A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Kee at 7:33 P.M. on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Glynn, Holmes, Kelley, Leonard, Tumbagag, Valentine, Chairman Kee

Absent: None

Staff: Community Development Director Nasser Shirazi; Planning Manager Randy Jerome; Associate Planner Chris Bekiaris; Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram; Assistant Planner Ken Strelo; and Civil Engineer II Alfredo Hurtado.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairman Kee advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, April 20, 2001.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Valentine led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES: April 10, 2001

Commissioner Glynn requested the following amendments.

To the last sentence in the fifth paragraph on Page 13:

He [Mr. Bekiaris] was otherwise unfamiliar with the flooding situation referenced by Commissioner Glynn who requested at some point in time that he and Commissioner Glynn visit the area to review the property on Industrial Way after a heavy rain.
To the last paragraph on Page 15:

*Commissioner Glynn asked if the sign would be illuminated and be controlled by a photoelectric or energy saving switch.* In response to Commissioner Glynn, Ms. Hoggatt affirmed that the sign would include ground illumination and would include energy saving controls.

Commissioner Kelley requested an amendment to the fifth paragraph on Page 19, as follows:

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

MOTION:

Motion by Commissioner Holmes to approve the minutes of the April 10, 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

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS:

There were no deletions or withdrawals.

COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

Commissioner Glynn recommended that the Continued Public Hearing for the General Plan be placed at the end of the meeting agenda. 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
PUBLIC HEARING:

ITEM 1: 7-Eleven and CITGO Gas. UP-01-03 and DR-01-06.

Application by Roy Pedro of RHL Design Group, for 7-Eleven and CITGO Gas requesting a use permit for a grocery store and gas station approval of architectural drawings to construct a 2,940 square foot convenience store, fuel pump islands and canopy at the southwest corner of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road, CC (Community Commercial) zone; APN 074-460-017.

Mr. Jerome explained that the application was the first proposal for the Century Plaza 2 Commercial Subdivision that had been approved in 2000 in the area located between State Route 4 and the Century Plaza Shopping Center near Somersville Road, where various types of commercial uses had been proposed. He explained that gas stations and grocery stores required use permits.

Assistant Planner Ken Strelo presented the request from Roy Pedro of RHL Design Group for a use permit and approval of architectural drawings to construct a 2,940 square foot convenience store, fuel pump islands and canopy on a .9 acre site at the southwest corner of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road for a 7-Eleven and CITGO Gas station.

The design would include three fuel pump islands, each island with four pumps and a canopy covering the pumps, measuring 40 x 90 feet. Two freestanding signs had also been proposed for the project. One sign would be located on the corner of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road to be set back approximately 15 feet from the property line. The other sign would be located on the northwest corner of the lot on Century Boulevard.

Both freestanding signs were approximately 32.5 square feet, 8 feet from grade. Additional signage would consist of 7-Eleven signage that would be placed on the front of the convenience store and CITGO signage to be placed on the canopy of the gas station pumps.

The physical design of the structure would involve a plaster finish, with canvas awnings above the storefront windows to be located on all elevations. Tile would accent the facade and would be attached to the columns found on all elevations. Trellises would be attached to the exterior walls on both the side and rear elevations. Vegetation would be planted at the trellis locations. The main building would be approximately 28 feet in height and the canopy and building would match one another. The business would operate 24 hours a day.

Mr. Strelo stated that the project involved a grocery store and gas station use that would fall unto a use classified as Service Station, requiring the approval of a use permit.

Mr. Strelo added that the traffic studies that had been prepared for Century Plaza 2 had analyzed the subdivision from a state of total buildout. The project would not create a more significant level of traffic as analyzed in the prior study. All of the signage complied with Title 19 of the City of Pittsburg Municipal Code. The project was also exempt under Class 32, Infill Development Projects, pursuant to the regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
Mr. Strelo recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9203, approving UP-01-03 and Resolution No. 9204, approving DR-01-06, with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Valentine requested clarification as to the trees proposed to be removed from the site, to which Mr. Strelo stated that he was uncertain of the exact tree species to be removed. He noted that the City's Park Planner had reviewed the proposed landscaping with the Landscape Architect and had found that the trees proposed to be removed were located in the center of the site. As a result, the City's Park Planner had proposed mitigation to install larger trees than those typically recommended in such cases.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSENT:

ROY PEDRO, RHL Design Group, 650 Howe Avenue, #504, Sacramento, was present to represent 7-Eleven Incorporated. He presented elevations of the proposed project to the Commission and advised that the developer had gone through a number of mitigation measures with the City's Park Planner. He added that the Landscape Architect had met with City representatives on site to discuss any potential issues and any mitigation measures in order to allow for a contiguous development of the site.

Mr. Pedro advised that the remainder of the center had been envisioned to match the project's colors and would be comprised of similar architecture. The building would consist of stucco material, with columns and tile wainscoting, canvas awning roofs and a metal roof on top. A canopy would have two fuel dispensers on each pump. The canopy would also match the color and texture of the building.

The site plan had identified large sized trees that were not normally planned in this stage of development. Those trees had been included at the recommendation of the City's Park Planner to mitigate the trees that had been identified for removal.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Pedro affirmed that he had read the conditions of approval and was in agreement with those conditions. He clarified that the facility would be open on a 24-hour basis and that the facility would sell beer and wine in closed containers. The applicants had applied for State Alcohol Beverage and Control (ABC) permits and were in agreement with the staff recommendations for all the conditions contained therein, including additional conditions as reflected in a staff memorandum dated April 24, 2001.

Commissioner Holmes inquired of the background of RHL Design Group, to which Mr. Pedro explained that RHL Design Group [Robert H. Lee] had been in business since 1966 and primarily designed service and fueling stations, with primary clients identified as Shell, Chevron, and Arco. Commissioner Valentine inquired whether or not any energy efficient standards would be incorporated into the building design.
Mr. Pedro explained that it was a priority of 7-Eleven Incorporated to comply with energy conservation measures, particularly since 7-Eleven Corporate was headquartered in the State of Texas.

He commented that when the energy crisis had arisen, RHL Design Group had met with Southern California Edison, and PG&E to inquire what mitigation measures could be placed in the building design to reduce utility fees and to save energy.

As a result of those discussions, a low voltage lighting system would be utilized that would result in 30 percent less energy than currently placed in service stations. In addition, one condensing unit would be mounted on the roof in order to serve all chilled refrigeration equipment located within the interior of the building.

Mr. Pedro also commented that a white duralast roofing system would be implemented rather than a dark colored roof. Such material had already been implemented through retrofitting of existing buildings, with successful results. Additionally, lamps would be utilized outside of the facility and would consist of a high intensity metal halide light that would reduce energy and cover more area in a direct disbursement process.

Mr. Pedro further commented that RHL Design Group had an energy program being utilized in conjunction with LSI Lighting and Sylvania Lighting, to be implemented into their stores to reduce energy consumption by nearly 25 percent for lighting alone. All of the measures described would be implemented into the subject project.

INTERESTED SPEAKER:

BRUCE OHLSON, a resident of Pittsburg, expressed concern with the overall traffic and circulation on Century Boulevard and commented that Century Boulevard had been identified in the General Plan 2000 as a major street, which had been planned for the installation of bicycle lanes. As currently constructed, he noted that Century Boulevard had curbs and gutters installed, although the road was not wide enough for two vehicle traffic lanes in each direction, let alone allow for the installation of bicycle lanes in each direction. As such, he requested that the Planning Commission direct the applicant to set the project back an additional eight feet from the curb line so that bicycle lanes may be installed at a future date.

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Mr. Jerome affirmed that Century Boulevard had been identified in the General Plan as an existing on-street facility, for a Class One or Class Two bicycle lane. Class One was identified where there was room for a bicycle lane although it was not specifically dedicated as such.
In a review of the City's Master Plan, Mr. Jerome stated that it had identified Century Boulevard as an existing facility, which was adequate. At this time, it would not be necessary to widen the road for bicycle lanes.

The General Plan had also identified bicycle lanes with connections from Somersville Road down Century Boulevard, all the way down Leland Road from the east part of town to the west part of town.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired of the Storm Pollution Prevention device and how it would stabilize the soil from erosion during the construction period.

Mr. Strelo explained that the conditions as identified in the resolution were standards from the City's Storm Water Management Plan, which helped the City comply with the National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) elimination permit. Mitigation devices that were typically used included black nylon fences, gravel bags and hay bales. The devices were used to control sediment and erosion during the time of construction, particularly during periods of rainfall, and helped to mitigate other pollutants from entering the storm drain.

The subject project would include post constructive measures and would have a different type of paving for the front half of the parking spaces, including a more pervious surface which would be more porous than what would be paved on the remainder of the site increasing infiltration of rainfall and eliminating oil or gasoline that may drip from parked vehicles.

Commissioner Valentine requested that an additional condition be imposed that the applicant would carry through with an energy efficient design as much as possible through the use of energy efficient standards of construction.

Commissioner Leonard requested clarification from staff as to the adequacy of the roadway for bicycle lanes. He inquired whether or not the existing roadway, which he understood had been specifically designated for a bicycle lane, had the necessary space to accommodate a bicycle lane.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that per the General Plan it spoke to bike paths, lanes and routes. He commented that Class One was identified as a bicycle path and was a segregated separated bicycle facility and was not part of the street. Class Two Bicycle Lanes involved dedicated striping and a typical four-foot lane within a street as a bicycle lane.

A bicycle route was defined as not being physically segregate but used as a route for bicycles as opposed to a striped lane. The General Plan stated that the Contra Costa County Regional Transportation Planning Committee was currently reviewing an update of the Bicycle Action Plan, which designated on-street bike facilities, either bike lanes and/or routes. Bicycle lanes had been planned for all major streets including West Leland Road, the proposed San Marco Boulevard,
Montezuma Street and Century Boulevard.

Community Development Director Nasser Shirazi advised that the City would need to draw a cross section to determine whether or not the roadway could accommodate any of the alternatives described in the Bicycle Action Plan. He was uncertain whether or not that would be feasible with the existing configuration.

Commissioner Leonard inquired if the existing roadway did not accomplish the goal of the General Plan, whether or not a condition could be imposed on the subject project requiring the applicant to set the project back an additional eight feet from the curb line so that bicycle lanes could be installed at a future time.

Chairman Kee re-opened the public hearing in recognition of a request for additional public testimony.

RON RIVES, General Counsel, Vice President, Century Plaza Development Corporation, owners of Century Plaza and Century Plaza 2, stated that he was uncertain whether or not the current street would accommodate striped bike lanes, a path or a route. He noted the action before the Commission at this time was the approval of the use permit and design review. He advised that all of the issues concerning the width of the street, the location of the turn lanes and the striping for Century Boulevard had been discussed and had been the subject of intense negotiations and conditions on the entire Century 2 Subdivision.

Mr. Rives suggested that the time to speak to those issues should have been at the time the Century 2 Subdivision had been considered for approval. He emphasized that the Planning Commission and the City Council had approved issues regarding the roadway at the time the subdivision had been approved.

Mr. Shirazi clarified that Century Plaza 2 included all of the lots on the east side of the wasteway. He affirmed Mr. Rives' comments that there had been significant discussion regarding the roadway. He too was uncertain whether or not bicycle lanes had been included.

Associate Planner Chris Bekiaris advised that Century Plaza 3 had also already been approved by the Planning Commission with Century Boulevard.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION: UP-01-03

Motion by Commissioner Valentine to adopt Resolution No. 9203, approving UP-01-03, a use permit for a service station (gas station and convenience store) located at the southwest corner of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road for 7-Eleven/CITGO, with the conditions as shown and with the additional conditions as identified in the staff memorandum dated April 24, 2001. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kelley and carried by the following vote:

April 24, 2001
MOTION: **DR-01-06**

Motion by Commissioner Valentine to adopt Resolution No. 9204, approving DR-01-06, design review approval of architectural drawings to construct a convenience store, fuel pump island, canopy and two freestanding signs located at the southwest corner of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road for 7-Eleven/CITGO, with the conditions as shown and with the additional condition that the applicant carry through with an energy efficient design through the use of energy efficient standards of construction. 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

**COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:**

**ITEM 3: Oak Hills Residential South Unit 5, Subdivision 8042 Model Plans and Entry sign. DR-01-09.**

Application by John Schermerhorn of Albert Seeno Construction Company requesting approval of architectural drawings and site improvements for construction of 154 single-family homes on approximately 42 acres of a 230 unit residential subdivision of approximately 55 acres, and for a sign exception for a neighborhood identification sign generally located south of the Oak Hills Apartments, east of Oak Hills South Subdivision and west of Bailey Road, PD (Planned Development) zone; portions of APN 094-360-001, 094-170-011 and portion of 097-160-333.

Mr. Jerome explained that part of Oak Hills South Unit 5 had been recently annexed to the City and had been originally part of the Keller Canyon Landfill buffer area. Through land swapping, the property had been annexed to the City and the area considered as an extension of the Oak Hills neighborhood, west of Bailey Road.

Part of the subdivision had some controversy relative to a proposed school site, which would now be located in the San Marco development. As a result of the school not being part of the subject site, it had been proposed and approved with an amendment to the zoning that additional homes be placed on a 12-acre area previously identified for the school site.
Associate Planner Chris Bekiaris presented the request from Albert Seeno Construction Company requesting approval of architectural drawings and site improvements for construction of 154 single-family homes on approximately 42 acres of a 230 unit residential subdivision of approximately 55 acres, and a sign exception for a neighborhood identification sign generally located south of the Oak Hills Apartments, east of Oak Hills South Subdivision and west of Bailey Road. The project was a phased project for Units 5, 6 and 7. Units 5 and 6 were now before the Commission while Unit 7 would be presented at a later date only if the home styles were different from what was being proposed at this time for Units 5 and 6.

Mr. Bekiaris described the lots as 6,000 square feet in size, with five floor plans to be provided. The floor plans would vary from 1,785 to 3,312 square feet, with options for dens and retreats.

Mr. Bekiaris corrected the description of the project as identified in the staff report in that the design of the homes would not consist of a Mediterranean style, rather there would be a variety of design styles, including Monterey and Country styles.

The applicant had also requested the approval of a sign exception for the neighborhood identification sign. The maximum size allowed for an identification sign was 15 square feet, and the proposed sign would be 19 square feet in size. The height of the sign would be 7 feet, where the City Code permitted a height of 5 feet.

Mr. Bekiaris commented that the signage was similar to a previous proposal for neighborhood identification for the San Marco development. Staff recognized that subdivision signs were now a bit larger than those that had been proposed in the past. In this instance, staff recommended approval of the sign exception as requested.

Mr. Bekiaris suggested that the home designs were pleasing and would represent an improvement to the City's housing stock.

Referencing the Findings for Resolution No. 9202, Item F, Mr. Bekiaris recommended the following revision:

F. The proposed sign exception conforms as closely as practicable to the sign size, number and placement regulations, in that the neighborhood identification sign will be located in a landscaped area at the main entrance to the neighborhood and is only four square feet more than the maximum allowable 15 square feet.

Mr. Bekiaris further recommended a revision to Condition No. 12, as follows:

12. The Developer shall fence all rear and side yards of all residential parcels with board-on-board redwood fencing in conformance with height and site regulations of the Zoning Ordinance subject to approval by the Planning Division, except where staff deems a view fence to be appropriate.
Mr. Bekiaris recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9202, approving DR-01-09, with the conditions as shown.

Chairman Kee referenced Condition No. 3, which stated that the building permit must be issued in two years. Since the Commission normally stipulated the issuance of permits for a one-year period, he requested clarification from staff if that was being extended in this instance due to the size of the project.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that the applicant had stated that the project might extend farther in the future. As a result, staff had recommended that the building permits be issued within a two-year period. He clarified that the City had made similar recommendations in the past on other applications.

PROPOSENT:

ALBERT SEENO, Jr., SEECON, 4021 Port Chicago Highway, P.O. Box 4113, Concord, presented colored elevations for Commission review. He commented that the project would involve 154 single-family homes for a total of 230 units as part of Units 5, 6 and 7. He noted that there were three units that had been identified on the maps, which had not been included, for a total of 233 units. He requested clarification from staff.

Mr. Bekiaris advised that the final maps that had been submitted to the Engineering Division by the applicant had identified only 230 lots.

Mr. Seeno described the designs for the homes through the use of eight different paint schemes and where some of the homes would receive two body colors, and some would include brick or stone veneer. Hardboard siding, with shake texture, porches, two and three car garage options all with metal sectional garage doors, and various roofing and window materials, would also be utilized on the home designs.

Mr. Seeno explained that the homes would consist of four to six bedrooms, with optional retreats and lofts ranging in size from 1,785 to 3,300 square feet.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Seeno affirmed that he had read the staff report and concurred with the staff recommended conditions of approval as proposed and as revised.

Commissioner Valentine referenced Condition No. 15, which stipulated that the air conditioning units be placed along the rear wall or side yards with a minimum three-foot unobstructed access. He inquired whether or not it would be feasible to place the air conditioning units on the side of the home that would receive the most shade, particularly in response to the current energy crisis.

Mr. Seeno advised that the builder would have to comply with all Title 24 requirements. The
heating and air conditioning units had all been situated in a worst case scenario, typically placed with a five-foot setback on one side of the home. If the home was placed on a corner lot, the units were typically placed within a ten-foot setback.

Commissioner Valentine questioned whether or not any shading mechanism could be added to obstruct the mid-afternoon sun for those units that could be impacted since the heating/air conditioning units would have to work harder if placed directly in the sun.

JOHN SCHERMERHORN, SEECON, 4021 Port Chicago Highway, P.O. Box 4113, Concord, explained that the suggestion by Commissioner Valentine was difficult since they would have homes facing in all directions.

Mr. Schermerhorn advised that the units were typically situated on the individual lots not only to provide adequate access but to mitigate the noise impacts generated by the equipment from negatively impacting the normal daily lifestyle of the homeowners. The units were usually kept away from the living spaces. Dependent upon how the units had been manufactured, shading of the units was not recommended since it tended to inhibit the ability for the equipment to properly function.

Mr. Schermerhorn advised that the developer could suggest to the prospective homeowners that screening of the units would, in fact, provide some energy saving benefits. He emphasized that the construction industry was heavily regulated in terms of energy usage and compliance with Title 24 standards. New standards were anticipated in June 2001 that would enhance the ability of the homes to contain energy used to heat or cool homes.

Additionally, air conditioning units were becoming more and more efficient each year. Manufacturers and the developer were required to use the most efficient units possible in the construction of the homes, based on Title 24 calculations.

Mr. Schermerhorn emphasized, when asked, that by law the developer would be required to comply with the requirements of Title 24. He recognized that they were close to the June date when the new regulations would come on line. He could not guarantee that some of the homes might be under one code while others could fall under the new regulations. At any rate, the developer had prepared for the inevitable June 2001 deadline. He otherwise suggested that homebuyers were astute and typically reviewed energy efficiency in the homes they were interested in purchasing.

Commissioner Holmes inquired of the proposed price range of the homes, to which Mr. Seeno explained that the sales prices would be dependent on what the market could bear at the time the homes were constructed and ready for sale.

Commissioner Glynn expressed concern with the way the resolution had been written since it had not clearly defined the construction of Unit 7. He suggested that an additional condition of approval be added, to be identified as Condition No. 24, as follows:
24. *Construction of Unit 7 would not begin without prior approval of the Planning Commission if the models or architectural plans were different from those that had been approved for Units 5 and 6.*

Commissioner Glynn also requested that another condition be added to the resolution, as follows:

25. *All occupied building sites shall adhere to applicable State and federal regulations with regard to minimum stand off distances from power distribution and/or transmission lines.*

Commissioner Valentine requested that recommended Condition No. 24 be modified further to reflect that the construction of Unit 7 shall be "exactly" as the models or architectural plans approved by the Planning Commission for Units 5 and 6. He expressed concern with the plans being changed at a later date without Commission review and approval. He referenced the Oak Hills development as an example of home designs that he found to be very unattractive.

Mr. Seeno recognized that Commissioner Valentine had been dissatisfied with the previous design for the other development. As such, contrasting colors and a variety of material had been proposed for the subject homes.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that the language as he had stated for Condition No. 24 was clear. If there were revisions to the architectural plans approved by the Planning Commission for Units 5 and 6 for the construction of Unit 7, the plans would be required to be returned to the Planning Commission for review and consideration.

Mr. Bekiaris suggested that existing Condition No. 22, could be eliminated and replaced with the language proposed for Condition No. 24.

Commissioner Glynn agreed with that staff recommendation.

Chairman Kee referenced Plan No. 2242, which had identified a cove on the roof of the right side of the building elevation. He noted that the other elevations did not show that design element to be carried around. He requested clarification from the applicant.

Mr. Schermerhorn clarified that the cove design element was the only design element on the rear of the home and the only element on that home that had been identified on the plans. He commented that it had been an apparent oversight on the part of the illustrator who had prepared the drawings. He stated that the cove design element would not be a part of the building design.

**MOTION:**

Motion by Commissioner Leonard to adopt Resolution No. 9202, approving DR-01-09, design review approval of architectural plans, site improvements and a sign exception for Subdivision No. 8042 "Oak Hills South Unit 5," with the conditions as shown and with the modification to Findings F, as shown, and with the modification of Condition No. 12, the addition of Condition Nos. 24 and
25, and with the elimination of Condition No. 22. 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

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 17, 2001).

Mr. Jerome reported that the public hearing had been continued from a Special Meeting of the General Plan on April 17, 2001, to the subject hearing to review policies and text within the General Plan other than hillside and ridgeline policies to be reviewed at a later date, pending the completion of additional visual analyses by the General Plan consultant. The intent of the hearing at this time was to allow the Commission to review the polices and text that the Commission would like to see revised with direction provided to staff. Corrections would be made as directed by the Commission or as discussed with the General Plan consultant.

Mr. Jerome added that public testimony could still be taken since the public hearing had been continued. Staff had received two letters this date, from Marilyn Torres and another letter from an Attorney relative to the Bertignoli property located on the west side of the City near State Route 4. Copies of the correspondence had been provided to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Kee declared a recess at 8:40 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 8:48 P.M. with all Commissioners present.

PUBLIC HEARING RE-OPENED

RON RIVES, General Counsel, Vice President, Seeno Construction Company, recognized that the Planning Commission desired to separate the issues regarding the hillsides and ridgeline policies, particularly since most of the land available in the City for future development was located in the hills. As such, he agreed that there should be a proper way to preserve significant scenic ridgelines and that the City not become unduly inflexible in that regard.
Mr. Rives also recognized the importance of the update and review of the General Plan, to allow City staff and the Planning Commission as much flexibility as possible concerning future development. He urged the Commission to be careful since in his opinion the process was moving very fast. As a result, he had made a request that the public hearing on the General Plan, other than the ridgeline and hillside policies, remain open for a given period of time.

Mr. Rives also suggested that the Planning Commission hold an additional public hearing on the issues in a workshop format to allow the developer the opportunity for give and take with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Rives advised that staff had provided the developer with a copy of the staff proposed revisions based on the public comment received as of April 17, 2001. Those comments had been reviewed during a meeting with staff on April 23, where the developer had made 55 suggested revisions to what staff had proposed be revised to the General Plan. Some of those revisions involved wordsmithing and technical language. During those discussions, agreement had been reached with respect to nine of the total 55 suggested revisions.

Mr. Rives noted that there remained some issues that would have to be resolved by the Planning Commission and ultimately by the City Council. As an example, he expressed concern with adequate flexibility for development around the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station. The developer desired assurance that the General Plan would not inhibit a future Specific Plan that would allow for the maximum use of that valuable resource of the City.

Mr. Rives also expressed concern with the City attempting to duplicate the efforts of federal and State agencies with regard to environmental concerns, whereby many issues were already regulated by the federal and State governments. He cited, as an example, the Endangered Species Act regulated by U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which regulated wetlands and creekbeds. The California Department of Fish and Game also regulated creekbeds. He stated that developers were required to also comply with regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Mr. Rives referenced the San Marco subdivision as an example of a project that had a creek that ran through the property. The plan had called for the creek to be preserved but elevated 30 feet higher than existing, which would be done in accordance with an agreement the developer had reached with the Department of Fish and Game. He described a possible scenario whereby a plan could be approved by the City after extensive review but which might not be accepted by one of the other agencies that had jurisdiction over the same property. He emphasized that those possible scenarios would have to be addressed in terms of how the City would show proper respect and concern for environmental issues, but at the same time recognize that the issues were already being regulated by other agencies.

Mr. Rives further expressed concern with regulations in the General Plan concerning the Blast Zone around the Concord Naval Weapons Station. The General Plan stated that the base must be decommissioned or closed prior to any development. He noted that if the easement was removed, there would be no impediment to development. He suggested that the language, which stipulated
that the base must be decommissioned or closed, be eliminated from that section. He described it as an example of wordsmithing that he was confident he could work out with staff.

Referencing the General Plan policies, Mr. Rives noted additional concern with the stated policies with respect to the dedication of parks. He reiterated that the land, which remained available for development in the City, was largely in the hillsides. A General Plan policy requirement for developers to dedicate parks consisting of 5 acres, or a minimum of 2 acres, also required that 80 percent of the land must be flat.

Mr. Rives suggested that there was a discrepancy in the General Plan policies that stipulated that extensive grading would not be permitted and that the natural topography must be followed, although extensive grading would be required since 80 percent of the land was required to be flat for a park to be provided. He emphasized that oftentimes that was not possible and it was a policy decision that should be reviewed carefully with respect to the reality of where such parks could be located.

Mr. Rives reiterated his recommendation that the public hearing on issues other than ridgelines and hillsides not be closed at this time. He requested that the public hearing be continued for a reasonable period of time with the process to be left open for three to four weeks.

Mr. Rives also reiterated his recommendation for the consideration of a workshop format to allow for dialogue back and forth between the Commission, staff and interested persons, rather than the public hearing format. He reiterated the need to take the time necessary to review the document carefully to allow for a proper review.

Commissioner Valentine described a scenario where a developer might have a creek design that the Commission might approve, but for which the applicable State or federal agencies opposed. He questioned what would occur in the event that those agencies supported such a plan, but where the Planning Commission did not. He questioned whether or not the developer would fight the Planning Commission in the event that the Commission were to impose standards above and beyond what the Department of Fish and Game or other State or federal agency might require.

Commissioner Valentine recognized that State and federal agencies regulated environmental issues. In his opinion, that was just the starting point. He pointed out that environmental regulations in some states were far different from those in the State of California. He suggested that should be where they started in that a developer could not do anything lower than what the State or federal agency might require, with the City to have local control to advise whether or not the City preferred regulations above and beyond State or federal requirements, with a developer obligated to comply with the City's standards.

Commissioner Valentine questioned whether or not the developer would be willing to go both ways.

Mr. Rives stated that he was uncertain since the developer would have to review a specific case and
determine whether or not what the City might require was in addition to State and federal requirements, or something different than what might be stipulated by those agencies. If the City were to require above and beyond what was required by a State or federal agency, he suggested that there would be no legal impediment for the City to require additional regulations. Such a situation would be more expensive and the developer would be put upon, and would probably oppose the imposition of additional regulations beyond what the State or federal agencies required.

Commissioner Valentine questioned the fact that the developer might oppose regulations that the City might see fit to impose above and beyond what other applicable jurisdictional agencies might require. He suggested that the City or local government had the right to impose additional restrictions or conditions upon any development in the community, above and beyond State or federal agency regulations. He commented that the statement made that the developer would probably oppose such a situation involving additional local government restrictions was unfair and self-serving. He emphasized that SEECON was not located in the City.

While he recognized that a developer had the right to buy and sell property, Commissioner Valentine stated that in his opinion, the developer did not have the right to develop that land until provided that right through elected or appointed leaders and the community.

Mr. Rives emphasized that the extent of regulations by State and federal agencies was not a minimal threshold requirement.

Commissioner Valentine cited another example of concern where the federal government was on the verge of making the Endangered Species Act less stringent. In his opinion, such agencies did not have the right to dictate what could be done in the local community. While he agreed that the imposition of minimum standards by those agencies was appropriate, he suggested that it was the City's right to go above and beyond what those agencies might require.

Mr. Rives reiterated that the concern he had with the way the current General Plan had been drafted was the requirement that a developer conduct an independent biological assessment and independent biological studies to satisfy the City in addition to associated studies, formats and protocols required by State and federal agencies. He emphasized that developers were highly regulated by State and federal agencies.

Mr. Rives clarified his earlier comments in that he had not made a comment that he was threatening to file a lawsuit if the developer was required to comply with restrictions above and beyond what might be required by State and local agencies. He further clarified that if the City were to require something different from those other agencies that could place the developer in a position that they would be forced to fight.

Commissioner Valentine recognized Mr. Rives' comments, although he reiterated in response to Mr. Rives' earlier reference to a possible scenario whereby a plan, such as for a creekbed, could be approved by the City after extensive review but which might not be accepted by one of the other agencies that had jurisdiction over the same property, that if a State or federal agency approved a
scenario that the City might not want, in his opinion the City should have the ability to impose additional restrictions above and beyond what was required by that State or federal agency.

Chairman Kee recognized the concerns being expressed, although he commented that there could be some issues that might need to be resolved between local, State and federal governments where the developer might have no control.

Commissioner Glynn requested copies of the 55 concerns referenced by Mr. Rives.

Mr. Jerome noted that during the meeting of April 17, the Commission had been provided with a redline strikeout version, including corrections to the various chapters, which had been a compendium of all of the comments either written or verbal that had been received.

Commissioner Glynn requested clarification in that the document provided to the Commission on April 17 had incorporated all comments received up to the date of the publication of that document. In addition, staff had been provided with correspondence this date. He reiterated his request that the Commission be provided copies of the 55 concerns identified by Mr. Rives.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that staff had just received the 55 concerns identified by Mr. Rives on Monday April 23. Staff had met with Mr. Rives to discuss those issues and had been unable to address all of the concerns at that time. Copies of the correspondence prepared by Mr. Rives would be provided to the Commission.

BRUCE OHLSON, a resident of Pittsburg, a member of the Delta Peddlers, and a member of the Board of Directors of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition Regional Bicycle Advocacy Group, referenced Page 7-25 of the Transportation Chapter of the General Plan. He suggested that it was not reasonable to define a bicycle route as a bicycle facility. He pointed out that if the right lanes were 16 feet wide or wider whether or not they had bicycle lanes painted on them, there was not enough room for a bicyclist to share the road with a motorist, or for the motorist to safely share the lane with a bicyclist.

Mr. Ohlson commented that if the right lane was only 12 feet wide, it had been designed exclusively for the use of motor vehicles with no room for a bicyclist to safely operate his/her bicycle. He stated that hanging a sign on a post beside the lane declaring it as a bicycle route would not change that fact.

Speaking to Map 7-4, Mr. Ohlson stated that the map had identified several streets in the City as bicycle facilities, although those roadways included only 12-foot right lanes. He requested that the map be revised to reflect that the streets that had been proposed for future, planned, or desirable bicycle facilities, were not existing facilities.

Mr. Ohlson volunteered to provide further input to planning staff concerning the suitability of City
streets as bicycle facilities.

Commissioner Leonard encouraged Mr. Ohlson to provide his written comments to staff so that those comments could be considered as part of the discussions.

Mr. Ohlson advised that he would provide written comments within the week.

Mr. Jerome stated that in reference to the comments made regarding the Policy on Page 7-29 of the Transportation Element, with respect to Policy 7-P-42, it stated "...provide adequate roadway width dedications for bicycle lanes, paths and routes as designated in Figure 7-4."

Mr. Jerome clarified that the General Plan was general in nature and could not be everything to everyone other than to provide policy direction for the City. He suggested that referenced policy provided that direction. He was uncertain whether or not those standards would come up through engineering staff, other discussions or workshops in terms of adequacy in addressing Mr. Ohlson's comments. He recognized that there were clearly many issues with respect to right-of-way access, construction and the like that would have to be addressed.

Chairman Kee understood that it had been the intent of the Planning Commission to receive public testimony and then close the public hearing this date on all issues with the exception of the ridgeline and hillside policies. In deference to the comments received this date, he inquired what direction the Commission desired to take.

Commissioner Leonard noted that he had received a call from another individual who had also requested additional time to provide comments in writing. He suggested that it was not unreasonable to allow more time for public comment.

Commissioner Glynn echoed the request made by Mr. Rives that the Commission consider workshops, albeit for the opportunity for public input, whereby those persons who had submitted written comments and who might have significant input could work with the Commission, allowing the Commission the ability to work through the document, as revised. He agreed that the public comment period should not arbitrarily be closed. He otherwise expressed concern that the Commission needed to proceed with the review of the document so that it could be completed in a timely manner.

Commissioner Tumbaga agreed with the comments, although she had initially agreed that the public hearing be closed in the near future to allow the Commission to work through the document. She also recognized that there were a number of public comments still being received. She suggested that until those comments had been incorporated into the working document, the public hearing should remain open, particularly when the Commission addressed the hillsides and ridgelines since that could generate more public comment. Upon the completion of that discussion, she suggested that a workshop be held with those individuals who had submitted written comments on the General Plan.
Commissioner Valentine suggested that the public hearing remain open until such time as the Commission was ready to sit down in a workshop format to discuss the policy issues. He too agreed that the hillside and ridgeline discussions would generate more public comment.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that the Commission should meet in a workshop format for the General Plan only. If there was regular Planning Commission business to be conducted during a regular Commission meeting, regular business should be conducted first. Mr. Jerome explained that staff's goal had been to complete the document as soon as possible so that it could be forwarded to the City Council. Staff had hoped that the document would be ready to be forwarded to the City Council in June.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that the Commission could conduct a workshop, although he cautioned that if the entire Commission was to participate, the meeting must be open to the public and be noticed or continued to a time and place specific so that the public could be invited. It would be up to the Commission whether or not additional public comment would be received at that time.

As an alternative, Mr. Jerome suggested that the Planning Commission could also appoint a subcommittee comprised of no more than three Planning Commissioners to review the document with staff or with anyone else. Individual Commissioners could also independently meet with staff.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that staff was working with SEECON and other individuals to address any comments or concerns, with comments thereafter to be provided to the Planning Commission. He also reiterated that a separate public hearing would be scheduled for the hillside and ridgeline policies. The Commission had also discussed a possible field trip.

Mr. Jerome noted that one of the City's property owners had expressed the willingness to open up his site at the top of Bailey Road for a possible field trip. He again clarified that if all Commissioners desired to participate in a field trip, it must be open to the public. If less than a quorum participated, a field trip could be conducted independently.

Commissioner Holmes encouraged the expedient scheduling of a field trip prior to the discussion of the hillside and ridgeline policies to tie everything together.

Commissioner Leonard questioned whether or not the public hearing could be closed on certain sections of the General Plan, to which Mr. Jerome explained that General Plans must be comprehensive and internally consistent. He expressed concern that something could be revised in one element that might affect another element. As such, it would not serve any benefit to close the public hearing on certain sections. He suggested that the Commission isolate and focus on issues or policies that needed to be revised.

Commissioner Kelley agreed with the need for a workshop. She also suggested that the discussions staff had with individuals, such as with SEECON, should be conducted with the entire Commission to allow the Commission the opportunity to participate in any dialogue.
Mr. Jerome noted that the strikeout version provided to the Commission on April 17 was reflective of the staff's recommendations. He recognized that the Commission might or might not agree with the staff recommendations, although he emphasized that the Planning Commission must reach a consensus.

Commissioner Leonard inquired whether or not staff had a timeframe when there would be agreement or disagreement on the specific points raised by SEECON or others. Mr. Jerome reiterated that staff had recently received the 55 concerns raised by SEECON and had not had the opportunity to address all of those concerns. He emphasized the need for the Commission to isolate and focus on the key issues so as to be more effective and efficient in the discussions. It was hoped that staff would reach a consensus on the issues raised by SEECON prior to a potential workshop discussion.

Associate Planner Avan Gangapuram explained that the strikeout version that had been provided to the Planning Commission on April 17 had included all of the issues that staff had considered appropriate based on the comments received up to that time. There were some issues where staff was not in agreement, although it was up to the Commission to reach a consensus on those issues.

Commissioner Leonard recognized that revisions were being made as the discussions went on. He recognized the time spent in the preparation and discussion of the document. He inquired when the Commission might reach the point of discussing those issues.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that it was up to the Commission to determine how to handle the continued discussion.

Commissioner Glynn commented that there was a great deal of terminology in the document that while some individuals might have experience or knowledge, the general public might not. He recommended that a document or glossary be considered for inclusion in the document to define or clarify the terminology contained in the document, which could offer a better understanding of the General Plan.

Mr. Jerome agreed that the document should be reader friendly and he recognized that terminology was very important. He also recognized the request for clarification in the document and expressed the willingness to determine whether or not the General Plan consultants could prepare a glossary, as recommended.

Commissioner Valentine expressed concern whether or not the Commission would complete its review of the document in a timely manner, particularly when two Commissioners terms would expire in July and two new individuals would be appointed. If the Commission had not yet completed the review of the document by that time and new Commissioners were appointed, the process might need to be recommenced.
Chairman Kee suggested that the Commission could expedite the review of the document. He suggested that if Commissioners had concerns or issues with the policy statements or other issues in the document, such concerns be raised during the meetings so that the document could be as close to complete as possible at the time the public hearing was formally closed.

Chairman Kee also recognized that a workshop would be in order to address the public's concerns. He too recognized that the public hearing could not be kept open indefinitely. He otherwise agreed that a planning glossary should be included in the final version of the document to offer the general public a better understanding of some of the terminology utilized in the document. Chairman Kee further recommended that all comments be incorporated into a comprehensive document for a final version of all comments, including policies that had not been changed. He clarified that he would request a more current version of the redline strikeout format.

Mr. Gangapuram advised that based on the Commission's comments, staff planned to enhance the strikeout version, which would incorporate all of the comments received. He clarified that those comments of which staff was not in agreement would not be included in the redline version, since they were, in staff's professional judgment, not deemed to be appropriate.

Mr. Gangapuram explained that once the Commission had reached a consensus on the entire document, a clear version would be prepared that would be reviewed for action and ultimately be forwarded to the City Council. It was not staff's intent to prepare new strikeout versions after each discussion.

On the discussion of a date and notification process for the workshop meeting, Mr. Jerome advised that since the public hearing was still open, the subject public hearing could be continued to a workshop at a designated time and place without public notification. A workshop could possibly be held in the Council Chambers Conference Room.

Mr. Jerome otherwise stated, when asked, that staff would probably not be able to resolve the concerns referenced by Mr. Rives within the next week. He was uncertain how much time would be necessary for staff to complete the discussions. He inquired whether or not the Commission preferred that those discussions be completed, with recommendations, prior to the scheduling of a workshop, or whether or not the Commission desired to work on the issues with staff and Mr. Rives.

Commissioner Glynn suggested that given the concerns referenced by SEECON and the letters recently received by staff, a newly revised strikeout version would need to be prepared.

Mr. Jerome explained that staff was doing such work as they moved along in the process. He reiterated that the strikeout version provided to the Commission during the meeting of April 17 was basically a staff recommendation based on all of the comments received up to that date. While some of the comments received were pointed, others had been discussion items only. A new strikeout version would be provided once staff had resolved some of the issues with SEECON, hopefully in a week or so.
Commissioner Glynn questioned when a second version of the redline strikeout document would be provided to the Commission, to which Mr. Gangapuram suggested that it would be appropriate to provide a final redline strikeout version only after all of the comments had been incorporated into the document, including any comments received by the Planning Commission. He expressed concern with the creation of numerous strikeout versions that could confuse the process.

Commissioner Glynn noted that a date certain needed to be established when no additional public comments would be accepted after which the final redline strikeout document could be prepared. Commissioner Glynn suggested that a second redline strikeout version be provided next week, to which Mr. Gangapuram explained that could be done once comments had been received from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Leonard clarified that he had preferred that staff and other entities provide any additional information to the Planning Commission prior to the assimilation of the Commission's comments. He questioned whether or not SEECON and staff could meet to address their concerns within the next fourteen days and he suggested that should allow sufficient time for further public comment. At that time a new strikeout version could be provided that the Planning Commission could review and provide comment.

Mr. Rives clarified that when he had met with staff on April 23 to address the 55 concerns, agreement had been reached on nine of those concerns. He suggested that by the time a workshop was scheduled, they would probably be able to narrow down what the Planning Commission might have to review. He requested that he be allowed a couple of weeks to work through those concerns with staff to have the ability to schedule a workshop. At that time, he could be prepared to address any significant issues that might remain during the workshop meeting.

Mr. Jerome reiterated, when asked, that it was unlikely that staff would be able to resolve the issues with Mr. Rives in the next week.

Chairman Kee suggested that staff and SEECON be allowed the ability to work through the issues with a workshop scheduled thereafter for Tuesday, May 15, 2001. A date could be set at that time when the public hearing would be closed to then allow for Commission comment on the document.

Commissioner Glynn emphasized the need to set a date certain by which no further public comment would be accepted in order for staff to be able to produce a second strikeout version, with the public comment period deadline to be heavily publicized. He suggested that a list of constituents, whether developers, public service entities, or businesses, which regularly dealt with the City, be sent a letter advising of the date certain for the end of the public comment to then allow the Planning Commission to comment on the document.

Chairman Kee suggested that a final public hearing could be scheduled for the first regular Planning Commission meeting after the workshop.

Mr. Jerome clarified that a workshop format would be open to the public. Whether or not the Planning Commission desired to take further public comment at that time would be dependent upon
the direction of the Commission at that time.

Commissioner Valentine suggested that the public hearing be closed after the regular Planning Commission meeting of May 8, allowing staff to compile everything for a workshop on May 15.

Mr. Rives explained that the purpose of a workshop was to allow for a dialogue between the interested parties and the Commission. He expressed concern that if the public hearing was closed prior to a possible workshop, public comment could not be received. He pointed out that the ridgeline and hillside policies were on a different track than the remainder of the General Plan. He expressed concern with the closure of the public hearing when those policies had yet to be addressed at length.

Mr. Jerome commented that it might be possible that staff would have a number of the issues resolved and be ready to address the ridgeline and hillside policies during the proposed workshop scheduled for May 15.

Commissioner Glynn inquired whether or not the public comment period could be posted with a deadline as of June 12, 2001, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission, where it was hoped that the workshops would be completed as would any discussion on the hillsides and ridgelines. He suggested thereafter, the Planning Commission could then start its review of the document.

Chairman Kee inquired of staff if June 12 was posted as a deadline, whether or not the Planning Commission would be obligated to keep the public hearing open to that point or whether it could be closed prior to that time.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that the Commission needed to reach some consensus to move the recommendations of the General Plan to the City Council, including the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). He pointed out that the public hearing for the EIR had also been kept open. Comments on the EIR must be acted upon by the General Plan consultants to be incorporated into the Final EIR, also to be acted upon by the Commission.

Mr. Gangapuram suggested that a public hearing deadline of June 12 might be too soon given the July expiration of two Planning Commissioner terms. The last regular meeting with the current Commission was identified as June 26. Given the steps that needed to be followed after a possible June 12 deadline, that would not allow staff or the Commission adequate time to review the document.

Mr. Jerome reiterated that it might be possible that the ridgeline and hillside policies could be discussed during a workshop scheduled for May 15, pending the receipt of additional analyses that staff had requested from the General Plan consultants.

MOTION:

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

Commissioner Tumbaga requested clarification that the motion that had just been taken had been direction that the public hearing had been continued to the meeting of May 8, with a workshop scheduled for May 15. She requested clarification whether or not the Commission could close the public hearing at the end of the session on May 15 if the Commission so desired. If that was the case, she requested that the deadline be posted in the newspaper with a large advertisement or through potential flyers to individuals indicating that no further public comment would be received on the General Plan after May 15.

Mr. Jerome noted that the General Plan would be forwarded to the City Council after action by the Planning Commission where additional public input could be received. He suggested that when the public hearing was closed, that the Commission make the statement that if any additional public comments were received after that time, the Commission might or might not act on them.

Commissioner Valentine emphasized that there had been advertisements of the General Plan public hearings in the local paper for the last several months. In his opinion, the public hearings on the document had been adequately posted.

Chairman Kee suggested that if the public hearing was closed, possibly at the May 15 workshop date or a later meeting, the Chair would advise in the event of further public comment past that time that there had been numerous public hearings and that additional comments could be made to the City Council.

In response to Commissioner Tumbaga, Mr. Gangapuram clarified regulations that mandated a deadline be posted for a 45 or 60 period public comment for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR had a posted deadline that had been extended. The General Plan did not involve such a mandate.

Commissioner Glynn inquired if the Final General Plan and EIR were adopted on June 26, the public comment period would be closed since the document could then be forwarded to the City Council, particularly since there would be no time remaining with the current configuration of the Commission. He reiterated that everything needed to be worked back from that date and a schedule...
needed to be determined to get the work done.

Commissioner Glynn also clarified that the EIR had already been prepared except as it needed to be modified against the Final Draft of the General Plan to ensure consistency between the two documents.

Mr. Jerome affirmed that the Planning Commission at some time would have to officially close the public hearing and bring the matter back to the Planning Commission for deliberations and a recommendation. He emphasized that numerous public hearing notices had been sent out to individuals on a mailing list and that the hearings had been noticed in the local newspapers. When the public hearing was continued to a date and place certain, formal public notification was not required. If not continued to a specific date, public notification would be required. The motion that had just been approved was for the public hearing to be continued to May 8, 2001, with the implication that the public hearing would be continued to a workshop on May 15. The public hearing could then be formally continued upon the completion of the May 8 meeting.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Mr. Jerome reported that an appeal of the Albertsons/Shurgard project had been scheduled for consideration by the City Council on May 21. An appeal of the Pittsburg Family Apartments project and design review application for Koch Carbon had both been scheduled for Council consideration on June 4.

**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR REPORT:**

There was no Zoning Administrator Report.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

There were no Committee reports.

**COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Leonard reported that the Traffic and Circulation Committee would be meeting on May 3, 2001 to discuss proposals to address problems experienced with parking in the Downtown Corridor. In addition, he advised that the Special Operations Unit of the Police Department had red tagged three buildings in the downtown area and he understood that it might be possible for the City to acquire those properties.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:27 P.M. to a Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission on May 8, 2001, at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.
RANDY JEROME, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission