A special meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:30 P.M. on Wednesday, March 28, 2001, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Kelley, Tumbaga, Chairman Kee

Absent: Commissioners Leonard, Valentine

Staff: Planning Manager Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram; Park Planner Joel Summerhill, Planning Secretary Fara Bowman.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, March 23, 2001.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Holmes led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES:

There were no minutes.

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS:

There were no deletions or withdrawals.

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.
PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:

There were no Commission Considerations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:


Public hearing on the proposed Draft General Plan and proposed General Plan land uses and policies for the comprehensive update of the City's General Plan, "Pittsburg 2020: A Vision for the 21st Century" (General Plan Update). The General Plan designates land uses and appropriate policies to guide future growth throughout the City of Pittsburg and the City's identified Planning Area.

Mr. Jerome explained that this was the fourth public hearing on the General Plan Update. The current discussion related to: Chapter Three, Growth Management; Chapter Ten, Health and Safety; Chapter Eleven, Public Facilities; Chapter Twelve, Noise; and Chapter Thirteen, the Housing Element. He stated it was staff's intent to continue the public hearing again, possibly for two additional meetings. All written and verbal comments would be brought back to the Commission in a format identifying what changes might be made based on those comments to allow for deliberations along with staff recommendations. A red strikeout version would be provided to the Commission at the completion of the process.

Mr. Jerome added that a separate public hearing would be held relative to hillside and ridgeline preservation since that appeared to be the most controversial aspect of the General Plan.

Mr. Jerome advised that the consultant had been asked to prepare further visual analyses. It was hoped that could be done in two weeks. The intent had been to review more visual analyses than in the current development in terms of how development could appear and which ridgelines could and could not be affected, with the intention that the Commission would decide what policies the City might want to continue, strengthen, remove, or modify based on the further analyses.

Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram explained that the Commission would discuss five different elements of the General Plan. The first discussion would be on the Growth Management Element, which described the projected growth of land uses and planning boundaries through the year 2020. That policy had been intended to ensure that public facilities and transportation systems were constructed in proportion to new urban development.

Pursuant to the Contra Costa County Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program, Measure C, adopted by County voters in 1988, the Growth Management Element would ensure a balance between new urban development and public facilities.
The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) had determined that a Growth Management Element shall identify the routes regional significance and level of service (LOS) standards for signalized intersections on basic routes.

In addition, the element shed light on the performance standards for parks and open space, fire and police services, water, sewer systems, flood control, and capital improvement programs. Certain policies had been drafted that would enhance the construction and improvement of public facilities to cater to the needs of the growing population through the year 2020.

The next chapter to be discussed was identified as the Health and Safety Element, which would address policies that identified where growth should be located and how the City could limit such growth if any construction was to be done on slopes greater than 30 percent. Policies were also included in that chapter to minimize the grading of hillside areas by limiting cut slopes to a 3:1 ratio and requiring vegetation of cut slopes to control erosion.

Policies also focused on the formation of Geologic Hazard Abatement Districts (GHAD) and to ensure detailed mitigation for seismic hazards in areas with unstable slopes and liquefaction potential. Those areas had been mapped and the analysis performed to identify the area of unstable slopes. The same element also evaluated downstream and cumulative impacts within deteriorating storm drains, construction of detention basins to cater to needs of runoff, and work with landowners to clean up fill sites.

The Health and Safety Element also discussed the designation of new sites for emergency response facilities, including policies that would guide how to react in the event of an emergency.

The Public Facilities Element would emphasize implementation, replacement, or expansion of the water supply system throughout the City, through Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) and through working with the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) to continue water conservation and expand the use of reclaimed water and improvements to sewer systems, particularly those south of State Route 4 where deteriorating sewer lines needed to be replaced or new lines constructed.

That same element would monitor industry discharge to ensure that water quality continued to meet the standards and comply with the guidelines of the Clean Water Act.

Additional policies discussed working with the Pittsburg Disposal Service for curbside recycling services and with PG&E to provide wildlife habitat and or multi-use trade along public utility corridors.

The Noise Element, as required by State law, identified different noise standards and decibels that would be allowed for any constructed building. That element had included standards to reduce the noise levels from State Route 4.

Additionally, the Housing Element would be discussed. It was noted that the Housing Element did not include all current data since the 2000 Census information was not yet available. The intent had
been
to create a framework where the data could be extrapolated based on the Census information.
Policies

had also been included in that element, which policies could be refined or replaced during a
comprehensive update of the Housing Element at a later date.

Commissioner Holmes commented that during a previous discussion, it had been suggested that a
possible field trip be scheduled for the Planning Commission to tour the City's hillsides. He inquired
whether or not that was still under consideration.

Mr. Jerome suggested that such a tour be conducted prior to the hillside hearing analysis. Possible
dates could be discussed at the completion of the subject discussion.

PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED:

JAY EGY, Project Manager, The DeSilva Group, commented on his understanding that the subject
discussion would be the last opportunity for the Commission to receive testimony from the public. If
additional public hearings were anticipated to be scheduled, he commented that it might be more
appropriate for him to return and address his concerns with the Commission at that time.

Chairman Kee affirmed that there would be future public hearings on the General Plan Update. He
welcomed comment from anyone from the audience at this time on any portion of the General Plan.

Mr. Egy presented the Commission with copies of correspondence he had provided to staff. He
referenced copies of a site plan that had identified a 1.9 acre site presently owned by Uecker &
Associates. He identified that property as bound on the south by the East Bay Municipal Utility
District (EBMUD) right-of-way, west of Loveridge Road, north of the access driveway through the
Los Medanos Hospital, and to the east of the convalescent home located on Loveridge Road.

Mr. Egy explained that The DeSilva Group had entered into a contract with Uecker & Associates
and two other groups to purchase three parcels, which included the 1.9-acre site and two vacant sites
located at the intersection of Gladstone Drive and Leland Road.

Mr. Egy advised of the intent to build a Medium Density residential project on all three parcels,
consisting of eight units to the acre for an urban infill project. The project would consist of single
family detached residences, where one unit would have a garage in the front while the other would
have a garage in the rear. Each of the units would include a single story element with a living room
in the front. Those units with garages in the front would sit back behind and be blocked by the living
room. He presented photographs of similar projects The DeSilva Group had built in the Cities of
Pleasanton and Dublin.

Mr. Egy explained that The DeSilva Group had also obtained approval of a project, which consisted
of similar architecture in the City of Concord and were also working on another project in the City
of Napa.
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Mr. Egy reported that the proposed homes would range from 1,875 to 2,012 square feet in size, with the smaller home a three bedroom unit and the larger home a four bedroom unit. Each home would include a full-length driveway in the front, a rear yard and a five-foot sideyard on one side.

Mr. Egy spoke to the proposed details of the project where along Leland Road, 61 units had been anticipated, with 16 to 18 units on the Loveridge Road site. He advised that he had conducted a survey of existing uses in the surrounding area and he identified each of the individual parcels along the Leland Road Corridor, with Highlands Square on Buchanan Road and a small commercial parcel located on the corner of Stoneman and Leland Road. Other than those uses, all others were residential in nature. As such, he was confident that the proposed residential use would be appropriate for the site.

Mr. Egy also referenced the mixture of housing types along Loveridge Road. He emphasized that the subject property had been aggressively marketed for the past two years with no interest. He requested that the Planning Commission reconsider reclassifying the subject site to Medium Density Residential.

In response to Commissioner Tumbaga, Mr. Egy explained that the other two parcels under contract consisted of seven and a half acres and that the designation of those two parcels in the General Plan Update had been Medium Density Residential.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that staff had spoken with Mr. Egy regarding the referenced parcels. Staff would be commenting on those parcels during the continued hearing relative to staff’s comments on the various public comments received.

SUSAN UECKER, President, Uecker & Associates, 353 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, advised that she was a Bankruptcy Trustee and that the three parcels referenced by Mr. Egy were part of an estate that her firm had been attempting to sell for the past two years. Once the parcels were sold, funds from the estate would go to creditors of the Los Medanos Health Care Corporation. She requested the Commission's consideration of reclassifying the subject 1.9 acre parcel, which was presently zoned for Quasi-Institutional to Medium Density Residential.

Mr. Jerome introduced Joel Summerhill, the City's Park Planner, to address some of the park policies in the General Plan.

Park Planner Joel Summerhill referenced Policy 8-P-6, a revision to the City's Park Dedication Ordinance, which defined usable area for parkland dedication requirements. He referenced the General Plan policy that park sites should be designed such that 80 percent of the site had slopes of less than 3 percent that were suitable for active recreational play.

Mr. Summerhill emphasized that the City needed usable land and the policy was in place to cover a void in the current Park Dedication Ordinance. He commented that a baseball or softball field with a 310 foul line took up 2.2 acres. Half of that land could not be located on a slope and needed to be on flat land. He added that a soccer field required 2.36 acres and a football field required 1.7 acres of land. Tennis, basketball, volleyball courts and the like also required flat land. He suggested that the
policy that 80 percent of the site required to be less than 3 percent slopes was a reasonable request.

Commissioner Glynn inquired of the current park inventory versus the current ratio to population with respect to current plans, which have either been approved or anticipated to meet the current requirements.

Mr. Summerhill explained that the basic standard was five acres per thousand residents. The City had not quite reached that standard. With an additional 48 acres of park, which had been identified in the General Plan, that would bring the City to approximately 4.3 acres per thousand residents. He added that the City was behind in terms of the proposed goals and in terms of specific parks.

Mr. Summerhill cited as an example the 190 acres of Stoneman Park that was basically undeveloped.

Commissioner Holmes inquired of the current number of employees required to maintain the City's current park facilities.

Mr. Summerhill advised that park maintenance employees were under the purview of Public Services Department and Park Maintenance division. Although he was uncertain of the current number of City employees in those departments, he stated that with the number of new facilities the City was adding through assistance with the energy funds, and the new facilities designated under the proposed General Plan, the City would need to keep pace in terms of the park maintenance crews and would need to hire additional employees. It was not realistic to assume that current staff would be able to handle those future requirements.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not the City was in arrears with respect to past projects that had already been approved and should be in place, particularly since at the time they were built there was room for a methodology that was different from what had been included in the current General Plan. As a result, under the proposed General Plan, he suggested that the City might be deficient for its current use. He requested clarification from staff.

Mr. Summerhill explained that there were no major changes in the plans since the City was still planning for five acres per thousand people, which was the previous requirement in the previous General Plan. He emphasized that the City needed to ensure that the land the City acquired under the Park Dedication Ordinance was relatively flat and usable land.

Mr. Gangapuram inquired what the Commission would like to see in the City's hillside preservation analysis that staff and the consultant would prepare since there were certain ideas the Commission had put forth during the previous meeting. Staff had also come up with certain ideas for consideration.

In response to Commissioner Glynn, Mr. Jerome explained that the Park Dedication Ordinance had been done in a formula basis where higher density dwellings, such as apartments, had a different ratio or rate than single family homes, since it had been determined that a single family residence would have more people than an apartment unit. The formula was therefore different for the two housing types and calculated to the number of units. Through that calculation would come the
parkland dedication requirement of a subdivision or a development.

Unless there was a park designated within a subdivision or a certain area, the City would exact the Park Dedication Fee based on that formula. The fee was based on the assessed value of a piece of property within that subdivision. The assumption was made that each subdivision or development would dedicate a certain amount of property within the project for a park, although that was not practical in some cases due to size and location. In certain areas, property would be more valuable per square foot than outlying areas.

Mr. Summerhill also clarified that single family homes, ranchettes, and low-density residences under the Park Dedication Ordinance required 1.42 acres of dedication per hundred dwelling units. Apartments, townhomes, and multi-family units only required one acre per hundred dwelling units. Developers could also acquire credit for private recreation.

As an example, Mr. Summerhill stated that every apartment complex in the San Marco subdivision would have a swimming pool, tennis courts, clubhouse and other recreational facilities allowing the opportunity to receive credit for such recreational amenities.

Commissioner Glynn stated that through his experience with the City of San Jose, developers building infill or high density development were allowed to enter into maintenance contracts with the school district where there was already significant acreage that was dedicated for playground space, instead of the standard parkland dedication requirement. He commented that the proposed General Plan had not indicated those type of negotiations, whereby land dedicated for school recreational use could be jointly maintained, or where a similar method of providing open space land for recreational purposes could be considered.

Mr. Summerhill noted that the school district also might not have enough land and could be depending upon a public park to provide grass, playfields and open space. He commented that the City could share hard surface court areas. He added that the City was currently in negotiations with the Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) for the school park site in the San Marco development.

Commissioner Glynn advised that the possible utilization of school grounds or other available space had not been mentioned in the proposed General Plan in order to acquire available space in close proximity to where residents lived.

Mr. Summerhill explained that the City did not have a good track record in building school park sites and the City had not done a good job in working with the local school districts for whatever reason.

Chairman Kee agreed that such options should be explored, particularly as the City grew and given the likely limited space available to locate parks directly adjacent to school sites. He emphasized the
need to explore all options to make the most creative use of the available space within the City.

Commissioner Glynn reiterated that the concern should be considered in the General Plan since concerns had come up on a number of occasions that transportation was not available to many facilities in order to utilize those services. Referencing Policy 8-P-32, Mr. Gangapuram suggested that section would address the concerns expressed.

Commissioner Glynn stated that he was unaware of any contractual arrangements that had been consummated at this point. Mr. Gangapuram understood such issues would occur through the development process. The policy could be used to make an arrangement and language could be added to require such action to take place during the entitlement process.

Commissioner Glynn agreed that a good faith effort should be made as part of the process.

Mr. Jerome advised that a policy in the 1988 General Plan specifically prohibited parks and schools from being together. The policy proposed as part of the new General Plan would encourage the placement of schools and parks adjacent to each other.

Mr. Jerome commented that communities in Southern California and the City of Los Angeles were encouraging the joint use of parks and school playgrounds as a benefit to both. The school library in that community was actually the public library, albeit in a larger area. The advantage to the City could be that the City could enjoy some of the school facilities, such as recreational programs or after school programs that were sponsored by the City, utilizing the school district's facilities.

Mr. Jerome recommended that the policy be cross-referenced with the parks section.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced correspondence received from Sharon Martell, the owner of property located at 1818 Loveridge Road. She reiterated the need for the Commission to review that property since the parcel was being singled out and not being included with an Industrial classification, as were surrounding properties. She emphasized that all surrounding properties should be treated equally.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged Ms. Martell's concerns. He invited Ms. Martell to meet with staff to discuss her concerns in detail since her concerns were legitimate and since the City was also considering other changes to the immediate area.

Mr. Gangapuram referenced the General Plan Map and the identified hillside and ridgeline areas within the City, noting that photographs of the hillsides and ridgelines would be taken to prepare computer simulations of potential development.

Chairman Kee commented that during a previous meeting it had been discussed that a development would more than likely gravitate towards the high end of the density range. He expressed a desire to see a photo simulation of the high and low ends of the density ranges relative to the hillsides and
Commissioner Glynn referenced Figure 10-1, which identified a top down view of all of the ridgelines and the various conditions of stability. He requested that the computer simulation also identify which of the various areas could be buildable.

Commissioner Tumbaga requested that a computer simulation not only simulate potential development on the ridges but also down the hill.

Mr. Gangapuram acknowledged that those opportunities would be explored as well.

Commissioner Tumbaga shared a telecast she had viewed with respect to a situation whereby a community had so poorly managed its water system that it had been bid out to a private concern, which concern had replaced all of the eroding and corroding pipes in the water system and had created an atmosphere of "Do the job right, or you're out of the business."

Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that the City could consider similar options in terms of maintenance to potentially offer a significant cost savings to the community.

Commissioner Glynn referenced Policy 10-G-6, which stipulated the restriction of development on slopes greater than 30 percent and along ridgelines. He inquired whether not that should be elaborated based on the 1:1 or 100:100 slope with respect to that statement, or whether that should be discussed elsewhere in the document. He commented that "along ridgelines" was an indefinite term in terms of what was being discussed.

Mr. Gangapuram acknowledged that some of the policies would be revised, particularly the policy referenced. He recognized that some of the policies were restrictive and defeated the purpose to a certain extent. The policy would be refined in such a way as to be applicable and would be revised in the redline strikeout version to be provided to the Commission at the completion of the public hearings.

Commissioner Glynn noted that one policy should not disagree with another policy in the General Plan. Either the policy should be deleted or be revised to be more specific.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced Policy 10-G-5, which stipulated a limit on urban development in high-risk areas to low occupancy or open forms of land use. She inquired who would identify the high-risk areas and how the City would ensure limited development in those areas. She cited, as an example, the Woodland Hills development that had been built primarily on cut and fill hills. There had been a number of problems with the homes in that area due to the subsidence of the land and type of soils that had been encountered.

Commissioner Tumbaga expressed concern whether or not any development where persons could reside in such low occupancy developments in a high-risk area should even be allowed.
Mr. Gangapuram explained that when discussing high risk areas, such concerns were typically addressed through the soils report during the environmental review process, as to whether or not the slopes were appropriate for any development with or without mitigation measures.

Commissioner Tumbaga also cited, as an example, property where Railroad Avenue ended and turned into Kirker Pass Road, where the hills behind the Kirker Creek Apartment complex was located. That land had eroded over time and the homes along the ridgeline had been built a long time ago. Uncertain whether or not geological studies had been conducted at the time those homes had been constructed, those homes were at a high risk due to landslides along that hillside.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that when discussing high risk areas, such concerns were typically addressed through the soils report during the environmental review process, as to whether or not the slopes were appropriate for any development with or without mitigation measures.

Commissioner Tumbaga also cited, as an example, property where Railroad Avenue ended and turned into Kirker Pass Road, where the hills behind the Kirker Creek Apartment complex was located. That land had eroded over time and the homes along the ridgeline had been built a long time ago. Uncertain whether or not geological studies had been conducted at the time those homes had been constructed, those homes were at a high risk due to landslides along that hillside.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that the General Plan document clearly identified policies stipulating that where there was cut and fill development, significant vegetation would be needed to avoid landslides. Commissioner Tumbaga inquired whether or not types of vegetation had been identified in the document. She referenced some developments where developers had open space that had been sprayed with green material to prevent landslides. She questioned the adequacy of such mitigation measures in preventing erosion of the hillsides.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that such mitigation measures were generally identified during the entitlement process when a developer proposed a specific project. Mitigation measures to address landslides would be stipulated as conditions of approval. The General Plan would lay the foundation to have something in place that could be further modified if proven necessary at such time as a specific project were to be submitted to the City.

Commissioner Glynn commented that a project placed on a particular piece of land with no stability problems but in close proximity to a hillside that was steep and subject to landslides could create a risk of landslide to the stable property in the future. He commented that many homes had been lost in the eastern foothills of San Jose where such a situation had occurred under that condition.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not such sites had been identified in the General Plan.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that the Geological Hazard Map had identified such sites. The General Plan did give an idea as to where such hazardous areas were located, although the General Plan had not gone into depth identifying each hill that could be impacted. That would involve project specific information.

Commissioner Glynn pointed out that there were several areas in the hills of the City where significant landslides had occurred as a result of heavy rains in the last three to five years. Although the land at the base had been defined as flat, the closest point of approach to the base of that mountain should be considered. He otherwise agreed that such issues were project site specific.

Mr. Jerome also referenced Policy 10-G-5 and agreed with the need to take a closer look at that policy to consider a better definition of "high risk." He concurred that many areas were questionable in terms of soils stability. He commented that if a site was not considered to be a significant ridge or hillside, it could be engineered to be better than it was before, and the document language should take care not to preclude such a consideration. While a hillside might currently be unstable, through
reengineering that could no longer be an issue.

Commissioner Holmes referenced Table 10-1, Earthquake Faults in the Vicinity of the City of Pittsburg, where it had shown identified faults in the City, as unknown. He questioned whether any faults had been specifically identified elsewhere in the document.

Mr. Jerome referenced Figure 10-2, Fault Branches, where a fault had been identified as the Pittsburg Fault. Table 10-1 referred to that fault and had identified the location as the downtown. The table further identified recent movement as unknown, fault classification active, historical seismicity unknown, and maximum critical earthquake unknown. The Pittsburg fault had been discovered a couple of years ago by a University of Berkeley Professor. There had been some evidence in the Bay through aerial photography that there was a fault that had been later labeled as the Pittsburg Fault, although there was no other evidence of any other fault activity in the City. That had been the reason why the unknowns in that section had been identified.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced Policy 10-P-16, Seismic Hazards, advising that she supported that policy. She inquired of the status of the Historical Resources Commission (HRC). She noted that the masonry buildings that were not reinforced were located in the downtown, which was the area of the historical district. She also commented on recent rumors that there were some discussion on the possible removal of those buildings. She encouraged the City to move quickly to have the HRC in place so as to discuss such an issue as opposed to rushing the removal of some of the buildings in the downtown historical district.

While she recognized that some of the buildings needed to be removed, Commissioner Tumbaga noted that some of the buildings provided aesthetic value and with seismic retrofit work they could still be an asset to the community.

Mr. Jerome advised that he was unaware of any plans to demolish any buildings, although he stated that he would speak to the Building Official to learn of any potential plans.

Commissioner Glynn inquired of the location of the historical building site within the Downtown Specific Area. The only building he was aware of that had gone through the entire process to be designated as a Historical Site was the St. Peter Martyr's Church. Other buildings were under consideration and had gone through some retrofits in order to comply at a minimal level to existing construction.

Commissioner Glynn agreed that prior to dealing with the Downtown Specific Plan, specifically with respect to Policy 10-P-16 and 10-P-17, the assets that currently existed should be identified to ensure that exempt and historical sites not be subject to specific regulations to comply with the designation requirements.

Mr. Jerome referenced Figure 52, as identified on Page 5-24, which had identified historic buildings as determined through the California Office of Historic Preservation.

Chairman Kee inquired whether or not the buildings that had been listed in that section had been
officially designated as historic buildings, since there were various levels of designating historical buildings pursuant to State and federal regulations.

Chairman Kee added that each level carried a different level of protection and responsibility for the property owner.

Mr. Jerome advised that the properties identified had been designated by the City as historic approximately 20 years ago.

Mr. Gangapuram stated that through research, staff had found that none of the City's designated historical buildings had been designated in the Federal Register as a Historic Building.

Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that regardless of the level of historical significance, if the citizens of the community determined that a building had historical value to the community that should be enough to preserve the downtown buildings.

Chairman Kee acknowledged Commissioner Tumbaga's concerns. He commented that when doing retrofit and renovation projects, if a building were designated as a State Historic Building, the building would be exempt from certain requirements of the Building Code in terms of exiting, which would otherwise be required if a new building were constructed. Such stipulations were intended to retain the historical character and nature of such buildings without having to perform some modernization to the building.

Commissioner Tumbaga further commented that some buildings in the downtown in the early and late 1960's had included some modernization for that period of time. Those changes were currently not as attractive, and if what had been designed at that time was removed, she suggested it would result in a much more attractive and aesthetically valuable building.

Commissioner Glynn expressed concern that the City had gone through several potential investigations as to the potential for the designation of historic sites for many of the buildings in the downtown. He suggested that the policy was essentially saying that if the building did not meet the current building code it would be subject to being put out of business from its current use until such time as it was brought to code.

Commissioner Glynn questioned whether or not there was any designation by the City or State for buildings of historic interest, which would give special consideration for the imposition of Policy 10-P-16 without regard to identifying those buildings as potential sites, or indicating to potential buyers or users that such buildings were possible historical sites and to the degree possible the buildings would have to comply with the current building code.

Commissioner Glynn cited, as an example, the fact that the City had spent a great deal of money on repairing the facade of the California Theater, which had yet to be designated as a historic site. While there had been significant interest in the purchase of that building, the cost associated with its retrofit had greatly discouraged that interest. He emphasized the need to resolve such situations where buildings of historic interest were trapped between exemption or designation as a historic site.
and the requirement to meet current codes.

Chairman Kee inquired whether or not the City had a process in place to designate a building as a local historic site.

Mr. Jerome explained that such a process had not been done for years, since the early 1980's, when contributing buildings had been designated. Through the Historical Society, certain buildings in the downtown were considered as having historic value, at a local level only. Those buildings had been identified in the document.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that if there was a list of buildings of historic interest in the downtown, an appendix should be identified in the document to allow potential sites to be investigated without otherwise changing the language in the policy.

Chairman Kee referenced the map located in Section 5 that identified the location of historic buildings.

Mr. Jerome advised of a more exhaustive list identifying the historic name and location of the buildings.

Commissioner Holmes referenced the Lee home located on the corner of Railroad Avenue and Buchanan Road, which should be included on the list.

Mr. Gangapuram noted the list had included three to four buildings outside of the downtown area. He was uncertain whether or not the Lee property was on the list, although that property could be incorporated into the list with the policy language modified in such a way so that such buildings would be subject to review prior to retrofit or condemnation.

Commissioner Tumbagha agreed that there were residential homes in the City that could be incorporated and should not be excluded from the list, particularly as the City aged in the future. She noted that the residences in the Central Addition had nice homes that could have a historical value in the future.

Mr. Jerome explained that the comments made were germane to the General Plan in terms of historic preservation as a general policy. He commented that the document could set up a format and foundation to allow for further analysis and suggested that could be one of the tasks of the HRC, to review the buildings in the entire City. He noted that the HRC had previously been focused on only four blocks of the community, and as a result had not been that active.

Mr. Jerome added that it had been envisioned that the design review component of the HRC would be brought back to the Planning Commission with the HRC to pursue tasks of a more historic nature, such as those under discussion. He suggested that there might be some opportunities to pursue grant monies through the Office of Historic Preservation to further that goal.
Commissioner Tumbaga advised that she would be leaving the Planning Commission in June and would no longer serve as the representative from the Commission to the HRC. If a community seat became available on the HRC, she expressed the desire to be appointed to fill such a seat. Referencing Policy 10-P-32, Commissioner Glynn requested clarification of the intent of that policy statement. If a property owner was not willing to work with the City, he inquired whether or not legal action would have to be taken. He suggested the use of the language "willing landowner" was inappropriate. He preferred a policy where the City would work with a property owner in one form or another.

Mr. Gangapuram stated that if a property owner was unwilling to work with the City, the City had other mechanisms that could be considered. He noted that through economic development, a property could be taken. Federal funds could be used to repair the property and the costs could be charged to the property owner. He expressed the willingness to modify that language.

Speaking to Policy 10-P-34, Commissioner Glynn suggested that the policy statement include a reference to "police." He also spoke to Policy 10-P-35 where he understood there had been an effort to relocate the fire station downtown, which he opposed.

Commissioner Glynn recognized that there was the need for a fifth fire station based on the diagram indicating a one and a half mile radius that needed to be shifted in the direction of the project build out somewhere in the Southwest Hills. He suggested that a statement should be made relative to staffing issues, since the Specific Plan had not addressed the issue of maintaining the quantity of emergency response personnel, including the Police Department, to increase the number of sworn officers to match the required ratios.

Commissioner Glynn suggested it was possible that a 1.75 ratio or 2 ratio may be necessary based on the population buildout. He suggested that staff speak with the Chief of Police to include a statement in the General Plan in terms of increasing sworn officers in relation to the potential buildout of the population.

Commissioner Glynn commented that the City of Antioch was incorporating those ratios into their General Plan. He suggested that staff contact the City of Antioch to determine what language they had used, which could be considered in the City of Pittsburg's General Plan.

Commissioner Glynn further commented that the City had a dead zone in the Southwest Hills with regard to police and fire communications due to insufficiencies in antennas. If various contractors were going to be charged to build roads to gain access to buildings in order to erect antennas, he suggested that someone should be willing to accept the cost of $150,000 to $175,000 to close the loop in the emergency response system on communications.

Commissioner Glynn advised that he had already spoken with the Police Chief on the issue. He suggested the consideration of a policy that would provide for fully functional emergency communication capabilities within the City and its Sphere of Influence.

Speaking to Policy 11-G-1, Commissioner Glynn noted that the policy had not included detailed
information on the availability of water capacity for drinking consumption and potable water supplies. As to Policy 11-P-4 with respect to water storage capacity in relationship to large projects, he suggested that same policy should be expanded to address such situations.

Commissioner Glynn added with respect to Policy 12-P-3, which had omitted any reference to "trains," that trains should be included in the language in that section.

Commissioner Glynn also spoke to Policy 12-P-9. He referenced an application for Koch Carbon, which had recently been addressed by the Planning Commission, where the applicant had indicated the normal conduct of business involved the transportation of coke petroleum in the evening hours after 5:00 P.M. and before 8:00 A.M., on an alternative route.

Commissioner Glynn expressed concern with the amount of money being spent to construct the truck bypass route and noted that many trucks were currently traveling on Railroad Avenue on a daily basis, including State Route 4 construction site truck traffic. He emphasized that the roadway had never been designed for heavy construction vehicles and oftentimes there had been crushed sewer pipes, failed pavement and loud noises as a result.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that policy should be expanded or placed in a more appropriate place in the document to address loud noises created within industrial areas or other issues regarding noise generated by truck traffic or similar issues.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced the Health and Safety Element with respect to the lead poisoning potential in the older areas of the City and in the City's schools. She inquired whether or not that concern should be addressed with a policy in the Health and Safety Element.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that there was a policy on lead poisoning, although unable to pinpoint the exact area of the document at this time, he expressed the willingness to review the document and report back to the Commission at the next meeting.

Commissioner Glynn understood that the issue of lead poisoning was also a Countywide program involving the turnover of homes of a certain age that were subject to lead paint, and where the County had a fully operational program on lead impacts to children.

Mr. Gangapuram affirmed that there was a State mandate which required that any home of a certain age be required to disclose potential lead in paint with precautions required to mitigate that concern.

Referencing Policy 12-G-2, Commissioner Glynn questioned the policy to discourage the use of sound walls to mitigate traffic noise along all major corridors, accept along State Route 4. He requested clarification from staff.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that oftentimes when major sound walls were erected on major arterials, it had been found that a softer mechanism could be used to divert the sound into sound walls. He noted that sound walls had been used on State Route 4, although he was uncertain whether or not it was in position to absolve all of the sound impacts without negotiating it into other areas.
Commissioner Glynn commented that a large contingent of neighbors had approached the
Commission in the past with respect to the absence of a sound wall and the raising of the road bed,
which was now grossly impacting properties along State Route 4. A three to five foot cyclone fence
had been installed along a considerable area where the sound was above any potential wall that
would be erected as an off-set to the freeway.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that might be possible for the policy statement, as written, although
the sound wall had not been installed and with the road bed raised, sound issues had been raised with
the sound washing over the entire project.

Mr. Jerome agreed that the policy should be reviewed carefully. Rather than place a wall to mitigate
all noise problems, he suggested that language could be inserted to design facilities such that the
design of the structure or the site planning eliminated noise by the way it was designed. He cited, as
an example, the City's policy of discouraging a walled community appearance. He noted that there
were a few successes in the City at the expense of some traffic noise coming into the development,
although setback from a street and turning the structure such that sensitive areas, such as bedrooms
not facing the street, had attempted to mitigate those concerns.

Mr. Jerome further commented that the City desired in its developments not necessarily sound walls,
but walls where appropriate, for aesthetics and long term maintenance. He noted that the City had
been working with the developer of the Americana Subdivision to place a wall along the entryway
of that development where an existing wood fence was currently in disrepair.

Commissioner Holmes referenced Policy 10-G-6. He inquired whether or not the City had always
restricted development on slopes greater than 30 percent.

Mr. Jerome explained that that policy would require further review since a hillside was
predominantly over 30 percent. A small hill could also be at a 30 percent slope although it did not
necessarily have to be preserved. He referred to an area in the City of San Ramon where there was a
steep hillside, within other hillsides, where there was no value in keeping the hillside geologically or
aesthetically. As such, it was appropriate for a 30 percent slope to be taken down or modified. He
recognized that the document needed to take care with the use of limitation features.

In response to Commissioner Kelley, Mr. Jerome clarified Policy 3-S-1, which stipulated that the
Police Department can maintain a three to five minute response time for all emergency calls, a five
to eight minute response time for priority non-emergency calls, and a ten to twenty minute response
time for non-emergency calls.

Mr. Gangapuram again encouraged Commissioners and members of the public to present written
comments to staff that could be reviewed and, where appropriate, incorporated into the updated
General Plan.

Mr. Jerome suggested that the public hearing be continued to April 11, 2001 where it was
anticipated that staff could provide a redline strikeout version of comments received thus far in
response to the previous written submittals and public testimony.
At that time, the Commission could discuss scheduling a field trip of the City's hillsides. A separate public hearing could then be scheduled when additional visual analyses was completed by the project consultants.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that a public hearing be considered to discuss the individual policy statements that could require further modification, expansion or clarification.

The consensus of the Commission was to continue the public hearing to April 11, 2001, with a start time of 8:00 P.M.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Glynn to continue the public hearing for the City of Pittsburg Draft Comprehensive General Plan Update, "Pittsburg 2020: A Vision for the 21st Century" GP 97-01, to the Planning Commission meeting of April 11, 2001, to commence at 8:00 P.M. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Valentine and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Kelley, Tumbaga, Kee
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Leonard, Valentine

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no staff communications.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

There were no committee reports.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

There were no comments from Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M. to a Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission on April 10, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

RANDY JEROME, Secretary

March 28, 2001