
RE: Re-zoning - 2025 Rumrill Blvd. & 2031 Rumrill Blvd.

From olivia@rumrillproperties.com <olivia@rumrillproperties.com>

Date Tue 7/8/2025 7:19 AM

To Libby Tyler <LibbyT@sanpabloca.gov>

Cc Mel Mackson <MelM@sanpabloca.gov>

There were only 3 attendees showed up in the 2 public hearings. 2 only came once, and they said they no longer wanted to join again.

The reason is we feel we do not have the opportunity to participate in the re-zoning process.

Firstly, I did not receive the notices according to the required timeline. I received the notice about the 1st public hearing on the weekend before the Tuesday public hearing.

Therefore, I was not able to make it to the first hearing. But, I still tried my best and wrote in the comment to explain why I could not attend.

And, at that time, I had received no information about the re-zoning to be able to reflect any feedback for the public hearing.

And, after missing the 1st hearing due to late notice, we asked your office for the date for the 2nd public hearing.

Surely, we did not receive the notice about the 2nd public hearing until about a week prior to the 2nd public hearing. I cannot think of other reasons, other than deliberately making it difficult for public to attend. And, the near absence of attendance reflects it.

Secondly, when I did go to the 2nd public hearing and made my comment, the Commission asked me to present my feedback to the staff. But in the same public meeting, the re-zoning was approved.

Then, what is the reason for public to attend the hearing, if it would be forwarded to the next Board anyhow?

Thirdly, there is no timeline showing to the public on critical information such as the number of public hearings, when each public hearing is held on. It was each hearing as it goes.

To this date, we still do not know the next timeline after the 2 Planning Commission public hearings. You had responded to me about 7/21/25 re-zoning hearing, but what comes after?

In all, the whole process is very unclear to the public. And the effect is so frustrating for the public to be able to participate in the process.

Would this be why I am the only attendee in the public hearing? And, how does this reflect the success rate of the public hearings process?

In the meanwhile, answers are needed for the following questions:

1. About the letter I wrote to the Planning Commission, how to confirm that it has been received by the Commissioners?
2. Is the same letter also being sent to the council members? And, how to confirm that it is received? Is the letter included in the 7/21/25 Agenda?
3. What is the required timeline for the notices to be received by the public? How many days are required for the notices to be received from the date of public hearing? If the timeline is not met, what is the responsibility of the City?

4. At this time, how can my feedback about my buildings be reviewed and provided to the council members prior to their 7/21/25 public meeting?

Sincerely,

Olivia Liou

Rumrill Properties LLC
2025 Rumrill Boulevard, Suite 7
San Pablo, CA 94806
olivia@RumrillProperties.com

From: SPAB <olivia@SanPabloAutoBody.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 12:15 PM
To: pcommission@sanpabloca.gov; libbyt@sanpabloca.gov
Cc: 'Mel Mackson' <MelM@sanpabloca.gov>
Subject: RE: Re-zoning - 2025 Rumrill Blvd. & 2031 Rumrill Blvd.

Libby,

I called you this morning to follow up about below, that from the last Public Hearing at Planning Commission, I was asked to present my concerns to the Planning Commission.

Today, you noted to me that the Planning Commission had already approved the zoning, without the opportunity of reading what they asked me to present.

Then, what is the purpose of a public hearing?
I experience my rights as public were not given in this Hearing process.

How can the Planning Commission review what I was asked to present, before it is sent to the City counsel?

----- Original message -----

From: olivia@rumrillproperties.com
Date: 7/7/25 7:13 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: pcommission@sanpabloca.gov
Cc: libbyt@sanpabloca.gov, 'Mel Mackson' <MelM@sanpabloca.gov>
Subject: Re-zoning - 2025 Rumrill Blvd. & 2031 Rumrill Blvd.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is Olivia Liou. I am the landlord of 2025 Rumrill Boulevard and 2031 Rumrill Boulevard in San Pablo.

I apologize that I was not able to attend the 5/27/25 public meeting. We had received the notice just a few days prior to meeting date; we could not come in time, but we had submitted our comment for the 5/27/25 public meeting.

I had come to the 6/24/25 public meeting. And I plan to come to subsequent public meetings.
Thank you for the review.

The matter is about the zoning for our buildings.

When we bought our buildings, the zoning was C-2 District, which by Zoning Ordinance 17.12.020, the intent was for C-2 Heavy Commercial.

Understand C-2 District zoning no longer exists.

When we review the current zoning categories, our buildings are more of IMU than the proposed EMU.

The structure of our buildings is primarily designed for industrial purposes, including manufacturing and repair services.

We are unable to attract tenants under the proposed EMU, which are for businesses such as residential care facilities, day care, schools, or dental offices.

Our buildings are 2-story high indoor for each unit, with industrial electrical wiring in place, and with 20-foot high industrial roll up doors mainly for trucks moving in and out. The businesses under the proposed EMU do not match with our buildings' structure.

From reviewing and discussing with Libby and Mel, we would like to ask the Commissioners to please kindly review below 2 options. Or other viable options that you may see?

Option 1 – categorize our buildings under IMU – IMU definition: “intended to implement the industrial mixed-use land use designation in the general plan by providing opportunities for light manufacturing, distribution, sales, and services with ancillary commercial and office space uses.”

Option 2 - maintain under proposed EMU, and to match with the critical areas under IMU.

Land use/Zoning District	IMU	EMU
Repair Services, General	R	<u>R</u>
Repair Services, Limited	R	<u>R</u>
Automotive, Major Repair	R	<u>R</u>
Automotive, Minor Repair	R	<u>R</u>
Industry, General	R	<u>R</u>
Industry, Limited	R	<u>R</u>
Storage, Personal	R	<u>R</u>
Warehousing and Storage, Enclosed	R	<u>R</u>

Thank you so much for your review, and your leadership and promotion of thriving businesses in our wonderful city of San Pablo!

Best regards,
Olivia Liou

Re-zoning - 2025 Rumrill Blvd. & 2031 Rumrill Blvd.

From olivia@rumrillproperties.com <olivia@rumrillproperties.com>

Date Mon 7/7/2025 7:15 AM

To Planning Commission Meetings <pcommission@sanpabloc.gov>

Cc Libby Tyler <LibbyT@sanpabloc.gov>; Mel Mackson <MelM@sanpabloc.gov>

 1 attachment (211 KB)

zoning chart - from Mel 062525 email.pdf;

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is Olivia Liou. I am the landlord of 2025 Rumrill Boulevard and 2031 Rumrill Boulevard in San Pablo.

I apologize that I was not able to attend the 5/27/25 public meeting. We had received the notice just a few days prior to meeting date; we could not come in time, but we had submitted our comment for the 5/27/25 public meeting.

I had come to the 6/24/25 public meeting. And I plan to come to subsequent public meetings. Thank you for the review.

The matter is about the zoning for our buildings.

When we bought our buildings, the zoning was C-2 District, which by Zoning Ordinance 17.12.020, the intent was for C-2 Heavy Commercial.

Understand C-2 District zoning no longer exists.

When we review the current zoning categories, our buildings are more of IMU than the proposed EMU. The structure of our buildings is primarily designed for industrial purposes, including manufacturing and repair services.

We are unable to attract tenants under the proposed EMU, which are for businesses such as residential care facilities, day care, schools, or dental offices.

Our buildings are 2-story high indoor for each unit, with industrial electrical wiring in place, and with 20-feet high industrial roll up doors mainly for trucks moving in and out. The businesses under the proposed EMU do not match with our buildings' structure.

From reviewing and discussing with Libby and Mel, we would like to ask the Commissioners to please kindly review below 2 options. Or other viable options that you may see?

Option 1 – categorize our buildings under IMU – IMU definition: “intended to implement the industrial mixed-use land use designation in the general plan by providing opportunities for light manufacturing, distribution, sales, and services with ancillary commercial and office space uses.”

Option 2 - maintain under proposed EMU, and to match with the critical areas under IMU.

Land use/Zoning District	IMU	EMU
Repair Services, General	R	<u>R</u>
Repair Services, Limited	R	<u>R</u>
Automotive, Major Repair	R	<u>R</u>
Automotive, Minor Repair	R	<u>R</u>
Industry, General	R	<u>R</u>
Industry, Limited	R	<u>R</u>
Storage, Personal	R	<u>R</u>

Warehousing and Storage, Enclosed	R	<u>R</u>
-----------------------------------	---	----------

Thank you so much for your review, and your leadership and promotion of thriving businesses in our wonderful city of San Pablo!

Best regards,
Olivia Liou