

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Commissioner Jensen: [Gavel] good evening. My name is Lisa Jensen, and I am the chair of the Planning Commission. On behalf of the entire Planning Commission, I would like to welcome you to the Planning Commission public hearing of Wednesday, November 3, 2010. Please remember to turn off your cell phones. Or put them on vibrate. Parking ticket validation machine for the garage under City Hall is located at the rear of chambers. If you want to address the commission, please fill out a speaker card located on the table by the door on the parking validation table at the back, and at the bottom of the stairs near the audiovisual technician. Deposit the completed card in the basket near the planning technician. Please include the agenda item number, not the file number, for reference. For example, 4.A, not PD 06-023. The procedure for this hearing is as follows: After the staff report, applicants and appellants may make a five-minute presentation. The chair will call out names on the submitted speaker card in the order received. As your name is called, please line up in front of the microphone at the front of chambers. Each speaker will have up to two minutes. After public testimony, the applicant and appellant may make closing remarks for an additional five minutes. Planning Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. Response to commissioner questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance. The public hearing will then be closed, and the Planning Commission will take action on the item. The planning Commission may request staff to respond to public testimony, ask staff questions, and discuss the item. If you challenge these land use decisions in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else has raised at this public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the city, at, or prior to, the public hearing. The Planning Commission's action on rezoning, prezonings, general plan amendments and code amendments is only advisory to the City Council. The City Council will hold public hearings on these items. Roll call. Let the record reflect that all Commissioners are here with the exception of Commissioner Platten. Deferrals. Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. A list of staff-recommended deferrals is available on the press table. Staff will provide an update on the items for which deferral is being requested. If you would like to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time. To effectively manage the Planning Commission agenda, and to be sensitive to concerns regarding the length of public hearing, the Planning Commission may determine either to proceed with the remaining agendized items past 11:00 p.m, continue this hearing to a later date, or to defer remaining items to

the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting date. Decision on how to proceed will be heard by the Planning Commission no later than 11:00 p.m. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. Darryl Boyd, principal environmental planner. Staff is recommending deferral of item 3A. This is the certification of the final environmental impact report for the single-use carryout bag ordinance. Staff is recommending deferral of that item two weeks, Madam Chair, to November 17th. And I think Jeannie also had a comment. Maybe not for deferral.

>> Yes, I also wanted just to note that your agenda for item 2 -- 6B is correct in its recommendation for approval. The summary that's up on the screen unfortunately is incorrect. It has a denial, so I just wanted to note that what's in the agenda and the staff reports is the recommendation for that item.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Are there any speaker cards or speakers regarding deferral of item 3A,P 09193, single use carryout bag ordinance, this is speaking to the item of deferral only. I see none, Oklahoma. Moving on, consent calendar. Oh, I'm sorry, yes. There's a motion to defer, there's a second, all those in favor? That item is deferred. To our next meeting. Thank you very much, Commissioner Cahan. Consent calendar. The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by a single motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Planning Commission, staff, or public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. Staff will provide an update on the consent calendar. If you wish to speak to one of these items individually, please come to the podium at this time. 2A. CP10-032. Conditional use permit to allow a drive through and 24 hour use for a new restaurant within an existing retail building on a 1.3 gross acre site in the CG commercial general zoning district located on the Northwest side of Berryessa. Staff.

>> No addition to the item. I just wanted to point out that unfortunately, the double-sided plan for this did not get included with the staff report, so it was handed out to you before the meeting.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would actually like to pull this from the consent.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, somebody else has their speaker light on. Please, we have no -- okay. We don't have speaker management so please forgive us. We're going to have lots of hands going up and down this evening. Thank you. So there are no further items on the consent calendar. We will open the public hearing with this item. Okay. So let me just read the notice regarding public hearing and then we'll speak to this item first. Generally, the public hearing items are considered by the Planning Commission in the order which they appear on the agenda. However, please be advised that the commission may take items out of order to facilitate the agenda such as to accommodate significant public testimony or may defer discussion of items to later agendas for public hearing time management purposes. Staff. On item CP 10-032.

>> Thank you. This is a conditional use permit application, to integrate a Drive-through use as well as late night uses into 2:00 a.m. at an existing restaurant. It also includes some modification to the existing landscape plan as a result of the drive-through configuration, and removal of five ordinance-sized trees including one California Pepper and one Incense Cedar and three Channel Ash. The conditional use permit is required for the drive-through portion and the late-night use for a restaurant. There was a previously approved permit adjustment which allowed the exterior alterations, a new trash enclosure, in addition to that existing building out there. The proposed late night and drive through uses comply with the applicable city council policies and are compatible with the surrounding commercial land uses. Again this is an existing building situate within an existing larger shopping center. We've concluded that subject site really does provide an ideal location for a drive-through and late-night. It is bordered by Interstate 680, Berryessa and you know is almost unnoticed from the thoroughfares. So again, our recommendation is approval for the drive-through use and the late-night No. 2:00 a.m. and staff is available for any questions.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. Upon visiting this site, I found the taco bell to be on the other side of Lee's Deli in a separate building and that's not where it's shown on this piece of paper that you gave us so sit moving?

>> There was a permanent easement that was given to the building which kind of adds to it. It is relocating out of its existing location into the larger building, to the western end. So yes. So the taco bell currently exists without a drive-through --

>> Commissioner Cahan: On the other side.

>> In a stand-alone but it will be relocating once the modifications happen and the additions to the larger building there.

>> Commissioner Cahan: And you're going to cut through from the back which now if my memory is correct, I thought it had a fence and the chain link fence in the back, is that going to come down? I might be remembering that wrong but --

>> There's some longer range plan. Currently there's a little -- it's like a little median that actually goes all the way down to the kind of Interstate 680 end and they're going to open that up so there will be more circulation from that site with the little building and the larger shopping center. That is part of this initial phase, and then there will be some further down the road, phase 2 improvements that involve the larger center. So it's really an effort to integrate both these which are now owned by the same property owner.

>> Commissioner Cahan: And currently, the taco bell seems to have the restrooms on the outside. In the new configuration I assume the restrooms will be on the inside.

>> They will conform to the building code so its -- more than likely they are going to integrate them from within. That was probably one of the older format, where they didn't have much indoor seating. Probably the value

of those improvements would cause them to upgrade and include within, you know. That's really not something that we deal with.

>> Commissioner Cahan: You wouldn't have to worry about safety other than --

>> Most places don't have them exterior because I don't think that's support through the building code, when you have interior seating and stuff like that.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Okay, well it sounds like it will be a much improved site this, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Is the applicant available? You will have five minutes to present this, please introduce yourself when you come forward.

>> Good evening, my name is Robert Atkinson with Sy West development. To answer your questions, the rest rooms will be interior to the building. We have had conferences with planning and building and regarding the home unless that area and the old taco bell will be remodeled and we are currently working with a couple local operators that serve breakfast and brunch that expressed interest in the old building. The phase 1, primarily we're going to try to get the employees to park there so it's more screen for our customers and that lot is well lit and will remain well lit so thank you very much. If you have any questions at all I'm here this evening to help answer them.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Any other questions from the commission? Motion to close public hearing? There is a motion, a second? All those in favor, please say aye. Thank you. Commissioner Cahan, would you like to lead off?

>> Commissioner Cahan: Yes, I would like to make a motion to approve a conditional use permit to allow a drive through and 24 hour use for a new restaurant within an existing retail on a 1.3 gross acre site in the CG commercial zoning general district as recommended by staff.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Cahan. Is there a second?

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Second.

>> Commissioner Jensen: There is a second. Would you like to speak to your motion?

>> Commissioner Cahan: Only to say that I believe this will be an improved site and thank you for upgrading that area.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Cahan. Seeing no speaker lights and no hands, may we vote by hand? All those in favor of approval of the motion, please raise their hand and that motion passes unanimously with Commissioner Platten absent. Thank you. Moving on item 4, open the 2010 fall general plan hearing. I would like to entertain a motion to open the fall general plan amendment hearing. There's a motion. Is there a second? There's a motion and second. All those in favor? Thank you. There are no items on the general plan consent calendar so we're moving on straight to the general plan public hearing. Item 6a. G.P. 10-10-01. A general plan amendment requesting to change the San José 2020 general plan land use transportation diagram land use designation from public park and Open space to medium density residential, eight to 16 dwelling units per acre on the subject 9.8 gross acre site located on the Northwest corner of Blossom Hill and Southcrest way. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. Just wanted to note that we did pass out two comment letters on the mitigated negative declaration, that we recently received. And comments in both of the letters did not raise any new or more significant environmental impacts not already identified in the initial study. In specific regards to the letter from the Santa Clara County parks and recreation departments the comments were of a technical nature and not environmental and with respect to the relocation of their park easement. This is a matter that will be dealt with at the planned development permit stage of the process when the site is designed. In specific regards to the letter from the Santa Clara County Audubon society, the subject site in its current vacant state can provide habitat for

the burrowing owl. However, no evidence of burrowing owls have been found on the site and because the site can provide habitat for owl a mitigation measure is included in the mitigated negative declaration that requires a preconstruction survey. If owls are found during this survey, they will be mitigated in accordance with the California Department of Fish and game requirements. The proposed general plan amendment from public park and open space to medium density residential, which is a density of 8 to 16 dwelling units per acre, would allow for residential development on the subject site that would provide an opportunity for compatibility with the adjacent neighborhoods in terms of density and will improve linkages and connectivity for the two neighborhoods on either side of the site. Planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the general plan to the city council and that it conforms with the general plan's major strategies and the general plan goals and policies in that it will facilitate infill housing development and provide housing at a density that's compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and, in essence, complete the whole. This concludes staff report.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. We have one speaker card, Joe head. If you'd like to come forward you may have up to five minutes and fuzz would introduce yourself.

>> Thank you, chairperson Jensen. Members of the commission, Joe head, president of Summerhill land. I have with me this evening Bob Hankins, senior Vice President with Summerhill, and Vince cantori, development manager with Summerhill, who have been intimately involved in our evaluation and processing of this property. We'd like to thank staff for the very thorough and clearly written report which I think outlines for you, it does for us, the major issues of looking at whether this should be replanned into a residential mode, in the general plan, as it was several years ago. As staff notes, the current GP designation really arose from Mr. Lester deciding to try to put together a major agricultural park on his family's holding of land in this immediate area. And that actually went forward, and is now being planned as a marshal Cottle park. A portion of that property was in a sense cut off from the major park site by highway 85 and therefore lies south of highway 85 and north of Blossom Hill. And it's that 9.8 acre site that is the subject of our proposal to you for a general plan change. And the reason we believe it's a good change, back to residential, it's returning it to its designated use before the whole broad park issue was brought up and concluded successfully and it's appropriate I think in the long term plan of the city,

this is residential land. We thank the staff for the favorable recommendation myself, Mr. Hankin and Mr. Cantori are here to fill in any knowledge gaps that would you wish to know about before you take your vote.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Mr. Head. I see no questions from the commission. Oops, I take it back. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. Should this move forward, I'm wondering if it's your plan to repave the roads that are running -- those residential roads that run along that site.

>> I'll ask Mr. Hankin to join me as our specifically our in-house engineering specialist. But basically the road to the East is half improved now, and we will improve the other half, and then make the appropriate full improvements that Public Works will require of us as we go through the next process. On the West side in Cahalan we will be adding radio portion of new road and then of course all the project roads themselves, the connecting public streets will all be done as part of the project.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you.

>> Yes. Thank you very much.

>> Commissioner Jensen: And now I don't really -- thank you very much. I have no additional speaker cards. Motion to close public hearing? There's a motion and second. All those in favor? Thank you. Staff. No further update, okay, thank you. Commission? Anybody want to say anything? Okay, I have a question for staff. I just want to clarify, then, that -- because it wasn't entirely clear to me what this little parcel was. And how it came to be isolated there. But if I understood Mr. Head correctly, this parcel was originally part of the Marshall Cottle parcel and it was dedicated as a park at the request of Mr. Lester and when 87 was built -- 85 I'm sorry, I always get those mixed up, when 85 was built that's when it became an island unto itself.

>> That's correct.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, thank you. Was there anybody else who -- Norm.

>> Commissioner Kline: There is a question on procedures if we approve this today will we get an opportunity to approve the actual design plans of this neighborhood or is this basically final?

>> This will be coming forward in a planned development zoning application. So it will come to the commission for their recommendation to council.

>> Commissioner Kline: So it will come back to us for the actual planning of the neighborhood.

>> Yes, the zoning will come to you.

>> Commissioner Kline: Will we have an opportunity to make recommendations of actual planning of the neighborhood at that time?

>> Yeah, as you're the recommending body on zonings to the council you will have an opportunity to recommend to the council on that planned development zoning.

>> Commissioner Kline: Okay.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you. Chairwoman Jensen. I'm actually very appreciative of Mr. Lester's preservation of the land and dedicating the adjacent land to the Santa Clara County for the open face because I think it's going to be huge benefit to the whole neighborhood and the community. And seeing as it was previously slated for housing, low density or medium density and now going back to that I am absolutely in support of it. I wish more property owners out there would dedicate their lands or portions of what they own to open space

because I think we're really lacking that, and not only the City of San José, but also in Santa Clara County. So I'm overall appreciative. And also as I have reviewed it it's adjacent neighborhood meeting urban conservation policy neighborhood strategy and neighborhood identity policies which are major policies for us to adhere to. So I'm support of this project or general plan amendment.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. Would somebody care to make a motion? Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Now that's going to be -- where is it? Thank you. So many papers today. I move to approve the general plan amendment request to change the San José 2020 general plan land use transportation diagram land use designation from public park and open space to medium density residential, on the subject 9.8 gross acre site located on the Northwest corner of Blossom Hill road and Southcrest Way.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. Is there a second? Would you like to speak to your motion?

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: As I stated, I'm just really thankful that we do have responsible landowners who are foreseeing the future, and I truly believe that the other parcel could have been housing long time ago. So it is to the benefit of our community that we have Marshall Cottle park adjacent to the existing neighborhood and the general plan meets the guidelines. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. Councilmember Kalra.

>> Commissioner Kline: I'm going to support this also but I do have some concerns, actually some heartburn. We are going into a new general plan, and which emphasizes neighborhood connectivity into villages and this represents an enormous tint for us to execute on those plans. We want to go away from what we term loosely as urban sprawl to more of a traditional neighborhood approach. I think that's been said over and over again. Things that would represent sprawl would be long, winding streets that encourage speeding. Unnecessary

use of cul-de-sacs, maybe unnecessary use of flag lots. What we have here is basically a continuation of traditional sprawl designs. It is consistent with the general neighborhood around it. Because that was the style at that particular time. But there are some characteristics that are not best practices. Overuse of new flag lots in a new subdivision is not something that's consistent with a new neighborhood design or even encouraged in communities outside San José even though they are legal. Here is another case of a cul-de-sac with some might consider unnecessary. Basically cutting off half of this residential community from the actual village across the street from it. We have that example over and over again. And here we are building a new or potentially building a new one. Now I'm raising these as issues for future insight and future discussion. And here again we have flag lots, 15, 16 brand-new homes in the back of brand-new homes. And it seems to be inconsistent with our definition of residential community, single family residential community with a front lawn, back lawn, cars in front of the street and we discussed this before. So my concern isn't on changing this from park to residential or there's a little bit higher density which it is, the diversity of that area, do we want to encourage sprawl on a situation like this or do we want to encourage traditional development? It is a hard case because so much of the surrounding neighborhood is sprawl designed. But it would be nice to make some attempt, for instance, making a trail connecting the cul-de-sac to the village that's been done in other areas, things like that. So as we go forward with this the communication to the developer could be try to implement some of the traditional neighborhood designs that we've talked about in this design and when we come back we don't have to start from scratch then. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Kline. Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you, Madam Chair. I also needed to add one more statement to my motion which is to consider the mitigated negative declaration in accordance with CEQA.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. I also have a bit of a challenge with this, and my challenge is that San José is fairly park-deficient. I have a question for staff. Was Mr. Lester aware that highway 85 was going to be built, would cut off these two parcels, would cut these two parcels?

>> The planning for highway 85 has been on the books since the '50s so a lot of people have been aware. And I do believe that he is still with us, so I think he is -- in answer to your question, I'm pretty confident he was aware of the impact of 85 on his property. Which is why actually this piece is not part of the area that has to be made into a park for the county of Santa Clara and was split off.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay so my earlier question was, originally these were part of the same parcel that had been donated. If I understand you now that is not the case.

>> Well, again, I think -- again, there's a private option on this so I'm going to assume that the private property owners are in control of who has options or ownership of their land.

>> Commissioner Jensen: You probably understand where I'm coming from. I'm trying to understand how it was that this was part of land that was dedicated for a park and that because of the development of 85 it is no longer part of the park but everybody knew 85 was coming so I'm trying to understand how this happened.

>> I think again just speaking from a historic lore, Mr. Lester wanted to preserve this for whatever reasons. Threw series of years and a series of events, what has evolved is that area to the north of 85 since it is intact and a single area is most appropriate to be utilized in whole for a county park and hence, county of Santa Clara has that land. Not really privy to what changes in any previous agreements or whatnot. But the area now that is South of 85 is apparently available for private development.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay. And so to add to Mr. Kline's -- Commissioner Kline's recommendations with respect to what you're keeping in mind as you're moving forward with this, I would like to ensure that there is ready pedestrian bicycle access under 85 to get to the Marshall Cottle park from the side. Because as it appears from here, this area is completely isolated and thus Marshall Cottle doesn't do them much good. I will be supporting in but I do have that reservation, madam director.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to point out the letter from the county parks office dated October 28th does acknowledge the perpetual nonexclusive easement on the property that would connect essentially the subject property up to the park. So that appears to be taken care of. But we do appreciate that because then the neighborhood design will make sure that that's actually usable. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Great, thank you. And would anybody else like to speak? Okay. Then we have a motion and a second. All those -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Kline. Commissioner Kamkar.

>> Commissioner Kline: Mine's quick. I'm just agreeing with Madam Chair, that the sequence of how this became dedicated to a park, and then, quote, not dedicated to a park is still really mushy to me and what makes it different than the park across 85 and why wouldn't that become somehow available in private hands too, if they were done at the same time. It's totally unclear. When it begins -- the explanation, the definition was muddy.

>> Again, unfortunately we've closed the public hearing. Just trying to give the best explanation. Again, it's Mr. Lester's prerogative, to decide what he wants to do with his land. And I would assume, since there is an option to a private home developer, that Mr. Lester has decided that, given its separation, that might have been reason that it may not make sense to keep them together. But again, I'm not sure that, from the planning staff's standpoint, we didn't feel compelled to dissect that. Because this is a private application so we're going to assume that there's the appropriate agreements with the property owner.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Director, did the director have something she wanted to add to this? Commissioner Kamkar.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Thank you, Madam Chair. Did the seconder add that second line?

>> Commissioner Jensen: Yes, the seconder did.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: That's the procedural one. I'm also concerned about the same thing you're concerned about, and I'm not quite comfortable with the answer. And the issue being, if Mr. Lester is 100% in control of the property, then you know my concerns are relieved. But if this was part of the property that he gave to the county and to the state, then I just want to make sure county and the state are also okaying, you know, I guess changing of the intended use of park.

>> Commissioner Jensen: If I may I believe counsel would like to weigh in on this.

>> Or if you would like to Jeannie as well.

>> I was going to say the county parks did comment on it and clearly if there was some discrepancy between what they thought was dedicated for a park land they would have noted. I have been in meetings with county parks on the master planning of this marshal Cottle park and they are aware that this is no longer aware of that larger park to be master planned.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: How about the state?

>> The state does not have any role this plan.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Any interest.

>> What I was actually going to mention, we have worked with deals and taking property from county parks. They are very limited on what they can convey. And this acreage goes above what they could convey, if it had ever been dedicated to them under their county parks charter. They work under a charter, and so this property more than likely, I'm sure someone in the audience knows better was never dedicated to the county. It never actually transferred ownership.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Good.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Madam Chair, if I may, we really appreciate the commission's concern about the underlying ownership. But again, we need to be able to allow for applications to move forward, if it appears private entities have a proposal for development. Tonight your question is, should the land use designation be changed to residential at a certain density. Please be aware, again, that the letter from the county was very clear, that the zoning needs to identify the easement. So this is additional comments that the staff will be working on, the zoning is not yet ready for hearing. We are still work with the applicant. So we do appreciate your comments tonight. You've got a full agenda with some other topics, so please, just recognize staff will be working to address the other county comments as they are more pertinent for the zoning level of discussion.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Okay, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Commissioner Abelite.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Yes, thank you chair. I do want to point out this is an eight acre site and I think the community should be thankful that the Lester family is actually donating several hundred acres into a park system that's going to benefit the greater San José area. It's probably the single biggest park donation I would speculate on record. I don't know. So you know, if -- if that property's been bifurcated by highway 85 and this fits nicely into an existing residential area, I think we should be thankful for the two or 300 acres worth of park. And move forward with the GP adoption. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Abelite. We just received the information from the county of Santa Clara and the other letters this evening and to be honest I personally have not had a time to fully read it and as I look at it on the first page of the letter from the county, I'd like to read into the record what the county says. The county parks department is very concerned about the lack of information regarding the recorded easement on the subject property which has not been shown in the proposal, the proposed site development site plan. The project application should have been deemed incomplete and the county parks department requests that the city Planning Department defer this project from the November 3rd, 2010 Planning Commission meeting

agenda until the county parks department grace to the city and the applicant's proposal for addressing the obligation related to the recorded easement for future neighborhood access to and from the marshal Cottle park. Director.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, if I can again just remind the commission that this is not an issue that we would typically somehow diagram for the land use transportation diagram for the general plan. This isn't a very important issue for the zoning and that will be coming back to the commission for your recommendation prior to the zoning going to the city council. So staff, we are hearing you loud and clear. That you share the concerns of the county parks staff. And since the application is still underway, this issue has a opportunity to get resolved.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, director. Seeing no further lights, Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair, I initially I was in support of this application, initially this large handout of letters which I have not been able to thoroughly review, I am not -- I feel like I don't have enough information to actually vote on this properly to support it at this time. There are still questions in my mind that have not been answered, and I will not be able to support this motion at this point. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Cahan. Anybody else? Okay. With the reservations and comments and so forth and so on that we've put forward, all those in favor of moving this forward, please signify by raising your hands. That motion passes with Commissioner Cahan, are you voting no? With Commissioner Cahan voting no on that. Thank you very much. Moving on to 6B. GP 10-04-01. A general plan amendment request to change the San José 2020 general plan land use transportation diagram land use designation from neighborhood community commercial and high density residential to general commercial and medium high density residential on 37.7 acres of the 27.4 acre subject site located at the southwest corner of East Brokaw road and old Oakland road. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, we passed out letters we just recently received to you on this project before the meeting. Both of these comment letters are in support of the proposed general plan amendment. This

proposed general plan amendment from neighborhood community commercial on six acres and high density residential which is a density of 25 to 50 dwelling units per acre on 21.4 acres to general commercial on 13.7 acres and medium high density residential which is a density of 12 to 25 DUs per acre on 13 of 7 acres would decrease the amount of residential land uses which is consistent with the City's goal of improving the balance between jobs and economic development and housing. Given this, planning staff recommends that the commission forward a recommendation of approval of this general plan amendment to the city council, and that it conforms with the general plan's major strategies, goals and policy. This includes staff report.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Sean Morley, we have the single speaker card and if you introduce yourself you may have up to five minutes.

>> Chair Jensen commissioners my name is Sean Morley with the Morley brothers, we are the development consultants for Markovitz and Fox, Inc., the owners of the property. They are a locally owned family business that's been operating in San José for over 100 years and they've owned this property since the 1950s. The fox family initiated the general plan amendment at the request of the planning director and the office of economic development to create a great new opportunity for retail and sales tax revenue in support of the city's retail strategy. The general plan amendment as staff mentioned we refer to in shorthand as a reverse conversion, moving six acres of residential land to revenue and job producing land opportunities and would also transition the site to better mix of uses and balance of uses for the neighborhood, which is itself today, a thriving mixed use neighborhood and we think that the site will very much help complement and with this change complement and complete the neighborhood and this issue is a very important one from a legacy standpoint for the fox family. The project is just one element of a multipart plan to make the site ready for redevelopment in 2011. You will be seeing we hope very shortly a planned development zoning application on the project. The family has also completed a very extensive environmental remediation project on the site that is just getting wrapped up this fall. In short, the family spent millions of dollars and many years making the site ready for reuse. That has been a very difficult proposition, in these recent turmoil in the economic difficulties. It's important to note too, that the undertaking is one of the biggest economic development opportunities that the city has got before it in 2010. And it has the potential to generate significant revenue for both the General Fund and the Redevelopment Agency

through new taxes. The revenue opportunity is really not the only reason to be considering this, and one that we don't like to dwell on but it is I think important to note in these times. The project is consistent with the North San José plan, North San José area development policy both to balance commercial and residential uses and create mixed use opportunities. It is consistent with the framework for the employment, preservation of employment lands, as well as the riparian corridor policy. It meets the spirit and intent of that. And it also obviously helps satisfy a number of the City's economic development objectives. We have looked at it and from -- we obviously think it's consistent with the current general plan but we did look at the general plan amendment as did staff with an eye towards the 2040 general plan update and I think it very ably fulfills the goals and policies of that plan, which is now moving forward. We'd like to point out that there are a couple of letters of support from Dollinger properties across the street the two biggest property owners who are presently moving forward with a large commercial development of their own as well as Sobrato Development Organization who has significant retail and residential holdings in the area. And just in conclusion, we would like to thank staff for their excellent work in bringing this application forward. They've got a lot going on. We specifically wanted to thank Leslie Xavier and Mike Enderby from the planning department as well as our assistant director, Laurel Prevetti, and then from Public Works, Karen Mack and Vivian Tom. And we respectfully request that you approve the amendment before you tonight as staff has recommended and happy to answer any questions.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Mr. Morley. Any questions from the commission? I see no questions, thank you very much. Motion to close public hearing? All those in favor? Thank you. And I would just like to remind the commission that the agenda we received last week, incorrectly states the staff recommendation is denial. The staff recommendation on this application is actually approval of this project. So that said, is there any discussion from the commission? Okay. Is there anybody who would like to make a motion? Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Yes I would like to make a motion to approve. A general plan amendment, request the San José 2020 general plan land use transportation diagram land use designation from neighborhood community commercial and high density residential to general commercial on 13.7 acres and medium high

density residential 13.7 acres of the 27.4 acre subject site located at the southwest corner of East Brokaw road and old Oakland road.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, commissioner. Thank you, there's a second. Would you like to speak to your motion?

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Yes, I would, thank you, Madam Chair. I think this is kind of the direction that we would like to see, at least would I like to see, which is increasing the job generating land uses and decreasing the residential, basically giving the City of San José the jobs and housing balance. Which is much-needed and for our tax revenues. This will allow for wider range of commercial uses which are needed in North San José area as well and will increase in the acreage of commercial and decrease in residential acreage. In North San José there is a great need for commercial uses housing and jobs balance. I think it's really -- North San José is our golden goose so any time we have opportunities to attract jobs and bring jobs to that area we should support it and therefore, I do support this general plan amendment change.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. And if I may, I'm going to assume that your motion is actually that the commission recommend to the city council the general plan amendment.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Yes, that's correct.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Anybody else wish to speak? Seeing none, may we please vote, all those in favor of the motion, please raise your hands. And that motion passes unanimously. With Commissioner Platten absent. Thank you very much. Item 3C. GP 09-07-02. General plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation to add mixed industrial overlay to an existing heavy industrial land use designation on a 3.95 gross acre site located on the east side of south 10th street approximately 350 feet north of Burke Street. Staff.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair this general plan amendment came before the commission back in January of 2010 and then went to the city council in February of this year for early consideration for denial. This proposed amendment is fundamentally inconsistent with council policies. The Planning Commission voted to recommend that the city council deny this amendment, once it went to the council they did vote to defer consideration of this application to the fall general plan hearings to allow the applicant the opportunity to complete the submittal requirements and environmental review for proposed amendment. To date, there really is no champion for this general plan amendment on the private side. So we stand by our recommendation for denial. And that it is still fundamentally inconsistent with adopted council policies and to date, CEQA is incomplete. That concludes staff report.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Is the applicant here? We have no speaker cards on this so I wanted to double check and make sure the applicant isn't here. So there's no public hearing on this. Is there a motion from the commission? Commissioner Kline.

>> Commissioner Kline: I move the staff's recommendation to deny the general plan amendment as stated in the recommendation.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Kline. Would you like to speak to your motion? All those in favor of the recommendation please raise your hand, that motion passes unanimously. With Commissioner Platten absent. Item 6D. GP 07-10-02. General plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation from very low density residential, two dwelling units per acre to low density residential, five dwelling units per acre on a 1.48 acre site located on the north side of Grimley lane. Approximately 1500 feet westerly of Almaden road. Staff.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair. The next three amendments for your consideration are essentially old applications that have been on file for many years. And because they have been on file for a long time, we need to essentially resolve their status. So that way, as we consider a new general plan for City of San José, we understand what the disposition of these properties are. So we have three applications for your consideration

tonight. The first one is on Grimley lane. It is a proposal to go from very low density residential, two units per acre, to a density designation of low density residential, five units to the acre. For the reasons stated in the staff report, staff is recommending a denial. This is not consistent with the overall character of the surrounding community nor is it consistent with long standing policies for the City of San José in terms of where we should be bringing more density to our community. As you know we've been focusing more about putting a lot more housing near transit and places where the infrastructure and this is a location that really should not be supporting increased density. I want you to know that we have attempted numerous times to reach the applicant on the particular site, so that way they would have an opportunity to speak before you. And hopefully, they are here, so they can make their case, as well. The council will be making the final decision on this proposal, so your recommendation is important. The choices are to deny, because we don't have environmental clearance, so it's not possible to recommend approval. The second option is to continue processing. And if that is your recommendation, then ultimately the action of the council, then we would work with the applicant to have them pay their fees and reactivate their environmental work, et cetera, and then this would come back in June of 2011, together with the general plan update. So I'm staff for the next three items. And I'll be happy to take any of your questions. We do have a fair number of speaker cards, so I'll turn it back over to the chair to guide us through. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Is the applicant here? If you would like to come forward and speak and if you would please introduce yourself.

>> My name is Madu Kavuji, I'm here with my husband. This is the first time I've received something regarding this since 2007. So I don't know where it was said that we'd been trying to reach us for this planned amendment. But I would like for the council to reconsider having a low density for us on this property so that we can have more than the two acres, two sections per acre. Further down on Grimley lane, we do have some homes that are at least four homes to an acre. And it will -- it will bring up the neighborhood. It will upgrade by having some homes and affordable family homes in that area. So I would like for the council to reconsider the amendment for how many homes can be built on the acreage.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Staff, this is a kind of an unusual situation in that you indicated you were unable to reach the applicant. We have the applicant here.

>> Laurel Prevetti: We've left voice mail message and e-mail message to the contact applicant. Actually, we did that back in early October. So we -- with the information that was available on file with us. So if there's a property owner or new property owner, you know, we did the best with the records that we had in terms of being able to contact the applicant. We -- so this is, you know, I think the fundamental decision is really, as a recommending body, what your recommendation would be, moving this forward. As I say we do have a fair amount of speaker cards, so you'll be hearing from the community as well. So what I would recommend is that the commission listen to the public testimony and then the applicant will have a chance after that to make a closing statement if you will, if you would like. And then the commission can deliberate in terms of whether or not you feel ready to make a recommendation. Again as a recommending body the council would make the final decision, and that's scheduled for December 7th of this calendar year.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. I'm going to call the first three speakers. We do have a number of speaker cards and I'm going to apologize in advance because I can promise you I don't know how to pronounce a lot of these names. Starting right in the beginning. Zupe Lakalata. Rajmir Raiuchandra. JΘsus Macias. Thank you for having an easy name. If you would please introduce yourself as you come forward.

>> Good evening, I'm Rupe Lakaraju. I'm a resident on Grimley lane and I would oppose the request to have five houses per acre. For a few different reasons. One is, we've chosen that neighborhood for the size of lots and the house specifically and the land associated with it in terms of what it represents and what we feel is needed for our families there. In addition, there's already a number of streets there that are streets wherein it is always has high traffic and this would only increase the congestion. There's a lot of children in the neighborhood. That play along the street. Play in the neighborhood. And that's only increasing the danger to those children. And from -- in terms of comparison to other neighborhoods or similar neighborhoods within that area, having five houses per acre, is inconsistent with that general neighborhood and area and therefore we would oppose it. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you.

>> Good evening, I'm Rajamayir Ramachinda, I live at 1111 Grimley lane which is just a few lots from this location, I have two small daughters, a lot of children play in the street. High density will increase the traffic, definitely lot of inconvenience, definitely against the reason we moved into that neighborhood so I would appreciate that this motion for request is denied. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. And Mr. Macias as you're coming forward I'm going to call the next three speakers. Tim Hess.

>> Reply name is JΘsus Macias.

>> Commissioner Jensen: If you would wait a moment I'll call the next three speakers, they can line up.

>> I'm sorry.

>> Commissioner Jensen: That's all right. Tim Hess, Randall whiting and Steve Garetas. Thank you Mr. Macias. Go ahead.

>> My name is Jess Macias and I live right next door to the host property. My brother has that lower half, that long property next to it and I live right adjacent to that property all the way down the property line. And I'm in favor of this because I don't think it's that much inconsistent with it, because you have the other houses down there that are five units per acre right below me. And as far as this traffic congestion problem, I don't think that five more parcels are going to hurt, add to that much congestion anyhow. It is inconsistent to the other side of the road, because they've been established one-acre parcels for years, because the county, that's all the county would allow. But now, with the city has taken over, it -- there is -- should be more parcels allowed per acre because that property out there is just very expensive. I don't know what it would cost to build a house on a half-acre. For the property to sell, would be very, very expensive for that. Breaking up smaller pieces just seems to me like it would -

- you know lessen the price of the home and they would not be -- they would be higher-end homes I would imagine. As are the other ones down below, on the other parcels, that is, that have the five parcels per acre. Now, eventually, not in the near future but eventually I plan also to build along that on our property and along with my brother. And I would hope to have that five dwelling units per acre at that point. So that would be a continuous -- a continuous -- how can I tell it -- continuous parcels per acre. From that point on, because all the houses on the other side, on this side of that Grimley lane with the exception of those four parcels there are on five dwelling units per acre.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Mr. Macias. Your time is up. Thank you very much. And if the other speakers would come down so we can save some time we have a number of speakers. Thank you, Mr. Hess.

>> My name is actually Mr. Herr.

>> Commissioner Jensen: I can't even get the easy ones. Thank you very much.

>> I live on Jaylynn court, which is across from this property. And I'm speaking against this change. I think it would change the entire nature of the community that we have up there at that part of the hill. This property is actually up at the top of a hill. And the street that Grimley at that point goes downhill and you heard people talking about having kids playing down the street and being concerned about them. I know why they're concerned because when people come down that hill you end up going very -- it's hashed to make sure you don't go too fast. If you add another 14 cars that creates another traffic problem for us. It's inconsistent with what is built right there right now with the neighborhood that we have right now to put an island of high density houses at this end of things. And it would be inconsistent to do that here and that's why we're against it. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you.

>> Madam commissioner, commissioners, thank you so much. My name is Randall Whiting. I live on Oscars daily pleas, approximately 250 feet from one end of the property under discussion. I wanted to share with you a couple

of specific points of why I'm against changing the density of any housing in this area. Southwest Almaden is a very unique neighborhood, particularly the area we're talking about. It is an area that has a number of qualities of larger lots. Of lots of open space. Of large trees, of wildlife, of on the border of literally rural areas. And I know many of our neighbors and I take it myself feel very strongly that changing the density of housing in this area starts to set a trend. And even though specifically I'm against this property but I think that's also, if this were to go through this starts a trend where we start to encroach on very important open space and open land that's part of San José. Particularly with the quicksilver park area and a lot of the open property that is owned by the Water District. And that's maintained as open space. This is really beautiful area and the reason that we bought ten, 11 years ago now in this area was because of those qualities. And I don't want to see those qualities go away. I think additionally, it's a trend towards higher density is going to create greater amount of traffic throughout the neighborhood and we really don't have the street infrastructure as it's set up now to be able to support greater density, it's a problem already and I think also the drain on city services down that far in the south side of San José of again a trend towards higher density housing is going to put a greater strain on city services at a time that we -- and the economic conditions that we have to consider very carefully on how those services are rendered. On behalf of my family and myself strongly recommend with denial along with assistant director Prevetti that we change any of the housing density guidelines in this part of San José. Thank you so much.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. And Mr. Garredez as you're coming forward I'm going to call the next three speakers. Margaret Garredez, Ben gills and Dr. Jarrett. If you would please come down. Thank you.

>> Thank you, madam commissioner and commissioners for allowing me to speak and thank you for pronouncing my name absolutely correctly. That's very unusual for me so I do appreciate that.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you.

>> I'm not going to say a lot different than has already been said. I and my wife are the land owners of the property contiguous with this property here, we live just below it. We've lived there for 26 years, we moved into the area because it was very quiet, very safe for our three boys as they grew up. I'm sure that that's going to be

important to the next family when we retire or move away or just don't -- just pass on to better world. It is a very low traffic area right now. Around Tim Herr made the comment that because we're on a hill and we're actually where the hill starts, that that traffic will increase, the speed going down the will create hazards certainly for the children at the bottom of the hill will be a potentially nasty spot at those points. The other thing is talking about the open space comments, these are half-acre parcels. We moved out there to get the feeling of open space. As I've heard some of the proposal, these are going to be five to seven homes, all double-story, it's going to remove that feeling of why we and hundreds of other families moved into that area. So I am definitely opposed to this project going forward. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, and before you leave just for the record would you give us your name yourself.

>> Yes, Steve Garretas.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Margaret Garretas.

>> Good evening. I'm Margaret Garretas, and I am here today because I too believe that the development is inconsistent with our neighborhood. Our neighborhood is single family homes. Our neighborhood has a pastoral feel. It is the reason we moved there. We could have moved to the country club, we could have moved over to via Santa Teresa and had beautiful scenic views, but instead we chose a pastoral setting. And these seven homes, two stories, do not fit into our neighborhood as has been developed. Our roads are only improved so in front of our house we have gutters and sidewalks. The other side of the street does not. And so there's major issues with the project on drainage. I don't think the Patels know, but their property floods our property every single year and we've never said anything to them in 26 years. But it floods by groundwater and it floods by springs that come up underneath the hill as their water gets to a point where you know it meets the level of our land. Their density shows that they would do a project that's five feet from our property line. And there's no way they can deal with that in a simple manner for drainage. Their access to the property maybe if Mr. Macias prefers to develop his land, they could come off his street, which is Macias lane and Macias court, and at least eliminate dealing with our

streets which are half-improved, and creating you know, access issues on our streets. But I think that as far as the environmental clearance goes, it's important to know there's still areas in San José where we have wild turkeys, we have deer that come down about six months out of the year and eat our roses, and we have quail. We must have 20 or 30 quail and our property has about 18 redwoods. So we're very natural.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Mrs. Garretas, thank you very much.

>> Thank you. Yes, I'm also against zoning. I live at the very --

>> Commissioner Jensen: And if you would introduce yourself please, sir.

>> I'm Ben Quill. I live at the very end of Grimley, and Grimley is a dead end road. So that anybody who, if they build up there, you just have to turn back around and go back down that hill. Traffic was already bad enough as it is. It was mentioned that building the 4.4 houses per acre down at the end of Grimley. All those highways down there have easy access to Almaden road which is not a problem. It is kind of a private neighborhood. Good to see kids playing on the street. But on a dead end road where people can't go through, they have to go on down the hill. It's just too many. They could build six acres for that acre and a half. Multistory houses, everybody has got ranch houses, I agree with my neighbors that this just should not be done and I hope it's not done.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Dr. Jarrett. Okay, is that D.B?

>> Hi my name is Dennis Jarrett. I'm against the proposed amendment change to the general plan. I do not feel it protects the existing neighborhood patterns. The previous administrations, the previous Planning Commissions and city councils, have agreed that the various development that's gone on there with the Pinn brothers, the plans of the developers were changed to make larger parcels up further from Almaden road which are consistent with the existing neighborhood patterns and the densities increasing as you get closer to Almaden road. Seven homes up there at the top of the hill in the middle of the horse properties is not an appropriate use for that property. Three homes per acre, under the existing zoning, is a greater density than what existing now. So the

general plan does not need to be changed, I don't feel, to allow proper infilling of the -- of that property. We talk about high density, low density, we have low density up there. But low density up there in an area that was developed originally for two and a half acres per lot, changed to two dwelling units per acre. And now, we want to go to a moderate density of five dwelling units per acre, which would allow development of seven homes. To us, that is high density. So when we talk low density we're talking something much different than what you're normally, you know, accustomed to hearing. This is not an upgrade to our property. I would counter that it would be an exact opposite of that. And I think it's evident when you look at the plan and how it's laid out. Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Ms. Clurgy, if you would like to come up, you have up to five minutes to respond. If you would introduce yourself again.

>> Thank you. I understand what my neighbors are saying. It is a very, very beautiful area where we live. And I also enjoy the wild turkeys, the quails and the deer. They do get into whatever we have around there and it's enjoyable for the children. Again, I agree with what my neighbor Dennis says, too. The homes per acreage, I understand that five may be too much for what I'm saying on that acreage. But I would be happy if the council would look at even approving to have at least five homes there, instead of the seven. To be cost effective, to develop that road going tall way up, to do the cul-de-sac, and to make the homes affordable chem the drainage and the water that comes down, both ends, I also get flooded down there, for some of the water that comes down from the north part of me, where my neighbors live. I know that some of my other neighbors also have a lot of water that does come down. Hopefully, with us doing the development and putting the road in, and doing the drainage, we won't have that water problem and the water logging. So please consider the fact that maybe less homes to the acre, but five would be affordable. And cost effective to do the development. And they're not going to be two-storied homes everywhere. I like the ranch type and I want to flow with what is going on. Maybe they'll be split level. But they're not going to be monstrous two-storied homes, no.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. If you would hold on a second, one of my commissioners, Commissioner Abelite has a question for you.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Yes, thank you. I just have a quick question. This GP application was filed in 2007.

>> 7, yes.

>> Commissioner Abelite: So typically my understanding is the applicant is the one that should actually work on moving it through the process. Could you tell me about your efforts --

>> Well, no. Because we -- every time I believe there -- the engineer, I'm not sure where we got lost. But every time it was -- it was brought up, it was just to say it was still being reviewed. I don't know where the -- I have no idea where -- where -- whatever was got, was lost. I was out of town for a couple of weeks, and I come to this notice, to say we had a hearing. I don't know what happened, sir.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Okay, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, I have no further questions, thank you. Motion to close public hearing? There's a motion and second. All those in favor? Thank you. Would like staff --

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair in response to Commissioner Abelite's question, our records indicate that there's really been no activity in this file since 2007. We had tried to contact the applicant back in late 2007. In 2008 we received contact that they were preparing to resubmit their application. However, we did not receive that re-submittal. And in addition it appears there's some outstanding fees. The application, it looks like communication really stopped in 2008 with nothing happening until as I say as we started really looking at all of our dormant files and really felt that it was time to come to a decision. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. If the chairwoman deems it appropriate, since you have been working with the 2040 task force, and have a good understanding of the plans for the city, could you discuss that with the commission for this particular area, what the plans are for 2040?

>> Commissioner Jensen: We have a more kind of global focus. I'm going to ask the director to address specific parcels in the context of the neighborhood in which they lie.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Right. So again this is a general plan update so it's looking at the city as a whole. And the question is really where are the appropriate places in our community to add a half-million more population which is really what's forecasted by the year 2040. Based on all of the community workshops and social media surveys and continuing responses to e-mail, et cetera, we have determined that it's really best to put new population really where we have the infrastructure to support it. And for that reason we are looking at corridors of major street, intensifying with two to maybe six-story development, more mixing of uses, more creation of villages, urban types of villages within our suburban neighborhood so people can cycle and walk to services instead of always having to get into a car. The more outlying areas of the city we're really trying to protect the pattern that's already there. And so we're looking at really protecting the low tense did I areas as low density areas. We do need executive homes in San José, as well as affordable housing and everything in between. And so this would be a location for executive housing. Two units to the acre still allows for development to occur. And so for that reason, we feel that it's got development potential and we would love to see the improvements. We agree with the owner, that through development, there are the opportunities to resolve the drainage and other issues that the community is seeing. But that can happen at a density lower than five units to the acre. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Commissioner Kline.

>> Commissioner Kline: Unified School District like to move this along and like to follow the staff's recommendation of denial of general plan amendment. And would like to move it along.

>> Commissioner Jensen: There is a motion and a second. Would you like to speak to your motion, Commissioner Kline?

>> Commissioner Kline: Just real quickly. Coming from city council where we had a significant amount of building on hillsides in Saratoga, water issues just go on forever. They never go away even when there's lots of development. It's really important to protect the hillsides from development, from high density development. Do whatever you can now, because once it stops it is extremely difficult to stop it. Once one gets divided you'll get a second application and a third and a fourth and it goes on forever. So you really have to be stern and draw a line in the sand and really stick with your general plan, which I think is a good one now and provide a great area for a rural environment that the City of San José really needs. To have a complete city. So I think the general plan right now is good, and we stick with it and stick to our guns.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Kline. Commissioner Cahan would you like to add to that?

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am a proponent of density, infill density specifically. However, where it's appropriate. And this is -- it's just not an appropriate area to increase the density. So I appreciate what you have said as the applicant, I appreciate what you have said but unfortunately it is not just not the right area.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Cahan. I see no -- Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Thank you, Madam Chair. I also agree with the motion. Having lived in that neighborhood, not too far, I actually concur with all the residents who have spoken against this project. Another thing is, also, this is inconsistent with existing neighborhood as they have stated. It's not appropriate to develop, higher density, this is not exact term of higher density but even seven or five homes on such lot should not be built on the lower foothill, which is right next to our urban growth boundaries. There is places that we need to do higher density, medium density. I'm all for infill as well, infill development, but this is definitely not the place. It's not appropriate. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. Seeing no additional speaker lights may we vote by hand? All those in support of the motion please raise your hand? And that motion passes unanimously. with Commissioner Platten absent. Thank you. Moving on to 6 E. GP 05-06-03. General plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation from light industrial to transit corridor residential on a 7.08 acre site. Located on the south side of Campbell avenue approximately 215 feet Northwesterly of O'Brien court. Staff.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair. Similar to the last application this, too, has been dormant for many years. We did have a planning process in the general vicinity and so for that reason, the applicant had held off. And then as that plan essentially was kind of coming to closure, we were involved with the general plan update. And as the council -- excuse me, the commissioners who were participating in the update know, it's really a jobs first plan. And so in that context then, all employment land, and this site is currently designated as light industrial, became all the more important. So combined with the dormancy of the application, the clear policy direction of the current council to enforce the framework for the preservation of employment land and the future direction of our city we are recommending denial. It is inconsistent with the existing general plan, and again, we did contact Barry Swenson builder regarding this application so they've been aware that we are intending to move this forward to council for its final decision on December 7th. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. And I see no speaker cards. Is the applicant here? Oh, I'm sorry we do have speaker cards. I'm going -- is the applicant here? No. Okay. I'm going to call the speakers and if you would come down and line up at the bottom of the stairs and I'm going to apologize again. Matthew bright, John Buchler and John urban. And if you would introduce yourself, you have up to two minutes.

>> Hello, my name is Matthew Bright, I'm a resident of the newhall neighborhood, the home of this parcel, and a member of the Newhall Neighborhood Association which represents approximately 2000 people in the Santa Clara border and Interstate 880 area of San José. In short, we strongly endorse the staff recommendation to recommend city council denial of the GP amendment for 1185 Campbell Avenue. The neighborhoods are

opposed to the GP amendment because a potential high rise tower is out of character with the rest of a largely medium density neighborhood. The site hosts and award winning tech based employer, exactly the kind of employer that we want to keep in the City of San José and as staff notes the redesignation from productive light industrial use is in direct conflict with established policy on employment land preservation. Furthermore, residential use is in conflict with the draft Envision general plan and super high-density residential is better located directly adjacent to transit rather than half a mile away. So I urge you to recommend denial of this GP amendment. Such a recommendation will support San José jobs policy, the spirit of Envision 2040, and the character of the existing neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Mr. Buchler, if you would come forward and introduce yourself, you also have two minutes, and my apologies for what I did to your name.

>> My name is John Buchler, and I'm a resident and part of the HOA of the community directly across from that site, and I just want to repeat basically what Matthew has said as well, pretty much covers what I would say as well. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you.

>> Hello, my name is John urban, president, newhall hall neighborhood association. As Matt described we represent about 2,000 folks in the greater area of this proposal. We definitely or I definitely support the planning department's recommendation to keep this parcel light industrial. For three reasons. One, it does not conform to our upcoming 2040 general plan overview, our idea. Number 2, we don't -- would rather not lose the revenue that's going to be generated from this light industrial property. We have a park in our neighborhood that we've had for two or three years, laying fallow. We have the land, we've got the construction money, we've got the design sitting on the shelf. All we need is money for the maintenance. And Zazow which currently occupies the property would be a great generator of money that could go to something like a park. And we'd appreciate consideration. But the biggest thing any kind of development like this simply would not fit the character of the

neighborhood and that's probably the biggest thing. We are highly encouraging you to support leaving it as the light industrial. Thank you very much.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Mr. Urban. Motion to close public hearing? There's a motion and a second to close public hearing. All those in favor? Thank you. Staff. Would you like to follow up?

>> Laurel Prevetti: No further comment, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, great, commission. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to make a motion to recommend to city council the denial of a general plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation from light industrial to transit corridor residential, 30 plus dwelling units per acre, on a 7.08 acre site as recommended by staff.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Is there a second? There's a motion and second. Would you like to speak to your motion?

>> Commissioner Cahan: No.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, thank you. Is there any discussion on this item? Seeing none, all those in favor? Please raise your hands. And that motion passes unanimously, with Commissioner Platten absent. Thank you. Moving on to our last GP item of the evening. GP 05-03-07. General plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation on a 14.23 gross acre site from light industrial to medium high density residential, 12 to 25 dwelling units per acre, on 8.5 acres, high density residential, 25 to 50 dwelling units per acre on 4.0 acres and general commercial on .5 acre. A portion of the former railroad spur consisting of approximately 1.23 acres would remain unchanged. Staff.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair. Similar to the other applications, this one has been lying dormant for quite some time. There has not been any response from the property owner in terms of how they intend to comply with the framework for the preservation of employment lands, nor have they paid all of their application fees. We are expecting the applicant or representative to be present this evening to provide you with their concerns and commentary. But similar to with the others, we have reached out, and again, we are recommending denial. This is an application that is for the retention of employment lands within the City of San José, consistent with the existing general plan of San José 2020. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. And is the applicant here? Is the applicant on this parcel available? I see nobody. So I'm going to assume that's not the case. And close public hearing. Since it really never got opened. Is there discussion from the commission? Would somebody like to make a -- Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. I make a motion to recommend to the city council the denial of a general plan amendment request to change the land use transportation diagram designation on a 14.23 acre site from the light industrial to medium high density residential 12 to 25 dwelling units per acre on an 8.5 acres high density residential 25 to 50 dwelling units per acre on a 4.0 acres and general commercial on a .5 acre. A portion of the former railroad spur consisting of 1.23 acres would remain unchanged as recommended by staff.

>> Commissioner Jensen: There is a motion and second. Would you like to speak to your motion?

>> Commissioner Cahan: No.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, please raise your hands and that motion passes unanimously, with Commissioner Platten absent. Thank you. And I would like to now entertain a motion to continue the general plan, the 2010 fall general plan amendment hearing to December 1st, 2010. There's a motion, is there a second? There's a motion and second. All those in favor? That motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Petitions and communications. Public comments to the planning commission on nonagendized items. Please fill out a speaker's card and give it to the technician. Each member of the public may

address the commission for up to three minutes. The commission cannot take any formal action without the item being properly noticed or placed. On an agenda. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to the following options: Responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. There are any speaker cards?

>> Laurel Prevetti: There are none.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Thank you. Referrals from city council, boards, commissions, or other agencies.

>> Laurel Prevetti: We have none this evening.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Good and welfare, report from city council.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to report out, the city council did consider a couple of the zonings that had come forward to you, and they did recommend a unanimous approval. This included the Chinmaya mission that you saw just last week. So that is now going to be moving into the planned development permit stage. We also did add some new historic landmarks to our City of San José. And then third, the city council did agree to suspend the inclusionary housing requirement for certain North San José housing projects. So we're hopeful that that might stimulate some construction in the North San José area in the short term. And that concludes the report from city council. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, commissioners reports from committees, Norman Y. Mineta San José international airport noise advisory committee. Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Madam Chair, we will be meeting next week so I hope to have a report at our next meeting.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. Envision San José 2040 general. Plan update process, Commissioner Kamkar.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Unfortunately, I missed that meeting. I was wondering if the director can report on it.

>> Laurel Prevetti: I would be happy to, thank you so much. A couple of nights ago, on November 1st, we conducted a small group exercise, while watching the end of the game, thank you very much John, and celebrated together, so that was a good time. But namely, we were actually testing some of the implementation policies in the proposed plan arounds village planning so we looked at three key areas, three potential villages and we got fabulous feedback. We were again using legos to get a hands-on understanding of how these policies would work and we had just terrific feedback from both the public and from the task force. So staff is now busy trying to incorporate those great ideas into new policy language that the task force will see at their next meeting on November 15th. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, staff. Review and approval of synopsis. Since we don't have a synopsis, I'm going to make a recommendation for -- make a request for a motion to defer that to our next agenda. Can I get a motion? Okay, there's a motion and second. Would everybody in support please say aye. Thank you, that passes unanimously. Subcommittee reports and outstanding business. We discussed at our last meeting, and several meetings prior to that, the development of several different subcommittees, based on input from the commission. And if counsel would like to provide us kind of a framework for how commissioners might work outside of the commission, or the director, to make these things happen, that would be great, before we get started on this discussion.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Sure, certainly, just to catch up the full commission, because we did have a couple of absences last week. There were really five issues that the commission identified that they would like to spend some time on. The first was the riparian corridor policy. The second was green building, and I'd say that was probably the one with the most interest. Lots of interest or some interest in staff's idea about having the

commission essentially help us with up-front guidance on our capital improvement program, so that way we can really align those city investments with our growth projections. The fourth idea was to allow the commission to conduct some research for the staff around best practices for how consultants can be hired, and we see this particularly as being a viable idea for the environmental consultant process. And then the fifth idea was to really dive into some urban design questions, that as we look at village planning in the future, how can we specifically turn shopping centers into villages, and then knit those new villages into the fabric of existing neighborhoods, is there a possibility of providing some design guidelines, some specificity, as developers come to our city, everyone would know what the rules would be in terms of urban design. As described last week, we've got some options. One is that some of these topics are probably better suited for study sessions, and certainly staff would recommend that for the green building items. Oftentimes the specific green building measures are not identified until we are at the planned development permit stage which is after you would have considered the zoning. But I think given the interest in terms of helping you obtain more expertise about what should you be looking for at the zoning stage, we think that would be a fabulous study session topic. Again, San José has very strong green building ordinances so it's a requirement for certain types of projects over a certain threshold to essentially be LEED silver or the equivalent for residential. The riparian corridor policy, we're already looking at how we can work with stakeholders who are interested in this. And we would love for a couple of commissioners, and I believe council last week said the maximum should be two, to work with us on some possibility of how we can strengthen the policy and/or provide some additional guidance to staff. The third comment I would just like to make is that counsel was very clear last week, that as we look at how to engage on these topics, that the commission really does not have the authority to make new policy. But rather, to make suggestions to the director and/or to council. So again just to manage expectations but we really are very appreciative that the commission is interested in getting involved in some of these key issues. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, director. So that said, what I'd like -- Commissioner Bit-Badal.

>> Commissioner Bit-Badal: Possible for me to make one more addition? I was also concerned about wireless C.U.P.s for wireless towers. And I talk about it offline but I just also wanted to bring it forward that I think it would

be great to have a study session on that and I would love to see an industry expert come and talk about it, in addition to our staff. But I definitely want to see industry expert at our study session. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Bit-Badal. Commissioner Abelite.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Yes, last week when we talked about this and Commissioner Cahan brought up the idea of the LEED building you know the green building study I liked that a lot. But then in hindsight I realized it probably is best for a study session. As I went away from what we talked about last week, I realized something else maybe we should be thinking about and that is, what can we do to spur economic activity in this city. And we didn't talk about it and then I just heard the report from city council where they just waived the inclusionary zoning requirements temporarily in an effort to move in this direction. Maybe this is something that -- I don't know if it's appropriate, that -- I would be interested in finding out how that happened. Did that come from the Office of Economic Development as a recommendation to get things going or does this body appropriate to look at other possibilities temporarily?

>> Commissioner Jensen: Director.

>> Laurel Prevetti: Yes, thank you, thank you for your interest. Actually this is something that the city administration is looking at very seriously at the highest levels with the City Manager's office really taking the lead from not only Office of Economic Development, the Redevelopment Agency, the other's from the efforts of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement, we are looking at ways to streamline the development process and really help welcome new businesses to our city. Jeannie and the staff are working very hard on a lot of C.U.P.s and special use permits and development application applications to really get those businesses going in our community. So we're looking at internal ways that we can move faster, but maintain the quality control that is so desperately needed for our city. So I don't see any specific work for the commission at this particular time. There may be future ordinance changes that you would be considering in terms of how we might deregulate certain types of uses. But I -- and I would look to Jeannie if she has any ideas, doesn't look light it either. So but thank you, if we can just kind of keep that in the back of our minds we do appreciate that support, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: All right, somebody -- Commissioner Cahan.

>> Commissioner Cahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. It was my understanding at the last meeting that when we discussed the green building, I brought up the point that I didn't believe that one study session was enough time to cover the depth of green building. I mean it's a very, very broad -- so from your description just now it sounded like it was back to just a study session. Would you clarify that again for me?

>> Laurel Preveti: Certainly. It takes a fair amount of staff resources to even prepare for a study session. You know I could see if we could do a series, kind of green building 101, what is it, green building 102, what are the policies and ordinances in San José, and then maybe green building 103, what might be coming forward in the future. But I don't think we have quite the depth to be able to actually do the types of training that are offered through U.S. green building, or through the LEED efforts. There are a lot of conferences and other training materials that are available. So we would certainly want to bring you up to speed and give you a comfort level in terms of what's applicable here in San José. But in terms of really getting that in-depth knowledge, we would certainly -- we would prefer to point you to other resources, and we do have staff who are certified professionals, who are available to do a certain amount of the training. So you would be learning with people who are credentialed. But we -- I think we would just need to identify what would be the appropriate level for the staff, and then for those of you who are interested in learning more what those resources might be.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, director. I'd like to lend to that. Because it appeared that the commission is very interested in self-study. And if you could provide a list of those resources, at the time of the study session, and access to how people might become members of the APA or the California league of cities, and what those -- where to go find those resources online, Commissioner Kline has amazing library of urban design books, perhaps he could provide a bibliography that would be useful for folks who are interested in self-study as well. Commissioner Kline.

>> Commissioner Kline: I think the study session are a great idea if the staff can actually get resources for it. But obviously we have motivate ourselves to do as much as possible to help out. I think two items I'd be willing to volunteer for. I'm more focused on less talk and less paper and more do. I love to have been available for the building of the urbans with the toys but baseball, what can you say?

>> Commissioner Jensen: That's your priority set so --

>> Commissioner Kline: To things. I think the idea of doing best practices is something we should start in early on. It's not just this particular task. There are lots of things going on out there, innovations and it's really exciting when you read in the material what other Planning Commissions and other cities are doing. It's not that San José is behind the times, there's a lot going out there. One idea is that our integrity is fine first, when a development comes along and a consult is giving us advice, we know that consultant is independent, giving us independent advice, no appearance of impropriety. It's not that there is impropriety, but we don't want appearance of impropriety. Doing a small task of going out and finding best practices finding out what our practices are currently and summarizing it quickly and comparing it to similar cities to ours, we may find that we do best practices, we are the ones that are leading the way or we may find there are better ways of doing it. In Sunday, Saratoga, Santa Clara, they do it differently than we do. I think that one is very truable, very quickly, I'm talking three four months time frame, not three four years. So I think we can get -- and I'm willing to spend time in doing that.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Kline. Is there anybody who would like to join Commissioner Kline in that small group of developing best practices? Reviewing best practices?

>> Commissioner Kline: It's basically environmental consultants. It's physically do we keep the existing system or do we go to a system that most cities have.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Do we make recommendations for change?

>> Commissioner Kline: Yeah.

>> Commissioner Jensen: So is there somebody who would like to participate with Commissioner Kline on that? Commissioner Cahan has volunteered, okay, great. We have a committee of two, with Commissioners Kline and Cahan investigating best practices for the hiring of environmental consultants specifically. And it may enlarge itself into other consultants as the two see fit. Director?

>> Laurel Prevetti: Thank you. I want to make sure we have all clear expectations in terms of how to move this forward. Now that we have a subcommittee I would recommend that you contact Darryl Boyd, who is here this evening, who can fill you in on our current practice. As well as some of the ideas that staff is considering, so you have at least that beginning. And then I think in terms of the form of your recommendation, or your ideas, it would really be to the director of planning, since it's more of an administrative process in terms of how we interact with our consultants community, and we look forward to what you find for us. Thank you.

>> Commissioner Kline: The one question falling out without getting into it, this is an internal procedural policy of staff not a council policy. I think that's true, right?

>> Laurel Prevetti: That is correct.

>> Commissioner Kline: Thank you.

>> But I loss want to add that the overarching rules for the hiring of consultants purchasing of goods and the contracting for goods and services is in the city code. So that really is the overarching rules that you need to look at. When you take you know the city staff policy, you take departmental policy into consideration, as well.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. We -- and I would just like to add that we look forward on the commission to periodic updates and you feel you have information to share with us. And we'll make sure to put you on the agenda for future meetings. The policy on urban design specifically with the subtitle shopping centers to villages, Commissioner Bit-Badal requested participation on that. Do we have another commissioner interested in

participating on that with Commissioner Bit-Badal? Commissioner, I see two hands flying around down here. Commissioner Kamkar.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: I was wondering if Commissioner Abelite was also interested, so if he's interested I will defer, but --

>> Commissioner Jensen: Mic.

>> Commissioner Abelite: I'm sorry, originally this was brought forth by Commissioner Kline and I'm surprised he's not jumping in on it kind of --

>> Commissioner Kline: Well I did not want to hog the subcommittee issues.

>> Commissioner Jensen: There's enough work to go around.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Only because he has more study on that and more baseline limit.

>> Commissioner Kline: I understand the two limit, although other cities don't have that two limit, if it's two limit I'd probably want other commissioners to do that, just because I'm already on a committee. If that two-limit is not hard, I'd love to jump in and help. I think there's enough work that the three could do it.

>> Commissioner Abelite: Is the two limit a hard limit?

>> Commissioner Kline: I understand why it is. It's not a Brown Act issue.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay so that question is up to our legal counsel.

>> I'd be more than happy to look at that if I knew that had been an agenda item that you had been looking at. I want not at your former meeting. We'll look at council policy and advise you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, great. And then riparian corridor policy. I would very much like to participate on that. Is there anybody who would like to work with me on that? Commissioner Kamkar. Please use your mic.

>> Commissioner Kamkar: Sorry about that. I will join you on the riparian corridor if there's no other interest so Commissioner Abelite can stick with the shopping center.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, so I'm switching Commissioner Abelite over to urban design. All right. And remember, no Brown Act violations on this, folks. So CIP up front guidance for staff, recommendations, staff specifically recommended any assistance that the commission could provide on how they might best approach the CIP, for those of you who haven't had the pleasure of doing it, a 400 pound notebook shows up at your desk and we review it in a meeting. And I don't see anybody thrilled about the opportunity to -- sorry, staff.

>> Laurel Prevetti: That's okay. I think you know again we wanted to put that out there. We still have some in-housework to do with our partner departments in terms of infrastructure. So when we're a little bit better organized you might see this come up on your agenda and then we can engage you in a more specific way. No offense, that's fine, thank you.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, and I'm going to make a request for both the wireless tower policy and economic growth discussion, turn into study sessions. Because then we might be able to have a brainstorming session that may result in a subcommittee or may result in more answers. There's not much left of the year so it will be pushed for a while. Commissioner Abelite.

>> Commissioner Abelite: As it relates to my suggestion about the economic development process having heard the answer of what's already going on in the background, I think there's a lot of horsepower being applied in the right direction so I'm going to remove that from my wish list.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, I think we are --

>> Laurel Prevetti: If I may, just again, since now we have three subcommittees we essentially described next steps on the first one, the consultants. Next step on the shopping center urban design group, I'm not really sure what you would like to do with that. Because that's a huge topic and there's a lot of research out there so I'm not sure if you would just be essentially creating maybe a list of resources that staff could consider, when it comes time for us to think about design guidelines. We already have a fair number of design guidelines, as it pertains to transit oriented development. There are some draft guidelines in the envision 2040 plan that are online. But give some thought in terms of what type of product or outcome you're looking at if you're -- and we're perfectly content if first you want to familiarize yourself with the literature. You know and if you want to use me as a contact person I'd be happy to be your point of contact. I know Commissioner Kline has interest in this topic so I think we -- you know this might want to come back for a fuller discussion with the task force. Excuse me, with the commission. We do foresee doing a study session with all of you around the Envision 2040, so I think that might be an opportunity for all of the commission to engage on these urban design issues. It's really time for San José to have a constituency around urban design so we welcome your interest. So I don't have specific guidance for you but just feel free to work with me. In terms of the riparian, we will be setting up a meeting with -- inviting the two commissioners who expressed interest with that and the other stakeholders. So the staff will be following up with you directly and you might be hearing from our assistant, Sue Diehl in terms of when that next meeting will be.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you. As with the green building and the best practices, I look forward to having regular and periodic updates from the subcommittees on how you're progressing and what you're learning and just to provide us input. Commissioner Kline.

>> Commissioner Kline: Just real quick, I recommend for subcommittees, if it be a recommendation, come back with the next meeting or the next two meetings with what you think the deliverables are going to be and a time to end your subcommittee so that the Planning Commission as a whole can bless the subcommittees as far as what

the expectations are. You know, I don't know what those are but I mean that's the first item that the committee should have is kind of like a work plan that you can come back and say this is what we are planning on doing so that the whole -- we get authority from the Planning Commission to actually go out and do the things we want to do.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Thank you, Commissioner Kline. Moving on to commission calendar and study sessions. So we have now a request to add green building as a study session and the wireless tower policy as a study session as well. Do we have any other requests for study sessions? Seeing none, okay, staff so if you could try and find, probably not this year because the year is running out pretty quick but --

>> We're actually putting together your calendar for next year so I think with this assessment tonight we'll you know look ahead understanding staff resources and whatnot. And try to include or look to include the study sessions related to green building, wireless, and was there one other --

>> Commissioner Jensen: That was it.

>> Yeah, as part of that so we get it on with one action.

>> Commissioner Jensen: That's great.

>> And we're looking to bring that to your November 17th hearing.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Okay, great. For those commissioners who are interested in versing themselves on the green building policy and green building and urban design and so forth, I realize staff is really stretched thin. But would it be possible to try and provide, perhaps by e-mail to the entire commission, resources where people might go, training programs, weekend classes, after-hours classes or where there might be certifications available, whatever the commissioners decide that they might be interested in doing?

>> Laurel Prevetti: We can follow up with an e-mail link to the San José resources and then some other large organization and their training and then they would have their own calendar, et cetera. Again, I don't see us having the bandwidth to do some extensive, but we can get you started and you can start your education process.

>> Commissioner Jensen: Great, thank you very much. Is there anything else from the commission? Excellent. And with that we are adjourned. Thank you very much.