

1 recommended approval with the proposed project conditions.

2
3 Commissioner Martinez-Rubin asked if the permanent facility would be located in
4 Pinole.

5
6 Ms. Hersch deferred that question to the applicant as she did not know what sites
7 were being considered for a permanent facility. She did note that it often takes
8 upwards of two years to complete lease negotiations, entitlement, and permit
9 processing for a permanent site.

10
11 **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.**

12
13 PAULA WELLS, Complete Wireless representing AT&T, noted that she is not
14 involved in permanent facility siting, but did note that the permanent facility will be
15 located in the City of Pinole.

16
17 Commissioner Toms asked if the proposed facility would overlap with the existing
18 site at 1106 San Pablo Ave.

19
20 Ms. Wells explained that there would be a slight overlap so that the two facilities
21 would be able to communicate with each other.

22
23 **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

24
25 Commissioner Brooks expressed concern about a two year operation window. He
26 wondered if the permit could allow a one year window for the applicant to operate
27 the facility while a permanent facility is located.

28
29 Commissioner Bender had no issues with the application but was alarmed that the
30 recently approved AT&T telecommunications facility in Hercules was not shown on
31 the project exhibits.

32
33 Commissioner Toms expressed no concerns about the proposed application.
34 However, she recommended that the applicant stealth the permanent facility to
35 blend in with building and consider building mounted equipment. This could include
36 creating a parapet wall and stealthing antennas behind it.

37
38 Commissioner Martinez-Rubin referenced Attachment E and asked staff to explain
39 the different between "Coverage Without" and Coverage With."

40
41 Ms. Hersch explained that the first page shows a star along San Pablo Ave., the
42 second page shows a cellular icon with additional red coverage. The red area
43 represents the expanded signal.

44
45 Ms. Wells responded to Commissioner Brooks concerns and noted that the leasing
46 terms are often lengthy to negotiate and prepare. Sometimes this process can take

1 two years or longer. The property owner expressed interest in making the site
2 available for permanent facilities.

3
4 Ms. Wells indicated that it is not financially feasible to collocate temporary sites.
5 Since the facility is pre-fabricated, it is very cost prohibitive to make modifications.
6

7 PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED.
8

9 MARCIA KALAPUS, spoke to security issues for the proposed facilities. She
10 identified recent criminal activity in the area and asked that the Planning
11 Commission condition the project to better secure the site.
12

13 Ms. Wells explained that AT&T would be willing to install a security fence with slats
14 to screen and secure the facility.
15

16 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.
17

18 MOTION to approve with the following added conditions:
19

- 20 • A 6 ft. chain link fence with vinyl slats to be locked be added to the project to
21 the satisfaction of staff.
22

23 **MOTION: Brooks**

SECONDED: TOMS

APPROVED 7-0

24
25
26 **F. OLD BUSINESS:**
27

28 1. Public Hearing Draft General Plan Update Document Workshop
29

30 Mr. Rhodes presented the memo dated September 13, 2010. He noted that this
31 evening's presentation is a workshop and that letters had been received from
32 property owners and have been included as report attachments, for Steering
33 Committee consideration.
34

35 SCOTT DAVIDSON, PMC CONSULTANTS, presented a Power Point
36 presentation dated September 13, 2010 addressing the Specific Plan. He noted
37 that Pam Johns, PMC Consultants, will present information about the Zoning
38 Code.
39

40 PAM JOHNS, PMC CONSULTANTS, presented a Power Point presentation of
41 the highlights of the Zoning Ordinance and the Subcommittee recommendations
42 for modifications.
43

44 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.
45

46 DEBORAH HAIR, 644 Quinan St., asked for clarification about the maximum

1 height limit with the current code. She understood the maximum height to be 35
2 ft. At some point in the future, she would like to construct a secondary dwelling
3 unit on the property and was unsure if the new code would accommodate this
4 development. She asked if her neighbor was to tear down his building, what
5 would be the maximum height for a new structure. She emphasized that
6 businesses and residents on Quinan St. are diverse and should remain diverse.
7 She opposed the proposed lane narrowing on San Pablo Ave. She suggested
8 that the street closures should be modified during the annual Car Show.
9

10 MONICA SHAW, 1508 San Pablo Ave., indicated that she received special
11 approval through the IRS for ReachWest, a group for parents of adult children
12 with special needs. She asked for confirmation that the requested unit density
13 and related development standards to accommodate the group home had been
14 designated.
15

16 Mr. Rhodes noted that language was to be included to accommodate lower
17 densities for housing that serves the special needs population based on prior
18 Steering Committee direction.
19

20 MARCIA KALAPUS, President of the Pinole Historical Society, she emphasized
21 that the character of Pinole should be preserved to the greatest extent possible.
22 She did support the narrowing of San Pablo Ave. due to increased traffic from
23 Hercules and Tara Hills, and that this would slow down traffic and preserve public
24 safety.
25

26 ERNIE VISCONTI, 2621 Samuel St., identified the Bartels property as Planned
27 Development on the current zoning map. He emphasized that the Samuel St.
28 neighbors are opposed to any development on that property. He also noted that
29 there is a Praxair line on the property and expressed concern in light of the
30 recent PG&E gas line explosion in San Bruno. He noted the proposed restrictions
31 on A-frame signs and asked if local realtors had been consulted about the
32 proposed regulation.
33

34 Mr. Rhodes explained that the restriction applies only to permanent businesses
35 operators at fixed locations which utilize the signs on a regular basis.
36

37 Mr. Visconti asked for clarification about the corporation yard relocation and
38 zoning that can accommodate the use.
39

40 Mr. Rhodes explained that Office Industrial Mixed Use can accommodate a
41 corporation yard. This land is along San Pablo Ave., including the Sugar City
42 property, and properties to the west of that site.
43

44 INGA LUNDEGAARD, 2553 San Pablo Ave., addressed the Steering Committee.
45 She mentioned that she and her husband recently move to Pinole and her
46 husband owns a business in town. She is a planner for Marin County and

1 supported the proposed plans. She asked that additional consideration be made
2 to extend safer bicycle access for westbound bicyclists entering Pinole on San
3 Pablo Avenue. She expressed concern about the possibility of the proposed
4 zoning resulting in a down zoning of their property with fewer allowable uses.
5 Currently, her family resides at the home at 2553 San Pablo Ave., and her
6 husband operates a home-based fine arts business including painting, metal
7 work and leather handling.

8
9 Mr. Rhodes explained that such home-based business uses could be
10 accommodated with a Conditional Use Permit with the proposed zoning.

11
12 KENT MORIARTY, 2699 Samuel St., reiterated Mr. Visconti's concerns about the
13 Planned Development (PD) designation at the Bartels' Property. He supported
14 the lane reduction for San Pablo Ave. and thinks that it will make the corridor
15 safer and more enjoyable.

16
17 NYLE SEABRIGHT, 632 Quinan St., noted the unique character of Quinan St.,
18 as with a mix of residential and commercial uses. He emphasized the need to
19 account for future energy consumption and advocated for alternative energy such
20 as solar, as well as food cultivation on one's property. He is opposed to zero lot
21 lines as it hinders the ability to have a fruit/vegetable garden. He expressed the
22 importance of enabling individuals to grow food in their gardens. He stated that
23 the 50 ft. maximum height proposed for Old Town is out of character for Quinan
24 St. He stated that a 35 ft. maximum height is sufficient for Quinan St. He asked
25 that Quinan St. be preserved in its current state.

26
27 CINDY TREGO, P.O. Box 787 Pinole, CA, a member of the Economic
28 Development & Housing Advisory Committee (EDHAC), explained that Old Town
29 Pinole should be pedestrian friendly. She noted that San Carlos' downtown is
30 small and well done and could be a good example for Pinole. Making Pinole's
31 downtown more pedestrian friendly will increase business in Old Town. She also
32 noted Solano Ave. as an example of an inviting corridor. She commended the
33 Planning Commission for the approval of the Sunnyview complex on San Pablo
34 Ave., and noted that is a benchmark for good in-fill development.

35
36 ANNE MORIARTY, 2699 Samuel St., reiterated what Kent Moriarity stated earlier
37 in the meeting, especially keeping the Bartels property Open Space. She also
38 supported the narrowing of San Pablo Ave. and the addition of bicycle lanes.

39
40 Commissioner Kurrent thanked everyone for their comments. He supported the
41 concerns identified by the Quinan St. property owners. He expressed concern
42 about Opportunity Site 1 in the Pinole Valley Rd. Corridor and a 50 ft. height limit.
43 He suggested reducing the height to 35 ft.

44
45 He noted that the Appian/80 Shopping Center was designated for potential future
46 housing development in the Housing Element.

1
2 Mr. Rhodes noted that there is a high density housing overlay on the site.
3

4 Commissioner Kurrent identified concerns with the zoning tables, especially
5 transitional housing. He thought that the density should be reduced to eight
6 occupants. He noted that this information is referenced in Section 17.62.020.
7

8 Commissioner Kurrent referenced the "Allowable Uses and Entitlements" table.
9 He asked that Caretaker Housing require a Conditional Use Permit in the R
10 "Rural" Zone.
11

12 Ms. Johns explained that caretaker housing is located on properties where the
13 primary use is not residential.
14

15 Commissioner Kurrent noted that transitional housing needs to be changed on
16 the uses table to show as a permitted use in the Office/Industrial Mixed Use
17 zone.
18

19 Commissioner Kurrent identified Bed & Breakfast uses or convenience stores
20 and suggested that these uses be permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the
21 R-1 & R-2 zones.
22

23 Commissioner Toms did not support the idea and identified the proposed change
24 as transitional housing.
25

26 Commissioner Kurrent noted a series of discrepancies of permitted uses
27 including retails uses in the Rural zone.
28

29 Ms. Johns noted that this could very well be an oversight and she would
30 reference previous direction provided by the Steering Committee to affirm past
31 review and modifications.
32

33 Commissioner Bender thanked the citizens of Pinole for volunteering their time
34 and interest and providing input during the review process. He supported the
35 idea of a road narrowing of San Pablo Avenue. He noted the road narrowing
36 completed on Marin Avenue in Albany/North Berkeley as a success.
37

38 Commissioner Bender referenced the private realm Design Guidelines on p. 7.0-
39 22 and noted the Old Town Sub-Area Design Guidelines specifying stucco
40 covered foam acceptable if properly applied. He was not convinced that that
41 requirement was appropriate and did not apply for every project. He suggested
42 that the language should be changed to read "maybe" and not make stucco foam
43 a requirement.
44

45 Commissioner Bender did not support the proposed 50 ft. height limit in Old
46 Town or in the Pinole Valley Rd. Corridor due to potential compatibility concerns.

1
2 Mr. Rhodes mentioned that adjacent architecture and compatibility would be
3 considered during architectural/design review. He noted that the 50 ft. height limit
4 provides flexibility for future development and that that height would not be
5 guaranteed unless design guidelines are also satisfied.
6

7 Nyle Seabright, returned to podium and disagreed with Mr. Rhodes. He stated
8 that Old Town is diverse and should remain so. He suggested that there be
9 alternative property zoning to accommodate taller buildings rather than having
10 one height limit specified for all properties. He feared that this could lead to
11 "McMansionization" of Old Town.
12

13 Commissioner Bender was glad to see Old Town parking standards carrying
14 forward.
15

16 Commissioner Kurrent and Commissioner Toms, expressed similar concerns as
17 Commissioner Bender about the proposed 50 ft. height limit in Old Town.
18

19 Commissioner Toms expressed concern about cottage industry uses in the
20 mixed-use zones. She noted that Ms. Lundegaard's home-based business is
21 light industry. She suggested that zoning matrix and Specific Plan matrix could
22 be confusing to interpret.
23

24 Ms. Rhodes noted that requiring a Conditional Use Permit for minor industrial
25 uses could address potential compatibility or operational concerns.
26

27 Ms. Johns noted that a more straightforward definition to assist property owners
28 and businesses could be utilized.
29

30 Commissioner Martinez-Rubin also expressed concern about the 50 ft. height
31 limit. She thanked everyone for their input.
32

33 Commissioner Brooks noted that Design Review for new construction is brought
34 to the full Planning Commission for review and consideration. He emphasized the
35 need to value and preserve the historical character of Pinole. He also supported
36 reducing the building height limit.
37

38 Commissioner McGoldrick thanked the community for their input and agreed with
39 concerns related to height and preservation. She asked about the bus service
40 illustration shown 3.0-12 which only showed a portion of bus service in the City.
41

42 Mr. Rhodes noted that AC Transit only provides a portion of transit service in
43 Pinole and that it overlaps with Westcat.
44

45 ROB THOMPSON, WESTCAT TRANSIT, affirmed for the Commission that the
46 bus service does indeed overlap. The illustration shows the overlap of service in

1 Pinole.
2

3 Commissioner McGoldrick noted that on p. 9.0-11 previous comments to omit
4 language about Fire Station 73 had not been incorporated.
5

6 Mr. Davidson asked for consensus based on the evening's discussion and
7 provided a summary list.
8

- 9 • Change land use around John St.,
- 10 • Change CMU to RMU on Quinan St.
- 11 • Modify the permitted uses table to show emergency shelter housing to be
12 permitted by right in the OIMU district
- 13 • Update permitted uses for the Rural Zone
- 14 • Revise stucco references in the Old Town Design Realm Guidelines as
15 "maybe" acceptable
- 16 • Clarify the legal requirement for occupancy of group homes
17

18 Mr. Davidson & Ms. Johns recommended making a decision for the height issue
19 at the September 27, 2010 meeting. This would allow the consultant to prepare
20 additional material to help the Commission make an informed decision.
21

22 **MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING UNTIL 11:15 PM.**

23
24 **MOTION: Kurrent**

SECONDED: Bender

APPROVED 7-0

25
26 **G. NEW BUSINESS:**

27
28 None.
29

30 **H. CITY PLANNERS REPORT**

31
32 Mr. Rhodes asked if September 29, 2010 would be acceptable for a possible
33 second meeting, if needed.
34

35 The Commission agreed to the possible meeting date.
36

37 Mr. Rhodes noted that the Duncan Canyon application had been deemed
38 incomplete and that a letter had been sent to the applicant.
39

40 Commissioner Toms noted that there is still no curb cut at 3318 Pinole Valley Rd.
41 and asked that staff review the matter further.
42

43 **I. COMMUNICATIONS**

44
45 **J. NEXT MEETING**

1
2
3
4
5
6

September 27, 2010 at 7:00 P. M.

K. ADJOURNMENT: 11:15 P.M.

Transcribed by: Associate Planner Anne Hersch