

1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE**
4 **PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

5
6 **February 22, 2016**
7

8
9 **A. CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 P.M.**

10
11 **B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL:**

12
13 Commissioners Present: Bender, Brooks, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Thompson,
14 Chair Kurrent

15
16 Commissioners Absent: None

17
18 Staff Present: Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
19

20 **C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

21
22 There were no comments.
23

24 **D. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

25
26 1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 25, 2016
27

28 **MOTION** to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 25,
29 2016, as shown.

30
31 **MOTION: Martinez-Rubin SECONDED: Thompson APPROVED: 6-0**
32

33 **E. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

34
35 **F. OLD BUSINESS:**

36
37 1. **Consideration of East Bluff Apartments Physical Rehabilitation Design**
38 **Review (DR 15-13) Items Requiring Further Planning Commission**
39 **Review**

40
41 **Request:** Consideration of precise design review features to satisfy
42 prior conditions of project approval relating to bicycle storage,
43 mailbox weather protection, message boards, and design of
44 on-site recreation amenities, and related improvements within
45 an existing 144-unit multi-family development.
46

1 **Applicant:** Eden Housing
2 22645 Grand Street
3 Hayward, CA 94541
4

5 **Location:** 1813 Marlesta Court, APN 401-240-032
6

7 **Project Planner:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
8

9 Commissioner Martinez-Ruben recused herself based on the proximity of the
10 project to her residence and left the dais at this time.
11

12 Planning Manager Winston Rhodes presented the staff report dated February
13 22, 2016.
14

15 JOANNA CARMAN, Eden Housing, the Project Manager for the rehabilitation of
16 the East Bluff Apartments, presented a PowerPoint to address the prior
17 conditions of project approval. With respect to bicycle storage, she described
18 and presented renderings of the plan to accommodate 40 to 60 bicycles in five
19 locations throughout the site, with no loss of vehicle parking. Security cameras
20 would be provided for those locations. She also described and presented
21 renderings of what had been proposed to address the request for mailbox
22 weather protection, changeable message boards at strategic locations to
23 enhance the resident communication process, along with the packaged terminal
24 heat pump (PTHP) electrical heating and air conditioning units intended to
25 improve comfort for residents and improve energy efficiency. With respect to
26 consolidated location of satellites on roofs, she explained that Eden Housing was
27 working with a low voltage consultant to address that issue which would be
28 reviewed by City staff.
29

30 STEVE ARAGO, Landscape Architect, 1350 Treat Boulevard, #380, Walnut
31 Creek, presented the final landscape plan and explained what had been done to
32 refresh a 1973 landscape. He described the renovations that had been
33 proposed, noted the overall goal to rehabilitate the existing landscaping and
34 improve the existing irrigation system, and projected a 40 percent reduction in
35 overall water use for the site. He added that a gray water system would reduce
36 water use by another 20 percent. Plant materials would be drought tolerant, low-
37 water use. He also described some of the recreational amenities and responded
38 to questions from the Commission with respect to the surface of the play area.
39

40 SYDNEY MOE, Ferrari Moe, Architects & Engineers, 2138 Fourth Street, San
41 Rafael, reported that solar panels would be provided on the roofs of five
42 buildings. The equipment would include solar photovoltaic and solar thermal flat
43 mounted panels on the roofs that would not project beyond the existing roof
44 plane of the affected buildings.
45

46 When asked, Ms. Carman reported that the residents had been advised of the

1 bicycle parking although the design had not yet been presented to residents.
2

3 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED
4

5 IRMA RUPORT, 1131 Marionola Way, Pinole, whose home is located adjacent
6 to the complex, expressed concern with the community notification area and
7 suggested that the notification area should be in the front of the complex to
8 better advise the apartment community of the rules and regulations and to
9 include police and other contact information. She was concerned with the play
10 areas and noted that play areas in the complex had previously been removed
11 because of problems. She expressed concern that the recreation areas need to
12 be better managed. She expressed concern for security, wanted the security
13 cameras installed first, stated issues remained to be considered, and urged that
14 a security plan be presented, the property be appropriately managed, and the
15 playgrounds be gated, with a curfew.
16

17 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED
18

19 In response to comments, Mr. Rhodes stated that one of the conditions of
20 approval required a Security Plan for staff review and approval to ensure clear
21 sight distances for the Police Department. He suggested that a curfew would be
22 a property management issue, as would complaints about noise and other on-
23 site issues, although he suggested that neighbors should feel comfortable
24 approaching the on-site managers to discuss areas of concern and resolve
25 complaints.
26

27 Ms. Carman advised that the contact would be the property management office.
28 While on-site managers were available after hours for emergencies, it would not
29 be appropriate to release their personal cell phone numbers. She described the
30 City's Public Safety Fee that included monthly meetings of property management
31 with the Police and Fire Departments to track and monitor incidents. Those
32 departments had the emergency contact information. She stated there would be
33 a Security Plan and there would be extra security during the construction phase.
34 Construction hours would be consistent with the City's requirements and there
35 were lease restrictions on noise. She added that tot lots would not be gated.
36 Security cameras would be installed after completion of construction, although
37 she could check to see if they could be installed earlier.
38

39 The Commission offered the following comments and recommendations:
40

- 41 • The Commission emphasized the need to be advised of the schedule of
42 meetings with the residents in advance, and to be provided a summary of
43 the resident meetings held without City notification. (Thompson)
44
- 45 • The bike storage and covered mailboxes were inconsistent with the
46 project architecture, and a design more consistent with the sloping roofs

1 of the existing structures was requested. The roof structures for those
2 amenities should also be considered for solar opportunities and lighting
3 should be provided for the mailbox area. (Brooks, Thompson)
4

- 5 • Concerns remained for security and fencing around the playground and
6 the installation of security cameras prior to completion of construction.
7 (Tave) On the discussion, the Commission noted that fences around the
8 playgrounds could be considered if there were issues at the completion of
9 the project.
10
- 11 • Bicycle lockers, as opposed to bicycle storage, was recommended to be
12 in close proximity to each building (Brooks) and the Commission wanted
13 to know what the residents preferred. There was considerable discussion
14 related to the concern for the security of bicycles parked at the bicycle
15 racks.
16

17 In response to comments, Mr. Rhodes stated the monument sign would be part
18 of design review and would be reviewed during plan check with all other
19 improvements; the Commission could consider a similar roof pitch on the
20 mailbox structures with asphalt shingles similar to what had been approved for
21 the buildings; and while there were currently noise standards in the General
22 Plan, there was no citywide noise ordinance although there had been
23 discussions to consider such an ordinance which would be at the discretion of
24 the City Council. He clarified that the purview of the Planning Commission was
25 to review design. Noise complaints from neighbors, which can be highly
26 subjective is an operational issue that the Police Department would address if
27 needed based on City requirements. He also pointed out the use was permitted
28 in the zone, not subject to a use permit. He understood that safety and nuisance
29 issues had improved dramatically at the site during the past seven years.
30

31 Mr. Rhodes requested direction and consensus about what the Commission
32 preferred for the roof of the mailbox enclosure, and the design of the bicycle
33 lockers. He pointed out that the number of bicycle racks and bicycle parking
34 exceeded what was required by the code.
35

36 On the discussion of secure bicycle lockers that could be allocated by property
37 management, Ms. Carman stated the issue had come up in community meetings
38 and in conversations with residents. She did not want to limit bicycle storage.
39 She emphasized grading issues and the fact they did not want to eliminate
40 parking spaces. While surveys could be conducted, at this time providing more
41 opportunities to lock bikes made more sense to property management as
42 opposed to allocating bike parking to specific residents.
43

44 Ms. Moe added that there were a number of kids' bikes involved and those used
45 for recreational purposes as opposed to bikes used for transportation purposes.
46 There would be room for 40 adult bikes or 60 bikes for kids. She had designed

1 the storage where a family could have multiple bikes on one connection. The
2 structure would be similar to a carport. She explained that bicycle cages in the
3 carports had been considered although they could not fit under the tuck-under
4 parking.
5

- 6 • Willing to sacrifice some parking spaces for secure bike lockers, mailers
7 to residents were recommended to clarify the situation where the loss of
8 the balconies would require a need for bicycle storage, to learn what kind
9 of storage residents would prefer, to identify the need, and to make sure
10 that whatever was provided would be used. Information was requested as
11 to how other Eden Housing projects addressed bicycle storage.
12 (Kurrent/Thompson)
13

14 By consensus, Commissioners expressed preferences for the following:
15

- 16 • That bicycle lockers be integrated into the parking site, even if there was a
17 loss of some parking or landscaping; residents be polled to determine how
18 many bicycle lockers or parking spaces would be needed to be able to
19 provide ultra-secure bicycle storage; to be discussed at the next
20 community meeting with notification to the City;
21
- 22 • There shall be pitched roofs for the mailbox area and for any bicycle
23 structures;
24
- 25 • Did not support a message board in the front as requested by Ms. Ruport.
26

27 Ms. Carman clarified that the units were rental units and what the residents
28 wanted today would not necessarily be what future residents might prefer. She
29 emphasized that Eden Housing had looked into bicycle lockers although given
30 the topography it was difficult to find the necessary space for bicycle lockers.
31

32 Ms. Woe noted that providing eight bicycle lockers would eliminate three parking
33 spaces.
34

35 Mr. Rhodes clarified that the Commission wanted to evaluate what the
36 neighborhood wanted to see as far as bicycle parking on site; the type, number,
37 and distribution, with a report back to the Commission and with the next steps in
38 the process based on that information.
39

40 Chair Kurrent designated a subcommittee of Commissioners Thompson and
41 Tave to work on the issue and report back to the Commission.
42

43 **2. Consideration of Precise Antenna Structure Design in Conjunction**
44 **with Design Review (DR 14-20) and Conditional Use Permits (CUP 14-**
45 **10 and 14-15) for Wireless Communication Facility Relocation**
46

1 **Request:** Selection of an antenna structure design for two existing
2 carriers relocating from one portion of the project site to a
3 previously approved wireless communications area south of
4 the previously approved CVS Pharmacy building on the
5 project site.

6 **Applicant:** Armstrong Development Properties, Inc.
7 2400 Del Paso Road, Suite 140
8 Sacramento, CA 95834
9

10 **Location:** Southeast corner of Appian Way and Canyon Drive, just north
11 of Interstate 80, APNs 401-273-043, -044, -045, and -046
12 addressed as 1617 Canyon Drive
13

14 **Project Planner:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
15

16 Commissioner Martinez-Ruben rejoined the Commission.
17

18 Mr. Rhodes requested a recess at 8:47 P.M. to be able to set up for the
19 presentation given that new information had just been presented. The
20 Commission reconvened with all members present at 8:57 P.M.
21

22 Mr. Rhodes presented the staff report dated February 22, 2016, to review the
23 two proposed antenna structure design options for Verizon and T-Mobile
24 equipment that had previously been reviewed last month and to provide direction
25 on a final design for staff and the applicant. He identified information presented
26 on the dais from the subcommittee, as well as a letter from Hammett & Edison
27 confirming that each of the two options to be considered for the design would
28 meet Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standards relative to radio
29 frequency (RF) emissions, and noted that the conditions of approval would
30 require an RF study prior to the activation of any wireless communication
31 antenna structure.
32

33 Mr. Rhodes identified what the Commission had approved at the January 25,
34 2016 meeting, described the range of options that the subcommittee had
35 reviewed, and identified the two options that had been supported by the
36 subcommittee; a three-pole with a metal ribbon option and a faux clock tower
37 option with a structure to accommodate two carriers. Any third future carrier
38 would require a separate application. Photo simulation information had been
39 requested. He reported that the subcommittee preferred the faux clock tower
40 design which was visually interesting, included a design reminiscent of the City's
41 railroad past, as well as a traditional clock tower appearance. The antennas
42 would be camouflaged to look like components of the clock, and much of the
43 structure would be open. Renderings of the proposal were presented and details
44 were provided.
45

46 JULIE MARTIN, Armstrong Development, for the CVS Wireless application,

1 thanked the subcommittee for coming to agreement on the preferred design, and
2 explained how the design would be run through the various consultants for all
3 those involved. She verified, when asked, that the clock tower could be a
4 working clock, and Commissioners expressed a preference for a working clock.
5
6

7 Ms. Martin apologized that the photo simulations had not been able to be
8 prepared for the meeting, but would be provided. Providing a picture of a similar
9 clock tower design from Bellflower, California; she clarified that the cabling would
10 be inside the support posts of the clock structure.
11

12 Mr. Rhodes clarified that the subcommittee had requested a simulation looking
13 north on Appian Way towards the water and towards San Pablo Avenue from the
14 Dollar Tree looking towards the project site.
15

16 KEVIN PARKER, Armstrong Development, explained that the proposal had not
17 been designed for a third carrier because it was not high enough. He
18 emphasized that everything was at a standstill until a design had been chosen to
19 allow the application to move forward. On the discussion of possible color
20 choices, he clarified the intent for an industrial look to tie back to the railroad,
21 which was why black had been presented. He also clarified that the verticals
22 were tube steel to carry the cable and the horizontals were wide flange.
23

24 Mr. Rhodes suggested the existing subcommittee of Commissioners Thompson
25 and Tave could be one way to enable the process to continue with some
26 certainty.
27

28 By consensus, the Commission supported the following:
29

- 30 • A working clock tower structure, (with the Bellflower example), with four
31 clock faces, modified to be more consistent with Old Town Pinole;
- 32 • No illumination;
- 33 • No “Welcome To Pinole” or “Pinole” text;
- 34 • Tile roof cap size as shown;
- 35 • In a color to match the CVS building, in black or in clear anodized
36 aluminum with a matte finish;
- 37 • Enclosed structure at the base, as shown in the example, with brick to
38 match the proposed elevations of the CVS building, and to include
39 landscaping comprised of shrubs, trees, and climbing vines to discourage
40 graffiti;
- 41 • Photo simulations to be provided.
42

43 Mr. Parker clarified that the enclosure would house the ladder to maintain the
44 structure and prevent people from climbing it. He also explained that the new
45 equipment and a new array of antennas would enhance service and coverage
46 and avoid the need for other coverage elsewhere.

1
2 **MOTION:**

3
4 **MOTION** to approve Option 2, the design of the antenna structure in conjunction
5 with Design Review (DR 14-20) and Conditional Use Permits (CUP 14-10 and 14-
6 15) for a Wireless Communication Facility Relocation, for a working clock tower
7 with four clock faces, no illumination, no text on the structure, and with details
8 pertaining to the color, landscaping, and size of the structure at the base to be
9 confirmed by a Subcommittee composed of Commissioners Thompson and
10 Tave.

11
12 **MOTION: Martinez-Rubin SECONDED: Thompson APPROVED: 6-0**

13
14 **G. NEW BUSINESS: None**

15
16 **H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT:**

17
18 Mr. Rhodes announced that the City Council had appointed the replacement for
19 former Commissioner Toms, and Simon Wong would be joining the Planning
20 Commission at its next meeting. He reported that there would be a workshop on
21 required text amendments needed to implement General Plan Housing Element
22 actions at the next meeting; an upcoming item would be a workshop on the Eye
23 Surgery Center proposed at Pinole Valley Road and Henry Avenue; and a
24 tentative date had been set in the spring for a joint City Council/Planning
25 Commission meeting. He also reported that Form 700s were due, and there had
26 been discussions of holding a meeting on the Brown Act to review requirements
27 related to open meeting laws and the legal requirements of Planning
28 Commissioners. He mentioned the status of the Gateway project, and stated
29 there was some information on the City's website that could be enhanced as the
30 construction process proceeds.

31
32 Chair Kurrent advised that he would not be present at the next meeting.

33
34 **I. COMMUNICATIONS: None**

35
36 **J. NEXT MEETING:**

37
38 The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be a special meeting on
39 March 14, 2016 at 7:00 P.M.

40
41 **K. ADJOURNMENT: 10:26 P.M.**

42
43 Transcribed by:

44
45
46 Anita L. Tucci-Smith

1

Transcriber