A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, May 8, 2001, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: Commissioners Kelley, Valentine

Staff: Planning Manager Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram; Planning Technician Dana Hoggatt, and Civil Engineer II Alfredo Hurtado.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, May 4, 2001.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Tumbaga led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES:

MOTION: April 17, 2001 (Special Meeting)

Motion by Commissioner Holmes to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2001 Special Meeting, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leonard and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Leonard, Tumbaga, Kee
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Commissioners Kelley, Valentine
MOTION: April 24, 2001 (Regular Meeting)

Motion by Commissioner Glynn to approve the minutes of the April 24, 2001 Regular Meeting, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holmes and carried by the following vote:

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

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS:

There were no deletions or withdrawals.

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

By consensus, the Commission changed the order of the agenda and moved to consider Item No. 2 prior to Item No. 1.

PUBLIC HEARING:

ITEM 2: Goodrich Technology Corporation, UP-01-05.
Application by Patrick Colahan of Goodrich Technology Corporation requesting approval of a use permit for Limited Manufacturing for a business to powder coat automobile wheels located at 670 Garcia Avenue, Unit A, IP (Industrial Park) Zoning District, APN 088-392-007.

Planning Technician Dana Hoggatt presented the request from Patrick Colahan of Goodrich Technology Corporation for the approval of a use permit for a Limited Manufacturing use. The business would involve the finish of new automobile wheels through a powder coating process. The wheels would be manufactured off-site to be delivered by truck to the site where they would be cleaned by a sand blasting process and coated with two layers of powder, to then be baked on to offer a smooth finish.

The use would not involve on-site automotive or automotive body repair. No installation of the finished product or the installation of tires or tire replacement would be conducted on-site. The business would operate Monday through Friday using two current employees, although the operation could employ up to ten people. The business hours were currently from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., with some flexibility as the workload increased.
Ms. Hoggatt reported that the project was consistent with the General Plan and with the Zoning Ordinance. A Limited Manufacturing use was conditionally permitted in the IP Zoning District. The adjacent uses in the area included a contractor and welding shop, while the Rockridge residential subdivision was located to the south. Staff anticipated no major negative impacts on the residential subdivision since the entire operation and the actual powder coating process would occur indoors.

Ms. Hoggatt advised that the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) had indicated that no permits would be required for the project. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) also exempted powder-coating businesses from their permitting process. The business was also exempt from the regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), under Class 1, Existing Facilities.

Ms. Hoggatt further advised that a representative speaking on behalf of the property owner had contacted staff to advise that the property owner would be unable to attend the meeting but was supportive of the application as submitted.

Ms. Hoggatt recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9205, approving UP-01-05, with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Glynn requested clarification as to the hours of operation for the business as indicated in the staff report and the hours of operation stipulated in Condition No. 13, since the times indicated differed.

Ms. Hoggatt explained that when she had first spoken to the applicant, the applicant had indicated that he might extend the hours of business as the workload increased. Initially the applicant had requested to be allowed to operate until 10:00 P.M. Since the business involved an indoor operation, staff was of the opinion that there was no problem extending the hours of operation past 5:00 P.M. Additionally, the City's Municipal Code stipulated that machinery that caused a substantial amount of noise was not allowed to operate past 10:00 P.M. As a result, staff was of the opinion that 9:00 P.M. would be an appropriate compromise, as indicated in Condition No. 13.

Commissioner Glynn requested clarification as to whether or not the business would be allowed to operate on the weekends.

Ms. Hoggatt advised that the business would operate Monday through Friday only and would not operate on the weekends. Condition No. 13 applied only to a Monday through Friday operation.

PROPOONENT:

PATRICK COLAHAN, 900 Roanoke Drive, Unit 115, Martinez, explained that the powder coating process described by staff would occur completely inside the business with a separate clean environment room for the application of the powder finish, where the air would be filtered and the powder collected and reused through the use of special equipment. Mr. Colahan also noted that a special air compressor had been purchased for the business that would...
generate a noise level of 76 dBA at five feet.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Colahan affirmed that he had read the conditions of approval and was in agreement with those conditions.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Glynn to adopt Resolution No. 9205, approving UP-01-05, a use permit for limited manufacturing for the powder coating of new automobile wheels for "Goodrich Technology Corporation," with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holmes and carried by the following vote:

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

Chairman Kee advised that a decision by the Planning Commission was not final until the appeal period expired 10 days from the meeting. The applicant, City Council, City Manager, or any affected person may appeal either the denial, approval or any condition of approval of an item within 10 calendar days of the decision.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:


Public Hearing on the proposed Draft General Plan for the comprehensive update of the City's General Plan entitled, "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. (Continued from April 24, 2001).

Mr. Jerome explained that the public hearing had been continued from the meeting of April 24, 2001, at which time the Commission had requested a full submittal of all of the changes that had been recommended by staff through a strikeout version of the General Plan document. He explained that the strikeout version included strike through of sections recommended for removal, as well as bold underline of new text staff had recommended for inclusion. The changes that had been made reflected comments received from the public and the Planning Commission to date.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that the strikeout version was reflective of the staff recommendations from the comments received. He explained that staff had rejected many of the comments that had been received, although it was up to the Commission to review the comments made.

Mr. Jerome further noted that the Commission had decided at the April 24 meeting to continue the May 8 meeting to a public workshop scheduled for May 15. That meeting would be held in the
Council Conference Room and would be open to the public. The intent of that meeting was to review the hillside and ridgeline policies as contained in Chapter Two, Land Use and Chapter Four, Urban Design, and to review the visual analyses to be prepared by the General Plan consultants.

Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram reiterated that staff had evaluated all of the comments received by the Commission, the general public and stakeholders. Staff had provided a second strikeout version of the General Plan, which represented all of the changes and all chapters of the General Plan where comments had been received to date.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that the discussions at the May 15 public workshop would evaluate the hillside and ridgeline policies. The General Plan consultants had completed the additional visual analyses to be considered. The visual analyses would involve conceptual drawings of how the hillsides and ridgelines would appear with three different types of grading, at the foothills, moderate levels and extensive grading.

Additionally, Mr. Gangapuram reported that the Commission had decided during the previous meeting to formally adopt the Draft General Plan document by June 26, 2001. If that deadline was to be achieved, the public comment period on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be closed by May 15, 2001 to allow the General Plan consultants the opportunity to evaluate comments received in order to prepare a clean version of the EIR, and to allow the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Gangapuram noted that the City had already exceeded the 60-day time period for the public comment on the EIR.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not a glossary of terms would be prepared for the purposes of clarification for the general public as he had requested at the previous meeting.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that the General Plan consultants were in the process of preparing an appendix as a glossary of all of the abbreviations, words, and acronyms used in the document. It was hoped that would be available in time for the May 15 public workshop.

PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED

K.D. THOMAS of Nortonville, inquired who would own the open space on the maps. She questioned how water would be brought to the top of hills for farm animals if homes were built down below.

Chairman Kee clarified that current property owners would own the open spaces as identified on the maps. He further clarified that no specific development was being proposed at this time.

BRUCE OHLSON, a resident of Pittsburg, referenced the Transportation Element of the General Plan and spoke to correspondence he had presented to staff where he had made a number of
recommended revisions to the General Plan Map. He inquired whether or not his suggestions would be considered.

Mr. Jerome explained that the Planning Commission and staff had yet to be able to review all of the comments made as reflected in Mr. Ohlson's correspondence. He noted that many of the issues in the Transportation Element must be coordinated with the Traffic Engineering staff. He suggested that Mr. Ohlson summarize his correspondence so that it could be included as part of the public record.

Mr. Gangapuram affirmed that staff had been working with the Traffic Engineer to review Mr. Ohlson's letter. He added that staff had yet to complete its review of the entire correspondence, although it would be evaluated with staff comments to be provided by the May 15 workshop. He otherwise affirmed that staff had found errors on the General Plan Map and that the appropriate changes would be made.

Mr. Gangapuram acknowledged that Mr. Ohlson had provided certain routes that should be incorporated in the General Plan document as part of a bike route plan.

Mr. Ohlson summarized his correspondence presented to staff in which he had recommended minor revisions to paragraphs describing bike lanes and paths. He suggested that the standard width of a bike lane be included and that all bike paths used in the General Plan 2000 document be designated as multi-use paths that permitted not only bicycles, but pedestrians, skaters, scooters, handicapped persons in wheelchairs, parents pushing baby carriages and the like.

Referencing Paragraph 7-P-37, Mr. Ohlson recommended that policy be revised to add the following language "bus benches, utility poles, street signs, fire hydrants and the like." He also recommended that all City sidewalks comply with the minimum width stipulated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Speaking to the General Plan Map, Figure 7-4, Mr. Ohlson suggested that the map be revised to define an on-street facility as "streets with a 16-foot wide or wider right lane." With that definition, he noted that there were a number of minor changes that could be made in the document.

Mr. Ohlson further commented that bicyclists, as motorists, had preferred routes and there were preferred routes throughout the City since the City was the gateway to East County. As a result, he had made a number of recommendations identified in his correspondence regarding routes that had not been listed on the General Plan Bicycle Facility Map, but which should be included.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that Mr. Ohlson's comments had yet to be included in the strikeout version of the document since staff had no opportunity to review the recommendations. He emphasized that the strikeout version was an ongoing process and there could be some comments received this date that could necessitate further changes to the document.

RON RIVES, Seeno Construction Company, referenced a statement made by staff recommending that the Planning Commission close the public hearing on the EIR on May 15. He suggested that was
premature in that they had not yet had the opportunity to make comments they desired to make on
the document. He stated that their failure not to make those comments was not due to lack of
diligence, but based on the understanding that the process was that the Commission would have a
Draft General Plan that the Commission would be satisfied with and an EIR that would follow that
document.

Mr. Rives stated that the EIR currently followed the General Plan in its original draft, and substantial
revisions had been made that would necessitate substantial changes to the EIR since the two
documents would have to be consistent.

Mr. Rives advised that Seeno Construction Company was in the process of requesting an annexation
to the City of Pittsburg for the San Marco Meadows area and the Sky Ranch area. The developer
had made a request of the City to petition the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for a
change to the Sphere of Influence (SOI) so that the eastern portion of the Chevron property located
at the intersection of Somersville and Buchanan Roads, which had been in the City's SOI, be placed
back into the City's SOI, all impacting the EIR.

Mr. Rives otherwise inquired whether or not the additional visual analyses to be prepared by the
General Plan consultants for the computer generated viewscapes of the City's hillsides would be
provided during the meeting of May 15.

Mr. Gangapuram reiterated that he was working with the General Plan consultants to obtain all of
the renderings and it was hoped that information would be available at that time. He also affirmed
that the viewpoints had been selected and included selected positions from State Route 4, Willow
Pass Road, Bailey Road and other major areas. Additionally, as one traveled along State Route 4
towards the City of Pittsburg, a viewpoint of a knoll adjacent to the Concord Naval Weapons
Station, with San Marco Meadows located behind that area, had been included.

Mr. Jerome explained that staff had recommended that the public hearing on the EIR be closed on
May 15 since the Commission had previously indicated the intention to bring the General Plan back
for adoption on June 26. Staff was working with that date in mind since the General Plan
consultants must be allowed the opportunity to comment on any comments received and to package
those comments in the final EIR document, which would be returned to the Commission for further
review prior to the adoption of the Final General Plan.

Commissioner Glynn understood that the public hearing period for the EIR was not to be closed
until the Commission had a matched document between the Final Draft General Plan, and the Final
Draft of the EIR, which would reflect any conditions identified in the Final Draft of the General
Plan. He understood that the Commission was to adopt both documents on June 26.

Mr. Jerome noted that the closure of the public comment period for the Draft EIR on May 15 was a
best case scenario and it could be done if a consensus was reached by the Commission on all of the
policies and changes in the General Plan. The public hearing for the General Plan itself could be kept open until it was formally adopted.

Commissioner Glynn agreed that the public hearing for the EIR not be closed since it needed to be consistent with the Final General Plan and since there were significant issues that would require adjustments to the document.

Mr. Jerome characterized many of the changes as minor, although he acknowledged that those changes might or might not change the EIR. He reiterated that the Commission needed to reach a consensus on the changes. Once that was done, the public comment period on the General Plan could be closed and the General Plan consultants would be allowed to draft any changes and to prepare the final document.

Commissioner Glynn volunteered to meet with staff on an individual basis to address his concerns and comments on the General Plan.

Commissioner Leonard requested clarification from staff regarding Mr. Rives' comments regarding possible annexation of property that could change the City's SOI. He suggested that could significantly impact the EIR.

Mr. Jerome explained that staff was working on preparing policies that would encourage a policy for the City to seek annexation of the areas referenced by Mr. Rives, in addition to areas located on the periphery of the City limits.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that as mentioned by Mr. Rives, there were two pieces of property that were being planned for annexation, with development on those properties. The Draft EIR did address San Marco Meadows and Sky Ranch, with the exception of the property located in the City of Antioch's SOI. Impacts had been identified that could be triggered by those developments, as Seeno Construction had indicated on preliminary plans.

Mr. Gangapuram noted that the General Plan EIR was not project specific and was a macro approach evaluating those projects in terms of the entire City. The micro approach had been considered on a project by project basis, which he suggested would have no impact on the EIR since the only impact would be on the hillside development policies dependent upon the approach ultimately pursued by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jerome advised that an EIR had been prepared in conjunction with the Highlands Ranch subdivision for the property known as Chevron East. It was likely there would be adjustments required to the old EIR.

Commissioner Holmes inquired whether or not the workshop scheduled for May 15 would be adequate to address everything that needed to be done. He questioned whether or not additional
meetings would be required.

Mr. Jerome explained that would be up to the Commission to decide. During the next week, the Planning Commission would be provided with more changes in response to further public comment. Staff was also continuing to work with Seecon Development Company to address a number of written comments that had been provided to staff. Efforts would be coordinated with other departments to address all of the comments received thus far. It was anticipated that another strikeout version would be provided to the Commission for the May 15 workshop discussion.

In response to Commissioner Glynn, Mr. Jerome affirmed that staff would be more than willing to meet with Commissioners, Councilmembers and members of the public individually to receive any comments on the General Plan. He also noted that the Commission had discussed a possible field trip to view some of the City's hillsides.

Mr. Jerome advised that John Strummel, the owner of the Bailey Estates property, had expressed the willingness to allow Commissioners to take a field trip on his property at the top end of Bailey Road where a fairly good vista of the hillsides would be permitted. A field trip could be scheduled on either Thursday, May 10, Monday, May 14, or Tuesday, May 15. He suggested that no more than three Commissioners view the property at one time due to requirements related to public notification.

Commissioners advised of dates when they would be available to participate in the field trip.

Commissioner Glynn expressed his appreciation to staff for the extra effort in preparing the second strikeout version of the General Plan so that it could be provided to the Commission for review. He recognized that the process was complicated and he reiterated his appreciation for the staff efforts.

Mr. Jerome inquired whether or not the Commission had any comments on the policies as proposed or revised at this time.

Commissioner Glynn referenced the policy with respect to the City's fire stations. He inquired of the proposed locations for the buildout of the new fire stations.

Mr. Jerome explained that the Draft General Plan had specifically stated that Fire Station No. 86 shall be relocated. While he recognized that was a controversial issue, staff had revised that policy in an attempt to be less controversial. As to where the fire stations might be located, he was uncertain since the locations would be selected by the Contra Costa Fire Protection District (CCFPD), which identified available locations that would best serve the needs of the CCFPD.

Mr. Jerome referenced Policy 11-P-24, on Page 11-17 and 11-18 of the Draft General Plan and the policy regarding the fire stations which stated in part: "cooperated with Contra Costa Fire Protection
District to ensure that all new development is constructed within the 1.5 mile response radii from a fire station." A discussion point stated that "further development in the Southern Hills may necessitate the construction of a new fire station by 2020, additional fire protection facilities, may be necessary to ensure that the safety of residents within the urban rural interface hazard areas...."

Mr. Jerome clarified that staff had not recommended a change to that policy, although a second policy stated in part: "cooperate with CCFPD in obtaining sites to relocate City fire stations to provide more efficient response times." That policy included bullet items that indicated the relocation of Station No. 84 near State Route 4 and west of Railroad Avenue, and a second bullet suggesting the relocation of Station No. 85 near Buchanan Road and West of Railroad Avenue.

Mr. Jerome advised that the CCFPD had been working with the City to relocate those two fire stations further south to better provide service.

Mr. Jerome also referenced Policy 11-P-26 which stated in part: "cooperate with CCFPD in obtaining a site for a new fire station or replacement for Station No. 86 south of State Route and West of Bailey Road." Staff had recommended a change to the first policy as follows: "cooperate with CCFPD in obtaining sites to either relocate or establish new fire stations within the City limits to provide more efficient response times." Staff was also proposing to strike the relocations of Stations Nos. 84 and 85 from the document..

The second policy staff recommended be revised would state in part: "cooperate with CCFPD in obtaining a site for a new fire station or relocation of Station No. 86 south of State Route 4 and west of Bailey Road."

Commissioner Glynn commented that there was no risk factor assigned to the service area of the 1.5 mile radii. He inquired of the content specificity of the geographical error as presently prescribed in the 1.5 mile radii of the current fire station locations. He questioned relocating the fire stations to encompass more dwellings while leaving behind higher valued properties or likely issues associated with explosives or any other item that might occur. He noted that had not been addressed in any of the policies in terms of the hazardous aspects of the territory.

Commissioner Glynn questioned why the fire stations had been built as currently located.

Mr. Jerome also referenced the policies in the Growth Management Element, a required element under Measure C, whereby the intention had been to provide minimum performance standards for future growth. He stated that performance standards for fire as well as police needs had been included.

The policies contained in that section were brief and included the following: "Ensure that the Contra Costa Fire Protection District can maintain a five minute response time for 90 percent of emergency calls." An additional policy "Ensure that the Contra Costa Fire Protection District can locate a fire
station within 1.5 miles off all residential and non-residential development." A further policy had been to "Pursue appropriate sites as needed to construct fire stations for efficient emergency responses to all City residents."

Mr. Jerome clarified that the policies had been received from the CCFPD.

Commissioner Glynn commented that another issue that had not been addressed was the old fire station, which would essentially be abandoned, becoming another downtown abandoned building.

LEON BANKS a resident of Pittsburg, understood that Fire Station No. 84 had been proposed to be relocated to Davi Avenue.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that the CCFPD was considering new locations and had been considering a site at City Hall or across the street from City Hall in the park area, although the site was dependent upon availability. The CCFPD had spoken to the City regarding retaining the downtown fire station as a training facility, although no decisions had been made at this time.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Leonard 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 a Special Planning Commission meeting of May 15, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Jerome reported that the Commission had been provided with a memorandum from staff regarding new Census Bureau Data on race statistics in the City.

Mr. Jerome also advised that the City Council had met on May 7 and had discussed a proposal from the Mayor to revise City Commission/Committee term limits, to continue the term limitation of two four year terms, but to allow one year to pass before an individual could reapply. The Council had also discussed eliminating term limits entirely. The Council had taken action by a 3-2 vote to consider the term limit proposal and to move it forward for discussion to a Council Workshop scheduled for May 15 at the Environmental Center.

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR REPORT:

There was no Zoning Administrator Report.
COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Holmes reported that the Traffic and Circulation Advisory Committee had met on May 3 and had been presented with alternatives for future parking configurations for the Downtown Railroad Avenue Corridor. A proposal comprised of a combination of all of the proposals had been forwarded to the City Council for approval.

Commissioner Leonard advised that he had also attended that meeting. He suggested that the proposal being recommended for Council approval would offer parking to accommodate upcoming proposals from the Pittsburg Economic and Housing Development Corporation (PEHDC), an investment group out of Oakland, and provide parking for existing uses in the downtown. The parking proposal would also facilitate the development of the downtown.

Mr. Jerome commented that he had been apprised of another parking proposal for the three blocks from Third Street to Eighth Street, designated in the Railroad Avenue Downtown Corridor. Staff was also preparing another proposal that would be far more conservative, but viable, based on information received on proposed projects. The process was being driven by the Economic Development Department and the Redevelopment Agency.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Leonard expressed his appreciation to staff for the updated strikeout version of the General Plan with follow through versions to include all Commission and public comments.

Commissioner Tumbaga requested that the City put more effort into the repair of City streets in the neighborhoods between Beacon Street and Railroad Avenue, Tenth Street and the Railroad Avenue tracks. She commented on the sad disrepair of the streets and was aware of no plans for repair. Although the neighborhoods were older, she suggested that the streets should not be allowed to further deteriorate.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:52 P.M. to a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission on May 15, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Conference Room, and thereafter to a regular meeting scheduled for May 22, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

RANDY JEROME, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission

May 8, 2001