

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

5
6 **October 7, 2024**

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

11
12 **A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:03 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, Sandoval, Uch, Vice-Chairperson
27 Martinez, Chairperson Menis
28

29 Commissioners Absent: None
30

31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager
32 Markisha Guillory, Finance Director
33 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner
34

35 Chairperson Menis reported he had ex parte communications having sent emails to his
36 mailing list covering the items on the meeting agenda.
37

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

40 Anthony Vossbrink, Pinole, referenced the severe and extreme heat wave over the past
41 week and a half in the region, with 100+- degree temperatures. He asked why the City of
42 Pinole had not officially recognized the Pinole Library or Senior Center as official cooling
43 stations or considered free-standing power generators for those who were compromised.
44 He stated that although a call had been made to Contra Costa County Supervisor Federal
45 Glover's office, there had been no response. Both the Pinole Library and Senior Center
46 had limited hours of operation but should have cooling station hours from the early
47 morning to at least 7:00 or 8:00 p.m., and be staffed by City employees or volunteers, and
48 he expressed the willingness to volunteer his time.
49
50

1 Mr. Vossbrink also asked for a status report on why and who had authorized the 'No
2 Parking' street signs that had been drilled into the sidewalks and bolted down on either
3 side of much of Pinole Valley Road, which work had been done absent any discussion at
4 the City Council level or input from the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety (TAPS) Committee.
5 In addition, there remained numerous street light outages along Pinole Valley Road and
6 signage that should be repaired or restored, and there had been complaints about the
7 speed of traffic up and down Pinole Valley Road and San Pablo Avenue at all hours,
8 particularly around Old Town. He asked why more citations had not been issued by the
9 Pinole Police Department and suggested the new City Manager and City Council should
10 step up prior to the election and make a commitment to the general public.

11
12 Planning Manager David Hanham was uncertain how the City established cooling centers,
13 which was something the City Council or Public Works Director would have to clarify. He
14 acknowledged the Senior Center had been used as a cooling center in the past but he
15 was unsure how it had been established or staffed. With respect to the 'No Parking' signs
16 on Pinole Valley Road, he would check with the Public Works Department.

17
18 Mr. Hanham advised the concerns with the speed of traffic along Pinole Valley Road and
19 San Pablo Avenue would be forwarded to Acting Police Chief Avery and Commander
20 Crone. In response to the concerns with street light outages, some of the street lights
21 were the responsibility of the City of Pinole while PG&E was responsible for others. He
22 understood the lights that were out did not belong to the City of Pinole, but he would check
23 with the Public Works Director to obtain an update.

24
25 **F. MEETING MINUTES**

26
27 **1.** Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for September 9, 2024

28
29 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for
30 September 9, 2024, as shown.

31
32 **MOTION: Martinez**

SECONDED: Huey

APPROVED: 7-0

33
34 **G. NEW BUSINESS**

35
36 **1. Measure I Presentation**

37
38 Finance Director Markisha Guillory provided a PowerPoint presentation on the City of
39 Pinole's Municipal Election and Measure I, and provided an overview of the City's fiscal
40 challenges and annual deficit, which had been projected to grow unless a reliable source
41 of local funding was identified; otherwise, the City would have to make severe cuts in
42 funding for City services. She walked through the priorities the community had identified
43 in the spring of 2024 as part of a community-wide survey as the City worked towards a
44 long-term strategy of maintaining fiscal stability and basic services, with Measure I having
45 been unanimously voted on by the City Council to be placed on the November 2024 ballot.

46
47 Finance Director Guillory explained that if authorized by voters, Measure I would establish
48 a voter-approved one-half cent Pinole sales tax designed to improve the City's fiscal
49 sustainability, with all funds generated to be spent on maintaining City services such as
50 911 public safety responses and maintaining local streets and roads.

1 Finance Director Guillory also highlighted the ballot question, local control and
2 accountability and the other items on the November ballot including the election of City
3 Treasurer and two at-large City Council representatives.
4

5 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Finance Director Guillory
6 clarified:
7

- 8 • Information had been provided to the Planning Commission, staff and elected
9 officials on what was or was not allowed related to the upcoming Municipal
10 Election. (Chairperson Menis)
11
- 12 • The allocation of Measure I funds would be decided by the City Council through
13 the budget development process. (Sandoval)
14
- 15 • This would be the last time the City may increase the sales tax percentage,
16 otherwise the City would have to go through a state approval process to be able
17 to present another similar sales tax increase in the future. (Lam-Julian)
18
- 19 • Acknowledged a recommendation for an Action Plan for “caking” streets in Old
20 Town and other roads in need of repair or other needed enhancements in the
21 community to better educate the public on the need for the approval of Measure I.
22 (Vice-Chairperson Martinez)
23
- 24 • Measure I funds would be allocated as described in the measure description.
25 Measure I funds would be general taxes and the City Council would have the power
26 to allocate the funds in any way it wished. (Chairperson Menis)
27
- 28 • This presentation would also be provided at a community workshop scheduled for
29 October 8, 2024 at the Senior Center. (Chairperson Menis)
30
- 31 • City staff may provide information on Measure I (such as the financial information,
32 how much the measure may generate and the accountability to voters and the
33 public on how the funds may be spent) but could not advocate for the measure.
34 (Chairperson Menis)
35

36 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

37
38 There were no comments from the public.
39

40 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

41
42 Commissioner Sandoval recognized the City would not be able to increase the sales tax
43 rate after this round due to state law other than meeting the state criteria when considering
44 a possible increase in the future.
45

46 Vice Chairperson Martinez thanked Finance Director Guillory for her leadership, her
47 steadfast hand and ability to work with numbers and he recognized the improvement in
48 transparency in the numbers. He thanked Director Guillory for doing a phenomenal job
49 for the City.

Chairperson Menis also thanked Finance Director Guillory for her leadership, working to make budgets clearer, break down information and typographical work to ensure everything was easy to read and accessible.

Chairperson Menis added that speaking as a private citizen, he approved of Measure I and he found it necessary for the City to be able to have those funds. He otherwise asked whether the City had crime rate data for the City of Pinole and how it compared to surrounding jurisdictions.

Finance Director Guillory advised that information could be provided by the Pinole Police Department.

Chairperson Menis suggested that information would be helpful to have and should be added to the Measure I presentation to make the comparison more concrete.

Finance Director Guillory thanked the Planning Commission for the feedback.

H. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Conditional Use Permit UP-24-01: Radiology Office at 825 San Pablo Avenue

Senior Planner Justin Shiu provided a PowerPoint presentation for a Radiology Office at 825 San Pablo Avenue (UP-24-01). He clarified there had been an error in the October 7, 2024 staff report, with respect to the Zoning Code Consistency, as shown on Page 31 which currently stated: *The Zoning Code (Title 17 of the Pinole Municipal Code) provides standards applicable to the project. Parking standards are established in Chapter 17.48 of the Zoning Code. The proposed use (medical office) and the prior use (professional office) fall under the same minimum parking requirement of one space per 250 square feet. Based on the building size, the minimum required parking is 13 spaces. The existing parking on site meets this standard and should be corrected to read 17 spaces and he clarified a total of 18 parking spaces would be provided on-site.*

Mr. Shiu asked the Planning Commission to adopt Resolution 24-06 approving UP-24-01, a Conditional Use Permit application allowing for the establishment of the medical office at 825 San Pablo Avenue, subject to the conditions of approval as contained in Exhibit A to the staff report dated October 7, 2024.

Responding to questions from the Planning Commission Messieurs Shiu and Hanham clarified:

- Based on the size of the building and the type of use a minimum of two bicycle parking spaces would be required but the applicant may provide more if desired. (Sandoval)
- Additional community engagement was not required by the applicant, particularly if the applicant met all City requirements, but if the Planning Commission determined there was an issue in the area such as concerns with parking or traffic, the property owner or contractor may be asked to provide notice to neighbors of the start of construction and that could be imposed as a condition of approval.

1 Most of the construction would occur in the interior of the building other than some
2 curb cuts and repair to the driveway and some resurfacing of the exterior of the
3 building. (Lam-Julian)
4

- 5 • As shown on the plans, a restroom located behind the reception area would include
6 a sink but the architect should provide clarification. (Uch)
7
- 8 • Staff was unaware whether the business was a certified Green Business, which
9 should be clarified by the applicant. Staff was also unaware whether the
10 Community Development Department shared information on the California Green
11 Network Business Certification process to applicants, but if the Planning
12 Commission wanted to share such information with staff that could be shared with
13 future applicants. (Huey)
14
- 15 • The building had been formerly occupied by an architectural firm. The center of
16 the building included a large square area that was flat against the wall and with a
17 small indentation. Acknowledged concerns with the proposed use for a medical
18 office and a request for a condition that area be covered to the sidewalk given
19 there would be individuals waiting for WestCAT, car sharing services or family
20 members, with a request for a waiting area with benches in that area. Also
21 acknowledged a request for additional conditions for a new exterior paint job, tree
22 trimming, new landscaping and at the front area of the building the first two parking
23 stalls in front of the door be designated as loading area parking spaces only. (Vice-
24 Chairperson Martinez)
25
- 26 • Acknowledged a request to impose a condition of approval for a shared parking
27 agreement between SAHA and the applicant, although staff clarified the project
28 was already close to the parking minimums and was actually one space over the
29 required number of parking spaces. Staff also clarified the curb cuts would provide
30 an additional parking space on the street. Staff was uncertain whether a shared
31 parking agreement with SAHA could be conditioned for the project but the
32 applicant could be encouraged to consider such an option between the private
33 property owners. (Vice-Chairperson Martinez)
34
- 35 • Exhibit A: Planning Commission Resolution 24-06 Conditions of Approval,
36 Condition 4, Site Maintenance, acknowledged requiring a proper replacement plan
37 for material/equipment related to the use as that material/equipment reached its
38 end of life could be considered as a condition of approval, but staff recommended
39 the property owner provide clarification. (Chairperson Menis)
40
- 41 • Condition 10, Construction Activity, this was a standard condition and would apply
42 to the proposed use since the applicant had proposed some work on the sidewalk,
43 which may include some grading and possible grading at the driveway entry.
44 (Chairperson Menis)
45
- 46 • Acknowledged a segment of Pinole Shores I located across the street from the
47 subject site had some constraints due to lead contamination but staff was unaware
48 of similar constraints for the subject site. (Chairperson Menis)
49

1 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
2

3 Joel Choe, Property Owner, 825 San Pablo Avenue, Pinole, explained that the Radiology
4 Office would be an out-patient diagnostic facility center that would provide MRIs, CT
5 scans, X-rays and ultrasounds, with the only radiation from the X-ray and CT Scan units.
6 All equipment would be governed by the California Department of Health, which conducted
7 routine biannual audits and inspections of the machines. The manufacturer of the
8 equipment would provide maintenance every month, particularly for the CT Scan and MRI
9 units. He explained that he currently operated a similar facility in the Hilltop Center in the
10 City of Richmond.
11

12 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
13

14 Commissioner Lam-Jullian asked of the estimated timeline for construction, and Mr. Choe
15 commented the time period for construction would depend on the time to obtain permits
16 and identify the right construction team to take on the project. He had projects that had
17 lasted anywhere from six months to a year depending on the efficiency of the contractor.
18

19 Hayoung Lee, Project Architect, Innovative Space, Architecture Planning Site
20 Development, 627 Hanover Street, Livermore, explained the power capacity into the
21 building must be increased and depending on the process with PG&E may also impact
22 the construction timeline.
23

24 Vice-Chairperson Martinez asked whether the applicant would consider a covering at the
25 front of the building as he had requested. Having used the Richmond Hilltop location, he
26 oftentimes had to wait outside for a ride share service and that area was uncovered given
27 the logistics of the building. Because of that experience, he suggested the applicant could
28 do better with the Pinole location, which was the reason he requested the modifications
29 he had outlined. He hoped the property owner and architect would be willing to consider
30 the request.
31

32 Mr. Choe stated they would try to provide the most convenient access to and from the
33 building for patients who used ride share services or taxis.
34

35 Chairperson Menis asked whether the waiting area had sufficient seating for those waiting
36 for an appointment but also adequate seating to allow people to wait after an appointment
37 was complete.
38

39 Mr. Choe described the planned design as a step-by-step process. He planned to have
40 two MRI units at a future date but currently he had a lease with the existing Richmond
41 facility he hoped to renegotiate at the time the lease was due to expire to keep that
42 location. If not, he would close that facility and move the MRI unit at that location into the
43 Pinole location. Depending on the length of construction, he planned to have one MRI
44 and one X-ray unit at the Pinole location.
45

46 Mr. Choe explained that there would be little foot traffic other than for the X-ray unit, and
47 based on activity at the Richmond facility, there could be one to two patients within a 30-
48 minute period. That facility had open walk-in hours from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 pm., with all
49 other modalities on an appointment-only basis.

1 Mr. Choe explained that MRIs took anywhere from 30 to 40 minutes to complete and ride-
2 sharing typically was timed with the front desk staff to pick-up patients at the time the
3 appointment was complete. Patients getting an X-ray usually drove themselves, came in
4 for the appointment and then left. It was difficult to determine how much waiting time
5 would be required for someone to wait in the waiting room since typically that did not
6 happen.

7
8 Vice Chairperson Martinez noted the configuration of the Richmond facility was larger than
9 the Pinole facility, and again given his personal experience having to wait to be picked-up
10 from the Richmond facility, he found the seats in the waiting area typically were occupied
11 and he had to wait in the atrium for an appointment. In that area, the seating was tight
12 and sometimes there were longer wait times. He again requested a covered seating area
13 with benches for the Pinole facility.

14
15 Mr. Choe stated he would have to defer to his architect to determine whether it would be
16 possible to design something.

17
18 Mr. Lee highlighted the dimensions of the building and commented that the awning could
19 be extended at the entrance, but the walkway was not wide enough given the original
20 building design. Providing a covered seating area would be better on the left side of the
21 building near the trash enclosure and a small landscaping area. The middle area of the
22 building would be a challenge and the only available area was the left side where an
23 awning could be provided. The parking layout did not provide options for open space.

24
25 Vice-Chairperson Martinez discussed with Mr. Lee the possible addition of an awning at
26 the front with seats added in that area even if only one or two seats on each side to allow
27 additional seating at the exterior of the building.

28
29 Mr. Lee expressed the willingness to work with the City Planner to ensure the area did not
30 stand out too much as part of the design.

31
32 Chairperson Menis referenced Sheet AS2.1, the Proposed Floor Plan, and clarified with
33 Messiers Lee and Choe the walls around the various medical equipment met all state
34 standards for shielding of the equipment per the manufacturers' specifications. With
35 respect to Sheet AS2.0, Demolition Floor Plans, he clarified which wall would be removed
36 to accommodate the MRI equipment and that there would be no structural implications by
37 removing that wall. He also clarified there would be one MRI suite occupied with the other
38 space to be shielded for preparation at a later date, and in the interim would be used as
39 necessary storage if required. For Sheet AS 3.1, Building Elevations, an entire door on
40 the west elevation would be removed that had been part of the previous office use since
41 it would be part of an X-ray room and the door would not be used.

42
43 Chairperson Menis asked whether a refresh of the exterior design would fall under the
44 scope of the project.

45
46 Mr. Choe advised there was graffiti on the back side of the building necessitating the
47 repainting of the entire exterior of the building.

1 Vice-Chairperson Martinez suggested a new color refresh but deferred the color scheme
2 to the property owner and project architect as to the color preference. He requested the
3 addition of trash cans outside of the building.
4

5 Chairperson Menis clarified with Mr. Choe an exterior trash can could be placed at the
6 entry point of the building. He referenced the possibility of installing a new awning and
7 seating in the front area between segments D and E of the plans, and asked whether that
8 could be imposed as a condition of approval.
9

10 Mr. Shiu advised that could be added as a condition of approval with the plans to be
11 reviewed again prior to finalization of the Building Permit, and that design component
12 could also be brought to the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittee for review and
13 consideration.
14

15 Vice-Chairperson Martinez asked that be added as a condition of approval for the reasons
16 previously stated and that element of the design be presented to the Planning Commission
17 Ad-Hoc Subcommittee for review.
18

19 Mr. Shiu suggested the Planning Commission may impose a condition for the plans to be
20 brought back to the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittee for inclusion of an
21 awning and seating as discussed prior to submittal of the Building Permit application.
22

23 The Planning Commission continued to discuss the recommendation for an additional
24 condition related to an awning and additional seating at the front of the building and also
25 discussed the dimensions of the front of the building, which may allow for one to two seats
26 to be added as an additional condition as part of the approval of the resolution.
27

28 Mr. Hanham suggested an additional Condition 14 could be added to read:
29

30 *The applicant shall provide a drawing of the awning and outdoor seating to be*
31 *reviewed by the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittee prior to issuance of*
32 *Building Permit.*
33

34 Commissioner Lam-Julian asked for an additional condition of approval to require public
35 notice given the area on Meadow Avenue and East Meadow Avenue was residential, was
36 very congested and community members had raised concerns with her about the
37 congestion in the area.
38

39 Mr. Choe referenced the large apartment complex being built on the other side of Meadow
40 Avenue and reported contractors had been parking their vehicles in his parking lot even
41 though they had been asked not to do so. He suggested residents were well aware of the
42 noise from construction in the area.
43

44 Mr. Hanham clarified the City's public hearing notice requirement for the project required
45 all residents within 300-feet of the project site to be notified of the public hearing, which
46 requirement had been met. Staff could work with the applicant to post information about
47 when construction may begin on the site but he asked whether Commissioner Lam-Julian
48 was requesting a re-notification to all residents.
49

1 Commissioner Lam-Julian requested that residents be re-notified of the project and
2 reported that residents had informed her they had not received notice of the project.

3
4 Mr. Hanham clarified if the project was approved by the Planning Commission at this
5 meeting, no additional public notice would be required and residents would not be able to
6 discuss the project further other than via an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision.
7 Residents could be notified when construction was due to start and possibly how long
8 construction may take.

9
10 Commissioner Lam-Julian reiterated community members had reached out to her stating
11 they were unaware of the project. She suggested in good faith the public notice for this
12 item should be re-noticed and residents informed when construction would occur so the
13 public would be aware.

14
15 Mr. Hanham reiterated if the project were approved at this time residents would not have
16 an opportunity to comment further on the project itself.

17
18 Commissioner Lam-Julian clarified, when asked by the Chair, she was not asking that the
19 item be continued.

20
21 Commissioner Bender found the idea of an awning on the north facing entry a good idea,
22 but suggested intervention should be an awning, something that was architecturally
23 permanent and not a canvas, with the overall opening of the framing retained as-is, which
24 would provide a simple awning suspended off the building with a beam and without posts,
25 something discreet and simple. An awning would be appropriate, particularly given the
26 winds from the northwest and he was pleased the building would be repainted. He
27 recognized the building had been vacant for awhile and finding a new purpose was an
28 improvement.

29
30 Commissioner Huey commented she had done research and found the business was, in
31 fact, not certified as a California Green Business Network. She asked that information on
32 the California Green Business Network be provided to the applicant for educational
33 purposes. She understood the applicant was following the book, but again noted the
34 medical equipment would use a significant amount of energy that further perpetuated
35 Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs). There were California Green Business Network
36 programs that were free of cost to small and medium sized businesses, with financial
37 incentives also offered that the applicant may consider.

38
39 Mr. Shiu advised that staff could forward the information.

40
41 Vice-Chairperson Martinez asked that the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittee
42 review additional exterior seating, the addition of a trash receptacle on the exterior, revised
43 exterior painting and a refresh of tree pruning and improved landscaping, with flowers.

44
45 Mr. Shiu advised there was a condition of approval related to the maintenance of
46 landscaping but not a requirement for additional landscaping.

47
48 Mr. Hanham identified Condition 4, Site Maintenance, part of which *required the property*
49 *owner to ensure trees and landscaping area on site are maintained in good condition and*
50 *dead vegetation to be replaced promptly.*

1 Mr. Shiu commented that adding new landscaping could be a new condition or could be
2 incorporated into the recommendations for the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc
3 Subcommittee to review.
4

5 Vice-Chairperson Martinez clarified he would be okay installing some mulch as an
6 improvement to the landscaping. He pointed out the SAHA development and Gables
7 Motel, also located in the area, had made an effort to improve the appearance of the area
8 and anything that could be done to tidy up the subject property would be appreciated.
9

10 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to adopt Resolution 24-06 with Exhibit A: Conditions of
11 Approval, a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Pinole, County of Contra
12 Costa, State of California, Approving Conditional Use Permit UP-24-01 to Establish a Medical
13 Office at 825 San Pablo Avenue, and subject to:
14

- 15 • Add a new Condition 14, which would require an awning and seating be
16 applied to the front alcove area along with exterior trash receptables, and the
17 areas of raw dirt be improved either by the addition of mulch and plants with
18 all changes in this matter to be brought back to the Planning Commission Ad-
19 Hoc Subcommittee for review before final approval of the Building Permit.
20
- 21 • Add a new Condition 15, which would require public notice prior to the start
22 of construction to those properties on the same mailing radius of 300-feet as
23 the standard public hearing notification process, with the public notice to
24 clarify this was not a notice for the approval of the project.
25

26 **MOTION: Menis**

SECONDED: Martinez

APPROVED: 7-0

27
28
29
30 **I. OLD BUSINESS:** None
31

32 **J. CITY PLANNER'S/COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**
33

34 Mr. Hanham provided the following updates:
35

- 36 - He had attended the American Planning Association (APA) Conference and
37 briefed the Planning Commission on the discussions.
38
- 39 - A final map had been recorded for Pinole Shores II.
40
- 41 - Staff was working on the mylars for the Appian Plaza Map and finalization of the
42 Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and Homeowners Association
43 (HOA) documents.
44
- 45 - The Planning Commission would consider a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
46 request for Tina's Place at its October 28, 2024 regular meeting.
47
- 48
49
50 - Staff was working on the Housing Element Implementation text amendments with

1 the next set of amendments to be presented to the Planning Commission at a
2 meeting in November, and with the first set of amendments previously reviewed
3 and approved by the Planning Commission to be presented to the City Council
4 for approval in November.

- 5
- 6 - Staff continued to work on the parklet design policies and guidelines.
- 7
- 8 - Vista Woods was close to completion with Wings A and B issued temporary
9 occupancy and staff was in the process of inspections for Wings C and D.
- 10
- 11 - SAHA was due to have final inspection soon.
- 12
- 13 - Staff was working with the property owner of the project at 2801 Pinole Valley
14 Road who was getting closer to the submittal of documents.
- 15
- 16 - Pinole Shores II plans should be submitted by the end of the year.
- 17
- 18 - Staff was working on the City's Development Impact Fees and finalizing the
19 Safety and Environmental Justice Elements, with the consultant having been
20 provided comments from the Planning Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittee.
- 21

22 Commissioner Bender reported he had recently viewed the unfinished trail from the
23 caretakers' home to an area where there had been a washout and was surprised about what
24 was being dumped in the area, including two small mounds of recent asphalt. The area had
25 also been used for dumping broken-up asphalt.

26
27 Mr. Hanham advised he would check with the Public Works Director.

28
29 Chairperson Menis reported this issue had been raised with the City Council on more than
30 one occasion. He too had viewed the area and advised the Public Works Director had
31 reported the intent was to pave the area with the asphalt.

32
33 Commissioner Lam-Julian asked about the status of Safeway, to which Mr. Hanham reported
34 staff had been meeting with the property owner who was working on due diligence and he
35 hoped to have something shortly. He understood the new City Manager also planned to
36 meet with the property owner.

37
38 In response to the Chair, Mr. Hanham confirmed the Safeway project would not include a
39 new gas station as part of the plans due to the City's moratorium on new gas station
40 development.

41
42 Chairperson Menis understood staff was working on the City's Development Impact Fees but
43 he understood the fees had been reviewed and revised in 2022. He asked staff to provide
44 clarification if a full fee nexus study was also being done.

45
46 Mr. Hanham explained the Development Impact Fees needed to be reviewed given the
47 agreement with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD), which had taken
48 over the City's fire services and he understood all City facilities needed to be part of the study.

49
50 Most of the nexus study was complete, it was just a matter of moving it forward to the City

1 Council for approval prior to the end of the year.
2

3 Chairperson Menis asked about the status of the Adobe Road Trail, an issue that had been
4 raised by a member of the public during the September 9, 2024 Planning Commission
5 meeting, and Mr. Hanham acknowledged he had not asked the Public Works Director about
6 the status of the trail.
7

8 Commissioner Lam-Julian reported the sudden appearance of the 'No Parking' signs had
9 been discussed at a previous meeting with the understanding those signs may have been
10 related to the Pinole Valley High School homecoming event.
11

12 Mr. Hanham clarified the 'No Parking' signs were not related to Pinole Valley High School
13 but portable 'No Parking' signs had been used when Green Day had been recognized by the
14 City. He would have to reach out to the Public Works Director to get an update.
15

16 Chairperson Menis asked about the status of the City's grant application with Contra Costa
17 County for sea level assessments and vulnerability assessments, and Mr. Hanham reported
18 staff continued to work with the county, which was putting together the criteria needed for
19 grant eligibility.
20

21 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED 22

23 Anthony Vossbrink, Pinole, referenced the Adobe Road Trail and commented the trail had
24 been cut in half by a major breach several years ago when the then-Fire Chief had been
25 informed by the county and state the breach must be repaired. A member of the Public
26 Works Department at the site had recently been asked about the status but only stated they
27 were moving around dirt. He questioned the dumping in the area of the trail and behind the
28 caretaker's home that was blocking the trail and was a potential health and safety hazard.
29 He asked whether the CCCFPD needed to be contacted to clear the trail. He suggested the
30 City had violated the Pinole Municipal Code (PMC) having littered the trail and he urged that
31 the trail be cleared to ensure it was walkable for the public and for the City to avoid potential
32 litigation.
33

34 As to the caretaker's home, Mr. Vossbrink commented on rumors that something was
35 happening with the property and he asked whether a multi-use permit had been issued and
36 why the general public was not being informed of the status of the property.
37

38 Mr. Vossbrink also asked about the status of the extension of the Bay Front Trail near the
39 Hercules-Pinole Wastewater Treatment Plant. Further, he commented on the recent build
40 out in the City of Hercules for American Tire Company and asked whether the business had
41 considered locating in the City of Pinole since Pinole had property that could have
42 accommodated that business. Lastly, he congratulated the City on the receipt of a \$650,000
43 state grant that would be used towards housing projects and asked when the funds would
44 be used and what projects would be funded.
45

46 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED 47

48 Mr. Hanham reported the Community Services and Public Works Departments were working
49 on projects related to the caretaker's home but he was unaware of the specifics of the plans.
50 As to the trail that had been washed out, Mr. Hanham reported there had been some

1 discussion about the trail, concrete had been stockpiled in the area since the trail had been
2 a dirt trail for years and it needed to be repaved. He would have to check with the Public
3 Works Director on the project details and status.
4

5 Mr. Hanham added the City of Pinole had not been approached by American Tire Company.
6 He also confirmed the City had received a \$650,000 state grant for affordable housing, but
7 there remained a number of policies that must be put into place before the funds could be
8 allocated for affordable housing projects. No funds had been designated at this time and
9 more information would be provided at a future date.
10

11 In response to the concerns with items blocking the trail and possible exposure to the City,
12 Mr. Hanham understood the CCCFPD was involved in some aspect of that work but he would
13 have to get more information on the particulars of the project from the Public Works Director.
14 In response to the concerns with the Bay Front Trail extension, he again would have to check
15 with the Public Works Director on the status of the project. He noted the trail was not a City
16 trail but one that involved another agency.
17

18 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**
19

20 Chairperson Menis reported the City's website was still not updating properly, the City's
21 calendar was still not showing community events and only City meetings and the
22 hyperlinks in Pinole Pulse remained an issue and he asked staff to look into the matter.
23

24 Mr. Hanham reported he had spoken with the Assistant to the City Manager and when
25 Departments entered their events on their pages there was to be a link to the front page.
26 There was a problem with the link that staff was working to resolve.
27

28 Chairperson Menis noted some of the links in Pinole Pulse were also outdated. He
29 announced the following community events: Community Forum at the Senior Center on
30 October 8, 2024 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.; Blood Drive at Fire Station 74 on October 13,
31 2024 from 10:00 a.m.to 2:00 p.m.; and the Low-Income Senior Food Distribution on
32 October 8, 2024 from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m.
33

34 **L. NEXT MEETING(S)**
35

36 The next meeting of the Planning Commission to be a Regular Planning Commission
37 Meeting scheduled for October 28, 2024 at 7:00 p.m.
38

39 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 9:30 p.m.**
40

41 Transcribed by:

Reviewed and Edited by:

42
43 Sherri D. Lewis
44 Transcriber

City Staff