

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

6 **May 24, 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, Flashman, Kurrent, Martinez, Wong, Vice Chair
20 Moriarty, Chair Banuelos
21

22 Commissioners Absent: None
23

24 Staff Present: Tamara Miller, Development Services Director
25 David Hanham, Planning Manager
26 Misha Kaur, Senior Project Manager
27 Alex Mog, Assistant City Attorney
28

29 **C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**
30

31 The following speaker submitted written comments via email that were read into
32 the record and would be filed with the agenda packet for this meeting: **Rafael**
33 **Menis.**
34

35 Commissioner Flashman expressed her appreciation for the kind comments Mr.
36 Menis had attributed to her in his e-mail.
37

38 **D. MEETING MINUTES:**
39

40 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from April 26, 2021
41

42 Commissioner Moriarty reported that during a recent City Council meeting there had
43 been a comment about the quality of the City Council meeting minutes. The speaker
44 had also mentioned the quality of the Planning Commission minutes and she had

1 agreed that Planning Commission minutes were exceptional and she appreciated
2 the work of the minute-taker in recording the meeting.

3
4 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
5 from April 26, 2021, as submitted.

6
7 **MOTION: Flashman SECONDED: Moriarty APPROVED: 6-0-1**
8 **ABSTAIN: Benzuly**
9

10 **E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

11
12 **1. Zoning Code Amendment 21-02, Specific Plan Amendment 21-01**
13 **Update Use Definitions for Dental Office**

14
15 **Request:** Consideration of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment and
16 Specific Plan Amendment to add “dental office” to the Office,
17 Business and Professional” use definition in Section
18 17.22.020 (F) (40) of the City of Pinole Zoning Ordinance and
19 the “Office – Business and Professional” use definition in
20 Chapter 11, Definitions of the Three Corridors Specific Plan

21
22 **Applicant:** Navjeet Chahal
23 2300 Henry Avenue
24 Pinole, CA 94564

25
26 **Location:** 2300 Henry Avenue (APN: 401-410-010)

27
28 **Planner:** David Hanham
29

30 Planning Manager David Hanham presented the staff report dated May 24, 2021,
31 and recommended the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 21-06
32 recommending the City Council approve a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to
33 amend the definition of “Office-Business and Professional” in Section 17.22.020
34 (F) (40) of the Pinole Zoning Code and Chapter 11 of the Three Corridors Specific
35 Plan.

36
37 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Hanham clarified the permitted uses in the
38 Public/Quasi-Public/Institutional (PQI) Zoning District and the staff rationale for
39 adding “dental office” to the Office-Business and Professional Zoning District, as
40 outlined in the staff report. The property located at 2300 Henry Avenue was
41 currently zoned PQI. On parcels zoned PQI located within the Old Town-Sub Area
42 of the Pinole Valley Road Corridor, Office - Business and Professional was a
43 permitted use, but Medical Service – General was prohibited. The applicant
44 desired to open a dental office on the site which required a zoning change.
45
46

1 Mr. Hanham explained that dental offices involved less traffic than medical offices
2 and staff wanted to keep the area with as little traffic as possible and stay within
3 the PQI Zoning District. The subject parcel had been a dental office and dental
4 lab in the past and people were familiar with the site as a dental office. While a
5 complete zoning change could be considered if the Planning Commission so
6 desired, staff determined a dental office would have the least impact on the Zoning
7 Code and there had been a dental office on the parcel in the past.

8
9 Mr. Hanham also clarified the building occupancy would not change unless the
10 building was expanded in size, which would require design review or a Conditional
11 Use Permit (CUP) depending on the use. From a Professional Office use to a
12 dental office, as an example, the occupancy would not change since the building
13 would remain the same size. If however the building were to be demolished and
14 if the use changed, it would be subject to the allowable uses permitted within the
15 classifications in the Zoning Code and within the Three Corridors Specific Plan.

16
17 Mr. Hanham clarified that Office-Business and Professional was a permitted use
18 within the Zoning District and by allowing dental offices to that district it would
19 become a permitted use. The subject parcel was not a public facility zoned PQI.

20
21 Assistant City Attorney Alex Mog explained that the proposal was not intended to
22 change the PQI Zoning but to change the definition of what was included within
23 the Office-Business and Professional Zoning District. The Zoning Text and
24 Specific Plan Amendments would apply to any parcel citywide where Office-
25 Business and Professional was currently an allowed use.

26
27 Mr. Hanham further clarified that while the subject parcel was situated adjacent to
28 a school, it was located on a separate parcel. The Kaiser Permanente parcel was
29 zoned Office-Professional Mixed-Use (OPMU).

30 31 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

32
33 Navjeet Chahal, 2300 Henry Avenue, Pinole, explained that the parcel had been
34 occupied by a dental lab in the past and opening a dental office/clinic would have
35 no impact on the use since it would be a minimal change. The Zoning Ordinance
36 Text and Specific Plan Amendments, as proposed, would permit a dental office.

37
38 Ed Klotz, reiterated the parcel had previously been occupied by a dental lab and
39 surrounded by other health industry giants, such as Kaiser Permanente. The PQI
40 District allowed hospitals as a permitted use and it had been a strange twist that
41 medical and dental offices were not fully permitted at that location. He agreed with
42 staff that adding the dental office use definition to the Office-Business and
43 Professional Zoning District would allow the best use of the property.

1 The following speaker submitted written comments via email that were read into
2 the record and would be filed with the agenda packet for this meeting: **Rafael**
3 **Menis.**

4
5 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

6
7 The Planning Commission discussed Zoning Code Amendment 21-02, Specific
8 Plan Amendment 21-01 and offered the following comments and/or direction to
9 staff:

- 10
11
 - Understood the intent had always been that the parcel would remain the
12 way it was but suggested it should have been included in the Office-
13 Business and Professional District. Recognized the parcel had been
14 occupied by a dental lab in the past and suggested the Zoning Text and
15 Specific Plan Amendments would essentially repair a planning error with
16 little impact on the area. (Banuelos)
 - Uncertain the staff approach was the best solution in that if dental offices
18 were to be included in the Office – Business and Professional use definition
19 dental laboratories should be included and permitted as well. Found there
20 were no differences between Medical Offices and regular offices. Pointed
21 out that Pinole Business Park included a Lifeline Medical facility amongst
22 the surrounding businesses which had not created any issues. (Kurrent)

23
24
25 Mr. Hanham read into the record the definition for Medical Services General, which
26 uses were not permitted in the PQI Zoning District Old Town-Sub Area. Medical
27 Services Hospital, as defined, would be permitted in the PQI Zoning District. For
28 the City of Pinole, all of the uses in the PQI Zoning District were either schools, a
29 library, a church located on San Pablo Avenue and some dental offices which were
30 located in either OPMU or the CMU Zoning Districts. The subject parcel was the
31 only parcel within the PQI Zoning District which had anything other than that on it.
32 He reiterated the staff rationale for the Zoning Ordinance Text and Specific Plan
33 Amendments and the intent not to conduct a major rewrite of the land use
34 classifications other than to amend what was allowed without going through a
35 complete overhaul. Staff was of the opinion the recommended process was
36 simpler but it was the prerogative of the Planning Commission to provide direction.

- 37
38
 - Accepted the staff recommendation as the quickest way for the applicant to
39 open their office. Supported the staff recommendation but would also like
40 to see dental laboratories be included in the allowed uses. Suggested with
41 the next General Plan update the subject parcel should be flagged as
42 needing a permanent solution as opposed to a piecemeal approach.
43 (Kurrent)

- 1 • Agreed with the concerns raised by Commissioner Kurrent but recognized
2 that a singular parcel was involved and the change would not affect other
3 parcels in the PQI Zoning District. Had there been impacts to other parcels,
4 a more rigorous discussion would have been required. Appreciated the staff
5 effort to create an easier approach but agreed it should be done right in the
6 future. At this time, she was neutral on the recommendation to include
7 dental laboratories in the allowed uses. (Moriarty)
8
- 9 • Not opposed to the general idea of the recommendation offered by
10 Commissioner Kurrent, although noted when the general public searched
11 for the Zoning District description there could be an issue. Pursuant to the
12 information provided on the City's website, the PQI Zoning District had no
13 information in the description about offices, leading to potential confusion.
14 Per the current discussion, Offices were allowed in the PQI Zoning District
15 although the City's website did not include the same information. (Wong)
16
- 17 • Expressed concern if the Zoning Code Text and Specific Plan Amendments
18 were approved, as proposed by staff, it may impact all properties that were
19 zoned in this way, and the piecemeal repair may lead to greater problems.
20 Would have preferred a solution that was specific to the subject parcel.
21 Noted that hospital and emergency care was allowed whereas preventative
22 care, which was oftentimes more necessary in the community, was not,
23 which should be discussed in the future, such as the types of medical uses
24 that would be allowed. (Flashman)
25

26 Mr. Hanham understood that when the PQI Zoning District had been developed it
27 had been developed for all city facilities and it was possible the subject parcel had
28 been lumped in since it had always been a Professional Office or a Medical Office,
29 and never a PQI use or a school. He reiterated the staff rationale for bringing the
30 item forward and the challenges involved with making changes to the Zoning Code.
31

- 32 • Suggested including dental laboratories as an allowed use would depend
33 on the size since it could jump to different occupancy criteria, but recognized
34 the size of the subject parcel would prevent a potential dental laboratory
35 from becoming too large. Supported the staff recommendation and while
36 there may be some impact to other properties in the future, there would
37 likely be more flexibility involved than with the subject parcel. (Banuelos)
38
- 39 • Expressed concern that the staff recommendation could set a precedent for
40 other properties, and while supportive of a dental office would like to see
41 the zoning be corrected properly. (Martinez)
42

43 Mr. Hanham commented that based on the uses, the subject parcel would likely
44 have only two uses that were consistent with the General Plan and would include
45 CMU or OPMU uses; however, OPMU was not an option in the Old Town-Sub

1 Area since it was not a zoning category allowed in the Old Town-Sub Area of the
2 Three Corridors Specific Plan. It would likely be a CMU use, and while
3 Professional Offices and Medical Service General were allowed in the CMU Zoning
4 District, everything else permitted within the CMU Zoning District would also apply.
5 By leaving the zoning classification of PQI alone, everything permitted or not
6 permitted remained the same, and adding dental office to the definition changed
7 that use from a non-permitted to a permitted use and did not change anything else,
8 which was very different from changing the entire zoning classification from a CMU
9 to a PQI Zoning District.

- 10
- 11 • Recommended the definition of dental office be included in the Office,
12 Business and Professional Zoning District and not be stricken from the
13 Medical Services definition of the Three Corridors Specific Plan, as shown
14 in Chapter 11, Section 11.1 Definitions of Attachment 3 to the staff report.
15 While he would have preferred a long-term approach, if this action worked
16 for the applicant, he could support the staff recommendation subject to his
17 recommendations. (Kurrent)
- 18

19 Speaking to Attachment 3, Amended Sections of Three Corridors Specific Plan,
20 Chapter 11.1 Definitions, Medical Services, Mr. Hanham confirmed the definition
21 could be revised to read:

22

23 ***Medical Services – General. Facilities primarily engaged in furnishing***
24 ***outpatient medical, mental health, surgical and other personal health***
25 ***services, but which are separate from hospitals (e.g. medical and dental***
26 ***laboratories, medical, dental and psychiatric offices, out-patient care***
27 ***facilities, allied health service).***

28

29 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt Resolution No. 21-06, A Resolution of the City
30 of Pinole Planning Commission Recommending that the City Council Approve an
31 Ordinance Amending the Definition of “Office-Business Professional” in Section
32 17.22.020 (F) (40) of the Pinole Zoning Code and Chapter 11 of the Three Corridors
33 Specific Plan, subject to the following modification:

- 34
- 35 • Attachment 3, Amended Sections of Three Corridors Specific Plan, Chapter
36 11, 11.1. Definitions, Medical Services, to be revised to read:
- 37

38 ***Medical Services – General. Facilities primarily engaged in furnishing***
39 ***outpatient medical, mental health, surgical and other personal health***
40 ***services, but which are separate from hospitals (e.g. medical and dental***
41 ***laboratories, medical, dental and psychiatric offices, out-patient care***
42 ***facilities, allied health service).***

43

44 **MOTION: Flashman**

SECONDED: Wong

APPROVED: 7-0

1 **F. OLD BUSINESS:** None

2
3 **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

4
5 **1. Review of Draft Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Consistency**
6 **with the General Plan**

7
8 **Request:** Review of the Draft 2021/22–2025/26 City Capital
9 Improvement Plan for Consistency with the City's General
10 Plan

11
12 **Project Staff:** Tamara Miller/Misha Kaur

13
14 Development Services Director Tamara Miller introduced the item, clarified there
15 may be more evolution and changes to the Draft Five-Year Capital Improvement
16 Plan (CIP), and introduced Senior Project Manager Misha Kaur.

17
18 Senior Project Manager Misha Kaur provided a PowerPoint presentation of the
19 Proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2021/22-2025/26 which
20 provided an overview of the 29 planned citywide public improvement projects in
21 the categories of facilities, parks, sanitary sewer, stormwater and roads, with six
22 new projects, three of which had been proposed for FY 2021/22. The background
23 and purpose of the CIP, General Plan conformity, and the new projects proposed
24 for FY 2021/22 were all highlighted in detail.

25
26 Responding to the Commission, Ms. Miller and Ms. Kaur clarified the following:

- 27
28
 - 29 • The West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC)
30 had recommended some funding to the City of Pinole for the design of the
31 Appian Way Complete Streets Project, although the construction phase was
32 unfunded.
 - 33 • A slurry seal project that had been included in the prior years' CIP list had
34 been completed this fiscal year.
 - 35 • Some of the projects would include start and end dates to provide greater
36 narrative on the status of the projects.
 - 37 • A recent presentation to the City Council of the CIP list of projects identifying
38 project status and progress could also be made available to the Planning
39 Commission via a link to the same information.
 - 40 • For Project No. FA2002, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations, the City was
41 working to leverage grants from the Metropolitan Transportation
42 Commission (MTC) with \$20,000 identified as local match funding.

43
44
45

- 1 • For Project No. FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking Lot, the parking lot
2 would include the installation of charging stations.
3
- 4 • For Project No. PA2001, Bocce Ball Court, the Pinole Rotary Club had
5 identified the bocce ball court as its Centennial Project, with the project to
6 be funded through different grant sources.
7
- 8 • The City had considered adding solar and would continue to review solar
9 opportunities.
10
- 11 • For Project No. FA1702, Citywide roof repairs and replacement, the project
12 had been identified by a roofing company, repairs would be required prior
13 to consideration of any solar, and while some members of the City Council
14 supported solar opportunities there were regulations associated with the
15 ability to generate power via solar required to be offset by the use of power.
16 Staff had discussed solar opportunities with MTC and Marin Clean Energy
17 (MCE). The project may be added to the unfunded project list and would
18 continue to be monitored.
19
- 20 • Measure S included a pattern of funding for a modest amount of pothole
21 repairs in the City ranging from \$20,000 to \$50,000 each year. The Public
22 Works Department had purchased a specialty piece of equipment for patch
23 paving and would be conducting a more formalized pothole repair program.
24 The ongoing budget for pavement funding also allowed for the purchase of
25 asphalt material and staff promised the City Council when the equipment
26 was purchased that it would be on the road for approximately six weeks a
27 year to patch potholes using a technique to facilitate slurry seal projects.
28
- 29 • For Project No. RO2501, Residential Slurry Seal, the City funded between
30 \$250,000 and \$300,000 in slurry seal projects every other year. In 2020,
31 the City funded almost \$800,000 in slurry seal projects having paired two
32 projects and expanded them into the list of roads for 2022, which allowed
33 the City to do larger projects, obtain overall lower bid pricing, and maximize
34 staff resources. If funding was increased, the size of projects could be
35 increased and staff would be looking at the available federal and state
36 stimulus funding to determine whether the projects could be made larger.
37
- 38 • The Pinole Valley Underground District had impacted Pinole Valley Road
39 and its cul-de-sacs. There were rules associated with the funding sources
40 for the project which had used Rule20A funds. While the pavement
41 serviceability of the road on Pinole Valley Road would be like a new road
42 and patching would be done by the contractor, the cul-de-sacs would be a
43 challenge and the City would have to wait until after the job was complete
44 before deciding how to optimize the spending on the cul-de-sacs. An area
45 of the pavement towards the south end of the project would also have to be

1 evaluated to see how it could be optimized. All of the sidewalk work done
2 using Rule20A funds would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
3 compliant. Staff would look at the project once complete, and
4 acknowledged there would be funding demands on the City to try to
5 harmonize what was new and old in the area. Staff hoped the work would
6 be complete in the next 60 days.
7

- 8 • For the Hercules-Pinole Wastewater Treatment Plant, the cities of Hercules
9 and Pinole had the foresight to realize the construction project would have
10 an impact on the road and had included specific language in the Fiscal
11 Agreement each city had signed that stipulated for whatever life was lost
12 due to the construction project each city would pay half. The Hercules-
13 Pinole Wastewater Subcommittee would meet on May 26, 2021 to discuss
14 funding for the Tennant Avenue Rehabilitation Project and the budget
15 documents had been included in the Planning Commission packet. The
16 City of Hercules and the Sewage Enterprise Fund would be putting monies
17 towards that project. Given the service demands, the road was an
18 expensive project. Slurry seal provided three years of service life and the
19 option was to rehabilitate the pavement sections to produce a road with a
20 ten- to twelve-year service life.
21

22 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

23
24 The following speaker submitted written comments via email that were read into
25 the record and would be filed with the agenda packet for this meeting: **Rafael**
26 **Menis**.
27

28 Responding to public comment with respect to Project No. RO2501, Residential
29 Slurry Seal and Project No. RO2401, Cape Seal, Ms. Miller explained the City used
30 StreetSaver software which optimized recommendations and took the Pavement
31 Condition Index (PCI) scored by the field personnel and mapped it over time so
32 that during the Five-Year Budget report, a specific road would be scheduled for
33 slurry seal repair based on the methodology and algorithm that projected the
34 serviceability of the pavement itself. She also clarified that slurry seal was weather
35 dependent and a road could not be slurry sealed during wet and cold weather.
36

37 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

38
39 The Planning Commission discussed the Draft Five-Year CIP and offered the
40 following comments and/or direction to staff:
41

- 42 • Recommended that Project No. FA2002, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
43 and Project No. FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking Lot, be combined
44 to provide greater funding capabilities and consideration of solar. For
45 Project No. FA1702, Citywide roof repairs and replacement, suggested the

1 inclusion of solar on the roof of City Hall should be considered to provide
2 more efficiency and investment in green technology. For Project No.
3 PA2001, Bocce Ball Court and Project No. PA1704 Prepare a Park Master
4 Plan, supported a Park Master Plan, but questioned the cost of the bocce
5 ball court given the condition of city streets. Encouraged the support of
6 funding for the Bocce Ball Court via community organizations to potentially
7 reduce costs. (Martinez)
8

- 9 • Requested a list/matrix of completed CIP projects and the status of each.
10 (Moriarty)
11
- 12 • Agreed a list/matrix of completed CIP projects and the status of each project
13 should be provided. Liked the potential inclusion of solar and adding solar
14 to the unfunded project list. Acknowledged the concerns with the cost of
15 the bocce ball courts but recognized the identified funds for the project must
16 be used for parks only. (Flashman)
17
- 18 • Found the Draft Five-Year CIP to be a positive report and was excited to
19 see the upcoming projects come to fruition. (Banuelos)
20

21 **MOTION** by a Roll Call Vote to adopt Resolution No. 21-07, A Resolution of the
22 Planning Commission of the City of Pinole Recommending the City Council of the
23 City of Pinole Find that the Proposed Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years
24 2021/2022 Through 2025/2026 is in Conformance with the City of Pinole General
25 Plan.
26

27 **MOTION: Flashman** **SECONDED: Kurrent** **APPROVED: 7-0**
28

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

30 **1. Verbal Updates of Projects**

31
32
33 Mr. Hanham reported the application for 811 San Pablo Avenue for 33 units of 100
34 percent affordable housing would come to the Planning Commission during its
35 June meeting. Vista Woods, a 179-unit senior 100 percent affordable housing
36 project on San Pablo Avenue and Roble Avenue was in the process of completing
37 environmental work to be forwarded to the consultant to meet a Notice of
38 Exemption and would be considered by the Planning Commission in the August to
39 October 2021 timeframe. He also reported the applicant for Appian Village would
40 be holding a community meeting scheduled for June 2, 2021 at 6:00 P.M. via Zoom
41 with more information to be provided to the Planning Commission.
42

43 Mr. Hanham also reported that Pinole Vista, a 214-unit project on Fitzgerald Drive
44 in the former Kmart building was in the process of completing specific agreements
45 and may be considered by the Planning Commission in November/December 2021

1 or early 2022. Also, staff received responses from comments from the applicant
2 and other agencies for the project proposed for 2801 Pinole Valley Road and staff
3 continued to receive single-family home applications and permit requests. In
4 addition, staff was working on updating the City's standard conditions of approval
5 as projects were being processed.
6

7 Mr. Hanham added that staff had received a request for minor administrative
8 design review from East Bay Coffee, which would like to modify the outdoor seating
9 area. Staff was of the opinion the proposed modification rose to the level of
10 Planning Commission review and recommended a Special Meeting for either June
11 2 or June 7, 2021. All of the project conditions and the approval of a Public
12 Necessity for the sale of alcohol would remain in effect. The only items to be
13 reviewed would be the outdoor design features and the fence.
14

15 By consensus, the Planning Commission scheduled a Special Meeting for
16 Monday, June 7, 2021 at 7:00 P.M. and staff confirmed that public comment would
17 be accepted at that time.
18

19 Mr. Hanham further reported that given the volume of projects and since the
20 Planning Commission met only once a month, staff proposed a second Planning
21 Commission meeting each month and would bring that proposal to the
22 Commission for consideration at its next meeting.
23

24 Chair Banuelos stated he had discussed with staff the possibility of having a
25 presentation of projects planned for specific locations, such as all of the projects
26 planned along Pinole Valley Road, to allow the Planning Commission to identify all
27 potential impacts, such as traffic. He also recommended a regular Future
28 Requests for Agenda Items on each meeting agenda.
29

30 Planning Commissioners discussed the removal of a street tree at 2518 San Pablo
31 Avenue as related to the City's current Tree Ordinance, and recommended as the
32 City moved towards a Tree Master Plan the current ordinance be strengthened
33 with better enforcement and clarity to the regulations.
34

35 Commissioner Moriarty reported the appointment of an Alternate to the Ad-Hoc
36 Planning Commission Subcommittee was to have been agendized for this
37 meeting, and Mr. Hanham advised the item could be agendized for the Special
38 Planning Commission meeting scheduled for June 7, 2021.
39

40 In response to Commissioner Moriarty, Mr. Hanham also provided an update on
41 code enforcement related to the removal of the street tree from property at 2518
42 San Pablo Avenue. In that case, the City had sent a letter to the property owner
43 outlining the City's requirements and what the property owner was required to pay
44 for the tree's removal. A memorandum had also been sent to the City Manager.
45 He assured the Commission that there would be a replacement for the street tree
46 that had been removed.

Commissioner Moriarty also inquired of the status of Planning Commissioners having city e-mails and the Sprouts tree mitigation, to which Mr. Hanham advised he was still working on the e-mail issue and hoped to have more information on June 7. As to Sprouts, no trees would be allowed in the West Contra Costa County Flood Control right-of-way, the City would have to reconsider what could be done with the property owner, and staff continued to work on the matter. He also confirmed he would forward to Commissioners information on the CIP project status that had been presented to the City Council.

The Planning Commission expressed its appreciation to Commissioner Flashman for her work on the Planning Commission and wished her well on her next endeavor.

Commissioner Martinez referenced the Pinole Valley Road Underground District project and suggested it was an opportunity for broadband infrastructure and additional electric charging stations. He wanted to see a Master Plan for the City's roads which also identified the infrastructure under the roads and asked that the Planning Commission be allowed to view the City's larger scaled projects in order to provide input.

Chairperson Banuelos suggested that such a discussion would be important for future projects and the Planning Commission could provide input and recommendations for City Council consideration.

Commissioner Flashman expressed her appreciation to each Planning Commissioner, encouraged members of the public to participate in order to create the community desired, and stated she had been honored and grateful for the opportunity to serve on the Planning Commission. She planned to continue her civic life in the future and had enjoyed the vibrant and inclusive Pinole community.

I. COMMUNICATIONS: None

J. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Planning Commission to be a Special Meeting to be held on June 7, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.

K. ADJOURNMENT: *In Honor of Sarah Flashman* at 9:19 P.M.

Transcribed by:

Sherri D. Lewis
Transcriber