

1  
2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**  
4 **PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

5  
6 **November 8, 2021**  
7

8 **THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 361 AND**  
9 **A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING REMOTE**  
10 **MEETINGS FOR ALL CITY LEGISLATIVE BODIES**  
11

12  
13 **A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:03 P.M.  
14

15 **B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL**  
16

17 Commissioners Present: Benzuly, Kurrent, Martinez, Menis, Wong, Vice  
18 Chairperson Moriarty, Chairperson Banuelos\*  
19 \*Arrived after Roll Call  
20

21 Commissioners Absent: None  
22

23 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager  
24 Lilly Whalen, Community Development Director  
25 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner  
26 Alex Mog, Assistant City Attorney  
27

28 Assistant City Attorney Alex Mog clarified for the record that the Planning  
29 Commission agenda was slightly inaccurate in that the Planning Commission was  
30 meeting remotely, not in accordance with any executive orders from Governor  
31 Newsom, but in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 361 and a resolution adopted by  
32 the City Council authorizing remote meetings for all City legislative bodies.  
33

34 Planning Commissioner Menis apologized for his absence from the Planning  
35 Commission meeting that had been scheduled for October 25, 2021, since his  
36 absence had resulted in the cancellation of the meeting.  
37

38 **C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**  
39

40 An unidentified individual speaking on behalf of fellow residents commented that  
41 a number of ongoing issues had previously been raised with the Planning  
42 Commission and the City Council without resolution to date. He referenced a  
43 major breach at the end of the Sprouts Shopping Center between the parking lot  
44 and the bowling alley on the northeast side of the creek, which had become worse  
45 after recent rains. The landscaping and trees in the shopping center had not been

1 completed, with gaps in the parking lots, which were a health and safety issue  
2 since the curbs and abutments had not been appropriately painted to prevent  
3 safety hazards. The ingress/egress at DaVita Dialysis/Starbucks/Kaiser  
4 Permanente also remained an issue and a flag banner had been installed on one  
5 of the islands between the buildings, absent proper signage or landscaping, and  
6 the metering light system eastbound near Jack in the Box was inoperable.  
7

8 Staff was asked to provide an update on the status of the former Safeway  
9 Shopping Center and Doctors' Hospital buildings. The lights were out in the  
10 Safeway parking lot during the evening, also a safety hazard. In addition, three  
11 telephone poles along Pinole Valley Road and Granada Court had been band-  
12 aided together with orange cones around them. The City needed to work with  
13 PG&E to address the situation, particularly since the orange cones were blocking  
14 the sidewalk in violation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations.  
15

16 Planning Manager David Hanham explained that staff would have to contact the  
17 West Contra Costa Flood Control Protection District to look into the concerns with  
18 the creek. The metering lights were a Caltrans issue and the issues on the DaVita  
19 Dialysis side would have to be researched to determine whether it was a City or  
20 Flood Control Protection District issue. Also, the telephone poles on Pinole Valley  
21 Road would have to be addressed with the Public Works Department. He  
22 recommended that the speaker provide his e-mail in writing to staff to allow status  
23 reports to be provided. He provided his e-mail address to the public at this time  
24 [ghanham@ci.pinole.ca.us](mailto:ghanham@ci.pinole.ca.us).  
25

26 Commissioner Kurrent asked that a future agenda item be considered to allow staff  
27 to provide an update on the items identified.  
28

29 Mr. Hanham expressed the willingness to include a status report in the  
30 Communications section of the next meeting agenda.  
31

32 Irma Ruport, Pinole, referenced the passage of Measure X, a countywide half cent  
33 sales tax measure and a recent article regarding the proposed use of the funds by  
34 the Measure X Advisory Committee, which included a goal for the reopening of  
35 East not West County Fire Stations. She had raised this issue with the City Council  
36 during its October 19, 2021 meeting.  
37

38 Ms. Ruport understood the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) had  
39 planned to discuss the Measure X Advisory Committee recommendations during  
40 a meeting on November 2, but the item had been continued to a BOS meeting  
41 scheduled for November 16, 2021. She had contacted Supervisors Glover and  
42 Gioia to inquire of the status of the Measure X funds and why West County had  
43 been eliminated from consideration. Supervisor Gioia had contacted her and had  
44 provided a report to the City Council on November 2. She read into the record  
45 Supervisor Gioia's response to her inquiries.  
46

1 Ms. Ruport added that Planning Commissioner Menis had placed a petition on the  
2 NextDoor website with information on this issue, with residents encouraged to e-  
3 mail and contact the BOS prior to its November 16 meeting pledging support for  
4 the use of Measure X funds to reopen Pinole's Fire Station No. 74.

5  
6 Lilly Whalen introduced herself to the Planning Commission as the new  
7 Community Development Director. She looked forward to working with the  
8 Planning Commission and the local community.

9  
10 **D. MEETING MINUTES:**

11  
12 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from September 27, 2021

13  
14 Commissioner Menis requested that a land acknowledgment be added to the start of  
15 each Planning Commission meeting agenda consistent with City Council meeting  
16 agendas.

17  
18 Mr. Mog suggested the request be made as part City Planner's/Commissioner's  
19 Reports.

20  
21 **MOTION** with a Roll Call Vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
22 from September 27, 2021, as submitted.

23  
24 **MOTION: Kurrent**

**SECONDED: Martinez**

**APPROVED: 6-0-1**  
**ABSENT: Banuelos**

25  
26  
27 **E. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

28  
29 **F. OLD BUSINESS: None**

30  
31 **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

32  
33 1. **Three Corridors Specific Plan – San Pablo Avenue Corridor**  
34 **Information and Discussion**

35 Information and discussion item reviewing the content of the City's adopted  
36 Three Corridors Specific Plan, with a focus on the San Pablo Avenue  
37 Corridor

38  
39 Mr. Hanham presented the staff memorandum dated November 8, 2021 and  
40 explained that over the next few meetings the Planning Commission would review  
41 the Specific Plan and its relationship with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance,  
42 and the potential of each of the corridors for both residential and non-residential  
43 developments.

44  
45 Mr. Hanham provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Three Corridors Specific  
46 Plan – San Pablo Avenue Corridor which included an overview of the vision for

1 San Pablo Avenue, urban design and circulation principles, parking and focal  
2 points, aesthetic, landscaping, lighting and signage principles for San Pablo  
3 Avenue, economic and land use development, and the sub-area framework for  
4 San Pablo Avenue including the Mixed Use, Old Town and Service Sub-Areas  
5 along with eight zoning areas, as outlined in the staff memorandum.  
6

7 Examples of projects in the Three Corridors Specific Plan area were also  
8 highlighted and included the Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA)  
9 Project located on Appian Way consisting of 33 units on .5 acres, and Vista Woods  
10 also on Appian Way consisting of 179 units on 2.01 acres. The San Pablo  
11 opportunity sites west and east of Appian Way and the permitted land uses, design  
12 standards, and economic development strategies in the Three Corridors Specific  
13 Plan were all highlighted.  
14

15 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Hanham and Mr. Mog clarified:  
16

- 17 • The City had limited Geographic Information System (GIS) capacity to  
18 prepare a comprehensive Three Corridors Specific Plan Map, but staff was  
19 working on plotting projects in the Three Corridors Specific Plan area with  
20 frontages using Google Earth.  
21
- 22 • San Pablo Avenue was a four-lane expressway with significant traffic volume.  
23 Parklets or outdoor dining on San Pablo Avenue were challenging given the  
24 traffic, sidewalk width, and need to ensure pedestrian safety. Some  
25 businesses had been fortunate to provide outdoor dining but the traffic on San  
26 Pablo Avenue during the rush hour was a constraint, although using side  
27 streets (Tennant Avenue, Pinole Valley Road and Fernandez Avenue) to  
28 create the outdoor dining and public space experiences could be considered.  
29 The City may also need to consider the area between John Street and  
30 Tennant Avenue and expand back into Oakridge Road, which would open up  
31 the possibility of parklets through repaving and other street work. West  
32 towards San Pablo Avenue, the buildings were set back providing more  
33 opportunities for public spaces.  
34
- 35 • The Three Corridors Specific Plan included design guidelines, some of which  
36 removed parking, but the parking removed would need to be added elsewhere  
37 or consideration of a garage to make San Pablo Avenue a more walkable  
38 community. Properties that were underutilized or able to handle more parking  
39 was another constraint requiring collaboration with property owners. Many  
40 parcels were flag parcels, requiring some parcel reconfiguration to make them  
41 easier to develop, and determining property lines was another constraint.  
42
- 43 • Priority sites had previously been handled by the Redevelopment Agency,  
44 and with the new Community Development Director on-board staff would be  
45 reviewing the priority sites to look at the desired uses that may be possible to

1 develop a strategy. Staff may also be able to identify a Priority Development  
2 Area (PDA), although that would depend on a property owner's willingness to  
3 sell the property. The existing physical constraints on San Pablo Avenue were  
4 again highlighted as outlined in the PowerPoint presentation.  
5

- 6 • Prior to 2010, Pinole Shores had been undeveloped and the City owned a  
7 portion of the property. With the development of the Three Corridors Specific  
8 Plan in 2010, most light industrial uses were to be located in that area.  
9
- 10 • The Quimby Act was a state law which governed how much park land should  
11 be dedicated for residential subdivisions. The City had a Quimby Act  
12 Ordinance but staff was uncertain when it had last been used. The City also  
13 had a Park Impact Fee for parks and recreation imposed on all new residential  
14 development, although there had not been significant residential development  
15 in the City since the adoption of the Three Corridors Specific Plan. The funds  
16 were used for new facilities such as buying park property or building new park  
17 recreational facilities at parks.  
18
- 19 • The City had not initiated a green plan but as the City implemented its Climate  
20 Action Plan (CAP) and green inventory it would be able to identify projects  
21 that may work.  
22
- 23 • Properties located at 1456 San Pablo Avenue through 1504 San Pablo  
24 Avenue, and 1990 through 2100 San Pablo Avenue were identified as areas  
25 with gaps in the sidewalks and where the City currently had no plans to  
26 improve the sidewalks. If the properties were developed in the future, curb  
27 and sidewalk improvements would be required. Staff could also consider  
28 whether or not there was a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project that  
29 may have been considered for this segment of San Pablo Avenue. The  
30 Caltrans Complete Streets program was described along with potential  
31 planning grants which may offer opportunities to address street improvements  
32 along the San Pablo Avenue corridor. In order to create a pedestrian  
33 environment in the Three Corridors Specific Plan area all sidewalk gaps must  
34 be closed and would have to be further evaluated.  
35
- 36 • Staff would have to review whether or not the City was compliant with Quimby  
37 Act funding requirements.  
38
- 39 • Concerns with pedestrian safety related to the Vista Woods development was  
40 noted with solutions and options sought to ensure pedestrian safety. Staff  
41 noted that an easement may be required to install a sidewalk or retaining wall  
42 and staff would have to review whether or not any engineering plans had been  
43 prepared in the past, or whether such improvements could be included in the  
44 CIP in order for staff to consider grant opportunities.  
45

- 1       • Staff acknowledged a request to red stripe 2137 to around 529 San Pablo  
2 Avenue since vehicles routinely parked in front of the three Victorian homes  
3 where there was not a cut-in for parking, and vehicles were parked in the  
4 middle of the major thoroughfare impacting the path of travel for vehicles and  
5 buses. The City also needed to ensure that vehicles moved in and out of the  
6 cities of Hercules and Pinole as efficiently as possible.  
7
  - 8       • Staff asked to open up conversations with WestCAT to ensure adequate bus  
9 service for the SAHA and Vista Woods developments, and staff confirmed  
10 initial contact had been made with WestCat.  
11
  - 12       • San Pablo Avenue was identified as part of the Lincoln Highway and the 1927-  
13 28 route across the Carquinez Strait, the first dedicated road that traveled  
14 coast to coast and which had been designated as a Route of Regional  
15 Significance as part of Measure J. Any improvements to San Pablo Avenue  
16 would require concurrence with the surrounding cities, which was another  
17 constraint given the lack of interest from neighboring cities for any  
18 improvements that could create a bottleneck.  
19
  - 20       • The Planning Commission through staff could review the comments offered  
21 during this meeting, identify what could be done, and bring the Three  
22 Corridors Specific Plan back to the Planning Commission for formal action or  
23 recommendation to the City Council. Staff could also be directed to put  
24 something together for the Planning Commission to review and the Planning  
25 Commission may make recommendations to the City Council.  
26
- 27       As an example, if the Planning Commission wanted staff to consider a grant  
28 application for Sustainable Communities staff would research all of the  
29 particulars to be brought back to the Planning Commission for a  
30 recommendation to the City Council; however, much was outside of the scope  
31 of the Planning Commission's authority. The Planning Commission's role on  
32 the CIP was to confirm consistency with the General Plan but not add  
33 individual items to the CIP, which was the City Council's role. The Planning  
34 Commission may pass on recommendations to the City Council about any  
35 number of topics.  
36
- 37       • Staff could work with the Public Works Department in that the CIP was  
38 updated and reviewed each year. Projects could potentially be added and if  
39 the City Council permitted staff may consider potential grant opportunities.  
40
  - 41       • The City Council reviewed the CIP annually and received quarterly updates  
42 on the CIP.  
43

44 Vice Chairperson Moriarty still sought a map of projects in the Three Corridors  
45 Specific Plan area which would help to visualize what had been proposed for the

1 area, particularly given major expected changes as part of future development. She  
2 emphasized the importance of seeing how the Three Corridors Specific Plan area  
3 may change.  
4

5 Commissioner Menis suggested a future agenda item for an examination of  
6 possibilities to identify constraints in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area, and  
7 Mr. Hanham suggested if so directed by the Planning Commission staff could look at  
8 specific areas in the Three Corridors Specific Plan and zero in on creating a path,  
9 sidewalk or retaining wall, and as a project was defined it would be better refined.  
10 Staff could place an item on the agenda with information on what staff may find and  
11 the next steps and outline those steps to achieve the goal. He could not guarantee  
12 any timing for any projects.  
13

14 Chairperson Banuelos suggested a joint meeting between the Planning Commission  
15 and the City Council prior to such direction to staff. While some of the items may not  
16 be under the purview of the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission had  
17 identified issues of concern and it was very important for the two entities to meet  
18 jointly to discuss those issues.  
19

20 Mr. Mog advised that apart from speaking as individuals, the Planning Commission  
21 may instruct the Planning Commission Chair to make public comments at a future  
22 City Council meeting and request the City Council consider a future agenda item.  
23

24 Mr. Hanham recommended if that was the direction the Planning Commission sought  
25 he would recommend a motion, second and consensus on an item with an individual  
26 Commissioner designated to appear before the City Council to represent the  
27 Planning Commission. He acknowledged the following:  
28

- 29 • A recommendation to consider narrowing the lanes of San Pablo Avenue  
30 while retaining the Route of Regional Significance designation.  
31
- 32 • The volume of planned residential development had not been anticipated in  
33 the San Pablo Avenue corridor.  
34

#### 35 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

36  
37 Mr. Hanham reported there were no comments from the public for this item.  
38

#### 39 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

40  
41 The Planning Commission thanked staff for the presentation.  
42

## 43 2. **2021 Housing Legislation Presentation**

44 Informational presentation on State housing legislation passed in  
45 September 2021

1 Mr. Mog provided a PowerPoint presentation of the 2021 Housing Legislation  
2 which highlighted Senate Bills (SB) 8, Extension of Housing Crisis Act (SB 330);  
3 SB9, End of Single Family Zoning; and SB10, Streamlining for Upzoning and  
4 responded to specific questions from the Commission on SB8 and SB9.

5  
6 The Planning Commission meeting was interrupted when staff reported technical  
7 difficulties with the Zoom feed when the public was unable to see the meeting, and  
8 two Commissioners and the Assistant City Attorney had lost their Zoom feed.

9  
10 Commissioners Benzuly, Menis, Moriarty, Martinez, Wong and Planning Manager  
11 Hanham were present via Zoom. Community Development Director Whalen was  
12 also present by telephone.

13  
14 Mr. Hanham reported he had spoken with the Assistant City Attorney by telephone  
15 who had recommended the meeting adjourn at this time with the remaining agenda  
16 items to be continued to the next Planning Commission meeting.

17  
18 **MOTION** with a Roll Call Vote to continue the current meeting with the discussion of  
19 the 2021 Housing Legislation, specifically a discussion of SB10 continued to the next  
20 meeting scheduled for November 22, 2021.

21  
22 **MOTION: Wong                      SECONDED: Martinez                      APPROVED: 5-0-2**  
23 **ABSENT: Banuelos, Kurrent**

24  
25 **H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT**

26  
27 No report.

28  
29 **I. COMMUNICATIONS: None**

30  
31 **J. NEXT MEETING**

32  
33 The next meeting of the Planning Commission to be a Regular Meeting scheduled  
34 for November 22, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.

35  
36 **K. ADJOURNMENT: 9:54 P.M.**

37  
38 Transcribed by:

39  
40  
41 Sherri D. Lewis  
42 Transcriber