MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION

April 8, 2003

A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Mark Leonard at 7:33 P.M. on Tuesday, April 8, 2003, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Harris, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Chairperson Leonard

Absent: None

Staff: Director of Planning and Building Randy Jerome; Planning Manager Melissa Ayres; Associate Planner Noel Ibalio; Assistant Planner Dana Hoggatt; and Planning Technician Christopher Barton.

POSTING OF AGENDA:

Chairperson Leonard advised that the agenda had been posted at City Hall on Friday, April 4, 2003.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Jack Garcia led the Pledge of Allegiance

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.
PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

CONSENT:

A. Minutes - March 25, 2003

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt the Consent Calendar consisting of the March 25, 2003 minutes, as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Harris and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Harris, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS:

Item 1: Cingular Wireless 1100 Bailey Road. DR-02-46.

Application by Misako Hill of Plancom, on behalf of Cingular Wireless requesting design review approval of plans for the installation of a 30-foot tall monopole with 4 antennas and related ground mounted equipment at 100 Bailey Road, OS (Open Space), APN 097-220-003.

Planning Technician Christopher Barton presented the staff report. Mr. Barton advised that the project was consistent with the General Plan and zoning in the Open Space zoning district, with development standards established during the design review process. He recommended the adoption of Resolution No. 9420 approving DR-02-46 with the conditions as shown.

Commissioner Tumbaga inquired whether or not there were other antennas in the area, to which Mr. Barton advised that there was a Sprint telecommunication facility located on the same property in close proximity to the one being proposed.

PROPONENT:

DUFFY DORY, PlanCom for Cingular Wireless, 4420 Rosewood Drive, Building 2, Pleasanton, stated that he had read and was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval.
MOTION: DR-02-46

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9420, approving DR-02-46, Design Review Approval of plans for the construction of a 30-foot tall wireless telecommunication monopole and the placement of one equipment shelter and associated support equipment on property located at 1100 Bailey Road for “Cingular Wireless,” with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tumbaga and carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Harris, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Commissioner Harris stepped down from the dais as a result of a potential conflict of interest with Item No. 2.

Item 2: Valencia at San Marco House Plans – Amendment of Approval of DR-02-24

Application by John Schermerhorn of Discovery Builders requesting an amendment to the front yard setback requirement adopted by Planning Commission Resolution No. 9366, which approved architectural plans for the construction of 292 single-family houses in San Marco Subdivision, Units 3, 4, 5 and 6, beginning south of Rio Verde Circle and east of San Marco Boulevard, in a PD (Planned Development No. 1057) district; APN 097-055-045.

Assistant Planner Dana Hoggatt presented the staff report. Ms. Hoggatt agreed that the smaller setback was appropriate for some of the smaller lots but recommended that the larger 20-foot setback be maintained on the larger lots. She recommended that the Planning Commission approve the amendment with the conditions as shown.

PROPONENT:

SALVATORE EVOLA, Discovery Builders, 4061 Port Chicago Highway, Suite H, Concord, advised that he had read and was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: DR-02-04

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 9421, amending Resolution No. 9366 for DR-02-24 to amend the Design Review approval of architectural plans for 292 single-family residential houses in Units 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the San Marco Development for "Valencia at San Marco," with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dolojan and carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Commissioners Dolojan, Garcia, Kelley, Ramirez, Tumbaga, Leonard  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Commissioner Harris  
Absent: None

Commissioner Harris returned to the dais at this time.

Given the time anticipated to evaluate the issues under Item 3, the Commission addressed the Staff Communications Item A. at this time.

A. **Wal-Mart Temporary Activity Permit Request - 10 Storage Containers**

Planning Manager Melissa Ayres reported that Wal-Mart had submitted an application for a temporary activity permit for 10 storage containers to be placed on a temporary basis at the rear of the Wal-Mart building. The containers would be used for the storage of spring and summer products. Ms. Ayres noted that temporary activity permits are approved at staff level, but staff wanted to apprise the Commission of the request because it had expressed concern with the placement of previous storage containers in the front of the building that had resulted in a code enforcement action. Draft conditions prepared by planning staff to be imposed as part of the administrative approval were presented to the Commission for review and input.

Commissioner Garcia acknowledged that the issue of the prior storage containers had been with their placement in the front of the building and with Wal-Mart's lack of response to the City's request for a relocation of those containers. He had no problem with the request for storage containers, whether temporary or permanent, if placed at the rear of the store.

Commissioner Dolojan inquired whether or not the placement of the containers at the rear of the site would hamper the trucks entering or backing out of the loading dock area.

CYNTHIA MOSELY, Store Manager, Wal-Mart, 2203 Loveridge Road, Pittsburg explained that the storage containers would be approximately 9 feet in height, 40 feet in length and 9 feet in width. She clarified that the containers would be placed at the rear of the site away from parking and in an area where there would be plenty of room for semi-trucks to access and exit the loading dock area. The area actually had been tested with a Wal-Mart moving van to ensure that there were no issues with the trucks going through that area. She took the opportunity to introduce the co-manager of the store present in the audience at this time.

Commissioner Harris expressed his hope that the new management would better maintain the parking lot area clean and free of debris. He otherwise had no problem with the placement of the containers at the rear of the property.
Chairperson Leonard agreed that unsightliness and unresponsiveness had been the issue with Wal-Mart in the past. He also noted that there had been problems with the shopping carts in the past. He encouraged better maintenance of the property.

Commissioner Tumbaga also commented on the historical lack of cleanliness of the parking lot. She otherwise encouraged Wal-Mart to revise its restocking plan to stock product later in the evening to avoid cluttering the aisles during store hours.

Commissioner Kelley recommended that the lighting in the parking lot be increased stating it was too dark and unsafe during the evening periods.

There was Commission consensus to support the administrative approval, with conditions, for a Wal-Mart Temporary Activity Permit.

**COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:**

**Item 3: General Plan Internal Inconsistencies Review.**
A staff request for Planning Commission feedback and policy direction on internal inconsistencies within the General Plan Land Use Map and Elements.

Planning Manager Melissa Ayres explained that several inconsistencies had been found in the General Plan hearing draft document (as conditionally approved by the City Council) as it was being prepared for reproduction. Since the State required the General Plan to be internally consistent, the Planning Commission was being asked to review the inconsistencies and provide staff directions on which section of each set of inconsistencies should be changed to make them consistent.

Ms. Ayres also clarified that the City was allowed to conduct four General Plan Amendments each year. The inconsistencies were located in the Land Use Element. She understood that there had been only one General Plan Amendment this year.

Associate Planner Noel Ibali began to walk Commission through individual inconsistencies noted in Attachment 1 to staff report.

Commissioner Garcia stated he supported the staff recommendations for Items 1 through 8. Speaking to Item 9, he suggested that it was time to move away from the development of small parks and consider the development of a park similar to Buchanan Park in the west end of the City where Oak Hills, Monterra, and the San Marco developments were located. He recommended that the City collect fees rather than building another small park since the City had difficulty maintaining those parks. He also suggested that the west end needed a swimming pool and clubhouse similar to Buchanan Park.
Commissioner Garcia further suggested that the fees for the parks designated for Highlands Ranch and San Marco Meadows be collected rather than have another park in those areas.

At this time the Commission decided to review each of the inconsistencies individually to clarify the issues involved.

Speaking to Item 1, Mr. Ibalio noted that Figure 2-4 had identified the northeast corner of Sixth and Railroad Avenue as designated Retail, although Figure 2-2 (General Plan Diagram) had identified the property as Public/Institutional. The site was currently a public parking lot.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to Amend Figure 2-4 to identify the site as Public/Institutional.

Referencing Item 2, Mr. Ibalio noted that Figure 2-2 had identified the northeast corner of the Loveridge/DeAnza Trail as High Density Residential, although Figure 2-4 had identified the same site as Public/Institutional. The site had recently been approved for a new fire station, Station 85.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to Amend Figure 2-4 to identify the site as Public/Institutional.

Mr. Ibalio explained for Item 3 that Figure 2-4c had identified the southwest corner of the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway/Loveridge Road as Business Commercial, although Figure 2-2 had identified the property as Industrial. The site was currently occupied by Praxair and was used as a manufacturing and distribution plant of natural gas.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to Amend Figure 2-4c to identify the site as Industrial, which was in keeping with the existing use.

Speaking to Item 4, Mr. Ibalio noted that Policy 2-P-58 governing Railroad Avenue, Sub Area Plan, stated "Allow development at an intensity of up to 2.0 FAR [Floor Area Ratio] along Railroad Avenue from State Route 4 to East Leland Road." It also states areas are designated for community commercial and business commercial uses in the General Plan Diagram. However, stated maximum non-residential FAR in the Community Commercial and Business Commercial Land Use Category Descriptions (Pages 2-18) were only 0.4 and 1.0 respectively. In neither description was residential listed as a permitted/desirable use.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to accept the staff recommendation that depending on the intent, to amend the descriptions (Pages 2-18) to include residential as an acceptable use (above the ground floor) and/or include a qualifying clause that
allowed for higher FAR in land use categories as may be noted in Sub Area Plans.

Commissioner Harris stated for the record that he would abstain from any discussion regarding the San Marco Meadows property to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

With respect to Item 5, Mr. Ibalio commented that Figure 7-1 had designated San Marco Boulevard as a Proposed Minor Arterial, although the projected traffic counts based on the traffic study prepared for San Marco Meadows indicated that the street should be designated as a Major Arterial.

In response to Commissioner Dolojan, Ms. Ayres explained that per the adopted street standards for different routes, a major or minor arterial had been based on the number of trips through those areas. The City Transportation Engineer had indicated that the numbers out of the San Marco study on projecting additional traffic farther south in that area and tying into the Bailey Estates project would generate more traffic than a minor arterial standard. The road had originally been developed as a minor arterial prior to anticipated numbers.

Mr. Ibalio also clarified that per the City's Engineering Department standards, a major arterial had a traffic volume of 15,000 to 55,000 trips per day. A minor arterial involved a travel volume of 15,000 to 40,000 trips per day. The volume for a collector street was also defined.

In further response to Commissioner Dolojan, Mr. Ibalio advised that San Marco Boulevard had been planned to connect to Bailey Road. The volume would still be at the major arterial level. The average MPH on a major arterial would be 26.7 MPH.

Ms. Ayres noted that the actual speed limit that would be posted would be dependent upon the Transportation Engineer's studies of prevailing speeds in the area.

Chairperson Leonard commented that if they were to go from a minor to major arterial the road would change as well and the road would be widened. He inquired whether or not it was necessary to make the road a major as opposed to a minor arterial and he questioned whether that would be considered a major arterial.

Mr. Ibalio noted that based on the City's roadway classifications, a major arterial could handle from two to six lanes of roadway. A minor arterial would take up to two to four lanes.

Chairperson Leonard suggested that four lanes would be appropriate for that roadway.

Ms. Ayres commented that it was not anticipated that six lanes would be considered given the hillsides area. The City would not install parking lanes on such arterials and the topography of the area would be recognized when the lane widths were set.
Ms. Ayres explained that the staff recommendation had been provided by the Transportation Engineer based on the traffic studies prepared for San Marco Meadows Development. She understood that State Route 4 to Leland Road had been developed to arterial standards. Part of the subdivision had been approved in 1993 and had not initially been intended to go through. There were currently two lanes in each direction from Leland Road north into the project site. She noted that there was not adequate width for an on-street bicycle lane, which the City General Plan also required.

Ms. Ayres explained that the developer had agreed to construct an off-street bicycle path, a wider sidewalk behind the curb face to be used by students going to and from school, in the section between the existing construction and the next unit of development. There was insufficient width on the planned street section to accommodate an on-street bicycle lane. The desire was to have enough right-of-way width for the rest of the street extending up to Bailey Road to have on street bicycle lanes, consistent with other provisions in the General Plan.

Chairperson Leonard suggested that could still be accomplished with a minor arterial, to which Ms. Ayres acknowledged that could be done although there could be some changes in the lane width or the width of the landscape median between the two areas.

Commissioner Dolojan inquired whether or not it would be a hardship on the City if the route were not designated as a major arterial.

Ms. Ayres explained that would be difficult to say at this time. She expressed the willingness to forward the Commission’s concerns to the Transportation Division, which could provide more guidance on that issue. More information would be provided to the Commission at a future meeting.

Chairperson Leonard suggested that the item, Item No. 5, be brought back to the Commission with additional information.

Mr. Ibalio referred to Item 6 and noted that Figure 7-4 Bicycle Facilities had not contained all of the routes identified through the City of Pittsburg in the East Contra Costa County Bikeway Regional Plan, which had been adopted by TRANSPLAN on August 9, 2001.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to Update Figure 7-4 to include all TRANSPLAN approved routes through the City.

As to Item 7, Mr. Ibalio commented that Figure 7-4, Bicycle Facilities had shown a proposed Class II (on-street) bicycle lane the entire length of San Marco Boulevard. Table 7-5 Bicycle Facilities identified a Class II lane between State Route 4 and “south” of the West Leland Road extension.
Chairperson Leonard raised the same concerns as expressed with the recommendation for the designation of a major arterial for San Marco Boulevard.

In response, Mr. Ibalio explained that Class II was a bike lane within the right-of-way, marked as a bike lane and striped on the street. Class I was an off-street pathway, physically separated by a space or barrier from the roadway used by motor vehicles.

Ms. Ayres noted that Figure 7-4 had shown the bicycle trail along San Marco Boulevard as a Class II (on-street) lane. There was a provision in Table 7-5, which had shown a Class II bicycle facility from State Route 4 to “south of West Leland Road”. She noted that “south of West Leland Road” did not indicate all the way down San Marco Boulevard and staff did not want that interpreted in the future as something south of West Leland Road that would terminate before Bailey Road. She noted that the developer had been cooperating with staff in creating a Class 1 (off-street) street bicycle path for a portion of the original San Marco development approved in 1993 before the need for a bike lane was identified. Rather than be shown as inconsistent with the plan, staff recommended that Table 7-5 be clarified to mean the extension of San Marco Boulevard all the way to Bailey Road with an acknowledgment that a portion would be Class I rather than Class II, where existing and approved road sections didn’t accommodate a Class 1 (on street) bike lane.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to Amend Table 7-5 to clarify that the bicycle route extends to Bailey Road as shown on Figure 7-4 with a note that the portion of the route between W. Leland Road and the new San Marco Elementary School site had been designated as a Class I (off-street route) due to pre-existing/previously approved road conditions.

With respect to Item 8, Mr. Ibalio explained that Figure 7-4 Bicycle Facilities did not identify any bicycle facilities on Willow Pass Road, that the East Contra Costa County Bikeway Plan, showed facilities on Willow Pass Road only between Range Road and the western City limit and that Figure 4-10, Urban Design Element identified a bicycle lane to be constructed along all along Willow Pass Road, including that section between Range Road (east) to Beacon Street that was not shown on the other documents.

Commissioner Garcia commented that the problem with North Parkside Drive was that it would not be widened enough to permit a bike lane. He suggested that they would be better off considering the old northern right-of-way, which ran from West Eighth Street and Herb White Way where a bike lane could be accommodated.

Commissioner Tumbaga noted that the area of West Tenth Street and Range Road involved bicycle riders given that there was no bus stop in that area.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated that it would be more logical to consider the old northern
right-of-way, which ran from West Eighth Street and Herb White Way where a bike lane could be placed. In addition, he suggested that Power Avenue could be another option since it was a much safer street. He recommended that the item be continued for further study.

Ms. Ayres noted that the issue of North Parkside Drive could be explored further, although the subject issue was whether or not reference to future bicycle lanes should be included for that section of Willow Pass Road east of Range Road.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to support the transportation staff's recommendation to delete references to future bicycle lanes on Willow Pass Road east of Range Road in Figure 4-10. Area residents could still ride on the shoulder of the road to reach the designated routes, with staff to consider another more appropriate route.

Referencing Item 9, Mr. Ibalio commented that Table 8-2 had identified future five-acre neighborhood park site in an area known as San Marco Meadows and a future 10-acre neighborhood park in the area known as Sky Ranch II. The Neighborhood Parks had been defined as parks oriented to recreational needs of youth, usually within a one-half mile radius of the park. In addition, the Growth Management Element Performance Standard, 3-S-6 states "Provide a ratio of 5 acres of community and neighborhood park land per 1,000 residents. Ensure that residential developers dedicate park land in accordance with this standard." However, the adopted General Plan Diagram had shown no new parks in those locations and both projects were anticipated to generate more than 1,000 residents. (See radius circles on Figure 8-1, Page 8-5 of hearing draft plan).

Commissioner Garcia reiterated his earlier recommendation that fees be collected for the consideration of a larger park, such as Buchanan Park, for the west end of the City. He noted that the City could also consider working with the Bay Point Municipal Advisory Committee (MAC) to see if the MAC might be willing to collaborate with its existing parks, particularly for a potential enlargement of the existing Ambrose Park.

Commissioner Garcia also noted that there was already a neighborhood park designated for Highlands Ranch.

Ms. Ayres commented that the large community park in the San Marco area had originally been envisioned to be about 17 acres. If the other two parks were not developed, as referenced in Item 9, and the developers paid in-lieu fees, those fees would probably go towards improving the existing park land as opposed to acquiring additional land near Ambrose Park.

Unless that section of the General Plan was rewritten to show a proposed expansion to Ambrose Park or some other vision, Ms. Ayres had concerns since the removal of the two parks from the Land Use Element would be contrary to the Growth Management Element.
Performance Standards providing a neighborhood park within a quarter mile or half mile of the development sites.

Commissioner Dolojan noted that the San Marco School site should be retained, to which Ms. Ayres commented that was another park site and that land had already been set aside.

Ms. Ayres added that one rationale for supporting the removal of the San Marco Meadows Park was that it was located in a hillside area and there were other policies that supported new parks only in flat areas.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated his recommendation to collect fees for the development of a larger park. There was also a small park site that would be located at the school site and in most cases would be located within walking distance.

He also believed the Sky Ranch II development would be located within a half mile of the Highlands Ranch park. He noted that if the park at Sky Ranch II was eliminated, residents could still use the Highlands Ranch Park, which he understood would be a 5-acre site.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to eliminate all reference to both the San Marco Meadows and Sky Ranch II parks in the General Plan.

Mr. Ibalio spoke to Item 10 and explained that Figure 9-1, Resource Conservation Element had identified the entire Site LA (POSCO) property as Seasonal Wetland/Grassland, although the site had also been designated as Department of Toxic Substance Control for toxic clean up.

Staff had questioned the environmental designation of the site on all but the drainage ditch along the front of the property because of the long-standing contamination issues.

Director of Planning and Building Randy Jerome explained with respect to Figure 9-1 that he believed the entire map should be eliminated since many of the sites with that designation had already been developed, was approved for, or under development. The designation of wetlands was under discussion with the General Plan Consultants and Environmental Sciences subconsultant since POSCO had not agreed with that designation. Staff would be considering either an acronym or eliminating that designation altogether.

Mr. Jerome commented that it was possible that the only areas that would be designated as wetlands would be ditches and the like that were actually known as wetlands. He also noted that the issue would likely return to the Commission as soon as possible since City staff was working with POSCO on that issue. Since the adoption of the General Plan, POSCO had requested that designation be changed.

Commissioner Garcia stated that having worked in the area for 40 years he had never...
known the area to be a wetland. He agreed with the staff recommendation.

- It was the consensus of the Commission to delete the designation on all but the frontage of the site as Seasonal Wetland in Resource Conservation Element, with the entire map to be changed, as discussed.

As to Item No. 11, Mr. Ibalio explained that Figure 2-4 had identified four properties with a color code that had not existed on the map key. Staff believed that the color, not the key, was inaccurate. Three of the lots were oriented towards East Tenth Street and lent to Service Commercial that matched the land use designation on adjacent properties. The fourth lot on the southeast corner of Los Medanos and Ninth Street had been developed as an apartment complex, which matched the Downtown High Density designation on adjacent properties.

Mr. Ibalio recommended that the two properties on the southeast corner of East Tenth Street and Railroad Avenue and the property on the southeast corner of East Tenth Street and Los Medanos Street be designated as Service Commercial and that the property on the southeast corner of Los Medanos and Ninth Street be designated as Downtown High Density Residential.

Commissioners questioned the actual uses on the referenced properties, and Mr. Ibalio expressed the willingness to clarify the existing uses.

Commissioner Garcia stated that he would support the staff recommendation upon the clarification of the uses of the existing properties.

Chairperson Leonard suggested that there could be a concern with the designation of the property where the old hotel had been located as Medium Density Residential and with Service Commercial on the opposite side of the street at Tenth and Railroad Avenue.

- The consensus of the Planning Commission was to accept the staff recommendation for the two properties on the southeast corner of East Tenth Street and Railroad Avenue and the property located on the southeast corner of East Tenth Street and Los Medanos Street, designated as Service Commercial. The Commission requested verification of the uses on the southeast corner of Los Medanos and Ninth Street before providing more direction on the preferred designation.

Staff agreed to provide more information when the item came back as a public hearing.

The Commission also acknowledged the number of technical changes as reflected on Page 3 of 3 of Attachment 1.

Ms. Ayres explained that the technical changes would be noted when staff returned with a
Commissioner Tumbaga noted the need for the General Plan to address lead paint issues.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Ms. Ayres reported that a Zoning Administrator meeting had been held on April 7 to consider a request from the Stone Harbor Homeowners Association (HOA) for an increase in fence height. The request had been made in response to a series of burglaries, vandalism, trespassing and the like on the property. The HOA had requested approval to add a 4-foot high chain link fence on top of the existing 8-foot wall in the areas deemed to be the most vulnerable to trespassing.

The Zoning Administrator considered the request. Everyone present spoke in support of the request. Since the public hearing notice had not been sent to everyone within 300 square feet of the site, as required, the item had been continued to the next Zoning Administrator meeting scheduled for April 21.

Commissioner Harris explained that his construction company had framed the homes in the Stone Harbor Subdivision and that he had recommended at that time that a taller wall be erected along the California Avenue elevation of the site since the property was located adjacent to an existing Commercial use. He recognized the problem with the site and agreed that a taller wall/fence should be considered.

Chairperson Leonard pointed out that the security gate system to the subdivision was well known by many people. He suggested that gate system did not serve its purpose to secure the site. He acknowledged the problems with burglaries and vandalism in the subdivision.

Commissioner Tumbaga suggested that gating a community would make people want to get in. She encouraged the development of open neighborhoods.

Commissioner Garcia also acknowledged problems with trespassing over the wall of that subdivision.

In response to Commissioner Dolojan, Ms. Ayres clarified that the height of the fence would be measured from the highest adjacent grade to the ground.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

Commissioner Kelley reported that she had attended the recent Traffic and Circulation Advisory Committee (TCAC) meeting during which time the TCAC had considered a request for a multi-way stop at Benjamin and California Avenues. Staff had indicated that a
multi-way stop was not warranted at that site, although she had suggested that the multi-way stop should be considered for Diane Avenue. In addition a multi-way stop had been requested at Stoneman and Meadowbrook Avenues. The TCAC had delayed action on that request pending the outcome of traffic counts.

Commissioner Kelley also reported that a number of residents had expressed concern with the speed of traffic on Eighth Street near the Dan Scales Funeral Home, with a request for a multi-way stop and "Children at Play" signs. The TCAC had recommended that the Police Department be contacted to improve the police presence in the neighborhood. Further, the TCAC had discussed the problems with traffic trying to make a left turn from Power onto Railroad Avenue with staff to review that issue.

**COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Garcia advised that he would be attending the April 10 TRANSPLAN Committee meeting, at which time one of the items of discussion would be the request from the City of Pittsburg to address the right-of-way issue on the north side of Century Boulevard and Somersville Road as it related to the existing Circuit City building.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) had indicated that if the building had to be moved the City of Pittsburg would be required to pay for the relocation of the building since the City had been informed in writing by the CCTA of the required right-of-way, which had been ignored. He understood that a legal opinion was being sought on that issue. He questioned whether or not the City had ever been notified in writing by the CCTA of the required 50-foot right-of-way. He urged the City to review the matter carefully.

Mr. Jerome reported that he could not recollect that understanding although the City files could be checked. He noted that the City had nothing on its zoning map to reflect that the street widening would include any setback requirements. He suggested that the CCTA was putting the City in the middle between its requirements and the developer with the City forced to pressure the developer to comply with a potential widening.

Commissioner Tumbaga expressed concern with a median that had been placed at the northwest corner of Power Avenue and Railroad Avenue to prohibited left hand turns.

Commissioner Kelley expressed the willingness to forward the concern to the TCAC.

Commissioner Harris reported that an adjacent tenant had expressed concern with the Antioch Building Materials business given the pile of debris on that property that was being blown onto adjacent properties. He also noted that the traffic signals were still not operational on California Avenue, although it was to have been installed and operational as of February 1.
Commissioner Harris also expressed the desire to have an update on the church property that had been approved next to the Frances Green Church site that he understood had been sold, along with the status of possible interest in the development of the St. Vincent de Paul property.

Mr. Jerome understood that there had been some interest from developers in developing the St. Vincent de Paul property, although no formal applications had been submitted.

Commissioner Garcia understood that the problems with power being provided by PG&E had been resolved to provide power for the California Avenue traffic signals, earlier referenced by Commissioner Harris.

Chairperson Leonard suggested that part of the problem with speeding on Eighth Street had been that most of the improvements to the Eighth Street Linear Park had been completed although a curb where parking was to be located had yet to be removed.

Chairperson Leonard also expressed concern with the fact that downtown developers were required to meet current building codes while the Greigo building located on Fifth and Railroad Avenue had yet to have building or occupancy permits. He questioned how that individual could occupy that building without the required permits.

Mr. Jerome acknowledged that the Greigo building was on a list of City building code violations and that staff was aware of that situation.

Ms. Ayres updated the Commission on a previous request for information about the status of the parking improvements on Eighth Street. She stated the City Engineer had informed her that a design consultant for the project was expected to be hired next month, that the design was expected to take three months and that construction would occur later this year.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:25 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on April 22, 2003 at 7:30 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburgh, CA.

______________________________
MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission