

**April 18, 2017**

**SB 343**

Senate Bill 343 mandates supplemental materials that have been received by the City Clerk's office that relate to an agenda item after the agenda packets have been distributed to the City Council be available to the public.

The attached documents were received in the City Clerk's office after distribution of the April 18, 2017, City Council meeting agenda packet.

**Item 6.1**

**From:** Marlene Massetti  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2017 10:28 AM  
**To:** City Council  
**Cc:** Luke Sims; Jeff Baker; Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Fw: Public Hearing: Site Development Review CVS Remodel

Mayor Haubert, Council members Biddle, Hernandez, Goel and Gupta:

The Planning Commissioners' hearing and deliberations presents a strong case in support of their rejection of CVS with findings the project fails to comply with the Site Development Review, the General Plan and Downtown Dublin Specific Plan.

The alternative resolution, submitted by Staff for Council's consideration is a resolution that reverses the Planning Commission's decision citing these same plans.

Council has an alternative to these two resolutions. One that will address the appeal and be a catalyst for the revitalization of our Downtown Retail District and the development of our Pedestrian Friendly Downtown.

1) **Approve, with modifications, the CVS Facade Remodel:** Revise the current remodel plans to comply with the recommendations of the Planning Commission for the (3) retail buildings. Their recommendations with Staffs' direction and input will ensure the retail stores reflect a higher level of building materials and "quality of design" identified by the Planning Commission, required in the Downtown Dublin Specific Plan.

**Outcome:** Modifying the CVS buildings to a higher quality (that also complies with our Downtown Plans) will establish the standard for future retail remodels and attract higher end stores to our Retail District.

2) **Postpone Parking Lot Improvements:** Repaving and landscaping the CVS portion only of the parking lot and leaving 2/3's of the mall in place is a piece meal approach, identified by several Planning Commissioners. The parking lot should be planned and developed as one, cohesive project. Developer Vic De Melo has confirmed his interest in developing the retail businesses south of CVS to the (vacated) Sports Authority building. This would allow for a seamless development of this site; the center of our Downtown Retail District.

Staffs' report states the Recreation Master Plan will result in a Downtown Plaza, location to be determined. The Plaza should be located in our Downtown Retail District, in the center of our retail district which is the CVS parking lot; an underutilized area. The site is surrounded by retail, new residential housing and is our Community's Downtown. The Downtown Plaza should be located here, in our retail district.

**Outcome:** Postponing parking lot improvements now will result in a cohesive Retail District Downtown with gathering places, a plaza, other amenities as provided for in the General Plan and Downtown Dublin Specific Plan.

3) **Develop a Master Plan for CVS Parking Lot that Provides the Community with a Pedestrian Friendly Downtown:** This site is the one remaining area, the center of our retail district, that could be the foundation for a vibrant, walkable downtown with connections to major streets, retailers and residents that could be realized in partnership with the City and Retailers.

**Outcome:** A Master Plan for the CVS parking lot will be a catalyst for other retailers; seeing the benefits in remodeling their stores and advantages to developing a Pedestrian Friendly, vibrant, Downtown which will support their businesses and attract new ones.

Please consider this two stage approach to the development of the CVS Facade Remodel which will set the standard for remaining retail remodels and support a vibrant, Pedestrian Friendly Downtown in Dublin. This approach is feasible, could be accomplished under the appeal process and one I believe the developer would also support.

Finally, we urge the Council to allocate all of the Community Benefit funds realized from residential development (past and present) in our Retail, Transit and Village Parkway districts for the development of our Downtown.

Sincerely,

Morgan King, Dublin Resident & Former Dublin Planning Commissioner  
Marlene Massetti, Dublin Resident



April 13, 2017

Honorable Mayor David Haubert  
Vice Mayor Don Biddle  
Dublin City Council

Dear Mayor Haubert, Vice Mayor Biddle, and Dublin Councilmembers,

I would like to take this opportunity to address the proposed redevelopment of 7201 Regional Street by Browman Development Company. Based in Walnut Creek, our firm has over 30 years of experience in the leasing of both new and existing retail centers throughout the Bay Area, primarily focused here in the East Bay.

There are a few key observations that I believe the City Council should carefully consider in evaluating this proposal.

First, large format retail centers are increasingly experiencing dramatic and evolutionary changes, largely driven by the shift to internet based shopping. The recently announced bankruptcies of The Sports Authority and Sport Chalet, are only the latest major defaults, coming on the heels of closures by brands like Mervyns, Circuit City and Home Expo, all of whom have closed Dublin stores in recent years. Others like Staples, Office Depot, JC Penney, Sears and Macy's are front page stories every day in the business press, with mounting store closure announcements.

Downtown Dublin itself has been hit by a combination of antagonists, including **bankruptcies** (The Sports Authority, Mervyns, etc), and **relocations** (Orchard Supply Hardware). These changes reflect the inexorable effects of the fast-changing evolution in retail, and they will continue to affect Dublin and other communities.

Despite these daunting headwinds, Browman Development Company has voluntarily proposed to invest heavily in a dated retail asset in Dublin's downtown, with the goal of stimulating the surrounding retail and attracting quality merchants. It can't be overstated how BDC is proposing to make this investment knowing that they are doing so in an environment of a shrinking, not growing, number of mid-sized retail box users.

Our firm has successfully marketed numerous prominent retail assets for lease along the 680-corridor over the past 30 years, with great success. Let me kindly observe that the high-quality user interest that BDC has been able to attract to this project to date has occurred solely because of the proposed redevelopment concept plan, and BDC's proven reputation as an owner of first class retail assets. Absent the redevelopment design, prospective users would see a tired center with a 1960's appearance, a neighboring second-hand store (Savers) and a twice vacant big box (Mervyns, The Sports Authority).

I can attest with complete confidence that the ability to attract lasting, quality brands to this mid-block location would be nil without BDC's proposed plan and investment.

I would be pleased to further discuss this topic at your convenience. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**JOHN CUMBELICH & ASSOCIATES, INC.**



John L. Cumbelich  
Principal  
[john@cumbelich.com](mailto:john@cumbelich.com)

CA BRE # 01006249