

**CITY OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING COMMISSION**

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

**March 16, 2022
Meeting Conducted Remotely**

The City of Antioch, in response to the Executive Order of the Governor and the Order of the Health Officer of Contra Costa County concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), held Planning Commission meetings live stream (at <https://www.antiochca.gov/community-development-department/planning-division/planning-commission-meetings/>). The Planning Commission meeting was conducted utilizing Zoom Audio/Video Technology.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schneiderman called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. on Wednesday, March 16, 2022. She announced that tonight's meeting was being held in accordance with the Brown Act as currently in effect under AB 361, which allowed members of the Planning Commission, City staff, and the public to participate and conduct the meeting by electronic conference. She stated anyone wishing to make a public comment, may do so by using the raise your hand tool or by submitting their comments using the online public comment form at:

www.antiochca.gov/community-development-department/planning-division/planning-commission-meetings/. Public comments that were previously submitted by mail or email have been provided to the Planning Commissioners.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Vice Chair Martin and Chair Schneiderman

Staff: City Attorney, Thomas Lloyd Smith
Director of Community Development, Forrest Ebbs
Planning Manager, Anne Hersch
Community Development Technician, Hilary Brown
Minutes Clerk, Kitty Eiden

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chair Martin led Pledge of Allegiance.

4. EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Planning Manager Hersch stated she did not anticipate any ex-parte communications tonight since there were no applicants for the item before the Commission. She clarified that ex-parte communications pertained to items only the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-1. Minutes of the January 19, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting

On motion by Commissioner Motts, seconded by Commissioner Hills, the Planning Commission approved the minutes of January 19, 2022, as presented. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: *Motts, Gutilla, Martin and Schneiderman*
NOES: *None*
ABSTAIN: *Hills, Lutz*
ABSENT: *Riley (temporarily lost audio)*

7. PUBLIC HEARING

7-1. Strategic Housing & In-Fill Policies: The Planning Commission will review a draft General Plan Amendment, Zoning Text and Map Amendment and Design Standards policies that affect ten (10) privately owned, infill parcels. This request includes:

- A. CEQA:** EIR Addendum analyzing the impacts with the associated project scope.
- B. General Plan Amendment.** General Plan Amendment that establishes Commercial Infill Housing Policies in the Land Use Element.
- C. Rezoning.** Rezone the following ten (10) sites to include a “Commercial Infill Housing (CIH) Overlay District” designation:
 - 1. 99 Cents Only/Big Lots, 2521 Somersville Rd.
 - 2. Buchanan Crossings, 3110 Buchanan Rd.
 - 3. Crestview Dr. & W. 10th St., APN: 074-334- 030
 - 4. Deer Valley Plaza, 4346 Lone Tree Way
 - 5. Delta Fair Shopping Center, 2710-3040 Delta Fair Blvd.
 - 6. Hillcrest Summit, Shaddick Drive & Harris Dr
 - 7. Hillcrest Terrace, 3440 Deer Valley Rd.
 - 8. In-Shape Shopping Center, 4099 Lone Tree Way
 - 9. Lakeview Center, 4042 Lone Tree Way
 - 10. Somersville Towne Center, 2556 Somersville Rd
- D. Zoning Text Amendments.** Zoning text amendments to Sections 9-5.203 “Definitions,” 9-5.301 “Districts Established and Defined,” 9-5.3801 “Summary of Zoning Districts,” 9-5.3808 “Table of Land Use Regulations,” and 9-5.601 “Height, Area & Setback Regulations for Primary Structure.”
- E. Objective Design Standards.** Establish objective design standards for multi-family residential development that apply to the “Commercial Infill Housing (CIH) Overlay District”

Planning Manager Hersch presented the staff report dated March 16, 2022, recommending the Planning Commission adopt the following resolutions making recommendations to the City Council: 1) Resolution 2022-02 CEQA. Adopt the resolution recommending the City Council adopt the addendum to the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. 2) Resolution 2022-03 General Plan Amendment. Adopt the resolution recommending the City Council adopt the General Plan Amendment (GP-22-01) establishing Commercial In-Fill Housing Policies in the Land Use Element. 3) Resolution 2022-04 Zoning Map Amendments. Adopt the resolution recommending the City Council rezone ten (10) sites to include a "Commercial Infill Housing (CIH) Overlay District" designation. 4) Resolution 2022-05 Zoning Text Amendments Adopt the resolution recommending the City Council adopt an ordinance for a zoning text amendment Sections 9-5.203 "Definitions," 9-5.301 "Districts Established and Defined," 9-5.3801 "Summary of Zoning Districts," 9-5.3808 "Table of Land Use Regulations," and 9-5.601 "Height, Area & Setback Regulations for Primary Structure" and a zoning map amendment (Z-22-01). 5. Resolution 2022-06 Objective Design Standards. Adopt the resolution recommending that City Council approve a resolution adopting the project's Objective Design Standards. CEQA: An EIR Addendum was prepared analyzing impacts associated with the project scope. She reported the City received a letter from the Confederated Villages of the Lisjan that was published to the agenda page and the link was sent to all Commissioners. She noted that a standard condition regarding archeological remains was applied to all development applications.

Bruce Brubaker, Janet, Chang and Allison Dagg, Placeworks, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Antioch Strategic Housing and In-fill Study which included Project Goals and Timeline, Study Sites and Criteria, General Plan Amendments, Zoning Ordinance Amendments, Objective Design Standards and Environmental Analysis.

In response to Vice Chair Martin, Planning Manager Hersch stated Commercial Infill Housing Overlay and Cannabis Overlay Districts in the same area would provide flexibility for the property owner. City Attorney Smith added the two overlays would co-exist and if someone developed housing, they would see how the rules would apply with regards to cannabis businesses in the same area.

Vice Chair Martin mentioned that page 6, table 4 did not agree with page A-18 with regards to the estimated unit capacity numbers.

Planning Manager Hersch stated that page A-18 was correct, and she would correct the table on page 6.

Commissioner Gutilla questioned if an EIR would be needed for items not included in the original EIR.

Mr. Brubaker explained If there was not an existing section in CEQA, there would need to be some level of professional practice applied to understand if there would be an impact. Allison Dagg added that the 2018 CEQA checklist questions were analyzed in the addendum and Mr. Brubaker reported the conclusion was that they would not create an environmental impact.

Commissioner Gutilla questioned what project would qualify for the 15183 exemptions.

Mr. Brubaker responded that 15183 was a global exemption in CEQA and if projects were exempt, they did not need further analysis or consideration.

Director of Community Development Ebbs explained that if a project was consistent in density and there were no outstanding features, it would be considered exempt.

Commissioner Gutilla questioned how this item related to the comment letter received from Confederated Villages of the Lisjan.

Planning Manager Hersch reported she spoke with an attorney assisting with this project and their request would be more appropriate when looking at a project specific item. She noted the Planning Commission was not considering development at this time and the standard condition would apply universally to any application.

Commissioner Motts questioned if the economic impacts were analyzed for overlay districts that were built out.

Mr. Brubaker responded the project did not look specifically at fiscal impacts; however, the housing that would be created was assumed under the previous General Plan and it was determined that the impacts would not be negative. Additionally, in discussions with stakeholders the commercial property owners felt that having housing on these sites would help existing commercial properties.

Chair Schneiderman stated she believed development on the sites identified would be a great improvement to Antioch.

In response to Commissioner Gutilla, Mr. Brubaker explained that table 2.3-1 on page A-17 described what the General Plan assumed and confirmed the numbers for this project fit within the assumption.

In response to Commissioner Lutz, Mr. Brubaker explained the process for expanding the commercial overlay district for future projects.

In response to Chair Schneiderman. Planning Manager Hersch clarified that there were no applicants at this time; however, some were observing the process.

In response to Commissioner Gutilla, Mr. Brubaker defined regional commercial and neighborhood commercial zoning designations. Ms. Chang explained that table 4.A on page B10 existed in the General Plan and they had added a row for existing commercial infill housing.

Commissioner Gutilla stated that being unaware of what was already allowed made it difficult to visualize how this may tie into the overlay district.

Mr. Brubaker stated residential and commercial could exist on the same site. He explained residential would need to adhere to the zoning standards and the objective design standards, and commercial development would need to conform to the existing General Plan definition.

Director of Community Development Ebbs added what was being referred to was the zoning type for those areas and land uses currently allowed would continue to be permitted.

Ms. Chang added check marks in the table indicated which land use types were allowed.

Mr. Brubaker explained several sites designated for the overlay were partially built so new housing could be developed on the site provided it adhered to the overlay district and objective design standards.

Commissioner Gutilla questioned if vertical residential would be a viable option.

Director of Community Development Ebbs commented vertical mixed use was allowed but he would not anticipate a project like that coming forward.

Mr. Brubaker added that vertical mixed use was more expensive, and rents did not support that type of construction in Antioch at this time.

In response to Commissioner Gutilla, Planning Manager Hersch explained the Table of Land Use Regulations.

Mr. Brubaker stated the General Plan provided an overview of the types of uses permitted and zoning code provided more detail.

In response to Chair Schneiderman, Mr. Brubaker stated the Economic Consultant was very conservative in their assumptions and found that townhomes would be a viable project and would likely proceed if the overlay district was approved.

Director of Community Development Ebbs commented that the state would not directly fund these types of projects. He noted they wanted to align the city with what the market could deliver so there would be no conflict.

Vice Chair Martin questioned if the City could change their regulations to make it less expensive to develop in the overlay district areas.

Mr. Brubaker explained this project would assist potential developers by rezoning the properties and including environmental review for some projects.

Vice Chair Martin questioned if groups could object to the CEQA process and stop a project after the overlay was approved.

Mr. Brubaker responded projects that did not have environmental issues, could be approved at an administrative level by staff. He confirmed that if someone had an objection they should be objecting to the overlay and conditions otherwise there would be no public hearing unless environmental issues needed to be addressed under CEQA.

Director of Community Development Ebbs explained that this project was driven by a grant and one of the outcomes was objective design standards to remove barriers for a reasonable housing project.

Commissioner Hills questioned what the process would be if the owners of Somersville Towne Center wanted to retain commercial and build residential on the other half.

Mr. Brubaker stated the Somersville Towne Center was under multiple ownership and was a complicated development project. He noted there were no design standards specifically for commercial because the City had zoning that addressed it separately.

Ms. Chang added that there were objective design standards pertaining to building multi-family housing with a commercial development.

Commissioner Riley, speaking to the Objective Design Standards, suggested amending standard 3.4.1.A Pedestrian Safety, to include illumination along an abutting public sidewalk.

In response to Vice Chair Martin, Mr. Brubaker confirmed that the minimum front yard setback was from the property line. He added there was also a design standard pertaining to line of sight. He clarified that the landscape buffer was for the residential component and did not apply to commercial.

Ms. Chang added Objective Design Standards referenced the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Director of Community Development Ebbs stated there was a citywide ordinance requiring utilities to be underground.

In response to Commissioner Gutilla, Mr. Brubaker stated it would be difficult for a single owner to develop a piece of property within Somersville Towne Center without having a collaborative arrangement with other owners.

Director of Community Development Ebbs added that those property owners had contracts among themselves and would have to coordinate with each other.

Mr. Brubaker stated Somersville was a prominent area and he anticipated it may need some level of CEQA analysis and therefore, it would become a discretionary project.

Commissioner Gutilla expressed concern that Italian buckthorn was referenced as an example, and it had a high potential to be a very invasive species in California.

Mr. Brubaker responded that the examples came from the landscape practice as recommendations and the potential for invasiveness may have been overlooked. He noted all examples could be removed.

Ms. Chang commented that the species were selected as examples to provide the adequate height and density.

Commissioner Gutilla stated she did not want the Italian buckthorn encouraged as the species of plant to be used.

Mr. Brubaker stated the developer would be required to adhere to the latest landscape standards that were adopted by the City.

In response to Commissioner Gutilla, Planning Manager Hersch commented that the California Green Building Standards Code specified requirements for EV chargers for all new developments.

Commissioner Lutz questioned how spill over parking into adjacent neighborhoods would be minimized.

Mr. Brubaker stated the entry to every commercial development was from an arterial so spill over traffic would be minimized.

Ms. Chang added that the Objective Design Standards referenced developers should provide the appropriate amount of parking to minimize spillover to adjacent residential neighborhoods and prevent stacking at ingress and egress points.

Commissioner Lutz questioned how the public could express their opinion on a project if all the standards were met.

Planning Manager Hersch explained that if a project met all city standards and went through the administrative process, there would be no public hearing process or noticing requirements.

Chair Schneiderman opened the public hearing.

Jeff Schroeder representing Ponderosa Homes and Reynolds and Brown, stated they were the owner of the Lakeview property, and he was in attendance to observe the process. He noted they were looking at possible residential development for their parcel.

Chair Schneiderman thanked Mr. Schroeder for his comments and consideration of building on their site.

Drew Nichol stated he was working with Mr. Schroeder on the Lakeview property. He noted they appreciated the process, and it would expedite development.

Chair Schneiderman thanked Mr. Nichol for his comments. She closed the public hearing. She reiterated that taking areas of blight and transforming them would be positive for the City.

Vice Chair Martin thanked staff and the consultants for the comprehensive report. He stated his only concern was that these projects would not help to satisfy the City's very low and low-income housing RHNA allocation.

Commissioner Motts stated he was in favor of the project. He expressed concern that the public may not support the process taking away their ability to provide input.

Planning Manager Hersch explained sites included in the overlay district were not part of the housing element because they were maintaining the flexibility between commercial and residential development.

In response to Commissioner Hills, Chair Schneiderman stated that even though she and Commissioner Lutz were not part of the previous discussion regarding this item, they would be able to vote on these items before the Commission this evening.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-02

On motion by Vice Chair Martin, seconded by Commissioner Riley, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted Resolution 2022-02 recommending the City Council adopt the addendum to the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-03

On motion by Vice Chair Martin, seconded by Commissioner Gutilla, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted Resolution 2022-03 recommending the City Council adopt the General Plan Amendment (GP-22-01) establishing Commercial In-Fill Housing Policies. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-04

On motion by Vice Chair Martin, seconded by Commissioner Gutilla, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted Resolution 2022-04 recommending the City Council amend the City of Antioch Zoning Map to include the "Commercial Infill Overlay District". The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-05

On motion by Commissioner Riley, seconded by Commissioner Motts, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted Resolution 2022-05 recommending the City Council adopt an ordinance for a zoning text amendment Sections 9-5.203 “Definitions,” 9-5.301 “Districts Established and Defined,” 9-5.3801 “Summary of Zoning Districts,” 9-5.3808 “Table of Land Use Regulations,” and 9-5.601 “Height, Area & Setback Regulations for Primary Structure” and a zoning map amendment (Z-22-01). The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

In response to Commissioner Riley, Commissioner Gutilla stated she did not want to add anything regarding invasive species because she wanted to bring an item regarding amending the City’s landscape regulations to the City Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-06

On motion by Commissioner Riley, seconded by Commissioner Gutilla, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted Resolution 2022-06 recommending the City Council approve a resolution adopting the project’s Objective Design Standards with the following amendment:

- ***3.4.1.A Add pedestrian safety lighting along property lines against abutting public sidewalks.***

The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Chair Schneiderman thanked the consultants and staff for responding to all their questions.

8. ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- 8-1. Chair & Vice Chair Reorganization for 2022** - The Planning Commission will select a chair and vice-chair to serve facilitate Planning Commission meetings in 2022. The Chair and Vice Chair roles are rotated on an annual basis in January or February.

Commissioner Motts nominated Commissioner Gutilla as Chair.

On motion by Commissioner Motts, seconded by Vice Chair Martin, the Planning Commission unanimously appointed Commissioner Gutilla as Chair. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Director of Community Development Ebbs stated he would agendaize a discussion on resuming in person meetings for a future Planning Commission meeting. He noted with new technology there were some limitations and training that would need to take place.

Commissioner Motts nominated Commissioner Riley as Vice Chair.

On motion by Commissioner Motts, seconded by Chair Schneiderman, the Planning Commission unanimously appointed Commissioner Riley as Vice Chair. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Commissioner Motts suggested the City address oversight for Heritage trees noting that he believed some had been removed irrespective of protections.

Director of Community Development Ebbs stated he would bring back a report on the City's tree policy for discussion.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Motts stated that he was unable to attend the TRANSPLAN meeting; however, he had reviewed the agenda and reported on what had taken place.

Commissioner Riley reported on his attendance at an Urban Habitat meeting and the League of California Cities Planning Commissioners Academy.

Commissioner Gutilla wished Commissioner Riley a Happy Birthday.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Vice Chair Martin, seconded by Commissioner Motts, the Planning Commission unanimously adjourned the meeting at 8:57 P.M. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Motts, Riley, Gutilla, Hills, Lutz, Martin and Schneiderman

NOES: *None*
ABSTAIN: *None*
ABSENT: *None*

Respectfully submitted:
KITTY EIDEN, Minutes Clerk