

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

5
6 **February 23, 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, Lam-Julian, Uch, Vice-Chairperson Menis and
27 Chairperson Sandoval
28

29 Commissioners Excused: Martinez
30

31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
32 Justin Shiu, Associate Planner
33

34 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on his ex-parte communications to his email list about the
35 topic on the meeting agenda.
36

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

39 There were no comments from the public.
40

41 **F. MEETING MINUTES**
42

43 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for February 9, 2026
44

45 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported the motion shown on Page 9 of 96 of the agenda packet,
46 Lines 22 through 27, and which had shown him as both the maker and second of the motion,
47 needed to be clarified by staff and corrected for accuracy.
48

49 Planning Manager David Hanham advised the meeting minutes could be approved, with staff
50 to make the correction as requested.

MOTION with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for February 9, 2026, subject to the staff modification to Page 9 of 96 of the agenda packet, as noted by Vice-Chairperson Menis.

MOTION: Menis

SECONDED: Sandoval

APPROVED: 5-0-2

ABSTAIN: Lam-Julian

ABSENT: Martinez

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Uptown Yard (CUP19-09 & DR19-14) Use Permit Review and Modification

Planning Manager David Hanham presented the staff report dated February 23, 2026 and provided a PowerPoint presentation for Uptown Yard (CUP19-09 & DR19-14) Use Permit Review and Modification.

Mr. Hanham explained in response to a request from the applicant that staff had proposed modification to a number of the existing conditions in Exhibit A: Planning Commission Resolution 26-03, Conditions of Approval, as follows:

Condition 5: Non-Food Vendors Hours
Monday through Sunday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Food Vendors:

Food Vendor Booths – Monday through Sunday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Food Truck Vendors – Only during events and Saturday Market, and no more than two (2) trucks, food trucks, must have permission from Farmer's Market Management to operate during the market. The trucks must be only in adjacent parking lots, not on City right-of-way (ROW) or Community Corner, unless approved by the City seven (7) business days before the event.

Condition 6: *There shall be no more than seven food and non-food truck vendors on site. All vendors shall have Contra Costa County acceptable booths.*

Condition 8: *The owner shall submit any proposed modifications to the site design or use. The Community Development Director, or their designee, shall determine whether the project should be brought back to the Planning Commission for future consideration.*

Condition 15: *The Site may have live music no more than 36 days a year, with no more than three (3) days per month. There shall be no live music during City Sponsored Events located at Community Corner (e.g. Christmas Tree Lighting, Earth Day, Juneteenth, etc.) unless Uptown Yard is part of the City-sponsored event. If these conditions are violated, it could cause the revocation of the use permit.*

Acoustic Music Schedule

Wednesday-Thursday – 1:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Friday-Sunday – 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Amplified Music Schedule

Friday-Sunday 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

1 **Condition 16:** *There shall be no amplified music during City-sponsored Community*
2 *Corner events. All amplified music events that are scheduled outside of City-sponsored*
3 *events on Community Corner must be reviewed and approved by the Community*
4 *Development Director or their designee seven (7) business days before the event. If the*
5 *amplified music event is not approved, it will lead to the revocation of the Conditional Use*
6 *Permit.*

7
8 **Condition 20:** *The owner, vendors, artists, or other parties setting up booths, furniture,*
9 *and other items shall only be on the Uptown Yard site. There shall be no booths, furniture,*
10 *or other items on parcels adjacent to the Uptown Yard property unless approved by the*
11 *City seven (7) business days in advance of an event. Site access shall be accessed from*
12 *the adjacent parking lot. There shall be no storage of materials (merchandise, vehicles,*
13 *etc.) on any adjacent lots. All access materials for events shall be stored off-site.*

14
15 Mr. Hanham recommended the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 26-03, with
16 Exhibit A: Conditions of Approval, approving the yearly review for Uptown Yard and finding
17 the use complied with the Conditions of Approval, subject to the staff recommended
18 modifications.

19
20 Mr. Hanham added Condition 43, which read: *ONE YEAR REVIEW – These conditions*
21 *of approval shall be brought back for review before the Planning Commission in one year*
22 *to review the adequacy of the Conditional Use Permit and possible modification,* had not
23 been modified by staff, although the Planning Commission may extend the review period,
24 if desired. If not, the CUP would be brought back to the Planning Commission for a one-
25 year review in 2027. The applicant may also request a review of the CUP at their own
26 cost.

27
28 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Mr. Hanham clarified the
29 following:

- 30
31
 - The PowerPoint presentation with the staff recommended modifications to
32 conditions had not been included in the agenda packet; however, the original
33 conditions had been included. The staff recommended modifications were
34 provided to the Planning Commission for consideration. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
 - Conditions 23 and 25, as outlined on Page 17 of 96 of the agenda packet, were
36 administrative conditions and required as part of the CUP. Staff had not
37 recommended any proposed language modifications at this time. (Vice-
38 Chairperson Menis)
 - The intent of Condition 6 was clarified. The reference to non-food truck vendors,
41 meant “food that was not in trucks” with Kitchen@812 (a commercial and food
42 business incubator) used as an example. Acknowledged a recommendation to
43 further revise the condition to read: *There shall be no more than seven food*
44 *vendors on-site. All vendors shall have Contra Costa County acceptable booths.*

45
46
47
48
49

- 1 • Condition 16 was clarified. Staff acknowledged a recommendation to revise the
2 condition to read: *There shall be no amplified music during City-sponsored*
3 *Community Corner events. All amplified music events that are scheduled outside*
4 *of City-sponsored events on Community Corner must be reviewed and approved*
5 *by the Community Development Director or their designee seven (7) business*
6 *days before the event. If there is an unapproved amplified music event, it will lead*
7 *to the revocation of the Conditional Use Permit.* (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
8
- 9 • Condition 15 was clarified and one of the reasons for the revision was to allow
10 patrons to enjoy music during the Farmer's Market. The applicant had requested
11 an expansion of the music time period, with special events during the week, and
12 with the revised time allowing the applicant to expand that offering more than had
13 been allowed in the past. Staff reported there had been no reported issues with
14 the playing of acoustical music at the site. Again, clarified that if the City had
15 sponsored events, the music would not be allowed at that time and the revision
16 allowed the applicant to expand on that offering outside of City-sponsored events.
17 (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
18
- 19 • Condition 18 had not been revised by staff and currently read: *LIGHTING – The*
20 *owner shall ensure that lighting is available on site during late-afternoon to evening*
21 *hours and the entire lot has adequate lighting. Lighting equipment shall include*
22 *shields to project light downward and to prevent light and glare impacts on adjacent*
23 *properties and the right-of-way. The proposed lighting set-up locations, including*
24 *portable lighting equipment, shall be identified in the final plan set for review by the*
25 *Police Department.* The use of the term "adequate lighting" was intended to be
26 subjective to ensure there was some lighting provided for an event, especially at
27 night and which allowed the applicant some flexibility on the type of lighting to be
28 used. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
29
- 30 • Condition 5, as modified by staff, offered flexibility in the schedule and ensured the
31 times were identified. Staff clarified the City did not have an ordinance regulating
32 food trucks and staff wanted to clarify how food trucks were used in the area. The
33 lead times had been proposed by the applicant and staff had looked at some of
34 the events, with most of the events in the afternoon. The expanded hours would
35 allow for setups and takedowns after an event. Staff met with the Community
36 Development and Community Services Directors to discuss the lead times, and it
37 was determined the lead time of seven (7) business days before the event provided
38 adequate time for the applicant to obtain City approval. (Chairperson Sandoval)
39
- 40 • Food trucks were only allowed in coordination with special events such as the
41 Farmer's Market, Little League events or a birthday party, as examples. Staff
42 reiterated the City did not have an ordinance allowing food trucks on private
43 property; however, there were new laws about mobile food vendors, and if a food
44 truck was associated with a restaurant the City could not stop that use. To date,
45 the City had been unsuccessful modifying the current ordinance related to the use
46 of food trucks. Staff was aware this was an issue not only for Uptown Yard, but
47 with other food truck vendors desirous to park in the downtown for lunch. Staff
48 was aware of the need for tighter regulations. (Chairperson Sandoval)
49

- The intent of Condition 6, as modified by staff was again clarified. Staff reported the applicant proposed, as part of the new site plan, no more than seven food vendors, which was a good number. Staff had increased the original number from no more than four (4) to no more than seven (7) food vendors allowed on-site since the applicant was adding more spaces for retail uses. (Chairperson Sandoval)

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Raquel Contreras, Uptown Yard, 2337 San Pablo Avenue, Pinole, thanked the Planning Commission for considering the project. She explained that Uptown Yard was a grassroots effort which started slow, with one to two vendors and volunteers. Uptown Yard had grown a bit more and had several retail vendors that were Mom and Pops who wanted to increase their income and had developed a following in Pinole. The proposed changes would allow more time to prepare for events. She reiterated the business was building momentum and the changes would allow for more flexibility as the business grew and was allowed to expand organically.

Ms. Contreras commented that a brick-and-mortar store was envisioned for the future with a mixed use and she hoped to achieve that in a few years. She also described the difficulties to find food vendors who wanted to setup in the yard given that the pandemic changed how mobile vendors operated. The mobile vendors were not positioned in one place, and they typically looked for bigger cities to ensure a bigger turnout, and given the fees for food vendors with the County were pricier and there was more work to setup. The reason the food vendors wanted to be mobile was to save time, energy and money for permits. With those challenges, she had little success with the food vendors. She implored the Planning Commission to consider that to allow them to gather more food vendors. She added the mobile vendors were a part of promoting and bringing in their own clients to the City.

Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 96 of 96 of the agenda packet, and the diagram provided for the Uptown Yard Saturday Market Vendor Set Up and Marketplace/Workshops. He asked if the workshops would involve the manufacture of industrial goods on-site or artisan workshops.

Ms. Contreras described the workshops as planting or an art workshop, such as art on campus, small Mother's Day potting workshops for children and a bead workshop for children to make bracelets, as examples.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Uch referenced Page 91 of 96 of the agenda packet, Condition 23, and noted the information shown under WestCAT for public transportation was incorrect, and currently read: *Hercules Transit Center is 1.7 miles from 2337 San Pablo and accessible by train and a 4 min walk. Estimate time of arrival is 14 min.* He was unaware of a time line where the area was accessible by BART and noted the area was more accessible by bus. The Hercules Transit Center was mostly a bus center serviced by WestCAT, with more transit routes to Uptown Yard by WestCAT buses. He stated at least four of the bus routes would be active on Thursdays and Fridays when the JL, JR and JPX WestCAT lines ran through Uptown Yard and San Pablo Avenue, which was important information for transit users.

1 On the weekends, there was a different schedule, and Commissioner Uch asked that the
2 information be updated and accurate for transit users in the Bay Area. He added one
3 could reach Uptown Yard from BART by taking WestCat routes and that should be
4 clarified.

5
6 Commissioner Uch also recommended on the same page with respect to the information
7 in the category for Bicycle that it should be clarified there was an alternate path. He would
8 recommend anyone who wanted to bike to the site not take the route identified since most
9 traffic on San Pablo Avenue traveled at a high rate of speed. Alternatively, there was a
10 better route for bicyclists by using the Bay Trail, whereby from Uptown Yard, one could
11 connect to Tennent Avenue and then to the Bay Trail with a nice trail from Fernandez
12 Park, which also connected easily to Uptown Yard and the Bay Trail.

13
14 Commissioner Huey referenced Pages 13 and 14 of 96 of the agenda packet, which had
15 listed the conditions with minor issues. The first condition shown on Page 14 had not been
16 identified and she confirmed with Mr. Hanham that condition should be identified as
17 Condition 5.

18
19 Commissioner Bender referenced the proposed site plan revisions. He was pleased the
20 applicant was considering metal pergolas as opposed to wood since during the pandemic
21 he found that the use of wood material for some of the outdoor dining areas had not aged
22 well. He otherwise had no issues with the proposal and found it to be great.

23
24 Chairperson Sandoval referenced Condition 6, as modified by staff, and suggested the
25 condition be further modified to read: **Condition 6:** *There shall be no more than seven*
26 *food vendors on site. All vendors shall have Contra Costa County acceptable booths.*

27
28 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Condition 5, as modified by staff, and commented the
29 existing condition had included an asterisk that indicated the hours may change due to
30 Daylight Savings. That statement had not been included as part of the staff recommended
31 revision and he asked if that would change anything.

32
33 Mr. Hanham explained the new condition with the time period, as identified, would be the
34 time period whether Daylight Savings or Pacific Standard Time (PST) from 9:00 a.m. to
35 9:00 p.m., and the asterisk as part of the original condition was no longer needed.

36
37 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested to staff that given the volume of documents and raw
38 paper, it would have been helpful to have some staples. He also referenced Condition
39 16, as revised by staff, and recommended further revision to the condition to read:
40 **Condition 16:** *There shall be no amplified music during City-sponsored Community*
41 *Corner events. All amplified music events that are scheduled outside of City-sponsored*
42 *events on Community Corner must be reviewed and approved by the Community*
43 *Development Director or their designee seven (7) business days before the event. If an*
44 *unapproved amplified music event occurs, it will lead to the revocation of the Conditional*
45 *Use Permit.*

46
47 The revision was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

48
49 Vice-Chairperson Menis thanked Commissioner Uch for highlighting the public transit
50 points on Exhibit A.

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested it would be worthwhile to have the public transit
2 information updated. As to Condition 23 on Page 34 of 96 of the agenda packet, he asked
3 if the condition should be modified with respect to Commissioner Uch's recommendation.
4

5 Mr. Hanham noted Condition 23 currently read: *PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION*
6 *INFORMATION – The owner shall provide clearly visible information and maps inside the*
7 *site regarding the location of Old Town parking lots and public transportation stops. The*
8 *owner should also incorporate parking and transit information in marketing materials and*
9 *project-related webpages where possible*, and it would be on the property owner to provide
10 the information, with the applicant present and understanding the need for accurate
11 information.
12

13 Ms. Contreras wanted her patrons to reach their destination and not get lost.
14

15 Chairperson Sandoval would be wary changing the condition since the applicant
16 understood the information just needed to be updated.
17

18 Commissioner Bender stated he was opposed to government overreach.
19

20 Commissioner Uch suggested the information to be provided could easily be changed.
21 The public transit information was publicly accessible with updated information.
22

23 Vice-Chairperson Menis commented the initial overreach was the condition itself, as
24 written, and he sought something concrete. If the information was being required by the
25 City, it should be accurate. He did not see how accuracy was an overreach as opposed
26 to the existing condition itself.
27

28 Mr. Hanham described the origin of the initial condition and the need to include the
29 downtown parking lots and downtown transit stops. The Planning Commission at that time
30 wanted to ensure the condition, as written, was followed and allowed patrons to know
31 where the parking lots and transit stops were located. How they get there was on the
32 patron. The condition was saying the owner needed to provide information on the Old
33 Town parking lot and transit stops within the area and incorporate parking and transit
34 information in marketing materials and project-related webpages, where possible.
35

36 Vice-Chairperson Menis understood the focus on parking lots and transit stops needed
37 less modification than the routes, but stops could change and he asked if the applicant's
38 obligation was as it existed now.
39

40 Mr. Hanham reiterated his interpretation of Condition 23, as it had been written, with the
41 owner to update the downtown parking lots and downtown transit stop information as
42 necessary. Whether or not the parking and transit information in marketing materials was
43 incorporated was up to the owner, and whether or not the information was accurate was
44 up to the owner. The condition could be amended to reflect that information be updated
45 periodically. It would be up to the majority of the Planning Commission whether to update
46 the condition.
47
48

1 Commissioner Huey suggested the applicant not be micro-managed as it related to
2 Condition 23. She acknowledged the Vice-Chair's concern but that could be addressed
3 as part of Condition 43 and as part of the one-year review.
4

5 Vice-Chairperson Menis reiterated his concern with Condition 23. As to Condition 43,
6 assuming it was retained and while it provided the structure for periodic review, the
7 wording in the condition did not create a process for the review.
8

9 Vice-Chairperson Menis offered a motion to amend Condition 23 to read: *PARKING AND*
10 *TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION – The owner shall provide clearly visible current*
11 *information and maps inside the site regarding the location of Old Town parking lots and*
12 *public transportation stops. The owner should also incorporate parking and transit*
13 *information in marketing materials and project-related webpages where possible.*
14

15 On the motion, Chairperson Sandoval recommended Condition 23 be amended to read:
16 *PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION – The owner shall provide clearly*
17 *visible information and maps inside the site regarding the location of Old Town parking*
18 *lots and public transportation stops. The owner should also incorporate parking and transit*
19 *information in marketing materials and project-related webpages where possible.*
20 *Information should be checked regularly by the applicant for accuracy.*
21

22 Vice-Chairperson Menis accepted the phrasing but asked if that could be managed for the
23 applicant.
24

25 Ms. Contreras preferred to have something vague. She wanted everyone to come to the
26 business but holding it over her head to be accurate on the transit stops when she did not
27 take public transportation was a concern. People who used public transportation knew
28 the routes more than she did. She could provide a map and recommend taking public
29 transportation and using the Bay Trail, but to continuously require a check of the
30 information was overreach.
31

32 Mr. Hanham clarified all that was required was identification of the parking lots and transit
33 stops, not the routes, and basically it would require one map for WestCAT showing its
34 transit stops/routes, and if placed in the establishment would cover the condition.
35

36 Vice-Chairperson Menis suggested the condition could be further modified to require the
37 owner to display the latest WestCAT map.
38

39 Chairperson Sandoval asked what would happen if WestCAT was eliminated.
40

41 Mr. Hanham suggested leaving the condition vague with respect to public transportation,
42 with a map of the downtown parking lots and a map of WestCAT, as long as it was posted
43 somewhere on-site and which could be checked periodically to verify the accuracy of the
44 transit stops. It was up to the Planning Commission whether or not to revise Condition
45 23.
46

47 Vice-Chairperson Menis read into the record Condition 23 as currently written and Mr.
48 Hanham expressed the willingness to work with the owner on meeting the condition.
49

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis added the intent behind Condition 23 was not for those who knew
2 how transit worked, but an easy reference or wayfinding for those who did not have
3 experience with public transit.
4

5 Ms. Contreras welcomed the additional information about the Bay Trail as an alternate
6 bicycle route.
7

8 Chair Sandoval suggested that Condition 23 did not need to be modified, as long as the
9 information required to be provided was accurate, and although he had offered some
10 modified language for the Planning Commission to consider, he personally would not
11 modify Condition 23.
12

13 Vice-Chair Menis offered a motion to modify Condition 23, to read:
14

15 *PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION – The owner shall provide*
16 *clearly visible information and maps inside the site regarding the location of Old*
17 *Town parking lots and public transportation stops. It will be the responsibility of*
18 *staff to confirm the accuracy of this information on an annual basis. The owner*
19 *should also incorporate parking and transit information in marketing materials and*
20 *project-related webpages where possible.*
21

22 There was no second to the motion.
23

24 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to adopt Resolution 26-03, with Exhibit A; Conditions of
25 Approval, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Pinole, County of Contra
26 Costa, State of California, Approving the Adequacy of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP19-09),
27 and Making a Similar Use Determination, to Make Site Improvements for an Outdoor Seating
28 Space with Fencing, a Small Structure, and a Trash Enclosure Redesign and to Provide for
29 Hosting of Artisan Displays, Events, Vendors, and Food Vendors on an Approximately 4,140
30 Square Foot Vacant Lot in the CMU Zoning District at 2337 San Pablo Avenue, APN 401-
31 162-002, subject to the staff recommended revisions to Conditions 5, 6, 8, 15, 16 and 20,
32 and as further modified, as follows:
33

- 34 • Condition 6, to read:

35
36 There shall be no more than seven food vendors on site. All vendors shall have
37 Contra Costa County acceptable booths.
38

- 39 • Condition 16, to read:

40
41 There shall be no amplified music during City-sponsored Community Corner
42 events. All amplified music events that are scheduled outside of City-sponsored
43 events on Community Corner must be reviewed and approved by the Community
44 Development Director or their designee seven (7) business days before the event.
45 If an unapproved amplified music event occurs, it will lead to the revocation of the
46 Conditional Use Permit.
47

- 48 • Condition 43, to be removed.
49
50

1 **MOTION: Sandoval**

2 **SECONDED: Bender**

3 **APPROVED: 6-0-1**

4 **ABSENT: Martinez**

5 Chairperson Sandoval identified the 10-day appeal process of a decision of the Planning
6 Commission in writing to the City Clerk.

7 **H. OLD BUSINESS:** None

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

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

12
13 Mr. Hanham provided the following updates:

- 14
15 • Staff was in the process of a demolition permit for the former Kmart.
- 16
17 • The owner of Pinole Shores II was getting building plans together.
- 18
19 • Staff was working with the current developers of Appian 80 and staff would meet with
20 the Chair to go over the presentation to be made to the City Council on the Planning
21 Commission's recommended ideas for the renovation of the property.
- 22
23 • Progress was being made on the Appian Village development.
- 24
25 • Staff was working on park projects and also working to resolve title issues related to
26 the U.S. Post Office property.

27
28 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked for more information about the U.S. Post Office property, to
29 which Mr. Hanham explained while the City owned the property, staff was working to find the
30 deeds that showed the transfer of the property to the City. The City would be selling the
31 property and the Planning Commission would be asked to consider a request to ensure the
32 sale conformed to the General Plan at a future meeting.

33
34 Commissioner Bender asked whether the Community Development Department had any
35 sense whether the owners of the Appian 80 Shopping Center were trying to lease spaces.

36
37 Mr. Hanham reported that staff was meeting with the property owners on a quarterly basis.
38 He confirmed the property owners were trying to lease the properties and had informed the
39 City they would be moving forward after securing the site given code enforcement issues.
40 He also confirmed new cameras had been added in the parking lot.

41
42 Chairperson Sandoval asked if the applicant was recruiting to lease the current building.

43
44 Mr. Hanham was uncertain since the property owners had not informed staff whether they
45 planned to demolish, modify or lease the existing building as part of their recruitment efforts.
46 Depending on the tenant recruited, staff was working to get an idea of what the property
47 owners wanted to do with the property.

48
49 **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

1 Anthony Vossbrink asked about the status of the following: the two bridge crossover flooring
2 planks that were rotted out between the Senior Center and Fernandez Park and between the
3 dog park and soccer field, which issue had been raised on multiple occasions and still needed
4 to be addressed; status of the large breach on Pinole Creek between the bowling alley and
5 Sprouts where the County Flood Control District was to remediate or shore up the property;
6 and the status of the former Union 76 gas station property near Pinole Valley High School
7 (PVHS) and a former gas tank that had been buried under the property and was to be
8 remediated and/or removed from the property. He asked whether new tenants would be
9 subject to its removal or be required to comply with special code inspections.

10
11 Mr. Vossbrink also asked about the upcoming closure of the Pinole Library and whether the
12 City would receive credit for its lease agreement with the county since the Library would be
13 closed for a year; status of the reopening of the two restrooms at the corner of the Library
14 and if that was a City or county responsibility, and given public access was prevented it could
15 be a violation of City codes. In addition, he asked about the status of the outdoor tables at
16 Dave's Hot Chicken, which were also in violation of City codes.

17
18 **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**

19
20 Chairperson Sandoval apologized the speaker had not been provided any response from
21 City Departments, but he encouraged the speaker to follow up his comments with the City
22 Council.

23
24 Responding to the public comment, Mr. Hanham advised staff was working with Dave's Hot
25 Chicken about the need for an administrative use permit for the outdoor tables, and he
26 confirmed that code enforcement was involved.

27
28 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked whether the former Union 76 site required remediation.

29
30 Mr. Hanham was unaware of any remediation needed. The underground storage tanks had
31 been removed when the canopies and pumps were removed, with the site ready to be
32 developed, although a soils report would be required when the property was developed.

33
34 Vice-Chairperson Menis also asked about the restrooms on the outside corner of the Pinole
35 Library and asked if that was a Public Works Department or county question, to which Mr.
36 Hanham explained it would be the Public Works or Community Services Departments.

37
38 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**

39
40 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported upcoming community events included the Senior Food
41 Distribution at the Senior Center from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m. on February 24, 2026, with
42 application eligibility required and bring your own bag; Community Services Commission
43 meeting on February 25, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. and a protest was planned from 11:00 a.m. to
44 Noon at the intersection of Tennent and San Pablo Avenues on February 28, 2026. On the
45 same date, a celebration of the Pinole Library would be held from Noon to 2:00 p.m., before
46 the Library's planned closure on March 1, 2026.

47
48 **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

49
50 There were no comments from the public.

1 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

2
3 **L. NEXT MEETING**

4
5 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on March 9, 2026 at 7:00 p.m.

6
7 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 8:51 p.m.**

8
9 Transcribed by:

10 Sherri D. Lewis

11 Transcriber
12