

Senior Planner Morris provided a summary of the Staff Report dated February 20, 2009.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING AND WITH NO COMMENTS TAKEN, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-05

On motion by Commissioner Brandt, and seconded by Commissioner Manuel, the Planning Commission recommended approval of amendments to the General Plan Growth Management Element to comply with the requirements of Measure J.

AYES: Brandt, Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Manuel and Azevedo

ABSENT: Travers

Commissioner Travers arrived at 7:36 p.m.

- 3. The City of Antioch requests that the Planning Commission hold a Public Hearing to consider the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan. In addition, amendments to the City's General Plan and Zoning Designations will also be considered to ensure consistency with the Specific Plan. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) has been completed for the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan, and corresponding General Plan and Zoning amendments. The project area consists of approximately 375 acres bounded by Hillcrest Avenue on the west, Highway 4 on the south, Highway 160 on the east and Oakley Road on the north.**

Deputy Director Economic Development (DDED) Carniglia clarified that this item would not be a study session, but rather a Public Hearing, as noted in the amended Staff Report, as distributed. He then proceeded to provide a summary of the Staff Report dated February 23, 2009.

City Consultant Leslie Gould stated that any comments regarding the Draft EIR need to be submitted in writing and that tonight was not a hearing to take oral comments on the Draft EIR. She provided a Power Point Presentation pertaining to the Ridership Development Plan.

City Attorney Nerland clarified that in response to any comments, all formal comments are required to be submitted in writing to the City, before any type of formal action is formally presented for action.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Armando Zardona, resident, stated that he looked forward to working with the City's local hiring strategies.

Commissioner Manuel questioned Chapter 2, Page 2-6, in terms of notifying the public when a decision is made and/or the next steps which would be taken. DDED Carniglia stated that it would make sense to have a reference point within this section as to the implementation and have some type of continuity for the public. He noted it would be added.

Commissioner Brandt expressed concern to Chapter 3, in terms of the proposed changes, as to related setbacks and landscape buffers. She did not doubt that this particular piece of land was challenged in many ways with the aesthetics that surround it, but felt it was critical to the success of what is trying to be created in this area, to maintain the setbacks and landscape buffers. She stated that she was disappointed and discouraged to see that the 25 foot setbacks were reduced from 0 to 15 feet and so many other particular areas changed to reflect the same. She understood from the Staff Report, that flexibility was to be provided, but did not see that there was flexibility in changing the setbacks 25 to 0 feet. She felt this eliminated flexibility, in terms of the positive for the City and the surrounding area. Commissioner Brandt also spoke to past community involvement, and if the City was going to ask for community engagement it made no sense to wipe out the setbacks within the text.

In responding to Commissioner Brandt, DDED Carniglia stated there was a balance between the economic and development viability of the site and internal discussions were still ongoing. He felt the best way to approach this issue was to bring this back at the meeting of March 18, 2009. At the next meeting he would, within the Staff Report, physically mark the sections that were being changed, identify those changes and provide a report for further discussion.

Commissioner Brandt further wanted to express her concern to the setbacks, in terms of the width of the trail and the planting strips going from 25 to 15 feet, as well as the trail going from 12 to 8 feet. She felt comfortable with an 8 foot trail, but when landscaping is added on either side of any 8 foot trail, the trail will work its way down to a 5 foot trail which would make it difficult for any individual to walk in any other manner but in a single file line. She felt if the width of the trail could be preserved, including the landscaping, she felt that it would be beneficial for bicyclists and pedestrians.

In terms of the pathways being proposed at 8 to 12 feet, Commissioner Brandt felt that in conjunction with the setback from the building being proposed at 0 to 10 feet, she wanted to ensure that as much of the setback is preserved as necessary. She also questioned why sidewalks were eliminated in particular areas, such as adjacent to PG&E in Chapter 4, page 4-16, and felt that walking within the dirt area would be difficult. Also, if parking is allowed within this area, then an individual should have space to exit their vehicle. DDED Carniglia

explained the landscaping buffered area that would be allowed by PG&E, wherein Commission Brandt stated that if this were to be allowed she wanted to see flexibility in this area to preserve landscape easements.

In speaking to setbacks between buildings, Commissioner Brandt felt that it was important regarding how wide the setback would be, and that it was important to preserve windows along the freeway area.

Chairman Azevedo expressed concern to reducing any setback, in terms of setting an expectation in the early planning stages of this project that would establish a setback at 0 to 15, and wanted to place some type of flexibility within the text. DDED Carniglia added that an explanation could be provided to articulate this issue. City Consultant Gould interjected that the plan within Page 4-12 provided discretion to consider different setbacks and landscaping requirements to meet special conditions. Furthermore, she could aide in writing the piece to provide flexibility for the setback concerns of the Commission. Chairman Azevedo wanted the setbacks to clearly state a 25 to 15 foot setback and wanted the case explained clearly as to why it would be at 15.

Commissioner Brandt stated that in terms of setbacks, she wanted to clarify that it not be reduced to a 0 setback, and felt the character of this development was critical for the City.

Chris Schildt, Trans Form, spoke to setbacks and encouraged the Commission to speak to the City of Pittsburgh's Planner regarding this issue. She stated that the City of Pittsburgh reduced some of their setbacks to 0' and felt that the wide sidewalks, and not the landscaped buffers, were more of an asset. Also, other cities have done this also and it has become a benefit to other cities, in terms of walk-able benefits. City Consultant Gould interjected that landscaped buffers were an asset to residential areas, and not so much commercial areas, in terms of providing privacy.

DDED Carniglia explained the aspects of Chapters 5.

Commissioner Manuel asked about any type of mitigations that would be considered relative to the communities that exist adjacent to the proposed development and questioned if it would be relevant within the EIR because of the impacts to the adjacent communities. DDED Carniglia explained the plan, as it related to this issue presently, and spoke to traffic impacts, circulation patterns, noise and other related issues.

Commissioner Manuel felt that there would be significant differences within the circulation based on the preferred plan and this would include the inclusion of Phillips Lane. He felt that if this is included, assumptions could be calculated on car trips and could be adjusted and prepared within the text of the documents. DDED Carniglia stated that the plan had language contained within it that if the

Phillips Interchange is not built, that the development located at the eastern portion of the development would need to be revised. He felt the plan took into account the streamlining of the benefits of the Phillips Lane Interchange.

DDED Carniglia explained the aspects of Chapters 6 and 7.

Raul De Anda, resident, stated that the City of Richmond used 20% of specific funding that went to local hiring and encouraged Antioch to use this strategy also. He also suggested that some type of training be provided to local residents, wherein the residents would then spend their earnings on local businesses.

DDED Carniglia requested that the Commission leave the Public Hearing open and stated that he would provide further explanations regarding setbacks at the next meeting. Furthermore, the comment period for the Draft EIR would be left open and that he would compile any comments that are received and provide feedback, if warranted, to the Commission. This information will all be included in the Staff Report at the Planning Commission's March 18 meeting.

THE PUBLIC HEARING REMAINED OPEN AND WAS CONTINUED TO MARCH 18, 2009.

4. AR-07-26 – Cal American requests approval of exterior building improvements to the existing Raley's Shopping Center located at 3612 – 3714 Lone Tree Way (APN 071-181-031 and 071-181-028).

Community Development Technician (CDT) Stahl provided a summary of the Staff Report dated March 3, 2009. She noted that additional information was distributed to the Commission regarding the color schematics.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Fritz Lamb, applicant, provided a brief history of the project and requested project Specific Conditions Nos. 25, 26, 27 and 28 be removed, due to the fact that he was not involved in the landscaping details. He also requested that Project Specific Condition Nos. 12, 16 and 17 be removed. He felt that in the replacement of the alligatored asphalt within the parking lot, some curbs would also be replaced to satisfy the aforementioned conditions. Mr. Lamb stated that he wanted to keep costs down, due to hard economic times, and did not want to pass any unnecessary costs onto the existing tenants. He stated that he agreed to all other Conditions of Approval.

In regards to Project Specific Condition No. 12, Commissioner Johnson questioned its removal. CDT Stahl explained that the concrete issues would fall into the category of Code Enforcement issues and if they are not repaired, a citation will be issued. Furthermore, there is currently an open Code Enforcement action against the shopping center, in terms of property

maintenance. In regards to the landscaping issues, CDT Stahl stated that Project Specific Condition Nos. 25, 26, 27 and 28 was included in the original 2006 Staff Report and should not have been included within this Staff Report, due to the fact that the applicant does not wish to address the landscaping issues.

Per Commissioner Brandt, Mr. Lamb stated that he was in the process of collecting bids for the slurry seal and asphalt issues. Per Condition 16, in doing the asphalt parking lot replacement, he stated that the broken and uplifted curbs on site will be dealt with through this process. Mr. Lamb stated that he did not have an issue with repairing the broken sidewalks on site, but wanted to omit the replacement of sidewalks along Lone Tree Way.

Per Commissioner Brandt, Mr. Lamb spoke to the color scheme and the proposed stone. For the record, CDT Stahl noted that a color scheme rendering was distributed to Commission for review.

Per Commissioner Brandt, City Attorney Nerland stated that it was in the best interests of the City and for the safety of the patrons of the shopping center, that public safety is upheld, in terms of the broken and uplifted curbs and sidewalks.

Regarding Condition No. 31, through discussion there was a consensus to add the wording ~~%approximately+~~ before the measurements ~~%21 x 34+~~, and add after the words ~~%as approved by Staff+~~

Commissioner Brandt stated her approval of the remodel modifications.

Commissioner Brandt spoke to Project Specific Condition No. 36, and through discussions, there was a consensus to remove the last sentence ~~%The wall shall be painted to match the existing buildings.+~~

Commissioner Manuel expressed concern to large columns, per Project Specific Condition No. 31, in terms of safety issues.

Commissioner Langford requested that per Project Specific Condition No. 14, that the wording ~~%slurry seal+~~ replace the wording ~~%asphalt concrete.+~~ In regards to Project Specific Condition No. 31, he requested that the columns be maintained at a width of at least 3 tiles wide on the front and 2 feet deep. Per Commissioner Langford, Mr. Lamb spoke to the shopping cart wall and stated that it would consist of a footing with a cinder block wall that would consist of stucco to match the face of the building. The shopping cart area wall would consist of a painted cinder block with a metal bar.

Commissioner Langford stated that he did not want any grout line along the columns, and felt that this would create additional maintenance costs. Between the stucco and the slate, he suggested that the applicant use an alternative

method such as a water table mold or wainscot. He felt this would break up the aesthetics of the columns and be a benefit, in terms of maintenance and long term wear-ability.

Commissioner Manuel expressed concern to the landscaping along Lone Tree Way, wherein Mr. Lamb stated that the property landlord was currently addressing this issue.

Chairman Azevedo took comfort with the applicant's responses, but stated that he would like to see the stone cap placed on the columns. He expressed his disappointment that Project Specific Condition Nos. 26, 27 and 28 would be removed, stating that he was concerned regarding the medians that had chipped and broken concrete.

Per a discussion between Commissioner Langford and Mr. Lamb, it was determined that regarding Project Specific Condition No. 36, the word "repaired" would be replaced with the word "replaced".

Commissioner Langford spoke to the gates, in terms of materials and time of opening and closing, and he stated that he did not want to see a chain link material placed on this gate.

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-06

On motion by Commissioner Langford, and seconded by Commissioner Westerman, the Planning Commission approved a remodel of the Raleys Shopping Center (AR-09-26), with the following changes:

- ***Project Specific Condition No. 14, changing the wording "asphalt concrete" to "slurry seal".***
- ***Change the wording of Project Specific Condition No. 25 to read: All chipped or broken curbs will be repaired in the medians located throughout the site.***
- ***"Delete" Project Specific Condition Nos. 26 through 28.***
- ***Project Specific Condition No. 31, changing the measurements of the columns changed to read approximately "24 x 36".***
- ***Project Specific Condition No. 36 be changed to read: "That the masonry wall surrounding the site be replaced as approved by staff."***
- ***Add a Project Specific Condition No. 39 to read: "That the gates shall be approved and reviewed by staff and the material used will be something other than chain link."***
- ***Add a Project Specific Condition No. 40 to read: "That a decorative concrete masonry pre-cast cap shall be added to all columns, with the color scheme and design to be approved by staff."***

AYES: *Langford, Westerman, Johnson, Brandt, Travers, Manual and Azevedo*

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

DDCD Wehrmeister stated that the proposed project BG Market was tabled by the City Council.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Nothing was reported.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Manuel reported that the Housing Subcommittee met and reviewed Sections 1 through 4 and will review Section 5 in the near future. A Housing update will be addressed at the upcoming April 4 Quality of Life Forum.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Azevedo adjourned the Planning Commission at 10:08 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 18, 2009.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debra Lawson