

Larry Scto - FYI - Mark Dressler (see p. 1)

Published Twice Monthly

SERVICE DIRECTORY PAGE 15

**CASTRO
VALLEY**

Forum

Vol. 2 No. 22

Community News * Calendar of Events * Lifestyles

Week of February 11, 1991

Hayward & Ridgeland Property Owners in Tug-of-War Setbacks Leave C.V. on Sidelines on Pleasanton Annexation Plan

by Mark C. Dressler

Plans by Pleasanton city officials to annex 6,855 acres of ridgeland west of that city (including a part claimed by Castro Valley) have received a green light from two recent developments, but a November Hayward city council vote amounts to setting up a red light for Pleasanton's annexation plans.

In response to the Nov. 27 Hayward city council vote keeping the East Hills annex (a 4,200-acre area that comes up to Pleasanton's city limits) as part of Hayward, property owners in the ridgeland who support the Pleasanton annexation plan sued the Hayward city council in late December.

The property owners claim that the Hayward city council vote allegedly violated the state's Brown Act by not specifically listing the

Two recent developments gave the green light to Pleasanton's annexation plans.

In late October, County Supervisors rescinded Mary King's open-space "Greenbelt" plan, and in November, Pleasanton voters defeated a ridgeland preservation initiative.

The Hayward city council vote

fused to "de-annex."

Except for the Hayward city council vote, two recent developments have given the green light for Pleasanton's annexation plans.

First, in late October, the county Board of Supervisors rescinded Supervisor Mary King's open-space "Greenbelt" plan, to keep county-run areas like the ridgeland as areas devoted to open space.

Second, in early November, a preservationist-backed initiative in Pleasanton to keep in the ridgeland the county's strict zoning of one-house-per-160-acres—known as Measure N, sponsored by the Save Pleasanton Ridgeland Committee—went down to defeat.

At the same time, Pleasanton voters adopted a rival initiative known as Measure M to set up a Pleasanton city council-created Ridgeland Review Committee to determine what the city should do

C.V. Gas Station: Eyesore Festers While Parties Fight



by Mark C. Dressler

Meanwhile, Hawley Hutchins, a spokesperson for Shell Oil, says that instead the owner has

C.V. Gas Station: Eyesore Festers While Parties Fight



by Mark C. Dressler

A closed Shell Oil Co. gas station at the northeast corner of Lake Chabot Rd. and Castro Valley Blvd. has long been characterized as an eyesore, but it appears that nobody able to improve the site wants to take responsibility for doing so.

Matthew Righetti, an attorney for the seven members of the Righetti family which owns the property, says the tenant Shell Oil Co. must either get out or clean up the toxic waste on the property.

He says the station is closed until his family resolves a current lawsuit with Shell Oil demanding that either Shell move out or clean up the toxic waste, and that a trial on the Righetti-Shell dispute is scheduled in Hayward Superior Court in Fall 1991.

Meanwhile, Hawley Hutchins, a spokesperson for Shell Oil, says that instead the owner has the primary obligation to clean up the property, and that Shell's current toxic waste clean-up plans need a go-ahead from county officials.

Finally, county officials say they did everything they could do concerning the disputing parties, and that they don't care which party takes action to clean up the site.

However, none of the disputing parties appears to take responsibility for cleaning up the outside of the Shell Oil station visible to motorists and pedestrians, especially the weeds, garbage, and general eyesore appearance.

County zoning officials have received numerous complaints about the Shell Oil station during 1990.

Cont.on page 6 : Eyesore

Eyesore

Cont. from page 1

They have generally responded to those complaining that the property is currently in civil litigation, that county zoning police powers don't apply to civil disputes, and that a county ordinance to prevent eyesores applies only to residential and not commercial property.

Righetti blames Shell Oil for the site's appearance, and he says that change will occur only if Shell Oil Co. concedes to one or the other of the Righetti family's demands—either it gets out or cleans up the toxic

waste.

But a county Environmental Health Dept. Hazardous Material specialist, Larry Seto, says that Shell Oil has submitted a toxic waste clean-up plan that complies with state and county toxic waste standards.

Seto concludes that county officials don't care "whether Shell Oil or the Righetti family cleans up the site, just as long as it's done."