

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

5  
6 **September 8, 2025**

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, Martinez, Uch, Vice-Chairperson  
27 Menis, Chairperson Sandoval

28  
29 Commissioners Absent: None

30  
31 Staff Present: David Hanham, Planning Manager  
32 Justin Shiu, Senior Planner

33  
34 **E. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

35  
36 Sheila Grist, reported she attended the Safety and Environmental Justice Element  
37 Workshop at the Pinole Library on August 27, 2025. The workshop had not been well  
38 attended with only two attendees but with a lot of City staff. The PowerPoint presentation  
39 was 33-pages in length and had been presented quickly on Zoom, with little time for notes  
40 and comments since citizens did not have a copy of the presentation. She thanked  
41 Planning Manager David Hanham for posting some information at the library which she  
42 found to be informative, but it would have been nice to have information in a flyer format  
43 during the meeting. She suggested another workshop should be held and be better  
44 advertised to the public including signage posted throughout the City similar to signs used  
45 to advertise Coastal Cleanup. She also suggested the use of banner signage near Pinole  
46 Valley Road and Tennent Avenue near Collins Elementary School.

47  
48 Ms. Grist also suggested the workshop should have been held at the Senior Center where  
49 there was more prep time to set up.  
50

1 Ms. Grist further noted the end of the PowerPoint presentation included adoption  
2 strategies, with a Planning Commission hearing scheduled for September 22, 2025, and  
3 a City Council meeting on October 21, 2025. She asked whether the Planning  
4 Commission was aware of those meetings. She also referenced a flyer that had been  
5 distributed to citizens Citywide, which she recently received but which included no mention  
6 of the recent public workshop.  
7

8 Planning Manager David Hanham advised that he planned to provide an update on the  
9 Safety and Environmental Justice Element Workshop under the City Planner's/  
10 Commissioner's Report section of the agenda.  
11

12 Vice-Chairperson Menis commented that if the timeline for this topic was as mentioned by  
13 the speaker, whether there would be enough time for another public workshop to be held  
14 between now and the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for September 22, 2025.  
15

16 Mr. Hanham suggested there was not enough time for another workshop between now  
17 and the September 22 Planning Commission meeting; however, if the Planning  
18 Commission needed additional time to discuss the topic after the September 22 meeting,  
19 a Special Meeting could be considered.  
20

21 Commissioner Martinez understood there could have been a better way to communicate  
22 with the community about the public workshop. He asked whether information was being  
23 sent to residents via social media platforms, to which Mr. Hanham confirmed the public  
24 workshop had been advertised on the City's social media platforms. He reiterated he  
25 would provide more details under the City Planner's/Commissioner's Report section of the  
26 agenda.  
27

28 **F. MEETING MINUTES**

29  
30 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for August 25, 2025  
31

32 **MOTION** with a Roll Call vote to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for  
33 August 25, 2025, as shown.  
34

35 **MOTION: Menis**

**SECONDED: Sandoval**

**APPROVED: 6-0-1**

**ABSTAIN: Martinez**

36  
37  
38 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**  
39

40 **H. OLD BUSINESS:**

41  
42 1. **Discussion of Redevelopment of Appian 80 Shopping Center – Compiled**  
43 **Ideas Resolution – Revised**  
44

45 Mr. Hanham presented the staff report dated September 8, 2025, and recommended the  
46 Planning Commission review the revised ideas for the redevelopment of the Appian 80  
47 Shopping Center, make any changes and adopt the resolution contained in Attachment A to  
48 the staff report.  
49  
50

1 Responding to questions from the Planning Commission, Mr. Hanham and Senior Planner  
2 Justin Shiu clarified the following:  
3

- 4 • Exhibit A, Development Ideas and Concepts Appian 80 Shopping Center, Mixed  
5 Use Development, No. 2 could be further revised to read: *Development should*  
6 *consider the community's needs and well-being. Project design may consider*  
7 *potential for adding market rate and affordable housing, businesses, and offices*  
8 *that further the needs of the community.* (Martinez)  
9
- 10 • Exhibit A, Design and Development, No. 26 could be revised to read: *Future*  
11 *development of the site should include ground floor retail space of sufficient size*  
12 *to attract a well-known and respected retail grocery such as a Whole Foods; 2) a*  
13 *ground or top floor restaurant space and potential outdoor patio seating with*  
14 *amazing views of sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected destination*  
15 *restaurant and potentially draw corporate-related events; 3) multi-story, multi-*  
16 *family rental apartments or ownership condos; 4) parking sufficient for both*  
17 *housing and retail/restaurants and 5) electric charging stations<sup>2</sup>.* (Martinez)  
18
- 19 • Exhibit A, Design and Development, No. 12, could be revised to read: *Taller*  
20 *developments should consider mitigation of potential views overlooking other*  
21 *property, in particular overlooking residential properties to the west of the site.*  
22 *Consideration may include heavy landscaping and trees. Projects should include*  
23 *features that reduce potential noise pollution and light pollution as light pollution*  
24 *has effects on the circadian rhythm and sleep which ultimately effects our*  
25 *residents' health, including speed disorders, mental health, obesity and cardio*  
26 *vascular health.* Staff also acknowledged concerns with tall signage that could  
27 have effects on light pollution. (Huey)  
28
- 29 • Clarified light pollution would be addressed as part of the California Environmental  
30 Quality Act (CEQA) process and acknowledged concern whether light pollution  
31 could be called out beyond standard processes but it could be a factor in the design  
32 of new signage. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
33
- 34 • Acknowledged billboard or parking lot signage could also have light pollution  
35 effects. (Chairperson Sandoval)  
36
- 37 • Acknowledged concern that Exhibit A, Design and Development No. 26 and  
38 Markets and Commercial Opportunities No. 28, as written, may be in conflict with  
39 one another. Clarified those were ideas being recommended from the Planning  
40 Commission to the City Council and developer to consider. It was up to the  
41 Planning Commission to consider whether to weigh one bullet point more than  
42 another and determine which one a developer may find more suitable for future  
43 development in terms of attracting a tenant to the site. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)  
44
- 45 • Exhibit A, Mixed Use Development, acknowledged a recommendation to  
46 condense Nos. 1 and 5, as written, and possibly strike the first two sentences of  
47 No. 5 to now read: *Development should consider a vision for mixed-use*  
48 *development that offers opportunities to create a more walkable environment.*  
49 (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

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

- Exhibit A, Mixed Use Development, Nos. 1 and 5, acknowledged a preference for mixed use for a CoBiz or WeWork type of space and open green space for families with entertainment, and with mental health balanced by open green spaces to allow families to enjoy without having to pay for an experience. (Lam-Julian)
- Acknowledged the concern Pinole was lacking spaces to congregate and build community with the downtown having few places to sit and there needed to be a better understanding of the older population who may walk to a grocery store, as an example, and having that outdoor green space while not necessarily designated for families, was important. (Lam-Julian)
- Exhibit A, Mixed Use Development, acknowledged a recommendation to further amend No. 5 to read: *It can become a key destination where people want to be and where a variety of activities are involved including green space. Development should consider a vision for mixed-use development that offers opportunities to create a more walkable shared community environment.* (Martinez)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, acknowledged a recommendation to further revise No. 11 to read: *Any housing on site would need to be designed with mitigations to address the noise, vehicle, exhaust, pollution and light pollution from the I-80 corridor and roadways such as landscape buffers.* (Bender)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, acknowledged a recommendation to further revise No. 12 to read: *Taller developments should consider mitigation of potential views overlooking other property, in particular overlooking residential properties to the west of the site. Consideration may include heavy landscaping and trees.* (Bender)
- Exhibit A, acknowledged a recommendation to make a distinction between vehicle noise, exhaust and light pollution creeping in, with staff confirming neon lighting was not allowed in Pinole. (Bender)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, acknowledged concern that No. 16 conflicted with No. 6 and while No. 16 included a footnote, acknowledged the need to clarify a movement in England where when projects were assessed where the existing structures were demolished there was attention to the carbon component and how that added to the carbon footprint of a project, although the subject buildings in this case may not be worth preserving and were a strip mall built in the 1950s and 1960s with no public amenity space. Acknowledged a preference not to preserve the existing buildings. (Bender)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, No. 27, acknowledged agreement with the statement in principle, although a developer looking at the site would entertain providing a parking structure, such as ground floor parking for a residential multifamily building, with the benefits of that approach being reduced surface parking and allowing for more housing development and more public/private amenity spaces, all with the knowledge that the status of retail would be unknown. (Bender)

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

- Exhibit A, Design and Development, No. 17, acknowledged concern it had already been discussed under No. 6 and a recommendation it be stricken in its entirety. (Bender)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, acknowledged a recommendation to further revise No. 26 to read: *Future development of the site should include ground floor retail space of sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected retail grocery such as a Whole Foods; 2) a ground or top floor residential space and potential outdoor patio seating with amazing views of sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected destination restaurant and potentially draw corporate-related and public events; 3) multi-story, multi-family rental apartments or ownership condos; 4) parking sufficient for both housing and retail/restaurants and 5) electric charging stations<sup>2</sup>.* (Uch)
- Exhibit A, Design and Development, acknowledged a recommendation the footnote for No. 27. be further revised to read: *Parking examples include Center Street in downtown Berkeley, and community benefit examples in parking design include coffee shop, bicycle parking, and bicycle stops.* (Uch)
- Clarified the information in Exhibit A to be presented to the City Council either in a format with numbers or bullet points, and the numbering currently shown in the document would be renumbered since the information had been shown as it had for the Planning Commission for tracking purposes. (Chairperson Sandoval)
- Acknowledged a recommendation to add another policy recommendation for City Council consideration to consider a vacancy fee, specific to commercial properties, which would be another incentive to get some sort of development on the site and could be structured in such a way that once an application or pre-application process started, the fee would not start to be accumulated and only be considered after a specific amount of time the property had been completely vacant. (Chairperson Sandoval)
- Acknowledged a recommendation if the City were to create a commercial vacancy fee it be general in nature rather than targeted to the subject site even if the subject site would be the most affected. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)
- Acknowledged Safeway initially preferred to renovate the space, although the cost to do so would have been excessive relative to the potential profit. Clarified the space was usable for a grocery tenant and was comprised of 65,000 square feet for the former Safeway and around 30,000 square feet for the former CVS. The site could be used as a grocery store or a retail establishment, subject to updates pursuant to current codes and other design considerations, which would require City review from a Building Department standpoint. Depending on who and what was developed, the former Safeway building would be reviewed to ensure it could hold whatever was proposed and would involve an inspection process. (Vice-Chairperson Menis)

- 1 • Acknowledged a recommendation to consolidate Design and Development Nos. 6  
2 and 17, and Mixed-Use Development No. 5, and streamline the points together.  
3 (Lam-Julian)  
4
- 5 • Exhibit A, Design and Development No. 16, acknowledged the need to be  
6 cognizant of many development projects in the country struggling due to rising  
7 costs of building materials, interest rates and other factors and if the subject  
8 property was at end of life, allowing the developer the flexibility to reimagine its use  
9 was important. (Martinez)  
10
- 11 • Acknowledged lenders played an important role in development and if structural  
12 upgrades were required it could be expensive, particularly when building codes  
13 were revised after a significant earthquake event. Acknowledged the preference  
14 that the property not be preserved, with Design and Development No. 16 to be  
15 stricken from Exhibit A. (Bender)  
16

#### 17 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

18  
19 Sheila Grist, was uncertain a grocery store had expressed interest in the site and whether  
20 there was interest in redevelopment or the demolition of the property. She questioned  
21 how far the City was in this process. As a 66-year resident of Pinole, she had knowledge  
22 of the property, with Safeway and Longs having been at the site for years. She understood  
23 Safeway had added 10 to 20 feet at the front of the store at one point and there had been  
24 a fair at the site for years. She expressed the willingness to discuss the history of the  
25 property with the Planning Commission.  
26

#### 27 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

28  
29 Commissioner Huey referenced Exhibit A, Markets and Commercial Opportunities, No. 3,  
30 which currently read: *Development should consider the need for an affordable grocery*  
31 *option vacated by the Safeway. Markets and should consider the price point and needs of*  
32 *the community in the area, in particular seniors and persons on fixed-incomes.* She  
33 commented that the Planning Commission had discussed examples of affordable grocery  
34 options and it had been included in the footnotes as shown. She noted there were some  
35 common denominators for ethnic markets such as H-Mart, Las Montañas and Whole  
36 Foods and possibly the City could expand on that in this section offering an example of  
37 the types of stores desired for Pinole.  
38

39 Chairperson Sandoval was open to the recommendation.  
40

41 Vice-Chairperson Menis asked if that would require amendment to Exhibit A, Markets and  
42 Commercial Opportunities No. 28.  
43

44 Commissioner Huey was open to combining Exhibit A, Markets and Commercial  
45 Opportunities, Nos. 3 and 28.  
46

47 Commissioner Martinez stated using Whole Foods as an example, the grocery chain offered  
48 better and healthier food choices. Whole Foods also provided prepared foods that would  
49 drive higher taxes than some food items that were not taxed.

1 Whole Foods had a lot of revenue on prepared foods and that sales tax could assist with the  
2 City's overall budget, and while Commissioner Martinez liked the examples of the other  
3 ethnic chain stores, as earlier referenced which offered a mixture of the community, he liked  
4 the language shown in the section under discussion.  
5

6 Vice-Chairperson Menis commented there could be both ethnic markets and prepared foods.  
7 He referenced Vik's Market located in the City of Berkeley as an excellent example. He liked  
8 the idea of having prepared foods being available that could increase the City's sales tax  
9 base, which was worth considering.  
10

11 At this time the Planning Commission further debated and discussed the verbiage contained  
12 in Exhibit A, Development Ideas and Concepts Appian 80 Shopping Center at length and  
13 there was consensus to make the following revisions:  
14

- 15 • Mixed Use Development, No. 2 revised to read: *Development should consider the*  
16 *community's needs and well-being. Project design may consider potential for*  
17 *adding market rate/affordable housing, businesses, and offices that further the*  
18 *needs of the community.*  
19
- 20 • Eliminate Design and Development No. 16.  
21
- 22 • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, No. 28. revised to read: *Development*  
23 *should consider adding a unique grocery option or ethnic grocery store option,*  
24 *which includes a significant portion of prepared foods that could be well-positioned*  
25 *in the Pinole market<sup>5</sup>.*  
26
- 27 • Design and Development, No. 26 revised to read: *Future development of the site*  
28 *should include ground floor retail space of sufficient size to attract a well-known*  
29 *and respected retail grocery such as a Whole Foods; 2) a ground or top floor*  
30 *restaurant space and potential outdoor patio seating with amazing views of*  
31 *sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected destination restaurant and*  
32 *potentially draw corporate-related events; 3) multi-story, multi-family rental*  
33 *apartments or ownership condos; 4) parking sufficient for both housing and*  
34 *retail/restaurants and 5) electric charging stations<sup>2</sup>.*  
35
- 36 • Design and Development No. 12, revised to read: *Taller developments should come*  
37 *up with mitigating measures to protect the residents' privacy. Consideration may*  
38 *include heavy landscaping and trees. Projects should include features that reduce*  
39 *potential noise pollution.*  
40
- 41 • Design and Development No. 11, revised to read: *Any housing on site would need*  
42 *to be designed with mitigations to address noise, vehicle, light pollution and pollution*  
43 *from the I-80 corridor and roadways and include landscape buffers.*  
44
- 45 • Eliminate Design and Development No. 17.  
46  
47  
48

- Mixed Use Development, No. 5 and Design and Development No. 6 to be combined and revised to read: *The site does not need to remain a strip mall. It can become a key destination where people want to be and where a variety of activities are involved. Such as, walkability, public spaces, green spaces for the community, offices or community spaces, and something new, unique, and vibrant.*
- Access and Transportation, No. 7 revised to read: *Development should consider multi-modality and offerings from various forms of transportation, rather than mono-modality. Encourage public transit use at the future site.*

Given the number of changes that had been recommended, Mr. Hanham requested the Planning Commission again go over Exhibit A page-by-page to determine consensus on each item and clarify any changes, with the items to be renumbered in the final version.

At this time, staff and the Planning Commission walked through Exhibit A, page-by-page with consensus for the following revisions:

- Mixed Use Development No. 1, the statement in the footnote as shown with the spelling of Santa Row to be corrected to read *Santana Row*.
- Mixed Use Development, No. 2 to read: *Development should consider the community's needs and well-being. Project design may consider potential for adding market rate/affordable housing, businesses, and offices that further the needs of the community.*
- Mixed Use Development, No. 5 to be merged into Design and Development No. 6 to read: *The site does not need to remain a strip mall. It can become a key destination where people want to be and where a variety of activities are involved. Considerations in design should be given to walkability, public spaces, green spaces or offices or community spaces, and having something new, unique, and vibrant.*
- Design and Development Nos. 8, 9 and 10, no changes recommended.
- Design and Development No. 11, to read: *Any housing on site would need to be designed with mitigations to address light, air, and noise pollution from the I-80 corridor and roadways and include landscape buffers.*
- Design and Development No. 12, to read: *Taller developments should consider mitigation of potential views overlooking other property, in particular overlooking residential properties to the west of the site. Consideration may include heavy landscaping and trees.*
- Design and Development No. 26, to read: *Future development of the site should include ground floor retail space of sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected retail grocery such as a Whole Foods; 2) a ground or top floor restaurant space and potential outdoor patio seating with amazing views of sufficient size to attract a well-known and respected destination restaurant and potentially draw nonprofit, public, and corporate-related events; 3) multi-story, multi-family rental*

1           apartments or ownership condos; 4) parking sufficient for both housing and  
2           retail/restaurants and 5) electric charging stations<sup>2</sup>.

- 3
- 4           • Design and Development No. 27, revise footnote 3 to read: *Parking examples*  
5           *include the Center Street parking structure in downtown Berkeley, and community*  
6           *benefit examples in parking design include coffee shop, bicycle parking and bicycle*  
7           *stops.*
- 8
- 9           • Eliminate Design and Development No. 16 and Footnote 4, and eliminate No. 17.
- 10
- 11          • Access and Transportation, No. 4, no change recommended.
- 12
- 13          • Access and Transportation No. 7, add a sentence at the end of the statement to  
14          read: *Encourage public transit use at the future site.*
- 15
- 16          • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, No. 3, no change recommended.
- 17
- 18          • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, No. 28, to read: *Development should*  
19          *consider adding an affordable, healthy and culturally relevant grocery store option*  
20          *that could be well-positioned in the Pinole market<sup>5</sup>.*
- 21
- 22          • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, No. 19, to read: *Consideration should be*  
23          *given to bringing in the type of tenant mixes and restaurants that the city does not*  
24          *have and that would bring patrons to Pinole, would be a good fit for Pinole, and*  
25          *would add significant sales tax revenue<sup>6</sup>.*
- 26
- 27          • Markets and Commercial Opportunities, Nos. 21 and 29, no changes recommended.
- 28
- 29          • Community Enhancement and Partnerships, Nos. 23, 24 and 25, no changes  
30          recommended.
- 31
- 32          • Add an additional bullet point for the City Council to consider a Citywide commercial  
33          land vacancy fee.
- 34

35           Mr. Hanham recommended the Planning Commission continue the item to the next Planning  
36           Commission meeting given the substantial revisions made to Exhibit A, with the changes to  
37           be brought back for formal adoption at the next meeting.

38

39           **MOTION** to continue Resolution 25-08 with Exhibit A, Development Ideas and Concepts, as  
40           revised, to the next regular Planning Commission meeting.

41

42           **MOTION:        Menis                    SECONDED: Bender                    APPROVED: 7-0**

43

44           **I.        NEW BUSINESS: None**

45

46           **J.        CITY PLANNER’S/COMMISSIONER’S REPORT**

47

48           Mr. Hanham provided the following updates:

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

- A virtual public workshop had been held on August 27, 2025 for the Safety and Environmental Justice Element at the Pinole Library. The workshop had been advertised through all of the City’s social media platforms. The Planning Commission would review the Safety and Environmental Justice Element at its next regular meeting scheduled for September 22, 2025, and Special Meetings of the Planning Commission may be considered, as needed.
- The Planning Commission was due to meet once during the months of October, November and December, but again Special Meetings may be scheduled, as needed.
- A workshop was being considered for the first or second week of October for the Parklet Program, date to be determined.
- Staff continued to work on the Objective Development Design Standards (ODDS) and hoped to have something for Planning Commission consideration in the next 60 to 90 days.
- Staff continued to process Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Senate Bill (SB) 9 projects.
- Staff continued to work with the developers for Pinole Vista and Appian 80 Shopping Center to learn of the status of any development.
- Appian Village was moving forward with staff working on the Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD).

Commissioner Lam-Julian asked about the status of the Community Engagement Subcommittee and noted a list of ideas had been discussed and previously forwarded to staff.

Mr. Hanham advised he would have to meet with the members of the Community Engagement Subcommittee to schedule a meeting. He would have to go back and review the submitted information and move forward from there.

Chairperson Sandoval asked when Blackstone purchased Pinole Vista, and Mr. Hanham advised that Blackstone purchased the property 60 to 90 days ago but ROIC remained the owner of the rest of the Pinole Vista/Target Shopping Center.

Commissioner Bender reported the Brandt Court historic house that was to be relocated from the City of Hercules to property in Pinole had disappeared and the property had been for sale for some time.

Vice-Chairperson Menis reported a senior food distribution would be held on September 9, 2025 at the Senior Center as reported in the Pinole Pulse, with the food distribution to occur the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, and while the exact dates had not been identified as they had in the past, one could double check the information on the City website.

1 Mr. Hanham asked the Planning Commission to advise staff of any vacations and availability  
2 in the event a Special Meeting was needed to be scheduled in the next few months. He  
3 reported he would be out of town September 27 through October 1, 2025.  
4

5 **K. COMMUNICATIONS**  
6

7 Vice-Chairperson Menis reported on is ex-parté communications to his email list about the  
8 topic on the meeting agenda. He also had a brief conversation with Council member Murphy  
9 during the recent Pinole Art Walk.

10  
11 **PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED**  
12

13 Anthony Vossbrink, commented he missed the discussion about the Appian 80 Shopping  
14 Center and understood he could provide his comments now or at the next Planning  
15 Commission meeting.  
16

17 Chairperson Sandoval confirmed the item had been continued to the next meeting of the  
18 Planning Commission.  
19

20 Mr. Hanham advised the speaker could provide written comments to staff prior to the next  
21 Planning Commission meeting or the Planning Commission may allow the speaker to speak  
22 to the item at this time.  
23

24 Chairperson Sandoval suggested the speaker provide his comments at the next Planning  
25 Commission meeting or comments may be provided to staff in writing.  
26

27 Mr. Vossbrink otherwise asked the status of the following: Faria House, property wedged  
28 between the Senior Center parking lot and an adjacent parking lot, property on Pinole Valley  
29 Road, behind 7-Eleven and adjacent strip mall, and why there had been a delay in the  
30 opening of Diosa Restaurant. He also asked about the status of the old vacant Pinole Creek  
31 Café which was an eyesore and a public health safety issue as repeatedly reported to the  
32 City staff, with an old dead tree in the front yard and old tree on top of the roof, and suggested  
33 the property owner should be taxed. He expressed concern with the lack of action by the  
34 City given the potential safety, health and fire hazards to the community. In addition, he  
35 questioned the piecemeal maintenance approach by Caltrans of the City's on- and off-ramps,  
36 and not addressing large potholes below the Jack and the Box on-ramp. These issues had  
37 been brought to the attention of the City Manager. Also, there remained light outages on the  
38 I-80 overpass on both sides of the freeway with the lights inoperable for over six months.  
39

40 **PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED**  
41

42 Mr. Hanham clarified some of the issues involved the Public Works Department. He was  
43 unsure of the schedule for Caltrans, Diosa Restaurant had its business license and alcohol  
44 permits and was doing mostly catered events but was open for business; and the Faria  
45 House and another vacant City property were currently for sale. He was also unaware of the  
46 status of the Old Pinole Creek Café, and understood the City was in contact with BCRE (the  
47 project behind 7-Eleven) and had learned the developer had other projects taking priority at  
48 this time.  
49  
50

1 Mr. Shiu reported the Code Enforcement Officer had made contact with the property owner  
2 of the old Pinole Creek Café property.

3  
4 Commissioner Bender reported he had filed a complaint with code enforcement regarding  
5 the old Pinole Creek Café and a case had been opened.

6  
7 Commissioner Martinez asked for a call out to DeNova Homes regarding the fencing on the  
8 property that had recently been down from the stop light all the way to the northern part of  
9 the project site, and while he understood the fence was now up, it was a security and safety  
10 concern given the close proximity to a nearby middle school.

11  
12 **L. NEXT MEETING**

13  
14 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting on September 22, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.

15  
16 **M. ADJOURNMENT: 9:33 p.m.**

17  
18 Transcribed by: Sherri D. Lewis  
19  
20 City Staff  
21 Transcriber