A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairperson Dolojan at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, January 24, 2006 in the City Council Chambers, Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, California.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Garcia, Ohlson, Tumbaga, Vice Chairperson Dolojan

Excused: Commissioners Harris, Thomas, Chairperson Ramirez

Absent: None

Staff: Planning Director Melissa Ayres, Associate Planner Ken Strelo, Associate Planner Matthew Freitag, Administrative Analyst Alexis Morris, Assistant Planner Christopher Barton, Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado, Assistant City Engineer Keith Halvorson, and Redevelopment Agency Project Planner Ursula Luna.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, January 20, 2006.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Tumbaga led the Pledge of Allegiance.

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.
COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

PETE CARPINO, El Camino Drive, Pittsburg, spoke to when projects were approved by the Planning Commission with conditions and questioned when those conditions were to be met. He spoke to a specific project which had not met the timeline for some of the conditions of approval imposed on its use permit.

Planning Director Melissa Ayres advised that the project planner was responsible for following the conditions to ensure compliance. In this instance, the referenced project was the Mehran Restaurant which had missed a deadline on one of its performance standards. The project planner was working with that business and the City had received a letter this date stating when it was believed the business would be able to meet that condition, which was being evaluated by staff.

Ms. Ayres reported that one of the City’s project planners was in the process of conducting a comprehensive evaluation of all active use permits that had been approved in the City. Staff had begun field inspections and writing code compliance letters to those businesses in violation of the approved use permit(s) to advise owners what needed to be done and the timeline when conditions were required to be met. The Code Enforcement Division was also training planning staff as to how to write citations for projects that were not compliant within a reasonable time period.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

CONSENT:

b. Kingdom Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses (Extension of Approvals). AP-04-116 (UP/DR)

Staff requested the removal of Consent Item b for discussion.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Ohlson to adopt the Consent Calendar consisting of the minutes of the January 10, 2006 meeting, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garcia and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Garcia, Ohlson, Tumbaga, Dolojan
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Harris, Thomas, Ramirez
Speaking to Consent Item b, Associate Planner Ken Strelo spoke to Condition 15 of Resolution No. 9619 and clarified that since the time the project had originally been approved there had been plans drawn for changes to the railroad track overpass over Solari Street. Changes had included a pedestrian connection from the north-south sides of the tracks. Staff had originally asked the applicant to continue the sidewalk on Solari Street all the way down to the property line.

The plans for the connection and railroad improvements had shown a sidewalk being constructed on part of the applicant’s property. Because of that and since there would be no pedestrian connections until those improvements had been completed; staff would like the condition to be as originally approved. The project would still have pedestrian access at the front, corner and part of Solari Street and would stop from the walkway to the front door.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Extension of Approvals of AP-04-116 (UP/DR), Kingdom Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses, with clarification of Condition 15 of Resolution No. 9619. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Item 1: Black Diamond Mixed Use Project. AP-05-225 (DR)

Continued public hearing on an application filed by A. F. Evans Development (applicant) design review approval, in order to construct a new mixed use development consisting of 195 residential units and approximately 37,855 square feet of commercial space to be located on three downtown blocks of approximately seven (7) acres that are bounded by Fifth Street on the north, Railroad Avenue on the east, Eighth Street on the south and Black Diamond Street on the west. The project site consists of 39 parcels on three city blocks (APNs 085-164-001 through 085-164-016, 085-165-002 through 085-165-017, 085-166-003 through 085-166-017).

Administrative Analyst Alexis Morris presented the staff report dated January 24, 2006. She recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9620, approving Design Review Application No. AP-05-225 (DR), with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ohlson inquired whether or not the apartment units would have bicycle
parking either within the garage or along the balconies. Ms. Morris advised that there would be several options for residents. Not all units would have private balconies. There would be centralized locked bicycle storage in Building B intended to serve the entire project. Some of the units would open to the podium level with patios and some would have private balconies.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSER:

MUHAMMED NADHERI, Project Manager, A. F. Evans Development, 1000 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland, was pleased to present Vidrio for Black Diamond Old Town, LLC. He clarified that there would be bicycle storage in each of the buildings in the garage and there would be a centralized storage for bicycles. In addition, the ground floor town homes would have individual garages where additional space was available for bicycle storage, if needed.

Mr. Nadheri explained that they had worked closely with planning staff on the project and with their design team to reflect what was desired in Old Town and what the architects/developers determined was appropriate for the project scale. The Railroad Avenue elevation would have retail and residential above with a strong retail presence at the ground level. Moving from Railroad Avenue back to Black Diamond Street, the architecture would appear as if the buildings had been built over time.

GLEN SIMMONS, Dahlin Group, 2671 Crow Canyon Road, San Ramon, presented a PowerPoint presentation depicting the project site, surrounding uses, Art Deco and Spanish influences in the architectural design, and the integration of local colors into the architecture. The project would be comprised of three City blocks, consisting of Buildings A, B and C. The retail core of the project would be along Railroad Avenue with townhomes facing the residential areas. The parking garages for the project were also identified.

Building A would have a small plaza on one corner, with a larger plaza for Building C. Both plazas could be used for local community activities. The project would include enhanced paving and fountains, and would be pedestrian friendly.

Building C would have a sculpture and larger plaza and would be located across from St. Peter Martyr Church. Each building complex would have special community activities with each building connected by a bridge to the next building. All facilities would be shared. Building A would have a lawn area for casual use, Building B would be built first with a recreational center and swimming pool, and Building C would have tot lots. Each plaza would have a grand stair that would connect the street to the podium level. Views of each of the buildings were presented from each elevation depicting a variety of unit types, consisting of flats, townhomes and lofts, which would vary in size from 700 to 1,600 square feet.
The materials would include Spanish tile roofs, asphalt shingles, lap siding, stucco, some smooth and medium dash, different types of brick, pre-cast concrete on some of the trim pieces, different colors to be used on the brick, and travertine stones, among other materials.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to Condition 11 of Resolution No. 9620 and inquired if the condition for black metal gates across the entrances to the parking garages was intended for decorative or for security purposes.

Mr. Simmons explained that there would be key access into the parking garages and the gates were intended for security but also to be decorative and attractive.

Commissioner Ohlson also spoke to Exhibit A, Diagram A1.2, which had illustrated how the trucks would back into the loading zones. The diagrams had shown that the trucks would back up blind on the right side. He suggested that the trucks would likely back up on the left side. He recommended the placement of a five inch diameter pipe filled with concrete at the edge of the building to avoid damage from trucks backing up.

Mr. Nadheri explained that trucks would not back into the loading area since the intent was that the trucks would parallel park in a designated unloading area and would pull past the loading dock and into the reserved area during loading times. The only truck in that area would be the garbage trucks which could access from the front. Semi-trucks and loading trucks would not back into that area. Some of the diagonal parking along the side streets would allow the trucks to parallel park while unloading during designated time periods. He added that the diagram led into a service corridor behind the retail component. There should be no problems with trucks backing up and maneuvering into the loading area.

Ms. Morris noted that the garbage trucks would back into the areas to collect the trash through double doors in the loading area. The trash containers would likely be rolled out and the trucks would either back in or pull in. Delivery vans would use the area as well. Larger trucks would have to use the designated loading areas on the side streets as depicted in the approved Planned Development Plan. She acknowledged that bollards had been located in the interior of the project, as shown on the plans.

Commissioner Tumbaga spoke to the plaza for Building C and inquired whether it would be controlled by the City or be a public space. She also inquired whether or not the parking along Black Diamond Street had been eliminated for the length of the project, specifically in front of the church.

Mr. Nahderi explained that the plaza would be public space. The parking on Black Diamond Street was public space as well and the residential parking only would be in the interior.
Mr. Nahderi noted that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) had asked for the elimination of some parking spots at the corners of Black Diamond Street to comply with sightline regulations and guidelines. There would still be parallel parking on both sides of Black Diamond Street.

Commissioner Tumbaga also requested clarification on the staff recommendation for the use of the brick material.

Ms. Morris noted that the applicant had proposed an acrylic stucco brick material on the entire project. Staff had recommended that material only be used on the residential portion and the townhomes and that a brick veneer be used on the commercial storefronts. The townhomes would be buffered by landscaping, be set back and would not interact with the public other than the residents. The retail would be on the street elevation and brick veneer would offer a more quality material on Railroad Avenue.

Commissioner Tumbaga spoke to the parking on Sixth and Seventh Streets which had diagonal parking. She asked if that was where the trucks would unload.

Mr. Nadheri advised that the retail would be under one management company. The intent was for one management company to coordinate all of the loading for the retail for each project. The loading areas would be designated loading for specific periods of time and would be called out in the project CC&R’s.

Ms. Morris added that the PD Plan included conditions that the loading area be signed for deliveries only during specific time periods in the morning. After that time, the area would be available for vehicle parking.

Commissioner Ohlson inquired whether or not the truck parking time restrictions could be adjusted if found to be infeasible. He was advised by Ms. Morris that the truck parking regulations had been included in a prior approved resolution and was not an ordinance restricting deliveries, which was the reason for the PD Plan. Changes could be made to any other condition that did not work out.

Commissioner Ohlson inquired of the dimensions of the swimming pool, to which Mr. Simmons stated the pool would be four feet deep.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired of the expected population given the total number of units and the total number of parking spaces. She was advised by Mr. Nadheri that he would calculate that information and respond back to the Commission.

Ms. Morris clarified that there would be 1.8 parking spaces per residential unit on site and within the enclosed garages. She acknowledged that the residents could use the street for parking.
Commissioner Tumbaga noted the likelihood that two people, each with a vehicle, would occupy the one bedroom units.

Mr. Nadheri expected approximately 600 people in the project. As to the parking, based on the studies conducted, he was confident that every resident would be able to park internally. At 1.8 parking spaces per residential unit, most units would have two vehicles. He suggested that the one bedroom units would be over parked. Overall, he stated that the project would be over parked by a few spaces.

Ms. Morris noted that the General Plan allowed as little as one parking space per unit in Old Town. The approved PD Plan and rezoning application had established a parking requirement of 1.8 spaces per unit.

Commissioner Tumbaga questioned whether or not the applicant had considered the preservation of the Scampini building as part of the project.

Ms. Ayres advised that the project (site plan for Black Diamond) had already been approved (by the City Council and Planning Commission with approval of the P-D plan). The Council certified the EIR for this project. Additionally, the City Council had determined that the Scampini building could be removed and had adopted Overriding Considerations. The only matters before the Planning Commission at this time were the materials and colors of the buildings, since technically even the architecture had also already been approved with the P-D Plan.

In response to the Vice Chair, Mr. Nadheri agreed with the staff recommended conditions of approval. He otherwise clarified that the swimming pool dimensions would be 24 by 45 feet in size, and four feet deep.

Ursula Luna of the Pittsburg Redevelopment Agency advised that the Agency had worked closely with the applicant on the project. She expressed her hope that the Planning Commission would positively consider the project given that the applicant had worked to make the project fit in with Old Town.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: AP-05-225 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9620, approving AP-05-225 (DR), Design Review approval of architectural plans and elevations for the three buildings of the Black Diamond Mixed Use Development Project, with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ohlson and carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Garcia, Ohlson, Tumbaga, Dolojan
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Harris, Thomas, Ramirez

Item 2: East Leland Subdivision II. AP-04-179 (Subdivision 8892)

A public hearing on an application by Todd Callahan of KB Homes requesting approval of a tentative map to subdivide six parcels totaling 7.5 acres into a 65 unit small-lot single family residential development with private recreation and open space areas. The site is located on the southwestern and southeastern corners of East Leland Road/Gladstone Drive intersection. APNs 088-521-020, 021, 022, 046, 047 and 048.

Associate Planner Ken Strelo presented the staff report dated January 24, 2006. He recommended approval of Subdivision AP-04-179 approving Vesting Tentative Map No. 8892, subject to conditions.

Mr. Strelo requested the following amendments to the conditions of approval shown under Resolution No. 9617. Condition 4 was recommended to be amended to direct the applicant to prepare a more refined acoustical study, with details for how the sound wall could be placed along Leland and Gladstone Drive and still reduce exterior noise levels to 65 dB or less, to be brought back to staff.

Mr. Strelo also noted that the initial plan had shown a sound wall around the entire property. After meeting with the developer, he suggested that such a sound wall would be unsightly and had agreed to open up the sound wall. The location of the sound wall was not yet determined and would be evaluated by the Planning and Engineering Departments. The sound wall itself would be as shown on the landscaping plans, to consist of brick material. Those portions of the wall where the sound wall would not be required would consist of decorative wrought iron.

Condition 41 was amended to read:

41. The developer shall provide a 20 foot sanitary sewer easement for Lots 1 through 4 and F, and a 15 foot sanitary sewer easement for Lot 5.

Ms. Ayres noted that Condition 20 was also a new condition and regarded provisions for entering into an affordable housing agreement prior of approval of the final map.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
PROPONENT:

DENISE CUNNINGHAM, Director of Forward Planning, KB Homes South Bay, 6700 Koll Center Parkway, #200, Pleasanton, introduced the design team present in the audience.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Ohlson suggested that the property should have been left with a Community Commercial zoning designation, although he recognized that the City Council had approved the rezoning request and he would therefore approve of the project. He was also disappointed that Los Medanos College (LMC) would not allow the project to connect to the LMC trail around the lake. He expressed his hope that would change in the future.

Commissioner Tumbaga expressed a desire that the City Council would maintain affordable homeownership within the project as opposed to allowing payment of an in-lieu fee option.

MOTION: AP-04-179 (Subdivision 8892)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9617, approving AP-04-179 (Subdivision 8892) approving a Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide six parcels into a 65-lot single-family residential subdivision for “East Leland Subdivision II, AP-04-179 (SUBD 8892),” with the conditions as shown and with amendments to Conditions 4 and 41, as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 3: East Leland Subdivision II. AP-04-179

Application by Todd Callahan of KB Homes for design review approval of the proposed home designs and landscape plan for a 7.5 acre, 65 unit single family residential subdivision (East Leland Subdivision II (SUBD 8893,)) The site is located on the southwestern and southeastern corners of the East Leland Road/Gladstone Drive intersection. The site is zoned PD (Planned Development) District; APNs 088-521-020,
Associate Planner Strelo presented the staff report dated January 24, 2006, and recommended approval of Design Review Application No. 04-179, with the conditions as shown and as amended.

Mr. Strelo stated that after speaking with the applicant, Condition 14, as written, would have been limiting for potential homebuyers. As such, staff recommended the elimination of Condition 14. Condition 13, as written, would still limit two adjacent homes from having the same color scheme.

PROPONENTS:

DENISE CUNNINGHAM, Director of Forward Planning, KB Homes South Bay, 6700 Koll Center Parkway, #200, Pleasanton, affirmed when asked that she was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval, as amended.

Vice Chairperson Dolojan questioned the durability of the Styrofoam trim, to which RALPH STRAUSS, SDG Architects, Brentwood, advised that the trim would be durable, coated with plaster for a hard finish and would last over the life of the home.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired whether or not an energy study had been performed for the project and whether or not there would be additional effort for the homes to be more energy efficient given the continual increase in energy costs.

Mr. Strauss advised that the homes were designed to meet Title 24 energy requirements and would be energy efficient.

SAM LEE, Architectural Manager, KB Homes South Bay, added that KB Homes would offer some improved energy efficient lines in both light fixtures and appliances as options for homebuyers. He was uncertain of the exact items that would be offered for the subject development.

OPPONENTS: None

MOTION: AP-04-179 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9618, approving AP-04-179 (DR), Design Review approval of the proposed home designs and landscape plan for a 7.5 acre, 65 unit single family residential subdivision, “East Leland Subdivision II, AP-04-179 (DR)”, with the conditions as shown and with the elimination of Condition 14. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Garcia, Ohlson, Tumbaga, Dolojan
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Harris, Thomas, Ramirez

**Item 4: Railroad Plaza Multi-Tenant Building. AP-05-281 (DR)**

Application submitted by Randy G. Baugh, President, Development Consultants, Inc. for design review approval of architectural and site development plans for the construction of a 9,500 square foot multi-tenant commercial building on a 0.80-acre (34,892 square foot) parcel with 41 parking stalls, located at 2120 Railroad Avenue in a CC (Community Commercial) District. APN 087-036-051.

Associate Planner Matthew Freitag presented the staff report dated January 24, 2006. He recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9619, approving Design Review Application No. AP-05-281 (DR), with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ohlson thanked staff and the developer for Condition 13 requiring bicycle parking.

**PROPONENT:**

PHILLIP MOSS, Development Consultants, Inc., 3941 Park Drive, Suite 20-338, El Dorado Hills, thanked staff for direction early in the process. He explained that the project would be a retail building and would match the existing center’s colors, materials and textures. He acknowledged that the City’s Traffic and Engineering Divisions had reviewed the project and their comments had been incorporated into the site plan. He clarified that additional trees would be added to the greenbelt along Railroad Avenue. The building had also been designed with some storefronts on the back side of the building so that the building did not appear to be the back of a building.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired of the potential tenants for the building, to which Mr. Moss expressed his hope to secure commercial tenants that would fit into the neighborhood. Interest had been expressed by a small retailer and a restaurant use.

Mr. Moss affirmed, when asked, that he was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval.

**OPPONENTS:** None
Commissioner Ohlson was pleased with the subject development as opposed to a self storage facility that had been proposed but not supported by the City a few years ago.

**MOTION: AP-05-281 (DR)**

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9619, approving AP-05-281 (DR), Design Review approval of architectural and site development plans for the construction of a 9,500 square foot multi-tenant commercial building located at 2120 Railroad Avenue, “Railroad Plaza Multi-Tenant Commercial Building,” with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

**Item 5: Sky Ranch Residential Subdivision Draft Environmental Impact Report.**

A public meeting for the Commission to provide comments to staff on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the Sky Ranch Residential Subdivision project. The proposed project involves an application filed by Discovery Builders Inc. requesting approval 1) to prezone 163 acres to RS (Single Family Residential) District, 2) a vesting tentative map to subdivide those 163 acres into 415 residential lots, parcels for a water tank, detention basin, and other remainder parcels, and 3) design review approval of proposed home designs. The proposed project is located approximately one mile southwest of the Somersville Road/Buchanan Road intersection, just south of the existing Highlands Ranch subdivision located in Pittsburg, CA, and just west of the existing Black Diamond Ranch subdivision located in Antioch, CA. APNs 089-050-042 and 067, and portions of Highlands Ranch.

Associate Planner Strelo presented the staff report dated January 24, 2006. He recommended that the Planning Commission provide verbal comments and accept additional comments from the public on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Commissioner Garcia commented that there was a couple who lived at the south end of the existing Ventura Drive who had read the EIR on-line. The property owners were aware of the project at the time their home had been built on the lot and had not been disturbed by the fact that the subdivision would go in with traffic down Ventura Drive. However, he along with those property owners preferred that the Buchanan Road Bypass (BRB) not be open to Ventura Drive until completed all the way to Kirker Pass Road.

Commissioner Garcia referenced correspondence from the City of Antioch recommending that the BRB be open even if it was not continued to Kirker Pass Road.
Mr. Strelo explained that where the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch met, the BRB would continue onto James Donlan Boulevard.

The EIR had proposed that area remain barricaded until the BRB connected to Kirker Pass Road or another location where it could connect to Buchanan Road west of the project site.

Commissioner Garcia added that once the subdivision had been built, stop signs should be considered along Ventura Drive between the BRB and the existing Buchanan Road, given the increase in traffic and given the major intersections along Ventura Drive. He further disagreed with the financial figure that had been quoted for the cost of the BRB from Vista Del Rio to Kirker Pass Road. He suggested that a developer would not be able to build the homes after the road had been built due to the estimated costs.

Commissioner Ohlson also spoke to the barricade issue, identified as Impact 11 on Page 259 of the EIR under the second bullet under the Mitigation Measures, and asked that it be amended to reflect that bicycles and pedestrians would be able to go through the barricade without bikes having to be carried over the barricade.

Mr. Strelo clarified that the barricade was meant to prohibit vehicular traffic only.

Commissioner Ohlson outlined his concerns with the EIR as follows:

- Page 47 of the EIR, the last line on the same page, with the sentence to be amended to read:

  The adjoining petroleum product pipeline easement is 10 feet wide and includes a multi-purpose underground fuel pipeline.

Commissioner Ohlson noted that the trail identified in Alternative 1B had not been listed in the General Plan although that document had been written prior to the EIR. He questioned where the connection would be made to the existing trail system in the City or to any of the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBPRD) trails, or to the south to Black Diamond Regional Preserve.

MARK PAPINEAU, Environmental Service, Castro Valley, identified Alternative 1B and noted the idea of the trail was something that would apply to any of the on-site alternatives, including the proposed project. There was a mention of a use of a PG&E transmission corridor as a trail corridor for the north-south PG&E transmission lines. The idea was to use an east-west connection following the east-west PG&E transmission lines, which would go as far as Black Diamond Ranch. The connection from that point would be on the streets, such as the future BRB.
Mr. Papineau explained that the alternatives analyses was important. The purpose was to take a larger look at things that could be done to avoid or reduce the impacts of the proposed project, including what could be done as opposed to the development of the project.

The analyses included a no project alternative, proposed project alternative, on-site alternatives, and on-site conservation alternatives which would all save a portion of the site.

No homes were to be on that portion of the site, the southwestern corner. There were also two off-site alternatives as shown in the diagram identified on Pages 344 to 354 of the EIR, identifying Alternatives 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D, along with a diagram showing where the alternative sites were located. With the passage of Measure P, all were within the Urban Limit Line (ULL).

Alternatives 4A and 4B were in the same general area within the ULL on the urban edge, the outer edge like the proposed project site. Similar in size to the proposed project, both could support a similar number of homes, possibly reduced to a comparable density.

It was noted that the entire site was a potential habitat for the San Joaquin Kit Fox and the Tiger Salamander. Mitigation could be accommodated through a compensatory mitigation, designating other land off the project site for comparable habitat for the identified wildlife. There was a large planning study, EIR and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). While the HCP was not yet approved, if the project was built on the project site, compensatory mitigation would be found either independently of the County planning process or through the HCP, once adopted. The on-site conservation alternatives would allow a reduction of the off-site compensatory mitigation.

There were other impacts of the project including acoustical, traffic, air quality, emergency vehicle access, fire response times and the like. The impacts could not be avoided with the project on the alternative sites in that the alternative sites on a planning level were similarly situated, at the urban edge within an area known as grass land habitat, and susceptible to wild land fire as were other sites at the urban edge.

Mr. Papineau described other mitigation measures, such as changing part of the southern part of the site where Lots 180 through 191 had been shown, to potentially be used as a neighborhood park. He explained that the General Plan called for a certain amount of park land based on the project size. The development plan could be amended to place the park land and avoid some of the small sized lots.

Mr. Papineau also explained that B Street had also been evaluated with a diagram in the EIR that had shown a traffic calming zone, an area around B Street to possibly reduce the grade and take some of the homes shown with driveways between the BRB and J Court, and either eliminate those lots and driveways or rearrange B Street to allow the lots to be...
built on the other side of the street. He added that B Street should function as a residential collector in that area, with few driveways on the street. B Street was a mitigation measure, considered as a traffic calming zone.

Mr. Papideau spoke to mitigation measure to build a water reservoir off-site at a higher elevation, in coordination with City staff. If the water reservoir were built as shown in the EIR, south of the project site at elevation 565, there would be enough water pressure to serve all of the homes without a pump. The alternatives would share similar impacts and it was an equal challenge to either develop the residential development on the project site or on the alternative sites.

Commissioner Ohlson identified further concerns with the EIR:

- Page 257, Impact 7, noted that General Plan Policy 7-P-52 stated that all new arterial and collector streets would have bicycle facilities. He asked that the mitigation measure be amended to reflect that Standard Oil Avenue would have bicycle facilities. He also asked that the body of the EIR indicate that applicable to all traffic mitigations, the provisions of existing bicycle facilities would be maintained when the mitigations were constructed.

- Page 263, Impact 23, as written, had referenced Impact 3, which would not apply since it involved a different intersection, although staff clarified that it was the same mitigation measure although the impacts would be different for Impacts 23 and 3. Staff would clarify that the document had the correct intersection.

- Page 297, top paragraph, third sentence, referenced Pittsburg High School as being near the intersection of Railroad Avenue at Leland Road. He asked that the sentence be modified to show that the school was closer to the intersection of Harbor and School Streets.

- Page 310, the reference in the last paragraph to the abbreviation, “sra” [state responsibility area], to be included in the abbreviation list

On the discussion, Mr. Strelo clarified that the General Plan did not have Ventura Road shown as a bike route although it was a 25 MPH residential street. The BRB had also not been designated as a bicycle route in the General Plan although there would be ample room for an 8-foot wide bike lane on the BRB.

Commissioner Ohlson stated that the City of Antioch had bicycle lanes on James Donlon Boulevard. He spoke to General Plan Policy 7-P-52, which stipulated that all new arterial and collector streets would have bicycle facilities. If Ventura Drive was a collector or arterial it would have an additional 4 to 5 feet on each side to accommodate bicycle lanes.
In response to Commissioner Garcia as to whether or not staff would consider a park or an in-lieu fee option for the park land, Ms. Ayres stated that would be determined by the Planning Commission and the City Council. She noted that there was no park on that side of Buchanan Road, children would have to cross a major thoroughfare to reach park amenities.

Ms. Ayres added that there was park land in the Highlands Ranch project although that park land served that neighborhood. The City standard was 5 acres per 1,000 people, which would not be enough to serve both projects. She noted that the Council and Commission would need to evaluate the benefits of long term land banking for future generations versus smaller improved parks in the area now. She understood that the developer had expressed the willingness to consider adding a portion of the project benefiting future residents of Sky Ranch.

Commissioner Garcia noted that children would have to cross the Buchanan Road Bypass to reach school as well, although Ms. Ayres suggested there could be volunteer crossing guards due to the speed on the street for school crossing times.

Commissioner Garcia also understood that the use of the PG&E easements as trails would be up to that agency. He did not see that PG&E would accept the liability associated with such a use.

Commissioner Ohlson preferred to see more land set aside for parks whether they could be constructed now or not.

Commissioner Garcia pointed out that the City was running out of money to maintain its existing parks. Given that issue, he suggested it would be a problem for the City to maintain larger parks as opposed to the smaller parks and a reduction of lawn space.

ALBERT SEENO III, Discovery Builders, advised that the project was in its early stages. He stated that he would work with staff and the EIR Consultant to address all concerns as best as possible. He noted that the project had first been presented to the City four and a half years ago, and had evolved since that time. He was eager to keep the project moving.

Mr. Seeno added that the project would give back to the City and would involve the building of two water tanks, one to replace the existing Highlands Ranch tank and another which would help with the City’s Water Master Plan System. The project would also improve streets and address other impacts. Parks, trails and bike lanes would all be addressed so that the project would be something that would be enjoyed by the community.

Ms. Ayres explained that all comments would be addressed in the Final EIR to be presented to the Planning Commission and the City Council prior to final action on the project.
STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no staff communications.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Garcia reported that the TRANSPLAN Committee had received a report on the widening of State Route 4.

Commissioner Garcia added that the TRANSPLAN Committee had also elected a new Chair and representative to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), approved the Antioch Southern Arterial Bike Project, received a report from the City of Pittsburg for the metering plan for Buchanan Road at Meadow Lane, received a status report on how to speed the widening of State Route 4, and received a report on the 511 Program with funds used to subsidize children using buses to school.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced the report from staff at the last Commission meeting that the City was involved in a lawsuit regarding the Black Diamond project. She advised that the lawsuit was a private suit and had nothing to do with the corporation she worked for. As such, she was not a part of that lawsuit.

Commissioner Garcia inquired whether or not the City had dropped the designation of buildings as historic buildings in Pittsburg, to which Ms. Ayres clarified that the historic designations were identified in Chapters 5 and 9 of the General Plan. Some of those historic buildings were within the New York Landing District and others were outside of that district. In response to a question, Ms. Ayres stated that the Historic Resources Commission had authority to make recommendations to the City Council as to whether or not to add or eliminate a historic designation on a building.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on February 14, 2006 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.