MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
November 14, 2006

A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Tumbaga at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, November 14, 2006 in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, California.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: None

Staff: Planning Director Melissa Ayres, Assistant Planner Leigha Schmidt, Assistant Planner Kristi Vahl, Assistant City Engineer Keith Halverson, and Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, November 9, 2006.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Ramirez 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:
There were no presentations.

**CONSENT:**

a. Minutes – October 24, 2006

**MOTION:**

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

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

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Item 1: Universal Auto Sales/Repairs. AP-06-350 (UP)**

Application by Angela Naidenova requesting modifications to an existing use permit for automotive repair and automotive sales (Resolution No. 9153). The business is located at 499 and 475 East Tenth Street, on the northwest corner of Harbor Street and East Tenth Street within the Downtown Service Commercial District. APN 085-185-001; 037.

Assistant Planner Kristi Vahl presented the staff report dated November 14, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9674 approving AP-06-350 (UP), with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Garcia spoke to Section 3. Decision, Condition 2 of Resolution No. 9674, regarding the recommendation for a solid wall or fence. He inquired of the material for the solid wall and questioned whether or not it would consist of masonry, tilt up cast or a wooden fencing material.

Ms. Vahl suggested that a wooden fence could be an option, although she sought a solid fence with some landscaping in the front.

Commissioner Garcia noted the length of the property along Tenth Street and stated that if a wooden fence was required he recommended the use of pillars rather than just two by fours. The property was also an entrance to the downtown area. He added that the business had been operating for some time and had not completed all of the original conditions of approval. He sought a condition to review the use permit in a year to ensure that the new conditions were being met.
Ms. Vahl advised that the conditions of the use permit remained with the property unless the use permit was revoked, although a condition could be added to review the conditions in a year to ensure compliance.

Commissioner Ramirez also spoke to the recommendation for a solid fence or wall and questioned allowing the applicant six months for installation once the plans had been approved. He suggested that 90 days was more than enough time for the installation of a fence or wall.

Ms. Vahl understood that the applicant was financially constrained. To be flexible, she had recommended six months to allow the applicants more time.

Commissioner Ramirez suggested that 90 days was acceptable. He commented on the number of items that must be done immediately, within 30 days, and noted that some of the conditions should have been met some time ago. He reiterated that 90 days was more than enough time to install the solid wall or fence.

Planning Director Melissa Ayres pointed out that there were no plans at this time for the fence, no contractor had been hired to install it, nor had a design been reviewed or gone through plan check. The upcoming rainy period must also be taken into consideration when designating a time period for installation.

Commissioner Ohlson also spoke to Resolution No. 9674, Section 3. Decision, Condition 12 and commented that since the business painted vehicles, those vehicles would likely be washed before being painted. He questioned where the vehicles would be allowed to be washed since he understood that would not be allowed on site.

Ms. Vahl explained that Condition 12 was intended to comply with National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater requirements and the vehicles would likely be taken to a facility that would allow the vehicles to be washed on a commercial basis. She added that the condition had been carried forward from the old use permit.

Commissioner Ohlson further referenced Resolution No. 9674, Section 3. Decision, Condition 18, and inquired whether or not the Fire Protection District had reviewed the application and the fact that there would be over 40 vehicles stored on the property.

Ms. Vahl advised that as part of the referral phase of the project the Fire Protection District received plans for review. She had a copy of a letter from the District which had requested sets of the plans be submitted for further review and approval.

Commissioner Ohlson commented that as long as the Fire Protection District accepted the plans and code enforcement was pleased, that would be acceptable to him.
PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOLENENT:

RACHEL HAMILTON, the Architect representing Angela Naidenova, the applicant, 2054 University Avenue, Suite 200, Berkeley, explained that the landscaping and screening were issues that had previously been discussed. She described the numerous attempts to plant in the area to the south. She noted that part of the property faced south and water had been an issue. They were working to achieve a cost effective drip irrigation system. She added that oftentimes, nice plants were missing a week after being planted.

Ms. Hamilton commented that one of the issues was that the husband of the husband/wife operation had injured his leg two to three years ago and had severe complications and was unable to run the business as desired. As a result, things tended to look run down. She stated that both applicants were now eager to make things work and find a way to comply as best as possible with the conditions.

Since there were monetary issues, Ms. Hamilton stated that a concrete block wall would be beyond their economic capacity. It was the applicants desire to use the relatively new, existing fence and double up the chain link on the outside with chain link on the inside, with offset slats offering no visibility directly through. Noting that on the south side between the sidewalk and the fence there was a section that was asphalt, she recommended that be eliminated and be replaced with landscaping and drip irrigation.

Ms. Hamilton also noted that the applicants originally had the slats in the chain link fence although the Police Department had asked that those slats be removed to allow views into the lot during the evening. Those slats had therefore been removed. City staff had later advised that the fence was not in compliance and the slats had then been reinserted. She sought a clarification of the screening requirements for the fixed portion of the fence, such as the gates, to allow views into the site at night for the Police Department.

As to the washing of vehicles on site, Ms. Hamilton understood that occurred only in the spray booth that was pre-fabricated with all State required pollution control devices. She explained that car washing would only occur in that area.

In response to Commissioner Ramirez, Ms. Hamilton affirmed that she had reviewed the conditions of approval and that for the most part they were happy to comply with what was being requested, with the exception of the recommendation for a solid wall or fence, to allow a more layered screening method.
ANGELA NAIDENOVA, 449 Fair Oaks Drive, Pleasant Hill, explained in response to Commissioner Thomas that they could not meet the four conditions highlighted by staff since she was an automotive dealer who by law could not register all of the vehicles. Ms. Naidenova stated that her husband had vehicles for repair, which was the reason there were more vehicles on the lot and the reason for their purchase of the large lot to conduct their business.

Ms. Naidenova commented that when her husband did not have customers of his own, he worked on her vehicles and sold them after that. Her husband and his son conducted the repairs. She was the automotive dealer. She reiterated that she would comply with the conditions, with the exception of the recommendation for a solid wall or fence. Not only did she not have the funds for a solid wall, she expressed concern that a solid wall could be a magnet for graffiti resulting in additional costs for graffiti removal.

Commissioner Ohlson recommended that Section 3, Decision, Condition 12 be modified to reflect that vehicles would be washed in the paint booth.

Ms. Vahl commented that she had been unaware that was the case, although the condition could be amended as requested.

Commissioner Ohlson also recommended a condition that any graffiti on the fence be removed on a daily basis.

Commissioner Garcia inquired whether or not the recommendation for a solid fence had been discussed with the Police Department. If not, he suggested that could be an issue for the Police Department since the slats had been removed at the recommendation of that Department. He suggested that the Police Department should indicate whether or not a solid wall or fence would be required.

Ms. Vahl explained that the issue of code enforcement had been raised during staff code enforcement meetings and no one had expressed concerns with a solid wall or fence. She added that she had received no actual comments from the Police Department relative to the application.

Commissioner Garcia recommended that the Police Department be contacted to avoid a financial burden on the applicant if a solid wall was installed and later recommended for removal by the Police Department. He suggested that the used vehicle storage area for repairs could be screened by a solid wall. He recognized that the existing fence allowed views inside the property which might be why the Police Department had not objected to the application.

Ms. Naidenova identified a large pipe adjacent to the fence for the sprinkler system, which
was easily breached. She described the problems associated with the property and explained that items had been stolen from the vehicles on the property, a situation which the Police Department was made aware of and which could be the reason that Department wanted to be able to see inside the lot.

Commissioner Garcia recognized that people would climb over the fence whether or not the water pipe existed. He recommended that something be placed on the water pipe to prevent someone from climbing over.

Commissioner Diokno inquired of staff whether or not the Police Department or the Planning Commission would have precedence in terms of the solid wall or fence.

Ms. Ayres explained that the Municipal Code governed the regulations and required the property to be screened, as shown on Page 4 of 10 of the November 14, 2006 staff report, relating to Outdoor Storage.

Commissioner Diokno understood that the fence was to be solid with the gates left unscreened to allow views inside. He stated that slatted fences were not appealing and he recommended the planting of climbing vines or a hedge that would grow through the chain link fence, which would be solid over time and also be inexpensive.

Ms. Hamilton recommended the consideration of a Bougainvillea plant since it had thorns and would be difficult to climb. While the plant material was growing, she expressed a preference to leave the slats in place. She reiterated the situation where plants had been stolen from the property. She recommended that any vines planted inside the fence be allowed to grow over.

Commissioner Thomas liked that option since it appeared to be the way to go.

Commissioner Ohlson inquired whether or not the water pipe was on the subject property, to which Ms. Hamilton noted that the water pipe was just inside the fence and could be easily climbed. She had recommended to the owners that the fence be taller in that area or that something be mounted horizontally on the water pipe to prevent someone from reaching over.

Commissioner Ohlson recommended a condition to ensure that something be done at the corner of the fence so that the water pipe could not be used for climbing over the fence.

In response to Commissioner Harris as to the length of the fencing, Ms. Hamilton noted that it would be 70 to 80 feet long.

Commissioner Harris suggested that based on the length of the needed fence, it might not be that much of a financial hardship to the applicants, particularly if it were a tilt up
pre-cast wall. He also noted that there were many solid walls in the community where graffiti had been an issue and he did not see that would prevent the applicant from installing a solid wall fence.

Ms. Hamilton suggested that type of wall could be a hardship. She commented that she could work with a contractor to identify potential prices.

Based on her experience, Ms. Hamilton noted that a pre-cast system was typically used on a much larger scale project. She added that the business was a Mom and Pop operation. She also noted that the existing fence was only five years old.

Commissioner Harris sought a beautification of the area. He recommended consideration of a solid pre-cast wall. He suggested that the applicant obtain prices for such a wall prior to the approval of the project. He also suggested that the applicant work with staff on that issue and return in two weeks. He clarified that his intention was not to delay the project. He would like to see a solid wall on a main street.

Ms. Hamilton reiterated that such a wall would be a relatively expensive system and no prices had been sought at this time.

Ms. Ayres reported that the City had received a bid for a pre-cast concrete system for property located at Railroad Avenue that had been priced at $90 a linear foot, at 8 feet in height. The subject property fence did not have to be eight feet high and could be five to six feet in height.

Ms. Hamilton suggested that the price quoted had likely been based on a long length of wall rather than the size of the subject property where an incremental cost would be much higher. She clarified, when asked by Commissioner Garcia, that the scale drawing in the packet was not her drawing but a drawing for the original use permit. She added that the drawing had assumed 20 foot deep parking spaces, potentially 120 feet of fence. She suggested that the west side would not have to be done since it was screened by the building.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Ohlson recommended the following modifications to Section 3. Decision of Resolution No. 9674:

- Condition 12 to be amended to reflect that vehicles would be allowed to be washed in the paint booth;
- Add a new condition that any graffiti on the fence or on the buildings shall be
moved on a daily basis, as needed;
- Add a new condition that the security fence shall be adjusted in the vicinity of the fire stand pipe so that security was maintained in that area;
- Add a new condition that vines shall be planted on the chain link fence; and
- Add a new condition that plant material shall be planted adjacent to the fence and be maintained in a thriving and weed free condition to create a visual barrier as it grows up the fence.

Commissioner Ramirez recommended a 30-day continuance as opposed to a two-week continuance to allow the applicant the opportunity to obtain contractor bids for the wall or fence.

Commissioner Harris clarified that he was only speaking of the need to screen the vehicles from view. He did not see it would take that long to obtain bids. He reiterated that he did not want to see a chain link fence on a main street. If the bid was too high, it could be discussed if the item was continued.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the business was in operation with no intent to shut it down. As such, a continuance for 30 days should not affect the operation of the business.

Commissioner Ohlson suggested that if the item was continued for 30 days, the Fire Protection District should be contacted to ensure that there was no problem storing the vehicles on the property.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to continue the application for either two weeks or 30 days.

Ms. Ayres asked that the item be continued to a date certain of December 12, 2006.

Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion.

On the motion, Commissioner Ohlson asked that the requested amendments to the conditions of approval be incorporated into the resolution when the item was returned.

Ms. Vahl affirmed that could be done.

**MOTION: AP-06-350 (UP)**

Motion by Commissioner Harris to continue AP-06-350 (UP), a Use Permit for Universal Auto Sales/Repair at 475 East Tenth Street to a date certain of December 12, 2006. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garcia and carried by the following vote:

- Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ohlson Ramirez, Thomas,
COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:

Item 2: KFC/A&W Remodel. AP-06-330 (DR)

Application by Harman Management Investment requesting design review approval to demolish the existing 2,971 square foot KFC drive-thru restaurant and to construct a new 3,052 square foot drive-thru restaurant containing both KFC and A&W at 2155 Railroad Avenue in the CC (Community Commercial) District. APN 088-183-011.

Assistant Planner Leigha Schmidt presented the staff report dated November 14, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9675 approving AP-06-330 (DR), with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ohlson was pleased to see bicycle parking on the drawings although he noted that a condition had not been included in the resolution of approval.

Commissioner Ramirez inquired whether or not the current building would remain while the new business was under construction. He was advised by Ms. Schmidt that the business would be shut down and the current building would be demolished. The new building would be constructed within the six month period to allow the use permit to remain active.

Chairperson Tumbaga noted there were existing palm trees on the site and a eucalyptus tree in the front. She inquired of staff whether or not those trees would be removed or preserved.

Ms. Schmidt advised that the eucalyptus tree, which was in front of the drive-thru, would be removed. The traffic circulation would change and the landscaping would be doubled. The landscaped parking in the front would also be maintained. While some new trees would be added, she understood that some palm trees would be preserved on site.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPONENT:

LINDA BUDGE, Harman Management Investment, 199 First Street, Los Altos, introduced the Store and Area Managers, and the Vice President of Development for Harman Management, the largest franchisee of KFC restaurants. She described the background of the firm and its relationship with Colonel Sanders, the founder of KFC restaurants. She
noted that many of the existing restaurants were old and needed replacement, particularly since development standards and building codes had changed. In all cases, existing buildings would have to expand by approximately 10 feet to be compliant with certain dimensions and clear spaces for doorways, customer aisles and the kitchen. The existing building would be completely demolished. The demolition of the old building and the construction of the new building would take approximately three months.

Ms. Budge explained that KFC had been at the subject location for some time and would continue to remain, although at one time other locations in the City had been considered.

Ms. Budge affirmed that bicycle parking would be provided on site. The facility would be made pedestrian friendly for those along Railroad Avenue or those using the future eBART train station. The entire site would be cleared. She noted that the preservation of the existing mature trees was not always in the best interest of the building and the pedestrians along the street since those trees had created shedding and dropping concerns.

Ms. Budge added that she had enjoyed working with planning staff and had attended the meetings for the Railroad Avenue eBART extension.

Commissioner Harris inquired who would be responsible for the removal of the existing eucalyptus trees, to which Ms. Budge noted that the trees would be removed by an appropriate contractor as part of the project.

Commissioner Harris noted that the trees were located on City property. He pointed out the damage the trees had caused to neighboring properties, not only from shedding, but as a result of buzzards that had nested in the trees.

Ms. Budge explained that demolition was not an inexpensive process and it was likely the City would want those trees to be removed. She stated that smaller trees would be planted on the property.

Mr. Hurtado explained that if the trees had damaged the sidewalk it would have been the City’s responsibility to remove those trees, however if the removal of the trees was part of the demolition process, the trees would be removed by the developer.

Commissioner Garcia affirmed with Ms. Budge that she had read and was in agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. He was pleased to see the business remain at the subject location.

Commissioner Thomas understood that KFC and A&W would be at the same location.

Ms. Budge clarified that KFC and A&W were a co-brand, were all of the same family and were popular together, offering a family restaurant atmosphere. She noted that the
interior of the restaurant would be seamless with the ordering, kitchen and all seating seamless together with a juke box in the dining area.

Commissioner Diokno welcomed A&W back to the community. He also spoke to the outside seating area to the west on the site and inquired whether or not the seating area would be shaded.

Ms. Budge suggested that umbrellas could be added, although there were mature trees on the west side of Railroad Avenue that might offer shade. The new trees to be planted on the site would shade the seating area as well. She added that the owner was a co-owner of the store and their livelihood was to serve the clientele.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Diokno requested clarification whether or not the sidewalk at the subject property would remain at the same width. He suggested that as the Railroad Avenue Specific Plan moved forward, the sidewalk in that area might be widened.

Commissioner Harris understood that the sidewalk would be 10 feet in width and would conform to the adjacent use.

Ms. Budge understood that the sidewalk would be the same along that portion of Railroad Avenue.

Commissioner Harris noted that Super Taco, an adjacent use, would be screening its outside tables from the eucalyptus trees which were shedding and because of the buzzards nesting in those trees.

Commissioner Diokno requested a sidewalk width sufficient enough to allow two people to walk side by side, although Commissioner Harris suggested that the sidewalk was currently wide enough for two people to walk side by side.

Ms. Ayres referenced Section 3. Decision, Condition 35 of Resolution No. 9675, requiring compliance with Title 12 of the Municipal Code. She added that the Engineering Department could review the issue of the width of the sidewalk at a later date.

Commissioner Garcia commented that based on the scale, the sidewalk did not appear to be much more than six to seven feet in width.

Commissioner Ohlson liked the mature eucalyptus trees and was sad to see them go but understood the need for development. As to the width of the sidewalk, he stated that the bicycle community would like to see the width of the sidewalk be reviewed by the
Engineering Department for compliance with the standard width for a commercial
development, which was 10 feet. The drawings had not reflected a 10 foot sidewalk,
although he was confident it would likely be adjusted during the plan check process.

Commissioner Thomas clarified with the applicant that the development would be
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

Commissioner Garcia noted his understanding that the Engineering Department would
review the sidewalk width. If the plans were inaccurate, he would recommend that the
required sidewalk width be taken from the landscaping side and not the building side. He
agreed that the trees which shed all the time should be removed.

**MOTION: AP-06-330 (DR)**

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9675, approving AP-06-330
(DR), Design Review approval to construct a new KFC and A&W restaurant at 2155
Railroad Avenue, for “KFC/A&W Remodel,” with the conditions as shown. The motion
was seconded by Commissioner Thomas and carried by the following vote:

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

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Ayres reported that the City Council had denied an appeal and upheld the decision of
the Planning Commission for a design review application for Koch Carbon. The City
Council would also soon consider an appeal by USS POSCO of the recent Planning
Commission approval of the Mt. Diablo Recycling Center. She also reported that the City
Council had recently certified the Trans Bay Cable Environmental Impact Report (EIR),
and had introduced an ordinance to approve the Trans Bay Cable Development
Agreement and amendments to the West Tenth Street Overlay District with an
amendment to the setback in the ordinance to 250 feet. Further, the November 20th
Railroad Avenue Specific Plan Update joint workshop with the City Council/Planning
Commission had been rescheduled to Monday, November 27th at 6:00 P.M.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

Commissioner Ohlson reported that he had attended the most recent eBART Partnership
Policy Advisory Committee (ePPAC) meeting. He noted that the last TRANSPLAN
meeting had been canceled. ePPAC had discussed the issues surrounding the Union
Pacific Railroad (UPRR) aspect of the eBART proposal, discussed the definition of
eBART in the EIR, and had defined the project extent for eBART to travel from the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch, which included only one station at Hillcrest Avenue.

Discussions had also taken place on the possibility of extending eBART to Empire/Neroly Road in Antioch/Oakley.

The Railroad Avenue station in Pittsburg had also been discussed with the fact that station would be included in the EIR, although the City of Pittsburg may have to pay for that station. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Diokno reported that he had attended the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) General Assembly with a discussion of the adoption of Green Building Practices by cities and counties throughout the country. He announced that the County’s Residential Green Building Program would be meeting on December 7 from 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. at Walnut Creek City Hall. On December 13 from 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. there would be a Build It Green Public Agency Council meeting in Martinez at 651 Pine Street related to municipal buildings. Everyone was invited to attend the meeting.

Commissioner Garcia referenced the area of Stoneman Avenue where there had been a recent fatal accident and another accident that had involved children. Although the posted traffic speed in the area was 35 MPH, reduced to 25 MPH when children were present, the traffic sign had been ignored. He stated there were three crosswalks in the area which were not illuminated in the evening. Since it was a school crosswalk, he suggested that crosswalks with flashing lights would be beneficial and would likely reduce the speed of traffic in the area. He asked that at least two of the crosswalks on Stoneman Avenue have flashing lights installed.

Chairperson Tumbaga suggested that should be a special concern for the Commission.

Commissioner Ohlson noted that the City had a grant for bicycle lanes the entire length of Stoneman Avenue which might reduce the speed of traffic.

Commissioner Ramirez reported that The Olsen Company would be having an Open House on Friday, November 17, 2006 at 11:00 P.M.

Commissioner Thomas wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

Commissioner Harris clarified with staff that the property owner of property located on Garcia Avenue, which had a chain link fence, had been sent a third letter and could be referred to the City Attorney.

Commissioner Harris also reported a continual problem with trucks parked on Garcia Avenue.
Avenue for loading and unloading, one having been parked in the middle of the street obstructing traffic. He added that at the entrance to 961 Garcia Avenue, a large van had been parked in that area obstructing the entrance. He advised that he had photos of those vehicles. He suggested that the main street be designated a 'No Parking' zone and he asked staff to review that matter. Commissioner Harris also spoke to the number of chain link fences along the sidewalk with overgrown grass, particularly at Harbor and Bliss and a new apartment complex at Harbor.

Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado stated that the concerns would be referred to the Traffic Department and code enforcement. Commissioner Garcia also noted that the southeast side of the Harbor Street Overpass area had been landscaped prior to Caltrans work in that area and the landscaping should be replaced by Caltrans and not the property owner. He added that the northeast side where a PG&E easement was located was full of weeds and should be abated.

Mr. Hurtado stated that he would forward all concerns to the Project Engineer and code enforcement.

Chairperson Tumbaga invited everyone to attend the PACO Art Show on Saturday, November 18th at the temporary Impulse Gallery at 329 Railroad Avenue with a reception to be held from 6:00 to 9:00 P.M. She reported that over 50 artists would participate in the art show.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on November 28, 2006 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

____________________
MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission