

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR
PINOLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

February 27, 2017

A. CALL TO ORDER: 7:04 P.M.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Brooks, Hartley, Martinez-Rubin, Tave, Thompson,
Wong, Chair Kurrent

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
Eric Casher, Assistant City Attorney

C. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

There were no citizens to be heard.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 23, 2017

MOTION to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting from January 23, 2017, as submitted.

MOTION: Hartley SECONDED: Martinez-Rubin APPROVED: 7-0

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **Conditional Use Permit 16-08: Maria's Daycare**

This item has been continued indefinitely to a date to be determined

Request: Consideration of a use permit request to expand the day care capacity of an existing small family day care home for up to 8 children to a large family day care home for up to 14 children within an approximately 2,234 square foot single-family residence

1 **Applicant:** Maria Magana
2 1191 Marlesta Road
3 Pinole, CA 94564

4
5 **Location:** 1191 Marlesta Road, APN 402-133-009

6
7 **Project Staff:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
8

9 Planning Manager Winston Rhodes reported that staff had been to the site on
10 three different occasions for inspections. During one of the site visits, a code
11 violation had been found which was the reason the item would be continued
12 indefinitely to a date to be determined.

13
14 **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

15
16 There were no comments from the public.

17
18 **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

19
20 **2. Design Review 16-23 and Conditional Use Permit 16-06: Happy Ramen**
21 **Restaurant with Alcohol Sales**

22
23 **Request:** Consideration of a design review request to modify an
24 existing approximately 2,584 square foot commercial
25 building for a restaurant including a use permit request
26 to sell beer and wine within the restaurant for on-site
27 consumption.

28
29 **Applicant:** Richard Brunelle
30 1552 167th Avenue
31 San Leandro, CA 94578

32
33 **Location:** 1907 San Pablo Avenue, APN 401-112-029

34
35 **Project Staff:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager
36

37 Planning Manager Rhodes identified a typographical error on Page 1 of the staff
38 report dated February 27, 2017, with the staff recommendation to be revised to
39 read: *Adopt Resolution 17-03 (Attachment B) approving a design review request*
40 *to make exterior changes within the existing vacant commercial building and a use*
41 *permit request (CUP 16-06) which permits beer and wine sales within the existing*
42 *Happy Ramen Restaurant with project conditions modified as follows:*

1 Condition 1 to be modified to read: *The project shall be constructed in substantial*
2 *compliance with the approved Design Review Package for the Happy Ramen*
3 *Restaurant, Design Review (DR 16-23), approved by the Planning Commission*
4 *and plans date stamped received February 8 and February 14, 2017, and color*
5 *and material board stamped received February 14, 2017, unless otherwise*
6 *conditioned; and Condition 46 modified to read: The proposed building paint colors*
7 *shall be applied to sample areas of the new Happy Ramen Restaurant for*
8 *confirmation prior to painting the building.*
9

10 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Rhodes clarified the two parking spaces in the
11 garage satisfied the residential portion of the parking requirement freeing up two
12 parking spaces in the driveway for employees to park; residential parking could
13 utilize the commercial parking lot; the property was located in a Commercial Mixed
14 Use Zoning District; there had been a long-established dual use on the property for
15 decades; staff had been to the site; and there were many conditions of approval
16 that would address crime prevention based on the history of the site. The property
17 was located in Old Town and in the Three Corridors Specific Plan Area and no off-
18 street parking was required in Old Town due to the existing supply of public
19 parking spaces. There would be one handicap parking space with the ultimate
20 location to be determined during the plan check process; a bicycle rack currently
21 located in the parking lot would be relocated closer to the front entry door; if the
22 home was leased in the future, the residential parking spaces could be disclosed
23 by the property owner and part of a potential lease agreement but would not be
24 guaranteed in the future; and the applicant was providing more parking than
25 required at the subject location.
26

27 Mr. Rhodes also detailed the City Council discussion on alcohol sales and the City
28 Council support of a Public Convenience and Necessity finding, although the City
29 Council had not discussed the restaurant operation which was under the purview
30 of the Planning Commission. Conditions of approval related to the consumption of
31 alcohol came directly from the Pinole Municipal Code (PMC); the site had a lot of
32 impervious surface which the applicant did not plan to alter; a full C.3 Report would
33 not be required, although Best Practices would be required in terms of drainage to
34 the appropriate storm drain system, preferably to a landscaped area. The path of
35 travel for handicapped persons or improvements to an Americans with Disabilities
36 Act (ADA) space to the restaurant had not been shown to the sidewalk and would
37 have to be identified and reviewed during the Building Department plan check
38 process.
39

40 Mr. Rhodes further clarified the project would not create enough trips to warrant a
41 site specific traffic analysis; traffic control during the construction and renovation
42 process required an encroachment permit for any work in the public right-of-way
43 (ROW); and a hauling plan would have to be submitted to the Public Works
44 Department.
45

1 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

2
3 RICHARD BRUNELLE, 1552 167th Avenue, San Leandro, stated he would serve
4 as both Project and Construction Manager; the existing Green Lantern sign would
5 be disposed of although if the City desired it be preserved it could be delivered to
6 any private party; rooftop equipment would include an air conditioning unit to be
7 screened with light mesh to be located on a flat portion of the roof where the
8 existing air conditioning unit was located; the roof material would remain as is;
9 there had been extensive discussions about the parking and consideration of valet
10 parking; a parking lot could not be built; and it was anticipated once the business
11 opened that parking would not be an issue. An adjacent business which closed
12 early in the evening could be an option for overflow parking, although he had not
13 yet spoken with that property owner as to that possibility.

14
15 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

16
17 The Planning Commission discussed Design Review 16-23 and Conditional Use
18 Permit 16-06, and offered the following comments and/or direction to staff:

- 19
20
- 21 • Recommended a condition that the rooftop equipment material and color be
22 clarified on the plans; with an additional statement to be added to Condition
23 29 to read: *Materials and colors to be shown on the plans and reviewed by*
24 *staff prior to installation.* (Brooks)
 - 25 • Expressed appreciation the building design included windows allowing
26 natural light into the building. (Martinez-Rubin)
 - 27 • Recognized the zoning in Old Town allowed challenging sites, such as the
28 subject site, to become usable. (Hartley)
 - 29 • Recommended the applicant consider options for parking given the
30 potential for overflow parking. (Kurrent)
- 31
32
33

34 **MOTION** to approve Planning Commission Resolution 17-03, with Exhibit A:
35 Conditions of Approval, Approving a Design Review Request (DR 16-23), to
36 Modify an Existing Approximately 2,584 Square Foot Commercial Building for a
37 New Restaurant and Approve a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 16-06) to Allow Beer
38 and Wine Sales for On Site Consumption in Conjunction with the New Restaurant,
39 1907 San Pablo Avenue, APN 401-112-029, with modifications to Conditions 1
40 and 46, as shown; and with a modification to Condition 29, as follows:

- 41
- 42 • Add the following sentence to Condition 29: *The equipment screening*
43 *design choice shall be reviewed by City staff to ensure that it complements*
44 *the building colors and materials.*
- 45

1 **MOTION: Thompson SECONDED: Brooks APPROVED: 7-0**

2
3 **3. Design Review Request 16-29 and Conditional Use Permits 17-01 and**
4 **17-02: Gateway Medical Office Dialysis Clinic**

5
6 **Request:** Consideration of a design review request to enlarge a
7 previously approved 4,000 square foot medical office
8 building to 11,135 square feet; consideration of a
9 conditional use permit request for a reduction in the
10 required parking spaces; and consideration of a
11 conditional use permit request to amend a previously
12 approved sign program for the Gateway Shopping
13 Center.

14
15 **Applicant:** Thomas Gateway LLC
16 3100 Oak Road, Suite 140
17 Walnut Creek, CA 94597

18
19 **Location:** 1335 Pinole Valley Road, APN 401-211-034

20
21 **Project Staff:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager

22
23 Mr. Rhodes advised that copies of the staff PowerPoint presentation had been
24 provided to the Planning Commission with copies available to the public; new
25 information had been provided by the applicant including three photo simulations;
26 two alternate parking floor plans identified as Lower Garage Floor Plan Alternates
27 “A” and “B;” a handout with an enlarged floor plan for the dialysis clinic; and an
28 email correspondence between himself and Catherine Reilly, Senior Land Use
29 Manager with Kaiser Permanente. He introduced Consultants from Raney
30 Planning & Management, who had prepared the California Environmental Quality
31 Act (CEQA) analysis, and TJKM Transportation, which had prepared the parking
32 and circulation analysis.

33
34 Mr. Rhodes presented the staff report dated February 27, 2017, and
35 recommended the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 17-04, recommending
36 conditional approval of Design Review request (DR 16-29), for the proposed
37 Gateway East Dialysis Clinic and Conditional Use Permit requests to grant a five
38 space reduction in the normally required medical office parking (CUP 17-01), and
39 amending the previously approved sign program to change the monument sign
40 adjacent to the new medical office dialysis clinic building (CUP 17-02), after
41 conducting a public hearing and considering the information provided.

42
43 NICK PAPPANI, Raney Planning & Management, provided an overview of the
44 CEQA analysis for the proposed project; an overview of the approved Initial Study/
45 Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Gateway Shopping Center, and

1 the previously approved 4,000 square foot medical office building and balance of
2 the entire shopping center, along with proposed changes to the medical office
3 building component and an increase in square footage from 4,000 to 11,135
4 square feet; an increase in the size of the subterranean single level parking
5 structure; and relocation and replacement of the monument sign. The modified
6 project had been evaluated pursuant to CEQA, particularly on-site circulation and
7 access, and an Addendum had been prepared related to the geotechnical analysis
8 and Stormwater Control Plan. No new impacts or impacts to previously identified
9 impacts had been identified as part of the modified project, and the project would
10 be conditioned to comply with the applicable mitigation measures contained in the
11 adopted IS/MND.
12

13 CHRIS KINZEL, Vice President, TJKM Transportation, provided an overview of the
14 traffic, access, circulation and parking, with the increase in square footage and
15 amount of new trips having assumed the same trip rates, which had been found to
16 be minor with no effect on traffic in the intersections or a change in Level of
17 Service (LOS); and the trip generation rate for a medical dialysis clinic was less
18 than a medical office building. No additional impacts from a traffic standpoint had
19 been identified.
20

21 In terms of the parking, a number of dialysis centers in the state had been
22 evaluated and a somewhat lower parking generation requirement had been found
23 in that many dialysis patients were dropped off and then picked up by different
24 means rather than driving themselves to appointments. The internal circulation
25 was also detailed and while the applicant had presented alternate parking floor
26 plans, those plans had not yet been reviewed in detail. It was recommended that
27 ceiling indicators may be helpful to motorists entering the parking garage to
28 determine whether parking stalls were occupied and could help address concerns
29 with the dead-end areas in the parking garage. Surface parking was found to be
30 acceptable.
31

32 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Kinzel recognized concerns with the lack of
33 continuous circulation and dead-ends in the parking garage making it difficult to
34 reverse course; much of the parking would be for the dialysis clinic employees who
35 were present all day; and suggested there was room for the parking spaces near
36 the elevator to accommodate patients.
37

38 Mr. Rhodes clarified that in addition to the parking spaces for the dialysis clinic
39 there would be 14 parking spaces for Kaiser Permanente employees, which had
40 yet to be assigned. Kaiser had no issue with the reduction in required parking
41 spaces although Kaiser was concerned with the total number once it dropped
42 below that figure. He detailed the history of the Kaiser Permanente development
43 when a reciprocal access had been recorded for the entire property prior to the
44 subject site being acquired by the City's Redevelopment Agency (RDA). Kaiser
45 desired to be made whole on the parking spaces lost, and was under no obligation

1 to share parking with a developer who came in after the Kaiser development.

2
3 Mr. Rhodes highlighted Attachment A, Project Plans Received February 3 and
4 February 21, 2017, which included a summary of the parking, and highlighted the
5 City's current parking standards.
6

7 Commissioner Martinez-Rubin reported she had been contacted by the applicant
8 on February 22, 2017, and had communicated with Pinole Councilmember Murray
9 to discuss concerns with the subject project.
10

11 Mr. Rhodes stated the project met the criteria of the Three Corridors Specific Plan;
12 clarified the typical use of deciduous trees to avoid blocking lines of sight as
13 proposed in response to concerns by the Pinole Police Department; acknowledged
14 concerns that trees planted along Pinole Valley Road in front of the building could
15 obstruct the line of sight of the driveway leading to the parking garage entrance
16 unless; any permits required by other agencies including Caltrans would have to
17 be obtained by the applicant prior to issuance of a building permit; identified
18 building and fire code regulations and setbacks; and reported staff had no
19 comments from Caltrans about the proposed change in the project although there
20 was a requirement that the property be fenced from the Caltrans right of way. He
21 acknowledged the potential expansion of the parking structure could affect some
22 of the compact parking spaces and would still require discussion with the applicant
23 and potentially Caltrans. He also clarified the vantage points of the photo
24 simulations; and acknowledged a request for future photo simulations to provide
25 additional vantage points from the street level.
26

27 ERIC CASHER, Assistant City Attorney, further verified the ADA requirements for
28 any development and that an analysis for the path of travel would need to be
29 studied further.
30

31 Mr. Rhodes clarified that a Programmed Environmental Impact Report (EIR) had
32 been prepared as part of the development project when Kaiser Permanente had
33 first been planned for the site in 2004, and that any issues with the line of the sight
34 that were mentioned for the southernmost driveway in the EIR will require further
35 review of that EIR. He added that a certain number of ADA parking spaces would
36 have to meet building code requirements. The parking standards were different
37 from when the Kaiser Permanente's parking standards had been approved and
38 more research would be required on the history of why the Kaiser Permanente
39 parking was short. It was the intent that Kaiser Permanente employees park
40 farther away from the medical building than patient. He reiterated there was
41 reciprocal access, not reciprocal parking, with Kaiser Permanente
42

43 Mr. Kinzel detailed the photo simulations in terms of vehicular traffic patterns and
44 circulation in terms of lines of sight, identified the location of the most convenient
45 full sized parking stalls, detailed the likely transit patterns for patients to the dialysis

1 clinic, the likely location of employee parking, and noted an ideal location for
2 patient parking could be designated although there would be no enforcement.
3

4 Mr. Pappani again clarified the CEQA requirements and noted the 10,000 square
5 foot CEQA criteria would not apply in this case given the evaluation of the entire
6 shopping center project at the time. The City Council had adopted the IS/MND,
7 which had included a worst case conservative analysis and an actual design at
8 4,000 square feet.
9

10 Mr. Kinzel detailed the methodology used to calculate the parking needs based on
11 actual parking observations of eight dialysis centers, with the variable being the
12 actual number of dialysis stations and patients served. The average had been
13 calculated at one parking stall per dialysis station with some variation. A ratio of
14 1.2 parking spaces per dialysis station had been found to be an appropriate
15 parking standard, and there would be a comfortable surplus between the
16 applicant's proposed parking supply and the required supply based on 1.2 parking
17 spaces per dialysis station.
18

19 Mr. Rhodes explained the action being requested of the Planning Commission,
20 with a recommendation to the City Council since it involved a Development
21 Agreement (DA) for the original development of the shopping center. In an
22 attempt to provide further clarity, he again detailed the history of the development
23 of the Gateway Shopping Center. He also clarified the location of the proposed
24 trash enclosure with pick-up to be scheduled at a time when the site would be
25 closed to the public. Given that the dialysis clinic planned to open at 6:00 A.M.
26 and operate seven days a week, the pick-up schedule would need to be
27 coordinated.
28

29 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

30
31 STEVE THOMAS, Thomas Gateway LLC, was pleased with the success of the
32 Gateway West Shopping Center; emphasized the importance of moving the
33 project forward to the City Council in order to bring the DaVita Dialysis Clinic to the
34 community; and clarified the five parking space variance, the relationship of Kaiser
35 Permanente to the project, the history of Kaiser Permanente's development as
36 part of the RDA, and its insistence it would not have any reciprocal parking. Kaiser
37 Permanente supported the DaVita project but was emphatic that any parking lost
38 would need to be replaced, with five displaced stalls having been replaced as part
39 of the Starbucks parcel to create the access into that parcel, and another nine
40 parking stalls that had been displaced to be replaced in the garage.
41

42 Mr. Thomas clarified why the size of the building had been driven by DaVita's
43 requirements; the property was located on an upslope with the driveway 75 feet
44 from Pinole Valley Road. The latest round of study in the CEQA process had
45 found it would be better to move that driveway farther away from Pinole Valley

1 Road to improve the line of sight when entering the garage. The building and
2 garage had been redesigned which meant more excavation; the garage would be
3 tall, open, and able to accommodate an ambulance. He acknowledged that a
4 turnaround could be created at the back through adjustments to circulation and
5 parking; the percentage of compact spaces and parking stalls would remain the
6 same with the revamped parking garage, and would involve poured in place
7 construction. Based on the TJKM studies, he suggested there would be a 10 to 12
8 parking space surplus.
9

10 JENNIE FUNK, Regional Operations Director, DaVita, 7755 Pardee Lane,
11 Oakland, provided an overview of the provider of dialysis services with
12 approximately 25 clinics across the country. Patients would typically come to the
13 clinic seven days a week, spend up to three to four hours per visit in the dialysis
14 chair, with limited parking needs for dialysis patients as compared to other medical
15 office buildings. The closest dialysis clinics were located in Vallejo, San Pablo,
16 and El Sobrante. She read into the record a letter from a Pinole resident who
17 currently commuted to the City of San Pablo for dialysis and asked that the
18 Planning Commission approve a facility closer to her residence. Copies of other
19 patient letters could be provided upon request.
20

21 Ms. Funk explained that the clinics in San Pablo and El Sobrante area were of a
22 similar size and the subject facility was a common size for a dialysis clinic in
23 suburban and urban environments. Larger clinics with more dialysis stations were
24 located in Oakland, Berkeley, Benicia, and San Rafael. In terms of ADA parking,
25 she had typically seen two to four parking spaces provided at other clinic locations.
26 She supported the proposal to require designated staff parking in the least
27 convenient locations. She clarified there was typically a 45-minute gap between
28 patient treatments. She recommended that patient parking could be
29 accommodated in the larger parking spaces as one entered to the left of the
30 parking garage, with wheelchair accessible vans typically dropping patients off at
31 the front of the building. She also supported the designation of a 15-minute drop-
32 off area for patients.
33

34 DONALD KINYAN, Harriman Kinyan Architects, 1801 Oakland Boulevard, Suite
35 320, Walnut Creek, provided an overview of the floor plan for the dialysis clinic;
36 identified the drop-off location for patients at the front of the building; patient
37 access to the facility from the main drop-off area; and walked through the building
38 floor plan itself and the patient process for dialysis treatment. He reiterated that
39 most patients did not drive themselves; many were picked up and brought out
40 once the treatment had been completed by a family member or paratransit. He
41 also described the lobby area and its amenities where patients would wait for pick-
42 up.
43

44 LESTER MEU, George Meu Associates, 499 Embarcadero #6, San Francisco,
45 detailed the exterior elevations of the existing building with some of the changes to

1 the architecture in response to comments from Commissioner Wong and others
2 consistent with what had been deemed to be appropriate. Pursuant to the number
3 of parking spaces and the requirements of the Building Code, three handicap
4 parking spaces would be required, although two van accessible and two vehicle
5 accessible parking spaces would be provided. The building could not be closer to
6 the property line given the area needed for storm drains and pursuant to
7 constructability review.
8

9 In order to reach the required number of parking spaces, Mr. Meu stated the
10 number of compact parking spaces had to be increased, with some modification in
11 the width of the compact spaces to ensure the required total and allow
12 maneuverability, which had not changed the number of parking spaces or the
13 proportion between compact and standard parking spaces. In terms of
14 designating some of the parking spaces for Kaiser Permanente employees, he
15 was uncertain how that could be accommodated. He reiterated that the site would
16 be over-parked as identified in the analysis presented. In terms of a covered drop-
17 off area, the area between the main entry and elevator had a covered area and
18 was intended to be covered between the two doors.
19

20 Mr. Meu described the details and dimensions of the rooftop mechanical
21 equipment used by DaVita, which would be screened by the main building wall,
22 and Mr. Rhodes noted that the rooftop equipment would be conditioned to be
23 screened from view from Interstate I-80.
24

25 In an attempt to clarify why the building square footage had been increased in size,
26 Mr. Thomas detailed the history of the Gateway West Shopping Center; RDA
27 agreement with Kaiser Permanente; the original CEQA analysis for the original
28 building at 9,886 square feet, and pursuant to all State, OSHPD and ADA
29 requirements the building size had been driven to 11,135 square feet. While the
30 building was larger in size and while more parking was required, in reality the
31 demand of the dialysis clinic and number of employees had not changed from the
32 2015 CEQA analysis. It was noted that if the building was reduced in size, the
33 number of dialysis stations would also have to be reduced.
34

35 Given the lateness of the hour, the Chair recommended that the item be continued
36 to the Special Planning Commission meeting of March 13, 2017.
37

38 The Planning Commission discussed Design Review 16-29 and Conditional Use
39 Permits 17-01 and 17-02, and offered the following comments and/or direction to
40 staff:
41

- 42 • Recommended Lower Garage Floor Plan Alternate "A" as a better
43 alternative but also recommended evaluating designated parking for the
44 dialysis clinic patients and Kaiser Permanente patients and DaVita
45 employees; expressed concern with the security of the Caltrans property;
46 suggested the parking structure be expanded a bit; expressed concern with

1 the drop-off area given patients would be dropped off by whatever means
2 and the applicant should consider a limited parking area for drop-offs and
3 pick-ups; recommended that some of the compact parking spaces in the
4 basement be designated for Kaiser Permanente; sought a better resolution
5 to the number of proposed compact parking spaces; questioned whether or
6 not to conditionally approve designated parking for employees and patients;
7 and expressed concern with the security of the Caltrans zone created by
8 the building design. Requested an alternate and cleaner parking plan to
9 show possible options, and that the pedestrian ADA path of travel pattern
10 be identified on the plans. (Wong)

- 11
- 12 • Recommended consideration of a valet drop-off area to address some of
13 the parking issues; expressed concern with parking problems in the future
14 with a desire to address the potential dialysis center use and any potential
15 future uses by increasing the size of the building or negotiating an
16 arrangement with Kaiser Permanente; asked for a better justification for the
17 reduction in the parking standard; questioned whether or not there was a
18 parking problem; asked whether it was possible the City's parking standards
19 did not support medical office building uses pursuant to OSHPD
20 regulations; sought an analysis of the recommended parking layout and the
21 justification for increasing the building size from 4,000 to 11,135 square feet
22 while recognizing the CEQA document had analyzed the building at 9,886
23 square feet. Staff and the applicant were also asked to return with
24 recommendations for the designation and location of employee parking.
25 (Hartley)
- 26
- 27 • Supported the wider compact parking spaces since mid-sized vehicles or
28 less could use those spaces, which satisfied many of his concerns; and
29 requested a cleaned up garage floor plan to identify the size and location of
30 compact parking spaces. (Kurrent)
- 31
- 32 • Clarified with staff the Gateway West Shopping Center conditions of
33 approval had been cross referenced in the conditions of approval for the
34 subject application, with the most recent conditions talking precedence.
35 Requested copies of the 2003/2004 traffic study which referenced the line
36 of sight at the intersection; further review of the path of travel to the building;
37 and more photo simulations from street level, with vantage points from the
38 on-ramp of I-80 and standing at the bowling alley corner. Recommended a
39 public workshop, although staff noted the agenda had been publicly noticed
40 allowing for public input and the Chair suggested the Planning Commission
41 essentially had just held a study session. (Thompson)
- 42
- 43 • Agreed with Commissioner Hartley's requested information. (Martinez-
44 Rubin)
- 45

- Requested more information on the designation and location of DaVita employee parking. (Brooks)

MOTION to continue Design Review Request 16-29 and Conditional Use Permits 17-01 and 17-02: Gateway Medical Office Dialysis Clinic to a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission scheduled for March 13, 2017.

MOTION: Thompson SECONDED: Tave APPROVED: 7-0

F. OLD BUSINESS: None

G. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Formation of East Bay Regional Park District Bay Trail Bridge Design Planning Commission Subcommittee**

The item was continued to the Special Meeting of March 13, 2017.

H. CITY PLANNER'S / COMMISSIONERS' REPORT:

There were no City Planner's/Commissioner's Reports.

I. COMMUNICATIONS: None

J. NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be a Special Meeting to be held on Monday, March 13, 2017 at 7:00 P.M.

K. ADJOURNMENT: 11:34 P.M

Transcribed by:

Anita L. Tucci-Smith
Transcriber