

**CITY OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

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

**April 16, 2025
City Council Chambers**

1. CALL TO ORDER

An interpreter announced that translation services were available this evening.

Chairperson Riley called the meeting to order at 6:32 P.M. on Wednesday, April 16, 2025, in Council Chambers.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Jones, Martin, Perez and Chairperson Riley
Absent: Commissioner Webber

Staff: Assistant City Attorney, Brittany Brace
Planning Manager, Zoe Merideth
Senior Planner, Kevin Scudero
Assistant Planner, Monet Boyd
Minutes Clerk, Kitty Eiden

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Riley led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

5-1 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes March 19, 2025

On motion by Commission Martin, seconded by Commissioner Jones the Planning Commission members present unanimously approved the Minutes of March 19, 2025. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES: Jones, Martin, Perez, Riley
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Webber

6. STUDY SESSION

6-1. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Study Session | Citywide – Study Session to review and discuss the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

Planning Manager Merideth introduced Greg Goodfellow, PlaceWorks, who presented the PowerPoint Presentation and staff report dated April 2, 2025, recommending that the Planning Commission provide direction as necessary.

Chairperson Riley opened the public comment period.

Greg Colley, Multi-Faith Action Coalition, expressed support for the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) and recommended the Planning Commission to move forward with it. He suggested setting higher affordability targets, limiting the use of in lieu fees, and tying incentives to performance. He emphasized the importance of engaging stakeholders and residents in refining the ordinance and highlighted the need for the City to focus on racial and economic equity, as well as addressing integration and displacement risks.

Deborah Carney, Hope Solutions, Antioch resident, spoke in support of the IHO and recommended that the City mandate a minimum of 20% affordable units that meet diverse local needs. She advocated for onsite construction of fully integrated affordable units, sufficient in lieu fees to cover the total cost of building these units, and for those fees to be invested in affordable housing in high-opportunity areas. Additionally, she called for no sunset clauses to maintain long-term affordability and stated that incentives for developers should be matched by significant benefits for the public.

Ramon Amaral, Nor Cal Carpenters Union, questioned if the ordinance would include labor standards.

Joey Flegel-Mishlove, East Bay Housing Organizations, expressed support for the IHO, recommending that affordable housing remain affordable in perpetuity. He suggested establishing a baseline inclusionary rate of 15% while also considering the possibility of higher rates.

Chairperson Riley closed the public comment period.

Planning Commission Discussion Questions

➤ What are your concerns about an IHO in Antioch?

Commissioner Martin raised concerns about the feasibility of constructing affordable units and the practice of clustering them together.

Senior Planner Scudero clarified that clustering was a unique feature of a specific project in Antioch, not a common development practice.

Commissioner Jones expressed concern that affordability metrics were based on Contra Costa County's median family income rather than Antioch's.

Mr. Goodfellow responded that using countywide figures is standard practice as dictated by the Department of Housing and Community Development, ensuring consistency with state guidelines.

Commissioner Jones expressed concern that in-lieu fees might become the primary option for developers, suggesting that they should be set sufficiently high to encourage actual housing construction instead. She also voiced apprehension about offsite development, fearing it might lead to a concentration of affordable units in specific areas. She questioned how the units would remain affordable in perpetuity.

Chairperson Riley raised concerns about the limited availability of land for building affordable units funded by in-lieu fees.

Mr. Goodfellow clarified that these units would be developed with deed restrictions and emphasized the need for clear legal and financial frameworks for managing them. He noted that the buying and selling of these units would require monitoring by staff or a consultant and mentioned that he would provide the City with a staffing plan.

Commissioner Jones raised concerns about the suitability of affordable for-sale and rental units in large lot subdivisions, which are the typical developments proposed.

Mr. Goodfellow explained that the housing element's primary goal is to identify relatively small sites and increase density for housing in those areas.

Senior Planner Scudero added that there has been a trend toward smaller lot subdivisions.

In response to Commissioner Jones, Mr. Goodfellow indicated that the relationship between density bonuses and inclusionary housing would enable developers to construct more market-rate units.

Senior Planner Scudero mentioned that waivers and concessions to development standards, such as increasing height restrictions, would be available through this process.

Chairperson Riley agreed with the idea of not including a sunset clause for the affordable units.

➤ **How can Antioch's IHO produce affordable housing without constraining overall development?**

Commissioner Martin suggested donating vacant city or state land or hotel/apartment building conversions to produce affordable housing. Additionally, he suggested establishing a housing trust fund; however, the amount needed to be enough to build a house.

In response to Commissioner Martin, Mr. Goodfellow summarized the Builders Industry Letter. He noted building inclusionary units as part of market rate housing projects, meant that affordable units would be paired with the natural progression of housing development in Antioch.

Commissioner Martin expressed concerns regarding the affordability of units in relation to median household incomes.

In response, Mr. Goodfellow indicated that there are various ways to make the IHO more acceptable, and he highlighted the flexibility and potential alternatives available.

Commissioner Jones emphasized the need for clear guidelines on how in-lieu fees would be utilized if implemented.

Mr. Goodfellow clarified that the allocation of these fees would be at the City's discretion and noted that a housing trust fund, along with a management plan reflecting the City's housing priorities, would need to be established. He also explained that the City could determine where to apply the IHO and the corresponding in-lieu fee amounts.

➤ **What types of housing does Antioch need?**

The Commission reached a consensus to prioritize low and very low-income rental housing.

Commissioner Perez emphasized the importance of maintaining a balance between jobs and housing.

Mr. Goodfellow noted that the IHO aimed to address a portion of the existing demand in Antioch and that the jobs/housing issue would be considered during the General Plan update.

Acting Director of Community Development Scudero agreed that the job/housing balance had long been a concern in Antioch.

Commissioner Jones reported a low development rate of high-density apartments due to financial infeasibility, highlighting a disconnect between community needs and developer willingness. She expressed the desire for a healthy balance between ongoing development and affordability.

➤ **What compliance alternatives should Antioch offer developers?**

Commissioner Jones endorsed the compliance alternatives proposed by staff and expressed support for exploring partnerships with non-profit organizations.

Chairperson Riley indicated his opposition to using Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as a form of alternative compliance.

➤ **What incentives should Antioch offer developers to ease IHO requirements?**

Commissioner Martin proposed changing height and setback requirements to facilitate development and suggested streamlining the permitting process.

Commissioner Jones recommended reducing the size of inclusionary housing units to make them more feasible. She stressed the critical importance of IHOs, noting that without a policy mandating affordable housing, such units would not be constructed. She emphasized the need for a healthy balance that makes development financially viable for builders and proposed an annual re-evaluation of the IHO to assess its effectiveness.

Commissioner Martin suggested that the IHO should not apply to developers constructing fewer than eight units and recommended that oversight of the IHO be outsourced to ensure effective management.

Acting Planning Manager Merideth announced that the item would be presented to the City Council for a Study Session, after which the consultant would start drafting an ordinance based on the recommendations. She encouraged anyone with additional questions to contact her or submit inquiries through the project website: <https://antioch-iho.com/>.

Mr. Goodfellow mentioned that he would also be submitting a staffing report along with a fee study.

The Commission thanked everyone who participated in the discussion this evening.

7. REGULAR ITEM

7-1 Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek Design Review | DR2024-0010 | Sand Creek Road - The applicant requests the approval of Design Review and proposed street names for the Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek project approving residential architecture, parks, and landscaping and street names for the Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek project site at APN: 057-050-024.

Assistant Planner Boyd presented the staff report dated April 16, 2025, recommending that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution approving the Design Review and proposed street names for the Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek project approving residential architecture, parks, landscaping and street names for the Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek project site at APN: (057-050-024).

Mike Bowes, Tri Pointe Homes, expressed his gratitude to the staff for their assistance with their application. He provided a brief background about the company and outlined the project timeline. He also introduced the design team, who were present and available to address any questions.

Chairperson Riley opened the public comment period.

Alexander Broom spoke in opposition to the project's location and density, citing concerns about the high fire risk in the area. He also encouraged the inclusion of a landscape plan featuring California native plants.

Chairperson Riley closed the public comment period.

In response to Commissioner Martin, Planning Manager Merideth clarified that the project would not involve the widening of Sand Creek Road, as the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) did not include that as part of the mitigation measures related to traffic.

Andrea Bellanca, the Civil Project Engineer, informed the Commission that the project would include the construction of the extension of Hillcrest Avenue, which would connect back to Sand Creek Road. He pointed out that on the east side of the project, at the extension of Heidorn Ranch Road, there is an existing PG&E bridge. The project plans to construct a new bridge for Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA), which would create two points of access for emergencies. Additionally, he noted that the EVA would provide a connection to the Sand Creek trail.

In response to Commissioner Martin, Mr. Bowes confirmed that all units in the development would be two-story and market rate. He added that the community would be named Brooks and Trails, which aligned with the street names proposed by their marketing department.

Commissioner Martin expressed support for the project design, noting the variety of placements and architectural diversity.

In response to Commissioner Jones, Mr. Bellanca reported that the fire department had reviewed their tentative map and would continue to review the final plans for the project. He indicated that fire hydrants would be strategically placed along the perimeter of Hillcrest Avenue, as well as internally within the development.

Responding to Chairperson Riley, Planning Manager Merideth explained that the street names were subject to review as part of the application process by both staff and the Antioch Police Department (APD). Additionally, Acting Director of Community Development Scudero clarified that Hillcrest Avenue currently terminates at the city limits but would extend if further development occurred in that area.

On motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Commissioner Perez the Planning Commission members present unanimously adopted the resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Antioch approving the design review application for the residential architecture, parks, landscaping and street names at the Creekside Vineyards at Sand Creek (DR2024-0010) (APN: 057-050-024). The motion carried the following vote:

AYES:	<i>Jones, Martin, Perez, Riley</i>
NOES:	<i>None</i>
ABSTAIN:	<i>None</i>
ABSENT:	<i>Webber</i>

8. ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Acting Planning Manager Merideth announced that the nomination of a new Chair for the Planning Commission would be included on the agenda for the May 7, 2025, meeting. She also reported that the appointment of a new Planning Commission member was scheduled for the

April 22, 2025, City Council meeting, and noted that applications were currently open for the remaining vacancy on the Planning Commission.

In response to Commissioner Jones, Planning Manager Merideth explained that Mayor Bernal was in communication with TRANSPLAN to determine the process for appointing an alternate to that committee.

Commissioner Martin took a moment to congratulate the staff for their excellent work on the comprehensive staff reports.

9. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Jones announced that the TRANSPLAN meeting was canceled.

10. NEXT MEETING: May 7, 2025

Chairperson Riley announced the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on May 7, 2025.

11. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Commissioner Martin, seconded by Commissioner Jones, the Planning Commission members present unanimously adjourned the meeting at 8:54 P.M. The motion carried the following vote:

AYES:	<i>Jones, Martin, Perez, Riley</i>
NOES:	<i>None</i>
ABSTAIN:	<i>None</i>
ABSENT:	<i>Webber</i>

Respectfully submitted:

Kitty Eiden
KITTY EIDEN, Minutes Clerk