

AGENDA FOR THE



CITY OF PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Monday, February 28, 2022

7:00 P.M.

Via Zoom Videoconference

DUE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY – THIS MEETING IS BEING HELD VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE PURSUANT TO AB 361 – CITY COUNCIL AND COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT CURRENTLY 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/87637149010>

OR

<https://zoom.us/join>

Webinar ID: 876 3714 9010

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

B1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

B3. 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 December 13, 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 – Appian Way Corridor Information and Discussion

Informational and discussion item reviewing the content of the City's adopted Three Corridors Specific Plan, with a focus on the Appian Way corridor.

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

I. COMMUNICATIONS:

J. NEXT MEETING(S):

Planning Commission Regular Meeting, March 14, 2022 at 7:00PM

K. ADJOURNMENT

POSTED: February 24, 2022

David Hanham
Planning Manager

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

December 13, 2021

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

A. CALL TO ORDER: 7:02 P.M.

B1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

B3. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Benzuly, Kurrent, Martinez, Menis, Wong, Vice
Chairperson Moriarty, Chairperson Banuelos

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
Alex Mog, Assistant City Attorney

C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no Citizens to be Heard.

D. MEETING MINUTES:

1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from November 8, 2021

MOTION with a Roll Call vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from November 8, 2021, as submitted.

MOTION: Kurrent

SECONDED: Wong

APPROVED: 7-0

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

1
2 **F. OLD BUSINESS:** None

3
4 **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

5
6 **1. 2021 Housing Legislation Presentation (Continued)**

7 Informational presentation on State housing legislation passed in
8 September 2021
9

10 Assistant City Attorney Alex Mog continued a PowerPoint presentation on the 2021
11 Housing Legislation Presentation and continued to provide an overview of State Bills
12 (SB) 9, End of Single Family Zoning, SB10, Streamlining for Upzoning and SB8,
13 Extension of Housing Crisis Act (SB330).
14

15 Mr. Mog and Planning Manager Hanham clarified the following:
16

- 17 • Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) were allowed pursuant to SB9 as long as
18 there was not a lot split. If the lot was divided with two SB9 units built on each
19 of the lots, an ADU was not permitted to be built on each of the lots. If the lot
20 were split with one unit built on each lot, an ADU would be permitted. If the
21 lot was not split and two units were built, an ADU would be permitted on the
22 property.
23
- 24 • Examples of objective and subjective standards related to SB9 were provided.
25
- 26 • The City of Pinole did not have any bus routes that met SB9 criteria since if
27 not spaced out equally, there would be headways more than 15 minutes apart.
28
- 29 • SB9 regulated local agency authority but did not preempt Covenants,
30 Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) or Homeowners' Association (HOA)
31 rules. Most State planning and zoning laws focused on establishing
32 restrictions on cities as the land use regulators and not private agreements
33 between property owners.
34
- 35 • The criteria of SB9 was again outlined and would go into effect January 1,
36 2022. There was no penalty to not having the objective and subjective
37 standards in place at that time.
38

39 While the City did not have specific regulations in place, the City's experience
40 with ADUs was instructive and it had taken time to get a sense of what was or
41 was not allowed.
42

- 43 • The City of Pinole had approved one or two ADUs as part of new construction
44 in the past year.
45

- The building constraint limits were again highlighted. The City of Pinole may consider adopting a size limit but it was not required by SB9, with the Planning Commission and the City Council as the ultimate decision maker to determine whether there was a public policy benefit. As an example, an approved application for four lots on Hazel Street, if not built, staff acknowledged the applicant could come back with a Design Review request to build eight homes rather than four homes; and
- A project at 2801 Pinole Valley Road included an affordable housing component, and pursuant to the Housing Affordability Act (HAA), the City could not deny a project or require a project to be built at a lower density, if the project met all of the City's objective standards, although reasonable conditions may be applied. The law previously required projects to be judged based on when a development application is submitted. Under SB10, applications are judged based on standards at the time a preliminary application is submitted rather than development application.

Mr. Mog asked whether the Planning Commission would like to make a recommendation to the City Council to adopt Pinole specific SB9 regulations or rely on State law and reevaluate in the future.

Chairperson Banuelos supported objective standards. He had concerns with over-densifying the City and emphasized that public transit must be addressed as part of the requirements related to SB9. A lot needed to be taken into account when considering lot splits, which was not covered by SB9 necessitating the City to have its own objective standards.

Commissioner Martinez suggested the Planning Department should do some research on the number of lots that could be established related to the possible scenario for the lots on Hazel Street, as described.

Commissioner Wong noted the reality for possibly eight homes on the lots on Hazel Street was due to the fact the City had no objective standards and the homes could be quite large.

Mr. Mog clarified the Hazel Street project was unique in that the project included a Development Agreement (DA) binding the applicant to do certain things and there was an affordable housing requirement as part of the DA.

In response to Vice Chairperson Moriarty, Mr. Hanham stated the City had until March 2022 to craft objective standards and those standards could be considered by the Planning Commission prior to going to the City Council.

Vice Chairperson Moriarty thanked Mr. Mog for the presentation and information on the changes in Housing legislation, potential scope, and potential changes to the

1 community.

2
3 Mr. Mog confirmed that any objective design standards would go to the Planning
4 Commission prior to the City Council.

5
6 Mr. Hanham explained that staff was currently working on crafting objective
7 standards, and looking at what other cities had done or were considering as part of
8 the update to the Housing Element. Staff hoped to have something presented to the
9 Planning Commission fairly quickly as part of the Housing Element Update. He was
10 unaware of any city that was comparable to the City of Pinole that already had
11 objective standards in place. He reiterated that staff was researching that information
12 and he hoped to have information to the Planning Commission in the next eight to
13 ten weeks.

14
15 In response to Commissioner Menis who had some comments related to the Hazel
16 Street Project, Mr. Mog stated that while the project had been approved by the City,
17 Commissioner Menis lived within a 500-foot radius of the project site and he
18 recommended Commissioner Menis not comment on the project at this time.

19
20 Mr. Mog expected there would likely be changes to the Housing Legislation over a
21 period of time.

22
23 **2. Three Corridors Specific Plan – Pinole Valley Road Corridor**
24 **Information and Discussion**

25 Information and discussion item reviewing the content of the City's adopted
26 Three Corridors Specific Plan, with a focus on the Pinole Valley Road
27 Corridor

28
29 Mr. Hanham presented the staff memorandum dated December 13, 2021 and
30 explained that the Planning Commission had been reviewing the Three Corridors
31 Specific Plan and its relationship with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance,
32 along with the potential of each of the corridors for both residential and non-
33 residential developments. The Planning Commission had reviewed the San Pablo
34 Avenue Corridor at its November 8, 2021 meeting, with the Appian Way Corridor
35 to be discussed at the January 24, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

36
37 At this time, Mr. Hanham provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Three
38 Corridors Specific Plan - Pinole Valley Road Corridor with an overview of the vision
39 for Pinole Valley Road, Pinole Valley Road Sub-Area framework, zoning
40 designations, urban design and circulation principles, parking and focal points,
41 aesthetic, landscaping, lighting and signage principles for Pinole Valley Road, and
42 economic and land use development (with the figures in the table for this section
43 to be corrected).

44
45 An example of a project in the Pinole Valley Road Corridor at 2801 Pinole Valley
46 Road was highlighted and consisted of a Mixed-Use Project with 29 residential

1 units with 17,280 square feet of office addition, with the project to be presented to
2 the Planning Commission for consideration in January/February 2022. Pinole
3 Valley Road Opportunity Sites north and south of I-80 were also highlighted.
4

5 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Hanham clarified:
6

- 7 • The overall parking situation and goals in the Pinole Valley Road Corridor as
8 detailed in the staff memorandum.
9
- 10 • Building garages would centralize parking to allow the rest of the parcels to
11 be able to be maximize their use and have minimal parking on their parcels.
12 The goal was to maximize parking where they could and limit areas where
13 they could share parking and not create individual parking for each individual
14 use.
15
- 16 • The historical perspective on a potential parking garage in Old Town was
17 detailed and had been considered at the time the City had a Redevelopment
18 Agency, although it was not cost effective given the absence of the
19 Redevelopment Agency. Pinole Municipal Code (PMC) requirements for
20 parking in Old Town were identified and there were alternative options to
21 provide parking rather than a multi-story parking garage.
22
- 23 • An example of a cottage-industry under Industrial Uses included Kitchen at
24 812, located at 812 San Pablo Avenue, a local community service/non-profit
25 kitchen incubator.
26
- 27 • Table 2, Existing vs. Proposed Development Projections for the Pinole Valley
28 Road Corridor, as shown on Page 3 of the staff memorandum, included future
29 potential development for Pinole Valley Road.
30
- 31 • The Three Corridors Specific Plan section of the Local Road Safety Plan
32 would have to be further researched by staff to determine the status.
33
- 34 • The Three Corridors Specific Plan had not addressed creek rehabilitation
35 policies but those policies could be addressed in the General Plan. Staff
36 would have to do further research to determine whether a creek plan and
37 action items could be addressed in the Open Space Element or in the
38 Community Character chapter of the General Plan.
39
- 40 • There had been discussions internally amongst staff on a new or updated
41 wayfinding signage program and creation of a more standard entry into Pinole,
42 and a program which incorporated the trails and a more comprehensive
43 program that brought in each of the corridors of the Three Corridors Specific
44 Plan.
45

- Staff was working with the applicant regarding the bowling alley property on changes to the color scheme, with staff working to ensure the colors matched the Sprouts Center. The applicant had plans to address the parking lot although due to the pandemic those plans had fallen through. Staff had informed the applicant they would be willing to allow painting but any changes to the structure outside would trigger improvements to the parking lot and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

As to whether requirements could be imposed for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations, if any parking lots were reconstructed staff advised the applicant of the need for the conduit to be installed for the electric vehicles so that if and when the applicant was ready for charging stations they could easily be installed. Staff was also looking into the adoption of Reach Codes (amendments to the Energy and Green Building Standards Code to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs)) regarding all-electric buildings and EV charging stations.

- Staff would have to check with the Fire Department on the status of an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) regarding traffic backups related to the I-80/Pinole Valley Road interchange. Most of the City's street, curb and road standards were consistent with Contra Costa County requirements. Many issues related to the I-80 interchange involved Caltrans which was responsible for the on/off-ramps.
- Staff acknowledged a request for more communication between the City and involved agencies such as the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (CCCFCWCD) and Caltrans.

Several Commissioners offered their historical perspectives on several issues including issues related to the I-80 interchange and traffic backups in the community, future projects planned by Caltrans, issues involving Pinole Valley Creek, and the need to improve public transportation vis-a-vis WestCAT given that future multi-family/senior development had not been considered when the Three Corridors Specific Plan had been developed.

The Planning Commission also emphasized the need to remain in contact with the City Council with a request for a Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting in 2022 to discuss items of interest.

The Planning Commission thanked staff for the presentation.

3. Planning Commission Schedule 2022

Reviewing and adopting the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Schedule dates in 2022.

1 The Planning Commission acknowledged receipt of the Planning Commission
2 Schedule for 2022.

3
4 Chairperson Banuelos suggested the meeting dates scheduled for August 2022
5 may have to be modified due to National Night Out.
6

7 As to when a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and City Council
8 could be scheduled, Mr. Hanham would meet with the Community Development
9 Director and the City Manager to determine when a potential meeting could be
10 considered. Commissioners were encouraged to provide staff with a list of
11 potential items for discussion as soon as possible.
12

13 Commissioner Kurrent pointed out that October 10 was Indigenous Peoples' Day
14 and Commissioner Benzuly noted that February 14, 2022 was Valentine's Day and
15 those meeting dates may have to be canceled.
16

17 Mr. Hanham advised that meetings could be canceled, as needed, and the meeting
18 schedule could be approved subject to modification.
19

20 **MOTION** with a Roll Call Vote to adopt the Planning Commission Schedule for 2022,
21 subject to removing the meeting dates of February 14 and October 10, 2022.
22

23 **MOTION: Menis** **SECONDED: Martinez** **APPROVED: 7-0**
24

25 Mr. Hanham advised that an updated meeting schedule would be provided to the
26 Planning Commission.
27

28 **H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT**
29

30 Mr. Hanham reported he was working on the three remaining multi-family projects to
31 be presented to the Planning Commission including Appian Village to be considered
32 by the Planning Commission in early January 2022, with the remaining two projects
33 to be presented in February. He also reported that staff had issued a Request for
34 Proposal (RFP) for the Housing Element and staff would be doing some code
35 updates in response to new housing legislation.
36

37 The Appian Way Corridor would be presented to the Planning Commission on
38 January 24; and staff was working with WestCAT related to future development.
39
40

41 Mr. Hanham added that a Planning Commission Ad Hoc Subcommittee meeting
42 would be scheduled for either January 5 or 6, 2022, to consider the Appian Village
43 and Pinole Vista projects and the respective design plans. An invitation with the
44 meeting date would be e-mailed to subcommittee members. Staff was also working
45 with the applicants on another round of community meetings which would be held via
46 Zoom.

1
2 Mr. Hanham otherwise had no additional information as to when meetings would
3 return to an in-person format and suggested it was likely in-person meetings would
4 not be held until the spring. Further, staff would be scheduling a meeting in the next
5 couple of weeks with the property owner for the Gateway project to discuss a number
6 of issues.
7

8 Vice Chairperson Moriarty thanked staff for responding to the public comment that
9 had been raised during the November 8, 2021 Planning Commission meeting. She
10 inquired of the status of a request to red stripe San Pablo Avenue just prior to John
11 Street, and Mr. Hanham explained that the request would require City Council action
12 and staff was still looking into that request.
13

14 At this time, a number of Planning Commissioners reported difficulties accessing their
15 City e-mails and were guided by staff as to how to access the Planning Commission
16 e-mails via the City's website and specific links. Planning Commissioners were
17 encouraged to contact staff to walk through how to get into their e-mails if problems
18 persisted.
19

20 Planning Commissioners wished everyone a Happy Holiday.
21

22 Mr. Hanham also reported that sand bags were available for the community at Pinole
23 Valley Road towards the Fire Station.
24

25 **I. COMMUNICATIONS:** None
26

27 **J. NEXT MEETING**
28

29 The next meeting of the Planning Commission to be a Regular Meeting scheduled
30 for January 10, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.
31

32 **K. ADJOURNMENT:** 10:00 P.M.
33

34 Transcribed by:
35

36
37 Sherri D. Lewis
38 Transcriber



Memorandum

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: David Hanham, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Three Corridors Specific Plan - Appian Way Corridor Information and Discussion

DATE: February 28, 2022

BACKGROUND

The City Council adopted the Three Corridor Specific Plan (the Specific Plan) in 2010.¹ The purpose of the Specific Plan as it was developed, was to define the three major corridors within the city. The three corridors are San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road, and Appian Way. The Specific Plan outlined visions and economic development strategies for the three corridors to facilitate revitalization of the San Pablo Avenue, Pinole Valley Road and Appian Way commercial corridors. The Specific Plan intended to implement the General Plan, land use development standards, public and private standards, and design guidelines for the three corridors. The Plan also identifies circulation and infrastructure improvements for the three corridors.

Over the recent years, an influx of new Planning Commissioners led to opportunities for Staff to provide information sessions on the General Plan in order to enhance Commissioner and community member familiarity with the Plan. Similar information sessions were envisioned for the Specific Plan. Early in 2021, the City received five applications for large multifamily residential projects totaling approximately 618 units over the three corridors, with two of the projects located on the San Pablo Avenue Corridor, two projects in the Appian Way Corridor, and one along Pinole Valley Road Corridor. The submittal of these applications, in addition to conversations the City was having regarding a Historic Overlay District, led to a series of programed information sessions with the Planning Commission regarding the Specific Plan. The purpose of the information sessions is to review the Specific Plan and its relationship with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and the potential of each of the corridors in terms of both residential and non-residential developments.

The Commission meeting on November 8, 2021 highlighted the San Pablo Avenue Corridor, and the meeting on December 13, 2021 highlighted the Pinole Valley Road Corridor. This report focuses on the Appian Way Corridor.

The goal of the Three Corridor 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 as outlined in the General Plan and Specific Plan. Another goal of the plan is to enhance the Old Town Pinole as a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented commercial destination with a strong civic identity. The Plan will encourage Transit Oriented Developments (TOD)

¹ Available online: https://www.ci.pinole.ca.us/city_government/planning/general_plan/three_corridors_specific_plan/

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.

Below is a brief description of the three corridors, followed by a detailed description of the Appian Way Corridor in the Analysis section.

San Pablo Avenue

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area extends north and south along the San Pablo Avenue Corridor between Dursey Drive to the west and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail line to the east. San Pablo Avenue has a diverse history as a major thoroughfare in the East Bay, home to important industrial and light industrial land uses, community aims of attracting new retail and service industry, while achieving more diverse residential development that can be served by transit.

Pinole Valley Road

The Pinole Valley Road Specific Plan Area extends east and west along the Pinole Valley Road Corridor between San Pablo Avenue to the north and Simas Avenue to the south. The northern edge of the corridor does not extend all the way to San Pablo Avenue. The boundary of the Pinole Valley Road is at Prune Street. Plum and Pear Streets are in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area. Pinole Valley Road's 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

The Appian Way Specific Plan Area extends east and west along the Appian Way Corridor between San Pablo Avenue to the north and the City of Pinole boundary to the south. Appian Way's history as a large-scale shopping area, medical care services, service corridor, attracting new retail and higher density residential development, while simultaneously improving open space access, automobile flow, and bicycle circulation.

ANALYSIS:

The Three Corridors Specific Plan outlines the Vision, Economic Development Strategy, Circulation, Private and Public Realm Standard and Design Guidelines, Land Use and Development Standards, Infrastructure, and Implementation for the Appian Way Corridor. See **Figure 1** for a map illustrating the Appian Way Corridor.

Figure 1: Map showing the Appian Way Corridor



Land Area

The Appian Way Corridor encompasses approximately 110.7 acres and extends from approximately 150 feet south of the Appian Way and San Pablo Ave intersection to the southern City limits at Appian Way.

Development Projections

The following **Table 2** examines the existing development and the proposed development projections for the Appian Way Corridor.

Table 2: Existing vs. Proposed Development Projections for the Appian Way Corridor

Existing	Residential Units	Retail (SF)	Office (SF)	Industrial (SF)
	244	561,260	468,449	48,352
Proposed	Residential Units	Retail (SF)	Office (SF)	Industrial (SF)
	877	807,698	728,129	0
Total	+633 units	+246,438 SF	+259,680 SF	48,352 SF

Land Use Standards

The Appian Way Project Area has three Sub-Areas (Corridor, Old Town, and Service). The Appian Way Zoning Districts described in the Land Use Plan consist of seven Zoning Areas. They are Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Commercial Mixed Use, Office Professional Mixed Use, Office Industrial Mixed Use, Public/Quasi Public/Institutional, and Open Space.

Each of these categories have corresponding uses that are either permitted, not permitted or conditional use. The use categories permitted range from Residential Uses, Community Service Uses, Utility, Transportation and Communication Uses, Retail/Service/Office Uses, Automotive Uses, and Industrial/Manufacturing, and Processing Uses. The Land Use table is provided in Chapter 6

Development Standards

The Appian Way Corridor has a number of development standards, which provides maximum or minimum requirements for development. The development standards are listed in Chapter 6 and

includes regulations regarding the height of structures, building placement, setback requirements, allowable building types, and allowable parking types. Generally, maximum height of structures in this area ranges from 40 to 50 feet and setbacks range from zero to 15 feet. See **Table 6.18 -- 6.19** below for examples of allowable frontage and building types, along with allowable parking types.

Table 6.18
Building Types

Allowed Building Type	Corridor	Service	Mixed-Use
Podium	X	X	X
Full Block Liner		X	
Half Block Liner	X	X	X
Quarter Block/ Infill Housing	X	X	X
Stacked		X	X
Terraced	X	X	X
Carriage House	X		X
Du/Tri/Quadplex	X	X	X
Multi-Family Faux House	X		
Rowhouse	X	X	X
Courtyard Housing			X

Table 6.19
Parking Types

Allowed Parking Type	Corridor	Service	Mixed-Use
Parking Structure		X*	X*
Behind Structure		X	X
Next to Structure		X	X
Alley Access		X	X
Subterranean		X	X
Tucked-under Structure		X	X

* - lined with ground floor retail

Private and Public Realm Standards and Design Guidelines:

Chapters 7 and 8 of the Specific Plan identifies standards for all three corridors. There are no specific standards for the Appian Way Corridor. The standards and guidelines address Site Planning and Design, Site Amenities, Architecture, Landscape and Hardscape, Circulation, Parking, Service and Storage, Lighting, Signage, and Green Design. This Chapter also requires mandatory design standards, some of which are provided below, as examples.

- a. **Site design shall be pedestrian-oriented, not dominated by parking lots, automobile use, or unattractive utilities.**
- i. **Sidewalks and on-site pedestrian paths shall provide direct and safe access to building entrances and transit stops.**
- e. **Renovation of existing buildings with historic value shall preserve those aspects of the site and structure that contribute to the historic character and context.**
- h. **Residential buildings shall have main entrances from the street to facilitate pedestrian activity and increase security through more “eyes on the street.”**

Infrastructure:

The Appian Way Corridor infrastructure is a developed area with existing infrastructure (e.g., roadway network, water, sewer, storm drainage). Essential services (e.g., police, fire, schools, parks, street lighting, and utilities) for the Appian Way Corridor are the same services that are used throughout the city. The service providers in the Specific Plan areas are listed below:

Service Providers in Specific Plan Project Areas	
Parks and Community Facilities	Library: Pinole Library, Contra Costa County Library system
	Parks: East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) (Regional Parks, regional inter-park trails and trails within EBRPD parklands) and City of Pinole (community and neighborhood parks) City provides recreational facilities including parks and trails – 1 regional park, 4 community parks, 5 neighborhood parks and 4 unimproved open space public areas
	Community Recreation Facilities: Pinole Youth Center City of Pinole Recreation Department Tiny Tots, a child care service and facility Pinole Valley Tennis Courts Pinole Swim Center Pinole Playhouse (Memorial Hall) Pinole Senior Center
Public Transportation	Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WestCAT) Alameda Contra Costa Transit Authority (AC Transit) Eastbay Paratransit

Service Providers in Specific Plan Project Areas	
Water Supply, Treatment, and Distribution	East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)
Sewer/ Waste Water	City of Pinole and West County Sanitary District (WCWD)
Solid Waste Collection, Disposal and Recycling	Richmond Sanitary Services (RSS) Portero Hills Landfill
Storm Drainage and Hydrology	City of Pinole Public Works Department
Dry Utilities	Electrical and Natural Gas: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
	Telephone and Telecommunications: AT&T and Comcast Pinole Local Cable Access – Channel 26 and 28
Public Safety	Police: City of Pinole Police Department.
	Fire: City of Pinole Fire Department
	Ambulance: American Medical Response
Parks and Public Facilities	
City Government Facilities	City Hall
School Districts	West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) – 8 schools
	Private Schools: 4 schools

Economic Development Strategy:

The Economic Development Strategy for the Appian Way Corridor is entwined with the other two corridors (Pinole Valley Road & San Pablo Avenue). The Guiding Principles for the Economic Development Strategy for all three areas including the Appian Way Corridor are listed below:

- ❖ Market forces are the dominant drivers of a regional economy.
- ❖ Public-sector economic development efforts must focus on factors internal to the workings of the regional economy and under the influence of public policy at any given level of government, be that local, regional, state, or federal.
- ❖ Sensible economic development policy must build upon the strengths of the regional economy. Economic development should yield real net impacts on growth or, in the short term, the potential for growth.
- ❖ The public sector should pursue economic development policies that result in broad benefits for residents and businesses, especially benefits that will continue to have a positive impact even if specific businesses close or move.
- ❖ Public-sector economic development efforts should pay attention to the needs of lagging or distressed areas and of groups at the lowest rungs of the economic ladder.
- ❖ Public policy should recognize the regional nature of economic development and advance strategies that address challenges and opportunities throughout the regional economy.
- ❖ Economic development efforts should address the development potential of places, as well as the needs of people in that place