

1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING**
4 **PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**
5

6 **February 28, 2022**
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 **A. CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 P.M.**
13

14 **B1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
15

16 **B2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** Before we begin, we would like to acknowledge the Ohlone
17 people, who are the traditional custodians of this land. We pay our respects to the Ohlone elders,
18 past, present and future, who call this place, Ohlone Land, the land that Pinole sits upon, their
19 home. We are proud to continue their tradition of coming together and growing as a community.
20 We thank the Ohlone community for their stewardship and support, and we look forward to
21 strengthening our ties as we continue our relationship of mutual respect and understanding
22

23 **B3. ROLL CALL**
24

25 Commissioners Present: Benzuly, Kurrent, Martinez, Menis, Vice Chairperson
26 Moriarty, Chairperson Banuelos
27

28 Commissioners Absent: Wong
29

30 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
31 Justin Shiu, Contract Planner
32

33 **C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**
34

35 Tony Vossbrink, Pinole, speaking on behalf of friends and neighbors, inquired of
36 the status of several inoperable street lights along Pinole Valley Road around
37 Pinole Valley High School near the library. While he had previously reported this
38 issue to the City Council, and had been informed this was a PG&E matter, it was
39 a safety hazard which should be addressed immediately. The streets and
40 crosswalks in the valley and along Pinole Valley Road also needed to be restriped
41 and parking spaces along Adobe Road should be striped since it was a public
42 health, safety and quality of life issue. In addition, an existing breach along Pinole
43 Creek behind the Sprouts Shopping Center was to be addressed by the County,
44 but nothing had been done. He asked the Planning Commission to urge the City
45 Council to work with the appropriate parties to get these matters resolved.

1 Planning Manager David Hanham stated he would forward the concerns to the
2 Public Works Department. As to the lights along Pinole Valley Road, he
3 understood that PG&E was having some issues and he would check on the status.
4

5 **D. MEETING MINUTES:**
6

7 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from December 13, 2021
8

9 Commissioner Menis requested an amendment to Lines 15 through 18 of Page 4,
10 of the December 13, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, as follows:
11

12 *In response to Commissioner Menis who wanted to know whether he was*
13 *permitted to comment on the Hazel Street Project, Mr. Mog stated that while*
14 *the project had been approved by the City, Commissioner Menis lived within*
15 *a 500-foot radius of the project site and he recommended Commissioner*
16 *Menis not comment on the project at this time.*
17

18 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
19 from December 13, 2021, as amended.
20

21 **MOTION: Menis SECONDED: Benzuly APPROVED: 6-0-1**
22 **ABSENT: Wong**
23

24 **E. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**
25

26 **F. OLD BUSINESS: None**
27

28 **G. NEW BUSINESS:**
29

30 **1. Three Corridors Specific Plan – Appian Way Corridor Information and**
31 **Discussion**

32 Information and discussion item reviewing the content of the City's adopted
33 Three Corridors Specific Plan, with a focus on the Appian Way Corridor
34

35 Mr. Hanham presented the staff memorandum dated February 28, 2022, and
36 advised that the Planning Commission had been reviewing the Three Corridors
37 Specific Plan and its relationship with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance,
38 along with the potential of each of the corridors for both residential and non-
39 residential developments. The Planning Commission had reviewed the San Pablo
40 Avenue Corridor at its November 8, 2021 meeting and the Pinole Valley Road
41 Corridor on December 13, 2021.
42

43 Mr. Hanham provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Three Corridors Specific
44 Plan – Appian Way Corridor with an overview of the vision for Appian Way, Appian
45 Way Sub-Area Framework, zoning designations, urban design and circulation
46 principles, parking and focal points, aesthetic, landscaping, lighting and signage

1 principles for Appian Way and economic and land use development. The Appian
2 Way Opportunity Sites north of Interstate-80 and the Development Standards, and
3 Private and Public Realm Standards and Design Guidelines were also highlighted.
4

5 An example of projects in the Appian Way Corridor were identified and included a
6 151-unit residential development; a 345,430 square foot Multi-Family Project to be
7 located at 2151 Appian Way; and the 553,212 square foot Safeway Project at 1300
8 – 1577 Tara Hills.
9

10 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Hanham clarified:
11

- 12 • The property owner was working with Safeway related to issues with the
13 Pinole Square project and staff was working to obtain a project schedule, but
14 it was anticipated the project would commence in 2022.
15
- 16 • The Appian Village project would likely be presented to the Planning
17 Commission at its second meeting in March. Staff was reviewing the traffic
18 analysis the applicant had submitted which had been compared to the former
19 Doctors Hospital. All potential impacts including fire services would be
20 analyzed as part of the project.
21
- 22 • A full traffic signal had been planned at Marlesta Road as part of the Capital
23 Improvement Plan (CIP) but staff would have to return with a status report on
24 the specifics of the design.
25
- 26 • Staff acknowledged that bicycle and pedestrian improvements ended at the
27 south end of the Appian Way Corridor and that any plans by the City to extend
28 those improvements into the Appian Way Corridor would require an extension
29 of the right-of-way (ROW), bicycle lane and shoulders. This issue had been
30 discussed by staff but there had been no development interest in the area.
31 Grant funding would have to be considered for the pedestrian and bicycle
32 improvements which may be the only way for such improvements to be
33 provided by the City of Pinole, unless a development had been planned that
34 would install needed improvements.
35
- 36 • The former Kmart property on Fitzgerald Drive was currently part of the
37 Appian Way Corridor. There had been a prior recommendation by
38 Commissioner Wong to consider making it its own corridor, which
39 recommendation was being discussed amongst staff and the Community
40 Development Director although the area was built out.
41
- 42 • There were no plans to change the existing bridge over Appian Way although
43 the City was working with Caltrans on safety measures since the City would
44 be adding more residential units in the Three Corridors Specific Plan area.
45

- There were two WestCAT JPX Express lines coming through Appian Way and Fitzgerald Drive that currently provided services to BART, which routes would be most impacted by BART's plans to stop funding to connectors. Existing bus routes between Pinole and Richmond to the BART station should not be affected.
- Developments in the Service Area of the Appian Way Corridor may be as high as 70 feet with the knowledge that new projects would include numerous mitigations, such as requiring the purchase of fire equipment or the payment or mitigation fees for the purchase of fire equipment.
- Using the proposed Appian Village project as an example, a Commercial Mixed-Use (CMU) would allow for 100 percent residential in the Three Corridors Specific Plan as long as it provided community benefits as described in the General Plan. Staff clarified that once the project was built out, an existing chain link fence would be removed. Since the building had become dilapidated, the property owner had been required to provide protective fencing around the property which had led to the use of the chain link fence.
- Clarified Table 2: Existing v. Proposed Development Projections for the Appian Way Corridor, as shown in the staff memorandum.
- Updating the Housing Element process would include discussions along with public input on meeting the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and more vertical density would be reviewed as part of that process, particularly in those areas of the Three Corridors Specific Plan area that were currently built out.
- Referencing the Pinole Square development, the project design was locked in with the exception of the landscaping, with more native trees proposed to be part of the project. Staff had discussed different ideas with the applicant who was in the process of working on the tenant spaces. The applicant had the ability to return and request design review to make modifications. The applicant would provide 16 to 18 electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces throughout the development and all spaces would be wired for EVs.
- Staff was working on possibly providing a stop light across San Pablo Avenue near the new senior housing development on San Pablo Avenue, with the CIP currently calling for a lighted sidewalk. Staff would verify that information.
- Staff acknowledged the traffic congestion at the Tara Hills and Appian Way intersection and the need for better directional signage or clear street markings in the intersection.

- Staff also acknowledged that a lot had happened since the creation of the Three Corridors Specific Plan and it may have to be updated along with the General Plan.

The Planning Commission discussed at length its concerns with the future development application for the former Kmart property; recognition of the housing crisis and issues related to affordable housing along with the fact that not all communities had provided their fair share of affordable housing; and the fact that former shopping center properties were ideal for residential development with a need to consider thoughtful vertical density in Pinole.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Mr. Hanham advised there were no public comments for this item.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

In response to Vice Chairperson Moriarty, Mr. Hanham advised the community benefits had been detailed in Section 5, Page 23 of the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

The Planning Commission thanked staff for the presentation.

H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

Mr. Hanham reported the project proposed for 2801 Pinole Valley Road would likely be considered by the Planning Commission in April, and the Pinole Vista project the second meeting of March or first meeting of April. Appian Village would be presented to the Planning Commission at the end of March. He also reported an application had been received for the Pinole Shores II project and staff was working on the Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs) Inventory, and hoped to issue a Request for Proposal for a Climate Action Plan (CAP). In addition, the City website had been updated with general information on all Planning Department projects and the City was working on new software for planning and building permits to provide more efficient and transparent operations. The City Council would be considering a hybrid in-person format for its March 15, 2022 regular City Council meeting to be held in the Council Chambers. The Planning Commission would be apprised when its meetings would return to the in-person format.

Mr. Hanham further reported on the upcoming in-person Planning Commission Academy scheduled for March 16 through 18, 2022 in San Ramon. Planning Commissioners interested in attending were asked to contact staff.

Commissioner Kurrent liked the Zoom meeting capabilities and hoped there would be a way for a Commissioner to continue to participate remotely if unable to attend

1 in person, particularly since he would not be present for the March 14, 2022 Planning
2 Commission meeting.

3
4 Mr. Hanham expressed the willingness to look into a hybrid option. It was likely the
5 City Council would meet in-person first, which would allow staff to work out any issues
6 prior to the Planning Commission returning to an in-person format.
7

8 Vice Chairperson Moriarty inquired of the status of creating objective standards to
9 comply with Senate Bill (SB) 9 since she understood there was a March 2022
10 deadline, to which Mr. Hanham reported that staff was reviewing what other cities
11 had done, may consider an Urgency Ordinance, but would definitely adopt objective
12 standards in compliance with SB 9. He anticipated information would be presented
13 to the Planning Commission at a meeting in March.
14

15 Vice Chairperson Moriarty inquired of the status of the meeting schedule for the
16 Historic Overlay Ad Hoc Committee, and Mr. Hanham advised he would have to
17 follow-up with the Assistant City Attorney and would provide an update to the
18 Planning Commission.
19

20 Vice Chairperson Moriarty also asked about the status of plans to install a granite
21 boulder at the entrance to the City of Pinole off of I-80 near the DaVita Dialysis
22 building, and the status of a replacement tree for a street tree that had been removed
23 on San Pablo Avenue.
24

25 Mr. Hanham commented that the only boulder he was aware of was moving one near
26 the creek as part of the park bench. He would check with the Public Works
27 Department regarding the replacement tree on San Pablo Avenue.
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 March 14, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.
35

36 **K. ADJOURNMENT:** 8:50 P.M.
37

38 Transcribed by:
39
40

41 Sherri D. Lewis
42 Transcriber