

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  
46

**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

**Applicant:** Maria Magana  
1191 Marlesta Road

1 Pinole, CA 94564

2  
3 **Location:** 1191 Marlesta Road, APN 402-133-009

4  
5 **Project Staff:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager

6  
7 Planning Manager Winston Rhodes reported that staff had been to the site on  
8 three different occasions for inspections. During one of the site visits, a code  
9 violation had been found which was the reason the item would be continued  
10 indefinitely to a date to be determined.

11  
12 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

13  
14 There were no comments from the public.

15  
16 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

17  
18 **2. Design Review 16-23 and Conditional Use Permit 16-06: Happy Ramen**  
19 **Restaurant with Alcohol Sales**

20  
21 **Request:** Consideration of a design review request to modify an  
22 existing approximately 2,584 square foot commercial  
23 building for a restaurant including a use permit request  
24 to sell beer and wine within the restaurant for on-site  
25 consumption.

26  
27 **Applicant:** Richard Brunelle  
28 1552 167<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
29 San Leandro, CA 94578

30  
31 **Location:** 1907 San Pablo Avenue, APN 401-112-029

32  
33 **Project Staff:** Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager

34  
35 Planning Manager Rhodes identified a typographical error on Page 1 of the staff  
36 report dated February 27, 2017, with the staff recommendation to be revised to  
37 read: *Adopt Resolution 17-03 (Attachment B) approving a design review request*  
38 *to make exterior changes within the existing vacant commercial building and a use*  
39 *permit request (CUP 16-06) which permits beer and wine sales within the existing*  
40 *Happy Ramen Restaurant with project conditions modified as follows:*

41  
42  
43  
44 Condition 1 to be modified to read: *The project shall be constructed in substantial*  
45 *compliance with the approved Design Review Package for the Happy Ramen*

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

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

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

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

44 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED  
45

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

13 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED  
14

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

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

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

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

44 **MOTION: Thompson**

**SECONDED: Brooks**

**APPROVED: 7-0**

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

3  
4           **Request:**            Consideration of a design review request to enlarge a  
5                                previously approved 4,000 square foot medical office  
6                                building to 11,135 square feet; consideration of a  
7                                conditional use permit request for a reduction in the  
8                                required parking spaces; and consideration of a  
9                                conditional use permit request to amend a previously  
10                              approved sign program for the Gateway Shopping  
11                              Center.

12  
13           **Applicant:**        Thomas Gateway LLC  
14                                3100 Oak Road, Suite 140  
15                                Walnut Creek, CA 94597

16  
17           **Location:**        1335 Pinole Valley Road, APN 401-211-034

18  
19           **Project Staff:**    Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager

20  
21           Mr. Rhodes advised that copies of the staff PowerPoint presentation had been  
22           provided to the Planning Commission with copies available to the public; new  
23           information had been provided by the applicant including three photo simulations;  
24           two alternate parking floor plans identified as Lower Garage Floor Plan Alternates  
25           “A” and “B;” a handout with an enlarged floor plan for the dialysis clinic; and an  
26           email correspondence between himself and Catherine Reilly, Senior Land Use  
27           Manager with Kaiser Permanente. He introduced Consultants from Raney  
28           Planning & Management, who had prepared the California Environmental Quality  
29           Act (CEQA) analysis, and TJKM Transportation, which had prepared the parking  
30           and circulation analysis.

31  
32           Mr. Rhodes presented the staff report dated February 27, 2017, and  
33           recommended the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 17-04, recommending  
34           conditional approval of Design Review request (DR 16-29), for the proposed  
35           Gateway East Dialysis Clinic and Conditional Use Permit requests to grant a five  
36           space reduction in the normally required medical office parking (CUP 17-01), and  
37           amending the previously approved sign program to change the monument sign  
38           adjacent to the new medical office dialysis clinic building (CUP 17-02), after  
39           conducting a public hearing and considering the information provided.

40  
41           NICK PAPPANI, Raney Planning & Management, provided an overview of the  
42           CEQA analysis for the proposed project; an overview of the approved Initial Study/  
43           Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Gateway Shopping Center, and  
44           the previously approved 4,000 square foot medical office building and balance of  
45           the entire shopping center, along with proposed changes to the medical office

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

10  
11 CHRIS KINZEL, Vice President, TJKM Transportation, provided an overview of the  
12 traffic, access, circulation and parking, with the increase in square footage and  
13 amount of new trips having assumed the same trip rates, which had been found to  
14 be minor with no effect on traffic in the intersections or a change in Level of  
15 Service (LOS); and the trip generation rate for a medical dialysis clinic was less  
16 than a medical office building. No additional impacts from a traffic standpoint had  
17 been identified.

18  
19 In terms of the parking, a number of dialysis centers in the state had been  
20 evaluated and a somewhat lower parking generation requirement had been found  
21 in that many dialysis patients were dropped off and then picked up by different  
22 means rather than driving themselves to appointments. The internal circulation  
23 was also detailed and while the applicant had presented alternate parking floor  
24 plans, those plans had not yet been reviewed in detail. It was recommended that  
25 ceiling indicators may be helpful to motorists entering the parking garage to  
26 determine whether parking stalls were occupied and could help address concerns  
27 with the dead-end areas in the parking garage. Surface parking was found to be  
28 acceptable.

29  
30 Responding to the Commission, Mr. Kinzel recognized concerns with the lack of  
31 continuous circulation and dead-ends in the parking garage making it difficult to  
32 reverse course; much of the parking would be for the dialysis clinic employees who  
33 were present all day; and suggested there was room for the parking spaces near  
34 the elevator to accommodate patients.

35  
36 Mr. Rhodes clarified that in addition to the parking spaces for the dialysis clinic  
37 there would be 14 parking spaces for Kaiser Permanente employees, which had  
38 yet to be assigned. Kaiser had no issue with the reduction in required parking  
39 spaces although Kaiser was concerned with the total number once it dropped  
40 below that figure. He detailed the history of the Kaiser Permanente development  
41 when a reciprocal access had been recorded for the entire property prior to the  
42 subject site being acquired by the City's Redevelopment Agency (RDA). Kaiser  
43 desired to be made whole on the parking spaces lost, and was under no obligation  
44 to share parking with a developer who came in after the Kaiser development.  
45

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

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

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

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

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

41 Mr. Kinzel detailed the photo simulations in terms of vehicular traffic patterns and  
42 circulation in terms of lines of sight, identified the location of the most convenient  
43 full sized parking stalls, detailed the likely transit patterns for patients to the dialysis  
44 clinic, the likely location of employee parking, and noted an ideal location for  
45 patient parking could be designated although there would be no enforcement.

1  
2 Mr. Pappani again clarified the CEQA requirements and noted the 10,000 square  
3 foot CEQA criteria would not apply in this case given the evaluation of the entire  
4 shopping center project at the time. The City Council had adopted the IS/MND,  
5 which had included a worst case conservative analysis and an actual design at  
6 4,000 square feet.  
7

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

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

#### 27 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

28  
29 STEVE THOMAS, Thomas Gateway LLC, was pleased with the success of the  
30 Gateway West Shopping Center; emphasized the importance of moving the  
31 project forward to the City Council in order to bring the DaVita Dialysis Clinic to the  
32 community; and clarified the five parking space variance, the relationship of Kaiser  
33 Permanente to the project, the history of Kaiser Permanente's development as  
34 part of the RDA, and its insistence it would not have any reciprocal parking. Kaiser  
35 Permanente supported the DaVita project but was emphatic that any parking lost  
36 would need to be replaced, with five displaced stalls having been replaced as part  
37 of the Starbucks parcel to create the access into that parcel, and another nine  
38 parking stalls that had been displaced to be replaced in the garage.  
39

40 Mr. Thomas clarified why the size of the building had been driven by DaVita's  
41 requirements; the property was located on an upslope with the driveway 75 feet  
42 from Pinole Valley Road. The latest round of study in the CEQA process had  
43 found it would be better to move that driveway farther away from Pinole Valley  
44 Road to improve the line of sight when entering the garage. The building and  
45 garage had been redesigned which meant more excavation; the garage would be



1 tall, open, and able to accommodate an ambulance. He acknowledged that a  
2 turnaround could be created at the back through adjustments to circulation and  
3 parking; the percentage of compact spaces and parking stalls would remain the  
4 same with the revamped parking garage, and would involve poured in place  
5 construction. Based on the TJKM studies, he suggested there would be a 10 to 12  
6 parking space surplus.  
7

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

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

32 DONALD KINYAN, Harriman Kinyan Architects, 1801 Oakland Boulevard, Suite  
33 320, Walnut Creek, provided an overview of the floor plan for the dialysis clinic;  
34 identified the drop-off location for patients at the front of the building; patient  
35 access to the facility from the main drop-off area; and walked through the building  
36 floor plan itself and the patient process for dialysis treatment. He reiterated that  
37 most patients did not drive themselves; many were picked up and brought out  
38 once the treatment had been completed by a family member or paratransit. He  
39 also described the lobby area and its amenities where patients would wait for pick-  
40 up.  
41

42 LESTER MEU, George Meu Associates, 499 Embarcadero #6, San Francisco,  
43 detailed the exterior elevations of the existing building with some of the changes to  
44 the architecture in response to comments from Commissioner Wong and others  
45 consistent with what had been deemed to be appropriate. Pursuant to the number

1 of parking spaces and the requirements of the Building Code, three handicap  
2 parking spaces would be required, although two van accessible and two vehicle  
3 accessible parking spaces would be provided. The building could not be closer to  
4 the property line given the area needed for storm drains and pursuant to  
5 constructability review.  
6

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

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

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

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

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

- 40 • Recommended Lower Garage Floor Plan Alternate "A" as a better  
41 alternative but also recommended evaluating designated parking for the  
42 dialysis clinic patients and Kaiser Permanente patients and DaVita  
43 employees; expressed concern with the security of the Caltrans property;  
44 suggested the parking structure be expanded a bit; expressed concern with  
45 the drop-off area given patients would be dropped off by whatever means  
46 and the applicant should consider a limited parking area for drop-offs and

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

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

1  
2 **MOTION** to continue Design Review Request 16-29 and Conditional Use Permits  
3 17-01 and 17-02: Gateway Medical Office Dialysis Clinic to a Special Meeting of  
4 the Planning Commission scheduled for March 13, 2017.

5  
6 **MOTION: Thompson      SECONDED: Tave      APPROVED: 7-0**

7  
8 **F.      OLD BUSINESS:** None

9  
10 **G.      NEW BUSINESS:**

11  
12 **1.      Formation of East Bay Regional Park District Bay Trail Bridge Design**  
13 **Planning Commission Subcommittee**

14  
15 The item was continued to the Special Meeting of March 13, 2017.

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

18  
19 There were no City Planner's/Commissioner's Reports.

20  
21 **I.      COMMUNICATIONS:** None

22  
23 **J.      NEXT MEETING:**

24  
25 The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be a Special Meeting to be  
26 held on Monday, March 13, 2017 at 7:00 P.M.

27  
28 **K.      ADJOURNMENT:** 11:34 P.M

29  
30 Transcribed by:

31  
32 Anita L. Tucci-Smith  
33 Transcriber