

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

5
6 **January 12, 2026**

7
8 **THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN A HYBRID FORMAT**
9 **BOTH IN-PERSON AND ZOOM TELECONFERENCE**
10

11
12 **A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 p.m.
13

14 **B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
15

16 **C. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** *Before we begin, we would like to acknowledge the*
17 *Ohlone people, who are the traditional custodians of this land. We pay our respects to*
18 *the Ohlone elders, past, present and future, who call this place, Ohlone Land, the land*
19 *that Pinole sits upon, their home. We are proud to continue their tradition of coming*
20 *together and growing as a community. We thank the Ohlone community for their*
21 *stewardship and support, and we look forward to strengthening our ties as we continue*
22 *our relationship of mutual respect and understanding.*
23

24 **D. ROLL CALL**
25

26 Commissioners Present: Bender, Huey, Uch, Lam-Jullian, Martinez, Vice-Chairperson
27 Menis and Chairperson Sandoval
28

29 Commissioners Absent: None
30

31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
32 Erica Gonzalez, City Attorney's Office
33 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner
34

35 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on his ex-parté communications to his email list about the
36 topics on the meeting agenda.
37

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

40 Anthony Vossbrink, stated a while back some members of the Planning Commission and
41 other members of the community brought up to the Planning Manager and other people
42 at City Hall, the fact that City parks were in disrepair, particularly the park off of Appian
43 Way where the seesaw benches were broken, which was to be investigated and repaired.
44 To date the seesaw benches remained broken and unusable by the public. The same
45 park included a steep drop-off at the sidewalk with no guard or hand rails or Americans
46 with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, which also should be addressed. In addition,
47 water fountains were broken in many City parks, one of the restrooms at Bay Front Park
48 had been vandalized and remained unusable, wooden planks at the Fernandez Park-
49 Senior Center bridge were rotten and similarly wooden planks on the bridge across from
50 the Pinole Soccer Field to the dog park needed repair.

1 Mr. Vossbrink commented although these issues had been reported to the Police
2 Department or the Public Works Department by members of the community, he
3 understood the City's Public Works Manager did not want Public Works staff to work on
4 these issues.

5
6 Planning Manager David Hanham advised he would forward the comments to the Public
7 Works Manager.

8
9 Commissioner Martinez asked that any communication with the Public Works Manager be
10 done electronically via email and that the Acting City Manager be copied as well as the
11 City's legal team given the sense of urgency so the repairs could be handled quickly.
12

13 **F. MEETING MINUTES**

- 14
15 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for December 8, 2025

16
17 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for
18 December 8, 2025, as shown.

19
20 **MOTION: Sandoval**

SECONDED: Menis

APPROVED: 5-0-2

ABSTAIN: Lam-Julian, Martinez

21
22
23 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

24
25 **1. MISC25-0009 Study Session for Self-Storage at 890 San Pablo Avenue**

26
27 Senior Planner Justin Shiu provided a PowerPoint presentation for the Study Session for
28 a self-storage facility to be located at 890 San Pablo Avenue, which included an overview
29 of a prior proposal for a self-storage facility project in 2018, which had been approved by
30 the Planning Commission in 2019 by a vote of 4-3. The project had been appealed to the
31 City Council and the City Council denied the project in 2019, with the determination
32 outlined in Attachment F, 2019 City Council Resolution of Denial of Design Review Appeal
33 for 890 San Pablo Avenue, attached to the January 12, 2026 staff report. The elevations
34 of the final design and the renderings denied by the City Council were also provided in the
35 staff report.
36

37 Mr. Shiu explained the applicant was interested in revisiting the concept for a self-storage
38 facility along with other uses. No development plans or application had been received by
39 City staff and no approval could be taken at this time. The Planning Commission may
40 receive the presentation and ask questions of the applicant and provide feedback for
41 general consideration. Once a formal development application was received, the Planning
42 Commission could comprehensively review the specific design and uses proposed for
43 approval at that time.
44

45 Erica Gonzalez, City Attorney's Office, reiterated this was a Study Session only and would
46 not constitute a preliminary review, public hearing or a formal evaluation of the potential
47 proposed development project. A formal development application had not been received
48 or filed with the Planning Department. The Planning Commission may receive the
49 presentation and ask questions of the prospective applicant.

1 Ms. Gonzalez explained the purpose of the Study Session was for high-level feedback for
2 general considerations as the applicant explored conceptual designs and potential site
3 constraints. In accordance with due process and fair hearing standards, the Planning
4 Commission should refrain from discussions, comments or conclusions that indicated its
5 potential decision or definitive stance on future applications should it be presented to the
6 Planning Commission. Doing so, would be considered engaging in a premature
7 deliberation or expression of an opinion on the merits of a project before it was presented
8 to the Planning Commission which may indicate a bias, which would necessitate the
9 recusal of the affected Commissioner should that be taken this evening once the project
10 was formally presented in the future.
11

12 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Messieurs Shiu and Hanham and
13 Ms. Gonzalez clarified the following:
14

- 15 • Page 22 of 86 of the agenda packet, Attachment B, Planning Commission staff
16 report dated August 26, 2019, clarified Land Use and Economic Development
17 Element, Goal LU.7, Policy LU7.1, Policy LU7.2 and the City's Regional Housing
18 Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers. Page 23 of 86 of the agenda packet, Table 1.
19 Storage Facilities in Pinole, was also clarified. Staff responded to questions
20 related to whether or not the proposed plan met the intended goals, which should
21 be phrased as a general question as to what would be done to meet the goals, but
22 not phrased as to whether or not the project did or did not meet those goals to
23 avoid any bias. As to whether or not the project met the stated goals and policies,
24 the Planning Commission would make that consistency finding when a full project
25 was brought forward to the Planning Commission. (Martinez)
26
- 27 • Clarified the number of existing storage units in Pinole had been based on County
28 records. (Martinez)
29
- 30 • Staff was unsure whether the developer was aware of the Vista Woods and
31 Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA) developments located on either
32 side of the project site on San Pablo Avenue, which had been built since the 2019
33 City Council denial of the original project. (Martinez)
34
- 35 • The existing zoning for the site was Office Industrial Mixed-Use (OIMU). The
36 project involved discretionary review and should some sort of concept be brought
37 for an Office use, as an example, the Planning Commission could make a more
38 specific determination or have a conversation with the applicant on the potential
39 tenants and uses. (Uch)
40
- 41 • Page 24 of 86 of the agenda packet, Attachment B, Table 2. Development
42 Standards and Proposed Project, clarified the parking requirements. As part of its
43 discretionary review, the Planning Commission may determine the appropriate
44 number of parking spaces for the proposed use considering the context and site
45 area. The original project had included a parking study and traffic report providing
46 professional guidance on the ratios for parking. (Uch)
47
48

- In response to concerns with the site constraints for the Pinole Shores II project due to contamination of the soil, that issue only applied to the Pinole Shores II site, although that site was adjacent to the property at 890 San Pablo Avenue. Clarified a Phase I study for Pinole Shores II had studied environmental hazards and documentation applicable to the original project for 890 San Pablo Avenue had not identified any specific issues; however, if a project was brought before the Planning Commission another Phase II analysis would be done as part of the documentation. Staff acknowledged the initial reports for the original project were old and a new submittal would likely include another Phase I environmental assessment of hazardous materials on the site and include any mitigations that might be needed. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Page 27 of 86 of the agenda packet, Table 3. Trip Generation, clarified the figures in the table served as general guidance. The applicant should clarify whether the information contained in the table, was reasonable or reflected the typical sizes for storage units that could be used as an estimate. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Acknowledged concern some of the documentation provided was not clearly legible, particularly Page 48 of 86 of the agenda packet, Sheet L1, with the text in the landscape narrative challenging to read, and Page 42 of 86 of the agenda packet, A.14, where the lighting details were also not legible. Staff was asked to split the pages amongst multiple letter pages so the text would not be as reduced in size. Staff clarified when a formal application was made, the documentation would be provided on larger paper. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Acknowledged a request for the applicant to be provided the 2019 Pinole Insight Market Analytics, Void Analysis Report, prepared by HdL Econ Solutions, which included good data points. (Martinez)

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Beau Reinberg, Applicant, 3167 Fee Fee Road, Bridgeton, MO, explained the development process had started in 2017, with the current owners of the property who had gone through a lengthy application process with the City. At that time, they received a lot of good feedback with the goal of the materials to show the extent of the applicant's willingness to work on what was best for the City of Pinole while also within their business model and show what they did on a nationwide basis.

Mr. Reinberg stated the applicant tried to take feedback from staff, the City Council, the Planning Commission and the community through study sessions to reach a solution that would be well received by the residents of Pinole. As stated, the project started in 2017 with a husband and wife who owned the property for years. Early in the process, the husband had a stroke and Mr. Reinberg stated he worked with the wife to take the project to the finish line. Ultimately, the original project was denied, and he went back to Missouri. Around two months ago, the son of the property owners reached out to him and informed him his parents had passed away and he was working through the process of the estate.

1 Mr. Reinberg had thought the property would be developed and was surprised it had not
2 been developed and improved over the ensuing years, which spoke to the fact the site
3 was challenging with easements and oil lines and it was not an easy site to develop.
4

5 When considering the next steps, Mr. Reinberg reported he reached out to City staff and
6 requested a study session to reintroduce the project and answer any questions. At this
7 time, he provided a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of the project
8 site and highlighted the community need for storage units which served one in ten
9 households, supported downsizing and small businesses and local residents and involved
10 low impact land use with little traffic to be generated.
11

12 Given the desire for a mixed-use concept, the project would involve affordable small office
13 suites, live-work support and daytime economic activities, with low trip generation, and
14 secure indoor loading. Community benefits would include minimal traffic, high quality
15 architecture, job creation and tax base enhancement through property tax, impact fees
16 and support of the retail sales tax. The project would also include controlled access, 24/7
17 surveillance and on-site management. The project would provide high quality infill
18 development to be aligned with the Specific Plan goals and would be community serving
19 with a low impact use.
20

21 In terms of the design, Mr. Reinberg explained the project would reduce massing and
22 provide enhanced articulation, as compared to the original submittal, while also balancing
23 the economic goals and objectives for a feasible and sustainable project along with the
24 goals and objectives of the plan for the City of Pinole. In terms of the operational
25 commitments, those included hours of operation, noise controls, lighting and security
26 measures.
27

28 Mr. Reinberg highlighted the design evolution of the massing and compared having one
29 versus two buildings and three versus four stories. Based on feedback from staff, the
30 Planning Commission and the public, the applicant worked to come up with something
31 that worked for them and the rest of the area. He also provided a San Pablo Avenue
32 streetscape comparison, which showed what the facility may look like, replacing the
33 vacant frontage with an active designed building, improving the corridor aesthetics along
34 San Pablo Avenue, with pedestrian-scale architectural articulation consistent with the San
35 Pablo Avenue Specific Plan vision. Additional conceptual plans showed the nighttime
36 appearance and safety lighting, with the lighting to be fully shielded, downcast with light-
37 emitting diodes (LED) lighting with no spillover to adjacent residential properties and with
38 enhanced pedestrian and vehicle safety consistent with the City lighting standards. The
39 lighting levels would be reviewed and approved during plan check.
40

41 Mr. Reinberg emphasized he was committed to working with City staff and taking
42 feedback. He wholeheartedly believed there was a need within the community for a Class
43 A, self-storage mixed-use development and he was willing and able to take feedback,
44 ideas and thoughts from the Planning Commission to present a development plan to staff
45 that was ultimately acceptable and have an opportunity to present that plan to the Planning
46 Commission.
47

48 Ms. Gonzalez reiterated the parameters of the study session and stated there could be
49 clarifying questions from the Planning Commission.
50

1 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Messiers Reinberg and Hanham
2 clarified the following:
3

- 4 • The project would support retail sales taxes by enabling retailers the ability to
5 maximize square footage for sales space versus warehouse space, since
6 oftentimes a retailer may only be able to use a certain amount of square footage
7 for backstock and different things, with the use able to maximize the amount of
8 space customers could buy product by using the facility for storage and using their
9 entire footprint for retail sales. This was where they had seen retail increases
10 occur. (Bender)
11
- 12 • The property had become vacant between 2014/15 when the initial business was
13 closed and the property had sat vacant for over ten years. (Bender)
14
- 15 • Acknowledged the recommendation to review the 2019 Pinole Insight Market
16 Analytics, Void Analysis Report, prepared by HdL Econ Solutions. Recognized the
17 concerns raised about the City's long-term maintenance and operational needs,
18 such as road repair and housing needs and would work with staff to obtain
19 information about those issues. Clarified impact fees were tied to traffic, roads,
20 water and the Fire Department, with a lot of that tied to square footage. Explained
21 how infill lots were typically filled with parking spaces and not a lot of square
22 footage and noted the use would maximize the square footage on the parcel,
23 maximizing potential impact fees to be generated from the parcel. Suggested the
24 vertical side of things could help assist and maximize the fees generated from the
25 development. (Martinez)
26
- 27 • Impact fees were a one-time fee for capital improvements based on the impact of
28 a project. The City used property taxes and sales taxes which were ongoing each
29 year for maintenance needs. Reported the City's Impact Fee Update Study had
30 been recently updated. (Martinez)
31
- 32 • The project, when open and operational, would have two full-time employees.
33 (Martinez)
34
- 35 • Acknowledged a recommendation to not use ChatGPT for a presentation in the
36 future which would bias him against the project in the future. (Vice-Chairperson
37 Menis)
38
- 39 • Page 73 of 86 of the agenda packet, Page 2 of Attachment F, 2019-106 City
40 Council Resolution of Denial of Design Review Appeal for 890 San Pablo Avenue,
41 where the City Council found the project was not consistent with the General Plan,
42 as outlined, and clarified it was too early in the process to determine how the
43 proposed project would address the concerns as outlined in the attachment. Staff
44 reiterated that the applicant had yet to provide a fully developed application to the
45 City and it would be unfair to anticipate how that future application would be
46 completed and submitted. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
47
48
49

- 1 • Acknowledged the concept for an office incubator design may have waned since
2 2019 and there were a lot of office vacancies currently in Pinole, but most of that
3 challenge was due to renting office space for six months to a year if not three years,
4 and that type of commitment was very difficult for small and growing businesses.
5 The type of office suites concept being offered would be for a short-term duration,
6 only a month that someone could lease the space. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
7
- 8 • The applicant clarified Impact Fees would be a one-time fee. As the development
9 application was furthered, the applicant would be able to dig into the indirect sales
10 tax revenue from the project. Based on traffic and different municipal needs, the
11 applicant asserted it would be a low impact project that would be a benefit to the
12 City due to the larger property structure that was not generating a lot of traffic that
13 would produce wear and tear on the roads. The project would also not have a
14 number of restrooms, with wear and tear on water and sewer utilities and there
15 would be a benefit to a larger structure in terms of higher property taxes, with
16 municipal support through schools, fire and different taxing districts. It should be
17 taken into consideration that the project given its scale would have a higher tax
18 than was provided currently, which was very little and had been for ten years.
19
- 20 • Raised a concern that the one-time fee may not offset ongoing needs (Vice-
21 Chairperson Menis)
22
- 23 • Pages 83 through 86 of the agenda packet, Attachment I, Three Corridors Specific
24 Plan, Table 6.2, land use classifications, clarified as to whether the design could
25 be adjusted with less storage and more business support services, (which uses
26 would be permitted by right) could be looked into as the applicant went through the
27 application process and re-evaluated the product in the project for the development
28 submission. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
29
- 30 • Acknowledged appreciation for the level of detail and number of renderings
31 provided as part of the study session (from 2019), particularly the three-
32 dimensional visualizations from different viewpoints from the site. Acknowledged
33 concerns with Pages 50 (aerial view from the southeast) and 52 (aerial view from
34 the northeast) of 86 of the agenda packet, in that some areas had relatively less
35 articulation. Based on the views provided on Page 65 (photo simulation View 7)
36 of 86 of the agenda packet, while there were good articulation and variation in color
37 and shape in the front building, there was less in the areas where the building
38 overlapped with the other building and the back of the building. The applicant
39 clarified the goal of the elevations and renderings were to show the first approach
40 and process of adapting to feedback. Things would be incorporated into the final
41 development plan based on feedback but there was a good baseline
42 understanding based on some of the newer projects being developed, design
43 standards that had been approved since 2017 and what the applicant would
44 ultimately present to the Planning Commission to achieve a look and design the
45 City was looking for. The renderings and elevations provided were described as
46 artifacts, with the applicant to submit a new project, take a lot of the initial feedback
47 from this study session and any continued feedback to ensure the project met the
48 goals of the City of Pinole. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
49

- Clarified again the project would have fewer sewer impacts given the design involved fewer restrooms due to the physical size of the office spaces themselves; however, in response to concerns about the initial proposal lacking adequate restrooms that could be taken into consideration to see what could be done to make the project as marketable and as customer focused as possible. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Clarified the oil lines that ran through the property involved a Chevron line that ran through a number of parcels, ran on an angle and through Pinole Shores. Where the oil line traveled in the other direction and where it landed was unknown, although staff understood the oil line did not run through the Vista Woods development. There was also a 30 or 50-foot easement running through the back of the property and an East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) line that ran through the property. Some of the site plans showed those lines with the building cut off at an angle due to the Chevron easement. (Chair Sandoval)
- Staff also clarified the EBMUD easement was where the parking area separated between the two buildings and was an issue that had come up in 2018. This would not affect the potential uses on the site. Since the lines existed, a Phase I preliminary environmental assessment would be done. The applicant clarified the impact of the lines, and while on the owner's property, the easements indicated the owner of the line had to be able to access the line with a type of vehicle at different hours, and depending on the location of the line, what could be built on the other side of it and how the line could be accessed prohibited certain things in different areas. As an example, there had been soils issues on the Pinole Shores II property and there were certain criteria for development due to the soil issues. At this time, there was nothing on the property to restrict development with the environmental documents having noted the pipeline had been decommissioned for over 60-years although the pipeline remained in the easement. (Chair Sandoval)
- Confirmed a new market analysis had been done to verify there remained a demand for self-storage unit development. (Chair Sandoval)
- Clarified again the concept for small office incubator spaces, with the applicant open to listening to the feedback and hearing how they could balance the concept with their economic model, for Class A self-storage and ancillary uses to complement the primary use, and with an effort to accommodate the goals of the City and surrounding areas to ensure the design worked well with the primary use for a Class A climate controlled self-storage facility. (Chair Sandoval)
- Clarified as they go through the development process anything proposed must be commercially viable. The applicant would always think about how to attract and appeal to the consumer being targeted and again acknowledged the importance of the recommendation to review the 2019 Pinole Insight Market Analytics, Void Analysis Report, prepared by HdL Econ Solutions. (Martinez)

- 1 • Acknowledged a recommendation to review the ideas proposed by ROIC for the
2 former Kmart site since the ideas that were relevant in 2019 in terms of colors and
3 combinations may not be relevant in 2026. (Martinez)
4
- 5 • Acknowledged a request for information on the property tax revenue to Pinole for
6 a project similar to that being proposed and any referenceable information related
7 to businesses generating retail tax revenue. Clarified again the project must work
8 economically for the applicant and the City and the applicant could focus on that
9 information when going through the process. (Martinez)
10
- 11 • Acknowledged a recommendation to review Mercado La Paloma located in the City
12 of Los Angeles, which involved an industrial mixed-use property that converted an
13 old garment factory to retail community space and was a creative way to reuse the
14 property. (Lam-Julian)
15

16 Ms. Gonzalez commented the Planning Commission was starting to get into making
17 recommendations. She recognized the Chair opened the public hearing, with the
18 applicant asked to make a presentation which had been made, and the Commission had
19 engaged with the presenter on clarifying questions. She clarified when the members of
20 the public had the opportunity to speak, there was no project before the Planning
21 Commission to approve or disapprove but public comment would need to be opened and
22 later closed and then the Planning Commission could have further discussions and make
23 recommendations or further suggestions to the applicant within the parameters earlier
24 discussed.
25

26 Staff reported there were no comments from the public.
27

28 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED 29

30 Ms. Gonzalez again stated the Planning Commission may offer recommendations based
31 on the parameters discussed.
32

33 Commissioner Martinez referenced the last rendering of the materials package and asked
34 whether there was any way the applicant could consider a combination of retail or office
35 space, and suggested windows would go a long way with nice lighting. Those elements
36 would make the building more inviting rather than having just huge walls.
37

38 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked to what extent the Planning Commission was allowed to
39 consider and prioritize the revenue generated by a project in determining the preferable
40 uses.
41

42 Ms. Gonzalez commented in general she could provide more specific guidance if and
43 when an application was presented, but that should not be part of the discussion at this
44 time. She further clarified the Planning Commission may offer recommendations for the
45 potential applicant to consider in terms of revenue when presented to the Planning
46 Commission in the future, but the Planning Commission should not make any ruling or
47 statement of preference as to how that should be done in the comments to be provided.
48

49 Vice-Chairperson Menis stated many of his comments had been made during the question
50 phase.

1 In terms of the split of uses in the first building, assuming the applicant planned a similar
2 bi-building split, Vice-Chairperson Menis commented that one building was almost entirely
3 storage and the other a mix of storage and other uses. He asked about the amount of
4 space the applicant was willing to allocate to non-storage uses in the smaller building.
5

6 Mr. Reinberg advised they were looking at a mixed-use concept and he appreciated the
7 feedback and desire to have a mixed-use approach. He would consider that feedback as
8 he worked to complete the development proposal and application but it was currently
9 premature in the process to say how much mixed-use there would be at this time.
10

11 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked whether Commissioner Martinez's questions about
12 windows was linked to the first or second building since the first building, as reflected in
13 Attachment C, Project Description and Traffic Memo dated May 10, 2019, had a fair
14 amount of windows at several points, including the west elevation (Page 38 of 86 of the
15 agenda packet, Preliminary Elevations, A.10), east elevation and (Page 40 of 86 of the
16 agenda packet Preliminary Elevations A.12), with windows on most of the public facing
17 sides. He suggested that would be a worthwhile rendering to show what it looked like for
18 the in-between the buildings space which would not have much of an impact on the public
19 perception, but shape the relationship of the two buildings to each other and how they
20 would integrate stylistically. Based on Attachment C, there would be a fair amount of
21 windows on the front building.
22

23 Commissioner Martinez clarified his comments about windows and noted there were some
24 glass windows as referenced on the front of Attachment D, Planning Commission
25 Renderings, and a sketch which had been included in the agenda packet.
26

27 Mr. Reinberg clarified the differences between windows and glazing, used in part because
28 a self-storage facility with too many windows would become a security issue and they
29 could not have a window into a storage unit. The inside of the window on elevated floors
30 sometimes used a glazing or faux technique offering the appearance of a frosted or tinted
31 window to improve aesthetics but was not an actual window, as opposed to the first floor,
32 where one would want window visibility. Such design elements would be part of the
33 development of the design application.
34

35 Commissioner Martinez commented that if office space, it was likely one would want
36 windows, which would be more inviting.
37

38 Vice-Chairperson Menis also spoke to Attachment D and suggested a way in the new
39 design to take the articulation and variety of colors in the first building and expand that out
40 more to the second building, and while some articulation and color design was being
41 proposed it was sharper on the first building. Referencing Page 50 of 86 of the agenda
42 packet, the front page of Attachment D, it had shown the shading of the front building and
43 he suggested the top space could use more variety and articulation of color.
44

45 Commissioner Bender referenced Attachment C, Planning Commission Plan Set, the
46 frontage along San Pablo Avenue, and noted the ground floor had some version of
47 translucent glass for the lobby and then proposed office space which wrapped around
48 both sides. There were also references to spandrel glass, which was opaque glass
49 material.
50

1 Chair Sandoval suggested given the project had not been approved the first go-around a
2 creative use of the space may be more successful in the future.

3
4 Mr. Reinberg asked whether residential would be an allowed use in the OIMU District.

5
6 Mr. Shiu clarified residential development would require the approval of a Conditional Use
7 Permit (CUP); however, a CUP was required for the self-storage facility anyway and
8 residential could be part of the application.

9
10 Mr. Hanham explained the allowed density for the site would be 20 to 30 dwelling units
11 per acre. Once a proposal was made, it would have to be compared to the standards of
12 the Three Corridors Specific Plan, which would permit a structure of 40 feet in height, or
13 four stories, but an affordable housing development could include waivers and possibly a
14 taller building.

15
16 Vice-Chairperson Menis commented that when reviewing the Land Use and Development
17 Standards for the OIMU District, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) would be permitted by
18 right, but ADUs may not work in the OIMU District.

19
20 Mr. Shiu clarified for an ADU, a primary dwelling unit must be on-site prior to requesting
21 approval of an ADU and absent that component, just an ADU would not be permitted.

22
23 Commissioner Lam-Julian asked whether the applicant would consider leaning more
24 towards retail industrial mixed-use, and again offered the example of Mercado La Paloma
25 in Los Angeles.

26
27 Mr. Hanham referenced the Pinole Shores II development that had multiple uses
28 associated with the project including retail, a kitchen incubator and a restaurant as part of
29 the industrial portion of the project. He understood Commissioner Lam-Julian was
30 suggesting potentially the property could do the same type of thing as Pinole Shores II
31 had done but on a smaller scale due to the size of the subject property.

32
33 Commissioner Lam-Julian again asked whether the applicant would consider going that
34 route.

35
36 Ms. Gonzalez clarified the applicant was not required to make a statement as to which
37 way he may or may not go now, but that recommendation could be made as consideration
38 for a future application. She clarified that Commissioner Lam-Julian had provided an
39 example for consideration in consideration of a potential future application.

40
41 Chair Sandoval noted the City of Emeryville had similar development the applicant may
42 also consider as a potential idea, which involved multi-level development but on the taller
43 side, and which included different uses within the project, such as industrial, commercial,
44 retail and health care settings.

45
46 Mr. Reinberg stated he would take a look at those developments.

47
48 Mr. Hanham explained for the benefit of the applicant when going through the permitted
49 uses table, that he would find that many uses required a CUP, but only one CUP would
50 be considered for the project.

1 Mr. Hanham added that when the applicant was close to making application, it could be
2 brought to the Planning Commission Design Review Ad-Hoc Committee for more specific
3 feedback and recommendations prior to the full Planning Commission for formal
4 consideration.

5
6 **H. OLD BUSINESS:** None

7
8 **I. NEW BUSINESS:** None

9
10 **J. CITY PLANNER'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

11
12 Messiers Shiu and Hanham provided the following updates:

- 13
- 14 • The next meeting of the Planning Commission may include three or four items.
 - 15
 - 16 • The City Council would hear the Planning Commission recommendations for
17 potential redevelopment of the Appian 80 Workshop in the first quarter of 2026.
18 Representation from the Planning Commission was encouraged to be present to
19 speak to the item, either the Chair or someone nominated to be the spokesperson
20 for the Planning Commission. Commissioners may also speak as a private citizen
21 on the matter.

22
23 Ms. Gonzalez recommended the appointment of a spokesperson from the Planning
24 Commission be agendized at a future Planning Commission meeting.

25
26 Chair Sandoval offered a motion, approved by general consensus, to add the appointment
27 of a spokesperson from the Planning Commission to attend a future City Council meeting on
28 behalf of the Planning Commission to speak to the Planning Commission recommendations
29 for the Appian 80 Shopping Center on the January 26, 2026 meeting agenda.

- 30
- 31 • Staff also continued to prepare a report to the State Department of Housing and
32 Community Development (HCD) regarding updates to the City's Housing Element
33 over the past couple of years, to be considered by the City Council in March 2026.
 - 34
 - 35 • The City's gas station moratorium would be considered by the Planning Commission
36 on January 26, 2026 and the City Council at its second meeting of February 2026.
 - 37
 - 38 • A Parcel Map for the United States Post Office was being finalized.
 - 39
 - 40 • Staff continued to work with the Pinole Vista and Appian 80 property owners as to
41 the status of the properties with no additional updates at this time.
 - 42
 - 43 • Staff hoped to present the Parklet and Outdoor Dining Regulations and Objective
44 Development Design Standards (ODDS) to the Planning Commission in February.
 - 45
 - 46 • The Uptown Yard yearly use permit review and the applicant's request for
47 recommended changes to the operating schedule was scheduled to be reviewed by
48 the Planning Commission on January 26, 2026.
- 49

- The Planning Commission Academy would be held March 11 through 13, 2026 in Anaheim, with Chair Sandoval and Commissioners Huey and Uch to attend along with staff (Hanham and Shiu). Another Commissioner may attend but must let staff know immediately.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Anthony Vossbrink, asked about the status of the following: the Faria House property, property across from the Pinole Valley High School (PVHS) corner where the former Union 76 Gas Station was located, a fencing proposal in front of St. Joseph Church and the Pinole Police Department, open property across the street from the United States Post Office and the Tara Hills//Safeway Shopping Center. He asked whether the City had a grid chart showing the status of pending grants the City had applied for in the past year or 18 months, including the value of the grant and whether the City had been successful in obtaining the grant. He understood the City obtained a grant for the San Pablo Avenue Bridge and asked whether those same grant funds or another grant could be considered to repair the bridge next to Fire Station 74 at the sharp turnout along Pinole Valley Road. He noted two sawhorses had been placed in the area, the batteries in the sawhorses had gone out, and at night the area was dark along the corner with only concrete barriers to protect the area.

Mr. Vossbrink also asked for an update from the Contra Costa Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FCWCD) as it related to the area behind Sprouts where there was a landslide breach, which has become worse on the northeast side of the creek between the Sprouts parking lot and the retail property stores. There were also breaches farther down by the school across the street which had been impacted by the latest rain storms and tarps that had been placed in the area had been blown off. He understood this area was to be evaluated by the FCWCD and while some trimming of vegetation and trees had been done, nothing had been done to address the breaches.

Mr. Hanham reported City-owned properties for sale continued to be for sale and while he understood the City Council had considered some offers in executive session, he had no further information. In terms of the issues with the FCWCD, he would have to reach out to the Public Works Department about what was being done since the area referenced was the purview of the FCWCD. In terms of the status of grants, there may be some information internally, but he was uncertain that information was available for external purposes. He would ask if that was something staff could present to the City Council.

In response to the inquiry about property located at 2995 Pinole Valley Road, Mr. Hanham stated that was privately-owned property that was for sale and no applications had been filed for the property. As to the status of the Pinole Vista and Appian 80 properties, staff continued to work with the property owners in the hopes of getting the properties developed or redeveloped. Staff was also working with Pinole Vista on a demolition permit to demolish the Kmart building since there were code enforcement issues with the building and there was a desire to remove the building quickly. Entitlements for the property were good through October 2026. He added the issues with City parks and bridges were under the purview of the Public Works Department and he would have to check with the Department on the status of the inquiries.

1 Commissioner Martinez commented on the receipt of maintenance and operations questions
2 and asked if the Planning Commission was the body to address those issues, or whether the
3 issues should be directed to the City Council to be tracked and resolved, particularly given
4 many issues had been reported for years and had not been addressed.
5

6 Mr. Hanham suggested the Planning Commission was used to raise the concerns since the
7 Planning Commission was a body of the City and the Planning Commission made
8 recommendations to the City Council. He acknowledged there were items that should go to
9 the City Council since the Planning Commission had no jurisdiction over those issues and
10 only had purview over land use or some entitlement that the Planning Commission had the
11 ability to govern or make a decision. Concerns which had been raised in the past had been
12 funneled to the Public Works Director and Public Works Foreman as a courtesy, and the
13 Planning Commission and planning staff had no control or authority over the status of the
14 work.
15

16 Ms. Gonzalez recommended when public comments were made outside of the jurisdiction
17 of this body, at that time the member of the public could be directed to the appropriate staff
18 member. It was a courtesy for staff to relay those messages to the appropriate department
19 but this was a good item to refer the member of the public to the appropriate body.
20

21 Commissioner Martinez commented some of the concerns were serious and should be
22 brought to the next level. He was concerned some of the issues had gone on for years, with
23 nothing done and it should be brought to the leadership's attention since otherwise it looked
24 like the City was not doing something, which was not good for governance.
25

26 Mr. Hanham advised he could provide the speaker with the number for Public Works and
27 reiterated that anything related to operations and maintenance issues were all Public Works
28 issues where the Planning Commission had no jurisdiction. The concerns would be relayed
29 to the appropriate staff person in the Public Works Department. As to the concerns with the
30 FCWCD, that was a county and not a City issue. He understood after speaking with the
31 Public Works Department, during City Council meetings, members of the public had been
32 asked to call certain phone numbers where a work order process could be started with the
33 Public Works Department. He would continue to inform the Public Works Department of the
34 concerns and added the comments would be included in the meeting minutes.
35

36 Chair Sandoval thanked staff for forwarding the comments to the appropriate people.
37

38 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED
39

40 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**

41

42 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported the Senior Food Distribution would be held on January 13,
43 2026 from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m. at the Pinole Senior Center for low-income eligible persons
44 over 55 years of age and a Pinole resident; a Special City Council meeting was scheduled
45 for January 13, 2026; a Finance Subcommittee meeting was scheduled for January 14, 2026
46 at 3:00 p.m., and a West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) Listening Session
47 was scheduled for January 14, 2026 from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. at Pinole Middle School.
48

49 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED
50

1 Anthony Vossbrink, appreciated the time Commissioner Martinez and others took to address
2 some of the past/old issues he had raised and noted the majority of the issues had been
3 reported before by residents calling in and were documented with a case number. However,
4 oftentimes there was no call back from anyone at City Hall or from Public Works to provide a
5 status update, requiring the public to call back, which was unfair to the community. Those
6 concerns had been raised with the past two City Managers and people needed to be held
7 accountable for what they should be doing.
8

9 Mr. Vossbrink commented in some instances the issues raised to the level of lawsuits. He
10 emphasized he also reported Caltrans issues in the past, which he detailed at this time and
11 suggested it was time for the City to do what was right for the taxpayers and have a follow-
12 up protocol with City staff to be held accountable rather than the City hiring, firing, staff getting
13 raises and changing job titles to keep someone in the same position rather than addressing
14 the City's basic infrastructure problems. He further commented that often he had seen Public
15 Works members doing one job at one place or another, hanging out at the dog park or at Fire
16 Station 74 or the soccer and baseball fields in the afternoon. He reiterated that Caltrans
17 needed to be held accountable for required repairs on Caltrans property, including pothole
18 repair and the replacement of non-operable lights. He hoped to hear back from someone
19 and did not want to put it all on the Interim City Manager.
20

21 Chair Sandoval recommended the speaker reach out to the City Council. As to the Caltrans
22 issues, he made a note, and explained that speakers could reach out to their state
23 representatives since Caltrans was a state agency. He noted Caltrans had an online system
24 where customers may submit a service request by providing basic information about the
25 location of the issue, and while Caltrans may take some time to respond given the number
26 of service requests in the district, they were doing their best.
27

28 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED 29

30 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested Caltrans' lack of response for the ramp leading from
31 Pinole Valley Road onto I-80 eastbound was due to the fact it was getting close to
32 implementing a land expansion project, although Chair Sandoval was uncertain but was
33 aware that anything on Pinole Valley Road was under the City's jurisdiction.
34

35 Mr. Hanham clarified Caltrans had an easement over the bridges, and underneath the
36 freeway sometimes Caltrans had maintenance agreements with cities to work on sidewalks
37 and streets on that level. In terms of the on- and off-ramps in Pinole, it could be a matter of
38 scheduling since some projects in the region were currently underway, and it may be possible
39 Caltrans was getting closer to addressing the issues raised.
40

41 **L. NEXT MEETING** 42

43 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on January 26, 2026 at 7:00 p.m.
44

45 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 9:27 p.m.** 46

47 Transcribed by:
48

49 Sherri D. Lewis
50 Transcriber