge
- Agricultural Wastewater Connections
- Wastewater Pollution Prevention Outreach

### INF-4 Stormwater

- Storm Drainage Design
- Storm Drainage Studies
- Impervious Surfaces
- Green Stormwater Infrastructure on City Assets
- Stream Modifications
- Zone 7 Flood Control Coordination
- Storm Drainage Improvements Prioritization
- Stormwater Code Revisions
- Stormwater Maintenance Collaboration

### INF-5 Utilities

- Utility Provision
- Utility Expansions
- Wireless Communication Facility Location
- Public Utility Assessment
- Utility Project Review

## Public Services Element (PS)

### PS-1 Schools

- School District Coordination
- School District Development Review
- School Facility Development
- School Funding
- School Site Location
- Information Sharing
- Student Generation Rates
- General Plan Amendment and School Facilities

### PS-2 Childcare

- Childcare Planning

- LARPD Childcare Coordination
- Childcare Colocation
- Childcare Compatibility
- Childcare Facilities in Residential Development
- Employer Provided Childcare
- Childcare to Support Business Attraction
- Childcare and STEAM
- Development Impact on Childcare
- Childcare Incentives
- Childcare Partnerships
- Childcare Support for Low Income Families
- Childcare Site Inventory

## PS-3 Solid Waste

- Recyclable Materials
- State Diversion and Recycling Requirements
- State Waste Programs
- Alameda County Measure D
- Waste Management
- Recycled Material City Purchase Procedures
- Waste Bin Storage
- Business Recycling
- Source Reduction and Recycling Programs
- Increased Diversion
- Recycled Material for City Operations
- Recycled Container Enclosures
- LARPD Recycling
- LVJUSD Recycling

## PS-4 Healthcare and Healthy Food Access

- Healthcare Facilities
- Social Services
- Mental Health
- Healthy Food Access
- Community Supported Agriculture
- Community Gardens in Residential Development

- Collaborative Community Gardening
- Home Food Production
- Healthy Food Access Regional Coordination
- Healthy Foods at School
- Healthy Food Regulatory Barriers
- Food Production Education Programs
- Affordable Water for Local Food Production
- Tree Replacement for Fruit Trees
- Downtown Farmers Markets
- Food Pantry Locations

### PS-5 Libraries

- Library Facilities and Staffing
- Library Services and Programs
- Library Funding
- School District Partnership
- New Branch Library
- Children's Library Resources
- Springtown Library Improvements

### PS-6 Seniors and Aging Adults

- Universal Design
- Caregiver Support
- Healthy Aging
- Outreach to Seniors
- Age Friendly Action Plan
- Senior Services

## Open Space and Conservation Element (OSC)

### OSC-1 Natural Resources and Ecosystems

- Diverse Open Space System
- Greenbelts
- Open Space Public Access
- Open Space Preservation and Restoration
- Open Space Acquisition

- Open Space Easement Designation
- Open Space Preservation Agency Coordination
- Preservation of Natural Amenities
- Conservation Easement Education
- Open Space Acquisition Funding
- Open Space Acquisition Prioritization
- Open Space Easement Monitoring

## OSC-2 Biological Resources

- Biodiversity Preservation
- Habitat Restoration
- Stream Setbacks
- Cluster Development
- Habitat Corridor Maintenance
- Wildlife Linkage
- Subsurface Soil Disturbance
- Habitat Mitigation
- Riparian Enhancements
- Existing Native Vegetation
- Biological Resources Mitigation
- Wildlife-Compatible Farm Management Practices
- Wetland and Biological Resources Impact Calculation
- East Alameda Conservation Strategy
- Mitigation Bank and Habitat Corridor Parcel Database
- Alameda County Biological Resources Mapping
- Biological Resource Preservation Grant Funding
- Biological Resource Preservation Agency Coordination

## OSC-3 Water Quality and Water Resources Management

- Water Quality
- Waterway Maintenance and Improvement
- Runoff Regulation
- Salt-Loading
- Creek Improvement Grants
- Groundwater Recharge
- Integrated Pest Management

## OSC-4 Agricultural Resources

- Farmland Preservation
- Vineyard Expansion
- Diversity of Agricultural Products
- Williamson Act Land Conservation
- Agricultural Soil Preservation
- Agricultural Preservation Agency Coordination
- Agricultural Preservation Funding

## OSC-5 Parks and Recreation

- Comprehensive Park and Recreation System
- Park Access
- Park Development Fees
- Park Service Standard
- Park Improvement Prioritization
- Park and Public Facility Co-Location
- Park Improvements Coordination
- Regional Park Development Coordination
- City Park Coordination
- Future Community Park Site
- Park Service Standard Shortfall Projects
- Isabel Neighborhood Park Space
- Recreational and Cultural Facilities and Activities
- Open Space and Trail Access
- Creekside Recreational Opportunities
- Park Water Conservation and Shade Provision
- Park and Trail Master Plan Update
- In-Lieu Park Fee Ordinance
- City Public Facilities Study

## OSC-6 Air Quality

- Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance
- Health Risk Assessment
- Odor-Generating Land Uses
- Toxic Air Contaminants Sources
- Construction Air Quality Impacts Reduction

- Refrigerated Trucks
- Development Requirements Near I-580
- Construction Air Pollution Control Plan
- Sensitive Receptors
- Wildfire Health Protection
- Clean Air Center
- Vehicle Emissions Reduction
- Anti-Idling Requirements
- Public Transit Support
- Zero Emission City Equipment
- Privately-Owned Zero Emission Equipment
- Air Filtration Systems
- Low Emission City Vehicles
- Zero Emission Equipment
- Vehicle Trip Reduction Incentives
- Agency Coordination for Dust Control

## OSC-7 Energy Conservation and Efficiency

- Climate Action Plan implementation
- Per-Capita Energy Use
- PG&E Grid Resilience
- Renewable Energy
- Renewable Energy for Municipal Facilities
- All Electric Buildings
- Energy Efficient Development Decisions
- Solar Siting
- Energy Reduction Incentives

## OSC-8 Mineral Resources

- Mineral Resources Consideration
- Mining Operation
- Mineral Extraction Impact Evaluation
- Mining Reclamation

# Noise Element (N)

## N-1 Noise Sources

## N-2 Noise Exposure Reduction

- Noise Minimization
- Noise Land Use Compatibility
- Noise Measurement Methodology
- Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Exterior Noise
- Airport Noise Contours
- Exterior and Interior Noise Levels
- Downtown Area Noise Standards
- Isabel Neighborhood Noise Standards
- Construction Noise Minimization
- Site Design Noise Mitigation
- Noise-Sensitive Development
- Noise Mitigation in Permit Review
- Noise Attenuation Measures
- Sound Walls
- Ground Borne Vibrations
- Noise Insulation Materials
- Noise Attenuation Programs

## N-3 Transportation Noise

- Federal and State Noise Regulation
- Transportation Noise
- Truck Noise
- Roadway Noise
- Transit System Noise Quantification
- Bus Noise

## N-4 Mechanical and Short-term Noise

- Industrial and Commercial Noise
- Short-term Noise Events
- Noise Exemptions
- Noise Ordinance Update

# Safety Element (S)

## S-1 Emergency and Disaster Preparedness

- Emergency Operations Plan
- Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Public Education
- Community Resilience Hubs
- Emergency Communications
- Emergency Alerts
- Natural Hazard Mitigation
- Interjurisdictional Coordination
- Evacuation Route Maintenance
- Evacuation Route Coordination
- Community Emergency Response Team
- Emergency Preparedness
- Emergency Warning Mechanisms
- Evacuation Study
- Evacuation Access
- Evacuation Route Publicity
- Emergency Awareness
- Hazard Risk Information
- Emergency Mock Exercises
- Emergency Preparedness Activities
- Hazard Information
- Resilient Development
- Risk Reduction for Plans
- Risk Reduction for New Development
- Two Evacuation Routes

## S-2 Police Service

- Law Enforcement Review
- Law Enforcement Coordination
- Police Department Staffing
- Crime Prevention Information
- Crime Rates
- Crime Prevention Programs

## S-3 Urban Fire Protection

- Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department
- Coordinated Fire Protection
- Fire Fighting Equipment and Staffing
- Mutual Aid Agreements
- Fire Department Performance
- Fire Protection Coordination
- Fire Station Sites
- Fire Apparatus Roadway Access
- Water Supply for Firefighting
- Fire Flows
- Addresses and Signage
- Fire Inspections
- Fire Department Staffing
- Future Fire Station Locations

## S-4 Wildfires

- Fire Hazard Mapping
- Fire Hazard Development Review
- Fire Hazard Development Parameters
- Wildfire Hazard Area Development Parameters
- Rebuilding After Wildfire
- Fire Safety Plan
- Wildland-Urban Interface
- PG&E Wildfire Resistant Landscaping
- Wildland-Urban Interface Code
- Wildland-Urban Interface Development Review
- Defensible Space
- Post-wildfire Agricultural Support
- Debris and Brush Clearing

## S-5 Seismic and Geologic Hazards

- Geologic Hazard Mapping
- Geotechnical Investigations for Private Development
- New Construction on Faults
- Geotechnical Investigations for Critical Facilities

- Utility Lines Across Faults
- Erosion and Slope Failure
- Erosion Prevention
- Expansive Soils
- High Shrink-Swell Potential Soils
- Registered Geologist
- Setback Requirements
- Unreinforced Masonry Buildings

## S-6 Flooding and Inundation

- Floodway Modifications
- Development in Floodplains
- Development in 100-year Flood Zone
- Critical Facility Prohibition in Flood Zone
- Public and Private Services in 100-year Flood Zone
- Essential Facilities
- Storm Drain Blockage
- Flood Emergency Services
- Living Arroyos Program
- Regional Flood Risk Coordination
- Floodproofing Services
- Floodplain Management Training
- Creek Restoration Funding
- Evacuation Plan for Inundation Areas
- Funding for Dam Inspections
- Disaster Relief for Inundation

## S-7 Drought

- Rainwater Retention
- Water-efficient Landscaping
- Greywater Systems
- Low Water Agricultural Techniques
- Water Conservation Agency Coordination
- Water Conservation Measures

## S-8 Severe Weather and Extreme Temperatures

- Utility Undergrounding Funding
- Cooling Centers
- Energy Reduction Techniques
- Landscaping with Native Vegetation
- Electrical Grid Agency Coordination
- Solar Energy
- Vulnerable Neighborhoods Extreme Heat Risk Reduction
- Cooling Center Promotion
- Public Facility Severe Weather Resiliency
- Extreme Heat Notification Agency Coordination
- Heat-resistant Farming Techniques
- Wellness Checks
- Heat Pumps
- Tree Maintenance
- Extreme Heat Action Plan Coordination
- Mobile Cooling Centers

## S-9 Hazardous Materials

- Residual Repositories
- Hazardous Waste Management Facility Location
- Hazardous Materials Transport
- Hazardous Material Transportation Coordination
- Hazardous Waste Emergency Response Plan
- Environmental Investigation
- Hazardous Waste Reduction
- Hazardous Material Release Investigation
- Reuse and Recycling Post-disaster
- Hazardous Material Processing and Siting
- Hazardous Waste Disposal

## S-10 Airport Safety

- Development Requirements in Airport Vicinity

# Economic Development (ED)

(*under development*)

# Public Services Policy Options

The Public Services Element policy topics for GPAC consideration are:

- Childcare
- Healthy Food Access
- Seniors and Aging Adults

The above Public Services policy topics have been created based on input previously received from the Committee and ongoing GPAC discussions.

The following Imagine Livermore 2045 may be useful to support this discussion:

- General Plan Existing Conditions Report: Public Services

## Childcare

Childcare facilities are important components of the community. Affordable and high-quality childcare services that are equitably distributed throughout the city allow parents, grandparents, and guardians to work and contribute to the local economy. Childcare facilities come in many forms, in home (both small and large) or in dedicated centers that are either public or private or provided by companies. Childcare facilities are regulated by the State and must meet certain zoning standards to receive applicable permits. The City is committed to providing childcare facilities within the City Limits. The City has adopted a Social and Human Service Facility Fee for new residential and commercial development to fund childcare, community care, and senior services. Recognizing the ongoing need to address this challenge, the GPAC requested that the General Plan Update bolster the existing childcare policies and actions.

Policy support for childcare could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

Goal: *Ensure an adequate range and supply of childcare services to meet the needs of all Livermore residents.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Support the provision of childcare programs and facilities to meet the needs of children of all abilities, incomes, and backgrounds.
B. Policy Option B: Encourage new multifamily, public, office, and industrial projects above a minimum size to include space for childcare.
C. Policy Option C: Encourage public and private agencies and employers to provide childcare services and facilities.

DRAFT

D. Policy Option D: Encourage housing developers to include units that support the operation of licensed family childcare home providers.

## Healthy Food Access

The accessibility, availability, and affordability of healthy and varied food options in the community increases the likelihood that residents will have a balanced and nutritious diet. A diet composed of nutritious foods, in combination with an active lifestyle, can reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer, and diabetes and is essential to maintaining a healthy body weight and preventing obesity. Low-income and underserved areas often have a limited number of stores that sell healthy foods. People living farther away from grocery stores are less likely to access healthy food options on a regular basis and thus more likely to consume foods which are readily available at convenience stores and fast-food outlets. In addition, addressing fresh and healthy food in the General Plan will reinforce the importance of these topics to Livermore's identity.

Policy support for healthy food access could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

Goal: *Support access for all residents to important community health amenities.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Remove regulatory and physical barriers to healthy food retailers and farmers' markets to improve community access to healthy foods.
B. Policy Option B: Encourage new residential development to include community gardens, rooftop gardens, and places to grow fresh fruits and vegetables.
C. Policy Option C: Promote the planting of home vegetable/fruit gardens.
D. Policy Option D: Remove regulatory barriers to food production on institutional/public land.
E. Policy Option E: Establish educational programs through the library and promote other local programs that educate residents about local food production and healthy food preparation.

## Planning for Various stages of life: Seniors and Aging Adults

In 2020, approximately 16 percent of Alameda County residents were 65 and over. The California Department of Finance estimates that by 2045 the 65 and over age group in Alameda County will grow to 30 percent of the total population.[1] Residents 65 and older

[1] https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/

DRAFT

can benefit from dedicated programming and policies to ensure that seniors can age in Livermore with dignity, independence, and connection to the wider community.

Active adults whose children are now grown and no longer living in the same household are commonly referred to as empty nesters. Most people become empty nesters between the ages of 40 and 60. Many are still working, and some experience newfound financial freedom since they're no longer paying for food, clothing, childcare and other costs related to raising children.

The World Health Organization developed a framework to help jurisdictions foster age friendly cities to assist aging adults "to live longer and healthier lives."[2] Cities that are age friendly facilitate safe travel, active lifestyles, reduce social isolation, and housing that meets the needs of seniors. Some jurisdictions choose to create an Age Friendly Action Plan to establish policy direction aimed at improving the daily lives of older adults.

Policy support for seniors and aging adults could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

Goal: *Deliver public services and facilities that serve the needs of seniors, are age friendly, and allow residents to age in place.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Encourage universal design in new residential development.
B. Policy Option B: Create an Age Friendly Action Plan to work toward Livermore becoming an age friendly city.
C. Policy Option C: Collaborate with private, nonprofit, faith-based and public community service organizations to offer support for caregivers of seniors and people with disabilities.
D. Policy Option D: Promote policies, programs, services, and public infrastructure improvements to ensure that older adults can age in place while feeling valued and supported.
E. Policy Option E: Provide regular and timely communication to seniors and aging adults about the services, programs, and other opportunities available to these groups of people.
F. Policy Option F: Support volunteer programs that connect seniors with the broader population to reduce isolation and utilize the depth of skills and experience of aging adults.

[2] https://www.who.int/activities/creating-age-friendly-cities-and-communities

DRAFT

# Infrastructure Policy Options

The Infrastructure Element policy topic for GPAC consideration is:

- Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization

The above Infrastructure policy topic has been created based on input previously received from the Committee and ongoing GPAC discussions.

## Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization

The City of Livermore owns, operates, and maintains over $3 billion worth of public infrastructure. This includes streets, sidewalks, traffic signals, streetlights, parks, landscaped areas, buildings, storm drains, water system, sewer system, recycled water system, airport, and golf courses. The City is currently in the process of developing an Asset Management Program for General Fund Assets which is aimed at fully understanding the long-term impacts and costs associated with this public infrastructure. This program will include an inventory of the City's assets, estimates of the remaining life and replacements costs, prioritization methods, and other related components.[3]

In the shorter-term time frame, the City of Livermore plans for infrastructure upgrades and improvements for a five-year period in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CIP is both a fiscal and planning tool which identifies which infrastructure projects the City plans to undertake, provides a schedule for the projects, and identifies funding sources. The CIP includes projects necessary to support the implementation of the General Plan, Specific Plans, and Neighborhood Plan areas. When identifying infrastructure projects to include in the CIP, the City applies a number of considerations:

- Consistency with the General Plan.
- Consistency with City Council adopted master plans.
- Consistency with other formal long-range plans adopted by Council.
- Recommendations of the Council and Commissions.
- Input from residents and business owners.
- State, Federal, or other legal mandates.
- Potential impact to the operating budget.
- Benefit to the community.
- The need to mitigate health or safety issues.

[3] https://www.livermoreca.gov/departments/public-works/asset-management

DRAFT

The General Plan Update could add some additional guidance for prioritizing infrastructure improvements given the demand for improvements exceeds the funding available for these projects.

Policy support for infrastructure improvement prioritization could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

Goal: *Plan for infrastructure improvements using a fiscally sustainable and equitable approach.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Prioritize infrastructure improvements in underserved communities.
B. Policy Option B: Undertake community outreach to solicit input on which projects to include in the Capital Improvement Plan.
C. Policy Option C: Create a quantifiable scoring system to identify the highest priority infrastructure improvements.
D. Policy Option D: Establish a set of guiding principles, such as resiliency, sustainability, safety, etc, to guide the development of the infrastructure improvement scoring system.

DRAFT

# Summary of GPAC Feedback on the Public Services and Infrastructure Policy Options

At the September 25, 2024, General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting, the project team gave an overview of policy options for some topics that will be addressed in the Public Services Element and Infrastructure Element. The policy options do not represent the complete set of topics that will be covered in these Elements but focus on topics that the GPAC has previously discussed and indicated interest in. The community and GPAC will have the opportunity to review and comment on the complete draft Public Services and Infrastructure Elements as part of the Draft General Plan, which is anticipated to be published in Summer 2025.

A summary of the GPAC feedback on the policy options is below. The policy option topics included:

- Public Services Element
  - Childcare
  - Healthy Food Access
  - Seniors and Aging Adults
- Infrastructure Element
  - Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization

## Childcare

- Clarify Policy Option A: "Support the provision of childcare programs and facilities to meet the needs of children of all abilities, incomes, and backgrounds."
  - List agencies and/ organizations to collaborate with.
  - Add some concrete actions the City can take to support childcare provision, e.g. tax breaks.
  - Consider changing "support" to "incentivize."
  - Include actions associated with this policy, e.g. waive permitting fees for childcare facilities.
- Allow developers to build spaces that could have a dual purpose in case a childcare facility is not needed at that building.
- Encourage facilities that accommodate both aging adults and childcare.
- Create an inventory of underutilized properties that could be used for childcare.
- Encourage childcare programs to support working families.

- Cater childcare policies to families of all incomes and provide further support for lower income families who cannot afford childcare, e.g. taxpayer subsidized childcare.
- Explore innovative childcare facilities and programs that integrate STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) into early education and childcare.

## Healthy Food Access

- Focus the goal on just healthy food access instead of all "community health amenities."
- Better define healthy food in policy options.
- Add a policy to encourage schools to allocate a percentage of the food be purchased from local farms and increase the percentage each year.
- Encourage community gardens where people work collaboratively together to grow food.
- Support/incentivize Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) programs.
- Add a policy that addresses affordable water supply for community gardens and planting home vegetable/ fruit gardens.
- Identify potential locations for food pantry operations in Livermore.
- Add a policy that allows property owners to replace mature trees with fruit trees.
- Encourage healthy food retailers to be in locations that need better healthy food access, e.g. Northeast Livermore.
- Incentivize farmers markets to operate year-round by potentially providing funding to farmers market management companies.
- Explore potential facilities that can house farmers market in weather-proof stalls on public land.
- Explore policies that connect access to transit with access to healthy food (e.g. farmers market, local grocery stores, food pantries).
- Collaborate with other jurisdictions in the Tri-Valley area to encourage healthy food access in the region.

## Seniors and Aging Adults

- Define "Age-friendly City" in Policy Option B according to World Health Organization (WHO).
- Clarify the specific design elements of "universal design" in Policy Option A: "Encourage universal design in new residential development." E.g. encourage single-story townhomes and limited staircases for certain projects.
- Streamline the production of affordable senior housing.
    - Encourage ADUs in accordance with the Housing Element.
- Clarify Policy Option C to acknowledge that seniors may also have disabilities: "Collaborate with private, nonprofit, faith-based and public community service organizations to offer support for caregivers of seniors and people with disabilities."

## Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization

- Add "environmentally and climate sustainable" to the goal: "*Plan for infrastructure improvements using a fiscally sustainable and equitable approach.*"
- Include City-owned buildings as part of the City's infrastructure.

    - Add an action to create an inventory of City-owned buildings.
    - Consider the future needs/expansion of City buildings when planning for infrastructure improvements.
- Need to make space available for non-profits to operate in Livermore.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements that improve community safety.
- Add a policy that addresses agricultural resilience as agricultural is part of the city's infrastructure.
- Expand Policy Option A**:** "Prioritize infrastructure improvements in underserved communities" to prioritize sewer connection to vineyards.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements in older neighborhoods.
- Increase the potable water supply through the use of recycled water.
- Specify the timeline for infrastructure improvement.

# Mobility Policy Options

The Mobility Element policy topics for GPAC consideration are:

- Vision Zero
- Transit-Oriented Communities/Mobility Hubs
- Connectivity Across Barriers
- Transportation Technology and Innovation

The above Mobility policy topics have been created based on input previously received from the Committee and ongoing GPAC discussions.

The following resources may be useful to support this discussion:

- General Plan Existing Conditions Report: Circulation
- Livermore Active Transportation Plan
- Livermore Roadway Safety Plan
- Vision Zero Plan

## Vision Zero

The City of Livermore is currently in the process of developing a Vision Zero Plan and adopted a Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) in December of 2023. Vision Zero is based on the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Safe System Approach for roadway safety. The guiding principles are: death and serious injuries are unacceptable, humans make mistakes, humans are vulnerable, responsibility is shared, safety is proactive, and redundancy is crucial as shown in Figure 1. Vision Zero aims to reduce traffic-related deaths to zero. This concept is slightly different than designing complete streets, or developing a transportation network that is accessible and comfortable to all ages and abilities.

A Vision Zero Plan and the LRSP, should be consistent with a General Plan Vision Zero policy framework. There is an existing policy in the General Plan to improve the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians and provide safe mobility options for all users (CIR-2.3). The General Plan Update provides an opportunity to provide policy direction for Vision Zero planning and implementation.

Policy support for Vision Zero could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

**Goal**: *Achieve a transportation system that prioritizes user safety.*

**Figure 1: FHWA's Safe System Approach**




The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. **Policy Option A**: Prioritize pedestrian and bicycle improvements that increase connectivity and safety over speed and convenience for cars when designing roadway and intersection improvements.
B. **Policy Option B**: Evaluate opportunities to reduce speed limits on residential streets.

## Transit-Oriented Communities/Mobility Hubs

Transit-oriented communities (TOC) are centered around a transit station which creates compact, mixed-use communities where people enjoy easy access to jobs and services, whereas Mobility Hubs are places in a community that bring together public transit, bike share, car share and other mode options for people to get where they want to go without a private vehicle. Under this approach, the City, Valley Link, ACE, and LAVTA would take the lead on the development of Mobility Hubs, and individual components such as bikeshare docks would be provided by private developers as future development occurs.

The current General Plan includes a policy to provide viable alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel and collaborating with regional transit providers to situate transit stops and hubs (CIR-2.1). Additionally, the City has a policy to design and maintain a safe and interconnected pedestrian-oriented Downtown circulation system (CIR-7.1).

Policy support for transit-oriented communities and mobility hubs could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

**Goal**: *Make transit and other mode options a viable transportation option for the community.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. **Policy Option A**: Implement Mobility Hubs to within a half-mile radius of the planned Valley Link Rail Stations at Isabel Avenue and Midtown.
B. **Policy Option B**: Partner with LAVTA/ACE and other service providers to improve the existing Downtown Transit Center to create a Mobility Hub that provides interconnectivity and seamless travel to and from Downtown.

## Connectivity Across Barriers

Removing physical barriers that impede circulation can facilitate walking, biking, and connections to surrounding areas. Barriers to circulation in Livermore include the I-580 freeway, railroads, and major streets. I-580 make crossing difficult for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles and limits connectivity between neighborhoods to its north and south. Although most development during the previous General Plan occurred south of I-580, with new projects now centered around the Isabel Neighborhood Specific Plan area, Midtown and Laughlin Road focus areas, the need for improved freeway connectivity is greater than ever. The current General Plan lacks policies addressing the issue of connectivity across barriers. However, the Livermore Active Transportation Plan has a policy to establish safe crossing of barriers (ATP Policy 1.5).

Policy support to improve connectivity could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

**Goal**: *Design a multimodal transportation system that connects the community using all modes of transportation*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. **Policy Option A:** Facilitate connectivity across I-580 and SR 84 (Isabel Avenue) by improving linkages among interrelated activities across neighborhoods.
B. **Policy Option B**: Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity across I-580 through new and enhanced over and underpasses. Consider green passageways/linear parks and similar facilitates, which also function to support wildlife movement across freeway barriers.
C. **Policy Option C**: Improve connectivity between and through neighborhoods, to and from activity centers, for cyclists and pedestrians.
D. **Policy Option D**: Identify opportunities to convert the existing at-grade railroad crossings to grade separated crossings.

E. **Policy Option E**: Conduct a barrier analysis to see if other crossing improvements are needed.

## Transportation Technology and Innovation

Transportation and mobility services are constantly evolving, with emerging technologies having the potential to significantly change travel behavior and the transportation system.

### *Bicycle and Scooter Sharing Programs*

Bicycle sharing services provide short-term bicycle rentals and are typically associated with bicycle travel in busy areas (such as downtowns and business districts) and improve access to transit stations, the work place or other activity centers. Similarly, e-scooters sharing programs are gaining popularity, especially in the San Francisco Bay Area. Although these services are becoming increasingly popular in California, the current General Plan does not include any policies related to the new shared mobility-related technology.

Policy guidance for bicycle and scooter sharing programs could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

**Goal**: *Build and maintain a safe, connected, and equitable bicycle and micromobility network*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. **Policy Option A**: Implement shared mobility options in a way that maximizes the benefits without adversely affecting the communities. This could include regulating the dockless vendors to store the bikes and scooters in an assigned location.
B. **Policy Option B**: Develop standardized regulations and infrastructure standards for micromobility operators to facilitate safety and streamlined implementation of these programs.
C. **Policy Option C**: Require micromobility devices to be equally distributed in the rights-of-way into economically disadvantaged areas, provide discounts or subsidies for low-income users based on income qualifications.
D. **Policy Option D**: Require shared mobility operators to implement pilot programs and demonstrate that the shared mobility service maximizes the benefits without adversely affecting the communities.
E. **Policy Option E**: Prohibit commercial shared micromobility services from the public right-of-way.

*Facilitate Electric Vehicles*

With incentives from the government, more Californians are moving towards cleaner, alternative energy sources for their vehicles to reduce their impact on the natural environment. AB 1236 (2015) and AB 970 (2021), require cities and counties to adopt streamlined permitting procedures for electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS), including a streamlining ordinance and checklist. Currently, there are no policies in the General Plan to regulate and support the development of EVCS. The Climate Action Plan (CAP) has adopted a strategy to facilitate the transition to electric vehicles. To be consistent with CAP, the General Plan should include a policy to support the expansion of EV charging stations and infrastructure.

Policy support for electric vehicles could be located under this type of goal in the General Plan:

**Goal**: *Foster a transportation system that encourages emerging transportation technologies in service of City and community climate action goals*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. **Policy Option A**: Support the expansion of electric vehicle charging stations and infrastructure.
B. **Policy Option B**: Explore establishing standards for installing EV chargers in new residential and nonresidential development that exceeds state minimum requirements or otherwise maximize EV charging opportunities.
C. **Policy Option C**: Collaborate with local and regional partners to provide incentives, rebates, and education on zero-emission vehicles and charging/fueling infrastructure.
D. **Policy Option D**: Partner with community-based organizations to develop a zero emission vehicle car-share pilot program. The program should prioritize convenience and affordability for lower-income communities in Livermore.

# Summary of GPAC Feedback on the Mobility Policy Options

At the October 9, 2024, General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting, the project team gave an overview of policy options for some topics that will be addressed in the Mobility Element. The policy options do not represent the complete set of topics that will be covered in this Element but focus on topics that the GPAC has previously discussed and indicated interest in. The community and GPAC will have the opportunity to review and comment on the complete draft Mobility Element as part of the Draft General Plan, which is anticipated to be published in Summer 2025.

A summary of the GPAC feedback on the policy options is below. The policy option topics included:

- Mobility Element
    - Vision Zero
    - Transit-Oriented Communities/Mobility Hubs
    - Connectivity Across Barriers
    - Transportation Technology and Innovation
        - Bicycle and Scooter Sharing
        - Facilitate Electric Vehicles

## Vision Zero

- Support for bike lanes that separate bicyclists from high traffic areas.
- Implement bicycle improvements on East Avenue to increase bicycle safety.
- Support for Policy Option B, “Evaluate opportunities to reduce speed limits on residential streets.”
- Encourage redesigning older roads to be safer for cyclists.
- Educate roadway users about ways to improve roadway safety.

## Transit-Oriented Communities/ Mobility Hubs

- Expand policy options from addressing traditional transit centers/ mobility hubs to include a range of other places including libraries, schools, parks, and other activity centers.
    - Consider keeping the language broad by using “any new emerging mobility center” or “a concentration of uses.”

- Partner with local tourist-serving businesses to offer mobility/transit passes to visitors.

## Connectivity Across Barriers

- Support for policy options A through C:
    - Policy Option A: Facilitate connectivity across I-580 and SR 84 (Isabel Avenue) by improving linkages among interrelated activities across neighborhoods.
    - Policy Option B: Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity across I-580 through new and enhanced over and underpasses. Consider green passageways/linear parks and similar facilities, which also function to support wildlife movement across freeway barriers.
    - Policy Option C: Improve connectivity between and through neighborhoods, to and from activity centers, for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Okay to keep Policy Option D "Identify opportunities to convert the existing at-grade railroad crossings to grade separated crossings," but converting existing at-grade railroad crossings should not be the priority.
- Consider partially removing barriers such as a sound wall for the development of walkways between blocks/neighborhoods.

## Bicycle and Scooter Sharing Programs

- Include vehicle sharing in the policy options.
- Add a policy to support public scooter and bike charging stations and infrastructure.
- Balance between providing bicycle and scooter ride sharing with limiting area and location that the bikes and scooters are stored to prevent littering.
    - Limit bicycle rentals to Isabel and Midtown.
- Support for Policy Option E: Prohibit commercial shared micromobility services from the public right-of-way.

## Facilitate Electric Vehicles

- Plan for publicly accessible infrastructure for electric bicycle and scooter charging.
- Should micromobility devices ever locate in Livermore, ensure that these devices are not left in the public right-of-way to avoid safety hazards.
- Support for the City proactively planning for micromobility so that the City can carefully manage its implementation.

## Other

- Goal suggestion: "Achieve a system that accounts for emerging transportation technologies."
- Consider emerging technologies like delivery drones and air taxis in the General Plan Update.

**Example Draft Policies Incorporating Planning Commission Feedback**

Previously, Planning Commission broadly recommended General Plan policy language that all the elements should remain at a higher level of abstraction and detailed strategies should be incorporated into the appropriate implementation documents. The purpose of this attachment is to illustrate how the General Plan project team interpreted Planning Commission feedback provided at the December 17, 2024, meeting for a sub-set of the policy options related to:

- Infrastructure
  - Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization
- Public Services
  - Childcare
  - Healthy Food Access
  - Seniors and Aging Adults
- Mobility
  - Transit-Oriented Communities/Mobility Hubs
  - Bicycle and Scooter Sharing Programs

The following items accompany each example policy topic:

- Original policy options presented to the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC).
- Summary of GPAC feedback on the policy options.
- Example draft policies that incorporate GPAC and Planning Commission (PC) feedback.

## Infrastructure Improvements Prioritization

### 1. Original GPAC Policy Options

**Goal***: Plan for infrastructure improvements using a fiscally sustainable and equitable approach*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Prioritize infrastructure improvements in underserved communities.
B. Policy Option B: Undertake community outreach to solicit input on which projects to include in the Capital Improvement Plan.
C. Policy Option C: Create a quantifiable scoring system to identify the highest priority infrastructure improvements.

DRAFT

D. Policy Option D: Establish a set of guiding principles, such as resiliency, sustainability, safety, etc, to guide the development of the infrastructure improvement scoring system.

**2. GPAC Feedback**

- Add "environmentally and climate sustainable" to the goal: "*Plan for infrastructure improvements using a fiscally sustainable and equitable approach.*"
- Include City-owned buildings as part of the City's infrastructure.
  - Add an action to create an inventory of City-owned buildings.
  - Consider the future needs/expansion of City buildings when planning for infrastructure improvements.
- Need to make space available for non-profits to operate in Livermore.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements that improve community safety.
- Add a policy that addresses agricultural resilience as part of the city's infrastructure.
- Expand Policy Option A**:** "Prioritize infrastructure improvements in underserved communities" to prioritize sewer connection to vineyards.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements in older neighborhoods.
- Increase the potable water supply through the use of recycled water.
- Specify the timeline for infrastructure improvement.

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC and Previous PC Feedback on Policy Approach**

i. Prioritize infrastructure improvements though a a consistent and transparent decision-making process.

ii. Follow the guiding principles of resiliency, sustainability, safety, and environmental justice to prioritize infrastructure improvements.

iii. Prioritize the extension of sewer lines into South Livermore agricultural areas to support agricultural uses.

## Childcare

**1. Original GPAC Policy Options**

**Goal**: *Ensure an adequate range and supply of childcare services to meet the needs of all Livermore residents.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Support the provision of childcare programs and facilities to meet the needs of children of all abilities, incomes, and backgrounds.

DRAFT

B. Policy Option B: Encourage new multifamily, public, office, and industrial projects above a minimum size to include space for childcare.
C. Policy Option C: Encourage public and private agencies and employers to provide childcare services and facilities.
D. Policy Option D: Encourage housing developers to include units that support the operation of licensed family childcare home providers.

**2. GPAC Feedback**

- Clarify Policy Option A: "Support the provision of childcare programs and facilities to meet the needs of children of all abilities, incomes, and backgrounds."
    - List agencies and/ organizations to collaborate with.
    - Add some concrete actions the City can take to support childcare provision, e.g. tax breaks.
    - Consider changing "support" to "incentivize."
    - Include actions associated with this policy, e.g. waive permitting fees for childcare facilities.
- Allow developers to build spaces that could have a dual purpose in case a childcare facility is not needed at that building.
- Encourage facilities that accommodate both aging adults and childcare.
- Create an inventory of underutilized properties that could be used for childcare.
- Encourage childcare programs to support working families.
- Cater childcare policies to families of all incomes and provide further support for lower income families who cannot afford childcare, e.g. taxpayer subsidized childcare.
- Explore innovative childcare facilities and programs that integrate STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) into early education and childcare.

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC and Previous PC Feedback on Policy Approach**

i. Plan for childcare facilities to meet the needs of the community.
ii. Combine childcare facilities with other land uses, services, and amenities to improve opportunities, access, and availability of such facilities.
iii. Collaborate with agency partners, Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District and Livermore Area Recreation and Park District, to provide affordable and quality childcare program options throughout the community.

DRAFT

## Healthy Food Access

### 1. Original GPAC Policy Options

**Goal**: *Support access for all residents to important community health amenities*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

1. Policy Option A: Remove regulatory and physical barriers to healthy food retailers and farmers' markets to improve community access to healthy foods.
2. Policy Option B: Encourage new residential development to include community gardens, rooftop gardens, and places to grow fresh fruits and vegetables.
3. Policy Option C: Promote the planting of home vegetable/fruit gardens.
4. Policy Option D: Remove regulatory barriers to food production on institutional/public land.
5. Policy Option E: Establish educational programs through the library and promote other local programs that educate residents about local food production and healthy food preparation.

### 2. GPAC Feedback

- Focus the goal on just healthy food access instead of all "community health amenities."
- Better define healthy food in policy options.
- Add a policy to encourage schools to allocate a percentage of the food be purchased from local farms and increase the percentage each year.
- Encourage community gardens where people work collaboratively together to grow food.
- Support/incentivize Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) programs.
- Add a policy that addresses affordable water supply for community gardens and planting home vegetable/ fruit gardens.
- Identify potential locations for food pantry operations in Livermore.
- Add a policy that allows property owners to replace mature trees with fruit trees.
- Encourage healthy food retailers to be in locations that need better healthy food access, e.g. Northeast Livermore.
- Incentivize farmers markets to operate year-round by potentially providing funding to farmers market management companies.
- Explore potential facilities that can house farmers market in weather-proof stalls on public land.
- Explore policies that connect access to transit with access to healthy food (e.g. farmers market, local grocery stores, food pantries).

DRAFT

- Collaborate with other jurisdictions in the Tri-Valley area to encourage healthy food access in the region.

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC and Previous PC Feedback on Policy Approach**

i. Support Community Supported Agriculture programs that allow Livermore residents to purchase locally grown food.
ii. Expand community garden programs and increase community connections.
iii. Collaborate with other jurisdictions in the Tri-Valley area to encourage healthy food access in the region.
iv. Provide affordable water to users who grow local fruit and vegetables.
v. Incentivize the year-round operation of the Downtown Farmers' Market.
vi. Identify locations for food pantry operations in Livermore.

## Seniors and Aging Adults

**1. Original GPAC Policy Options**

**Goal**: *Deliver public services and facilities that serve the needs of seniors, are age friendly, and allow residents to age in place.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Encourage universal design in new residential development.
B. Policy Option B: Create an Age Friendly Action Plan to work toward Livermore becoming an age friendly city.
C. Policy Option C: Collaborate with private, nonprofit, faith-based and public community service organizations to offer support for caregivers of seniors and people with disabilities.
D. Policy Option D: Promote policies, programs, services, and public infrastructure improvements to ensure that older adults can age in place while feeling valued and supported.
E. Policy Option E: Provide regular and timely communication to seniors and aging adults about the services, programs, and other opportunities available to these groups of people.
F. Policy Option F: Support volunteer programs that connect seniors with the broader population to reduce isolation and utilize the depth of skills and experience of aging adults.

DRAFT

**2. GPAC Feedback**

- Define "Age-friendly City" in Policy Option B according to World Health Organization (WHO).
- Clarify the specific design elements of "universal design" in Policy Option A: "Encourage universal design in new residential development." E.g. encourage single-story townhomes and limited staircases for certain projects.
- Streamline the production of affordable senior housing.
  - Encourage ADUs in accordance with the Housing Element.
- Clarify Policy Option C to acknowledge that seniors may also have disabilities: "Collaborate with private, nonprofit, faith-based and public community service organizations to offer support for caregivers of seniors and people with disabilities."

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC Previous PC Feedback on Policy Approach**

i. Implement universal design strategies, such as no steps entry and wider doorways and hallways, in new residential development.
ii. Become and remain an age-friendly city to accommodate various stages of life.
iii. Increase and strengthen the availability of existing services in coordination with senior service providers.

## Transit-Oriented Communities/Mobility Hubs

**1. Original GPAC Policy Options**

**Goal**: *Make transit and other mode options a viable transportation option for the community.*

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Implement Mobility Hubs to within a half-mile radius of the planned Valley Link Rail Stations at Isabel Avenue and Midtown.
B. Policy Option B: Partner with LAVTA/ACE and other service providers to improve the existing Downtown Transit Center to create a Mobility Hub that provides interconnectivity and seamless travel to and from Downtown.

**2. GPAC Feedback**

- Expand policy options from addressing traditional transit centers/ mobility hubs to include a range of other places including libraries, schools, parks, and other activity centers.
  - Consider keeping the language broad by using "any new emerging mobility center" or "a concentration of uses."

DRAFT

- Partner with local tourist-serving businesses to offer mobility/transit passes to visitors.

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC Previous PC Feedback on Policy Approach**

i. Bring public transit, bike share, car share, and other mode options together near activity centers , including, Civic Center Library, the National Laboratories, employment centers, Downtown and future Valley Link stations.

## Bicycle and Scooter Sharing Programs

**1. Original GPAC Policy Options**

**Goal**: *Build and maintain a safe, connected, and equitable bicycle and micromobility network*.

The General Plan could include all, none, or some of the following options:

A. Policy Option A: Implement shared mobility options in a way that maximizes the benefits without adversely affecting the communities. This could include regulating the dockless vendors to store the bikes and scooters in an assigned location.
B. Policy Option B: Develop standardized regulations and infrastructure standards for micromobility operators to facilitate safety and streamlined implementation of these programs.
C. Policy Option C: Require micromobility devices to be equally distributed in the rights-of-way into economically disadvantaged areas, provide discounts or subsidies for low-income users based on income qualifications.
D. Policy Option D: Require shared mobility operators to implement pilot programs and demonstrate that the shared mobility service maximizes the benefits without adversely affecting the communities.
E. Policy Option E: Prohibit commercial shared micromobility services from the public right-of-way.

**2. GPAC Feedback**

- Include vehicle sharing in the policy options.
- Add a policy to support public scooter and bike charging stations and infrastructure.
- Balance between providing bicycle and scooter ride sharing with limiting area and location that the bikes and scooters are stored to prevent littering.
    - Limit bicycle rentals to Isabel and Midtown.
- Support for Policy Option E: Prohibit commercial shared micromobility services from the public right-of-way.

DRAFT

**3. Example Draft Policy Incorporating GPAC and PC Feedback to Date**

i. Shared micromobility services, such as shared bicycles, scooters, and other active transportation modes for public use must use the public right-of-way in an orderly and safe manner that limits disruptions from these devices.

DRAFT

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 7.1**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Planning Staff Responses to Matters Initiated by the Planning Commission.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

## SUMMARY

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Planning Staff Response to Matters Initiated By Planning Commission

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

**Planning Staff Response to Matters Initiated By Planning Commission - 02-04-2025**

| Entitlement | Description | Staff Response |
|---|---|---|
| MIP24-009 | At the October 17, 2023 meeting, Chair Leary stated he noticed the annual resurfacing / slurry seal program was underway and asked about opportunities for restriping. | Re-striping has been incorporated into the annual resurfacing / slurry seal program. |
| MIP24-014 | At the July 2, 2024 meeting, Commissioner Dunbar suggested consideration of design standards related to sidewalks and rolled curbs. | City's current design standard includes various types of sidewalks. Staff will consider including rolled curbs in the next round of standard plan revisions. |
| MIP24-018 | At the October 15, 2024 meeting, Commissioner Anderson said some of the Stockmen's Park Statue lighting was out. | Maintenance staff were able to get the statue lights repaired under warranty from the manufacturer. Staff will monitor the lights to ensure they operate properly. |
| MIP25-001 | At the December 3, 2024 meeting, Commissioner Anderson asked that Stockmen's Park lights need to be adjusted to match sundown and sunrise. | On 1/21/25, staff verified the timer turns the lights on at 4:30pm and turns off at 7:00am. |
| MIP25-005 | At the December 17, 2024 meeting, it was mentioned to include directional pedestrian ramps into future ATP Design Standards and/or other applicable city standards. | Noted. Staff will consider including directional pedestrian ramps into the design standards during the upcoming comprehensive ATP Update and the next round of standard plan revisions. |

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT** **ITEM NO. 8.1**

**DATE:** February 4, 2025

**TO:** Chairperson and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Steve Riley, Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Supplemental materials received prior to the meeting.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

## SUMMARY

These materials were posted online and made available to the public at the same time that they were distributed to the Planning Commission.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.1 | Approval of the March 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.<br><br>Materials: 03-19-24 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes |
| 3.2 | Approval of the July 16, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.<br><br>Materials: 007-16-24 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes |
| 3.3 | Approval of the August 6, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.<br><br>Materials: 08-06-24 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes |
| 3.4 | Approval of the November 19, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.<br><br>Materials: 11-19-24 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes |
| 3.5 | Approval of the December 17, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.<br><br>Materials: 12-17-24 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes |

## DISCUSSION

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 03-19-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
2. 07-16-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
3. 08-6-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes

4. 11-19-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes
5. 12-17-2024 Revised Draft Meeting Minutes

Prepared by: Michele Donley
Division Clerk

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**MARCH 19, 2024**

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Jacob Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR - NONE**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider Appeal (APL) 24-001 - Greenville Community Charging Depot, 151 Greenville Road - Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 23-004.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopt a resolution denying Appeal 24-001 and affirming staff's approval of Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 23-004.

Senior Assistant City Attorney Kim Cilley provided a summary of the matters for consideration before the Planning Commission.

Sustainability Program Manager Tricia Pontau presented the staff report.

Kelilah Federman, representing the appellant, summarized the grounds for the appeal.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Bruce Caron,** provided a comment.

**J.P. Ross,** provided a comment.

**Lien Dinh,** provided a comment.

There were no more speakers, and the public comment period was closed.

In response to Commission questions, Sustainability Program Manager Tricia Pontau stated she was unaware of case law related to charging stations triggering an EIR. Senior Assistant City Attorney explained the need to refile the notice of exemption.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Ms. Dinh explained that the proposed chargers were for medium and heavy-duty trucks and were higher powered chargers. She discussed the existing charging depot in Long Beach.

Commissioner Kronzak questioned the significant and adverse impact of potential fire risk. Will Mitchell, Executive Vice President of Sales and Operations of Forum Mobility, explained quality control and inspections for the proposed chargers; 24/7 personnel trained to monitor and mitigate emergencies; onsite fire hydrants; nationally rated cells used in vehicles; minimal incidents; and facility design reducing potential for the spread of fire. Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the potential of incidents was no greater or less than home chargers or e-bikes.

Ms. Federman provided a response to the comments.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Ms. Federman stated they were not comparing the proposed project to any other sites, rather had determined health and public safety risk of fire associated with the development.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Ms. Federman stated the evidence presented supported the potential of catastrophic fires from lithium-ion batteries. She stated the scale and number of chargers in the proposed project would result in a public health and safety impact.

In response to Chair Anderson, Ms. Federman confirmed her argument that lithium batteries caught fire creating a health and safety issue and should therefore be discretionary. Chair Anderson stated the Planning Commission was tasked with determining whether lithium-ion batteries should trigger a discretionary decision.

Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko questioned the assessment of safety made by the appellant's experts and indicated she did not see any modeling nor calculations. Ms. Federman stated her team included experts in hazardous materials and air

quality and quantified the level of fire risk associated with the project. She stated it was the City's duty to determine the project was safe, therefore they were requesting and environmental impact report. Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko indicated she did not understand the basis for the safety risk.

Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the appellant was aware that CEQA was a discovery law designed to produce transparency in the environmental reporting process, exempted ministerial projects; and that State law trumped local ordinance. Ms. Federman suggested Government Code Section 65850.7 might require a use permit and stated the appeal only addressed the proposed charging depot. Commissioner Kronzak expressed concern that if the appeal was upheld, every other project would require rereview. Ms. Federman suggested a precedent would not be set.

Assistant City Attorney Cilley summarized the three options before the Commission.

Commissioner Dunbar discussed his familiarity with the electric vehicles and lithium-ion batteries. He stated he could not make the findings for a health and safety impact.

Commissioner Leary concurred that the health and safety impact finding could not be made; discussed Government Code Section 65850.7 indicating EV chargers were administrative and non-discretionary; reiterated CEQA Section 15268 outlining ministerial projects were exempt from requirements of CEQA; and reminded the Commission that the project was conditioned for the installation to be in accordance with Electrical and Building Codes. He indicated support for denying the appeal.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Acting Planning Manager Steve Riley estimated 50 plus staff hours had been expended on the appeal. Commissioner Kronzak expressed appreciation to staff; indicated there were no evidence that health and safety concerns were any greater or lesser than any other EV charger project; that the site plan contained adequate remediation for any event that might take place on the site; and support for denying the appeal.

Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko rejected Appeal Point 4 because the General Plan did not require use of local labor; and stated Point 3 followed the timeline requirements; Point 2 was not subject to CEQA since it was a ministerial decision; and therefore, there was no basis for Appeal Point 1, therefore, the appeal should be denied.

Chair Anderson concurred with his colleagues. He reiterated that Government Code Section 65850.7 stated EV charging stations were to be administratively approved through a non-discretionary permit. He agreed with staff's recommendation and denying the appeal.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY

COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 04-24** finding that the Greenville Community Charging Depot is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Resolution 05-24** denying Appeal APL24-001 and approving Site Plan Design Review SPDR23-004 for the Greenville Community Charging Depot.

**6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE**

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**

Commissioner Kronzak recommended the City consider adopting a resolution stating, in circumstances where Planning Commission and staff were required to exercise quasi-judicial review related to CEQA, that should an appeal be found invalid, the appellant must reimburse the City for the cost of staff time and legal expenses expended in the appeal.

Commissioner Dunbar requested a preview of the Active Transportation Plan.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 8:29pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, April 2, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**JULY 16, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1 Approval of the March 21, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.2 Approval of the June 6, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.3 Approval of the August 15, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.4 Approval of the November 7, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.5 Approval of the November 21, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

3.6 Approval of the December 5, 2023 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED ITEMS 3.1, 3.3 AND 3.5.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, COMMISSIONER DUNBAR ABSTAINING, THEY WERE NOT IN ATTENDANCE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED ITEMS 3.2.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO ABSTAINING, THEY WERE NOT IN ATTENDANCE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED ITEM 3.4.

## 4. PROJECT REVIEW – NONE.

## 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

5.1 Hearing to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing Assisted Living Residential Care Facility at 3646 East Avenue to expand its capacity from six to nine clients.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt resolutions finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) which exempts negligible expansion of use and interior alterations of existing facilities, and approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

**Planning Intern Emily Gnecco presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

In response to Commission questions, Planning Intern Gnecco explained the proposed driveway; no concerns regarding runoff; history of ADA parking; onsite parking; parking standards; and condition to retain existing landscaping.

The Commission indicated it could make the required findings.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 22-24** Finding Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003 for a Residential Care Facility to be exempt from the provisions of The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**Resolution 23-24** Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-003 for the Residential Care Facility Project.

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for a Specific Plan Amendment, Planned Development, Site Plan Design Review Modification, and Development Agreement Amendment to modify the 2017 approval for the Arroyo Vista Residential Project to increase the height of the single-family detached units from two stories to three stories, remove a pedestrian bridge requirement, and secure community benefits including pocket parks and a financial contribution.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-002, Planned Development (PD) 24-001, Specific Plan Amendment (SPPA) 24-002 and Development Agreement Amendment (DAA) 24-001, subject to conditions.

**Assistant Planner Kaitlyn Harrison presented the staff report.**

In response to Commission questions, Staff explained the aerial easement and City's maintenance responsibility; cost to maintain the bridge; Las Positas project;

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

Michael Keaney, Trumark Homes, concurred with Staff's recommendation and initially proposed conditions of approval. He indicated acceptance of the proposed conditions related to the required bench on the Arroyo Vista Trail on Zone 7 property; accessible path of travel from the new park to the trail, with the addition of a note that it be to the extent feasible. He discussed the intent to build the bridge but challenge with public-private component.

David Lund thanked staff for the explanation of the bridge issue.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Dunbar received clarification from staff that the architecture met the design standards; four-foot rail fence and removal of existing fence along the Arroyo; public trail on west side; build out of Las Positas Road; and Social Endowment Fund. He expressed concern with losing the opportunity for community connections and bike infrastructure.

Commissioner Leary confirmed that the Ranch style was compliant with Design Standards; neighborhood park requirements; funds for pedestrian bridge; Community Benefit Fund; payment for offsite trail improvements; building height increase; and electric services.

Commissioner Kronzak confirmed the affordable housing and in lieu fees; HOA enforcement of garage parking; and indicated the need to notify homeowners of Midtown development.

Vice-Chairperson Fintschenko obtained clarification on the transfer of development credit; additional conditions and caveat if unfeasible.

The applicant confirmed they were agreeable to the conditions with the caveat that Conditions 2 and 3 could be waived unless determined to be infeasible by the Community Development Director.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Staff explained the ability to waive ADA compliant connections.

Chair Anderson suggested blocks of consistent styles and discussed the need to articulate the first residence visible from public areas.

The Commission discussed the style, massing and density. The applicant offered to improve the design elements on the entry home.

Commissioner Dunbar expressed concern about access to Safeway and the need to protect the bikeway; traffic improvements and bicycle access and trail connection; truck traffic noise; and curb radius and directional curb ramps.

ON THE MOTION OF VICE-CHAIR FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 24-24** Recommending that the City Council adopt the 2024 Addendum to the 2007 Arroyo Vista Neighborhood Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, as amended in 2017 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 25-24** Recommending that the City Council approve Site Plan Design Review Modification (SPDRM) 24-002, Development Agreement Amendment (DAA) 24-001, Planned Development Rezoning (PD) 24-001, and Specific Plan Amendment (SPPA) 24-002 for the Arroyo Vista Neighborhood Development

**6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE**

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**

Commissioner Dunbar requested the trail crossing to Contractors Place be conditioned to follow the trail design guidelines.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 9:12 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 6, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Library, Community Rooms A & B, 1188 S. Livermore Avenue.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**AUGUST 6, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1188 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened and closed the public comment period.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1 Approval of the June 18, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DUNBAR AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

3.2 Approval of the July 2, 2024 Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the draft minutes.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES.

**4. PROJECT REVIEW – NONE.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider a request for a Site Plan Design Review and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to develop a vacant lot to the north of the Portola Avenue and Rincon Avenue Intersection. The project will consist of three residential buildings totaling 31 three-story townhouse style condominiums. The project includes six affordable units and four accessible units, a Class 2b bike lane, and related landscaping, parking, stormwater, and frontage improvements.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15182 (c), Projects Pursuant to a Specific Plan, and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning;

2. Adopt a resolution approving Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) 11473 – Subdivision (SUB) 24-001, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-001, together with the requested Density Bonus waiver, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;

3. Direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, subject to project approval.

**Planning Technician Emily LaDue presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

**Connie Kopps**, provided a comment.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 26-24** Finding that the Planning Commission find that the City Ventures Parkview Development is exempt from the provisions of the California

Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 27-24** Finding that the Planning Commission approve Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) 11473 – Subdivision (SUB) 24-001 And Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 24-001 for the City Ventures Parkview Development

**6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION - NONE**

**7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**

**Commissioner Fintschenko** requested a briefing on legal constraints regarding Senate Bill 33 and density waivers.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 8:59pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, August 20, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Livermore-Pleasanton Elks Lodge, 940 Larkspur Drive.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**November 19, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Steven Dunbar, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR – NONE.**

**4. PROJECT REVIEW**

4.1 **THE PREVIOUSLY NOTICED ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO THE DECEMBER 3, 2024 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

Review of Site Plan Design Review to redevelop the 85-acre former Springtown Golf Course with recreational, conservation and scenic uses consistent with the provisions of Measure FF approved by the Livermore voters in 2016. The proposed project consists of a community park at the southern end of the project site consisting of a playground, picnic area, shade structures, restrooms and community garden, with the addition of four pickleball courts/two tennis courts, a half-basketball court, and an 18-hole disc golf course at the north end of the project site, the existing Marlin Pound Neighborhood Park.

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 Hearing to consider a request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road. The new name will be East Vineyard Avenue. New street numbers and the new street name will be issued to five parcels for

the purpose of improving emergency response time and delivery service along the portion of the subject street.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution recommending the City Council find that the project is exempt under CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3);
2. Adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve Matters Initiated by Staff (MIS) 24-001; and
3. Instruct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption with the Alameda County Recorder's Office.

**Associate Planner Jennifer Ackerman presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Kronzak, Vice Chair Fintschenko and Chair Anderson indicated they could make the required findings.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 38-24** Recommending that the City Council adopt a resolution That the request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road to East Vineyard Avenue is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 39-24** Recommending approval of matters initiated by staff (MIS) 24-001 for the request to change the street name on a portion of East Vallecitos Road to East Vineyard Avenue

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 24-007) to authorize a family dental and orthodontics office within an existing tenant space in the Republic Square commercial retail center located at the southwest corner of Livermore Outlets Drive and Freisman Road, east of San Francisco Premium Outlets. Address: 4527 Livermore Outlets Drive.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, Existing Facilities;
2. Adopt a resolution approving Conditional Use Permit 24-007, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;

3. Direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption with the Alameda County Clerk; and
4. Advise the applicant that the Project approval is subject to a 15-day appeal period.

**Assistant Planner Shannon Pagan presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

Aaron Rondon, applicant, indicated he was available to respond to questions.

In response to Commissioner Leary, Assistant Planner Pagan explained secondary uses in the Regional Commercial Zone.

Commissioner Dunbar thanked the applicant for bringing business to Livermore and indicated he could make the findings.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner Pagan stated the parking spaces were available for general use.

Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed the 10% use to fulfill the intent of the Specific Plan.

Chair Anderson indicated it was a good use for the space and thanked the applicant for growing his business in Livermore.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 40-24** Finding that Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-007 for a dental and orthodontics office in Republic Square is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 41-24** Approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-007 to authorize a family dental and orthodontics office within an existing building in Republic Square

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Consideration of General Plan Consistency Determinations for the acquisition of three properties for open space and conservation purposes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt three separate resolutions approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007,

Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008, and Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009, finding the City's acquisition of the following three properties for open space and conservation is consistent with Livermore's 2003 General Plan.

- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007 - 41 acres (Quint Property - APNs: 99B-5300-2-13, 99B-5450-10-3)
- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008 - 86 acres (Collier Canyon Property - APN: 903-10-1)
- Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009 - 82 acres (Goecken Road Property - APNs: 99B-5680-14; 99B-5680-18)

**Associate Planner Kam Purewal presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Kronzak announced involvement on the Land Use Advisory for Tri-Valley Conservancy, which had been determined to not be a conflict; indicated findings could be made; and thanked staff.

Commissioner Leary highlighted points in support of the General Plan and indicated the findings could be made.

Commissioner Dunbar indicated the findings could be made.

Vice Chair Fintschenko stated she could make the consistency determination and find with staff's recommendations on all three properties.

Chair Anderson stated he could make the consistency and required findings and thanked Staff for its hard work to preserve the properties.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KRONZAK AND CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 42-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-007 for the acquisition of approximately 41 acres (Quint Property – APNS: 99B-5300-2-13, 99B-5450-10-3)

**Resolution 43-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-008 for the acquisition of approximately 86 acres (Collier Canyon Property – APN: 903-10-1)

**Resolution 44-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-009 for the acquisition of approximately 82 acres (Goecken Road Property – APNS: 99B-5680-14 AND 99B-5680-18)

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Chair Anderson requested the lights at Stockmans Park come on at dark.

Vice Chair Fintschenko suggested training on how to use maps and the development code. Planning Manager Riley indicated training could be held when the new commissioner was on board.

Commissioner Dunbar encouraged public education on the new State law regarding parking setbacks from intersections. Planning Manager Riley indicated there had been internal meetings and an update would be provided. Senior Civil Engineer Debbie Salgado stated there had been an inventory of intersections and staff would be rolling out a program soon.

Commissioner Kronzak discussed the City of San Francisco not striping curbs due to cost and congratulated Councilmember Elect Dunbar.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 7:45 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, December 3, 2024, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Ave.

LIVERMORE
CALIFORNIA

**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**December 17, 2024**

---

## REGULAR MEETING

**1. CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jacob Anderson at 7:00 pm, held in person at 1016 S. Livermore Avenue.

**ROLL CALL** – Present: Chairperson Anderson, Vice-Chairperson Yolanda Fintschenko, Commissioner Daniel Leary, Commissioner Tracy Kronzak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. OPEN FORUM**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period, there were no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR - NONE**

**4. PROJECT REVIEW - NONE**

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1 **THE PREVIOUSLY NOTICED ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO THE JANUARY 7, 2025, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

Hearing to consider a request for a Municipal Code Amendment, Development Code Amendment, Conditional Use Permit Modification, Development Agreement, Site Plan Design Review, and Site Plan Design Review Modification for the Parkwest Casino 580 Expansion Project.

5.2 Hearing to consider a request for Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Site Plan Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, and Consistency Determination to develop vacant land located at the northwest corner of the Collier Canyon Road and Constitution Drive intersection, with a residential project known as Cornerstone.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt Resolutions:
1. Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-010;

2. Recommending the City Council adopt a resolution finding that the project is exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65457 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15182 (c), Projects Pursuant to a Specific Plan, and CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning;
3. Recommending the City Council adopt a resolution approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 8669 – Subdivision (SUB) 22-006, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 22-004, together with the requested Density Bonus waivers and concessions, and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-009, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;
4. Recommending the City Council direct the Planning Manager to file a Notice of Exemption, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, subject to project approval.

**Assistant Planner Emily LaDue presented the staff report.**

Chris Stockhouse, representing Cornerstone and the landowner, explained the purpose and mission of the church to give back to the community and proposal to build affordable housing.

Michael Keaney, Director of Forward Planning, Trumark Homes, presented an overview of the proposed project including exceedance of required affordable units; completion of infrastructure; and collaboration with Pacific Companies.

Caleb Roope, Pacific Companies, discussed their experience in affordable housing developments and work on other projects with Trumark; and expressed excitement about the project.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner LaDue explained the buffer between development and the riparian basin; confirmed no need to redesignate housing sites in the City's housing sites inventory and the units for this project can be included in RHNA Cycle 6.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

Brandon Evans, IBW Local 595, requested use of local construction workforces.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Leary suggested relocating and reducing the bioretention area; consideration of the location of the bus stop in relation to the pedestrian corridor and bridge; and ensuring appropriate easements for the bridge. He pointed out the requirement to plant trees and charging stations; and commended the developer on the contribution of affordable units above the requirements.

Commissioner Kronzak requested the use of California native trees. In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Assistant Planner LaDue explained the CUP is required

due to the project's distance from the creek.

In response to Vice Chair Fintschenko, Assistant Planner LaDue explained podium parking. Planning Manager Riley discussed the findings for the conditional use permit for grading near the creek.

In response to Chair Anderson, Mr. Roope explained the courtyard and outdoor spaces; proposed outdoor space; and bike storage and elevators accommodating bikes. Chair Anderson confirmed the units would be non-smoking and suggested consideration of tying bike parking to density. In response to Chair Anderson, Assistant Planner LaDue explained street design including street parking and bike lanes. Chair Anderson requested shortening of crosswalk distance at Collier Canyon Road and Gateway Avenue, and inclusion of at least pedestrian directional ramps.

Commissioner Kronzak summarized the briefings provided to the Commissioners.

ON THE MOTION OF COMMISSIONER KRONZAK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FINTSCHENKO AND CARRIED ON A 4-0 VOTE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolution 49-24** Approving Consistency Determination (CD) 24-010 for the Cornerstone Residential Development

**Resolution 50-24** Recommending the City Council find that the Cornerstone Residential Development is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act

**Resolution 51-24** Recommending that the City Council approve Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 8669 – Subdivision (SUB) 22-006, Site Plan Design Review (SPDR) 22-004, and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 24-009, and find no net loss for the Cornerstone Development with an

**RECESS**
Chair Anderson called a recess at 8:00 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:05 p.m. with all Commissioners present.

## 6. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Comprehensive General Plan Update – Draft Land Use Map and Policy Topics

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

- Review and ask clarifying questions on the Draft Preferred Land
- Use Map
- Receive an overview of the Open Space and Conservation Element, Safety Element, and Noise Element

- Consider General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) feedback on policy options for the Open Space and Conservation, and Safety Elements
- Recommend policy updates for City Council consideration and direction

**Principal Planner Andy Ross presented the staff report.**

Chairperson Anderson opened the public comment period.

Mark Thompson commented on the recommendation that future parks use less grass and suggested the use of artificial turf.

Connie Kopps questioned whether -702 was supposed to be listed twice in the land use changes section. She discussed her August 2024 letter and requested additional time for public review.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Kronzak confirmed that the owner at 2133 Las Positas requested the zone change from business and commercial park to medium density residential, which was anticipated to be granted; explained the lens through which the list was reviewed; and discussed the briefing on the revised land use map, which had not received much public input, other than the developer community finding it refreshing.

Commissioner Leary expressed appreciation for the public comments; agreed with the positive upgrades to the Land Use Map; support for the addition of Wine Country Commercial, and Mixed Industrial Commercial; and questioned combining Highway Serving and Community Serving Commercial. Principal Planner Ross explained the overlap of uses and areas; and confirmed that East of Greenville was paused.

In response Vice Chair Fintschenko, Principal Planner Ross indicated the issue raised by Ms. Kopps was a typographical error. Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed that the Neighborhood Commercial designation would be more compatible with the existing land uses and indicated the proposed Land Use Designations seemed sensible.

Chair Anderson expressed enthusiasm about the new map; confirmed the City would maintain the current level of control while providing flexibility; indicated support for clarifying Service Commercial and incorporating lite industrial; and expressed appreciation for the Mixed-Use clarification.

The Commission discussed and indicated support to the changes proposed to the General Plan outline.

Vice Chair Fintschenko confirmed the intent to switch to a simpler, goal policy

model.

In response to Commissioner Kronzak, Principal Planner Ross indicated the changes proposed by the GPAC to the Open Space policies were minimal. Commissioner Kronzak indicated Policies A, F and X3 and X4 were most directionally consistent and additive to the General Plan, and the others felt like tactics rather than policies.

Commissioner Leary discussed wildlife connectivity.

Vice Chair Fintschenko reiterated the goal to secure and maintain a green belt outside the Urban Growth Boundary seemed overly prescriptive and suggested the goals not describe the required actions. She questioned whether urban separators were possible around the entire City.

Chair Anderson confirmed that the multifunctional greenbelt was proposed for the edges of the City; suggested encouraging agricultural uses for preservation; indicated support for the GPAC feedback; and suggested ensuring the urban forest was maintained.

Commissioner Kronzak indicated Policy Options B and C were closer to the spirit, but A seemed impossible to accomplish; and suggested restrooms at parks in the definition of equitable park access.

Vice Chair Fintschenko reviewed the proposed policies and GPAC suggestions, indicating support for Policy Option C, and the idea of connectivity in open space, with definitions; and suggested prescribing how to conserve water not be included in the policy.

Principal Planner Ross confirmed the Commissioner direction action and tactically oriented items were not included in the goal and policy level, to ensure the goal and policy could be used to evaluate projects objectively for consistency. He explained unfunded mandates.

The Commission discussed the Noise Element and suggested consideration of the science of urbanized noise and mental health; noise metrics in neighboring cities; determination of a standard for equitable consideration of noise issues; addition of a standard for L Max; frequency component and context of what was generating the noise.

The Commission discussed the Safety Element.

Commissioner Kronzak indicated more specificity was a good thing; energy resilience felt too low; support for agricultural resilience; and consideration of insurability of developments.

Commissioner Ross stated developers would not advance projects without being able to insure.

Vice Chair Fintschenko indicated support for the emergency notification's goal; Policy Option C; ensuring General Plan policies were goal oriented rather than tactical; providing general direction of the goal on drought and moving actions elsewhere; and questioned whether there was agriculture within the City limits. Principal Planner Ross explained the agriculture within the City, sphere of influence and planning area.

Chair Anderson indicated agricultural resilience was important but perhaps should be in Economic Development. Staff indicated the Agricultural Industry could appear in multiple forms throughout the General Plan.

Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Fintschenko discussed the need to consider smoke in relation to walkable developments and transit-oriented communities. Principal Planner Ross discussed strategies on air quality in the Climate Action Plan and consideration of air quality in the General Plan.

Chair Anderson expressed appreciation for planning for a sustainable future.

## 7. MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Commissioner Kronzak expressed concern about the deteriorating asphalt and flooding on the ramp to east bound 580 at North Livermore. Chair Anderson stated it was Caltrans property.

Chair Anderson requested confirmation that the lights at Stockman Park were on at dark; and expedited processing of directional ramps.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – at 10:19 pm to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 7:00 pm, Civic Center Meeting Hall, City Council Chambers, 1016 S. Livermore Ave.