MINUTES

OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE

PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION

April 10, 2001

A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, April 10, 2001, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Kelley, Leonard, Tumbaga, Valentine, Chairman Kee (Commissioner Leonard arrived after roll call)

Absent: None

Staff: Community Development Director Nasser Shirazi; Planning Manager Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Chris Bekiaris; Planning Technician Dana Hoggatt; Civil Engineer II Alfredo Hurtado.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, April 6, 2001.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Valentine led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES: March 27, 2001

Chairman Kee requested the following amendment to the first page under the heading Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Leonard led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Kee also suggested that the first motion on Page 17 should have been after the actual motion was made. He further requested that the first paragraph after the second motion on Page 17 be revised as follows:
In response to a member of the audience, Mr. John Garcia, as to the appropriateness of the Chair's abstention on the vote, the vote on the motion was retaken at which time Chairman Kee's abstention was not shown.

Commissioner Tumbaga requested the following amendment to the first sentence of the seventh paragraph on Page 13:

ROSEMARY RANDAZZO, a resident of East Twelfth Street, Pittsburg, advised that her mother resided on East Santa Fe Drive.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Holmes to approve the minutes of the March 27, 2001 meeting, as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Glynn and carried by the following vote:

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

MOTION: March 28, 2001

Motion by Commissioner Kelley to approve the minutes of the March 28, 2001 special meeting, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS:

There were no deletions or withdrawals.

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE:

C. deBONNEVILLE, a resident of Pittsburg, requested that the Planning Commission reinitiate her business license, which had been revoked as had a grading permit that the City had indicated had expired. She commented that she had left phone messages for Chief Building Official John Little regarding the status of violation notices on her property.

Ms. deBonneville otherwise suggested that the City was in violation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements since there was no railing on the steps to the dais.
Chairman Kee advised that if the steps to the dais were 30 inches or higher, a railing would be required. In this instance, no railing was required.

Mr. Jerome expressed the willingness to request that Mr. Little contact Ms. deBonneville to address her concerns.

**PRESENTATION:**

1. **Group 4 Architecture - Senior Citizens Center**

Planning Manager Randy Jerome introduced the members of Group 4 Architecture to provide an update on the Senior Citizens Center project and to identify some of the alternatives that staff and members of the design group had considered.

DAWN MERKES, Group 4 Architecture, presented the update on the Senior Citizens Center project, which was currently in the schematic design phase. The presentation identified the review of the building program, site analysis, site alternatives A through C, and presented recommendations for the siting of the building on the property site. The project site was identified as property located at Harbor Street and Presidio lane, consisting of 1.33 acres.

The programming phase of the project had concluded in February with the project now in the middle of the schematic design phase to be completed in the middle of June. Thereafter, the project would proceed through design development and the construction document phase. The project would go out to bid early in 2002, with construction expected to take 10 to 12 months.

Ms. Merkes identified the project team including staff from the Community Development and Leisure Services Departments. She reported that public participation had been extensive during the programming phase when three public workshops had been held with 106 attendees, and two focus group meetings had been held with 24 attendees.

Ms. Merkes explained that the goals identified for the project had been taken from the public workshops as well as the focus groups, along with overview and input from the project management team. The goals of the project included that the project be accessible to the entire community as well as the diverse cultural community of the City, and that the project be maintainable and sustainable for a long period of time. She added that since such projects only occurred once in a long while, they needed to be functional and flexible over the long term, clean, uplifting, comfortable and have a good relationship between the indoor and outdoor spaces, maximizing the outdoor space. The center should also be supportive of seniors and optimize partnership opportunities.

Seniors had indicated that they should have some input as to the operations of the center and that the center be efficient to operate. Through the program based on input from the seniors and from the focus groups and project management team, it had been determined that the building have an entry and reception area, lobby, lounge, and staff offices with a work room.
A consultation room would allow for space for possible partnership services such as tax assistance, health screening or other consultation services that could provide shared services to seniors. A main hall would include storage space and would also serve as a multi-purpose room. A kitchen with storage would also be provided and be a satellite or catering kitchen, including all commercial appliances. Additionally, a multi-purpose arts and crafts room, games and billiards room, computer laboratory with storage, and building support spaces were identified.

The building would involve approximately 10,000 square feet of program spaces with the spaces to be designed with flexibility in mind so as to support future technology and the demands of the seniors. The storage spaces would be integrated into each of the spaces to allow the seniors to set up the spaces themselves and break them down for different activities. Based on the building size, 60 parking spaces would be required.

Speaking to the project site, Ms. Merkes identified the location of the existing Stoneman Senior Housing Complex as well as the property where future housing had yet to be identified, apartment buildings currently under construction, an existing fire station on Harbor Street, Memorial Park and Small World Park. It was noted that the sun path was east to west across the site on the southern side with the wind direction from the west in an easterly direction.

Ms. Merkes reported that views from the site would be towards Harbor Street and Memorial Park, as well as from the community into the site and into nice landscaped areas in the parks. The pedestrian movements were anticipated to include both the senior housing projects as well from Harbor Street, where a bus stop was identified. Vehicle movements would be from Harbor Street onto Presidio Lane and into the site.

Three alternatives had been developed for the building. Alternative A identified the building on the east side of the site on Harbor Street with parking on the west side. The entry would be adjacent to the parking lot as well within close proximity to Stoneman Avenue and Harbor Street from the bus stop. Adjacent to the main hall would be a large protected outdoor patio. Shared parking opportunities with the senior housing project were noted.

Alternative B would have the building situated on the west side of the site with parking in the current parking lot and with entry into the building near Harbor Street. Alternative B would be tight, the patio from the main hall was not well located and not protected from the wind. The community presence from this alternative would be from the parking lot and the circulation was supported given that the ingress and egress from the parking lot would be separated, although pedestrian circulation was not in a satisfactory configuration.

Alternative C would locate the building in the center of the site surrounded by parking, with the pedestrian entrance in the center of the building. The patio would be on the protected east side of the site. The project management team had indicated that Alternative C was not an option they desired to pursue since the center would be surrounded by parking and the utilization of the site would not be as effective.
Ms. Merkes detailed the evaluation of each alternative and noted that while there were some negatives with respect to Alternative A with respect to parking and noise, that alternative had been given the most positive rating in terms of community presence, pedestrian access, since it would be close to Harbor Street where transportation was located and close to the senior housing and with respect to design opportunities, through the preservation of mature landscaping along Harbor Street, and that it represented an efficient use of the site.

As a result of the evaluation criteria, Ms. Merkes reported that the project management team had determined that Alternative A was the preferable option to develop in the schematic design. That design would be brought back to the Planning Commission during a meeting in June.

Commissioner Glynn agreed that Alternative A was the most appropriate design, although he inquired how bus traffic would be delivered to the site through that design alternative, to which Ms. Merkes detailed a pullout that would be developed for bus traffic.

Commissioner Glynn inquired how the trash enclosure would be located or addressed, to which Ms. Merkes identified the location of the main hall and the kitchen. The trash enclosure would be located near the kitchen with an enclosure that would be well screened. She emphasized that they would be sensitive as to how the trash would be handled and to ensure that it was screened from public view.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not the seniors would have covered access to the building from the bus drop-off point.

Ms. Merkes explained that such detail had yet to be developed, although ideally the bus drop-off point would be pulled within close walking distance to the building entrance. More detailed information would be included in the building design.

Ms. Merkes clarified that the project would take 10 to 12 months to construct and could be open in late fall 2002. All funding was in place for the facility. In the event that additional funding was required, they would be required to approach the City Council with a request.

Commissioner Leonard commented that given the location of the kitchen and with the direction of the wind, odors from the garbage disposal area could affect the proposed location of the outdoor patio.

Ms. Merkes acknowledged that wind was an issue in the City and as the design developed, the project might be addressed through the Berkeley Wind Tunnel model to review how to effectively screen the patio from the wind.

Chairman Kee thanked Group 4 Architecture for the presentation.

2. **Code Enforcement Report**
Mr. Jerome advised that Commander William Hendricks was in charge of the Code Enforcement Bureau. The Planning Commission had requested an update on code enforcement activities. He suggested that the Commission determine after the presentation how often it preferred to receive future updates.

COMMANDER WILLIAM HENDRICKS, Code Enforcement Bureau, reported that the Bureau had expanded since his last presentation to the Commission subsequent to the receipt of a State Community Development Code Enforcement Incentive Program Grant. The City of Pittsburg was one of four agencies funded on a three-year program and the only Northern California agency to be so designated.

The Code Enforcement Bureau had now been retitled as the Strategic Operations Bureau, and consisted of Code Enforcement, the Narcotics Unit and the High Impact Criminal Investigation Team.

As part of the State grant, Commander Hendricks reported that over a three-year period, approximately $900,000 would provide for one additional sworn Police Officer, two Code Enforcement Officers and two Code Enforcement Aides. The Bureau was funded on multiple levels, through General funds, funding through the National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, and the State of California Alcoholic Beverage Control Program. The Bureau had also been a recipient of a three-year funding source through the ABC.

Commander Hendricks reported that when Code Enforcement had begun, there was a 40 percent plus sales rate of the sale of alcohol to minors in the community, which was now down to under 1.5 percent. The bureau was also funded by a grant that would last through September 2001, from Integrated Waste Management, for a tire enforcement program.

Commander Hendricks added that in 1996, Code Enforcement working for the Community Development Department, had amassed 1,800 cases. In 2000, Code Enforcement initiated 9,860 new cases, including public nuisances, weed and rubbish, mandatory garbage, non-domestic animals, and zoning complaints. Most of the public nuisance efforts had focused on substandard properties. The focus within the Bureau was neighborhood preservation, improving the community image, reducing the conditions of slum and blight, and reducing the environment for disruptive behavior that could lead to neighborhood issues and problems that could reduce the quality of life leading to criminal activity.

The Bureau had worked to establish and revise community standards to impact and improve the quality of life. Within the focus of the Code Enforcement Incentive Program Grant, a large portion of the work done would focus on quality of life issues and maintaining fair and equitable, safe and affordable housing, particularly in some of the downtown areas and target zones in the CDBG Programs.
The Bureau had also established partnerships with the Community Development Department and had been working hand in hand with the Building and Planning Departments, particularly with respect to sensitive business uses. The Bureau was also working closely with economic development through the redevelopment program and were focusing on the Railroad Avenue Corridor, beginning at the freeway traveling north.

Commander Hendricks stated that it was anticipated that the Phoenix Ordinance would be presented to the Council later in the year. The Phoenix Ordinance was described as an ordinance out of Phoenix, Arizona, that had been court tested and which prohibited the abandonment or boarding of property for a period of one year, without the property owner taking active efforts to revive the property for a living area, living quarter, work/live or work commercial business.

The Bureau was also working with the Public Services Department on all of their clean ups since the City had experienced serious problems with the dumping of tires and automotive parts. Some of the ways that issue had been addressed was to approach all of the automotive related businesses that dealt with tires, including auto body shops, tow yards, and businesses that accumulated tires. The City had also had problems with illegal hauling businesses.

Describing the area of West Santa Fe Avenue as a serious problem area, Commander Hendricks reported that the City had averaged no less than 300 tires a month over a one year period. Although surveillance cameras and other methods had been used to curb dumping, the Bureau had been unable to completely stop that activity. He added that in working with the railroad, fencing had been installed all the way down Santa Fe Avenue, at no cost to the City.

Commander Hendricks identified a number of cases on a number of properties where working with the property owners a demolition of structures had occurred to remove unsafe conditions and to allow other development possibilities.

Speaking to the West Tenth Street Corridor, Commander Hendricks identified several properties that were now in a state of rehabilitation through the collaborative efforts of the Planning and Building Departments to ensure that the buildings conformed to current codes. The Bureau was also working with the landlords along the West Boulevard area to establish some standard landlord/tenant documents to provide for manageable properties.

Another area of concern was the corner of East Tenth and Cumberland Street. That property had been purchased by a church that planned to develop a large school and church complex. The church had sufficient funding for the project and should meet the City's architectural requirements.

Another area that was being addressed was a parcel currently for sale in the area of Garcia Drive and Freed Way. That property had previously been occupied by a company that manufactured templates for cans. The City had experienced serious dumping problems at that site and the owner had paid extensive abatement fees to have the property cleaned. Through the City's efforts, the owner was permitted to install security fencing, which had stopped the problems with dumping and which had
made the property more appealing to prospective buyers.

Commander Hendricks emphasized that within the grant program, the Bureau would have funds for the next three years to focus on improving and maintaining the condition of affordable housing in the community and to work diligently in the West Boulevard area to bring those properties up to code.

Commander Hendricks added that through the presentation and possible adoption of the Phoenix Ordinance or similar ordinances, the Bureau could address buildings that had been boarded up and/or otherwise abandoned. The Bureau was also working to address abandoned properties, those in tax default or about to face default, and was working with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on a new program where if a property owner had a property on the market for 90 days and it did not sell, the City could acquire the property for $1.

At the direction of the City Manager, the position of a Property Manager who would focus on the development, acquisition, or sale of City owned properties to better the community was also being considered.

Commander Hendricks stated that the Bureau was also working on the commercial centers of the City. He referenced the Town Center, which had been known as Atlantic Plaza, and which was located on the north side of Atlantic Avenue in front of the site where Seeno Development was now developing apartment units. The City had a long standing problem with that property related to trash and debris from those using the dumpsters. Work had been done to resolve those issues through the use of automatic controlled gates and a commitment from the property owner to work with code enforcement and the Planning Commission to design trash receptacles that would prevent trash from overflowing out of the area.

Commander Hendricks added that the Bureau would also review other commercial areas in the City to ensure that the City did not have problems with pollutant exposure, such as those associated with automotive businesses, was focused on the area of Bliss Avenue, Clark, Garcia and the automotive related uses and were working closely with the Planning Department and the NPDES Program to resolve some of those issues, was working more closely on the area of the Marina, and on other enforcement issues relating to derelict boats, vessels, and learning the harbor and navigation codes. Four to five boats had been removed from the Marina, which were determined to be a hazard and which had impacted the quality of life at the Marina.

Referencing the Tenth Street and the Downtown Commercial Corridor, Commander Hendricks acknowledged concerns with some of the properties on East Fifth Street and Third Street. The Bureau was actively seeking to resolve those issues.

It was hoped that within 30 days they would have an established and written plan through working with the property owners and others to address the concerns with the condition of those properties.
As to the Downtown Commercial Corridor, particularly the area of East Tenth Street, many buildings had changed hands. The rehabilitation of the entire block was currently under consideration.

Commander Hendricks further commented on the efforts of code enforcement to deal with sensitive use businesses, in conjunction with the Planning Commission, to ensure that the businesses complied with the conditions of approval imposed by the Planning Commission.

Commander Hendricks encouraged Commissioners to utilize the existing zoning complaint form to be forwarded to the appropriate department for resolution. He also advised that the fiscal year end report for the Bureau would be complete in July or August. He expressed the willingness to return with a status report at that time.

Commissioner Holmes advised of continual problems with basketball hoops left in the middle of the street, particularly in the area of Carpino, Vincent and School Streets. He advised that he had raised his concerns with the Planning Commission and with the Traffic and Circulation Committee, but the problems had persisted. He expressed concern with the potential safety hazards.

Commander Hendricks commented that code enforcement had been dealing with the issue for the past year. He affirmed that there had been two collisions that had occurred on the south side of the City as a result of basketball hoops left in the street.

Commander Hendricks noted that with the closure of the Marina Center, that had eliminated an area for youth to play basketball. He also understood that the development and completion of the Teen Center on Crestview Drive would not be completed for another year. The Bureau had drafted a letter to the City Manager to address the issue. That correspondence would advise people that basketball hoops on any public property, on the sidewalk or in the street, was an encroachment and violation of City code. As such, the hoops could be taken by the City.

Commander Hendricks emphasized the need to address such situations carefully.

In response to Commissioner Leonard, Commander Hendricks acknowledged that Industry Road was another focus of the Bureau. He noted that one of the businesses that was in violation of City ordinances since 1982, was a property located on Industry Way. The bureau was in the process of a multi-task force investigation and had issued numerous fines to that business. Another enforcement action would be taken and the Bureau was working with the District Attorney to address the situation. The subject property owner was well aware of the matter and aware that there could be a criminal penalty or arrest.

Speaking to the proposal from U. S. Glass and Aluminum that was on the current agenda, Commander Hendricks advised that the Bureau was strongly supportive of such development, which he characterized as projects they would like to see in the City. Referencing the property that was tagged on Industry Way, he noted that he did not anticipate that that business would reopen, absent
the owner proposing something that was in compliance with the City's zoning codes and applicable State building code.

Commissioner Glynn referenced the area of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway at a curve on West Tenth Street, where an auto auction business had vehicles queuing at the side of the road pending an opportunity to place a vehicle into a wrecking yard. He questioned whether or not the same business or other automotive businesses in the City, were in compliance with current regulations, as related to the recovery of liquids from vehicles.

Commander Hendricks noted the need to review the area of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway to ensure that all those properties were within the Bureau's jurisdictional limits. He acknowledged that the West Tenth Corridor had been a long standing problem where many inspections had been conducted resulting in tremendous fines from the State, which fines had been paid by the property owner. A site inspection had been conducted in that area in relation to the NPDES Program on Industry Road and the mid-block of West Tenth Street.

The Bureau had also brought in the Bay Area Air Management Quality Control District (BAAQMD) to provide assistance and had brought in the Highway Patrol, Environmental Health Services, and the Department of Motor Vehicles as well, when needed. He referenced property at 680 Garcia Road where flagrant violations had occurred and which had currently been resolved. He stated that currently no automotive tenants were without a use permit at that site.

Commissioner Valentine congratulated Commander Hendricks on a job well done, although he referenced the Stroup property and questioned why the City could not purchase the property and resolve an ongoing eyesore.

Commander Hendricks described the Stroup property as an unfortunate series of situations. The City had required the property owner to do certain things, which had been done although what had been done had been substandard. The property owner sued the contractor and had won the suit, although the contractor had appealed the decision.

Code Enforcement had gone in to take enforcement action and had required that the weeds and debris be immediately removed and that the crushed diesel truck trailers located at the bottom of the ravine be removed. Through an administrative hearing, it had also been ordered that large blocks of cement be removed. It had later been learned that the cement might have been approved back in the 1970's by the Planning Commission at that time, to be utilized as road bed material under Leland Road. As a result, if the cement was allowed, the City could not require the property owner to remove the cement. The City was caught in a quandary and it was hoped that through the partnership the Bureau had with both the Building and Planning Departments, it would prevent such instances from occurring in the future.

Commander Hendricks acknowledged that there were a number of complaints regarding the Stroup property. He understood that there was still litigation pending on the property, based on the contractor's appeal.
Commissioner Valentine expressed support for a code enforcement update three times a year. Chairman Kee agreed that a status report from the Bureau would be appropriate three times a year. Mr. Jerome suggested that a code enforcement update be tentatively scheduled for the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for July 10, 2001. He also commented that once the update of the General Plan was completed, the City would be working to update certain areas of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff would be working with Commander Hendricks and his staff to learn where changes could be made.

Commissioner Glynn understood that the City's Sign Ordinance had not been updated since 1987 and should be included in any discussion with Commander Hendricks. He inquired whether or not that could be updated concurrently with the update of the General Plan.

Mr. Jerome explained that the Sign Ordinance was a separate title under the Municipal Code and was segregated from the Zoning Ordinance. An update of the Sign Ordinance should be dealt with separately.

Commissioner Tumbaga encouraged Commander Hendricks to pursue working with HUD on a good neighbor program and to keep in mind that Pacific Community Services (PCS) had been very active in acquiring HUD REO properties and rehabilitating those properties and turning them over. She encouraged Commander Hendricks to contact the Executive Director of PCS to see if there was a possible partnership with that program.

Commissioner Kelley inquired how long a motor home could be parked on the street, to which Commander Hendricks advised that a motor home could be parked on the street for a 72 hour period. Smaller motor homes on a van frame that were driven on a regular basis and which could be considered as a primary vehicle, unless stored on the street beyond the 72 hour period, were probably legal.

Chairman Kee inquired of the policy for big rigs being parked in residential areas.

Commander Hendricks advised that per the Zoning Code, big rigs were not permitted in a residential area. Officers had issued citations where such vehicles were parked in residential areas since they were off the truck routes, although some individuals had opposed the tickets indicating that such restrictions had not been posted. Since it was required that such parking restrictions be posted, the City would begin citing vehicles for zoning violations that prohibited a truck, other than a pick-up or lower weight truck, in a residential area.

Chairman Kee expressed his appreciation to Commander Hendricks for the detailed report.

**COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:**
ITEM 1: U.S. Glass and Aluminum, DR-01.08.
Application by John Brimmer of U.S. Glass and Aluminum requesting approval of architectural drawings for site improvements, construction of a 7,500 square foot storage building, remodeling of an existing 2,100 square foot storage building and landscape plan located at 12 Industry Road, CS (Service Commercial) zone; APN 073-042-005.

Mr. Jerome advised that the application was for design review of improvements to the property located at 12 Industry Road. The applicant had appeared before the Commission at the last meeting to advise of the proposal in light of proposed changes to the General Plan, changes that might not necessarily fall into what the applicant had proposed for the site. The applicant had requested assurance from the Commission at that time that he should move forward with the proposal. Consequently, the applicant had acquired the property and had made application for the design review of the requested improvements.

Associate Planner Chris Bekiaris presented the request for the approval of architectural drawings for site improvements, construction of a 7,500 square foot storage building, remodeling of an existing 2,100 square foot storage building and a landscape plan for the property at 12 Industry Road.

U.S. Glass and Aluminum was now located on East Third Street. The applicant intended to divide the business between office and light custom manufacturing on Industry Road. The office would remain on East Third Street, with the manufacturing aspect to move to Industry Road. There were currently three buildings on the site. The applicant planned to demolish the building in the middle and replace it with a 7,500 square foot metal building. The building on the north side of the new structure would remain and within a year it was anticipated that building would be remodeled to appear similar to the new building.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that at the time of the preparation of the staff report, staff was unaware of the plans for the small building located on the south side of the site. That building would either remain or be demolished.

Mr. Bekiaris stated that the size and color details had been identified in the staff report. There would be sufficient parking on the site for the use. The applicant planned to landscape and irrigate the property, which would be an improvement to Industry Road.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that there might be some future expansion to the building in the rear. If that was the case, Planning Commission review and approval of a design review application would be required. He added that due to the expansion, the rear portion of the site would be left in a rock gravel situation, which was acceptable to staff.

The business was considered as Custom Manufacturing and was a permitted use in the Zoning District. Under the new General Plan, light assembly work would also be allowed under the Marine Commercial Zoning designation.

Mr. Bekiaris recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9200, approving
architectural and landscape plans for DR-01-08, with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Holmes inquired who would be responsible for the maintenance of the street leading off of Harbor Street into the subject site.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that the property had been subdivided illegally many years ago before it became a part of the City. The street was now the responsibility of the City and was in the public right-of-way. It had been repaved three to four years ago, and a new water line had been installed with new sewers as well. The subject building and any other new building would have to connect to the water and sewer system.

Commissioner Glynn commented that while they may not be directly related to the property, there were several issues that should be considered by the applicant. Speaking to the site location, he identified a gap in the railroad spur, where every year major flooding had occurred. He questioned what the flood situation would be with respect to the subject property.

Commissioner Glynn also referenced an application from Koch Carbon to replace three domes that would necessitate the reactivation of the railroad spur to reach the domes. He questioned how that would affect the proposed project. In addition, he commented that due to the corner location of the lot on Harbor Street and Third Street, when traveling east one would have to divert into the oncoming lane from the right turn off of Third Street in order to travel right and around the building.

In order to improve the safety margin, and with the amount of truck traffic anticipated in the area, Commissioner Glynn inquired how the corner would be modified.

Commissioner Glynn further recommended that the street pavement should be improved due to the truck traffic in and out of the street and since the street was the responsibility of the City.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that a drainage plan would have to be submitted and the applicant would have to address the drainage off of the property. As to the concerns with respect to the railroad spur to Koch Carbon, he noted that the use was in the future with no immediate plans to use the railroad. It was on its own right-of-way and would not go through the subject property. He was otherwise unfamiliar with the flooding situation referenced by Commissioner Glynn.

PROPOSENENTS:

JOHN BRIMMER, U.S. Glass and Aluminum, Inc., 190 East Third Street, Pittsburg, explained that the site was 80 percent concrete or asphalt so that any additional drainage would be minimal. The railroad spur was at a lower elevation than the actual property, which elevation would be addressed to ensure that the property was not negatively impacted.

Mr. Brimmer commented that the street was City property and was currently littered with abandoned vehicles from a nearby wrecking company. He supported a clean up of the area. In response to the
Chair, he acknowledged that he had read the conditions of approval and was in agreement with those conditions.

Commissioner Kelley inquired of the plans for the building on the south side of the property.

Mr. Brimmer advised that he was uncertain of the structural integrity of the building on the south side. Uncertain what would be done with the building at this time, he commented that if proven to be usable that building could be used as an office.

Mr. Bekiaris stated that the conditions of approval included a condition that would either require the retention or the removal of the building on the south side of the property.

Commissioner Leonard inquired whether or not there were any environmental issues with respect to the property site.

DAVE STANLEY commented that an environmental report had been prepared and had been submitted and reviewed by the County. The County had indicated that the report was sufficient and that no further information would be required.

Referencing Condition No. 12, Commissioner Valentine suggested that it be modified to allow the applicant a 90 day period to address the building on the south end of the site rather than the one year that had been recommended. As such, he recommended the following modification:

12. The small structure at the south end of the site shall be remodeled per the submitted plans within 90 days of the date of the approval of this resolution or the building shall be demolished.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Kelley to adopt Resolution No. 9200, approving DR-01-08, design review approval of architectural and landscape plans for a custom manufacturing building and exterior modifications for U.S. Glass and Aluminum, with the conditions as shown and the modification to Condition No. 12, as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

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

ITEM 2: San Marco Subdivision Entry Signs. DR-01-10. Application by Richard Sestero of Seecon Financial and Construction Company requesting design review approval and a sign exception for size, height, sign area and illumination for a freestanding
Mr. Jerome reported that San Marco was commencing with construction at the west end of the City. Design review for the first phase had been approved by the Commission a few months ago. San Marco Boulevard was now complete but had yet to open to the public.

The developer was ready to start marketing the subdivision and place their subdivision signs. The developer expressed a desire for signage that would stand out. Options for entry features would be presented to the Commission in the near future. A large identification sign for San Marco was being discussed between the developer and staff and would be submitted to the Commission when refined.

The sign before the Commission was an entry sign for Unit 1 and would require some exceptions under the Sign Ordinance.

Planning Technician Dana Hoggatt presented the request for design review approval and a sign exception for size, height, sign area and illumination for a freestanding neighborhood identification sign to be located at the southeast corner of San Marco Boulevard and Santa Lucia Drive. A color board was presented to the Commission for review.

Ms. Hoggatt acknowledged that two signs had been submitted, although only one was being presented at this time for Unit 1, for the Serrano Development. The other sign would be presented at a later date.

The sign would be located at the southeast corner of Santa Lucia Drive and San Marco Boulevard, the first intersection immediately south of the current State Route 4, San Marco Boulevard Interchange, to be located on a landscaped parcel within the subdivision and to be dedicated to the City once the subdivision had been completed.

The sign structure would have a staggered footprint and be set back 12 feet from the back of the sidewalk on San Marco Boulevard and five feet back from the sidewalk on Santa Lucia Drive. Staff did not anticipate any traffic visibility problems with the setbacks. At the highest point, the structure would be approximately eight feet tall, with the sign face, gold lettering and blue tile and red frame around the blue tile at approximately four feet in height.

Stating that the Planning Commission had the authority to review applications for freestanding signs, Ms. Hoggatt reiterated that the sign plans, as submitted, did not comply with Title 19, which currently permitted neighborhood identification signs that were not illuminated, that were no more than five feet tall, and which had a sign face no more than 15 square feet in size.

Ms. Hoggatt explained that staff was of the opinion that the sign exception, as requested, was appropriate due to the larger size of the subdivision. In addition, current Title 19 standards were out of date and when the standards were created they had not anticipated subdivisions or signs of the neighborhood identification sign to be located at the southeast corner of San Marco Boulevard and Santa Lucia Drive, PD (Planned Development) zone; APN 097-150-007.
subject size.

The sign request would be exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Class Eleven, Accessory Structures.

Ms. Hoggatt recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9201, approving DR-01-10, with the conditions as shown.

In response to Commissioner Glynn, Ms. Hoggatt affirmed that the sign would include ground illumination.

Commissioner Valentine recommended that the applicant be required to incorporate energy efficient wattage for the sign, with measurable standards identified, to ensure that the sign would be energy efficient, particularly since the City would eventually own the sign.

In response to Commissioner Leonard, Mr. Jerome explained that the sign plans submitted to the Commission included many of the construction details that the Commission would not normally receive as part of such applications.

PROONENT:

RICHARD SESTERO, Seecon Financial and Construction Company, 4021 Port Chicago Highway, Concord, reiterated that Unit 1 for the San Marco residential subdivision, would be identified as Serrano and the sign would also be part of the landscape entry to Unit 1. He explained that the developer wanted to set a quality tone for the project. He referenced the Highlands Ranch development located off of Buchanan Road, which had similar entry signage, with a gazebo/rock stone feature designed for that development. He suggested that the sign size that had been proposed would be warranted for a project the size of San Marco.

Mr. Sestero affirmed that the sign would be located in an area that would be maintained by a Landscaping and Lighting District and would involve fluorescent lighting. He expressed the willingness to have staff review the lighting for the sign to ensure its efficiency in terms of energy use. The sign would otherwise involve low level lighting at the ground level and should not be intrusive.

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

Commissioner Valentine recommended the following amendment to Condition No. 9:

9. The Applicant shall ensure that exterior lighting or other illumination of the sign
shall be designed and installed so as not to interfere with the vision of drivers on San Marco Boulevard or Santa Lucia Drive, with the applicant to incorporate energy efficient lighting into the sign.

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Glynn to adopt Resolution No. 9201, approving DR-01-10, design review and a sign exception for a freestanding neighborhood identification sign for the first phase of the San Marco Residential Subdivision at San Marco Boulevard and State Route 4, "San Marco, Unit 1", with the conditions as shown and the modification to Condition No. 9 as presented.

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

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

ITEM 3: Resolution of Denial for RZ-00-13 and DR-00-17 (Albertson's Shopping Center Retail and Storage).

Mr. Jerome reported that the resolutions of denial had been returned to the Commission for action in response to the action taken by the Commission during the March 27 meeting, where by a vote of six to one, the Commission had denied RZ-00-13 and DR-00-17, Albertson's Shopping Center Shurgard Retail and Storage projects.

Mr. Jerome clarified that the ten day appeal period had commenced as of the Commission's decision on March 27, 2001. He reported that the action of the Planning Commission had been appealed by the applicant.

MOTION: RZ-00-03

Motion by Commissioner Valentine to adopt Resolution No. 9197, recommending a denial of RZ-00-03, a request for rezoning from an existing CC (Community Commercial) zone to CC-0 (Community Commercial with a Limited Overlay) zone to allow warehousing and mini-storage for Albertson's shopping center retail and storage, with the findings as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holmes and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Kelley, Leonard, Valentine, Kee
Noes: Commissioner Tumbaga
Abstain: None
MOTION: DR-00-17

Motion by Commissioner Valentine to adopt Resolution No. 9198, denying DR-00-17, site development and architectural plans for Albertson's shopping center retail and storage located at Railroad Avenue and Frontage Road, with the findings as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holmes and carried by the following vote:

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

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Jerome reiterated that the Albertson's shopping center retail and storage (Shurgard) project had been appealed by the applicant to the City Council and had been scheduled for consideration by the Council on May 21. The approval of Pittsburg Family Apartments had been appealed with the appeal scheduled for consideration by the Council on May 7. In addition, the design review application for Koch Carbon had also been appealed. That appeal had been scheduled for Council consideration on June 4.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATED REPORT:

Mr. Jerome reported that the General Plan Update meeting that had been scheduled for April 11 had been continued to Tuesday, April 17, 2001. During that meeting, the Commission would be provided with a strikeout version that would incorporate any changes proposed to the General Plan. He encouraged that written comments be provided to staff as soon as possible.

Mr. Jerome advised that Dyett and Bhatia consultants had been retained to prepare a more extensive visual analysis, which analysis was expected within two weeks, with a continued public hearing to be scheduled on hillside development policies.

Mr. Jerome further commented that staff was still working to schedule a field trip to view the City's hillside sites as soon as possible.

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR REPORT:

Mr. Jerome reported that the Zoning Administrator had denied an application for the Bustamante Fence Exception that had been continued from a February meeting. The denial of the request had been based on recommendations from Planning and Code Enforcement staff. The applicant had the ability to appeal the Zoning Administrator's decision within ten days of the decision in writing to the
City Clerk. If appealed, it would be brought to the Planning Commission for consideration.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

Commissioner Holmes reported that the Traffic and Circulation Advisory Committee had recently met and had received reports from staff on a field investigation of traffic cutting through the residential areas during commute periods, from Railroad Avenue through Harbor Street. Three options would be presented to the Committee to address those concerns. Those options included the installation of stop signs, allowing the traffic to go through the neighborhoods, or restrict right turning movements off of Railroad Avenue from 4:30 to 7:00 P.M.

Commissioner Holmes also noted that the BPOE (Elks Lodge) was attempting to relocate off of Frontage Road to the City of Antioch as a result of the widening of State Route 4.

Commissioner Holmes further commented that the Community Development Director had advised the Committee that the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway would be closed for ten weeks or more from Loveridge Road to Columbia Street, in order to elevate and raise the street level to prevent flooding on the roadway during inclement weather. Traffic would be rerouted during that time until the repairs were completed.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that the only business that would be impacted would be USS-POSCO, which could access the property from another gate.

**COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Glynn reported that he had been involved in several transportation committees headed by Senator Tom Torlakson. He also noted that a presentation on the eBART concept had been provided this date to the Rotary Club by the Vice President of BART.

Commissioner Glynn expressed concern with the future closure of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway and how it would interface with traffic traveling east and west. He expressed concern that it would prove to be difficult to get around town in an east-west direction with roadwork occurring. He emphasized the need to coordinate all efforts with other construction projects in the City. He also noted that the City of Antioch was pursuing a number of construction projects in the area and that there was a great potential for massive traffic problems in the City.

Commissioner Kelley inquired whether or not staff was aware of a property located off of Leland and Bailey Road where a home had placed a large unattractive tent in the front yard.

Ms. Hoggatt affirmed that staff was aware of the property and that Code Enforcement had taken photographs of the property. She noted that the tent was apparently being used to cover storage items. The tent structure was located in the front yard, was not stable, and was a violation of City code. The tent was also considered a public nuisance since if it was removed, there was a lot of
items that would be left located in the front yard. Staff was working with Code Enforcement to resolve the issue.

In response to Commissioner Tumbaga, Mr. Jerome explained that the rationale for prohibiting a six foot high fence in front yards was that front yards were considered an extension of the open space, to offer an open yard and to prevent enclosures around a street. City code stipulated that a fence be no higher than three feet in height in a front yard. A low barricade could be installed that would define a property or enclose the area for animals or children.

Mr. Jerome added that a fence could be as high as four and a half feet if an open fence, such as a picket, wrought iron or chain link fence. Anything higher than four and a half feet would require the approval of a fence exception.

Commissioner Tumbaga commented that there were a couple of homes in the City where the homes were set back and where a garage jut out where a wall was built to enclose a portion of the yard from the garage to the end of the sideyard, resulting in a courtyard in the front yard. She did not see any problem with those types of situations.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that at times there were no problems with such situations, although under the law, a fence exception would require approval under the appropriate regulations.

Mr. Bekiaris clarified that in most of the cases described by Commissioner Tumbaga, the garage was typically 20 feet back from the property line. As a result, a courtyard was legally created in those cases.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:46 P.M. to a special meeting of the Planning Commission on April 17, 2001 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

[Signature]

RANDY JEROME, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission
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