

**CITY OF ANTIOCH  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting  
6:30 p.m.**

**February 5, 2014  
City Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Hinojosa called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. on Wednesday, February 5, 2014, in the City Council Chambers. She stated that all items that can be appealed under 9-5.2509 of the Antioch Municipal Code must be appealed within five (5) working days of the decision. The final appeal date of decisions made at this meeting is 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 18, 2014.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Commissioners Pinto, Miller, Baatrup and Westerman  
Chair Hinojosa and Vice Chair Motts  
Absent: None  
Staff: Senior Planner, Mindy Gentry  
Contract Planner, Cindy Gnos  
Public Works Director, Ron Bernal  
City Attorney, Lynn Tracy Nerland  
Minutes Clerk, Cheryl Hammers

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Senior Planner Gentry thanked Virginia Sanderson for her service on the Planning Commission and Chair Hinojosa presented the sign to Ms. Sanderson. Fellow Commissioners also thanked Ms. Sanderson for her time on the Planning Commission.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. **Approval of Minutes:** January 15, 2014

***On motion by Commissioner Westerman, and seconded by Commissioner Motts, the Planning Commission approved the Minutes of January 15, 2014.***

**AYES:** *Hinojosa, Motts, Pinto, Miller, Baatrup and Westerman*  
**NOES:** *None*  
**ABSTAIN:** *None*  
**ABSENT:** *None*

**END OF CONSENT CALENDAR**

---

**CONTINUED ITEM**

2. AutoZone proposes to amend the General Plan from High Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial and the East Lone Tree Specific Plan from Medium High Density Residential (R<sub>H</sub>) to Community Retail, to rezone the property to Planned Development (PD), and to secure approval of a Final Development Plan, variance, use permit, and design review to develop a 7,928-square-foot AutoZone store. The proposed commercial building is 26 feet in height and would include an 8-foot monument sign with a stone veneer to match the building. The project would also include 22 on-site parking spaces, an 8,274-square-foot loading area, 5,222 square feet of formal landscaping, and 1,443 square feet of sidewalks.

SP Gentry stated that there was a letter received this afternoon which was on the dais.

***On Motion by Commissioner Westerman and seconded by Commissioner Baatrup, the Planning Commission continued this item to February 19, 2014.***

**AYES:** *Hinojosa, Motts, Pinto, Miller, Baatrup and Westerman*  
**NOES:** *None*  
**ABSTAIN:** *None*  
**ABSENT:** *None*

**NEW ITEM**

3. Buchanan Crossings, LLC, is requesting approval of Design Review for portions of the approved Buchanan Crossings shopping center project. Specifically, the applicant is requesting Design Review for Major D as a 17,000 square foot Grocery Outlet, Pad C a 5,500 square foot multi-tenant building, a revised site layout for Pad A, and the corner art feature element. The original shopping center approval included multi-tenant buildings labeled Shops C and Shops D, which the applicant is combining into one building, Major D. The project is located at the northwest corner of Somersville Road and Buchanan Road (APN: 074-080-013).

Contract Planner, Cindy Gnos, provided a summary of the staff report dated January 30, 2014. She indicated that there was a letter on the dais which was received this afternoon from Discovery Builders.

Commissioner Motts clarified with staff that the concern with the stone accents was visual.

In response to Commissioner Pinto wanting clarification on ADA stalls and bicycle parking, CP Gnos said that the building department review insures all ADA requirements are met and that Condition 9 requires that bicycle parking spaces are provided pursuant to Code.

---

SP Gentry said that planning is involved in the process when plans for a building permit are submitted.

In response to Chair Hinojosa's concern that details on parking stalls, bike stalls and shopping cart issues are resolved at a later time, SP responded that parking stalls have to be minimum as required by Code, that ADA parking will be finalized on the building permit submittal and staff will review bike stalls but that it is under the purview of the Commission to look at the shopping cart corrals.

Referencing Condition 5, Chair Hinojosa asked staff why the shopping cart area was not depicted on the site plans to which SP Gentry said that applicant can speak to why that was left out.

In response to Commissioner Pinto asking for an explanation regarding the crosswalk placement, SP Gentry said that they want the crosswalks to be at curb returns with clear visibility for cars.

Commissioner Motts commented that given the Somersville Road widening and the trail system nearby that this location may become a destination for biking and that should be taken into consideration.

In response to Commissioner Pinto's questions to staff about traffic studies, SP Gentry said that the most recent traffic study was done prior to approval as part of CEQA and that concerns with new residential in that area increasing traffic were analyzed in the previous study prior to 2008. She said that traffic studies take into consideration future considerations of build out in the vicinity.

PW Director Bernal said that this is correct and that staff is comfortable with the current design and there will be timing of signals and pedestrian crossings.

In response to Chair Hinojosa's concerns with the stone veneer, the proposed green screen, the trellises and the landscaping, SP Gentry said that there were approved color boards and stone examples on the dais, that she believed there was a maintenance plan to be submitted for staff to review, and that it would be within the purview of the Commission but that the maintenance plan to address irrigation would need to cover the full site.

Chair Hinojosa asked staff about the green screens and the low screen wall wrapping around to which SP Gentry responded that the low wall hides the loading dock and that given the green screens were added after the full submittal package, these plans don't reflect revised elevations.

In response to Chair Hinojosa's questions to staff about alcohol sales, hours of operation, the trash enclosure roof and the art feature, SP Gentry said that grocery stores over 10,000 feet are permitted to sell alcohol as part of the overall use, that the hours of operation are indicated in Conditions 50 and 51 of the previous approval, that the roof over the trash enclosure was not depicted but one is required as well as plumbing to the sanitary sewer, and that Condition 49 required that the art feature be

---

reviewed by the Design Review Board and the Arts and Cultural Foundation. She said that due to budget issues, the City no longer is under contract with the Arts and Cultural Foundation so would probably go to the City Council for approval.

Commissioner Miller asked staff about the importance of the veneer stone and his concern about the traffic backing up on Buchanan and the new signal going in.

SP Gentry responded that CVS had a lot of stone work and staff felt this project should maintain the same level of aesthetics and meet the City's guidelines. PWD Bernal said that the signal on Somersville would be coordinated to get people out of Antioch as smoothly as possible. He also said that there is a project for the Buchanan Road Bypass for four lanes south of this project but that was a few years out.

In response to Commissioner Pinto's concern with the hours of operation and the four proposed drive thrus, SP Gentry said that what was before the Commission tonight was design and CP Gnos stated that the drive thrus were part of the initial approval and would have been addressed at that time.

Commissioner Baatrup clarified with CP Gnos that the conditions of Resolution 2008-81 are applicable to the entire site.

### **OPENED PUBLIC HEARING**

The applicant and project architect David Blair said that it has been a number of years since the project was approved, that they finally have a good tenant and that while he doesn't have a presentation, he is here to talk through items, talk about the elevations and suggested changes. He said that looking at the project and drawings previously approved, each tenant had individual character and that it was the original intent not to copy the CVS building but to do something different to make this building unique. That regarding the stone, it is the intent that the stone be similar to what was originally approved. He said that Grocery Outlet stores their carts inside and that there is short term cart storage in the parking lot. They are happy to comply with the required bicycle parking. He said that Grocery Outlet only sells beer and wine in complete packages, that the beer and wine component is two to three percent of sales and that the floor plan shows the area in the far left corner. Applicant said that the loading dock wall on the north elevation angles out but may appear a little exaggerated.

In response to Commissioner Pinto regarding the Stantec letter, Matt Nohr with the Orosco Group, stated that they did receive Stantec's letter and that they prepared a response. He said that they had a strong response and had deep concerns but that there was clearly a disconnect and that Stantec did not have a clear grasp and lacked understanding or history of the project. He said that they responded to all thirty items to set the record straight and that they were disappointed with the letter. He said that this project has gone through four developers.

Commissioner Pinto said that he thinks when there is major development any and all comments should be accepted and analyzed and he confirmed with CP Gnos that staff is satisfied with comments to Stantec and Ms. Gnos said that they noted what was

already conditions in the previous one and where they differed and that they focused more on building design elements and enhancements visible from the street.

In response to Commissioner Pinto, Mr. Nohr stated that he has an architectural background, that they are looking at aesthetics and building mass, that stone looked appropriate at the base and that the arch usually has a lighter material. He said that CVS had stone going all the way up which lacked proportion and that they are proposing a bottom, middle and top with a far greater level of variation; having multiple elements gives visual interest dependent upon vision and taste.

In response to Chair Hinojosa's question about Stantec's comments being included as conditions of approval, CP Gnos said that staff included conditions of approval from Stantec's letter into the resolution. Mr. Nohr said that their concerns are with items 4, 5, 6 and 7.

In response to Chair Hinojosa, Mr. Nohr said that the roof cover for the trash enclosure would be similar to CVS and that there will be a sound landscaping plan with a maintenance program. Mr. Blair said that the temporary outside shopping cart storage is indicated on the site plan. Mr. Nohr said that the material boards containing two stone options were from original approval in 2008 and that the veneers are appropriate.

In response to Commissioner Baatrup asking applicant's position on conditions 6 and 7, Mr. Nohr said that they have added an additional tower on the south elevation and they don't think it is appropriate to continue the stone veneer all the way around. He said that it was inappropriate to have two mansard roofs which would lose visual interest and what they are proposing is superior.

Commissioner Baatrup commented that he appreciated the current thinking of Grocery Outlet to store carts inside but doesn't feel comfortable that in the future they may use the space inside and put the carts outside and that maybe a condition is needed that there be no outside storage.

Commissioner Motts asked about the theme of the art feature to which Mr. Nohr said the art feature was abstract with free flowing grasses similar to the hillside and natural landscape adjacent to the site. Commissioner Motts said that this might be an opportunity to make some sort of tie in to the East Bay Regional Park District.

### **CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING**

SP Gentry clarified that Resolution 2008-81 in Condition 34 requires that the refuse enclosure have a roof and that Condition 88 requires the project to comply with the Property Maintenance Ordinance; that those two elements are covered in previous conditions. She said that staff was looking thru the conditions of Resolution 2008-88 and that Council in Condition 25 changed the requirements for the art feature to require that the art feature be approved by one staff member, one member of the Design Review Board and one City Council member prior to the issuance of a building permit. She said that the Planning Commission can contemplate recommendation to approve as is, or provide direction to staff and one member of the Planning Commission.

Chair Hinojosa clarified with staff that they would need to nominate someone to approve.

Commissioner Westerman said that with respect to the stone he is happy with how it is proposed with stone part way up and the band a different color. That he doesn't think the towers have to be identical. He said that with respect to the art feature they don't really have an illustration of it and he would need to take a look at it.

Commissioner Motts pointed out that there was a small picture of the art feature on sheet L4.

Commissioner Baatrup said he agrees with Commissioner Westerman, that he is satisfied that the tower element doesn't have to have stone all the way up to the top, and would like to see a couple items in the conditions; that there be only temporary storage of carts in the lot and long term storage be conditioned inside the Grocery Outlet and that the art piece be conditioned that the steel panels would incorporate or reflect a design that reflects the character of the Regional Park District.

Commissioner Pinto asked staff why staff had strong feelings about the stone going all the way up on the columns and the type of plans considered for landscaping given the water situation now to which SP Gentry said that regarding the stone staff was trying to mimic the approvals of 2008 and there is a condition of approval to plant drought tolerate landscaping and be in compliance with WELO, the State adopted ordinance.

In response to Chair Hinojosa questions about the stone veneer, CP Gnos said that the guidelines are not that specific, that they did add a tower element, they do have differing materials but whether it goes all the way up is preference or taste.

Chair Hinojosa expressed concern about the location of the temporary cart storage and it possibly taking away from the landscape features being in direct conflict with the Zoning Code to which Commissioner Baatrup said that he didn't think it is compromising the landscape islands. SP Gentry said that it looks clear but they may want to bring the applicant forward to explain.

### **REOPEN PUBLIC HEARING**

Applicant said that sheet L3 contained an enlarged plan and that the landscape island is not compromised; that there is a paved space adjacent to that island.

### **RECLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Chair Hinojosa said that with respect to the art feature on such a prominent corner, she would appreciate a better depiction of what the art feature will look like and agrees with Commissioner Baatrup that it should reflect the character of the area.

Commissioner Motts said that he can support bringing options for the art feature to staff, one Council member and possibly one member of the Planning Commission, that the

---

site maintenance plan and the trash enclosure cover is already incorporated and that he can support staff's recommendation of the stone façade.

Chair Hinojosa stated that there seems to be a consensus that the art feature should be reviewed by various people to provide options and there would need to be a modified condition requiring long term storage of carts shall be inside the store. She said that she has heard from a couple of people that the veneer go only on the columns and not needing to go all the way up and she really doesn't have a strong opinion on this but she is inclined to say that the veneer half way up as proposed in the alternate elevations looks fine to her. She said that there should be a condition that the roof of the trash enclosure look like the other roof which is the concrete roof tile.

Commissioner Pinto stated that they have not addressed the letter given to them today and asked should they be addressing those.

Chair Hinojosa asked staff will a response be provided to Discovery Builders for review as requested to which SP Gentry said that drainage isn't going to be an issue and that one comment on the second page was glossed over but believes that the conditions will address that issue.

Commissioner Baatrup clarified with staff that tonight does not in any way change those issues Discovery has brought to their attention. He said that the tile roof over the trash enclosure is a pretty substantial amount of materials on a small structure and he is having a hard time seeing how this will add value and change appearance; that he doesn't see a need for a tile roof.

Chair Hinojosa said that it came from the approved site plan to match the original approval for the CVS building and the trash enclosure has tile roofing and that the material board says concrete roof tile.

Commissioner Baatrup thanked her for pointing that out and said he can see that it adds value. He made a motion to approve the design review for the Major Pad D, Pad C, the site plan for A and the art feature with conditions that are included in the staff report adding Condition 13 that the shopping carts long term storage be inside the building and outside cart storage only be temporary storage. Item 13 would be that trash enclosure be designed in a manner consistent with prior CVS approvals, should include tile roofs to be consistent with prior approval and add Condition 14 that the panels in the art project be designated in a manner that fits the character of the location of the project.

CA Nerland pointed out that City Council approval on the design element gave authority to make those decisions to a subcommittee of City Council, Planning Commission and staff so perhaps instead of a condition of approval that the Commission would recommend to that subcommittee that those panels have some reflection.

Commissioner Baatrup said that to insert as a %whereas+that the art project incorporate the regional character of the project for subcommittee consideration.

CA Nerland said that the Planning Commission can appoint a subcommittee member tonight.

CA Nerland clarified the language regarding the art feature on the Resolution would be deleted from the title and the first resolved and then a ~~now~~ therefore may it also be resolved that the Planning Commission recommend that the subcommittee panels reflect+.

Commissioner Baatrup said that on Condition 4 that the first sentence would be deleted and alternative elevations provided tonight would be part of the design review approval.

Commissioner Baatrup added to the motion if outdoor storage not in the design elements that we would expect that any future tenants would have to comply and store carts inside.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2014-03**

***On motion by Commissioner Baatrup and seconded by Commissioner Westerman, the Planning Commission approves the design review approval of Major D, Pad C, site plan for Plan A, and art feature for the Buchanan Crossings shopping center, subject to conditions included in the staff report with changes and modifications as discussed, as follows:***

- ***Additional Condition 13 to say: “Long term storage of shopping carts shall be inside the building and outside cart storage shall only be temporary storage.”***
- ***Additional Condition 14 to say: “The trash enclosure shall be designed in a manner consistent with prior CVS approvals and shall include tile roofs to be consistent with prior approval.”***
- ***Insert as a “whereas”, “that the art project incorporate the regional character of the project for subcommittee consideration..”***
- ***Delete from the title and the first resolved of the Resolution the language regarding the art feature and add a “now therefore” to say “may it also be resolved that the Planning Commission recommend that the subcommittee panels reflect the regional character of the project.”***
- ***The first sentence of Condition 4 be deleted and say “Alternate elevations provided tonight would be part of the design review approval.”***
- ***Additional Condition 15 to say: “If outdoor storage is not in the design elements, any future tenants would have to comply with the indoor storage of carts.”***

**AYES:** *Hinojosa, Motts, Pinto, Miller, Baatrup, and Westerman*  
**NOES:** *None*  
**ABSTAIN:** *None*  
**ABSENT:** *None*

Commissioner Baatrup nominated Commissioner Motts to serve on the subcommittee.



---

**On motion by Commissioner Baatrup and seconded by Commissioner Miller, the Planning Commission appoints Commissioner Motts to serve on the subcommittee.**

**AYES:** *Hinojosa, Motts, Pinto, Miller, Baatrup, and Westerman*  
**NOES:** *None*  
**ABSTAIN:** *None*  
**ABSENT:** *None*

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

SP Gentry said that the next Planning Commission meeting will be February 19<sup>th</sup>.

CA Nerland said that at that meeting or at a subsequent meeting, there will be a briefing on the Brown Act and meeting procedures. She said that it will be put on the 19<sup>th</sup>, but if meeting runs late, can continue to the next hearing.

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Commissioner Motts said that Transplan met on January 16<sup>th</sup>, elected officers and adopted the calendar.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Hinojosa adjourned the Planning Commission at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Cheryl Hammers