

AGENDA FOR THE



CITY OF PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Monday, August 23, 2021

7:00 P.M.

Via Zoom Videoconference

DUE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY – THIS MEETING IS BEING HELD PURSUANT TO AUTHORIZATION FROM GOVERNOR NEWSOM'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS – CITY COUNCIL AND COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NO LONGER OPEN TO IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE.

WAYS TO WATCH THE MEETING

- LIVE ON CHANNEL 26. The Community TV Channel 26 schedule is published on the City's website at www.ci.pinole.ca.us. The meeting can be viewed again as a retelecast on Channel 26.
- VIDEO-STREAMED LIVE ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE, www.ci.pinole.ca.us. and remain archived on the site for five (5) years.
- If none of these options are available to you, or you need assistance with public comment, please contact Planning Manager David Hanham at (510) 724-8912 or ghanham@ci.pinole.ca.us.

TO PARTICIPATE IN PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THE MEETING

Members of the public may submit a live remote public comment via Zoom video conferencing. Download the Zoom mobile app from the Apple Appstore or Google Play. If you are using a desktop computer, you can test your connection to Zoom by clicking [here](#). Zoom also allows you to join the meeting by phone.

From a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85372687051>

OR

<https://zoom.us/join>

Webinar ID: 853 7268 7051

By phone: +1 (669) 900-6833 or +1 (253) 215-8782 or +1 (346) 248-7799

- Speakers will be asked to provide their name and city of residence, although providing this is not required for participation.
- Each speaker will be afforded up to 3 minutes to speak.
- Speakers will be muted until their opportunity to provide public comment.

When the Chair opens the comment period for the item you wish to speak on, please use the “raise hand” feature (or press *9 if connecting via telephone) which will alert staff that you have a comment to provide. Once you have been identified to speak, please check to make sure you have unmuted yourself in the videoconference application (or press *6 if connecting via telephone).

COMMENTS

Please submit public comments to Planning Staff before or during the meeting via email ghanham@ci.pinoles.ca.us. Comments received before the close of the item will be read into the record and limited to 3 minutes. Please include your full name, city of residence and agenda item you are commenting on.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in a City meeting or you need a copy of the agenda, or the agenda packet in an appropriate alternative format, please contact the Development Services Department at (510) 724-8912. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist the City staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

Persons wishing to speak on an item listed on the Agenda may do so when the Chair asks for comments in favor of or in opposition to the item under consideration. After all of those persons wishing to speak have done so, the hearing will be closed and the matter will be discussed amongst the Commission prior to rendering a decision.

NOTE FOR VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS: Public comments may be submitted to Planning Staff before or during the meeting via email ghanham@ci.pinoles.ca.us. Comments received before the close of the item will be read into the record and limited to 3 minutes. Please include your full name, city of residence and agenda item you are commenting on.

Persons wishing to speak when items are opened for public comment may use the raise hand feature if connected via Zoom or press *9 if connected via telephone. When identified to speak, persons should ensure they have unmuted themselves or press *6 to unmute if connected via telephone.

Any person may appeal an action of the Planning Commission or of the Planning Manager by filing an appeal with the City Clerk, in writing, within ten (10) days of such action. Following a Public Hearing, the City Council may act to confirm, modify or reverse the action of the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission may act to confirm, modify, or reverse the action of the Planning Manager. The cost to appeal a decision is \$500 and a minimum \$2,500 deposit fee.

Note: If you challenge a decision of the Commission regarding a project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing or in writing delivered to the City of Pinole at, or prior to, the public hearing.

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

The public may address the Planning Commission on items that are within its jurisdiction and not otherwise listed on the agenda. Planning Commissioners may discuss the matter brought to their attention, but by State law (Ralph M. Brown Act), action must be deferred to a future meeting. Time allowed: five (5) minutes each.

D. MEETING MINUTES:

1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from June 28, 2021

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

At the beginning of an item, the Chair will read the description of that item as stated on the Agenda. The City Staff will then give a brief presentation of the proposed project. The Commission may then ask Staff questions about the item.

For those items listed as Public Hearings, the Chair will open the public hearing and ask the applicant if they wish to make a presentation. Those persons in favor of the project will then be given an opportunity to speak followed by those who are opposed to the project. The applicant will then be given an opportunity for rebuttal.

The Public Hearing will then be closed and the Commission may discuss the item amongst themselves and ask questions of Staff. The Commission will then vote to approve, deny, approve in a modified form, or continue the matter to a later date for a decision. The Chair will announce the Commission's decision and advise the audience of the appeal procedure.

Note: No Public Hearings will begin after 11:00 p.m. Items still remaining on the agenda after 11:00 p.m. will be held over to the next meeting.

None

F. OLD BUSINESS:

None

G. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Three Corridors Specific Plan: Informational and Discussion Item

H. CITY PLANNER'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:

I. COMMUNICATIONS:

J. NEXT MEETING(S):

Planning Commission Regular Meeting, September 13, 2021 at 7:00PM

K. ADJOURNMENT

POSTED: August 18, 2021

**David Hanham
Planning Manager**

1 **DRAFT**

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

5
6 **June 28, 2021**

7
8 **DUE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY – THIS**
9 **MEETING WAS HELD PURSUANT TO AUTHORIZATION FROM GOVERNOR**
10 **NEWSOM'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS – CITY COUNCIL AND COMMISSION MEETINGS**
11 **WERE NO LONGER OPEN TO IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE. THE MEETING WAS**
12 **HELD VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE.**
13

14
15 **A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:05 P.M.

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

18
19 Commissioners Present: Benzuly, Kurrent, Martinez, Wong, Vice Chair Moriarty,
20 Chair Banuelos

21
22 Commissioners Absent: None

23
24 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
25 Michael Laughlin, Interim Community Development
26 Director
27 Alex Mog, Assistant City Attorney
28

29 **C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

30
31 No comments were submitted in writing or via email for this item.
32

33 **D. MEETING MINUTES:**

- 34
35 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 24, 2021
36 2. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from June 7, 2021
37

38 Vice Chair Moriarty requested separate votes for the meeting minutes.
39

40 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
41 from May 24, 2021, as submitted.
42

43 **MOTION: Kurrent**

SECONDED: Moriarty

APPROVED: 6-0

1 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
2 from June 7, 2021, as submitted.

3
4 **MOTION: Kurrent**

SECONDED: Martinez

APPROVED: 5-0-1
ABSTAIN: Moriarty

5
6
7 **E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

8
9 **1. Comprehensive Design Review DR21-05 SAHA Apartments**

10
11 **Request:** Consideration of a Comprehensive Design Review for the
12 purpose of constructing 33 units for low-income households
13 that consist of 29-one bedroom apartments and 4 two-
14 bedroom units. The complex will provide management offices
15 for the residents with an outdoor courtyard connecting a
16 community garden and children's area. The complex will
17 provide 16 parking spaces as well as a community room with
18 kitchen and computer station for its residents.

19
20 **Applicant:** Satellite Affordable Housing Associates
21 1835 Alcatraz Avenue
22 Berkeley, CA 94703

23
24 **Location:** 811 San Pablo Avenue (APN: 402-166-030)

25
26 **Planner:** David Hanham

27
28 Planning Manager David Hanham provided a PowerPoint presentation of the
29 proposal for Comprehensive Design Review for Satellite Affordable Housing
30 Associates (SAHA) to construct 33 units for low-income households to consist of
31 29-one bedroom apartments and 4 two-bedroom units. The complex would
32 provide management offices for the residents, an outdoor courtyard connecting a
33 community garden and children's area. The complex would also provide 16
34 parking spaces as well as a community room with kitchen and computer station for
35 its residents.

36
37 Mr. Hanham recommended the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 21-09
38 recommending approval to the City Council for a Comprehensive Design Review
39 and a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notice of Exemption and find
40 the disposition of 811 San Pablo Avenue conformed to the General Plan.

41
42 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Hanham and Assistant City Attorney Alex Mog
43 clarified the following:

- Required public notification for the public hearing for both the June 28 Planning Commission meeting and the July 6, 2021 City Council meeting had been provided to residents by mail but had not included a Spanish version of the public notice. The project had also been noticed to the public in the local newspaper.
- With respect to Finding 2, as shown on Page 11 of the staff report, which stated in part: *There is a cross walk with high-visibility striping and pedestrian crossing signage on the west leg of the San Pablo/Meadow Avenue intersection with stop controls for the north and south bound traffic. There are future street projects that will create a pedestrian refuge median to be installed within the crosswalk area. Bicycle lane striping is also proposed on San Pablo Avenue*, staff noted that due to the width of the median a safety pedestrian area could be created and those projects would have to be prioritized in the future. The applicant would be paying traffic mitigation fees and a proportionate share of whatever those improvements were to be, to be connected to regional or transit plans.
- Existing oak trees had damaged the parking lot due to their size and the applicant sought smaller trees that would create less damage in the future, which had led to the tree species identified on the landscape plan.
- Staff was looking at ways to provide on-street parking but that would require the removal of the existing No Parking signage on the San Pablo Avenue frontage. If on-street parking was able to be provided in front of the building, three additional parking spaces may be accommodated.
- The ground floor would include a lobby with mailboxes, stairs, elevator, a spacious community room with a kitchen and a computer station, two property management offices, a resident services office, an exterior bike storage area, and a courtyard connecting to a community garden and children's playground.
- The Pinole Municipal Code (PMC) did not prohibit developments which include the amenities that had been proposed and no part of the amenities violated any aspect of the PMC, although concessions to the parking requirements and other minor concessions had been outlined in the June 28 staff report.
- Pursuant to State law, the City must allow those concessions unless the City could make a finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the concessions would have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety. Unless the City could meet that high bar, it must grant up to four concessions for 100 percent affordable housing. State law did not speak to the percentage of space that must be dedicated to bedrooms.

- The project was exempt from CEQA analysis since it was located within a half mile of an existing major transit stop along an existing High-Quality Transit Corridor, as defined with a bus route/stop that was active every 15 minutes. Three different bus routes stopped a quarter mile from the project area along San Pablo Avenue.
- The criteria used to determine whether the project's requested exemptions should be permitted had been detailed in the June 28 staff report.
- Reiterated that State law required the City to allow concessions unless the City could make a finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the concession would have a specific adverse impact on public health and safety, with State law limiting the Planning Commission's discretion.
- The applicant had proposed an exemption to the City's parking requirements and proposed 16 rather than 61 parking spaces that would be required pursuant to the PMC. Acknowledging the parking constraints, City staff had asked SAHA to contact the commercial businesses located across the street from the property which had excess parking to potentially discuss shared access. City staff asked SAHA to continue working with its commercial neighbors with the knowledge there would be parking issues.
- The project's General Plan consistency had been outlined in the June 28 staff report. The scale and detail of the building had been designed to contextually blend with this section of the San Pablo Avenue streetscape, which included a blend of newer and older buildings with varied setbacks and varied building forms.
- The building height and lot coverage would be within that allowed in the PMC, with buildings 50 feet in height permitted in the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) Zoning District. The applicant proposed 0.61 acres, 26,572 square feet of 33 affordable units which included the manager's unit. Due to the setback over the third story, the building would not appear as one long block. Given the project met the allowable height and lot coverage, the applicant had not requested those design components as additional exemptions.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

EVE STEWART, Vice President of Real Estate, SAHA, 1835 Alcatraz Avenue, Berkeley, introduced the design team who were also present via Zoom. She reported that SAHA had been selected by the City of Pinole in 2020 to develop the site for affordable housing. SAHA had initially proposed 32 units and had picked up one more unit during the design process.

1 Ms. Stewart confirmed that some community outreach had been conducted but it
2 had been limited due to the pandemic and included a project website, mailers to
3 neighbors prior to the issuance of the public hearing notice of the Planning
4 Commission meeting, and an on-line forum.

5
6 Ms. Stewart explained that the goal of the project was to provide needed housing
7 and create a feasible project for the small site while also meeting the required
8 funding, efficiency, and costs of building while also staying within the zoning
9 parameters of the City of Pinole. She acknowledged they had struggled with the
10 parking and were unable to house all of the people and vehicles on-site with a 1:1
11 ratio unless there was a taller building. She described it as a trade-off that had
12 been reviewed early on. A taller project had not been embraced by the community,
13 would add to the cost of the project, and would make the project infeasible.

14
15 Ms. Stewart commented that a .5 parking ratio had been provided at other SAHA
16 properties in the Bay Area. SAHA was active in Alameda, Contra Costa, Napa
17 and Sonoma Counties, managed their own properties, and were long-term
18 partners with the communities they served.

19
20 Ms. Stewart suggested there may an opportunity to reclaim some parking spaces
21 along San Pablo Avenue and spread the parking demand around; however, the
22 units would mostly be one-bedroom units usually occupied by single-person
23 households. Some of the units would also incorporate veterans who may not be
24 driving thereby reducing the parking demand.

25
26 Ms. Stewart added that as part of State funded programs for affordable housing,
27 SAHA would be required to provide amenities to the residents. SAHA projects
28 always included a community meeting room which was important for the
29 community. On-site staff offered an advantage to the neighbors and the
30 community ensuring a response to any issues that may arise on-site. One of the
31 on-site staff would live on the property, one management person would come to
32 the property as needed, and a services person would be visiting the site for
33 activities as needed.

34
35 Responding to the Commission, Ms. Stewart recognized that parking was the
36 biggest issue. She noted many communities had gone to lower parking standards
37 with no on-street parking and encouraging the use of public transit. Those
38 individuals in the income range SAHA served had much higher utilization of transit
39 services and based on the smaller units and the fact that some units would be set
40 aside for veterans meant that due to their disability status they would not be driving.
41 She suggested that 16 parking spaces would be fine and would strike a balance
42 but requiring more parking spaces would result in challenges to finance the
43 building.

1 Ms. Stewart clarified the offices would be for on-site staff, one for the office
2 manager and another for a service coordinator, all serving the residential
3 community. The third floor did not contain an office but a small community room.
4 Whether more parking could be included under the building, a reduction in the
5 open space, elimination of the proposed community garden and a reduction in the
6 community room space could be considered, she recommended consideration of
7 fewer trees planted in the parking area. Also, parking under the building would
8 create challenges that might not be overcome as well as challenges with circulation
9 for accessing those parking spaces. She emphasized the effort to balance the
10 parking and the open space. If it was more important to have parking, trees and
11 other plantings may be reduced. Additionally, tandem parking may be an
12 interesting option that could be considered but she was uncertain there was
13 sufficient width to maintain the drive aisle access.
14

15 BOB LINDLEY, Studio T-Square, Architects, 1970 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland,
16 acknowledged that tandem parking was an option to obtain additional capacity
17 without having to build another access aisle, but they did not want to have to assign
18 more than one parking space per unit, which would be a challenge with two
19 different units sharing a tandem parking space. He confirmed that other SAHA
20 projects had utilized tandem parking. He emphasized the effort made to strike a
21 balance between the open space and the parking, and while they may pick up one
22 to two more parking spaces he did not see they would get more without entirely
23 losing the outdoor open space which benefitted the project and had been required
24 by the City of Pinole. He clarified that SAHA had requested another exemption to
25 reduce the outdoor space in addition to the parking exemption.
26

27 Mr. Lindley added that tuck-under parking would add another layer of complexity
28 in terms of fire access, cost of construction, fire separation and loss of the ground
29 floor units, all requiring the construction of a taller building and one built out of
30 concrete. In this case, they were staying with as low a building as possible using
31 Type 5 wood-frame construction and all fire life safety for egress.
32

33 Mr. Lindley commented that when the basic design had been discussed, one of
34 the ideas was to create a two-story element along San Pablo Avenue to allow
35 consistency with the street height and the mixed-use commercial building to the
36 east. They could have gone to three stories at the street but rather went to two-
37 stories to afford a quiet and comfortable scale at the street and with the mass of
38 the four-story portion of the building to be set back from the street. Also, while
39 there had been an idea for the use of terraces affording views of the water from
40 the street, as they had started to review the building structure there had been too
41 many challenges to make that idea feasible. If the project was market rate with
42 high end rents, it would have made sense but for an affordable housing project
43 with open space on the ground floor it was better to spend money on a nice plaza
44 at grade.
45

1 Mr. Lindley also commented that solar panels had been provided on a SAHA
2 veteran's project located in the City of Pittsburg which involved a similar flat roof.
3 SAHA was committed to renewable energy on the project and planned an all-
4 electric building to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHGs) emissions and would have
5 quite a bit of solar on the project.
6

7 As to whether or not the level of proposed building materials could be reduced to
8 reduce costs, with the savings used to supplement the parking situation, Mr.
9 Lindley suggested that would only result in minor incremental changes. Given the
10 cost estimates for the project construction had not been done it was too early to
11 say at this time whether those costs could be traded. Such an option may not be
12 possible regardless given how the affordable housing project would be funded.
13

14 In terms of the landscaping, Mr. Lindley acknowledged a recommendation to
15 explore the use of California bay laurel trees rather than the Brisbane box and
16 replace the Australia willow with blue elderberry. He noted the landscape architect
17 was not present via Zoom but he could forward the comments.
18

19 The Planning Commission discussed the parking situation at great length. Options
20 discussed included parking slots 5 and 6 to be reconfigured and the bicycle parking
21 relocated to allow for tandem parking or compact-sized parking spaces.
22 Recommendations included providing parking along the pathway to the access
23 road, eliminating the No Parking signage along the San Pablo Avenue frontage,
24 reaching out to the Western Contra Costa County Transit Agency (WestCAT) to
25 encourage an increase in the frequency of bus routes to the area with the project
26 used as justification for an increase, moving the main lobby back and eliminating
27 the offices on the ground floor to allow for angled parking spaces with an outer exit
28 to the service yard, and cutting back on the community room.
29

30 The following speakers submitted written comments via email that were read into
31 the record and would be filed with the agenda packet for this meeting: **Maria**
32 **Rodriguez, Laura Ramos, Jason Watkins, and Rafael Menis.**
33

34 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
35

36 The Planning Commission discussed Comprehensive Design Review DR21-05,
37 SAHA Apartments, and offered the following comments and/or direction to staff:
38

- 39 • Referenced the third floor community area and encouraged exploration of
40 the use of the roof area which was directly off one of the lobbies, to ensure
41 the outdoor space was used as much as possible to provide a good
42 experience for the residents of the project. Questioned how the parking
43 footprint could be approved with over 30 units and only 16 parking spaces
44 in a heavily trafficked area on San Pablo Avenue, with no additional space
45 for parking. Urged the consideration of tandem parking spaces for the two-

1 bedroom units and possibly adding parking at the back of the property to
2 utilize as much space as possible. Found that public transportation was
3 lacking and complicated and the project would be given the best chance of
4 success if additional parking was provided. (Martinez)
5

- 6 • Suggested the offices at the front of the building were wasted spaces and
7 parking could be provided in the lobby area with the elimination of the offices
8 with possibly parking for small electric vehicles. Found 16 parking spaces
9 to be woefully inadequate and suggested the City consider designating East
10 and West Meadow Avenue as resident permit parking for the residents who
11 lived on those streets, preventing overflow traffic and parking on Meadow
12 Avenue. Agreed on-street parking on San Pablo Avenue should be opened
13 up, suggested a fleet of SMART vehicles be considered for the residents of
14 the units, and liked the project but found this was the wrong location for the
15 type of project proposed with many other potential locations in Pinole that
16 could have been considered. (Kurrent)
17
- 18 • Questioned the amenities proposed and providing amenities to residents at
19 significant sacrifice to the surrounding neighbors; urged the focus to be on
20 affordable housing and not a community complex; opposed the project
21 given it did not meet the 100 percent affordable requirements with the
22 inclusion of the office spaces and the needed parking; and questioned
23 whether the project was actually located in a High-Quality Transit Corridor.
24 (Kurrent)
25

26 Mr. Mog explained that the definition of a High-Quality Transit Corridor had been
27 part of the CEQA Notice of Exemption, as shown in Attachment B, and it could be
28 removed if the Planning Commission was of the opinion it was not accurate;
29 however, the reason the project was entitled to the parking was because the City
30 of Pinole was required to grant the exemption unless it was found by a
31 preponderance of evidence that not doing so would create a significant adverse
32 health and safety impact that could not be mitigated. He pointed out that all of the
33 ideas offered by Commissioner Kurrent involved significant cost.
34

- 35 • Uncertain of the costs associated with the modifications proposed and again
36 questioning the justification for the reduction in parking, suggested
37 emergency vehicles would find it difficult to traverse Meadow Avenue if on-
38 street parking was allowed given the narrowness of the street. Suggested
39 a parking study should be done for the area with a potential limit of parking
40 to the existing residents. (Kurrent)
41

42 Supported the project and found it would be good for the community while
43 recognizing the parking concerns. If the project were to move forward,
44 suggested the parking spaces be compact, not standard sized parking
45 spaces, which may afford one to two additional parking spaces. Liked the

1 idea of a special residential parking permit for one side of Meadow Avenue,
2 and supported the elimination of the No Parking signage on the San Pablo
3 Avenue frontage. Suggested there were ways to address the parking
4 situation via conditions or recommendations to the City Council without
5 dramatically revising the project design or pausing the project given the
6 importance of and the demand for housing. (Wong)
7

- 8 • Agreed with Commissioner Wong's recommended approach but wanted to
9 see all of the projects proposed for the San Pablo Avenue Corridor
10 presented to the Planning Commission so that all potential impacts to the
11 corridor and the San Pablo Avenue neighborhoods were better known.
12 Recognized the subject project was unable to handle permit parking but
13 multiple projects combined could handle such an option, with the San Pablo
14 Avenue Corridor as a whole having to address parking given the future
15 increase in population and needed parking. (Banuelos)
16
- 17 • Agreed a presentation of projects planned/proposed in specific locations in
18 the different corridors of the City as had previously been requested would
19 avoid piecemeal development with all of the attendant problems. (Moriarty)
20

21 Interim Community Development Director Michael Laughlin reported that the City
22 had received another application not far from the subject project, also located on
23 San Pablo Avenue, with other projects located a distance away. A general
24 presentation of the build out potential for the Three Corridors Specific Plan and a
25 project proposed on Appian Way could be presented to the Planning Commission
26 at a future meeting.
27

28 Mr. Laughlin commented there were also challenges given the 80 percent density
29 bonus law which had gone into effect on January 1, 2021, which SAHA and a
30 proposed senior project for San Pablo and Roble Avenues would be taking
31 advantage of, but which had not been anticipated in the Three Corridors Specific
32 Plan. He reiterated pursuant to State law the City was required to consider the
33 concessions with the burden on the City to show whether or not there would be a
34 public health and safety impact.
35

36 Mr. Laughlin added that the following bus routes traveled past the property: C3,
37 JL/JR and 17 Routes, with the J Routes having 40-minute headways and C3
38 Routes 30 minutes. Based on the State law definition, the City had to look at the
39 total average, and while the 17 Route was currently not operating due to the
40 pandemic, once it started back it would meet the definition of a High-Quality Transit
41 Corridor.
42

- 43 • Disagreed with the definition of a High-Quality Transit Corridor as accurate
44 in this case given the reality that traffic would intrude into the nearby
45 neighborhoods and the corridor as a whole, which must be considered when

1 considering mitigation of potential impacts. Urged pressure on WestCAT to
2 increase the frequency of bus routes. (Banuelos)

- 3
- 4 • Meadow Avenue was unique, too narrow, with parking on the sidewalk to
5 allow traffic flow. More parking on the street would be untenable,
6 particularly in the event of needed emergency access. (Kurrent)
- 7

8 Mr. Hanham confirmed that compact parking spaces could be considered, the
9 applicant had not exceeded the maximum number of compact parking spaces but
10 he recommended any changes to the application be formulated in a
11 recommendation to the City Council, and that prior to issuance of a building permit
12 staff review changes such as eliminating the No Parking signage on San Pablo
13 Avenue and adding two additional compact parking spaces. As to the
14 recommendation for a presentation of projects planned in the San Pablo Avenue
15 Corridor, he noted that a study had been done but the State had eliminated that
16 analysis since the City must plan for such development, which had been a
17 challenge. He acknowledged that some properties may be able to absorb some
18 parking and that could be considered by staff.

19

20 Mr. Hanham suggested alternatively that the applicant could be allowed to work
21 with staff in terms of prior to the issuance of a building permit, a revised site plan
22 could be submitted to incorporate two additional parking spaces on the property
23 and/or eliminate the No Parking signage on San Pablo Avenue to possibly
24 accommodate additional parking spaces.

25

- 26 • Referenced the Circulation and Sustainability Elements of the General Plan
27 which encouraged people to have different types of transportation options
28 and decrease reliance on vehicles. Expressed concern with the elimination
29 of the No Parking signs on the San Pablo Avenue frontage which could
30 result in the loss of funding opportunities for transportation improvements
31 for bicycle lanes and the like. Urged the developer to find three more
32 parking spaces on-site. (Moriarty).
- 33

34 Mr. Mog reported the application had been scheduled for City Council
35 consideration on July 6. Between now and then the applicant may be able to
36 sketch out how the project may appear with only compact parking spaces and
37 identify where three additional parking spaces may be possible.

38

- 39 • Suggested the main lobby was too large, could be cut in half, with the
40 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces placed
41 adjacent/perpendicular to the lobby to accommodate three additional
42 parking spaces. (Kurrent)
- 43 • Did not support reducing the lobby or the community program to allow for
44 more parking since the community space and offices were needed. Urged
45

1 the property owner to engage with the other property owners in the area
2 since other surface lots were not being fully utilized. (Benzuly)
3

4 Mr. Mog advised that was not something the City could enforce. The applicant
5 was technically able to meet the parking requirement since it could be waived. He
6 noted since the property would exist for some time, the applicant would essentially
7 be required to purchase the land that existed for the parking to ensure it would be
8 used as a parking space.
9

10 On the discussion of the parking, Mr. Mog understood the applicant had expressed
11 the willingness to change to compact parking spaces.
12

13 Mr. Hanham acknowledged that even with modifications and additional parking
14 spaces there would be an inability to meet the City's parking requirements.
15

16 The Planning Commission recognized that additional parking spaces might not be
17 possible and requiring the applicant to provide any more would be financially
18 infeasible; however, Planning Commissioners also recognized the potential
19 impacts to the residents of Meadow Avenue.
20

- 21 • Suggested a reduction in the size of the lobby, cutting it in half, would not
22 add to the cost and a couple of parking spaces could be accommodated.
23 (Kurrent)
24
- 25 • Disagreed that reducing the size of the lobby would realize more parking
26 spaces since the ADA parking spaces would require more space, taking up
27 the lobby altogether. (Banuelos)
28

29 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt Resolution 21-09, A Resolution of the Planning
30 Commission of the City of Pinole Recommending Approval to the City Council For a
31 Comprehensive Design Review for (DR 21-05) to Construct 33 Affordable Units and
32 Make Site Improvements, Located at 811 San Pablo Avenue (APN-402-166-030)
33 and Finds that the Disposition of 811 San Pablo Avenue Conforms with the General
34 Plan, subject to Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval, and subject to:
35

- 36 • The project was exempt from CEQA.
37
- 38 • The City Council to allow all compact parking spaces on the site.
39
- 40 • Staff to work on a more comprehensive plan for the San Pablo Avenue
41 Corridor.
42
- 43 • The landscape plan to be updated with native tree species; and
44
45

- Between now and July 6, 2021, the developer to use that time to possibly study the layout of the site plan regarding the parking.

MOTION: Wong

SECONDED: Moriarty

APPROVED: 5-1

NOES: Kurrent

F. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Selection of Alternate for Planning Commission Subcommittee

Mr. Hanham presented the staff report dated June 28, 2021, and recommended the Planning Commission select an Alternate for the Planning Commission Subcommittee for the 2021-2022 term.

MOTION by a Roll Call Vote to select Commissioner Wong as the Alternate to the Planning Commission Subcommittee for the 2021–2022 term.

MOTION: Kurrent

SECONDED: Moriarty

APPROVED: 6-0

G. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Amended Planning Commission Schedule for 2021

Mr. Hanham presented the staff report dated June 28, 2021, and recommended the Planning Commission review and approve the amended Planning Commission schedule for the remainder of the 2021 calendar year. He added that the City Council was considering a hybrid-model for public meetings, with in-person public meetings scheduled to return in August/September.

Mr. Hanham further reported he had received two e-mails after the close of the public hearing for Item E1.

Mr. Mog advised that if the comments were related to the amended Planning Commission schedule, they could be read into the record at this time otherwise they should have been read into the record under Citizens to be Heard but it was at the discretion of the Chair whether to allow the comments to be read into the record.

Chair Banuelos suggested the comments should be read into the record after the completion of the current item since he understood they related to requests for updates on current projects.

MOTION by a Roll Call Vote to approve the amended Planning Commission schedule for the rest of the 2021 calendar year, as submitted by the Planning Manager.

1 **MOTION: Moriarty SECONDED: Benzuly APPROVED: 6-0**

2
3 The following speaker submitted written comments via email that were read into
4 the record and would be filed with the agenda packet for this meeting: ***Jim,***
5 ***Neighbors and Friends, Citizens for a Better Pinole.***
6

7 **H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT**

8
9 **1. Verbal Updates of Projects**

10
11 Mr. Hanham reported staff was working on the environmental requirements for
12 Vista Woods, a 179-unit senior 100 percent affordable housing project on San
13 Pablo Avenue and Roble Avenue, to be presented to the Planning Commission in
14 late summer/early fall; reimbursement agreements and a focus on the
15 environmental work was being completed for the projects on 2801 Pinole Valley
16 Road and 2151 Appian Way, and updates to the various site plans based on
17 standards and concessions and the affordable agreements were being requested
18 for each of the projects.
19

20 Mr. Hanham also reported that staff had seen a big increase in building permits;
21 the City had lost both Planning Technicians with interviews scheduled for
22 replacements; contract staff had been hired and hopefully two more staff would be
23 hired in the next two to four weeks; and applications had been received for the
24 vacant Community Development and Public Works Directors' positions. In
25 addition, he would be working with Mr. Laughlin on the Housing Element Update.
26 City Offices were now open to the public but with appointments required for over-
27 the-counter requests.
28

29 Vice Chair Moriarty inquired of the status of future requests for agenda items on
30 the meeting agenda that had been requested by the Chair during a prior Planning
31 Commission meeting, and Mr. Hanham advised he could create an agenda item
32 for requests for future agenda items.
33

34 Vice Chair Moriarty also inquired of the status of the landscape plan for the new
35 Safeway, to which Mr. Hanham reported that Safeway had submitted its extension
36 requests this date, he was working to get that moving since only two extensions
37 were permitted, and once building plans had been submitted he could go out to
38 the landscape plans.
39

40 Vice Chair Moriarty further inquired of the status of the trees at Sprouts and e-mail
41 addresses for Planning Commissioners.
42

43 Mr. Hanham reported staff was uncertain what could be done with the trees since
44 they could not be planted in the creek bed and staff continued to work on that
45 issue. He would contact the Development Services Director to obtain more
46 updates. As to the e-mails for Planning Commissioners, he was working with the

1 City Clerk to see whether they must be authorized and would have a status report
2 available in the next couple of weeks. He also reported that Development Services
3 Director Tamara Miller would be retiring.
4

5 Chair Banuelos again requested a presentation of the projects planned in the San
6 Pablo Avenue Corridor, and any cross relationships with the development of
7 Doctor's Hospital relative to anything coming off of San Pablo Avenue.
8

9 Mr. Hanham reported a trip distribution study was pending and once that report
10 had been received impacts on San Pablo Avenue would be better known.
11

12 Vice Chair Moriarty inquired of the status of a meeting of the Old Town Design
13 Subcommittee, and Mr. Mog stated he would contact Planning Commissioners via
14 e-mail with a meeting possibly scheduled after the Fourth of July holiday.
15

16 Chair Banuelos reported the next meeting of the Planning Commission would be
17 July 12, 2021 at 7:00 P.M., although Mr. Hanham suggested that meeting date be
18 canceled since he would out of town on vacation. The next meeting of the Planning
19 Commission would be July 26, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.
20

21 As to the status of National Night Out, Mr. Mog understood an alternative date was
22 being considered for the month of October.
23

24 **I. COMMUNICATIONS:** None
25

26 **J. NEXT MEETING**
27

28 The next meeting of the Planning Commission to be a Regular Meeting scheduled
29 for July 26, 2021.
30

31 **K. ADJOURNMENT:** at 10:11 P.M.
32

33 Transcribed by:
34

35
36 Sherri D. Lewis
37 Transcriber



Memorandum

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: David Hanham, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Three Corridors Specific Plan: Informational and Discussion Item

DATE: August 23, 2021

Planning Commissioners:

BACKGROUND:

As you are aware, the City Council adopted the Three Corridor Specific Plan in 2010. Over the last 11 years, the City has been governing San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road and Appian Way using design guidelines and land use standards from the Specific Plan.

Over the course of the last six months, the City has received five multifamily residential projects totaling approximately 606 units over the three corridors. Two of the projects are located in the San Pablo Avenue corridor area, two are in the Appian Way corridor area, and one is in the Pinole Valley Road corridor area.

Over the next few meetings, we will be reviewing the Specific Plan and its relationship with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and the potential of each of the corridors for both residential and non-residential developments.

INTRODUCTION:

As stated above, the Three Corridor Specific Plan is a development plan that addresses land use and development standards for San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road, and Appian Way. The Plan identifies the existing conditions and the future vision of the areas. The Plan identifies economic development strategies while looking at the land use and circulation of the three corridors. The Plan defines public and private design guidelines and addresses infrastructure and public facilities. The Plan identifies an Implementation Element on the timing of improvements.

ANALYSIS:

A Specific Plan is a regulatory and economic development tool that local governments use to implement their General Plan and to guide development in a well-defined sub-area of the community. While the General Plan is the primary guide for growth and development in a community, a Specific Plan is able to focus on the unique characteristics of a special area by customizing the planning process and land use regulations for that area. Section 65450 to 65457 of the California Government Code implements the Specific Plan by further refining the objectives for the Project Area.

The purpose of the Three Corridors Specific Plan is to facilitate revitalization of the San Pablo Avenue, the Pinole Valley Road, and the Appian Way commercial corridors. Below is a brief description of the three corridors.

San Pablo Avenue

San Pablo Avenue has a diverse history as a major thoroughfare in the East Bay, home to important industrial and light industrial land uses, with community aims of attracting new retail and service industries, while achieving more diverse residential development that can be served by transit.

Pinole Valley Road

Pinole Valley Road has a history as a shopping and service corridor, attracting new retail, medical facilities, and higher density residential development, while simultaneously improving open space access, enhancing Pinole Creek, and improving automobile flow and pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

Appian Way

Appian Way has a history as a large-scale shopping, medical care, service corridor, attracting new retail and higher density residential development, while simultaneously improving open space access, automobile flow, and bicycle circulation.

The goal of the Three Corridors Specific Plan is to preserve the character of Pinole and support commercial and residential development that can function as the catalyst for economic revitalization and further the City's goals and objectives. Another goal of the plan is to enhance Old Town Pinole as a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented commercial destination with a strong civic identity. The Plan will encourage Transit Oriented Developments (TOD) within the Priority Development Areas (PDA) on San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road, and Appian Way. The Plan will support economic development that will bring more housing, retail, and employment opportunities to the community.

RESOURCES:

A copy of the Three Corridors Specific Plan can be found in the Planning Division section of the City of Pinole website at:

https://www.ci.pinole.ca.us/city_government/planning/general_plan/three_corridors_specific_plan