MINUTES

OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE

PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION

May, 10, 2005

A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Jack Garcia at 7:02 P.M. on Tuesday, May 10, 2005 in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Gordon, Dolojan, Ohlson, Williams, Chairperson Garcia
(Commissioner Williams arrived after roll call)

Absent: None

Excused: Commissioner Ramirez, Commissioner Tumbaga

Staff: Planning Director Melissa Ayres, Associate Planner Noel Ibalio, Assistant Planner Christopher Barton, and Senior Civil Engineer Alfredo Hurtado.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

The agenda was posted at City Hall on Friday, May 6, 2005.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Christopher Barton 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 – April 26, 2005

MOTION:

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

Ayes: Commissioners Gordon, Dolojan, Ohlson, Garcia
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Ramirez, Tumbaga, Williams

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 1: Pittsburg Medical Center Modifications. AP-05-213 (DR)

An application by Jennifer Yang requesting design review approval to construct a new, one-story, 10,071 square foot medical office building and related site improvements on a 0.85 acre site located at the southeast corner of E. Leland Road and Loveridge Road in the CS (Interim Zoning Ordinance – “Best Fit” zone) Zoning District; APN 088-161-013.

Associate Planner Noel Ibalio presented the staff report dated May 10, 2005. He recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9568 approving Design Review Application No. AP-05-213, with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to Section 3, Approval, No. 8 of Resolution No. 9568, which had shown that the existing street trees were not to conflict with the driveways, planned landscaping or parking. Contrary to that, he noted that Page 2 of 5 of the staff report had shown that all of the street trees would be removed. He requested clarification from staff.

Mr. Ibalio explained that while the landscaping plan proposed to eliminate all street trees on Loveridge and East Leland Roads, condition 8 required applicant to save the street trees that could be saved.

In response to Commissioner Ohlson with respect to Condition No. 10 and whether or not the applicant had indicated any plans for Loveridge Road, Mr. Ibalio explained that the applicant had met with the City’s Traffic Division and would be required to submit an offer of dedication and construct the new right-turn lane. The plans had shown a revised right turn pocket to include that exclusive right turn lane and a bicycle lane.
Commissioner Ohlson also spoke to Condition No. 33 and understood that had been revised by staff to include bicycle racks. He also referenced Plan AO and questioned what had been planned for the 10 foot section between the top of the curb and the landscaping. He also asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of that area.

Chairperson Garcia clarified that the area referenced on the plans belonged to the Los Medanos Hospital District and was not part of the subject application.

Commissioner Gordon inquired of the percentage of landscaping being proposed, to which Mr. Ibalio clarified that the project would meet the 10 percent required landscaping. Commissioner Gordon also spoke to the Loveridge Road side of the site and the existing driveway that would be 50 feet from the new driveway. He questioned whether that would create any conflicts.

Mr. Ibalio advised that he had discussed the design with the Traffic Engineer who had reviewed and approved the plans, and who had recognized that it was the only place for a driveway since there was a proposed bus turnout along East Leland Road.

Given that there were other entrances to the hospital parking lot, Commissioner Gordon questioned whether or not that driveway could be blocked off since it was seldom used.

Mr. Ibalio noted that blocking the hospital driveway had not been discussed as part of the traffic analysis.

Commissioner Dolojan expressed his hope that the possible blockage of the hospital driveway could be discussed with the City’s Traffic Engineer. If it were preserved, he suggested it could pose a traffic hazard with the competing driveway for the subject use.

Mr. Ibalio recommended that issue be discussed with the City Engineer and eventually with the Los Medanos Hospital District, although he commented that driveways were generally not closed as part of a project.

Chairperson Garcia recalled that it had not been a condition of the project for the applicant to reach an agreement with the Los Medanos Hospital District since the District had a history of not negotiating with anyone. He agreed that the City should make a request in writing to the Los Medanos Hospital District requesting that the hospital driveway be closed or barricaded since there were more than sufficient access points to the site; a main driveway on Loveridge Road and two driveways on Leland Road. He agreed that if the hospital driveway adjacent to the subject driveway were allowed to remain open it could pose a potential traffic hazard.

KEYVAN MASOUDI, 2734 Delta Fair Boulevard, Antioch, identified himself as the owner of the property. Mr. Masoudi commented that although he had worked to reach an
agreement with the Los Medanos Hospital District for the use of the hospital’s easement, and while the District had initially agreed on its use, at the last minute his request had been denied. He acknowledged that there was a main entrance for the hospital directly before his driveway. He saw no conflict for the two uses.

In response to Commissioner Williams, Mr. Masoudi advised that the plans had been reviewed and accepted by the Fire Protection District. He reiterated that he had tried to reach an agreement with the Hospital District although that had not been successful and the proposed modifications were the only option as a result. He also clarified that those using the facility could not enter the hospital site from this property since there was no access to that facility and there would therefore be no conflict with the two uses.

**MOTION: AP-05-213**

Motion by Commissioner Gordon to adopt Resolution No. 9568, approving Design Review Application No. AP-05-213, to construct a new, one story, 10,071 square foot medical office building and related site improvements on a vacant 0.85 acre lot located at the southeast corner of E. Leland Road and Loveridge Road with the conditions as shown and with a modification to Condition No. 33, as follows:

33. *The developer shall install bicycle racks accommodating six bicycles; the design and location of the racks shall be subject to review and approval of the City Traffic Engineer.*

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

Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Gordon, Ohlson, Williams, Garcia
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Ramirez, Tumbaga

The agenda was taken out of order at this time.

**Item 3: Planning Commission Review of Building Permit for Mehran Restaurant Exterior Refuse Enclosure and New Storefront Doors.**

Planning Commission request to review building permit plans (under PMC Section 18.36.310) to install a new customer access door and screen wall along the storefront of an existing commercial building, and to install a refuse enclosure (at the rear of the building) located at 3841 Railroad Avenue, CC (Community Commercial) District, APN 088-072-066.

Assistant Planner Christopher Barton presented the staff report dated May 10, 2005.

Mr. Barton recommended that the Planning Commission review the proposed building
Mr. Barton advised that a letter had been submitted on May 9, 2005 from Ben Camera, 115 El Camino Drive, Pittsburg, indicating that he had worked out a solution with the applicant to address his concerns with respect to noise and the visibility of the use from his home.

MARY KLINE, M. Kline Architect Inc., Project Architect, 131 Star Street, Oakley noted that the applicant had been negotiating with Mr. Camera during the process. The new door would be the only change to the façade of the building. The applicant had added a screen onto the door to block the views of people opening/closing the door so that it would not be visible from Mr. Camera’s residence. Rather than have the screen walls, Mr. Camera was now willing to have trees planted in the landscaped area adjacent to his home that would grow to a higher height blocking the view and sounds of the use.

Chairperson Garcia understood that Mr. Camera did not want a wall.

Ms. Kline noted that they had planned to place the screen by the door to block views of people going in and out of the restaurant. There was an existing sound wall up to the Camera property. While one of the earlier negotiations had been to extend the sound wall, Mr. Camera now indicated that plantings of a higher height would muffle the sounds and block views impacting his residence. Based on that recent agreement, Mr. Camera had agreed to eliminate the need for the screen near the front of the door.

Chairperson Garcia expressed concern with the adequacy of the parking. Having reviewed the plans he understood that there would be 26 tables in the restaurant.

Ms. Kline advised that they were in the process of finalizing the parking issues and had resolved the issue of the hours of operation of the business to not conflict with the adjacent church. When the church was in session, the restaurant with 44 seats could be open although the banquet would not be open at the same time.

Mr. Barton clarified that the pro rata share of the parking controlled by the applicant who owns 10,000 square feet of the shopping center would be 40 parking spaces based on the calculation of one parking space per 250 square feet. The full service restaurant would require additional stalls over the pro rata share which was being analyzed by staff and the applicant. The hours of operation would be staggered with the high demand for parking during the banquet hours. The only conflict was when the church was in session at which time the banquet would not be in use.

Mr. Barton identified the area where the new door had been proposed and which would be the access point for the restaurant which would be open during normal business hours. Ms. Kline advised that the restaurant had a capacity of 44 seats. The Fire Protection...
District had shown an occupancy of 52 persons. Again, the banquet areas would not be open during church hours.

Ms. Ayres clarified that the restaurant was a permitted use. The Zoning Administrator had been asked to make an interpretation on the proposed use to find it consistent with the zoning as long as it met the parking standards. The Zoning Administrator would be sending the applicant a letter stipulating the amount of the banquet facility/restaurant that could be open at any given time depending on when the church was open or not. Operation of the banquet facility/restaurant other than at times consistent with that interpretation would be in violation of the zoning. The parking standards were written to accommodate the number of employees in the use.

Commissioner Gordon spoke to the screen wall for the door and the letter from Mr. Camera which had spoken to the potential noise generated from the use and his agreement that a landscape screen wall would be acceptable.

Ms. Kline explained that they had proposed a solid wall to help block some sound. She reiterated that from the most recent agreement with Mr. Camera and per his May 9, 2005 letter, he preferred to see the installation of a landscape screen wall.

Ms. Ayres recommended that if there was a motion, that it be a motion to direct approval of the building plans back to staff, with the plans as proposed to be acceptable with the additional provision of the oleanders. The oleanders could be added to the applicant’s plans. Because the applicant had agreed to add that planting, the plans would not be approved without it.

PETE CARPINO, 151 El Camino Drive, Pittsburg, was pleased to see that the trash enclosure had been moved.

Mr. Carpino also spoke to the restaurant hours as proposed and questioned whether or not those hours should be called out in the plans. He also requested clarification of the required parking for the use.

Ms. Ayres noted that the City did not regulate hours of operation for permitted uses.

Mr. Barton reiterated that the applicant’s pro rata share of the parking was based on the square footage of the business facility, which was 10,000 square feet. The full service restaurant would have chairs that were movable and not fixed and the parking would be based on the square footage of the seating area. Required parking for restaurants is computed by dividing the eating area by 50. Mr. Barton explained that would exceed a commercial requirement of one parking space per 250 square feet. While it was confusing, the hours of operation would be staggered to ensure that the banquet use was not open at the same time as the church. The full service restaurant would be open seven days a week during normal business hours.
Ms. Ayres also reiterated that the parking requirements for a restaurant were spelled out in the Zoning Ordinance as one parking space per 50 square feet of dining area. When building permits are reviewed, applications for restaurants are required to meet that standard. The building permit plans would clearly identify the dining area, kitchen and restrooms. If in the future, seating was in a location other than in the designated dining area that would be cause for concern and the use could be found to be in violation of the designated zoning.

ASHLEY DAVID identified himself as one of the owners of the restaurant. He spoke to the doors on the far right hand side of the building and questioned whether or not it would be acceptable to eliminate the window and bring the door towards the other side of the building rather than closer to the Camera property.

Chairperson Garcia understood that with such an exterior modification the applicant would have to file a new application. He also noted that the window was quite large and he was not convinced it would be appropriate to remove it.

Ms. Ayres clarified that the applicant was requesting to place a door where the window was located. If that was done, the area would have to be repaired to match the materials on the exterior of the building. It would be up to the Commission as to whether or not that would be acceptable. Staff had no issues with that suggestion.

Mr. David acknowledged if that was allowed there would be no window into the restaurant.

Chairperson Garcia pointed out that would change the appearance of the entire center. He did not support that recommendation.

Commissioner Gordon commented that he had 25 years in the restaurant business and based on his experience there had always been windows in the dining area.

Mr. David explained that had been suggested to accommodate Mr. Camera. If the suggestion was not acceptable, the window would be left as is.

The property owner of 139 El Camino Drive, Pittsburg, commented that his main concerns related to the garbage enclosure, the security gate, the wall and the potential noise which could be generated by the use. He was not opposed to the restaurant. He expressed his hope that noise would not be a problem in the future.

In response to Commissioner Williams, Mr. Barton reiterated that the issue of the trash enclosure had been worked out between the residents and the applicant.

Commissioner Ohlson pointed out that no bicycle parking had been proposed, although Mr.
Barton explained that no bicycle racks had been included since there was no new site development being proposed other than the improvements to the parking lot. He recognized that bicycle parking was something the Commission would like to see included.

From the audience the applicant nodded his agreement to include bicycle racks.

**MOTION:**

Motion by Commissioner Gordon to direct staff to approve the proposed building permit plans for exterior changes to the building for Mehran Restaurant, subject to the following additional conditions:

- The applicant shall provide bicycle racks for at least six bicycles; and
- The applicant shall install oleander plants to fill in the gaps behind 115 El Camino Drive and 127 El Camino Drive.

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

- **Ayes:** Commissioners Dolojan, Gordon, Ohlson, Tumbaga, Williams, Garcia
- **Noes:** None
- **Abstain:** None
- **Absent:** Commissioner Ramirez

**Item 2: Zoning Code Update Study Session (Zoning Text Amendments – Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations)**

A study session to introduce proposed text amendments to the Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC) Chapters 18.08.140 (Accessory Use Classifications), 18.50.100 through 18.50.120 (Accessory Dwelling Units), 18.32.010 (Zoning Approval), and 18.50.010 (RR, RE, RS, RM and RH Districts- Land Use Regulations) to bring the zoning ordinance into compliance with State requirements. (Government Code 65852.2) and the goals and policies of the General Plan.

Associate Planner Noel Ibalio presented the staff report dated May 10, 2005. He recommended that the Planning Commission review the proposed zoning text amendments and provide feedback to staff on the proposed wording.

Chairperson Garcia referenced the five foot setback for a detached accessory structure and a five foot setback from the fence side yard. The Chair understood that they could add a 750 square foot accessory dwelling, if it met the setback requirements.

Staff affirmed that could be done although the maximum lot coverage standard would have to be met as well.
Chairperson Garcia understood that if the heated space of the dwelling unit was only 1,000 square feet only a 500 square foot accessory dwelling unit could be constructed.

Mr. Ibalio concurred.

Ms. Ayres added that one could add onto a 1,000 square foot home at the same time. As an example, if there was a desire to create a 700 square foot secondary unit, another 400 feet could be added to the single family home at the same time to allow a 700 square foot secondary unit.

Commissioner Dolojan noted that the yards in newer developed homes were very small. Those homes could barely have a dog run in the rear of the homes. He questioned whether or not the secondary unit could be leased out as a rental unit.

Mr. Ibalio advised that secondary units could be turned into rental units. He added that some cities had used such units as low income housing. Secondary units represented an alternative that could be used as part of the housing numbers to report to the State. The definition of an accessory dwelling unit would allow for a rental, in-law unit or the like.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to Page 1 of 4 of Attachment 2 of the State regulations which had shown that the total area of floor space of the secondary unit shall not exceed 1,200 square feet, although the City’s ordinance had proposed 750 square feet. He inquired if the City had the discretionary authority to make that change.

Mr. Ibalio commented that the City could change the allowable square footage. Staff had determined that 1,200 square feet would be essentially a second home on a property and that realistically an accessory unit was to be an accessory to the main home. It had been determined that 750 square feet would allow for a large one bedroom or two bedroom unit at the rear.

Commissioner Ohlson spoke to Page 2 of 4 of Attachment 2 of the State regulations, Section (5), which had shown sections (c) though (g). While he recognized that staff had not prepared the State regulations, he inquired why there were no sections (a) and (b).

Mr. Ibalio stated that he would have to further review the State regulations to determine whether or not any sections were missing.

Speaking to Attachment 1, the proposed amendments to the City’s ordinance, Commissioner Ohlson requested that the page numbers be paginated. He specifically referenced Section 18.50.110, Administrative Review (G), as written and recommended that the last word of that sentence ["in"] be eliminated.

Commissioner Ohlson referenced Section 18.50.115, Design and Development Standards, (F) of Attachment 1 and recommended the following revision:
F. *The property retains the appearance as a single family residence from adjoining right(s)-of-way.*

Commissioner Williams inquired whether or not the ordinance would address regulations for the access to the secondary units. She commented that most of the secondary units located in her neighborhood were located at the rear of the homes, which homes were located in a hilly area.

Mr. Ibalio advised that in order for the secondary unit to be clearly defined, as such, it had to have its own entrance and accessibility from the front and could not be accessed from inside the primary unit.

Ms. Ayres added that if the secondary unit was attached to the main home with a door on the side of the home from the street, it still had the appearance of a single home in a single family neighborhood with no visible or perceived impact on the neighborhood. She stated that a design requiring entrance through the rear yard to access the secondary units was the most desirable design. She did not anticipate a significant number of accessory dwelling units on the smaller lots in the community. On larger lots, property owners typically preferred a separation for privacy reasons.

In response to Commissioner Gordon, Ms. Ayres explained that the maximum lot coverage in Planned Development (PD) Districts is 50 percent for two story, and 55 percent for one story dwellings. In the RS Zoning District, the lot coverage standard is 40 percent.

Commissioner Gordon verified with staff that lot coverage would be handled under Section 18.50.110. Administrator Review (G), of Attachment 1. He recommended that section be further refined to address lot coverage issues.

Ms. Ayres explained that the requirement to comply with the development standards applicable to the Residential District in which the primary residence was located also addressed height limits, setbacks, lot coverage and the like.

Commissioner Gordon also spoke Section 18.50.110. Administrator Review (H), of Attachment 1, which would govern the secondary unit in terms of how it could be rented. He requested clarification from staff.

Ms. Ayres clarified that the secondary unit and the primary unit could not be rented out to two separate households on two separate leases. While the property owner might lease the property with one lease to one large family, the accessory unit could not be sublet. The City’s current ordinance allowed only the main dwelling unit to be owner occupied.

Commissioner Gordon requested that section be further refined to prevent any confusion as to the regulations on how the secondary unit could be leased. He had no problem with
the regulations as long as the primary or secondary unit was owner occupied.

Commissioner Gordon also commented that in the past the Commission had reviewed the Marina Walk development which had separate garages which would be able to accommodate a secondary unit over the garages. He inquired whether or not such scenarios had also been covered in the City’s ordinance.

Mr. Ibalio noted that the height limit might have to be changed for the accessory dwelling units to address the issue of a secondary unit over a garage.

Commissioner Gordon also spoke to the first paragraph of Section 180.08.140 of Attachment 1, where the definition of an accessory dwelling unit had been modified by staff. He specifically spoke to Item 3 under that section which addressed living quarters. He inquired if that was where they would discuss the issue of having a family of five, as an example, living in a one bedroom tilt-up shack with no bathroom or kitchen. He questioned the difference between an accessory dwelling unit and an accessory living quarter.

Ms. Ayres explained that it was defined in the Zoning Ordinance, Land Use Classifications. The primary difference was that a living quarter did not have a kitchen and was more a maid quarter or an au pair quarter as examples, where the occupant actually accessed the rest of the home and used the common areas.

Mr. Ibalio clarified that the difference was also in the allowable size. Per the Zoning Code, an Accessory Living Quarter was defined as “accessory living quarters or living quarters within an accessory building, but without kitchen facilities, and on the same site as the main building of a residential use for the purpose of housing servants, employees, or non paying transient visitors, or guests of the occupant of the main building. This definition includes the term guest house, but did not include accessory dwelling unit governed by Section 18.50.10.”

Commissioner Gordon inquired whether or not a property owner could rent out an accessory living quarter, to which Mr. Ibalio explained that the code did not distinguish what could be rented.

Ms. Ayres added that it was clear that the living quarters were not intended to be rented and if they had to fill that loophole, that could be done.

Commissioner Gordon also asked that staff review the language in Section 18.08.140 Accessory Use Classifications, (4), Caretakers Quarters, to prevent any confusion as discussed related to living quarters.

Commissioner Ohlson questioned whether or not the lot coverage could be increased to allow the accessory structures.
Mr. Ibalio explained that in the older neighborhoods where the lots had been built at 6,000 square feet there was space for an accessory dwelling unit. While it might not be at 750 square feet, an accessory dwelling unit could still be built under the maximum square footage allowed, and under the 40 percent lot coverage requirement. He could analyze that issue further as the next step to presenting the proposed text amendments.

During his preliminary analysis and the potential areas where secondary dwelling units could be built, Mr. Ibalio reported that he had found that there were areas that could be developed, although he acknowledged that for the newer subdivisions developers were building to the maximum lot coverage. He could not see accessory dwelling units being able to be added to the Harbor Lights or Willow Heights developments as examples, since those sites lacked the land.

Commissioner Gordon reiterated that the Marina Walk development would allow secondary dwelling units since they had the garages where a second story could be built.

Ms. Ayres advised that for a standard 5,000 square foot lot, consistent with many properties in the City, 40 percent would be 2,000 square feet in size. The zoning code would allow two stories, which equated to a combined 4,000 square foot home and accessory dwelling unit in the buildable area.

Commissioner Gordon suggested that a review of Stoneman and Presidio Villages would find that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had allowed 450 square feet for a one bedroom apartment with a living room, bedroom, kitchen and bathroom. He encouraged staff to also review the HUD guidelines for apartments.

Commissioner Williams inquired of the rationale for not recommending the maximum 1,200 square feet for a secondary dwelling unit currently allowed by the State.

Ms. Ayres reiterated that staff was recommending a maximum of 750 square feet, which was more than the current ordinance at 700 square feet, in order to create incentives for such units without over burdening a neighborhood or changing its character.

Mr. Ibalio further commented that the current code at 700 square feet was apparently not working since no one was proposing such units.

Chairperson Garcia pointed out that some people were unaware of the regulations. He suggested that at some point the regulations should be advertised to the community.

Ms. Ayres advised that the intent was to promote the regulations once the City code had been amended; it would then be made available on the City’s website and with brochures.

In response to Commissioner Ohlson, Mr. Ibalio clarified that lot coverage was calculated...
including any permanent structure with a roof covering the lot. As to a portable garage, unless it was a permanent structure requiring a building permit or a foundation it would not be counted as part of the lot coverage.

Chairperson Garcia understood that a driveway could not be covered without a variance. If someone were to place a canvas bolted cover on a driveway he verified with staff that would be a code enforcement issue.

Mr. Ibalio commented that they would incorporate the Commission’s comments into the draft text amendments. Staff would return to the Commission with additional amendments to the zoning ordinance throughout the summer.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

1. Notice of Intent (to review/approve projects at staff level):
   a. Cingular Antennas at Range Road Tower. AP-05-214 (AD)

The Planning Commission acknowledged the Notice of Intent item as shown.

2. Pending Zoning Administrator Action:
   a. Request for Side Yard Variances. AP-05-218 (VAR)  
      (St. Vincent de Paul property)

Mr. Ayres reported that she had provided the Commission with information on a Workforce Seminar on June 7, 2005 to be sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Diablo Valley and the Institute of Local Self Government. She also presented information on a Tri Valley Housing Expo scheduled for June 4, 2005.

Ms. Ayres also reported that the City Council had recently approved changes to the Planning Commission and Historical Resources Commission (HRC) bylaws and initiated a Municipal Code text amendment to change the structure of the HRC. She would be meeting with the Council Bylaws Subcommittee comprised of Councilmembers Kee and Glynn to discuss potential ideas to be presented to the Council during a formal hearing.

Ms. Ayres added that the Planning Commission Appreciation Dinner would be scheduled soon pending the availability of Commissioners.

The Chair recommended that staff select a date which the Commission could consider.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

There were no Committee Reports.
COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Gordon understood that the City had an ordinance preventing boats and recreational vehicles from being parked in front yards.

Mr. Ibalio affirmed that inoperable vehicles were not allowed to be stored in the front yard of a property.

Commissioner Gordon reported that a new home at the end of Third Street, which had been built a year ago, had trailers parked in front of the home and a boat parked on the lawn which was inappropriate. He understood that the City ordinance prohibited such activity and that such vehicles were allowed to be parked on the side yard if wide enough and if screened from view behind a gated fence.

Commissioner Gordon expressed his appreciation to staff and the Planning Commission for the condolences on the recent loss of his mother.

Chairperson Garcia reported that a home located at Ventura Drive and Loveridge Road had an inoperable truck parked in the drive and a trailer and vehicle parked in front of the home that had not been moved for some time, with a trailer on the side behind a gate where someone was living. The Chair added that the home had an addition on the west side which he understood had been built without building permits. There was also a fence right on the sidewalk. Further, the home had operated a flea market for three weeks.

Commissioner Williams encouraged staff to review the neighborhood of Alta Vista Drive which had a number of infractions which should be reviewed.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:36 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on May 24, 2005 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.