



CITY OF MILPITAS

Planning Commission

MEETING MINUTES

7:00pm

Wednesday, February 12, 2025
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS,
455 E CALAVERAS BLVD, MILPITAS, CA
and
via TELECONFERENCE (Zoom Webinar)

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Sonia Medina-Ashby called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Sonia Medina-Ashby led the pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Recording Secretary Medina called the roll.

PRESENT: Vice Chair Medina-Ashby, Gupta, Caulkins, and Kong.

ABSENT: Albana, Galang, Awasthi

STAFF: Jay Lee, Christopher Creech, Michael Fossati, Holly Pearson, and Elizabeth Medina

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION DECLARATION

Assistant City Attorney Christopher Creech asked if any member of the commission had any personal or financial conflict of interest related to any of the items on the agenda, and there were none.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2025

Caulkins nominated Gupta for Chair. Gupta accepted the nomination.
Motion/Second Kong/Caulkins
Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

Kong nominated Caulkins for Vice Chair. Caulkins accepted the nomination.
Motion/Second Gupta/Medina-Ashby
Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA

By motion, approve the meeting agenda for February 12, 2025.

Motion/Second Caulkins/Medina-Ashby
Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES

By motion, approve the meeting minutes for January 8, 2024.

Motion/Second Kong/Medina-Ashby
Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from Planning Director Lee or Planning Commissioners.

PUBLIC FORUM

Chair Gupta invited members of the public to address the commission, and there were none.

PUBLIC HEARING

X-1 PULTE HOME AFFORDABLE APARTMENTS MODIFICATION – 1355 CALIFORNIA CIRCLE – P-SA24-0005 / P-DB24-0002: A Site Development Amendment and Density Bonus Permit to modify the design and parking for a previously approved affordable residential apartment building, up to 78-feet in height, for a total of 75 residential units. The apartment building will include 85 vehicle parking spaces, two rooftop amenity areas, and associated site improvements on a 0.9-acre parcel at 1355 California Circle. An addendum to the Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2022110251) has been prepared, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR).

(23:25) Project Planner Michael Fossati and applicant's team, Jim Sullivan (Pulte), Megan Palmer (KTGY Architecture), and Sean Rossen (Waterford Property Company) addressed commissioners' clarifying questions on various topics related to:

- **Clarification on First Right of Refusal for Milpitas Unified School District (MUSD):** the resolution does not explicitly grant a first right of refusal. Instead, Condition 26 refers to the Affordable Housing Agreement. A separate private agreement between the developer and MUSD, which the city is not involved in but must comply with the Affordable Housing Ordinance.
- **Duration of Affordability Agreements:** The regulatory agreement ensuring affordability will last for 55 years, clarifying a potential confusion about a 30-year period.
- **Parking and Density Bonuses:** The project utilizes density bonuses to waive certain parking requirements. Fewer parking spaces are being offered than the typical city requirements, though state guidelines provide some flexibility for the developer.
- **Community and City Involvement:** There is a strong focus on aligning the developer's approach with the city's affordable housing ordinances. The city is committed to supporting the project's success.
- **Parking Concerns:** The project includes 86 parking spaces for 75 units, but concerns were raised about the adequacy of parking for guests, overflow, and street parking availability given the unit-to-parking ratio.
- **Parking Fee and Payment:** The developers have already paid \$3.9 million in parking fees to the city, with further discussions regarding adjustments to these fees.
- **School Fees and Impact:** Conversations were held around the impact of the project on local schools, particularly regarding any fees or obligations associated with the development.
- **Building Design and Height Adjustments:** There was a shift from a six-story to a five-story building, with a focus on minimizing the building's impact on the surrounding community.
- **Parking Issues and Solutions:** To address potential parking concerns, the developers are considering collaboration with nearby commercial buildings for additional parking spaces.
- **Project Design and Safety:** Discussions included adding a parkway and ensuring the design supports pedestrian safety. A shared rendering

helped clarify the design, with special attention given to creating an appropriate and safe building entrance.

Motion to close the Public Forum.

Motion/Second Caulkins/Medina-Ashby

Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Zoning Administrator open and close the public hearing, consider the exemptions in accordance with CEQA, and adopt Resolution 25-003, approving Site Development Permit No. SA24-0005 and Density Bonus No. DB24-0002, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Motion/Second Caulkins/Gupta

Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

NEW BUSINESS

XI-1 STUDY SESSION FOR COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE

UPDATE (Phase 2): Commission received presentation from Project Manager Holly Pearson and LWC Consultant, Jennifer Murillo, regarding the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update.

([1:41:57](#)) Discussion consisted of:

1. Permit Level Reduction:

- a. A positive change, with reduced permitting levels expected to lower both permit fees and review times for certain projects. This will streamline approvals for projects with lower review levels. Other projects will follow the current process.

2. Housing Opportunity District vs. Zoning Update:

- a. The Housing Opportunity District (HOD) and the zoning update are separate initiatives. The zoning update mainly focuses on modernizing the text of the zoning ordinance, while the HOD encourages housing development in specific areas. Both efforts aim to implement the General Plan, with no conflicts between the two.

3. Permit Requirement Clarification:

- a. "P" in the permit table means the use is permitted by right, though other permits (like a site development permit) may still be required.
- b. Mobile food parks only need a minor conditional use permit (MCUP) in mixed-use zones, focusing on site amenities and layout, not infrastructure.
- c. The appropriate permit level for mobile food parks will be reconsidered based on community feedback.

4. Parking Requirements:

- a. Proposed changes reduce parking requirements for certain residential units. For single-family homes, uncovered driveway spaces may count toward parking requirements, but covered parking will still be mandatory.
- b. The need for clearer guidelines on including uncovered parking in meeting the requirements was acknowledged.

5. Transportation Demand Management (TDM):

- a. TDM is mandatory for projects meeting certain size thresholds and includes a mix of strategies to reduce vehicle trips.
 - b. No detailed point system exists yet, but the city plans to monitor the effectiveness of these strategies and make adjustments as needed.
 - c. The burden of implementation and monitoring may fall on the city, but efforts will minimize the impact on staff, with a focus on applicants providing the necessary information.
6. **Staffing Impacts:**
- a. Lowering permitting levels for certain projects may free up staff time for other tasks but won't drastically change the workload.
 - b. A careful and selective approach has been taken in determining which projects benefit from reduced permitting levels.
7. **Single-Family Residential Design Standards:**
- a. A concern was raised about the feasibility of a 40-square-foot patio requirement for higher-density, multi-story homes with small lot sizes. This will be reviewed for further feedback and adjustments.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gupta adjourned the meeting at 9:03 pm

Motion/Second Caulkins/Kong

Motion carried by a vote of AYES: 4 NOES: 0

Meeting Minutes submitted by
Planning Commission Secretary Elizabeth Medina