MINUTES
OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE
PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
April 17, 2001

A special meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:37 P.M. on Tuesday, April 17, 2001, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: Commissioner Valentine

Staff: Planning Manager Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram; Secretary Fara Bowman

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, April 13, 2001.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Kelley led the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:


Mr. Jerome advised that the public hearing had been continued as part of a series of reviews of the
General Plan prior to recommendation to the City Council, which would approve the plan. He reported that staff was still in the process of gathering information from the public for both the General Plan itself and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). During the previous public hearing, the Commission had completed the remaining chapters of the General Plan. In total, the Commission had reviewed a total of twelve chapters.

The General Plan review had been updated to allow a review of the comments that had been received from both the public and the Planning Commission with a redline version of the General Plan to be provided to the Commission to reflect the staff recommended changes to the document. Changes were reflected not only in the text of the document, but to the goals and policies where staff had provided a strikeout format with the language proposed to be changed with a bold underline of recommended replacement language.

Mr. Jerome clarified that the Planning Commission could continue to take public comments on the General Plan itself at this time. He explained that staff had avoided a detailed discussion of hillside policies since staff had directed the General Plan consultants to provide additional visual analyses. At this time, he was uncertain when a presentation would be made, although it was hoped to be available in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Jerome advised that staff had received three letters of correspondence from Marilyn Torres, Phillip John Torres and Gerald S. Ketchum. All three letters had been distributed to the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED

There being no one from the public wishing to speak at this time, the discussion was brought back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Glynn referenced a recent newspaper article where the Contra Costa County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) was attempting to align the Spheres of Influence (SOI) with the existing Urban Limit Line (ULL), although that was not the approach that had been proposed for inclusion in the General Plan. He emphasized the need for the City to pay close attention to that situation since it could adversely impact the General Plan before it was actually published.

Commissioner Glynn also commented that the Commission had received significant public testimony with respect to inappropriate or misaligned zoning issues within certain projects or properties relative to surrounding properties. He noted that in each case staff had made record of those properties in question and had indicated the willingness to revisit those sites to determine the appropriate zoning, whether the property should be retained as it had been classified, or be changed to align with existing surrounding properties.

Commissioner Glynn further stated that he was not satisfied with the designation of open space,
particularly as it related to property that had a history of long-term agricultural use. In his opinion, open space did not necessarily apply to land that had been in use for 150 years or so as agricultural land, with limited housing. He acknowledged that concerns had been raised as to how many homes would be permitted in either open space or agricultural land.

Commissioner Glynn emphasized that there needed to be some clarification as to how open space would be designated or defined if the SOI were to be made coterminous with the ULL.

Commissioner Leonard referenced the SOI as it related to Figure 1-2 in the document, which identified the Southeast Boundary, south of Buchanan Road and outside of the County's ULL. He questioned where the City of Antioch's boundaries were currently located as related to the City of Pittsburg's SOI. He also questioned whether the City's SOI would abut the current SOI for the City of Antioch, particularly since housing proposals had been anticipated in that area.

Commissioner Leonard expressed concern that such development would impact both communities. He suggested that it might be more advantageous to move the boundary line further east to meet the City of Antioch's city limits. Uncertain whether or not the Commission could determine what ridgelines would be impaired in terms of views from other ridgelines and what really encompassed certain angles on the side of a hill, he expressed concern with specific verbiage in the General Plan that could prove to be too stringent.

Commissioner Leonard suggested that an entirely separate ordinance be considered for development on hillsides, to be more project specific.

Commissioner Holmes acknowledged the concerns from the public as related to potential development of the City's hillsides and ridgelines. He too expressed concern with such development.

Commissioner Leonard commented that he also had concerns with the term "open space," which would restrict development. He urged caution in the use of that term and noted that there were also areas outside of the City and in the hills that individuals desired to retain for agricultural use.

Commissioner Leonard added that there were areas in Livermore and Alameda County where agricultural zoning stipulated a specific amount of acreage to build a home. He emphasized the need to clarify the differences between open space and agricultural terminology.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged the concerns with respect to the SOI, the ULL and LAFCO policies. He explained that the ULL had been based on Measure C, which had been adopted by the voters in 1990 and which stipulated that two thirds of the land within Contra Costa County must be undeveloped, with one third allowed to be urbanized. A map had been included in Measure C that was loosely drawn, which had caused concern for many cities. He added that the ULL had been included as a policy of the 1985 Contra Costa County General Plan and affected only unincorporated property. The ULL did not affect incorporated properties within a city.

Mr. Jerome added that concerns had been expressed with respect to annexations when the ULL
would be applicable. LAFCO, the body that judged annexations, reorganizations and the like, had instituted a policy to respect the County's ULL. If a City wanted to annex property that was outside of the ULL, LAFCO would not approve that annexation without a compelling reason to do so.

Stating that policy had been challenged by many communities, including the Cities of Brentwood and San Ramon, which had initiated a lawsuit against the County on the ULL, Mr. Jerome reported that LAFCO not only had the power of annexation but also had the power to reduce the SOI, which was the legal line that essentially identified where a city or special district could expand through annexation. He emphasized that the ULL was a County policy and not a City policy.

Mr. Jerome identified another key factor as Measure C, which would sunset in 2010, unless the voters readopted it. Noting that the City's General Plan had been planned for a twenty-year period, he stated that planning was beyond the horizon of the ULL. While the City's General Plan referenced and identified the County's ULL as a legitimate boundary line, the City was only paying it some homage since it would theoretically disappear while the General Plan would remain in effect, which was why the City had shown some development potential outside of the County's ULL.

Mr. Jerome suggested that cities would probably be very opposed to LAFCO's modification to the SOIs. While currently uncertain of all of the potential ramifications of that possibility, he stated that the City of Pittsburg opposed that policy. The City otherwise did not consider the County's ULL as a limiting factor to the City's planning process through the General Plan.

Speaking to the SOI adjacent to the City of Antioch near Buchanan Road, Mr. Jerome referenced Figure 1-2 where the City of Antioch was coterminous with the planning area boundary, with the exception of an area located south of Buchanan Road, which was part of the Chevron property. That area was incorporated with the area directly to the south located within the City of Antioch, and identified as the Sky Ranch property.

The area located between Buchanan Road and that area located to the south in the middle of the same area was unincorporated and within the SOI of the City of Antioch. The City had modified the language such that the City of Pittsburg would respect that SOI line, although the language also implied that the City might pursue annexation of that area in the future.

Mr. Jerome stated that the City tried to respect what legal lines were now in place and had developed policies in the General Plan mapping that would respect those legal lines.

Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram explained that the language referenced had been defined specifically for the Chevron property in the area under discussion.

Mr. Jerome also referenced Page 1-7, Introduction, Planning Boundaries, where a change had been made to state that "The Planning Area boundaries largely coincide with those of Antioch and Clayton and with the Concord Naval Weapons Station, which is within Concord City limits." Commissioner Glynn questioned if the SOI and the ULL coincided with the respective cities and there was a gap in between, whether or not the County would be free under its own authority to
Mr. Jerome affirmed that if the property was located inside the ULL, the County could develop it. If outside the ULL, it was clearly the County's policy that there be no development except as allowed under policy to develop. He emphasized that it was a County General Plan policy and it was very clear that the County could not conduct any development outside of the ULL.

Commissioner Glynn commented that if the ULL and the SOI were coterminous, that could pose a clear problem in some cases, either by past practice or history, where certain lands were considered to be within a SOI or in fact had a relationship within an existing City, but was now beyond the ULL.

Mr. Jerome advised that there had been discussions related to pulling the SOI back primarily in open space or hillside areas. He cited, as an example, the community of Bay Point, which was unincorporated but entirely within the SOI of the City of Pittsburg. He understood that LAFCO had no intention of pulling that SOI line to the City limits, since Bay Point had been considered to be an urbanized area. All of Bay Point, which was unincorporated, was within the ULL.

Speaking to the concerns with respect to the definition of open space versus agriculture, Mr. Jerome stated that open space was one of the mandatory elements of the General Plan and needed to be addressed. He explained that the General Plan was not only the constitution for development, it was also the constitution for conservation, which was where the Open Space Element would apply.

The General Plan would not only provide guidelines and directions for policy regulations as to how the City should grow and develop in the future, it was also intended to provide policies for conservation for areas to be preserved, which was why General Plans must address open space specifically as a land use.

Mr. Jerome went on to explain that other cities and counties typically had zoning that was defined as agricultural zoning. Contra Costa County had a definition for agricultural zoning and land uses specific to agricultural land uses as opposed to open space. Agricultural land use was intended only for cultivation as opposed to grazing lands. The City's General Plan spoke to grazing lands, which were a form of agricultural use but not an intensification of cultivated crops. Open space was primarily a designation that implied no development of any kind, although it did not preclude development.

Mr. Jerome added that the General Plan had included policies that did not necessarily preclude development and policies that spoke to agricultural types of development, as well as limited types of residential development and non-sensitive environmental areas within the hillsides or within open space areas. Zoning areas within the City limits that were identified as open space on the General Plan diagram had included an open space designation that was somewhat consistent with the General Plan land use. Under that open space designation there was land uses that could occur, including residential at a certain density and agriculture, cultivation of crops and grazing of cattle and the like, all
conditionally permitted uses under the open space zoning. Agricultural zoning would imply intense
cultivation of crops within the City limits or in the planning area, which the City did not have, other
than Class A agricultural property within the City's Planning Area.

Speaking to the hillsides, Mr. Jerome stated that staff was considering how to draft the City's hillside
and ridgeline policies. The General Plan document included a discussion on re-drafting the City's
Hillside Development Zone, whereby the City might craft different regulations more relative to a
zoning district, which might be more project specific. He added that the General Plan would include
some broad goals and more specific goals for hillside and ridgeline protection after the completion
of a future public hearing on that policy.

Mr. Jerome noted that when the City had tested the three different alternatives initially proposed for
its General Plan direction, the alternative that had been supported by the public and the Planning
Commission had been the moderate hillside growth alternative, which would allow for development
in the hillsides to a certain extent. That was the reason why the policy in the General Plan spoke to
development within some of the hillside areas. The other two alternatives did not allow for any
development and had been subsequently rejected by the Planning Commission and the public as a
whole.

Referencing Page 2-20, Mr. Gangapuram noted that section spoke to open space, agricultural,
resource management and conservation. The focus would be on what habitat needed to be
conserved in an open space area and what agricultural resource management would allow for very
low-density residential areas. He added that the General Plan set some foundation for how different
zoning districts could be allowed in open spaces. Once the Planning Commission entered the zoning
phase, at that stage the Commission could create different districts to address agriculture.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that he had spoken with the General Plan consultants, who had indicated
that some of the additional analyses on hillsides and ridgelines could be available on Monday, April
23 so that some material to identify the ridgelines and the most prominent and visible locations
could be provided to the Commission at the regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, April 24. He
commented that panoramic views had been taken from State Route 4, from Bailey Road, and from
Leland Road to illustrate the City's ridgelines.

Additional analyses were being prepared with respect to mass grading, removal of the ridgelines and
the potential development of homes in terms of potential visual impacts. Grading associated with
development only at the foothills was also being analyzed, particularly for those ridgelines within
the land use designated areas.

Commissioner Leonard requested clarification as to whether or not the County was required to
comply with requirements to update its General Plan on a regular basis, since he understood from
staff comments that the County's General Plan had last been updated in 1985.

Mr. Jerome verified and corrected the staff comments in that the County General Plan had last been
updated in 1995. Measure C had been adopted and approved by the voters in 1990, and had been
incorporated into the 1995 County General Plan Update. He also clarified that there was significant land within the ULL, which was undeveloped and that some lands within the ULL might never be developed in that some lands were environmentally sensitive, or were designated for parks and the like.

In response to an unidentified member of the audience, Mr. Jerome explained that the Countywide measure adopted by the voters in 1990, identified as Measure C, stipulated that no more than 35 percent of the entire County could contain urban development.

Commissioner Holmes requested a clarification from staff as to the reference on Page 2 of the staff report to small yet exclusive development.

Mr. Jerome described four areas where staff had identified a need to change the General Plan Map. Referencing Figure 2-4-H, the Woodlands Area, he identified an area just to the east of the PG&E Corridor and adjacent to the Woodlands Area, where a small secluded valley was located. That area had some development potential and was not located on a ridgeline. The area was limited in terms of how much development could occur since it abutted the PG&E Corridor, which could not be encroached. There was access to that piece of property through existing lots in the Woodlands Area and there was the potential for the development of single family homes on that parcel of land.

Mr. Jerome also identified the area of Loveridge Road, and property owned by Sharon Martell. He noted that staff had met with Ms. Martell who had expressed concern with her property being proposed to be changed from Industrial in the existing General Plan, to a Business Commercial designation, although all of the uses surrounding her property were classified as Industrial.

In evaluating that property, Mr. Jerome reported that staff had come to the conclusion that everything south of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway was to be Business Commercial or some other use while the Heavy Industrial uses would be restricted to the north side of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway, with the exception of Praxair, an existing and well established use that staff did not foresee would vacate the area in the future. Business Commercial was a broad land use that would allow for more flexibility than would have been possible through the 1988 General Plan.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that Ms. Martell had requested that her property be classified as Industrial, although staff would propose that the Martell property be classified as Business Commercial, with the adjacent property, not part of Praxair, to be classified as Business Commercial as well. That property was currently identified on the map as Industrial.

Mr. Jerome also identified current vacant property along Parkside Drive. He noted that Stanley Works had been used as a steel industrial plant with a vacant property located adjacent to it, which extended down adjacent to Parkside Elementary School and the River Run residential development. The property had also been shown as Residential. He noted that the property along Parkside Drive had a very good opportunity for development.

Mr. Jerome added that staff had received correspondence from Stanley Works, which had suggested that the property would be better valued with residential development since it was located adjacent to existing residential development and since it would abut the River Run development and Parkside
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Elementary School. Staff had spoken with that property owner to potentially market the entire property for residential development, although staff would like to see the possibility of transitional commercial or light industrial land uses adjacent to the existing facility.

Referencing the Alves property, Mr. Jerome advised that the City had shown a park on that property, although that park would be too close to the Oak Hills Park and the new community park to be built in the San Marco development. As such, staff suggested that a park in that location would not be appropriate. In addition, the necessary funds to maintain parks was also noted as a concern. As a result, it was determined that the park site should be eliminated from the Alves property.

Mr. Jerome also clarified that a potential school site had been crossed out on the Alves property, although with all of the development that could eventually occur in the Southwest Hills, that site should remain since another elementary school would be needed. He added that the Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) had begun discussions with the developer of the Alves Ranch property to possibly locate an elementary school on that property.

Commissioner Glynn emphasized the need to review appropriate locations for City parks in terms of potential school sites and to consider the potential joint usage of school and park sites since there was a requirement for playground space. He emphasized the opportunities available to merge City and MDUSD facilities for the mutual benefit of each.

Mr. Jerome advised that the 1988 General Plan included a specific policy that parks and schools should be segregated. The San Marco development had included a joint park use and the Highlands Ranch development had included a five acre school site adjacent to a public park, although the possibility of a school being built in that development was unlikely. He stated that directly violated current General Plan policy. He added that currently the City was considering the advantages of joint uses, for such benefits as conserving property.

Mr. Jerome commented that in Southern California, there was a major effort to utilize school libraries as public libraries, which would allow better use of public monies and an efficient use of maintenance and operations activities.

Commissioner Leonard referenced the Marina Park area near the St. Peter Martyr Church, which was a park that was underutilized. He emphasized the need for flexibility to provide for smaller areas in larger areas or to enhance existing facilities rather than create major maintenance issues.

Mr. Jerome noted that there were three school districts within the City limits, including the Antioch Unified School District (AUSD) that had some property within the City limits, the Pittsburg Unified School District (PUSD) which had a number of school sites throughout the City that were undeveloped and which could be expanded into schools, and the Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) located at the west end of the City limits, which was seeking school sites in response to
all of the growth occurring in that area. The need for a high school in the Bay Point area was also a focus of the citizens of Bay Point.

Mr. Jerome understood that the MDUSD was considering the possibility of buying a smaller piece of property and utilizing a public park adjacent to it to serve the playground needs of a school.

Commissioner Leonard also expressed concerns previously expressed with respect to truck traffic and transportation, particularly in relation to the downtown area.

Speaking to the General Plan section pertaining to Transportation and Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Commissioner Leonard recommended the inclusion of a policy statement to address loading/unloading of trucks in the downtown area. He expressed concern with trucks stopping on City streets and impacting or obstructing the flow of traffic.

Mr. Jerome inquired whether or not Commissioners had noticed those problems elsewhere in the community, other than in the downtown area. He questioned whether a policy should be specifically directed towards the downtown area or whether there should be a broad policy Citywide.

Commissioner Leonard noted the area of Piedmont Lumber on Garcia Street and the area of Tenth Street, which had also experienced similar truck traffic problems. He supported a Citywide policy to accommodate future City growth.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that the problems with respect to trucks loading/unloading product in the downtown had been an issue that the Engineering Department had been attempting to address through discussions with a number of the downtown business operators. He also commented that the Railroad Avenue Corridor in the downtown area would be restriped with diagonal parking, and that additional parking would be added in that area with the elimination of the center lane where most of the truck loading/unloading had occurred.

Commissioner Glynn referenced the area of Harbor Street as one turned left into the industrial area heading toward Piedmont Lumber, where the entire area was typically parked with vehicles in the middle of the road for unloading. He also cited the area of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway heading east where an existing wrecking yard near the masonry supply business typically dumped all of its wrecked vehicles on both sides of the road. He noted that oftentimes a number of vehicles were left overnight at that location waiting to be pulled into the yard. Similar situations with respect to wrecking yards were occurring on West Tenth Street and in the area near the Americana residential development.

Mr. Jerome explained that staff would speak with the Traffic Engineer and with Code Enforcement to determine whether or not specific policies should be defined. He stated that some of the identified problems could be addressed through the existing Municipal Code or through other code enforcement tools.

Speaking to the Transportation section of the General Plan, Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that
another policy statement be included to stipulate that every effort would be made to provide public transportation from one end of the City to another.

Chairman Kee concurred with Commissioner Tumbaga's recommendation. He noted that he had recently patronized the Home and Garden Show at the Chronicle Pavilion and it would have been nice if there had been a shuttle back and forth over Kirker Pass Road.

Commissioner Glynn referenced the previous discussion with respect to wrecking yards and suggested that any policy statement should not attempt to replicate code enforcement issues, but include some type of generic statement to ensure that parking configurations be designed to maximize traffic flow.

Commissioner Glynn also referenced an application for Koch Carbon, which had been considered by the Planning Commission a few weeks ago and which would involve 160 truck trips. He emphasized that such situations needed to be addressed.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that a policy statement had been included in the document to address that issue.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced the Health and Safety section and inquired whether or not the previous concerns she had expressed with respect to lead poisoning had been incorporated into the document.

Mr. Gangapuram acknowledged that the concerns with respect to lead poisoning had been addressed in the document, although staff was awaiting specific language that could be incorporated. He encouraged Commissioner Tumbaga to submit the specific language that she preferred to have incorporated into the document.

Mr. Gangapuram also referenced Commissioner Glynn's recommended language offered at a previous public hearing with respect to the police force. He clarified that he had spoken with the City of Antioch and had been informed that city employed 1.2 sworn officers, and were attempting to attain a standard of 1.4 sworn officers. The City of Pittsburg's current standard was 1.4 sworn officers, which had been increased to 1.8 sworn officers.

Commissioner Glynn expressed his understanding that several members of the upper echelon of the Police Department were eligible for retirement next year, which was a concern to him since there were only five officers out of 75 officers on the street at any one time during each 24-hour period, an inadequate number to accommodate the population buildout contemplated in the General Plan. Commissioner Glynn suggested that to offset the potential increase and the potential for retirement and other issues, the quota needed to be increased, with excess funds utilized to strengthen the police force and to retain officers. He noted that police officers made a big difference in the quality of life in the City.

Commissioner Glynn also referenced the Health and Safety section and the possibility that an
existing fire station in the downtown would be closed with another station to be built uptown at a site yet to be determined. He emphasized that with the development of Marina Park, The Village at New York Landing, Bay Harbor, Marina Walk and The Olsen Company, a greater occupancy rate in the downtown buildings, along with additional industrial uses, the downtown station would be more than justified. He strongly opposed the removal of the downtown fire station as a result.

Commissioner Leonard agreed with the comments regarding the downtown fire station. He otherwise stated that he had a number of comments related to each of the policy statements. He suggested that the Commission review the strikeout version of the policy statements line by line.

Mr. Jerome stated that unless staff was told otherwise, staff would proceed with the redline version presented to the Commission. He encouraged comments from Commissioners.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that if there were no additional comments from the public, that the public hearing be closed and that the Commission review the document in public line by line, which would be more productive and allow staff to proceed.

Commissioner Holmes agreed with the need to carefully evaluate the document to clarify any comments or concerns.

Commissioner Tumbaga concurred with the need to review the redline version and to discuss what should be appropriate to include in the document.

Mr. Jerome advised that the document was in a draft format and had been presented to the Planning Commission, the City Council, other agencies and the public. Staff had received general and specific comments, which comments had been incorporated where staff and the consultant had determined would be appropriate. He clarified that the document was staff's version and did not include all of the comments that had been received. He emphasized that the document was the Planning Commission's document and he encouraged the Commission to review the document and make any comments or recommendations for revisions that could be discussed.

Mr. Jerome noted that staff had recommended that the public hearing be continued to the regular meeting of the Planning Commission on April 24, 2001. If at that time the Commission would like to discuss the document at length, he suggested that could be done at that time.

Chairman Kee suggested that the discussion of the General Plan be moved to the end of the agenda on April 24 so that any other applications could be addressed first.

The Chair also recommended that the public hearing remain open to allow any further public input and to allow the Commission to evaluate each of the policy items in comparison to the redline version.

Commissioner Leonard suggested that the public hearing be closed at some point to allow the Commission to review the document to finalize the policy statements in the document.
Mr. Jerome clarified that the public hearing should remain open for the discussion on the ridgelines and hillsides. He suggested that the public discussion could be closed on those items other than the hillside policies. He clarified the direction of the Commission, to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, April 24, 2001, where the Commission would discuss the items one by one.

Chairman Kee questioned whether or not the public hearing could be closed on only a portion of the General Plan since the hillside and ridgelines policies were outstanding.

Mr. Jerome suggested that if the Commission wanted to close the public hearing on the items other than the hillside policies, that could be done. If the Commission so desired, the public hearing could always be reopened to allow the opportunity for anyone to address any concerns.

Mr. Jerome inquired whether or not the Commission desired to close the public hearing on the General Plan, other than the hillside and ridgeline policies, after the meeting scheduled for April 24.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired whether or not the information related to the hillsides and ridgelines would be available to the Commission in time for the meeting on April 24, and Mr. Gangapuram commented it was unlikely that information would be available for discussion and consideration on April 24.

Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that the Commission discuss those items not affected by the hillside and ridgeline policies during the meeting of April 24. Upon the receipt of any public testimony at that time, she suggested that the public hearing be closed on those elements.

Mr. Gangapuram recommended that the Commission review the General Plan document from the beginning rather than piecemeal the discussion, with the exception of the hillside and ridgeline policies.

In response to Commissioner Tumbaga, Mr. Jerome advised that he foresaw no more than two further meetings to discuss the General Plan.

MOTION:

On motion by Commissioner Tumbaga 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 24, 2001 to commence at 8:00 P.M.

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

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

Mr. Jerome explained that the continued public hearing for the General Plan had been shown as the first item on the agenda for the April 24, 2001 meeting, but could be moved by the Commission to the end of the agenda after the opening of the meeting.

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 9:14 P.M. to a Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission on April 24, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

RANDY JEROME, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission