A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairperson Ohlson at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, October 10, 2006 in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, California.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ramirez, Thomas, Vice Chairperson Ohlson

Excused: Chairperson Tumbaga

Absent: None

Staff: Planning Director Melissa Ayres, Associate Planner Leigha Schmidt, Project Planner Ali Endress, Senior Civil Engineer Ron Nevels, Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, October 6, 2006.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Thomas led the Pledge of Allegiance.

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.
PRESENTATIONS:

1. **Capital Improvement Project Update** – Ron Nevels/Engineering Department
   Projects Currently Being Designed or Under Construction

Senior Civil Engineer Ron Nevels presented a Power Point presentation on the quarterly update of Engineering Department projects currently being designed or under construction. He presented each project description, budget, and status and answered questions from the Planning Commission on each of the identified projects.

CONSENT:

a. Minutes – September 26, 2006

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Thomas to adopt the Consent Calendar, as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Harris, Ramirez, Thomas, Ohlson
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioner Garcia
Absent: Chairperson Tumbaga

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**Item 1: The Mex-Tizos Grill. AP-06-369 (UP)**

An application for the approval of a use permit to establish a Mex-Tizos Grill (self-service restaurant) in a 2,695 square-foot lease space at 196 Atlantic Avenue, in the Atlantic Plaza Shopping Center. The property is zoned CC (Community Commercial) District. APN 088-121-015-7.

Project Planner Ali Endress presented the staff report dated October 10, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9666 approving AP-06-369 (UP), with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ramirez understood that the alcoholic beverages sold on-site would be limited to beer, wine and Margaritas. He inquired of staff whether the Margaritas would consist of wine or hard liquor or whether any other hard liquor would be sold.

Ms. Endress understood that beer, wine and Margaritas would be the only alcoholic drinks served, with no other hard liquor. She was uncertain what comprised the Margaritas and commented that the applicant could clarify that information.
Commissioner Thomas inquired whether or not there would be an area inside the facility that would serve non-alcoholic drinks given that the application was intended to be a fun, family-oriented restaurant, to which Ms. Endress clarified that there would be one dining area that would be all inclusive.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPONET:

ALEJANDRA MACIAS, 3194 Ameno Road, Concord, representing the Mex-Tizos Grill, affirmed when asked that she had read the resolution of approval and was in agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. She clarified her intent that the Margaritas would not consist of hard liquor but be a mixed drink. She commented that she now intended to only serve beer and wine and would not serve Margaritas as an alcoholic drink.

Ms. Endress advised that Margaritas could then be removed from the list of permitted alcoholic drinks. She noted that if the applicant desired to serve Margaritas with hard liquor in the future, a new use permit would have to be filed.

Commissioner Garcia noted that most Margaritas used Tequila, but some restaurants used wine to avoid having to obtain a hard liquor license.

Commissioner Ramirez inquired whether Ms. Macias had applied for a hard liquor license for the restaurant or for a beer and wine license.

Ms. Macias stated that she was applying for a beer and wine license and had no plans to make application for a hard liquor license.

Commissioner Ramirez pointed out that the restaurant had a large banner on the outside announcing the future location of the restaurant which had been disappointing given that the application had not yet been approved by the City.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that if the applicant planned to serve Margaritas in the future, he would suggest that reference remain in the resolution of approval with the understanding that the applicant must obtain a liquor license if planning to serve Margaritas with Tequila.

Ms. Macias reiterated that she had no plans to serve Margaritas in the restaurant.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
MOTION: AP-06-369 (UP)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9666, approving AP-06-369 (UP) a Use Permit to allow a self service restaurant with full alcohol service at 196 Atlantic Avenue in the Atlantic Plaza Shopping Center for “Mex-Tizos Grill. AP-06-359 (UP),” with the conditions as shown and with the sale of Margaritas removed from the resolution as a permitted alcoholic drink. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ramirez, Thomas, Ohlson
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chairperson Tumbaga

Vice Chairperson Ohlson identified the 10-day appeal process on a decision of the Planning Commission in writing to the City Clerk.

Commissioner Thomas reported that she attended the First Baptist Church, had no financial gain in the matter, and would participate in the discussion and decision on the next agenda item.

Commissioner Ramirez reported that he owned property at 487-489 West Eigth Street located within 100 feet of the subject site and would therefore not participate in the discussion to avoid any conflict of interest. He stepped down from the dais at this time.

Item 2: First Baptist Church. AP-06-368 (UP/DR)

A public hearing for 1) a use permit to operate a church with an ancillary social hall, meeting rooms, choir room, and other church related activities, and 2) design review approval of architectural and site development plans to construct a 26,400 square foot building on a vacant (approximately 4.00 acre) lot located at 550 West Tenth Street. The site is zoned CS-O (Service Commercial with a Limited Overlay) District; APN 085-270-026.

Project Planner Alexandra Endress presented the staff report dated October 10, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9668 approving AP-06-368 (UP/DR), with the conditions as shown.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson spoke to Page 2 of 8 of the staff report and clarified with staff the definition of the description of the property as a vacant compacted site covered with gravel and dirt. He also referred to Section 3. Use Permit of Resolution 9668, Condition 3, and requested better clarification that the reference to staff in the condition would be to “City staff.”
Again speaking to **Section 3. Use Permit** of Resolution 9668, Condition 6 (now Condition 5), Vice Chairperson Ohlson requested that the condition be amended to read:

5. *There shall be no containers or outdoor storage of goods on the subject site.*

With respect to **Section 4. Design Review** of Resolution 9668, Condition 2, Vice Chairperson Ohlson inquired of the size of the pipes of the backflow preventor located on the property to be screened from view. He was advised by an unidentified member of the audience that the backflow preventor pipes would be eight inches in size.

As to that same condition, Vice Chairperson Ohlson expressed his preference for oleanders to be planted in front of the backflow preventor to screen it from public view. For future applications, he expressed a desire to have lots of trees, similar to those planted at the Los Medanos Clinic where the trees had spread over the parking lot shading the entire area.

Commissioner Garcia referenced **Section 3. Use Permit** of Resolution No. 9668, Condition 3, and suggested that condition was not necessary given that the applicant would have to comply with the City’s noise standards regardless and since the church was currently situated in a residential area with no known noise complaints reported to the City.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

**PROONENT:**

REVEREND. KENNEDY PERKINS and DEACON ALEX BROWN, First Baptist Church, 375 15th Street, Oakland, offered a visual presentation of the proposed design of the interior and exterior of the church through a PowerPoint presentation. The proposed amenities were identified including the social hall, meeting rooms, offices, sanctuary, choir room, and other church related areas.

DEACON ALEX BROWN, an Antioch resident and the Acting Deacon of the Church, referenced Resolution No. 9668, **Section 3. Use Permit**, Condition 3 and explained that music was a large part of the services. He stated at times that music could get loud but it was during worship and would hopefully not be a nuisance to the neighborhood. He suggested it would encourage people to join them. With respect to **Section 4. Design Review**, Conditions 1 and 2, he explained that a letter of approval for the backflow preventor had been obtained from the Mirant Power Plant, which would allow the church to do whatever was necessary to screen the backflow preventor.

Deacon Brown liked the idea of using plants such as oleanders to screen the backflow preventor, although in this instance he stated it was the main water supply for the Mirant Power Plant. As such, Mirant required security around the backflow preventor and a hot
box or guard shack. Freestanding, anchored and lockable enclosures would prevent any potential vandalism and the church had agreed to do something in that nature. If acceptable to the Planning Commission and the Planning Department, that was the approach the church would like to take rather than having to build and design a custom enclosure.

Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado explained that the City’s Municipal Code required that anything above ground be screened whether with plants or another structure. He agreed that staff could work out that issue with the applicant.

In response to Commissioner Thomas, the applicants affirmed that they were comfortable with the remaining conditions of approval.

Deacon Brown added that Section 4. Design Review of Resolution No. 9668, Condition 9, should be modified since the plans had been modified to provide bicycle parking for at least ten bicycles.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson recommended the use of the wave design bike racks, as used at the front entrance to City Hall.

Commissioner Diokno inquired whether or not the acoustics had been considered as part of the design of the building. He also inquired of staff whether or not the neighbors to the rear of the site had been notified of the public hearing.

Deacon Brown explained that they were in the process of designing the acoustics for the sanctuary. In the fellowship social hall, they were considering audio, video and acoustical treatments for the rooms.

Ms. Endress affirmed that all surrounding property owners within 300 feet of the subject property had been notified of the public hearing. Staff had received no written or telephone comments on the application.

WILLIE MIMS, Black Political Association (BPA), Pittsburg, supported the church and the proposed building design. Having read the staff report and the parking accommodations, he questioned how a congregation with over 700 members would be accommodated by only 175 total parking spaces that would be provided on site. He noted that street parking would not be allowed. He recommended a parking variance to accommodate the large congregation.

Mr. Mims also questioned the imposition of Section 3. Use Permit, Condition 4 of Resolution No. 9668 and asked whether or not the requirement for a temporary activity permit was a requirement for all churches in the City. If not, he questioned its imposition on the subject applicant.
As to Section 4. Design Review, Condition 11, Mr. Mims questioned why a sign was not a part of the subject application. He suggested that the sign should be a part of the project.

Also, to Section 4. Design Review, Condition 31, he questioned the imposition of that condition and questioned where in the City there was a six-foot wide sidewalk.

Ms. Endress explained that a temporary activity permit was required for all uses holding temporary activities in the City and applied to all uses in the City. She also clarified that no signs had been proposed at this time and the applicant was aware that any future sign application could be filed for Planning Commission consideration.

As to the sidewalk width requirement, Mr. Hurtado advised that a six-foot sidewalk was a minimum requirement due to the placement of fire hydrants which must be placed 18 inches from the face of the curb. An exception to the requirement would be if there was a planter between the curb and the sidewalk. In that case, the minimum requirement would be a four-foot sidewalk.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated his concern with the condition relating to noise complaints in that the existing church was located in a residential neighborhood with no reported noise complaints. Also, the existing church had single pane windows and was not insulated. He recommended that Section 3. Use Permit, Condition 3 be eliminated from Resolution No. 9668.

In response to Commissioner Thomas, Ms. Endress reiterated that no signage was being proposed at this time, although that would not preclude the applicant from applying for signage in the future. Again, the requirement for a temporary activity permit applied to all temporary uses in the City, not just the subject church.

DARNELL TURNER, Pittsburg, thanked the Commission for considering the removal of Condition 3 relating to noise complaints. He noted that the Mirant Power Plant had been a nuisance in the area for over 40 years, 24 hours a day and he suggested that condition would have been a challenge for the City to enforce. He also questioned the condition requiring a temporary activity permit given his knowledge that many other organizations in the City had violated that condition. As such, he questioned how the City would enforce that condition.

Mr. Turner also spoke to Section 3. Use Permit, Condition 7, and noted there were several businesses in the area that did not currently comply with that condition with several business having been cited as a result. He also questioned how the City would enforce that condition.

Ms. Ayres explained that Condition 7 related to the National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) in that the City had a permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which required the City to implement clean water provisions.
Over time those conditions were applied to smaller and smaller projects. The City’s NPDES Coordinator was responsible to ensure that the NPDES requirements were being met. In addition, the City had a contract with Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) for spot inspections.

Mr. Turner questioned whether the City had applied that condition to all businesses. He questioned the fairness of that condition, citing an auto repair shop at the corner of Tenth Street and Beacon and a painting contractor business that were both in violation of those requirements. He also noted that not all storm drains had not been painted to identify the NPDES requirements.

Commissioner Harris questioned whether or not Mr. Turner had taken photographs of those sites, to which Mr. Turner acknowledged that he had not taken photographs of those sites.

Mr. Turner opposed the placement of conditions that were not applied to all businesses in the City and suggested that the City was not consistently enforcing those conditions. He noted that the church was moving into an area that was already blighted but would enhance the area. He suggested that the City should help improve the quality of life and suggested that a letter from the Chair of the Planning Commission to the City Council would emphasize the need for staff and others to enforce code requirements.

Commissioner Harris noted that he had identified numerous properties in the City in need of code enforcement and would take photographs of many of those properties to present to the City Council for consideration in the near future.

Commissioner Thomas reported her understanding that code enforcement had a backlog of 2,000 cases. She agreed that a letter from the Chair of the Planning Commission to the City Council should be considered.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: AP-06-368 (UP/DR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9668, approving AP-06-368 (UP/DR) Use Permit and Design Review approval of architectural and site development plans to construct and establish a 34,859 square foot church on a vacant 4.0 acre lot located at 550 West Tenth Street for “First Baptist Church, AP-06-368 (UP/DR),” with the conditions as shown and with the following modifications:

- Eliminate Condition 3 of Section 3. Use Permit;
Amend Condition 6 of Section 3. Use Permit to read:

6. There shall be no containers or outdoor storage of goods on the subject site.

Revise to allow final solutions to be worked out between staff and applicant later.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thomas and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Thomas, Ohlson
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioner Ramirez [recused], Chairperson Tumbaga

Vice Chairperson Ohlson identified the 10-day appeal process on a decision of the Planning Commission in writing to the City Clerk.

Commissioner Ramirez returned to the dais at this time.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson declared a recess at 8:15 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 8:22 P.M. with all Commissioners initially shown as present and excused.

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 3: Forrest Memorial Church. AP-05-291 (DR)

An application by Reverend Forrest of the Forrest Memorial Church Center requesting design review approval to demolish the existing church and construct a new two-story, 5,926 square foot church to replace it. The property is located at 1279 Railroad Lane and in the CS (Service Commercial) best fit zoning district. APN 086-160-013-8.

Project Planner Ali Endress presented the staff report dated October 10, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9667 approving AP-05-291 (DR), as conditioned.

Ms. Endress reported that staff had received a fax dated October 10, 2006, from Reverend Forrest who had raised concerns with the requirement for the demolition of the existing building. Staff had discussed the issue with the City’s Traffic, Building and Engineering Departments and saw no reason why the existing building could not remain while the new church was being built.

Ms. Endress clarified that a Certificate of Occupancy for the new church could not be obtained until the proposed structure and site plan were complete and compliant with the...
project plans. The existing structure would be required to be removed before the church could assume occupancy of the new structure.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson spoke to Sheet C-1 of the drawings, general notes, and requested clarification of the cut sheets required to be submitted to the City within 48 hours.

Mr. Hurtado explained that a cut sheet would identify the area of proposed grading providing the areas related to be filled or needing to be cut. He also clarified in response to the Vice Chair that the reference to a "pit box" or "pit vault" on Sheet C-2 referred to the electrical boxes in the front.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson also spoke to Sheet C-3 related to the placement of the bicycle parking stalls which he understood would be placed in what would have been a vehicle parking stall. He expressed concern that a bicycle parked in that area without a curb could be damaged by a vehicle. He noted that bicyclists preferred that bicycle racks be located no farther from the main entrance of a building than the closest handicap parking stall.

Speaking to drawing C-5, Vice Chairperson Ohlson, requested clarification from staff on the placement of the fiber optic rolls and the placement of the stakes.

PROONENT:

PASTOR BILL FORREST, Wedgewood Drive, Pittsburg, Agent/Project Manager for the application, explained that the church had moved forward with the project with all deliberate speed. He suggested that the project would beautify the location. He requested approval of the application as submitted.

Commissioner Garcia affirmed that the applicant had read the conditions of approval and agreed with the conditions as long as they applied to all applicable projects.

DARNELL TURNER, Pittsburg, spoke in favor of the project which would enhance the area and the businesses in the area.

WILLIE MIMS, BPA, Pittsburg, also supported the project and the staff recommendation. He too agreed that the project would enhance the area. He referenced Section 3, Decision, Condition 19, of Resolution No. 9667 and inquired whether or not the fee listed in that condition would be imposed for peak hour traffic. If so, he questioned whether or not the church or the prior church application would be required to pay that fee.

Commissioner Garcia noted that traffic mitigation fees were imposed on all new projects.

Mr. Hurtado advised that he would clarify with the City’s Traffic Engineer whether or not the Regional Transportation Development Impact Fee would be imposed on the church
application.

OPPONENTS: None

MOTION: AP-05-291 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Thomas to adopt Resolution No. 9667, approving AP-05-291 (DR), design review approval to construct a new church at 1279 Railroad Avenue for “Forrest Memorial Christian Center,” APN 086-160-013-8, with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ohlson, Ramirez, Thomas
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chairperson Tumbaga

Item 4: Loan Express Telemarketing Modular Office. AP-06-347 (DR/SR)

An application by Suliman Afzali requesting design review approval to install a free-standing sign and a new 756 square foot modular office building that will be used for telemarketing sales purposes on a 7,841 square foot vacant lot located on the east side of Harbor Street at East Tenth Street. The General Plan land use designation for the site is CS (Service Commercial). APN 073-060-007.

Assistant Planner Leigha Schmidt presented the staff report dated October 10, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9665 approving AP-06-347 (DR/SR), with the conditions as shown.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson spoke to Section 3. Decision, Condition 37 of Resolution No. 9665, and asked that the condition be amended to read:

37. The approved temporary structure, foundation, and related improvements, above grade shall be removed and the site shall be cleared, except the landscaping, within three years following the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy unless the applicant has received Design Review approval and building permits for a permanent structure that will utilize the same foundation, and the construction of the new building has commenced and is diligently pursued to completion.

Vice Chairperson Ohlson also clarified with staff that Condition 36 of Resolution No. 9665 applied to new buildings where the requirement for undergrounding all utilities would be triggered.

PROPOSENNT:
SULIMAN AFZALI, P.O. Box #3, Pittsburg, identified himself as the owner of the business, with the main offices located in Fremont.

Mr. Afzali explained that the business was a telemarketing center for the main office. No customers were expected on site. The building was intended as a temporary facility pending plans for a main office structure that would be submitted in the future.

Commissioner Garcia affirmed with Mr. Afzali that he had read and was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval as shown in the resolution.

WILLIE MIMS, BPA, Pittsburg, supported the application. As to the conditions of approval, he could not accept many of them. He cited Section 3. Decision, Condition 38, as an example of a condition he was questioned would apply to all businesses in the City.

Ms. Ayres explained that the City Council recently adopted an administrative citation process. Code Enforcement was very active throughout the City including along Tenth Street area. She cited, as an example, the California Restaurant which had opened without bicycle racks and had been cited because of it. She noted that the City had a tremendous amount of code enforcement problems with the applicant and the condition was to put the applicant on notice that the citation could be applied to this project, if he didn’t follow all conditions of approved.

Mr. Mims also spoke to the staff statement that the applicant had torn down the building, although he pointed out that the applicant had been forced to do so by the City even though the building was structurally sound.

BASHIR RAHIMI, Pittsburg, reiterated that the building would be a temporary structure. He understood that the City code would allow a trailer on the site temporarily for 36 months. He commented that when he had last proposed a project the cost had made it impossible for him to proceed. He added that two years ago when he had come before the City, the City had spent $45,000 for landscaping at the front of his property which had raised his property taxes. He questioned the requirement for a six foot sidewalk which would damage the landscaping the City had installed. He noted that the City Engineer had previously indicated that the area was a dangerous narrow area which was the reason a sidewalk had not initially been installed.

Ms. Schmidt clarified that per the State Building Code, a temporary structure was any building or facility intended for use at one location not more than one year. The application had been treated as a permanent structure since it would be at the site for more than one year. Since the project involved a new structure and new development, certain standard conditions would be triggered by the Engineering Department such as frontage improvements, sidewalk and the undergrounding of utilities.
Mr. Rahimi noted that the street was not a straight street south to east and the Engineering Department had previously indicated to him that from the end of his property there was no sidewalk while the rest was sidewalk, which would be a liability issue.

Mr. Hurtado also clarified that the sidewalk was a condition that applied to all new development.

Mr. Rahimi stated that he owned two parcels; the first parcel from the south to the north which already had a sidewalk and from the end of the subject development. Again based on a prior discussion with the City Engineer, he stated that a sidewalk in front of the subject site could be dangerous and a liability for pedestrians. He had asked for a report from staff on that issue which had not been provided. He reiterated that the City had installed landscaping at the front of his property raising his taxes. He again reiterated when he had last appeared before the City two years ago, it had been suggested that a sidewalk in front of the subject property would be a liability.

Commissioner Garcia clarified with Mr. Afzali that he was the applicant, while Mr. Rahimi was the property owner. Commissioner Garcia emphasized the problems the City had in the past with Mr. Rahimi’s projects where he had not complied with conditions of approval.

Mr. Afzali explained that it was his project but Mr. Rahimi’s property.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated that Mr. Rahimi had proposed past projects but had not complied with any of the conditions for those projects. He cited the past problems with those prior projects. He questioned whether or not the applicant would comply with the conditions.

Mr. Afzali reiterated that Mr. Rahimi was the owner of the property and Mr. Rahimi reiterated that he did not want to install a sidewalk.

Ms. Schmidt clarified in response to Commissioner Thomas that the project was a new building, a standalone project, and had been treated fairly as a new application.

Ms. Ayres understood that Mr. Rahimi had specific concerns with respect to Section 3. Decision, Condition 32, which required the applicant to install a new six-foot wide sidewalk. She recognized and agreed with his concerns and recommended that condition be left flexible as to where the City Engineer would like the sidewalk to start and stop. She also recommended a review and approval of the plans prior to issuance of a grading permit or parcel development permit. She added that the plans must be reviewed prior to construction not before the occupancy of the building. She recommended that Condition 32 be amended to read:
32. The developer shall install all frontage improvements, as may be required by the City Engineer. The design shall be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Department prior to issuance of a grading permit.

OPPONENTS: None

MOTION: AP-06-347 (DR/SR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9665, approving AP-06-347 (DR/SR) design review approval for a freestanding sign and modular office building for “Loan Express Telemarketing Modular Office” located at 1000 Harbor Street, with the conditions as shown and with modifications to Conditions 32 and 37, as discussed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ramirez, Thomas, Ohlson
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Chairperson Tumbaga

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no staff communications.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Garcia reported that the TRANSPLAN Committee had met on September 13 and had discussed the expenditure of Measure J bonds and the fact that eBART was short several million dollars. He advised that the TRANSPLAN Committee would next meeting on Thursday, October 12.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Diokno inquired how the lack of funding for eBART would affect the Pittsburg transit village, to which Ms. Ayres explained that BART was looking for ways to reduce costs along with different phasing mechanisms. The City planned to move forward with its goals and might have to consider park and ride lots and bus extensions to the closest BART stations. She emphasized that BART was a long term process.

Commissioner Harris inquired whether or not cellular towers required Planning Commission approval, to which Ms. Ayres advised that such projects must have Zoning Administer approval under Planning Commission delegated authority.
Commissioner Harris noted that the Martinez property on Bliss Avenue had a tall tower which appeared to have added a large piece on the top.

Ms. Ayres expressed the willingness to review approvals for that property.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:11 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on October 24, 2006 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

__________________________________________
MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission