

**CITY OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

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

**May 5, 2010
City Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 5, 2010, in the City Council Chambers. He 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 Thursday, May 13, 2010.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Johnson, Westerman, Langford, Azevedo, Baatrup
Travers and Manuel (arrived at 7:40 p.m.)
Absent: None
Staff: Senior Planner Morris
Community Development Technician Stahl
Associate Planner Gentry
Director of Capital Improvement Harrington
Minutes Clerk Hammers

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **Approval of Minutes** **None**

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

NEW ITEMS

2. **PW-150-10 – 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program Consistency with the Antioch General Plan** – It is recommended that the Planning Commission determine that the 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program is consistent with the Antioch General Plan.

Director of Capital Improvements Phil Harrington stated that he could respond to specific questions or he could go through the Plan briefly. Chair Johnson requested a brief synopsis from Harrington. Harrington read through the ~~added projects~~, the

completed projects overview+ and the community facilities+. He stated that the Hillcrest Avenue widening project is going on now and that the Wilbur Avenue bridge, which has been on the list for quite a few years, has finally been approved, surveyed, will be out to bid this fall and will be constructed in early 2011.

Commissioner Azevedo questioned Harrington about the funding sources and if most of those sources are anticipated or if significant money has already been collected for those projects. Harrington stated that everything in the report is pretty solid for the next five years but given the hit to the gas tax, they are looking to expand to other sources.

Commissioner Azevedo asked Harrington to share with the commission how projects were prioritized to which he stated that with road projects they are focusing on major and minor collectors and arterials and then working with streets on residential. He also said that CDBG has been helping to fund roadway improvements. Harrington stated that water and waste water priorities are based on capacity, age and demand. He went on to say that park and recreational needs are completed as money becomes available and that the town is split up in sections so that work is spread throughout the City to share the wealth.

Commissioner Travers asked if the signal battery backup was just at major intersections to which Harrington stated that they are starting with the major ones at this point. Commissioner Travers then asked if the \$5,100 per mile for pavement was standard to which Harrington stated that it was based on the life cycle of the pavement and that this is an average.

Commissioner Langford questioned Harrington regarding the water treatment plant on D Street and the estimated design cost of \$500,000 for project 7675 to which Harrington stated that a lot of projects are lumped into that program but that the \$500,000 was in error and it should state \$50,000.00.

Commissioner Langford asked Harrington if the feasibility proposal is something that other cities have done to which Harrington stated that a lot of major plants have switched over to ozone and that although the feasibility study has been put out there, he is not sure they will undertake it at this point.

Commissioner Langford asked about the water improvements at the golf course and how long the project would take to which Harrington replied that they are ready to test the facility, that it should be operational in August, and that after the testing is complete, they will be resurfacing the places where the pipes have been put in.

Commissioner Baatrup asked about the General Plan which was last updated in 2003, with CIP extended out to 2015, at what point is there reason for concern. Harrington stated that the General Plan is a living document and that although they are looking at improvements and that capacity needs to be there prior to demand, they are basically holding or scaling back at this point and that this is based on demand in terms of system and projections. Senior Planner Morris interjected that the General Plan itself is updated every 15 to 20 years and that it is a lengthy process. Harrington went on to say that a water management plan had to be submitted and that the State is calling for a

20% reduction. He also stated that the City has a clay pipe system which is weathering very well.

Commissioner Baatrup asked about the crime prevention aspect of the General Plan and stated that given that CIP only has three camera projects at three locations, if that is what the police department wants to improve crime prevention. Harrington stated that they are working hand in hand with the Police Department, and that although these cameras coming in will assist the Police Department cameras, the Police Department has grants to put other cameras throughout the City.

Commissioner Baatrup asked Harrington about the apparent pile of projects which remain unfunded until money is available to which Harrington stated that this wish list is prioritized and that some sit unfunded until money comes in at which point they move forward.

Commissioner Baatrup asked about the new boat ramp which will be state of art and what would happen to the old boat ramp to which Harrington stated that the old boat ramp would be decommissioned and taken out of service given it was not a good area for a boat ramp.

Chairman Johnson asked Harrington about project 7358 if part of that funding comes from property owners and how is the owners contributions calculated to which Harrington stated that if there is cause and concern about damage from an existing tree, the City will share that cost with the 50/50 program and that if there is a sidewalk defect, that is 100% the property owners responsibility but that there is a program in place which allows them to pay over 12 months.

Motion by Commission Azevedo, seconded by Commissioner Travers.

3. **AR-10-01 – Twin Creek Apartment Residential Buildings** - Eric Miller Architects, on behalf of Twin Creeks Apartments, requests design review approval of exterior modifications for the existing residential buildings for the Twin Creek Apartments (**APN 075-460-003**).

Kim Stahl, Community Development Technician, provided a summary of the staff report dated April 29, 2010 and stated that Ryan Graham was also present for questions.

Commissioner Travers asked CDT Stahl for clarification on the C2 renderings and applicant being conditioned to bring the brick veneer to the top of the chimney.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant, Tom Gentry, stated that he has concerns with two of the conditions which he would like to discuss. His first concern was with Condition 14 regarding the stone veneer. He stated that on the drawings originally submitted, there is not stone veneer on the chimney maskings or the base of the building and that this was based on the recreation building which was previously approved. It was his opinion that the stone veneer should be used as an accent material and that although peer review suggested

stone veneer only at the chimney mastings, that he feels his original submittal is better. His second concern is Condition 19 where it required that all railings be powder coated. He stated that all of the new wrought iron railings would be powder coated, but that they would like to repaint the existing railings to match the newly installed railings.

Commissioner Azevedo asked applicant for clarification on the stone veneer and if applicant would like to go with the proposed stone veneer plus the full chimney to which applicant stated that it would be instead of what peer review had recommended. Commissioner Azevedo then confirmed with applicant that the chimneys could support the weight of the stone veneer all the way to the top.

Commissioner Travers clarified with applicant that on the previously approved clubhouse that there was not a chimney with the stone element on the building.

Commissioner Langford questioned applicant about the ~~Hardieboard~~ being 8' and 4' to which applicant stated that the final condition did not include the 8' recommendation. CDT Stahl interjected that staff supported 4' ~~Hardieboard~~ installation and thus, the project was not commissioned for 8'.

Commissioner Langford confirmed with the applicant that the ~~Hardieboard~~ band was 1" thick and that the sides of the buildings have stone elements. Commissioner Langford expressed concern with the 4' siding on the whole building given the size of the buildings and stated his preference for 8' on the lower sections. He also stated that it was his opinion that the stone all the way down the chimney looked the best but that he would like to see a cap on the chimneys.

Commissioner Baatrup confirmed with applicant that all hand rails will be replaced with wrought iron.

Chairman Johnson confirmed with applicant the desire that Condition 19 be changed to separate existing wrought iron which would be painted and that the new wrought iron would be powder coated.

Chairman Johnson then clarified with applicant that the stone veneer going all the way up the chimney would not be a cost problem and that applicant had read and agreed with all conditions.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Langford stated that he thinks the project will look a lot nicer. He then clarified with applicant that the ~~Hardieplanks~~ will be painted by the Hardie factory to match their colors. He also stated that he would like to see a split with the 4' and 8' ~~Hardieplanks~~. He said that although painting can be done on existing railings, all new railings should be powder coated. He stated that he would like to see a cap on the chimneys.

Commissioner Travers clarified with staff that the colors would be switched so that the

lighter paint color would be on the top and the darker color on the bottom. He agreed with Commissioner Langford's suggestion that the stone go all the way up the chimney and clarified with CDT Stahl that there would not be consistency issues on the clubhouse with changing the stone veneer application.

Commissioner Azevedo clarified with CDT Stahl that the clubhouse does not have Hardieboard but has stucco with stone finish on the bottom and that although the colors will match, the materials will be different. He also confirmed with staff that the only reason to alleviate from the proposed conditions would be aesthetics.

Commissioner Travers confirmed with staff that if the owners are allowed to do what they want, there would only be a cap of stone on the top of the chimney.

Commissioner Baatrup stated that it is his opinion that stone and fireplaces go together and liked the concept of putting the stone veneer on the chimney. He also stated that although the 8+boards would cause fewer seams, that they may not be visible.

Commissioner Travers interjected that they are potentially discussing requiring 8+wider boards on half of the first floor.

Commissioner Langford questioned applicant about the galvanized nails being unpainted given that the siding would be pre-painted to which applicant stated that the nails would be recessed slightly and spackle or puddy would be put over the nails. Commissioner Langford expressed concern that once the face of the siding is fractured that it could leak and suggested that applicant talk to the manufacturing. Applicant stated that they have met with Hardieboard and that they will choose certified installers who will install according to specifications.

Applicant then stated that given the color scheme with darker on the base and lighter on the top, he preferred using 4+Hardieplank+.

Chairman Johnson stated that although it does appear to be purely aesthetics between the applicant and peer review that it is his preference to go with the applicant but that he did like the stone going all the way up the chimney and the 8+boards.

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-13

On Motion by Commissioner Azevedo and seconded by Commissioner Westerman, the Planning Commission approves AR-10-01, the remodel of existing residential buildings located at the Twin Creeks Apartments, subject to the following changes to conditions:

All Standard conditions to remain as proposed.

Add Specific Condition 23 to state that "all fireplaces have a cap which would be placed over the outside of the spark arresters, to be approved by staff."

Add Specific Condition 24 to state that "applicant shall be allowed to use the 4"

hardieboard for the entire face of the buildings.”

Modify Specific Condition 14 to state that “stone veneer shall be installed as proposed by applicant.”

Change Specific Condition 19 to read that “all replacement railways shall be powder coated and all existing railways shall be painted.”

AYES: *Johnson, Westerman, Baatrup, Azevedo, Travers, Manuel*

NOES: *Langford*

ABSTAIN: *None*

ABSENT: *None*

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

4. Northeast MND Annexation – A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the reorganization (annexation) of three subareas totaling approximately 678 acres into both the City, as well as the Delta Diablo Sanitation District. The project is generally located in unincorporated Contra Costa County near Wilbur Avenue and Viera Avenue. The three study areas (Areas 1, 2a, and 2b) are located generally along the San Joaquin River and in the vicinity of Wilbur Avenue.

Associate Planner, Mindy Gentry, provided a summary of the staff report dated April 29, 2010. She also introduced Mary Bean, the consultant who was present to answer any questions.

Commissioner Manuel asked staff to explain overall how did we get to the determination of MND at this point, when the General Plan states that it is in the sphere of influence of Antioch with employment area and light manufacturing, what the future will hold for build out and the impact being negative or positive. AP Gentry stated that the environmental document looked at all potential impacts, that quantification was used from the General Plan and that the City does not yet have a climate action plan.

Commissioner Travers interjected that this has answered his question.

Commissioner Azevedo questioned staff about proposed annexation into City limits and if there was a timeline, to which AP Gentry stated that City Council has only approved Area 1 and has not provided direction on the other areas. She also stated that the document is going to City Council on June 8 for direction and that LAFCO will rely on the environmental document.

Commissioner Azevedo asked staff who was notified of the hearing on this matter to which AP Gentry stated that this is not a public hearing item, but basically a hearing to determine adequacy of the environmental document.

Commissioner Manuel clarified with staff that this would be reorganization, given this is solely a boundary change. AP Gentry stated that annexation involves only one agency

and that reorganization involves more than one and that since this is presently in the City's sphere of influence and not part of Delta Diablo Sanitation District it is considered a reorganization. Commission Manuel asked that if the City chooses to do an annexation, would they need authorization from LAFCO to which AP Gentry said that LAFCO would be relying on this document to make that determination.

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-14

On Motion by Commissioner Westerman and seconded by Commissioner Baatrup, the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Northeast Antioch Area Reorganization.

AYES: *Langford, Johnson, Westerman, Baatrup, Azevedo, Travers and Manuel*

NOES: *None*

ABSTAIN: *None*

ABSENT: *None*

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Senior Planner Alexis Morris reminded the Planning Commission that the Walmart item would be presented at the next meeting, May 19th.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Nothing was reported.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Azevedo stated that he was hoping for a meeting soon.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Johnson adjourned the Planning Commission at 7:58 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting on May 19, 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,
Cheryl Hammers