



## **PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA**

**August 25, 2025**

**7:00 PM**

**Attend in Person: PINOLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 2131 PEAR STREET  
OR**

**Attend VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE – Details provided below**

---

### **How to Submit Public Comments:**

#### **In Person:**

Attend meeting at the Pinole City Council Chambers, fill out a yellow public comment card and submit it to the City Clerk.

#### **Via Zoom:**

Members of the public may submit a live remote public comment via Zoom video conferencing. Download the Zoom mobile app from the Apple Appstore or Google Play. If you are using a desktop computer, you can test your connection to Zoom by clicking [here](#). Zoom also allows you to join the meeting by phone.

#### **From a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86505375301>

**Webinar ID: 865 0537 5301**

**By phone:** +1 (669) 900-6833 or +1 (253) 215-8782 or +1 (346) 248-7799

- Speakers will be asked to provide their name and city of residence, although providing this is not required for participation.
- Each speaker will be afforded up to 5 minutes to speak
- Speakers will be muted until their opportunity to provide public comment.

When the Chair opens the comment period for the item you wish to speak on, please use the “raise hand” feature (or press \*9 if connecting via telephone) which will alert staff that you have a comment to provide and press \*6 to unmute. To comment with your video enabled, please let the City Clerk know you would like to turn your camera on once you are called to speak.

#### **Written Comments:**

Please submit public comments to Planning Staff before the meeting via email to [ghanham@pinole.gov](mailto:ghanham@pinole.gov). Please include your full name, city of residence and agenda item you are commenting on.

## OTHER WAYS TO WATCH THE MEETING

**LIVE ON CHANNEL 26.** They are retelecast the following week. The Community TV Channel 26 schedule is published on the city's website at [www.pinoles.gov](http://www.pinoles.gov).

**VIDEO-STREAMED LIVE ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE,** [www.pinoles.gov](http://www.pinoles.gov) and remain archived on the site for five (5) years.

**If none of these options are available to you, or you need assistance with public comment, please contact Planning Manager David Hanham at (510) 724-8912 or [dhanham@pinoles.gov](mailto:dhanham@pinoles.gov).**

**Americans With Disabilities Act:** In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in a City Meeting or you need a copy of the agenda, or the agenda packet in an appropriate alternative format, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (510) 724-8928. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist the City staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

**Note:** Staff reports are available for inspection on the City Website at [www.pinoles.gov](http://www.pinoles.gov). You may also contact the City Clerk via e-mail at [hbelle@pinoles.gov](mailto:hbelle@pinoles.gov).

### **CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

Persons wishing to speak on an item listed on the Agenda may do so when the Chair asks for comments in favor of or in opposition to the item under consideration. After all of those persons wishing to speak have done so, the hearing will be closed and the matter will be discussed amongst the Commission prior to rendering a decision.

Any person may appeal an action of the Planning Commission or of the Planning Manager by filing an appeal with the City Clerk, in writing, within ten (10) days of such action. Following a Public Hearing, the City Council may act to confirm, modify or reverse the action of the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission may act to confirm, modify, or reverse the action of the Planning Manager. The cost to appeal a decision is \$500 and a minimum \$2,500 deposit fee.

Note: If you challenge a decision of the Commission regarding a project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing or in writing delivered to the City of Pinole at, or prior to, the public hearing.

**Ralph M. Brown Act. Gov. Code § 54950.** In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly. The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies, which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**C. LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

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

**D. ROLL CALL**

**E. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

The public may address the Planning Commission on items that are within its jurisdiction and not otherwise listed on the agenda. Planning Commissioners may discuss the matter brought to their attention, but by State law (Ralph M. Brown Act), action must be deferred to a future meeting. Time allowed: five (5) minutes each.

**F. MEETING MINUTES:**

1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for June 9, 2025

**G. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

At the beginning of an item, the Chair will read the description of that item as stated on the Agenda. The City Staff will then give a brief presentation of the proposed project. The Commission may then ask Staff questions about the item.

For those items listed as Public Hearings, the Chair will open the public hearing and ask the applicant if they wish to make a presentation. Those persons in favor of the project will then be given an opportunity to speak followed by those who are opposed to the project. The applicant will then be given an opportunity for rebuttal.

The Public Hearing will then be closed and the Commission may discuss the item amongst themselves and ask questions of Staff. The Commission will then vote to approve, deny, approve in a modified form, or continue the matter to a later date for a decision. The Chair will announce the Commission's decision and advise the audience of the appeal procedure.

**Note: No Public Hearings will begin after 11:00 p.m. Items still remaining on the agenda after 11:00 p.m. will be held over to the next meeting.**

**H. OLD BUSINESS**

1. Discussion of Redevelopment of Appian 80 Shopping Center - Compiled Ideas Resolution

**I. NEW BUSINESS**

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

**K. COMMUNICATIONS**

**L. NEXT MEETING(S)**

1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on September 8, 2025 at 7:00PM

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

I hereby certify under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing Agenda was posted on the bulletin board at the main entrance of Pinole City Hall, 2131 Pear Street Pinole, CA, and on the City's website, not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting date set forth on this agenda.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**David Hanham**  
**Planning Manager**  
**POSTED: \_\_\_\_\_**

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION

June 9, 2025

THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN A HYBRID FORMAT  
BOTH IN-PERSON AND ZOOM TELECONFERENCE

A. **CALL TO ORDER:** 7:02 p.m.

B. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

D. **ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Bender, Huey, Lam-Julian, Uch, Vice-Chairperson Menis, Chairperson Sandoval

Commissioners Absent: Martinez

Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager  
Heba El-Guindy, Public Works Director  
Justin Shiu, Senior Planner

E. **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

There were no citizens to be heard.

F. **MEETING MINUTES**

1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April 28, 2025

Commissioner Lam-Julian requested the following revisions to the Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 28, 2025:

Page 19 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 12 through 14:

1 She [Commissioner Lam-Julian] also referenced 812 Kitchens, a small business  
2 incubator, where they could take it a step further and create pop-ups and space  
3 where food could be tested and where the space could be converted for use for  
4 multiple events.  
5

6 And Page 21 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 43 through 45:

7  
8 St. James Square, also in San Jose, was comprised of an odd-shaped piece of  
9 land that had been proposed to be converted to small micro-businesses and  
10 community space to serve as a destination location.  
11

12 Commissioner Bender requested amendments to Page 17 of 89 of the agenda packet,  
13 Lines 35 through 38:

14  
15 He [Commissioner Bender] had concern with the demand for more commercial  
16 space while he is interested in the movement in England to reuse buildings to  
17 reduce environmental impacts.  
18

19 And Page 22 of 89 of the agenda packet, Lines 4 through 9:

20  
21 He [Commissioner Bender] cited a mixed-use development in the City of  
22 Sunnyvale, which involved commercial on the ground floor with a major tenant on  
23 the bottom and housing above, a good project in terms of its size; however, when  
24 entering into negotiations with the project lenders, the lenders required the grocery  
25 store as a standalone building with the housing separate, which he found to be  
26 unfortunate but which showed the power that lenders had to dictate what would be  
27 built.  
28

29 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April  
30 28, 2025, as amended by Commissioners Bender and Lam-Julian.

31  
32 **MOTION: Sandoval**

**SECONDED: Bender**

**APPROVED: 5-0-**

33 **2**

**ABSTAIN: Huey**  
**ABSENT: Martinez**

34  
35  
36  
37 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

38  
39 **H. OLD BUSINESS: None**

40  
41 **I. NEW BUSINESS**

42  
43 **1. Review of Proposed Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Fiscal Year**  
44 **(FY) 2025/26 through FY 2029/2030 for Consistency with the General Plan**

45  
46 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on ex-parté communications with his email list about the  
47 agenda in general. He also had some discussions at the City's Pride/Juneteenth event with  
48 some members of the Pinole Police Department about Item I.1.  
49  
50

1  
2 Public Works Director Heba El-Guindy provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Draft  
3 Capital Improvement Plan for FY 2025/26 through FY 2029/30 and Priority FY 2025/26  
4 Capital Projects. The FY 2025/26 to FY 2029/30 CIP included 45 projects and five  
5 infrastructure assessments under six categories. Priority FY 2025/26 projects included  
6 three facilities, two parks, six sanitary sewer, two stormwater, eleven street and roads  
7 projects and two infrastructure assessments, which were all highlighted.  
8

9 Ms. El-Guindy stated the Final Budget and CIP would be approved by the City Council at  
10 its June 17, 2025 meeting. The City Council proposed no changes to the CIP at this time.  
11

12 Ms. El-Guindy recommended the Planning Commission review the Proposed Preliminary  
13 Five-Year CIP and adopt Resolution 25-07, as contained in Attachment A, finding the projects  
14 proposed in the CIP for Fiscal Years (FY) 2025/26 through 2029/30 were consistent with the  
15 General Plan.  
16

17 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Planning Manager David Hanham  
18 and Ms. El-Guindy clarified the following:  
19

- 20 • Project #FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking Lot, clarified the project had been  
21 put on hold and may be used for different purposes for redevelopment other than  
22 establishing a parking lot. (Bender)  
23
- 24 • Project #RO1710, San Pablo Avenue Bridge over BNSF Railroad, clarified  
25 construction funding to be sought through federal and state funds; \$28 million had  
26 currently been allocated for construction. Staff was uncertain if that amount would  
27 be sufficient, with the cost to be clarified through the design phase. (Bender)  
28
- 29 • Project #RO2506, Traffic Calming Program, clarified how some projects could be  
30 combined. Any agreements through consultants and contractors required City  
31 Council approval. Combinations may depend on the functionality and scope of the  
32 project. As an example, the Pavement Management Program for FY 2025/26  
33 planned to cover Pinole Valley Road, Shea and Sarah Drives and was planned as a  
34 Complete Streets Project, not just pavement rehabilitation, given safety issues in the  
35 vicinity of schools and a soccer field. Some pavement markings, signage  
36 improvements and physical traffic calming devices were planned. Staff planned to  
37 utilize funds for more than one project if the project under the Pavement  
38 Rehabilitation Project was insufficient. For Tennent Avenue, there were also plans  
39 in the future for a Complete Streets project to include pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle  
40 improvements. (Uch)  
41
- 42 • If Project #RO2506, Traffic Calming Program, was adopted by the City Council, it  
43 would start in FY 2025/26. Project #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools, had initially  
44 been planned to start in FY 2025/26, but due to financial constraints and since it was  
45 funded by Measure S, the amount out of the General Fund had been reduced and  
46 the project had been pushed back one year. Whatever was not used as part of the  
47 Pavement Rehabilitation project, the City would continue working on throughout the  
48 year to meet the community needs. Staff had a list of requests from the community  
49 for school and traffic calming-related needs mainly in areas surrounding schools in

1 residential neighborhoods and not arterials. (Uch)

- 2 • Staff wanted to address the transportation system on a broader perspective and  
3 extend as much as possible throughout the year, although limited staff and financial  
4 resources required the maximization of the use of funds and bundling projects to  
5 make them more efficient. (Uch)  
6
- 7 • Project #SS2407, Private Sewer Lateral Program, acknowledged concern the  
8 program did not apply to Median-Income households in Pinole, which would affect a  
9 number of residents in Pinole and a request to work with PG&E to expand the  
10 program for homeowners. Acknowledged concerns PG&E cut off residents when  
11 switching to gas lines and oftentimes PG&E cut into the roadway and sidewalks to  
12 access equipment, with the sidewalks repaired with asphalt, which was not up to  
13 code. It was also acknowledged that PG&E provided no response to residents'  
14 repeated requests for updates on repair. Clarified per state law, it was the property  
15 owner's responsibility to maintain sidewalks even if there were trees to be removed.  
16

17 The City has not yet prepared the guidelines for the program, to be clarified when  
18 establishing the program. The program was intended to help the community in need  
19 first as a priority and it was hoped a significant number of property owners would be  
20 helped by the program. The City recognized many property owners would not be  
21 able to afford such an improvement, remove trees and rebuild sidewalks, which was  
22 the intent for establishing the program. Staff acknowledged concerns with impacts  
23 to the roadway network due to work by PG&E and the East Bay Municipal Utility  
24 District (EBMUD) and staff was working with those agencies. (Lam-Julian)  
25

- 26 • In terms of updates to City Parks, acknowledged reference to Health and Safety Code  
27 Section 1157251, which stated tan bark should be about 12-inches underneath  
28 structures to soften falls from the play structures, although the tan bark at Nob Hill  
29 Park had been pushed up around the base of the play structure with several residents  
30 expressing concerns the tan bark had not been refilled for some time and the City  
31 had been asked to address that situation. Clarified the City was checking on current  
32 grant funds to determine whether that improvement could be targeted soon without  
33 having to include it in park upgrades. Reported the Community Services Director  
34 was actively working on seeking community partnerships, particularly for the dog  
35 park. Interested organizations could reach out to the Community Services Director.  
36 (Lam-Julian).  
37
- 38 • Clarified staff would continue to seek grants to supplement the funds for proposed  
39 projects. Staff was confident grants the City was currently receiving were not at risk  
40 due to the current political climate. As an example, the San Pablo Bridge project had  
41 been placed on hold but the City submitted environmental documents and other  
42 receipts to take the project off the inactive list. While some projects that were federally  
43 funded were being targeted, the City had already made its case for ongoing projects.  
44 Acknowledged funding under the various grant programs was less than had been  
45 provided in the past, but opportunities remained and staff continued to seek funds  
46 from the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and various transportation  
47 funding opportunities. Admittedly, grants had become more competitive since  
48 funding was less and although the City was competing with cities that had  
49 disadvantaged areas, staff continued to pursue the opportunities. (Huey)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

- Project # #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools, clarified concerns had been expressed from the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) and parents related to traffic issues in the public right-of-way (ROW) or within the site. As an example, the City was working with Pinole Middle School to redesign the parking lot to better accommodate staff parking away from drop-off and pick-up areas to make it more efficient. Clarified schools involved a different approval process pursuant to State Architect requirements, but the City was supporting the WCCUSD in this matter. There had been a request for a new crosswalk in front of the school, which was in a mid-block location but could not be approved absent a traffic control device to ensure safety. Improvements to signage, pavement markings, sidewalk conditions and accessibility were other issues that had been raised by the community depending on the area. Those concerns were being raised by the schools, WCCUSD and community members via email, reporting on the City website and from various avenues.

Staff was unaware whether the WCCUSD had conducted a Walk Audit, but City staff had the expertise to do this type of work to support the WCCUSD. There was also a group out of U.C. Berkeley that assisted with Walk Audits and the City needed to be ready to implement the improvements, which was why there was a level of managing expectations with improvements to be established gradually. The City was not usually notified of those studies but notified after the WCCUSD had already completed the studies. The City was not involved in the WCCUSD studies other than when the WCCUSD found it could not fund all of the projects, particularly off-site improvements, when the WCCUSD reached out to the City for assistance. There were plans to team with the Pinole Police Department for an Office of Traffic Safety Grant, for traffic education in the various schools to enhance what could be offered to the community. (Huey)

- Project #RO2503, City Streetlights Upgrade, clarified the City followed state standards for street lights but planned to develop its own standards, to be established whether for PG&E or City lights. Clarified placement of PG&E lights was dictated by the location of the utility poles, and street lighting would be updated through development projects such as the Appian Way project, which would install new lights with 150-feet of spacing on Appian Way and Canyon Road on the border of the project site. Reported that quarterly coordination meetings had been held with PG&E since PG&E had its own programs where the City could benefit to improve lighting conditions, save on the charges paid monthly for energy usage, benefit from the various programs and categorize usage differently. (Huey)
- While each CIP project had been given a priority score in the past that had not been followed as much this year. Unfunded projects had been prioritized in the past as well. Factors used when prioritizing include funding, funding source and level of need for the project; however, the projects had not been scored with a short list of projects to start sooner than later in FY 2025/26. Projects that had been grant funded had to remain on schedule to secure those funds. Staff tried to minimize any projects funded by the General Fund since Measure S was housed in the General Fund. Reiterated there would be six sewer-related projects to be funded by Sewer Enterprise fees, with sufficient funds available for the projects. (Huey)

- 1 • Clarified staff decided not to use priority scoring for this fiscal year since it had not  
2 been followed in past years and some unfunded projects had a high priority scoring  
3 but had not been pursued. Some projects had stayed on the books year after year  
4 even with a high score. Projects were really dictated by staff resources and available  
5 funding. Again, highlighted the CIP projects planned for this year and reported an  
6 Associate Engineer position had been approved by the City Council to help the Public  
7 Works Department implement the projects identified. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
8
- 9 • Project #PA1901, Pinole Valley Park Soccer Field Rehabilitation, clarified grant  
10 funding for the project had covered specific improvements such as the turf  
11 improvement. While the soccer field had been renovated, the irrigation system had  
12 not been rehabilitated and was part of the reason the turf had deteriorated quickly  
13 since the park was heavily used by various groups and community teams. Some  
14 sections of the turf and rehabilitation of the irrigation system was now being done.  
15 (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
16
- 17 • Project ##SS2407, Private Sewer Lateral Program, clarified staff had not yet  
18 discussed the guidelines for this program, but for equity purposes may place a cap  
19 on improvements. Staff had not progressed far in the process as yet, but would soon  
20 work on it and could bring it forward for review, if desired. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
21
- 22 • Project #RO2403, Old Town Traffic Calming, clarified the project would start in FY  
23 2026/27 due to staff capacity limits. Improvements to San Pablo Avenue in general  
24 would mainly follow the San Pablo Avenue bridge construction, which would create  
25 a significant amount of truck traffic. Staff did not want to implement improvements  
26 now that could be impacted later. Also, the main configuration of the roadway may  
27 be considered in different cross sections in the future and the City was working with  
28 Caltrans to build a four-lane bridge and did not want to do anything to affect Caltrans's  
29 decision. Staff planned to tackle this project after the bridge project. In the meantime,  
30 there may be improvements to the overall environment in the downtown area such  
31 as string lighting, curb/ramp improvements and possibly some street furnishings.  
32 (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
33
- 34 • Project #RO2301, Road Rehabilitation, clarified Vehicle Impact Fees (VIFs) had been  
35 listed for FY 2025/26 only and not moving forward in future years and whether that  
36 was due to debt financing had not been determined since the amount of debt  
37 financing had currently been estimated for FYs 2027 and 2028, and the amount  
38 would go down each year after that. Measure I was not mentioned since staff wanted  
39 sufficient funding to pay for the debt financing to be assessed in more detail in the  
40 future. Staff was pushing for VIFs in the first year since the scope of rehabilitation  
41 was too limited based on input from the City Council and insufficient to achieve as  
42 much as desired in the first fiscal year. VIFs could be included in future years, but  
43 would either be dedicated towards payments of the debt financing, or directly for the  
44 payments of the project. Use of VIFs had just been approved by the City Council on  
45 June 3, 2025, and the actual details of how VIFs would be used in the future remained  
46 to be worked out in future years, although they would be dedicated for roadway  
47 improvements. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
48  
49

- 1 • Project #RO1710, San Pablo Avenue Bridge over BNSF Railroad, clarified again \$28  
2 million had been planned for the project from HSIP with the exact cost and estimate  
3 not yet known. While there could be additional sources of funding, they had not been  
4 listed since it would have skewed the overall table for funding. (Vice-Chairperson  
5 Menis)  
6
- 7 • Project #IN2301, Facilities & Real Estate Master Plan, clarified the project had been  
8 pushed back due to availability of funding. Of the five infrastructure assessment  
9 projects, this project had been pushed back one year with the two infrastructure  
10 assessments that had been selected for the upcoming fiscal year due to the fact they  
11 would be funded by enterprise fees and not from the measure funds, which had been  
12 a factor in the selection process. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
13
- 14 • Clarified much of the funding would go towards sewer, sanitary and roads. Pursuant  
15 to the budget, there was an accumulation of over \$20 million in the City's enterprise  
16 fees, which was why the City was trying to catch up. (Chairperson Sandoval)  
17
- 18 • Pavement rehabilitation work would depend on the condition of the roadway. Pothole  
19 repair was typically the first step and depending on the condition it could involve a  
20 slurry or cape seal or full rehabilitation. The work would be contracted out but  
21 managed by the City. Regardless of the treatment, even if a slurry seal, it would  
22 cover the width of the roadway. Reconstruction would not occur in the first year given  
23 the cost and the amount of funding would not cover one road and that work may be  
24 pushed out depending in what the City could afford. The cost per mile to repair roads  
25 varied, but could cost several million dollars. (Chairperson Sandoval)  
26

27 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

28  
29 There were no comments from the public.  
30

31 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

32  
33 Commissioner Huey referenced Project #RO2505, Safe Routes to Schools and commented  
34 she had worked for a City on the peninsula with Safe Routes to Schools, a program that was  
35 under her Department's purview. While she understood the WCCUSD engaged in Walk  
36 Audits, she advocated for the City to bring it to the WCCUSD's attention. She was pleased  
37 to learn of the collaboration between the City and the WCCUSD and noted there was a group  
38 that did Walk Audits. Given the City's budget constraints and since the project had been  
39 pushed back another fiscal year, she suggested there was plenty of time to gear up for a  
40 Walk Audit if that was an option. Walk Audits helped to strengthen the partnership with the  
41 school district and invited community members to raise concerns. She recognized the City  
42 of Pinole was heavily engaged with the community. She had seen the results of a Walk Audit  
43 that could strengthen the relationship with the WCCUSD, invite community members to the  
44 table and supplement competitive applications for grants.  
45

46 Vice-Chairperson Menis referenced Page 31 of 89 of the agenda packet, and commented  
47 the font size was barely legible. He recommended separating out streets and roads to a  
48 separate column or turning the table sideways to be more visible given it was challenging to  
49 read.

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
2 Improvements and commented the design of the fence in the project had been described as  
3 a chain link fence with security gates. He had discussed this with members of the Police  
4 Department during the Pride event and had asked whether a chain link fence would be  
5 sufficiently secure to meet General Plan Policy CS2.6.  
6

7 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported that it was the opinion of the members of the Police  
8 Department he had spoken to that a chain link fence would not be secure, could be bypassed  
9 and people could cut through it and climb over it, and perhaps wrought iron would be superior.  
10 He asked if the City still planned to use chain link fence for the project.  
11

12 Ms. El-Guindy explained that the parking lot was part of the reason the project had been  
13 pushed back. The Police Chief was well aware a chain link fence was not an adequate plan  
14 and a redesign of the parking lot would be required, and that the pavement conditions and  
15 different fence would cost more resulting in an almost completely different scope for the  
16 project than provided. The project had been pushed back for a more detailed assessment.  
17 She otherwise agreed with the comments about the formatting of the CIP document. In terms  
18 of the comments about Walk Audits, she advised she was the former Vision Zero Program  
19 Manager for the City of San Jose and she fully supported Walk Audits. Walk Audits did not  
20 have to be initiated by a school or the WCCUSD, it was mostly initiated by a city and she  
21 would like to see the City of Pinole pursue that for Pinole schools.  
22

23 Vice-Chairperson Menis again referenced Project #FA2302, and commented that in the  
24 previous General Plan CIP cycle, the Planning Commission had stricken General Plan Policy  
25 CS2.6 as not being applicable to the proposed project. Now it was back and he noted while  
26 General Plan Policy CS2.6 fit, Goal CS.2 did not since it did not maintain a high level of public  
27 safety with the way the project had currently been designed. Absent Goal CS.2, the Planning  
28 Commission could not make the finding for General Plan Policy CS2.6. He added the project  
29 may meet Goal CE.5, as written, but he was unsure how to define "adequate" in this case  
30 and noted the Commission had stricken some of the General Plan goals and policies later  
31 on. He appreciated the Community Development Department for finding a General Plan  
32 finding that actually fit with the project as opposed to prior years and he was pleased to see  
33 the project would be redesigned.  
34

35 Ms. El-Guindy acknowledged she had not listened to the Planning Commission meeting to  
36 learn of the concerns with the project in 2024, which was why the goals and policies had  
37 been carried forward.  
38

39 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #RO2503, City Streetlights Upgrade, and  
40 asked, as an example, whether the City required one street light every 150-feet and whether  
41 that would create an obligation for the City or for PG&E.  
42

43 Ms. El-Guindy explained that the standard plans and specifications would be developed to  
44 be consistent with the state standards to establish specifications for the downtown area with  
45 different types of illumination, spacing between trees and the like, with the obligation on the  
46 City not PG&E, unless there was an opportunity to work with PG&E on some of their  
47 programs. As the City redeveloped and pursued capital projects, it would follow the approved  
48 standard plans and specifications at that time.  
49

1 Vice-Chairperson Menis also referenced Project #IN1703, Storm Drain Master Plan. He was  
2 glad to see the City was finally moving forward with the project due to state requirements on  
3 storm drain capture.  
4

5 Chairperson Sandoval asked if the Planning Commission found one of the projects was not  
6 consistent with the General Plan whether that project would return to the Planning  
7 Commission or be stricken from the CIP.  
8

9 Mr. Hanham explained a recommendation would be made to the City Council, with the City  
10 Council to make the final decision. The Planning Commission may recommend a specific  
11 project or policy was not consistent with the General Plan and that would be forwarded on to  
12 the City Council.  
13

14 Commissioner Bender again referenced Project #FA2302, Plum Street Parking Lot  
15 Improvements, and noted that he was the early advocate that the chain link fence as part of  
16 the project was not going to provide real security and the aesthetics were a bad look. The  
17 other issue he had with the project was that only 25 parking spaces would available for City  
18 use. He was concerned with halving a third of the parking, which would disappear in an area  
19 that was one of the most congested areas in the downtown. He frequented the area often  
20 and could attest to the limited parking in the downtown, which raised concerns based on the  
21 numbers he had seen. If the parking lot was, in fact, reconfigured it would trigger C.3  
22 requirements and that was another issue.  
23

24 Commissioner Bender also referenced Project #FA1901, Senior Center Auxiliary Parking  
25 Lot, and as someone who lived close to the area, and as he had mentioned in 2024 to the  
26 City Council, he passed the area 24/7, had jogged through the area, and had seen the main  
27 parking lot full; however, the auxiliary parking lot was rarely full and he was pleased to see  
28 the project had been pushed out. In addition, again speaking to Project #FA2302, Plum  
29 Street Parking Lot Improvements, he reported Council member Toms had stated during a  
30 recent City Council meeting that rather than a chain link fence, she asked why cameras had  
31 not been installed. He was unsure whether or not that could be a solution but it was an  
32 interesting point.  
33

34 Commissioner Bender thanked the Public Works Director for tackling a real prioritization of  
35 the CIP projects from the list of projects that had been added on to the CIP year after year,  
36 with some overlapping, and with the prioritization now based on fiscal and reality conditions.  
37 He was pleased the City of Pinole was finally trying to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century on some  
38 important issues, such as accessibility and levels of safety on City roads.  
39

40 Chairperson Sandoval found the City was spending a lot of money on roads but only filling  
41 lots of pot holes. He hoped with Measure I funding, the City could repave the entire City and  
42 while he recognized that was a tall task, the work could be broken up and possibly the City  
43 could have a pavement team that was constantly working. He again recognized that may  
44 not be feasible at the moment. but could be something to consider in the future to ensure that  
45 paving work was done on a regular basis, which was important to think about since Safe and  
46 Complete Streets Projects allowed the opportunity to reengineer the streets and possibly  
47 completely repave the streets and include modifications rather than spending money twice.  
48  
49



1 Mr. Hanham provided the following updates:

- 2 • A public workshop would be scheduled during the month of July for the Safety and  
3 Environmental Justice Element before coming to the Planning Commission.
- 4
- 5 • Public workshops were being planned for the Parklet Program.
- 6
- 7 • Staff was in the process of filing for the Final Map for Appian Village.
- 8
- 9 • Staff was working with the new owners of the Pinole Vista Project. A Lot Line  
10 Adjustment (LLA) had been approved for the prior owner but never recorded. Staff  
11 was working with the current property owners to have the LLA recorded as part of the  
12 new ownership.
- 13
- 14 • Staff hoped to have a recommendation for the Planning Commission to consider  
15 forwarding to the City Council based on comments related to the Appian 80 property  
16 during the April 28, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, at a meeting in July.
- 17

18 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked about the status of the request for a presentation on the  
19 Pinole Accessible Living (PAL) Program, and Mr. Hanham stated he had planned to provide  
20 an update under Item K. Communications. At this time, he provided information on the Draft  
21 Schedule for the PAL Program, to be launched in August 2025, hosted by the Building  
22 Department and intended to provide a series of free educational workshops through the  
23 months of August and November 2025 to help older adults and people with disabilities to  
24 make their homes safer, easier to live in and easier to navigate the permitting process.

25  
26 Commissioner Bender encouraged people to contact the State Licensing Board when hiring  
27 contractors, which was a way to protect oneself with smaller scale construction.

28  
29 Vice-Chairperson Menis thanked staff for the information and the infrastructure planned  
30 around the PAL Program process.

31  
32 Commissioner Lam-Julian reported the City of Concord would be hosting a Safety Fair on  
33 Emergency Preparedness in the month of July and the State Department of Developmental  
34 Services provided emergency preparedness, tutorials and presentations and was another  
35 possible resource.

36  
37 Commissioner Bender asked whether Pinole Shores II had filed for a building permit, to which  
38 Mr. Hanham reported the developer was in the process of working with the Contra Costa  
39 County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) since there were issues with fire flow. He planned  
40 to meet with the developer this week. Building plans had not been submitted since there  
41 could be changes to the building plans after discussions with the CCCFPD.

42  
43 Vice-Chairperson Menis commented the Los Angeles region allowed one to travel 40 miles  
44 from LAX to Anaheim for \$1.75 with caps on the overall pricing. He asked whether it was  
45 feasible for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and various public transit  
46 agencies under its purview to consider a shift away from higher fare box collection rates to a  
47 different funding system given the decline in ridership at the BART level.

48  
49 Chairperson Sandoval reported there had been discussions at the state level to move to a

1 more subsidized system but there was no funding for that at this time.  
2 Mr. Hanham added that due to State funding limitations, transit agencies wanted to maintain  
3 the 10 percent fare box ratio, which was needed to get the other 90 percent of funding, but  
4 there were problems with funding at the state level, helping to make trips more expensive.  
5

6 Chairperson Sandoval confirmed public transit agencies were very reliant on fare boxes more  
7 than they should be to be sustainable, which was why they were in a fiscal cliff now. New  
8 York used a completely different model and subsidized the New York City Subway and was  
9 not reliant on fare boxes. California could not consider that since it did not have the money.  
10

11 Commissioner Lam-Julian reported East County was working on a pilot program to explore  
12 caps for those fares for those with disabilities and for seniors and there were discussions to  
13 expand the program to all of Contra Costa County.  
14

15 Commissioner Uch commented that BART now had a \$90 million deficit, and if reducing fare  
16 boxes to a flat rate across the board may require funding from federal, regional and state  
17 resources. BART was a unique system based on other metro systems. BART tracks were  
18 a little over the standard gage of 6-feet, further increasing costs and maintenance making it  
19 more expensive to operate. New York recently passed congestion pricing which helped a lot  
20 with their transit system, whereas the Bay Area had studies from MTC which were mostly  
21 restricted to San Francisco. Systems in London and Denmark and most European cities had  
22 more funding for transit. Congestion pricing may be possible in the Bay Area in the future  
23 but would likely only be in San Francisco or possibly the use of the Bay Bridge.  
24

25 Commissioner Bender described how the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)  
26 had been set up through the voters with financing via property taxes. VTA as an agency was  
27 not facing the fiscal cliff yet but had ridership problems.  
28

29 **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**

30 There were no comments from the public.  
31  
32

33 **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**  
34

35 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**  
36

37 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported he had attended the Pride/Juneteenth celebration and staff  
38 did a great job putting it together. The event was well attended.  
39

40 **L. NEXT MEETING**  
41

42 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on June 23, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.  
43

44 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 9:16 p.m.**  
45

46 Transcribed by:  
47

48 Sherri D. Lewis  
49 Transcriber



# PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

H.1.

**DATE:** AUGUST 25, 2025  
**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION  
**FROM:** DAVID HANHAM, PLANNING MANAGER  
**SUBJECT:** DISCUSSION OF REDEVELOPMENT OF APPIAN 80 SHOPPING CENTER -  
COMPILED IDEAS AND CONCEPTS

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Consider adoption of the draft resolution

## **BACKGROUND**

On April 28, 2025, Planning Commission discussed ideas and concepts for redevelopment of the Appian 80 Shopping Center under Agenda Item J.1. Planning Commission provided direction to staff to prepare a resolution compiling the ideas and concepts to be received by the City Council.

## **REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

A draft resolution is attached for Planning Commission to consider for adoption and transmittal to the City Council (Attachment A). The resolution captures and compiles a summary of points that were discussed. Staff invites the Planning Commission to review and suggest any further text revisions that may be needed in the final version to City Council.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

A. Attachment A. Reso 25-08 - Appian 80 Ideas

**PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION 25-08  
WITH EXHIBIT A. DEVELOPMENT IDEAS AND CONCEPTS**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PINOLE, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EXPRESSING DESIRABLE IDEAS AND CONCEPTS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR FUTURE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE APPIAN 80 SHOPPING CENTER RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PINOLE**

**WHEREAS**, the Appian 80 Shopping Center is a commercial shopping center on Tara Hills Drive, near the Appian Way, comprising various parcels, including APN 402-282-002, -006 to -010, -014, -016, -019, -026, -027, and -028; and

**WHEREAS**, the site is located within the Appian Way corridor of the Three Corridors Specific Plan, has a Specific Plan land use/zoning designation of Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) in the Service Sub-Area, and has a High Density Residential Overlay (HDRO); and

**WHEREAS**, a prior redesign and renovation project for the majority of the site proposed by Lowney Architecture and Hillsboro Properties was reviewed and recommended for approval by Planning Commission on May 27, 2020, and approved by City Council on June 16, 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council approved an extension to the project entitlements to June 13, 2023; and

**WHEREAS**, the property owners did not exercise the project entitlements by June 13, 2023, and approval for development of the proposed project lapsed; and

**WHEREAS**, the property owners have not submitted a new application for redevelopment of the site since the project entitlements lapsed; and

**WHEREAS**, numerous tenant spaces are currently vacant on the site, including the anchor tenant space vacated by Safeway in early 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, the current vacancies and the absence of a current development application present an opportunity for the property owners and developers to consider ideas for redevelopment; and

**WHEREAS**, the Pinole Municipal Code establishes that Planning Commission is a seven-member commission appointed by City Council that shall have all the powers and shall perform all the duties conferred and imposed upon city planning commissions by the applicable provisions of the Government Code of the state of California and, in addition, duties and procedures per Pinole Municipal Code (PMC) Section 2.40.030; and

**WHEREAS,** the duties and procedures of the Planning Commission identified in PMC Section 2.40.030, include, but are not limited to work to: a) assist with the preparation, adoption and maintenance of a long-range, General Plan for the physical growth and development of the city and areas related directly to the city [...], b) consider as authorized by state law, requests for the development, rebuilding and redevelopment of areas within the city, and c) serve as an advisory body to the City Council on matters related to the city growth and development and on such other matters as may be requested by the City Council; and

**WHEREAS,** at the Planning Commission meeting on April 14, 2025, the Planning Commission wished to discuss ideas for the Appian 80 Shopping Center and requested placement of an item in a subsequent agenda for discussion; and

**WHEREAS,** at the Planning Commission meeting on April 28, 2025, the Planning Commission discussed ideas and concepts that may provide inspiration for future redevelopment proposals of the Appian 80 Shopping Center; and

**WHEREAS,** the Planning Commission desired to collect the ideas and concepts, as summarized in this resolution under Exhibit A, and transmit them to City Council to provide ideas for envisioning potential redevelopment at the Appian 80 Shopping Center; and

**WHEREAS,** the ideas and concepts presented in this resolution are intended to inspire further design exploration by those considering potential redesign of the shopping center, which the Planning Commission believe can enhance future redevelopment; and

**WHEREAS,** the ideas and concepts are not considered to be specific binding requirements imposed upon development applications, in and of themselves. Any potential application for development or redevelopment would be subject to review under the procedures and requirements in accordance with Local, State, and Federal policies and regulations, including the Pinole Municipal Code, and the findings and requirements for approval established therein; and

**WHEREAS,** the Planning Commission considered all public comments received both before and during the public meeting.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council receive this Resolution with Exhibit A.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Pinole on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August 2025, by the following vote:

- AYES:**
- NOES:**
- ABSTAIN:**
- ABSENT:**

---

Gabriel Sandoval, Chair 2025-2026

ATTEST:

---

David Hanham, Planning Manager

## EXHIBIT A

### DEVELOPMENT IDEAS AND CONCEPTS

#### APPIAN 80 SHOPPING CENTER

The City of Pinole Planning Commission discussed ideas and concepts intended to inspire further design and development exploration by those considering potential redesign of the Appian 80 Shopping Center. The ideas and concepts are summarized below:

1. The site provides opportunities for mixed-use development opportunities that developers should further explore and consider.
2. Development should consider the community's needs. Project design may consider potential for adding housing, businesses, and offices that further the needs of the community.
3. Development should consider the need for an affordable grocery option vacated by the Safeway. Markets should consider the price point and needs of the community in the area, in particular seniors and persons on fixed-incomes.
4. Persons in the neighborhood were able to walk to the grocery store at this location; it can serve as a walking destination and nexus. Residents in the area have an easier time accessing this market location, compared to other markets.
5. The site provides opportunities for mixed-use development. It can become a key destination where people want to be and where a variety of activities are involved. Development should consider a vision for mixed-use development that offers opportunities to create a more walkable environment.
6. The site does not need to remain a strip mall. Consideration in design should be given to walkability, public spaces, green spaces for the community, offices or community spaces, and something new, unique, and vibrant.
7. Development should consider multi-modality and offerings from various forms of transportation, rather than mono-modality.
8. Consideration should be given to design elements that connect different parts of a development, particularly for mixed-use development.
9. Development should consider the views of the water. Multistory developments should consider design orientation that takes advantage of the location's offering of water views.
10. The developer should consider ways to mitigate potential traffic impacts from any housing development, which had been previous concerns regarding potential housing on site.
11. Any housing on site would need to be designed with mitigations to address pollution from the I-80 corridor and roadways.

12. Taller developments should consider mitigation of potential views overlooking other property. Consideration may include heavy landscaping and trees. Projects should include features that reduce potential noise pollution.
13. Projects should include installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging stations.
14. The site could provide for a combination of residential and commercial, like more of a Pinole-oriented version of Santana Row in San Jose comprised of higher density commercial and residential.
15. Consideration may be given to examples in San Jose beyond Santana Row, such as the revitalized downtown and St. James Square, comprising small micro-businesses and community space to serve as a destination location.
16. Consideration should be given to a movement currently found in England where projects involved saving rather than demolishing buildings since it reduced environmental impacts. It is uncertain whether the subject buildings could qualify.
17. Consideration should be given to the opportunities for repurposing buildings with potential for community space, green space, open space and brick and mortar stores. Consideration may be given to ideas that were once proposed to repurpose Hilltop Mall; it may be a potential smaller-scale version of the concepts.
18. The commercial component of development may consider the look and feel of the Veranda Shopping Center in Concord, except for the parking.
19. Consideration should be given to bringing in the type of tenant mixes and restaurants that the city does not have and would bring patrons to Pinole.
20. Consideration should be given to tenants that could be a good fit for Pinole, such as Yard House and Whole Foods, that can add significant sales tax revenue.
21. Development should consider event space for people to have meetings and function space given limited options in the area. Other options may include a co-op for micro-office space to rent space or shared work space, similar to CoBiz in Richmond that offers a multi-space for the community or Kitchen@812 in Pinole that is a small business incubator.
22. For consideration of further developing a concept like Kitchen@812, a potential project could take it a step further and create pop-ups and space where food could be tested and the space could be converted to be used for multiple events.
23. Consideration should be given in exploring opportunities for possible partnership opportunities with the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD), supplemental space with the Senior Center, and housing.