MINUTES

OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE

PITTSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION

September 16, 2003

A regular meeting of the Pittsburg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Mark Leonard at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, September 16, 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
(Commissioner Tumbaga arrived at 7:21 P.M.)

Absent: None

Staff: Director of Planning and Building Randy Jerome; Planning Manager Melissa Ayres; Assistant Planner Ken Strelo; Assistant Planner Dana Hoggatt; and Civil Engineer II Alfredo Hurtado

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Dolojan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

DELETIONS/WITHDRAWALS/CONTINUANCES:

There were no deletions, withdrawals or continuances.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

FRANCES GREENE, Pittsburg, advised of the status of the New Bethel Baptist Church project. She noted that the architect and civil engineer were working on updates to be presented to City staff that she understood would be completed on September 17. She also noted that it had been discovered that there was no gas to the site, and as a result they had been working with PG&E to serve the site with the necessary gas and electric utilities from across the street. That work was anticipated to be completed in October.

In response to Commissioner Harris, Ms. Greene noted that a truck that had been on the
property and which had not belonged to the church had been removed. Landscaping improvements would not be pursued until PG&E had completed its work.

Commissioner Garcia questioned whether or not the church had considered selling the back end of its property to a potential developer, possibly in conjunction with the St. Vincent de Paul property since the church had sufficient property to meet its needs and since the sale of that property could generate funds to complete the church project.

Ms. Greene understood that someone had contacted the church in that regard, although such a decision could not be made without input from the congregation.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no presentations.

CONSENT:


Motion by Commissioner Garcia to approve the Consent Items, as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kelley and carried by the following vote:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Item 1: Annual Report – General Plan Status Update.

A public hearing on the City’s Annual Report identifying it’s progress implementing the General Plan.

Planning Manager Melissa Ayres reported that the State Government Code required that the City prepare an annual progress report on the General Plan and its status on the implementation of the General Plan, which report was to be delivered to the City Council, the State Office of Planning and Research and the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

The report was to be submitted every October. There was also a General Plan policy requiring that the report first be submitted to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Ayres noted that the General Plan had been adopted in 2001 and had identified the
community’s vision along with numerous goals, policies and actions to achieve that vision. Planning staff had reviewed all of the General Plan policies and had compiled a list attached to the staff report of the proactive actions that staff was to take to implement the General Plan, identified as Table 1 in the staff report. The actions would fall into three categories.

The first category was the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects funded through the CIP budget or by developers as individual projects developed. The second was amendments to the Municipal Code and other development standards such as the Subdivision Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance, sign codes, design guidelines and the like, which would require the initiation of some action. The last category would be to encourage developers to do things that would facilitate the implementation of the General Plan.

Ms. Ayres recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council accept the Annual Report on the status of the implementation of the General Plan.

Commissioner Garcia commented that somewhere in the staff report there had been mention of five acres of park land for every 1,000 residents, although the City Council and the Planning Commission had recently discussed it was getting to the point where the City could no longer maintain the parks they had and there were not enough monies to build new parks after land had been dedicated for that purpose.

Commissioner Ramirez noted that item had been identified on Page 1 of the General Plan Policy Matrix (Open Space Youth and Recreation Element), City of Pittsburg General Plan 2020, Open Space Element, Under Action Policies, Parks, and Policy 8-P-1, which had shown the policy status as “ongoing.”

Ms. Ayres suggested that the status could be amended to reflect “not implemented.” She noted that the issue before the Commission was not to change the General Plan, but to confirm the status of implementation of each policy.

Commissioner Garcia stated that he would accept that revision.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

PROPOSED: City of Pittsburg

OPPONENTS: None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Associate Planner Ken Strelo also noted that Policy 3-S-6, under the Growth Management Element, Action Policies had shown that policy status as being “ongoing.”

It was recommended that that policy status also be revised to read “not implemented.”
MOTION: **Annual Report**

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to recommend that the City Council accept the Annual Report on the status of the implementation of the General Plan, with revisions to the status for Policy 8-P-1 and 3-S-6, as discussed and as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

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

**COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:**

**Item 2: Delta Gateway Freestanding Sign. AP-03-35 (DR).**

An application by Kristy Bayer of Young Electric Sign Company requesting design review approval of plans and a sign exception for off-site location of a 14-foot tall, freestanding monument sign identifying four tenants within the Delta Gateway (Century Plaza 2) subdivision. The proposed sign would be located in the landscaped median of the private roadway between Lots 8 and 10 of Century Plaza 2, CC (Community Commercial) District; APN 074-460-019.

Associate Planner Dana Hoggatt presented the request from Kristy Bayer of Young Electric Sign Company requesting design review approval of plans and a sign exception for an off-site location of a 14-foot tall, freestanding monument sign identifying four tenants within the Delta Gateway (Century Plaza 2) subdivision. The proposed sign would be located in the landscaped median of the private roadway between Lots 8 and 10 of Century Plaza 2 in a Community Commercial District.

Ms. Hoggatt advised that the applicant had proposed a 14-foot high, 8-foot wide freestanding sign to be designed similar to the pylon sign located along State Route 4, with the top design featuring an arch design element spelling *Delta Gateway*. Below that design element would be a single internally illuminated cabinet with space for four individual tenant panels.

Currently, all of the tenants in the Delta Gateway had individual wall or freestanding signage. The tenants proposed for the freestanding sign had not yet been identified, although those tenants would primarily be the future tenants of the subdivision since the current tenants had existing signage.

Ms. Hoggatt reported that staff was of the opinion that the proposed sign would be
premature in that the prospective tenants and site plans were unknown and it was difficult
to make the required findings to approve the sign and the sign exception. The sign would
require an exception for sign area since it exceeded the maximum allowed and since the
sign would be located in an off-site location. The sign would identify tenants not on the
same parcel as the sign itself, which by definition would make it an off-site sign.

Ms. Hoggatt added that if the Commission was of the opinion that it could make the
findings to approve the sign, staff would request some restrictions or conditions that would
limit future freestanding signage to minimize the number of signs along Century Boulevard.

Ms. Hoggatt recommended the Planning Commission denying AP-03-35 (DR), without
prejudice.

PROPONENT:

MARK GASTINEAU, Young Electric Sign Company, 1015 North Market Boulevard, Suite
B, Sacramento, commented that they had started the project with staff a couple of years
ago when the property was being developed and at which time multi-tenant signs had been
discussed. He had mistakenly thought the signs had already been approved in conjunction
with the tentative map. He noted that most tenants such as In-N-Out Burger already had a
freestanding monument sign to identify their businesses.

Mr. Gastineau also commented that the retail commercial along the freeway was prime
property and without advertising tenants would not occupy the area. He stated that the
developer had agreed, as part of its lease agreement with Circuit City, to provide a
monument sign at the proposed location for Circuit City. He noted that Circuit City would
be one of the four tenants on the sign. He disagreed with staff that the tenants on the sign
should be prevented from having other freestanding signs and suggested that each case
and each prospective tenant should be considered individually.

DOUG MESSNER, Sierra Pacific Properties, noted that presently Circuit City would have
the top panel of the sign. He noted that prospective tenants had discussed the need for
such signage to attract business to their sites.

Mr. Messner clarified that they had also envisioned In-N-Out Burger on the sign along with
the tenants on pads 7 and 8 to the east of the entrance. He commented that they planned
to submit plans for a 9,000 square foot multi-tenant building this week for Lot 8. Further,
they were speaking to potential sit down restaurant users for Lot 10, including a steak
house, which could also be a candidate for placement on the sign.

Mr. Messner also clarified that the panel for Circuit City would be visible on both sides of
the sign, although that would not necessarily be the case for the other future tenants. He
added that at the time that Circuit City had entered into its lease, it had been concerned
with future development on both sides of its current entrance, which would block views of
the building. He noted that Circuit City required signage at the proposed location as part
its lease agreement, if Lots 8 and 10 were developed. The property owner had agreed to
the stipulation in the lease agreement based on the Tentative Map that had been approved
and which had shown future signs at each entrance.

OPPONENTS: None

Commissioner Garcia supported some flexibility in City signage. He commented that
future buildings on pads 9 and 10 could block the Circuit City building. Existing monument
signs for the properties were now on the street itself facing the street, with nothing to
identify the properties along Century Boulevard. He suggested that the City needed all of
the retail possible to attract patrons to shop in the community. He suggested that the
findings could be made to approve the sign.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that the increased size of the sign was not inappropriate
and that the income the property would generate should be taken into consideration.
Further, the sign had been identified on the approved Tentative Map. He recommended
that staff prepare and return with a resolution for approval at the next meeting.

Commissioner Ramirez suggested that the sign would be smart planning and was
envisioned in the original plans. He questioned the staff recommendation to delay the sign
since it would be a benefit to existing and future tenants. He too supported a
recommendation to direct staff to prepare a resolution of approval.

In response to Commissioner Harris, Mr. Messner reiterated that the approved Tentative
Map had shown approved signage at each of the locations along Century Boulevard,
although some of the entrances had not yet been developed. He preferred that staff and
the Commission consider each sign application as it was submitted and reviewed on its
own merits. As to the future tenant sign panels, he clarified that if the sign was approved
the sign panel for Circuit City would be installed right away.

Mr. Messner further acknowledged that the future tenant panels could remain empty for
close to a year. The intent was to get the sign approved now since Circuit City would not
allow the developer to move forward with development of the parcels in front of its building
until the sign had been installed consistent with its lease agreement. He presented a copy
of an exhibit to the Circuit City lease to illustrate the locations where the Circuit City
approved the installation of a monument sign in order to develop Lots 8 and 10.

Mr. Messner explained that the developer had letters of intent for potential leases and the
developer was speaking to many potential tenants at this time. Sit down restaurant uses
were the focus of the lots located to the west of the subject lots, which where not large
enough to accommodate other uses. A photograph of a monument sign in the City, which
had only three tenant panels, occupied with the remaining tenant panels empty was also
displayed to the Commission.

Mr. Gastineau clarified for the record that the plans had shown a brick planter around the
sign, although that had only been included in the conceptual rendering. Since the sign would be located in a narrow landscape island, he stated that the brick would not be used. The sign would consist of a stucco base with plant material and a drip system around it. He also clarified that if the sign were approved it would provide 12.4 square feet of identification per tenant.

Commissioner Garcia made a motion to direct staff to prepare a resolution of approval, subject to the five findings required to be made to approve a permanent freestanding sign as identified on Page 3 of the staff report.

Commissioner Ramirez seconded the motion.

Commissioner Dolojan disagreed that Finding 2 could be made to approve the sign. He disagreed with that finding that the sign would be necessary for the business identification and would be comparable to that of neighboring businesses. He suggested that only Finding Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 could be made.

Commissioner Garcia amended his motion to direct staff to prepare a resolution of approval for the sign subject to Findings 1, 3, 4 and 5. Commissioner Ramirez accepted the amendment to the motion,

MOTION: AP-03-45 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to direct staff to prepare a resolution to approve sign plans and a sign exception for the construction of a freestanding sign identifying Century Plaza 2, “Delta Gateway Freestanding Sign and Sign Exception,” AP-03-35 (DR), subject to required Findings 1, 3, 4, and 5 to approve a permanent freestanding sign as identified in PMC Section 19.12.020.A. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and carried by the following vote:

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


An application by Tom Ksenzulak of American Auto Body requesting a sign exception to allow the placement of a wall sign identifying the business “American Auto Body” on a building wall facing an interior lot line. The property is located at 3001 North Parkside Boulevard in the IP (Industrial Park) District; APN 088-151-012.

Assistant Planner Ken Strelo presented the staff report for the request for a sign exception to allow the placement of a wall sign identifying the business “American Auto Body” on a
building wall facing an interior lot line, located at 3001 North Parkside Boulevard in the Industrial Park zoning district.

The sign would meet the City's sign regulations for a wall sign in that it would be 170 square feet in size with the building 170 feet in length. Staff was of the opinion that the sign would be attractive and would match the freestanding sign located on the corner of Markstein Drive and North Park Boulevard. The sign would consist of blue channel letters with a red trim and be internally illuminated.

Mr. Strelo explained that the sign must conform to the maximum extent possible to the sign size, number and placement regulations. The sign would be consistent with the intent and purpose of the sign code. The sign would not be used for advertising purposes and would be used solely for identification purposes.

The sign will complement the freestanding sign, which was the only other identification on the site. The sign would identify the business for those traveling from North Park Plaza whereas the existing monument sign provides identification for those traveling along California Boulevard parallel to the train tracks and turning north towards the business.

Mr. Strelo recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 9449, approving AP-03-48, with the conditions as shown.

PROPOSER:

TOM KSENZULAK, 105 Bliss Avenue, Pittsburg acknowledged that he had read and was in agreement with the staff recommended conditions of approval as shown in the staff report dated September 16, 2003.

OPponents: None

MOTION: AP-03-48 (DR)

Motion by Commissioner Ramirez to adopt Resolution No. 9449, approving AP-03-48 (DR), a sign exception to allow a wall sign on an interior lot line located at 3001 North Park Boulevard, known as “American Auto Body”, with the conditions as shown. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kelley and carried by the following vote:

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

Item 4: Application of General Plan Hillside Policies.
Clarification of the application of General Plan Hillside Policies.

Ms. Ayres reported that the item had been considered by the Commission on August 26, 2003, at which time the Commission had continued the item to allow more time to review the hillside policies in the General Plan. The item was being returned with that information for easy reference and had been attached to the staff report dated September 16, 2003.

Display boards had also been prepared to depict what properties would be included in each of the four options presented to the Commission at its prior meeting.

The four options identified by staff included:

1. Apply policies to all property with hillside terrain. Definition of hillside terrain to include reference to land with existing slopes exceeding 30 percent as delineated on General Plan Figure 10-1 (Geologic Hazards).

2. Apply policies only to land designated Hillside Low Density Residential.

3. Apply policies only to lands designated Hillside Low Density Residential or Open Space.

4. Apply policies only to land above the 500-foot contour elevation as delineated on General Plan Figure 4-1 (View Shed Analysis).

Ms. Ayres also noted staff’s recommendation that the General Plan Hillside Policies in Chapter 4, Urban Design Element of the General Plan be applied (only) to all lands in the southern foothills above the 500-foot contour elevation, irrespective of General Plan or zoning designation.

If Option 1 were chosen, Ms. Ayres stated that might define hillside land too broadly, including properties between State Route 4 and Leland Road west of Bailey Road to the City limits. Much of the land had been designated for commercial uses and high-density residential developments where large flat pad grading would be expected and encouraged.

If Option 2 were chosen, that would limit the application of the hillside policies to generally four properties currently outside of the City limits. In addition most of the ridges and hilly terrain identified in the Urban Design Element that were visible to the public from State Route 4 would not be governed by the Hillside policies.

Option 3 would ensure hillside protections for much, but not all, of the foothills located south of the City’s current limits. If and when annexed to the City, it would not include areas of hillside lands west of Bailey Road and would include lands in the 200 and 300-foot level, which might not provide the necessary public benefit.
Option 4 would preserve the most visible hillside areas and those with the most potential environmental constraints and would be a line that would be easily manageable and understood by the development community and staff in terms of interpreting when and if to apply those policies to the context of a new development.

Ms. Ayres stated that it was important to develop some standard so that the development community and staff would not spend a lot of time debating whether or not the policy would apply to a specific project. She emphasized the importance of guidance from the Planning Commission and the City Council to identify the properties where the standards would apply.

Ms. Ayres added that the Chair had made comment at the prior meeting as to how the hillside policies, if applied to the area west of Bailey Road, would impact roads. A display was presented to the Commission to identify the extension of San Marco Blvd. as presented in one of the alternatives reviewed under the Bailey Estates Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). She clarified that the plans were conceptual only and that no engineering studies had been conducted at this point in time.

Chairperson Leonard declared a recess at 7:53 P.M. to allow the Commission to view the displays. The meeting reconvened at 7:55 P.M. with all Commissioners present.

Commissioner Dolojan inquired why changes to the General Plan were now being considered. He pointed out that the projects that had been developed had been successful. He suggested that the City follow the regulations previously approved. While each option had its own merits, he supported Option 2 as the preferred application of the General Plan hillside policies.

Commissioner Garcia noted that Option 2 had been approved as part of the approved General Plan in 2001. He noted that two former Planning Commissioners who now served on the City Council along with some current Commissioners had also approved Option 2 as part of the approved General Plan which had seemed to suffice for the current development in the west end of the City. In his opinion, the issue had already been studied at great length and had ultimately been approved. He suggested that Option 2 should continue to be the preferred application of the General Plan hillside policies and be the Commission’s recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Tumbaga clarified that while she had voted for the General Plan, she had not voted specifically for Option 2 interpretation. She emphasized that she had always been a proponent of something similar to Option 4, which would protect the views of the hillsides.

Chairperson Leonard commented on the display of the future linear road that would connect the west ends of the City and which was at an elevation between 575 and 900 feet and between a half to three quarters of a mile in length. He pointed out that the only way to
offset the cost of such a roadway would be through some type of development along the roadway. With Option 4, he believed, at 500 feet, there could be no connector.

Chairperson Leonard concurred that at the time of the Commission's review of the General Plan, Option 2 had been the most palatable application to most Commissioners and was the interpretation he believed had been approved by the Commission.

Chairperson Leonard also questioned why the matter was being returned to the Commission. The Chair emphasized the due diligence that the Commission had pursued through many meetings on the General Plan, with specific discussion on the hillsides. He suggested that the recommendations from the Commission at that time should remain intact.

Commissioner Harris continued to support Option 2 as originally recommended in the approved General Plan.

Commissioner Ramirez expressed concern supporting Option 4 in that there would be no development in a good portion of the identified property. He questioned how the roadway connecting the west end of the City to Bailey Road would be feasible and he inquired who would pay for that improvement. He supported Option 2.

Commissioner Kelley advised that she had not changed her mind from the last meeting and would continue to support Option 4.

Commissioner Dolojan clarified that although he had last supported Option 4, after reviewing the display of a possible connection to Bailey Road he noted that whenever a road was built anywhere it was likely to be subject to development alongside. He also understood that Option 4 would limit any development above 500 feet. He supported Option 2 at this time.

Ms. Ayres clarified that Option 4 did not prevent grading or houses between 500 feet and 900 feet; that 500 feet was simply the trigger proposed to apply the hillside policies. She further noted that 3 du/ac were still permitted in that area, even if the hillside policies are applied there.

Commissioner Tumbaga emphasized that she would continue to support Option 4.

MOTION: Hillside Policy Application

Motion by Commissioner Garcia to recommend to the City Council apply the General Plan hillside policies as shown in Option 2; apply policies only to land designated Hillside Low Density Residential. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and approved by the following vote:

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

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no staff communications.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Garcia reported that the TRANSPLAN Committee had recently met to discuss the possibility of combining the four different Joint Exercise of Powers Agencies (JPAs) into one committee. At that meeting, the Committee had also approved monies to subsidize children taking buses to school, and had discussed the EIR for eBART, although Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Contra Costa County had been disturbed with the fact they would have to count riders to justify the expenditures for the project.

Discussions had also been held on a request from Alameda County for funds from TRANSPLAN for improvements to Vasco Road, which would involve a $19 million project to straighten out the roadway between Contra Costa County and I-580. Additional discussions to combine JPAs and a recommendation to add newly appointed Supervisor Millie Greenberg who represented Brentwood, had been considered. There was a concern that an additional member would represent an even number of votes creating a potential for split votes. As a result, it was recommended that Tri-Delta Transit and/or BART also be included on the Committee.

Commissioner Tumbaga referenced the corner of Railroad and California Avenues where Carlos Pizzeria had been removed to allow the widening of State Route 4. She questioned whether or not adjacent homes would also be removed as part of that project.

Commissioner Garcia understood that the State was going to buy one more home since Railroad Avenue would be going up five more feet, which had necessitated the removal of the Carlos Pizzeria building. He also understood that much of the widening would be done on the south side of the freeway. As to comments related to a potential interchange at Range Road, according to Caltrans an interchange at Range Road was not needed since it was too close to Bailey Road, which would mean that the City would have to accept the cost of such an improvement.

Chairperson Leonard understood that the home in question had been purchased by a private party who was working on permits to relocate the home to a site on Locust Street. He also understood that there were efforts to take properties north from the Railroad Avenue interchange since many of those homes were in disrepair.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS
Commissioner Kelley referenced the signal at Harbor Street and Buchanan Road, which had been changed to allow turns without blocking traffic. She questioned why the same had not been done for the intersection at Harbor Street and California Avenue. She encouraged staff to review that issue.

Commissioner Garcia commented that traffic traveling south on Harbor Street and California Avenue had been backed up at great lengths due to the short green traffic signal at that location. On another issue, he inquired of staff whether or not The Olsen Company was taking the property between Herb White Way and Fifth and Eighth Streets. Mr. Jerome acknowledged that The Olsen Company was evaluating that property.

Commissioner Garcia reported that he would not be in attendance at the meeting scheduled for September 30 when the Bailey Estates DEIR would be presented to the Commission. He expressed concern about who would be responsible for the maintenance of the J-ditches since he understood that the City would not be responsible or able to afford to maintain those ditches. He also expressed concern with open space and wetlands and inquired who would maintain those areas of the property and whether or not there would be CC&R’s for the prospective homeowners to maintain that area.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the preferred alternative (249 units) had shown a two-acre park. He questioned whether or not that would be a developed park. He further inquired whether or not the City would have an agreement with the developer to deliver water to the property since a water line would be needed for the development and the future development of the Alves property.

Civil Engineer II Alfredo Hurtado advised that an additional 24-inch line would be required.

Commissioner Garcia requested assurance that the developer would be required to join an assessment district or whatever was necessary to deliver water to the site. He also disagreed with the staff assessment that that section Bailey Road was not a regional route of significance. He pointed out that portion of Bailey Road located within the limits of the City of Concord had a 4 lane right-of-way/easement that extended to Clayton Road. While the road is only two lanes now, the right-of-way/easement exists and the fences of the existing homes were setback to respect the future road alignment.

Commissioner Garcia suggested that sooner or later the roadway would be widened to four lanes. He did not expect the developer to widen the entire length from Leland Road to his project, although he recommended that the development frontage be widened to four lanes and that the developer be credited under the Traffic Mitigation fee for the two lanes and additional lanes that would be installed.

Chairperson Leonard commended the improvements made to the Vogue Theater and commented that the project was progressing well.

Commissioner Dolojan referenced the discussion of the hillside policies and in that regard
he encouraged City staff to work with future developers who could bring revenue to the City.

Commissioner Ramirez requested that staff review the signal lights at the intersection of Marks Boulevard and Railroad Avenue that needed to be reset to appropriately accommodate local traffic rather than the heavy commute traffic in that area.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:32 P.M. to a regular meeting of the Planning Commission on September 30, 2003 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers at 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA.

_____________________________
MELISSA AYRES, Secretary
Pittsburg Planning Commission