A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Ramirez at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, July 11, 2006 in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, California.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: None

Staff: Planning Director Melissa Ayres, Associate Planner Christopher Barton, Assistant Planner Kristi Vahl, Assistant Planner Leigha Schmidt, Planning Consultant, Alexandra Endress, Deputy City Clerk Alice Evenson

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, July 7, 2006.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Ed Diokno led the Pledge of Allegiance.

REORGANIZATION

1. Oath and Seating of Newly Appointed Commissioners

Deputy City Clerk Alice Evenson presented the Oath of Office to Ed Diokno and Ralph Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez, reappointed to the Commission, returned to the dais, and Mr. Diokno joined the Planning Commission as a newly appointed Commissioner.
2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Commissioner Thomas nominated Bruce Ohlson, who in her opinion was the next in line to be the Chair of the Planning Commission. It was her understanding that she would be the next in line to be the Vice Chair of the Commission.

There was no second to the nomination.

Commissioner Garcia nominated Rosemary Tumbaga as the Chair of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Harris seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, the nominations were closed. **Rosemary Tumbaga** was selected as the Chair of the Planning Commission by the following vote:

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

Chairperson Tumbaga chaired the meeting at this time.

Commissioner Garcia took this opportunity to thank former Chairperson Ramirez for his tenure as the Chair of the Planning Commission. He also clarified that his understanding of the rotation process was different from what had earlier been presented.

Commissioner Garcia nominated Bruce Ohlson to be the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Thomas offered a second to that nomination. She added that the rotation had been chosen by the City Council and that rotation would have Commissioner Ohlson first in line for Chair, Commissioner Thomas second, followed by Commissioner Tumbaga. She suggested that the nominations should have been in that order. While she respected Commissioner Tumbaga’s selection as the Chair, she asked that the record reflect that the Council had not chosen that rotation.

Commissioner Garcia nominated Bruce Ohlson to be the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Thomas seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, the nominations were closed. **Bruce Ohlson** was unanimously selected by a voice vote to be the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

*[For the record: All votes were taken through a voice vote or show of hands through the remainder of the meeting since the electronic voting system was not working properly.]*
DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

GLENN VALENZUELA requested that Commissioner Harris step down from the dais since he would be discussing a project in which Mr. Harris was the contractor.

Commissioner Harris left the dais at this time.

Mr. Valenzuela explained that he was speaking for Luis Guzman, a business owner in the City who had been informed that he would not be able to bring his project to the Planning Commission until August 21. He noted that where proposed, the business was an allowable use, similar to the Mehran Restaurant. Mr. Guzman had met continually with staff along with his architect and contractor to discuss and agree to all conditions of approval. He suggested that a staff report could be written quickly to allow the project to be agendized. His client was committed to a restaurant in the City and had worked with the various transportation agencies on the BART plan, offered to work with BART for a ticket kiosk for commuters, and had held a grand opening to celebrate his local business.

Mr. Valenzuela noted that he had been informed by a staff member that the City preferred the larger restaurant chains since the City was full of locally owned businesses, and he had been told that the proposed business was just another Mexican restaurant. He urged the Commission to direct staff to follow the City’s General Plan where enterprise zone businesses would be given fast track permitting. He requested that the item be agendized for the August 8 Planning Commission meeting.

Chairperson Tumbaga noted that the item would have to be agendized to be discussed.

Commissioner Thomas requested that the item be placed on the agenda for discussion at the next Commission meeting.

Planning Director Melissa Ayres explained that the matter had been brought to her attention this date by the City Manager. She had also spoken with the Project Planner to determine why the application had been scheduled for August 21. She reported that the Project Planner for the item was also involved in the National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and the months of July and August were that Planner’s critical time for the preparation of annual reports for the City’s compliance with NPDES permits, along with other projects in that Planner’s workload. She understood that Mr. Guzman’s application had been with the City for a year and had only recently been deemed complete. She said she would review the schedule to determine whether or not there was any way to reassign the project to another staff member to expedite the review,
although she noted that could also create delays as a result of their existing workload and learning curve on a new project.

Ms. Ayres advised that she would review the situation with a possibility of placing the item on the August 8 agenda, and would also continue to see if the application could be reassigned to another planner.

Commissioner Thomas took offense to the statement from Mr. Valenzuela that a staff member had suggested that the project was just another Mexican Restaurant in that the proposal should be considered as would any other business in the community.

Ms. Ayres agreed.

Commissioner Harris returned to the dais at this time.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

CONSENT:


MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt the Consent Calendar, as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ohlson and carried by a show of hands vote:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Item 1: Banister Electric. AP-06-325 (UP)

An application by Dan Pauline of Banister Electric requesting approval of a use permit to locate an electrical contracting service in an existing building located at 160 A. Bliss Avenue in the CS (Service Commercial) District. APN 088-171-005-7.

Planning Consultant Alexandra Endress presented the staff report dated July 11, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9652, with the conditions as shown.
Commissioner Ohlson advised that he had worked for the contractor who managed the building. As such, he had verified with the City Attorney that he would have no conflict of interest participating in the discussion and could therefore vote on the item.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSENT:

DAN PAULINE, Clayton, explained that he would like to preserve the business that had been in the City of Pittsburg for 50 years. He suggested that the project would significantly improve the buildings on Bliss Avenue and the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to the photos of the site, one of which had shown bollards around a fire hydrant which had been damaged. He requested that the applicant or the property manager preserve the integrity of the bollards.

Mr. Pauline understood that would be the building owner’s responsibility.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to another photograph of an uncovered drop box and inquired how the refuse from the property would be handled. He was advised by Ms. Endress that the drop box was not located on the tenant space and was not part of the project.

Commissioner Ohlson noted the problem with graffiti on the buildings. He requested that a condition be added that the applicant paint out any graffiti on his portion of the building within 24 hours of its existence.

Ms. Ayres explained that the City’s Municipal Code included a regulation on graffiti. When graffiti was discovered, the property owner was notified and would be responsible to remove that graffiti within a certain period of time or be charged by the City for its removal.

Commissioner Ohlson further spoke to the conditions of approval and asked that an additional condition be imposed that the front and back of the building be well lighted.

Mr. Pauline reported that the front and back of the building was wired for lighting, which would be provided.

In response to Commissioner Garcia, Mr. Pauline expressed his agreement with the conditions of approval, as proposed. He also affirmed that the company would be a union shop.

Commissioner Garcia expressed concern with the staff recommendation for planter boxes in that the street was private and during the evening those boxes could be damaged by
passing traffic. He recommended that the planter boxes be well anchored. He was pleased to see the company back in the community.

Mr. Pauline noted the planter boxes would be placed against the building. Familiar with the area, he was confident that the planter boxes could be maintained. He also clarified, when asked by Commissioner Ohlson, that the planter boxes would not impact the existing parking.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: AP-06-325 (UP)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9652, approving AP-06-325 (UP), a Use Permit to locate a contracting business and install exterior improvements to the existing building at 160 Bliss Avenue in the CS (Service Commercial) District “Banister Electric AP-06-325 (UP),” with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and carried by a show of hands vote:

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

Chairperson Tumbaga identified the ten day appeal process of a decision of the Planning Commission, in writing, to the City Clerk.

Item 2: Chapel Churches, Inc., AP-06-337 (UP)

Application by Basil Price of Chapel Churches Inc., requesting approval of a use permit to establish a religious assembly within a 1,751 square foot tenant space in a 14,089 square foot multi-tenant building located at 510 Garcia Avenue in the IP-O (Industrial Park with a Limited Overlay) District. APN 088-183-044.

Assistant Planner Leigha Schmidt presented the staff report dated July 11, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9650, subject to the conditions as shown.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

BASIL PRICE, 148 Tammy Circle, Bay Point, explained that the church had been at the
Fifth Street location since 2002 and had been on a site that was part of a redevelopment project, which had led to the pursuit of different locations. He looked forward to delivering and enhancing their services to the community.

In response to Commissioner Thomas, Mr. Price affirmed that he had read and was in agreement with all of the staff recommended conditions of approval.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: AP-06-337(UP)

Motion by Commissioner Thomas to adopt Resolution No. 9650, approving AP-06-337 (UP), a Use Permit to establish a Religious Assembly facility at 510 Garcia Avenue, Suite C, for Chapel Churches, Inc., with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by a show of hands vote:

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

Chairperson Tumbaga identified the ten day appeal process of a decision of the Planning Commission, in writing, to the City Clerk.

Item 3: Amendments to San Marco Development Park Requirements. AP-06-436 (RZ/SUBD)

A proposal to amend conditions of approval in Council Ordinance No. 93-1057 (San Marco PD District) and Council Resolution No. 93-7889 (San Marco Subdivision) in order to consolidate four small “village” parks and one-half of an obsolete utility/trail corridor (1 acre of net area) within the San Marco Development into the large community park planned at the southeastern corner of San Marco Boulevard and the future extension of West Leland Road and to change the timing of when the large community park must be built. The San Marco development is located south of State Route 4 along San Marco Boulevard, PD (Planned Development (Ord. No. 1057)) District. APNs 097-130-002, 097-140-001, 097-150-005, 097-150-002, 097-150-006, 097-150-007, 097-190-001 and 097-180-001.

Associate Planner Christopher Barton presented the staff report dated July 11, 2006. He recommended approval of Planning Commission Resolution No. 9648, recommending the City Council approval of the amendments to San Marco PD 1057 (Council Ordinance No.
1057), as conditioned, and move to adopt Resolution No. 9649, amending Tentative Map conditions of approval for City Council Resolution No. 93-7889 Vesting Tentative Map 7362, as described therein.

Commissioner Garcia pointed out that when the project, which was large, had initially been approved the Commission at that time had desired a large park at the western end of the community. He suggested that the developer could accumulate enough land for a large park, to possibly include a swimming pool similar to the pool at Buchanan Park.

Commissioner Diokno inquired whether or not Parcel D, which currently consisted of three acres, would remain three acres when moved.

Ms. Ayres clarified that Parcel D would remain three acres and would be moved farther southwest to pick up a wider range of people to serve.

Again speaking to Parcel D, Commissioner Diokno saw no concern with a slight slope on the parkland given the traditional games and athletics that could be played in the park. He also suggested that the view from the park with its location in the hills with views of the Delta and beyond was desirable.

Commissioner Ramirez spoke to the current interest in soccer where possibly a soccer field could be considered in the large park area.

Chairperson Tumbaga inquired whether or not the residents in the surrounding area had been notified of the public hearing.

Mr. Barton advised that the entire San Marco Subdivision of property owners and current residents had been notified as had those residing 300 feet outside of the subject area.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSENENT:

RICHARD SESTERO, SEECON Financial & Construction Company, 4021 Port Chicago Highway, Concord, suggested that the staff and verbal reports were complete. He stated that the developer had worked with staff for some time on the issue which would consolidate the smaller village parks that would be difficult to maintain into a larger community park. The consolidation would also allow the developer to add an additional park maintenance assessment which would generate more funds for the project rather than requiring the use of funds from the City’s General Fund.

Mr. Sestero explained that the park by the school was almost ready and would consist of four acres. The larger park below would comprise eight acres of usable parkland not
including slopes and the detention basin area. The contract for the park near the school was expected to be awarded later in the week and was hoped to be ready sometime in the fall, if not prior to the start of the new school year. That park would have views of the Delta. He noted that the streets around that park had recently been paved.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to the larger park at the northeast corner and inquired whether or not it would be connected by trail to the trail at the west side of San Marco Boulevard, yet to be built.

Mr. Sestero explained that the developer had an agreement to continue the trail down San Marco Boulevard to West Leland Road with a small bridge to cross the stream across the street at San Marco Boulevard to the park.

INTERESTED SPEAKERS:

TAMMY CABADING, 1838 Rosa Blanca Drive, Pittsburg, stated that at the time she had purchased her home in San Marco, she had been interested in the different community parks. She would have preferred the smaller parks that would have brought a smaller feel to a larger community. Having reviewed the request, she had concerns with the vehicle and pedestrian traffic that could be generated by a larger park. She understood the development was intended to be an upper scale community and having viewed future developments with larger parks, she understood that those larger parks were intended for the entire community and not for the specific neighborhood. She objected to the placement of such a large park along a major thoroughfare which she suggested would turn the park into a City park rather than a park for the San Marco development.

CHRISTOPHER OSTROWSKI, Pittsburg, a resident of the San Marco development, concurred with the prior comments. Having received notification of the public hearing on short notice, he would have preferred more information on the proposal. As to the fact that the developer would be allowed to build more homes on the sites originally planned for the smaller village parks, he expressed a preference for more parks as opposed to more homes.

Mr. Barton explained that the property identified as the site for Village G Park located at the southeast quadrant area had already been graded for homes. He reiterated that the intent of the item before the Commission was to consolidate the smaller village parks into one large community park, which had already been reviewed and supported by the City’s Recreation Commission.

In response to Commissioner Thomas, Mr. Ostrowski reiterated that he had only received notice of the public hearing ten days ago and had no time for preparation to form an idea on the development.

Ms. Ayres explained that the City’s Municipal Code and the State required notification of a
public hearing ten days prior to a public hearing which had been accomplished in this case.

Commissioner Harris affirmed with Mr. Ostrowski that he had been a resident of San Marco since 2003 and that he had been informed at the time he had purchased his home that there would be parks in the area.

Mr. Sestero explained that the sales brochure for San Marco for some time had shown the three larger parks and had not shown the smaller village parks. Also the CC&R’s for the development had mentioned that there would be several parks although those parks had not specifically been located.

Commissioner Diokno verified with Mr. Ostrowski that the recent sales brochures and maps for the San Marco development had not identified the pocket parks. He commended the developer for initially thinking out of the box and providing a central focus for the neighborhoods with the pocket parks. He understood that the City code required two acres minimum of parkland now and he expressed his hope that in the future the developer would abide by that requirement. He otherwise inquired of the developer why the existing residents had not been informed beforehand that the smaller parks might be consolidated into one large park. He questioned whether or not the existing neighbors had been part of the planning process.

Ms. Ayres explained that this was the first public hearing on the proposal to consolidate the smaller parks. She reiterated that the project had been approved in 1990. The latest General Plan had been approved in 2001 with more recent information forthcoming changes in the policies as to what the City could adequately maintain.

Ms. Ayres added that the Planning Commission had made a recommendation to consolidate the parks to the City Council at the time the development agreement on the original proposal had been extended. Those discussions had involved public hearings. She explained that the problem was that while the recommendation had been part of the background in the ordinance, it had not been included in the decision section of the ordinance, which was the reason the item was now before the Commission. She recognized that new residents had moved into San Marco since that time, although she had clarified with the developer that there were no residents who resided west of San Marco Boulevard since those homes did not yet exist and those parcels had not been graded. For the benefit of the audience, she reiterated the intent of the item and the background of the issue.

TINA PASCO-SANCHEZ, 173 San Tomas, Pittsburg, stated that she was one of the first ten people who had moved into San Marco. While she supported the expanded community park, she expressed concern that it was taking too long to build. She also noted that with the relocation of some of the parks at this time, some of the future neighbors could not be present to address his/her concerns. She added that this was the first time she had heard of the meeting and she too would have preferred more advanced
Ms. Pasco-Sanchez otherwise supported the consideration of a soccer field and possibly a dog park in the large community park.

Ms. Ayres explained that irrespective of what the developer had marketed in the sale brochure, a Master Plan for the larger community park with a consolidation of the smaller parks had not been finalized. A Master Plan for the community park would still require review by the Recreation Commission which was in charge of approving the recreational design of a park once a location had been established. As such, everyone in the San Marco development could be notified of when such a plan would be considered by the Recreation Commission to ensure that the residents were allowed to participate in that process.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Garcia pointed out that all the amenities listed in the sales brochure could not be possible without a larger park. He added that the City required five acres of parkland for every one thousand residents of a development, although the problem had been that the developer must only provide the land, not the park improvements. The maintenance and development of the park was usually the responsibility of the City. He noted that the City had later reduced the parkland requirement to two acres per one thousand residents with the developer to build the park immediately when the subdivision was built. In this instance, an assessment district would be formed for the maintenance of the subject park. Commissioner Garcia made a motion to approve Resolution No. 9648, with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ohlson seconded the motion and added that bicyclists did not agree with the requirement for two acres of park land for every one thousand residents with a requirement to have the park built immediately. As a citizen, he would rather see all of the land needed for parks land banked then built on as funding became available.

Commissioner Diokno expressed his appreciation to the neighbors for expressing their concerns. He urged the residents to remain involved when the item was next considered by the City Council and the Recreation Commission at such time the design of the park would be discussed.

MOTION: AP-06-346
Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9648, recommending that the City Council amend Ordinance No. 93-1057 (San Marco PD District 1057) to modify park requirements for the San Marco Development; San Marco is located south of State Route 4 along San Marco Boulevard, “Amendments to San Marco Development Park Requirements” (AP-06-346),” with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ohlson and carried by a show of hands vote:

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

MOTION: AP-06-346

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9649, approving AP-06-346, amendments to Conditions of Approval of Vesting Tentative Map 7362 (City Council Resolution No. 93-7889) to modify park requirements for the San Marco Development; San Marco is located south of State Route 4 along San Marco Boulevard; “Amendments to San Marco Development Park Requirements (AP-06-346),” with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ohlson and carried by a show of hands vote:

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

Chairperson Tumbaga declared a recess at 8:36 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 8:43 P.M. with all Commissioners present.

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 4: Garcia Master Sign Plan Program and Freestanding Sign. AP-06-329 (SR)
Application by Dale and Kathy Mardiros requesting approval for a master sign program and freestanding sign for five tenants within an existing building at 620-630 Garcia Avenue. The building is on the south side of Garcia Avenue, approximately 250 feet east of Harbor Street and is zoned IP (Industrial Park) District. APN 088-392-018, 017.

Assistant Planner Kristi Vahl presented the staff report dated July 11, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9651, subject to conditions of approval.
Ms. Vahl clarified that Suite B of the same building occupied by another tenant had existing window signage which would be allowed to remain until that business vacated the site.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOONENT:

KATHY MARDIROS, 2882 Acacia Road, Walnut Creek, explained that she had purchased the building a couple of years ago at which time the seller had indicated that everything was in compliance. She had later discovered that was not the case. She affirmed, when asked, that she had read the conditions of approval and would comply with those conditions.

Commissioner Ohlson referenced Attachment 2, the Master Sign Program, the first bullet point on the second page and recommended the actual size of the sign, in inches, be identified in that section. He also referenced the third sentence of the second paragraph on Page 2 of 5 of the July 11, 2006 staff report and asked that it be amended to read:

*The existing sign is made entirely of wood (painted blue) and has six slots, one for the building address and one for each of the lease spaces (A through E).*

In response to Commissioner Ramirez, Ms. Mardiros explained that she had started to install new signs, with like for like signs, although the City had issued a stop work order informing her she must go through the permit process and prepare a Master Sign Program.

OPPONENTS: None

MOTION: AP-06-329 (SR)

Motion by Commissioner Thomas to adopt Resolution No. 9651, approving AP-06-329 (SR), a Master Sign Program and freestanding sign located at 620-630 Garcia Avenue, with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and carried by a show of hands vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Diokno, Garcia, Harris, Ohlson, Ramirez, Thomas, Tumbaga,

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:
The Planning Commission acknowledged receipt of the following Notice of Intent (to review/approve project at staff level.)


Ms. Ayres reported that the Mehran Restaurant had installed the required windows and should have final building inspection this week. The signs required for the south side of the site and for the rear gates were on hand and expected to be installed that week.

In addition, Ms. Ayres reported that Fort Knox Self-Storage still had a temporary chain link fence on the property although the business operator had promised staff that fence would be removed. Since there had been vandalism problems with the glass on the newest mini-storage building, it was expected that the faux window area would be stuccoed and painted dark brown.

Ms. Ayres also reported that the City had received an administrative design review application from Public Storage for the mini storage on Loveridge Road. An application had been submitted for a beige colored building with purple and orange trim at the top representing Public Storage’s wall sign colors. Staff was uncomfortable with the change. While subjective, staff intended to submit the application to the full Planning Commission for consideration.

In response to the Chair, Ms. Ayres clarified that the Pheasant Ridge Apartments was not being converted into condominiums, although the adjacent development, Lakeside Apartments was being converted.

Commissioner Garcia agreed that the request from Public Storage should be considered by the Planning Commission.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

There were no committee reports.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Harris reported that a large boat on a trailer had been sitting on Army Street for a month and should be tagged. Also the vacant lot adjacent to Auto Zone had a For Sale sign that had been removed and three to four cars which were For Sale had been placed on the property facing Harbor Street. Further, he understood based on previous conversations with Frances Green and her Architect, that the church project was to have had the paving and landscaping completed by June 1.

Commissioner Thomas recalled the same discussion for the church, although she noted
that the Architect at that time had initially asked for a timeframe of June 1 to complete the improvements. She noted that the Architect had later acknowledged that might not allow sufficient time to complete the improvements and a later time had been identified for completion.

Commissioner Harris suggested that since the weather was good to allow the work to be completed, he would support a completion date to August 1. If the work was not done by that time, he would recommend that the building be condemned and torn down given that it had taken so long for the project to be completed.

Commissioner Diokno offered the following comments regarding Orlando Dolojan that he asked to be part of the public record:

First of all I want to thank Orlando Dolojan for the long years of public service put in by the former Planning Commission. I remember him coming up to me and my brother-in-law at my father’s funeral in 1974 and asking ‘Who will take your father’s place? Who will lead us?’ Mr. Dolojan answered his own question by stepping up to the plate, providing leadership and insight not only in the Filipino community but in the public arena of Pittsburg. He has set the bar high and I hope I can live up to it and all that he has done for Pittsburg.

Commissioner Garcia agreed with the comments made by Commissioner Diokno regarding Mr. Dolojan.

Commissioner Garcia otherwise reported that there was a raised sidewalk south of the stop sign on Stoneman Avenue and Harbor Street which was a safety concern that should be addressed.

Commissioner Garcia also spoke to the situation with respect to the Mexican restaurant earlier discussed. He suggested that the application should be agendized as soon as possible since it would generate sales taxes to the City. He added that the applicant had been in the City for many years and the requested restaurant was an allowable use.

Speaking to the tentative schedule for the Planning Commission and the list of projects under each Project Planner’s name, while he recognized the workload of staff, Commissioner Garcia recommended that the tentative schedule be revised to reflect which projects had already been considered by the Commission and what the next step would be in the process. Speaking specifically to the projects under Associate Planner Strelo’s name, he suggested that none of those projects were actually in process.

Ms. Ayres again noted she had just been made aware of the restaurant application this date and would work with the Project Planner to see if that application could be expedited for Commission consideration or be assigned to another planner.
Commissioner Ramirez inquired whether or not a motion could be made to agendize the El Matador Restaurant item for the next Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Ayres clarified that the Commission did not have the authority to make that decision. Per the Planning Commission Bylaws, the Planning Director set the agenda according to the priorities and workload of staff. She emphasized that this was not a political decision, that the meeting agendas were set when applications were ready and when staff was available. She again reiterated that she would work with staff to see whether or not the item could be expedited or be reassigned to another planner. She suggested that the applicant should have approached her when he had a problem with staff, and that unfortunately had not occurred.

Ms. Ayres reiterated that she would work with staff to determine whether nor the item could be scheduled as soon as possible without delaying other projects, although she again could not guarantee that the item would be scheduled as soon as the applicant desired. She encouraged Mr. Valenzuela (still in the audience) to call her to set up a meeting to discuss the matter further.

Commissioner Ramirez expressed his appreciation to the Commission for his service in the last year as Chair of the Commission.

Commissioner Ramirez reminded Commissioners of the Joint Workshop regarding the Trans Bay Cable Project with the City Council on July 17, 2006.

Commissioner Harris clarified with staff that the City had a General Plan and an enterprise zone which included fast tracking of projects. He also clarified with staff that the application for the El Matador Restaurant was in the enterprise zone. It was his understanding that projects in the enterprise zone should be fast tracked.

Ms. Ayres reiterated that the matter had been brought to her attention this date and she would work on that issue.

Commissioner Thomas stated that while she was supportive of a new restaurant in town, she was concerned about how this issue was being presented. In this instance, Commissioner Harris was the contractor for the restaurant and she found it inappropriate for him to discuss the project at the dais. She suggested that he should have asked someone else to bring up his concerns.

Commissioner Harris responded that he did not believe he had violated any rules as os comments were generic. He left the meeting at 9:14 P.M.

Commissioner Thomas welcomed Mr. Diokno to the Planning Commission.
In response to Commissioner Ohlson as to what had triggered the current situation with the aforementioned restaurant application, Ms. Ayres explained that the Project Planner this day had indicated to her that the plans had been in process for over a year and had been deemed incomplete during most of that time. Plans had been resubmitted to the City on June 23, reviewed by staff and had been determined verbally between staff and the applicant to be complete. She concurred two (2) months was an inordinate amount of time from project application completion to action for this type of application. Again, she subsequently would work with staff to determine whether not the application could be scheduled sooner.

Mr. Valenzuela reiterated his earlier comments and the history of the application. He again asked that the item be scheduled for the next possible Commission meeting and that the applicant not be forced to wait until August 21 to have the application considered by the Commission.

Ms. Ayres reiterated her earlier comments. She advised that she would be out of town for the next few days and she asked Mr. Valenzuela to contact her on Monday, July 17.

Commissioner Ohlson clarified that during the prior Commission meeting there had been a discussion about the appropriateness of a Commissioner making a motion and then voting against said motion. He referred to Page 47 of Robert’s Rules of Order and cited the statement that “The maker of the motion has the right to speak first on the motion.” “A member can vote against his own motion but cannot speak against it.”

Chairperson Tumbaga welcomed Mr. Diokno to the Planning Commission. She expressed her hope that the Commission would move forward to create a positive year for the City.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:21 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on July 25, 2006 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

__________________________
MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission