MINUTES
OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE
PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
June 5, 2001

A Special Meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, June 5, 2001, in the First Floor Conference Room 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 and Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, June 1, 2001.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:


Public Workshop/Special 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" The General Plan designates land uses and appropriate policies to guide future growth throughout the City of Pittsburg. This workshop/public hearing to focus on reviewing the "strikeout" version of policy revisions made to the Draft on Chapters 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 to this point. (Continued from May 29, 2001).

Planning Manager Randy Jerome identified the workshop setting to continue the discussion of the General Plan Update and described the strikeout version that had been prepared by staff based on comments from the public, the Commission and others. He stated that at the last workshop setting, Chapters 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 had been reviewed. He also reported that the Commission had been presented the changes made from the last week's workshop, primarily related to Chapter 2.
When asked by Commissioner Tumbaga, Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram reported that Bruce Ohlson had a meeting with Paul Reinders, the City Transportation Engineer, who had discussed the bike lanes and who had made changes to the classification of different bike routes, which information had been submitted to the planning consultant who was working on the designation of the different routes. He stated that the map and the matrix with respect to bicycle routes would be included in the final document. He also noted that some changes had been made to the classifications in the introduction of the bike lanes in the General Plan document.

In further response to comments with respect to a letter that had been submitted to Planning staff late afternoon on June 1, Mr. Gangapuram advised that the letter from Miller, Star & Regalia representing Seecon Financial and Construction Company had challenged the City's compliance with regulations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and had requested that the public comment period on the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) be opened for a two week period, with sufficient notice to the public. The letter had also appealed the Commission's action to the City Council.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that the City's attorneys and the planning consultant had evaluated the document and had verified that the CEQA guidelines allowed a 45-day public review period. The City had exceeded that period. He also advised that the minutes of May 15, 2001 had verified that the Planning Commission had determined that the hearing for the EIR would be closed on May 22, 2001. Since Ron Rives of Seecon had indicated that he had yet to submit his comments at that time, the Commission had granted Seecon another four days to provide those comments. Seecon's comments had been received within that time and the City's consultant had evaluated the comments.

With respect to the statements in the letter that there had been substantial changes to the plan, Mr. Gangapuram stated that the General Plan consultant had reviewed all of the changes discussed to date along with the strikeout document, and no substantial changes had been identified that would trigger either a recirculation or a revision to the EIR in that no land uses had been proposed to be changed, no extensive housing or industrial development had been added, and no major or minor arterials or any other street had been planned that could trigger traffic impacts. No substantial changes had been made to wetlands or natural habitat had been proposed to change. As such, no major impacts on the EIR would be involved based on the policies that had been proposed.

Further, the City did not extensively change the policies since changes were primarily wordsmithing, which would not have an impact on the environment that would trigger a recirculation or extension of the comment period on the General Plan.

Mr. Gangapuram stated that the City was therefore comfortable that the letter from Seecon would have no impact on the way the Commission had been proceeding. He added, when asked, that the comments had been received from Seecon within the additional four days allowed, and that all of the comments made were being evaluated for inclusion in the document, as appropriate. Based on the total analysis conducted at this time, he stated that no major changes were anticipated as a result of those comments.
Mr. Jerome further clarified the situation and advised that there had been some question as to whether or not the Commission's process to date was appealable to the City Council. He stated that working under CEQA law, it was unclear whether or not the Commission's actions to date were appealable.

Mr. Gangapuram also noted that any appeal would be based on the Planning Commission's approval to a resolution process. He noted that the public hearing process had been closed on May 22 and the Commission had yet to make an official recommendation to the City Council for adoption. He also noted that he had found nothing in the CEQA guidelines that required that the Commission's decision to close a public hearing was appealable.

Commissioner Glynn commented that there was nothing to prevent Seecon from submitting additional comments on the draft EIR even though the public comment period had been closed, to which Mr. Jerome noted that had been discussed and the question was that there were no substantial changes that would require a recirculation of the EIR.

Mr. Jerome added that as he had noted at the May 15, 2001 meeting, typically for comments that would be received by the City after the closure of the comment period, it would be up to staff and the consultant as to what would be done with those comments. What could be done was to respond to those comments and make note that they had been received after the comment period. He noted that there was any other number of ways the situation could be addressed.

Commissioner Glynn verified that the bulk of the comments that Seecon had to make had been received by Planning staff on or before the deadline on the four-day extension and were currently being considered by the City. When inquiring as to the total time allowed for the public comment period as part of the EIR, he was advised by Mr. Gangapuram that the public comment period had been open for four months and four days.

Commissioner Glynn also verified that the draft EIR had not been amended since its distribution at the beginning of that period of time.

Mr. Gangapuram commented that a problem in keeping the public comment period open was that it could create an unending situation with no closure.

Commissioner Tumbaga reverified that comments that had been received after the closure of the public comment period on May 22, 2001 could be included in the document as having been received after the closure of the public comment period.

Mr. Gangapuram clarified for benefit of the discussion that the entire packet had been provided to the Commission on May 15, 2001 and that since that time six chapters had been completed, with six more scheduled for review. He explained that the procedure to date had included a chapter by chapter, page by page review with the Commission and audience asked during that process whether or not there were any concerns or issues that needed to be addressed. He suggested that format be
continued for the discussion of the remaining chapters.
Mr. Gangapuram advised that the following elements would be discussed: Chapter 4, Urban Design; Chapter 5, Downtown; Chapter 9, Resources Conservation; Chapter 10, Health and Safety; Chapter 11, Public Facilities; Chapter 12, Noise; and Chapter 13, Housing.

With respect to Chapter 13, the Housing Element, Mr. Gangapuram advised that the current Housing Element would be adopted as is and the City would conduct a comprehensive update of the Housing Element after the adoption of the General Plan, as required by State law. He added that the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) would be so notified.

In response to Commissioner Glynn as to the planned date for final adoption of the EIR and the General Plan by the City Council, Mr. Gangapuram explained that the first week of August had been considered for the final adoption of the EIR and the General Plan. He clarified that the procedure to be followed was that once the Planning Commission had offered its recommendation to the City Council, all the changes to the document would be taken to create an updated version of the document with all of the corrections, with no strikeouts or highlights and with all of the maps in place. That document would be submitted to the City Council, at which time the public hearing process could start again.

Mr. Jerome and Mr. Gangapuram explained that the EIR was a final document and the City Council's role would be to certify that document. Should substantive changes require a modification to the EIR, an Addendum would be created to address those issues, which would also need to be certified by the City Council.

On the further discussion, Mr. Jerome explained that under State mandate, all Northern California cities had to adopt their Housing Elements by December 31, 2001.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that deadline had previously been postponed three times.

Chairman Kee opened up the review of the text and Mr. Jerome delineated some of the previous changes to the text starting with Chapter 4, Urban Design.

Referring to Section 4-G-1, Mr. Jerome clarified that the two or three ridgelines that would be affected by the proposed San Marco and San Marco Meadows projects had yet to be modified in response to the comments from Seecon. Accommodation of these projects could be addressed through Map 4-2 and not through the text.

Mr. Jerome commented that 4-P-1 was a somewhat major change in how a structure could be placed below a ridgeline within a certain distance both horizontally and vertically. He referenced the City's drawing that reflected a very steep grade and commented that while most ridgelines were not that steep, the placement of a structure could be as much as 150 vertical feet, more than the required 100 vertical feet for clearance purposes. As such, he had eliminated the vertical figure in that a horizontal dimension only would make it much easier for staff to analyze projects to ensure consistency with the General Plan.
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Commissioner Tumbaga supported the retention of a specific number in the document as appropriate.

Chairman Kee concurred and commented that 150 feet would ensure that a structure would remain below the ridge, although Mr. Jerome referenced the policy that discussed the development of ridgeline regulations and amending the Hillside Planned Development (HPD) district, where those detailed regulations could be placed to ensure that the policy would be kept general in character.

Commissioner Tumbaga requested a change to Policy 4-P-37 to replace Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce with community partners.

Commissioner Leonard requested that Buchanan Road be included in the section identifying key corridors, which section had primarily included Railroad Avenue, Willow Pass Road, Leland Road and State Route 4, although Mr. Jerome noted that Buchanan Road had been recognized as a major artery in the City elsewhere in the document. The section under discussion referenced primarily east/west routes and dealt with urban design and not transportation per se.

Mr. Jerome pointed out the significant corridors on a map displayed and explained that issue partly related to potential design opportunities, although he acknowledged that for the most part the area had been developed out. He described some of the problems in the area as fences and walls falling down and explained in response to Commissioner Leonard that the current policies would not preclude the City from doing what was necessary to the undeveloped extension of Buchanan Road.

Mr. Jerome explained, for instance, with respect to the Highland Ranch development, the City had been very concerned with the continuation of the walled community corridors. With Highland Ranch, he stated that there would be the opportunity to break up the wall by a school site, a park site and a significant portion of the Buchanan Road frontage, to provide a much better streetscape.

Mr. Gangapuram referenced the general guideline policies, which would identify the beautification aspect to address the same concern.

Continuing the discussion on the key corridors in the community, Mr. Jerome commented that Willow Pass Road needed a lot of work and Mr. Gangapuram added that Willow Pass Road had been identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for improvement.

With respect to the goals for State Route 4, Commissioner Tumbaga recommended a goal to discourage the placement of soundwalls, and while Mr. Gangapuram suggested that would be a good idea, he stated that Caltrans controlled that aspect of development.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not the fact that Caltrans failed to construct the soundwall along the mobile home park after the road had been raised could be addressed, to which Mr. Jerome noted that issue had been raised although he was unaware of its resolution at this time.
Commissioner Leonard inquired with respect to the signage previously requested of Caltrans to identify the Marina District on the road signs as part of the freeway improvements.

Mr. Jerome referenced Policy 4-P-62, to work with Caltrans to improve views and access to the Pittsburg Civic Center from State Route 4, to include landscaping and signage. He suggested that a policy could be added in that section.

It was the consensus of the Commission to enhance that policy to work with Caltrans to implement landscaping and signage for Pittsburg destination points from Pittsburg Civic Center.

Commissioner Tumbaga clarified with staff that live/work spaces had been included in the Downtown area and the section identified as Mixed Land Use Areas addressed those areas outside of the Downtown.

Speaking to the San Marco Village area in response to Mr. Gangapuram as to whether or not the Alves Ranch would have to be mentioned, Mr. Jerome explained that the actual zoning of the area would have to be reevaluated. He noted that the current zoning was all residential with low and high density residential and with no commercial opportunities. With the future plans for commercial, the General Plan would reflect that and allow a village concept as opposed to a typical shopping center, single family residential development.

Commissioner Leonard expressed a desire to ensure a policy that infill development would not be required to install underground utilities.

Mr. Gangapuram noted his understanding that the ordinance dictated the requirement for underground utilities and that any change would have to go through the City Council. He acknowledged Commissioner Leonard's desire to pursue that eventuality.

Addressing Chapter 5, Downtown, Mr. Jerome explained that the Downtown Element was not a mandatory element for the General Plan. It represented a recrafting of the existing 1986 Downtown Specific Plan, which was the legal document that had served as both the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance for all downtown development in the last fifteen years. It had been determined that instead of revising the Downtown Specific Plan, it would be incorporated in element form into the General Plan. As such, he emphasized that there was far more regulatory detail in the Downtown Element than in any other element of the General Plan.

Commissioner Leonard inquired whether or not the term "downtown" should be used when the reference had been changed to the Marina District.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not some policy had to be included to address the downtown parking methodology, and Mr. Jerome noted the process that had been involved in the consideration of a diagonal parking plan that was not necessarily reflected in a plan prepared by the City’s engineering consultant.
Commissioner Glynn suggested that could be included under the heading "Downtown in Transition" since parallel parking was a return to what had originally been included in the downtown.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired why religious centers were being discouraged within one thousand feet of one another as shown in Policy 5-P-11, to which Mr. Gangapuram advised that the downtown area had been sought as a destination point given the Marina activity and while religious centers within one thousand feet of one another were not prohibited, they were being discouraged to avoid a proliferation of churches that would be counter to the intent of the revitalization of the downtown.

Mr. Gangapuram emphasized that federal laws would not allow a prohibition of churches.

Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that a policy could be included to establish a policy to discourage churches in storefronts, which Mr. Gangapuram advised was the case.

Speaking to Policy 5-P-16, Commissioner Leonard noted the reference to the Johns Manville plant and allowing the existing use to operate and expand as needed, and Mr. Jerome explained that the policy had been included as a compromise between Johns Manville's desire to continue in their operation balanced with the City's desire not to continue the designation of the area as industrial.

Commissioner Leonard noted his concern with the language allowing a rebuild if damaged or destroyed. He did not want to see the use continued and he suggested that the language be modified to allow the existing uses to operate and expand as needed.

Mr. Jerome emphasized the time spent on the policy and the City's goal to recognize that Johns Manville had been a viable long-term user while also acknowledging that businesses could discontinue. If that became the case, the goal was to change the land use to affect new types of land uses on the property, potentially utilizing the existing historical buildings.

Motion by Commissioner Leonard to strike Policy 5-P-16. Commissioner Glynn seconded the motion.

On the question, Chairman Kee noted the concerns but wanted to clarify what would constitute a need to repair and what level of repair would be involved.

While Commissioner Tumbaga did not support an expansion of the facility, she suggested that since the use was an existing use, if the facility was damaged, it should be allowed to be rebuilt, even if destroyed.

Commissioner Holmes supported the language as is.

Commissioner Glynn commented that for two years the Johns Manville plant had been replaced by a facility owned by Schuler, although the Johns Manville crew had remained under the new ownership, and had remained until the return of the Johns Manville ownership. He inquired why
Johns Manville, to the exclusion of all other businesses in the City, had been named specifically in the General Plan.

In response, Mr. Jerome explained that Johns Manville had been included specifically. He stated that in the existing General Plan, the Johns Manville site was Heavy Industrial and there was no issue in that the facility was a heavy industrial use. To ensure a land use change for future development of the property and in response to the desire not to continue the Heavy Industrial designation, he stated that the language would allow a transition when a change of use would occur, although that had been contrary to the intent of the Johns Manville facility. As a result, the language would balance the economic gains, opportunities, and assets of a long-term facility with a future land use possibility.

Without that policy, if changed to a marine commercial zoning, the Johns Manville facility would become a legal non-conforming use and the operation could continue. If the operation was destroyed more than fifty percent or if it ceased operation for six months the use could not reoperate as an industrial use.

Commissioner Leonard reiterated his motion to strike Policy 5-P-16 in its entirety, which motion was again seconded by Commissioner Glynn.

On the continued discussion prior to a vote, Commissioner Glynn expressed his concern that the General Plan document was to be general in nature and he had therefore objected to the specific reference to Johns Manville. He stated that if the facility continued to operate as it had always operated, there would be no adverse impact to that facility unless it decided to vacate the site.

Chairman Kee clarified that even if Johns Manville were to vacate the site, with no six month abandonment, the use would remain and someone could assume that operation.

Commissioner Glynn emphasized his concern that if the area was contained within the designated Downtown area that Johns Manville, if it determined, could vacate the property and sell the land which land could not be utilized by a new owner for the purpose of heavy industry.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that would not be the case in that if Policy 5-P-16 was retained and Johns Manville was to vacate the site, another use could not utilize the site for heavy industry. If the policy was removed, as recommended, another heavy industrial use could occupy the site if done within six months.

Commissioner Leonard withdrew the motion. Commissioner Glynn withdrew the second to the motion.

Commissioner Holmes commented that the issue of the Johns Manville plant had been a topic of discussion by City Planning Commissions over many years.

Speaking for Johns Manville, BRIAN OLSON explained that he dealt with existing operations and
he could not speak to any future intent of the Johns Manville operator. He advised that he knew of no plans to shut down the facility in the immediate future into the next five to ten years. He explained that the Pittsburg facility was the major distribution point for the Johns Manville western region and was an important plant in its system.

When asked by Commissioner Tumbaga, Mr. Olson advised that he was aware of no plans for expansion of the Johns Manville facility. He added that the local facility produced the built up roofing, the underlayer of commercial and industrial roofs. Other plants manufactured the top layers. He stated that the local facility also brought in the production from the other Johns Manville plants on the west coast and shipped those out directly to job sites. Currently, the Pittsburg plant had 64 employees running three shifts.

It was the consensus of the Commission to modify Policy 5-P-16 to read in part: Until change of ownership for the Johns Manville property designated Marine Commercial allows this existing industrial use to operate.

Commissioner Glynn expressed his hope that would not prevent Johns Manville from suffering any damage from earthquake, broken windows, blast concussions, and the like from no fault of its own from repairing its building and from restoring its current use.

Mr. Jerome explained that without the additional language allowing a rebuild if severely damaged, the use could not be rebuilt. He noted that issue was addressed by building code provisions. He added that a non-conforming use could not expand. He emphasized that the policy had been written to recognize the Johns Manville facility as an existing viable use. While the City wanted to see the site occupied by another more appropriate use for the area, the City did not want to terminate the current use and supported the existing viable operation, allowing that company the freedom for expansion and repair if the facility was damaged through no fault of its own.

On the continuing discussion, Mr. Jerome explained that the Johns Manville operation was a legal non-conforming use with or without Policy 5-P-16. He also explained, when asked, that once effective, the General Plan required compliance under State law and any zoning action had to be found consistent with the document. He added that when the General Plan went into effect, a project had to be consistent with the zoning for the site. If a heavy industrial zone was not consistent with the site, a transitional ordinance would have to be established that would allow uses that were inconsistent with the existing Zoning Ordinance but consistent with the General Plan.

On the reconsideration of the Commission's consensus for a modification to Policy 5-P-16, there was a concern that without allowing the opportunity to expand there would be a prohibition of Johns Manville's business opportunity.

Ultimately, by consensus of the Commission, Policy 5-P-16 was left as is with the addition of "this" between allow and existing and making the use singular. In the last line, the property "must" be used for Marine Commercial activity.
On the continued discussion of Chapter 5, Commissioner Leonard recommended that Policy 5-P-12 under East Tenth Street be carried over onto West Tenth Street neighborhoods.

Commissioner Leonard referred to Policy 5-P-28, which stated in part "to ensure that new construction in the downtown including the New York Landing Historical District are reviewed for design capacity by the Planning Commission and the Historical Resources Commission (HRC)." He questioned the inclusion of the Historical Resources Commission.

Mr. Jerome explained the thought processes that had included the HRC in that policy and explained that the intent was to revise the Historical Resources Ordinance to redefine the authority and role of that Commission to more appropriately allow design review authority to the Planning Commission and to remove it from the HRC and expand the role of the HRC downtown.

By consensus, the Commission removed the reference to the HRC in Policy 5-P-28.

With respect to Downtown Parking Requirements, Commissioner Glynn referenced Table 5-4 and suggested that it might need to be revised to recognize the parking changes proposed to Railroad Avenue. A discussion developed on the fact that the table did not appear to be correct. Staff was directed to clarify the table and respond back to the Commission.

Commissioner Leonard suggested that Policy 5-P-44 be similarly addressed to ensure its appropriateness.

An unidentified member of the audience referred to Policy 5-P-46, "Continue to install and maintain crosswalks and landscaped curb extensions at heavily used intersections in the downtown." He recommended an addition to reflect that such curb extensions to be bicycle friendly.

A recess was taken at 9:40 P.M. The Commission reconvened at 9:50 P.M. with all members initially shown as present and absent.

Commissioner Glynn referred to the Diablo Services facility and suggested that facility be included in the document similar to what had been done for the Johns Manville facility. He referred to Figure 5-1 and clarified with staff the buffering park located between the Johns Manville facility and the Diablo Services site. He recommended that the site be designated as Marine Commercial and suggested that designation could allow useful access to the water. He also inquired how the Diablo Services facility was different from Johns Manville as related to Policy 5-P-16.

Mr. Gangapuram expressed concern if that area was changed to Marine Commercial, which could allow a marine related use that could eliminate access to the water. He also noted that most of the property referenced was owned by the State. He added that there were different options involved.

Commissioner Glynn emphasized the need to address the Diablo Services facility similar to the way the Johns Manville facility had been addressed in Policy 5-P-16.
Mr. Jerome explained that currently the land in question was zoned Heavy Industrial and under the General Plan it would be designated Marine Commercial. Currently the site was used for open petroleum and coke storage and could not be used for anything else under the new General Plan. He stated that if the site ceased operation for more than six months another operator could not continue that use. He noted his discomfort imposing the same stipulation as had been included to address the Johns Manville facility for legal reasons primarily because the language in Policy 5-P-16 had been recommended and supported by the Johns Manville operator.

Mr. Jerome clarified the intent to create both a view access and a continuation access corridor from the head of Harbor Street to New York Slough. He questioned the width of the buffering park and suggested that what could be included was that the developer of the property create a public access from the end of Harbor Street to the river.

Commissioner Leonard wanted some assurance that somewhere along the Marina Commercial zone, there would be marine commercial access to the water.

On another issue, Mr. Jerome referred to a note he had related to Page 5-14 right before Policy 5-P-3 where he was to add a policy in response to Commissioner Glynn's request regarding the rehabilitation of historic buildings or redevelopment of vacant or underdeveloped sites.

Commissioner Glynn concurred that there was a need to include such a policy given that there was a need to address the question of whether to demolish or rebuild. He cited the National Building as an example.

Chairman Kee opened the discussion of Chapter 9, Resources Conservation.

JAY TORRES-MUGA, with Seecon, referred to Policy 9-P-1, which he noted went in tandem with Policy 9-P-11 with respect to special status species and explained that the statement as required by State and federal agencies, which Seecon had requested had not been included. He requested that be added in the second line after "special status species as required by State and federal agencies." The intent was to ensure that the City did not become another agency enforcing the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Acts that would be enforced by other jurisdictional agencies.

Mr. Torres-Muga also referred to Policy 9-P-3 and requested a replacement of the first word of the policy from "participate" to cooperate in the development. He noted that the City had yet to act on the Habitat Conservation Plan and it was as yet unknown what would occur in that case.

Mr. Jerome stated that the City was already doing what was requested. The City was participating in the development and considering the adoption of the Habitat Conservation Plan. The policy had been crafted to clarify that the City had yet to adopt the Habitat Conservation Plan and might decide not to do so.

Referring to Policy 9-P-5, Mr. Torres-Muga referenced the Central Valley Project Contract Service area, after which he requested that the following be added: and if necessary address the requirement,
which he stated would be compatible with the rest of the sentence.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) had specifically provided the policy. Staff was directed to address that request through the CCWD.

Mr. Torres-Muga referred to Policy 9-P-6 and suggested that there was a conflict with an earlier policy for the vertical aspect of that setback. Staff concurred and noted that Mr. Torres-Muga had an old version of the strikeout document.

Further, with respect to Policy 9-P-8, Mr. Torres-Muga questioned the intent of the second line of that policy. He noted that normally Seecon did not promote irrigation on slopes for stability purposes and he suggested that the policy implied a form of landscaping that he suggested was in conflict with the cut and fill with native plant materials. He requested that the description of Policy 9-P-8 be removed as a result.

Commissioners questioned that request since they saw no reference to irrigation.

Mr. Torres-Muga explained that all of the slopes were vegetated with native grasses unless they were touched. He stated that the policy spoke to planting on existing slopes with native plant species and he suggested that would imply landscaping that was not native plant materials.

Mr. Jerome explained that Policy 9-P-8 spoke to the situation where a slope was being regraded. The description spoke in addition to that situation.

Commissioner Glynn concurred with the concern and supported the removal of the section requested.

By consensus, the Commission agreed to the modification of Policy 9-P-8.

For the section entitled "Creekways and Wetlands," the Commission requested that reference be modified throughout the document to read "Creeks and Wetlands."

It was recommended by Policy 9-P-3 be modified to remove the reference to "channels" and to Encourage the preservation of natural creeks.

Referring to the second paragraph on Policy 9-P-18, Mr. Torres-Muga noted the concern for the use of the term one hundred-year to determine the necessary capacity of the storm drainage system. He commented that traditionally the ten-year storm was used to design the capacity of the storm drain system. He added that the streets took the one-hundred year storm and it was unclear whether or not the pipes would have to be sized for a one-hundred year term, which was not typically what was done. He suggested that one-hundred year be stricken from that policy as a result.
Mr. Gangapuram advised that the engineers had offered that language and staff would have to check with the engineers to address that situation.

Speaking to the section on Historical Resources, Commissioner Glynn inquired when the list of historical resources had last been updated. He later noted that it had been clarified in the document that had last been done in 1997.

Mr. Gangapuram added that he, Associate Planner Bekiaris and the consultant had spent some time addressing each building on the list.

On the discussion of Chapter 10, Health and Safety, Commissioner Tumbaga verified the latest version of Policy 10-G-6, "Limit development on slopes greater than 30 percent as delineated on Figure 10-1 in upper elevations and along designated ridgelines."

Commissioner Leonard referred to Policy 10-P-17, Seismic, and questioned the description where it stated in part "Programs to encourage retrofit included additional transfer tax on property sales," and Mr. Jerome clarified that language was in the form of a suggestion only and was not being required.

Commissioner Leonard suggested that Policy 10-P-17 be modified to read: Programs to encourage the owner to pay for seismic retrofit work.

Commissioner Glynn had a concern with the Transport of Hazardous Materials and the designation of roadways and expressed concern that if West Tenth Street and Willow Pass Road were designated as hazardous roadway routes, along with the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway, there was a gap between those roadways which would require travel through residential areas. He reiterated his concern for a lack of connectivity between West Tenth Street and Harbor Boulevard and emphasized that the policy would have to be modified to eliminate the specific reference to West Tenth Street, with Tenth Street being included without reference to east or west.

When asked and for the benefit of the audience, Mr. Jerome reclarified Policy 10-P-2, "Limit future development from occurring on slopes greater than 30 percent as designated in Figure 10-1 to lower elevations with hills, knolls and ridges not classified as major or minor as delineated on Figure 4-2."

BRUCE OHLSON, referred to a matter that had been raised at the last meeting and which he requested be revisited. He referred to Goal 7-G-17, which he stated he had submitted to the consultant over a year ago and which had since been amended.

Mr. Ohlson read Goal 7-G-17 into the record, "Ensure that current bicycle friendly roadways featuring wide trails or marked bicycle lanes are not redesigned unless necessary to improve traffic level of service with additional narrower moving lanes that endanger bicyclists." He suggested that was not a reasonable goal to encourage the City to remove bicycle lanes whenever doing so would improve the traffic level of service. He suggested that the goal be stricken in its entirety.
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Mr. Ohlson was advised to speak with staff and the Commission would address that concern at its next hearing.

Chairman Kee raised the discussion of Chapter 11, Public Facilities.

Commissioner Glynn referred to Policy 11-P-23, "Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to ensure that only development is constructed within the one and a half mile response radii from a fire station." He expressed concern with that policy, referenced Figure 11-2 and noted that the current one and a half mile radius from particular stations would mean that the San Marco project and the Stremel property was not covered by any one and a half mile radius from existing fire stations. As such, he suggested that the language would indicate that those proposals could not be built as a result.

Mr. Jerome explained that he had previously noted that problem and had recommended a rewrite to read: "Cooperate with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District in locating fire stations within the one and a half mile response radii of all new development." He referred to Chapter 3, Policy 3-P-3 of the Growth Management Element and explained that section to "Ensure that the Contra Costa Fire Protection District can locate a fire station within one and a half miles of all residential and non-residential development." He supported a rewrite of Policy 11-P-23 to address that concern.

An unidentified gentleman suggested the following wording: "Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to facilitate that most new and existing developments be centrally located within approximately a 1.5 mile response radii from the fire station."

Commissioner Glynn supported some language to state that as a goal as opposed to some condition of approval for a development.

Chairman Kee open the discussion of Chapter 12, Noise, and requested under Noise Measurement levels that 10 dBA as the level of hearing be followed with the other end of the spectrum at 140 to 160 dBA as the threshold of pain to be included in the defined terms.

Speaking to Industrial Noise, Commissioner Leonard referenced a policy related to the Southern Energy plant and clarified that the reference in that policy should be irregular as opposed to "regular."

With the completion of the review of the draft General Plan, Mr. Gangapuram described the next steps and explained that the updated version of the General Plan with all comments and including revised tables would be provided to the Commission at its June 12 meeting.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Glynn to continue GP-97-01, the Public Hearing on the proposed Draft General Plan and proposed General Plan land uses and policies for the comprehensive update of the General Plan.
City's General Plan, "Pittsburg 2020: A Vision for the 21st Century" (General Plan Update), to the Regular Meeting scheduled for June 12, 2001. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leonard and carried by the following vote:

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

OTHER COMMENTS:

Chairman Kee brought the Commission up-to-date on the Commission appeals that had been scheduled for the City Council.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 P.M. to a Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission on June 12, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

RANDY JEROME, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission