

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD MARCH 10, 2005**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairwoman Mehranian called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present were Commissioners Cahill, Davitt, Engler and Gelhaar, City Attorney Steres, Director of Community Development Stanley, Senior Planner Buss and Planner Gjolme.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Engler led the salute to the flag.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Comments were not offered.

V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA

Chairwoman Mehranian pulled item B from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. Minutes of February 23, 2005 were not submitted

B. Resolution 05-14; La Cañada Presbyterian Church, 626 Foothill Boulevard
Chairwoman Mehranian thanked the audience for participating in the process and reminded them that the public hearing was closed. She advised of having received and read 84 electronic messages sent to her from parishioners. She believed that with Commission discussion focused on the final and "best proposal" submitted by each party, the remaining issues could be resolved. She requested comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Gelhaar agreed with the neighbors that the remaining issue of contention is noise, but he disagreed with their suggested resolution, which he believed was based on assumptions. He distributed alternate language for draft condition #54 and began reviewing the conditions with #21, addressing parking agreements. He suggested requiring *written agreements*, rather than recorded leases, with the canceling party notifying the Director of Community Development.

Commissioner Davitt suggested it should be the Church that notifies the Director if any parking agreement is cancelled.

The Commissioners agreed.

Condition 44 - Commissioner Gelhaar stated that the project architect convinced him that this condition was not necessary and he asked that it be eliminated. The condition required sealed windows on the east, south and west sides of the chapel, unless an alternate agreement was worked out with affected neighbors.

Conditions 45 and 46 - combined into his alternate language for #54.

Condition 48 - addressing allowed hours of construction. Commissioner Gelhaar stated he believed that all parties agreed that the City's Ordinance should apply, rather than the restricted draft language.

Condition 58 - addressing windows on "D"; eliminate *clerestory* and requiring their approval by the Director of Community Development, rather than by neighbors to the south and west of the site.

Condition 59 - combined with #54

He then read prepared language for condition #54, allowing use of the chapel from 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., seven days a week, with a review 6 months after occupancy of the chapel. Allowed uses: silent prayer, Sunday worship, weddings, memorial services, prayer groups and quiet meetings. A Certified Sound Engineer shall install two, 24-hr noise level recording devices (suggested locations included), to record noise levels from the date a Certificate of Occupancy is granted until the public hearing is posted. The church shall provide the Director of Community Development with a written record of the date and time of each event, the type of event and the number of attendees. Copies of all noise recordings and the event record would be provided to the Director ten days prior to scheduling a public hearing.

Commissioner Cahill advised that he had spent a tremendous amount of time thinking about this significant project and he believed the church and neighbors approached the mediation from a position of good will. The Planning Commission directed both parties to determine how many items in dispute could be resolved and the Commission attempted to create a mechanism that would drive the parties to a compromise. The "best proposal" received from each party suggests that all items were resolved with the exception of condition 54, use of the chapel, condition 51, landscaping, and a

few minor issues. He proposed to leave undisturbed those items where agreement had been reached and not revisit them.

Addressing use of the chapel and associated noise, Commissioner Cahill did not support a methodology by decibel testing. Technological solutions may not be correct and are inconsistent with what the Commission has done to mitigate noise for other projects. He referred to the initial Staff report in November '04. At that time, the intended use for the chapel was approximately 15 memorial services per year – which Staff supported. Eventually, that use was expanded and an intended use added, referred to as “quiet meetings”. At that point, the chapel, to some extent, became a meeting hall. Discussion followed as to the number of meetings and ultimately, there was a breakdown. Staff then came up with what it thought was a reasonable limitation of 30 worshipers, twice weekly.

The site is zoned Public/Semi-public and the DVSP permits church uses for religious worship and incidental church activities. He stated that a building used from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. daily is not an incidental use. That would mean that every hour, 40 people could meet – the associated noise from ingress and egress was not acceptable to him. The original use was limited to Sunday mornings from 7:30 to 12:30 p.m. He stated he was prepared to expand those hours, but not to the degree requested by the church. He stated that the 80,000-sf project was equivalent to building 20 large homes and he failed to understand why the church felt compelled to use the chapel as a meeting hall. Of the 6 surrounding neighbors, 3 do not have a problem with the proposed use. Using the baseball negotiation approach, he stated that he tended to lean more towards what the neighbors have proposed.

Landscaping – he did not view it as a significant issue; all parties agree that the landscaping need not be full, but must be comprehensive.

Minor remaining issues – This is a multi-year project. The typical approval period is two years, plus a one-year extension by the Director of Community Development. He believed that the construction timeframe needs to be restricted. Lighting – any lights in the back peninsula area should not shine into neighboring yards. Planning Commission review of the project should be annual and close down at some point.

In conclusion, he stated his belief that the Commission made significant allowances because of the church's stature in the community. Though the Commission believed the concessions were worthwhile, some measure of protection for the properties to the rear is necessary. The neighbors' proposal asks that the project not be final until the landscape plan is approved; that is

not an acceptable solution as it could delay the entire project and the church could not enter into contracts without final approval, though he recognized the importance of landscaping.

Commissioner Engler commented that since noise is the issue, there are ways to test for that impact. He was unsure about getting as finite as Commissioner Gelhaar suggested in requiring the exact placement of the noise level recorders. He did not want any restriction whatsoever on the chapel without knowing the level of noise at the back of the property and doubted that the neighbors would want to restrict the number of garden parties in their yards. By the time noise reaches residences at the rear, it would be at a very low level.

Construction hours – for the neighbors sake, he suggested prohibiting construction on weekends and holidays and restricting week day construction from 8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.

Construction equipment – Commissioner Engler asked that power equipment be required to use scrubbers; there are sensitive receptors nearby at the preschool and diesel particulates can be very detrimental. He asked for strict enforcement of construction activities by Staff.

He reiterated previous concerns with street parking on Woodleigh and Oakwood.

Commissioner Davitt remarked that the majority of time spent with a single condition for this very significant project. He supported requiring review of the landscape plan by the Commission. Responding to a question whether the Commission should allow the chapel to be built at the rear of the property, he believed the chapel would be in a good location and meets the community's goals. He did not believe there should be a laundry list of restrictions, stating it would not be good planning or productive. He supported a review following 6 months of occupancy and if it is shown there is excessive noise, that would be the time to impose restrictions.

Chair Mehranian concurred that the only way to gauge noise is through a technical process. If parking and construction can be regulated, the remaining issue would be noise and if that could be resolved through technology, she could support the project.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to adopt Resolution 05-14 with modifications: condition 21; restrict parking to one side of Woodleigh and Oakwood. No. 27; diesel powered equipment shall be required to use scrubber equipment; #21, the church is the responsible notifying party in the event any parking

agreement is canceled; #44, 45, 46 – eliminate; #48, add that during Phase II, construction shall be limited to Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; construction is not allowed on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays; #51 addressing landscaping, eliminate “full” and replace with “an effective visual buffer”. #58, eliminate “in writing by all neighbors” and replace with “to the Director of Community Development”; #54, replace sound engineer with “Industrial Hygienist”.

The motion passed with 4 ayes; Cahill abstaining.

VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Conditional Use Permit 383; Pepe’s Restaurant; 927-29 Foothill Boulevard:

Senior Planner Buss recalled the request to expand an existing restaurant, including sale of alcohol and to establish a take-out express service on the corner at 931 Marvin. The request was initially heard in January and continued so the applicant could clarify the parking situation through a parking study. He emphasized that the Pepe’s site cannot provide code-required parking. The applicant has submitted a parking analysis showing the average number of cars parked during February at various nearby locations; the demand for those spaces is fairly low as observed in the past. The home at 4519 Marvin will be demolished to provide parking. Senior Planner Buss reminded the Commission that development standards are not under review; the CUP process deals only with the number of required parking spaces, rather than parking space dimensions or landscape requirements. The project architect is requesting further direction as to how parking might work in this area.

Project architect, Jay Johnson, commented that the parking analysis verified that demand was low compared with similar facilities; the Sport Chalet ski shop and Pepe’s are doing well with the existing parking. The proposal includes removal of two homes, which will add approximately 32 more spaces, which he felt would adequately handle the 50-55 new seats in the remodeled restaurant. He stated his belief that the required parking requirement is “extremely overstated; if this was permanent, more concern might be warranted”, however, his client has a three-year lease. He spoke with Mr. Olberz, the property owner, and believes that he is at the point of letting the properties remain in their current condition and allow his family to determine whether the area will be redeveloped.

Addressing the Code section that sets parameters for landscaping in parking areas, Mr. Johnson reiterated that this was a temporary situation and therefore requiring landscaping is unnecessary. He suggested that the Commission

accept the Sport Chalet Ski Shop, Pepe's parking and 4519 Marvin as "shared parking".

Chair Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed

Commissioner Cahill asked if Mr. Olberz was willing to reveal his future development plans.

Mr. Johnson responded that he was unaware of any such plans.

Commissioner Engler stated that he somewhat disagreed with Mr. Johnson's statement that the City's parking requirements are overbearing, though he believed Mr. Johnson's suggestions are appropriate. As proposed, the project would have the maximum available parking and he did not believe that "spaces between trees would do anything". He asked that a condition be added requiring the applicant to pay into a Parking District if, and when, one is created. He also strongly felt that service of alcohol should be restricted to inside the existing restaurant.

Commissioner Davitt "the best way to consider the request is that it's a temporary situation"; the applicant is risking an investment. He felt that the parking as designed is adequate and stated that if the Commission failed to look beyond the requirements and make exceptions, nothing would ever improve. He remained supportive of the project.

Commissioner Cahill stated that he did not have a problem with parking and agreed with Commissioner Davitt that adding 32 parking for 55 seats was good, incrementally. His concern with hodgepodge development continued; he stated that the landowner is the legitimate applicant and felt he should be present to understand the concerns. He agreed that it is a good project but he did not want to create the possibility of averting a greater development, and would most likely abstain.

Commissioner Gelhaar believed that everyone would like to see the DVSP evolve as envisioned, but talking with residents and members of the Council, it "doesn't look like the DVSP will ever happen". He stated that he would have a problem with holding up this project.

Chairwoman Mehranian asked if the parking exceptions would be temporary.

City Attorney Steres responded that the Conditional Use Permit and the required Variance would run with the land and with the use.

He advised further that a Variance is not part of the application at this time; the applicant would have to file an application for inadequately-sized parking spaces.

Chairwoman Mehranian recognized that an approval would be precedent setting, but she did not know a better way to preclude blight. Given the situation, the Commission needs to do the best it can and she would support the request.

Director Stanley asked for specific direction from the Commission. Though the applicant has the option of applying for a variance, there are several factors he would like to see eliminated on the proposed parking plan e.g., use of the alley for through traffic and the compact spaces near the handicapped space appear too close. He wanted the Traffic Engineer to review the plan. Director Stanley stated that he would prefer eliminating parking spaces then allowing a variance for substandard parking that might come back to haunt them. He recalled the errors at the Trader Joe's center. He also had significant concerns with sanctioning commercial parking at a residential use (4512 Marvin).

The Commissioners directed the applicant to work with Staff to provide full-size parking stalls.

M/S/C Engler/Mehranian to tentatively approve Conditional Use Permit 383 as discussed and to continue the hearing to April 12. Conditions are to prohibit service of alcohol outside or from Pepe's Express and the applicant is to work with Staff as directed regarding parking. 4 Ayes; Cahill abstaining.

B. Hillside Development Permit 04-47; Cho; 5215 Stardust Road:

Director Stanley described the applicant's request to allow a 920-sf, first floor addition and a 394-sf upper floor addition atop a new, 568-sf garage. The Commission continued the hearing on January 11th, for clarification of the plans and story poles. Since then, the property has been surveyed, so the property line is now clarified and the second-story line is shown. Story poles also correctly reflect the project's width and height. Floor area has been verified and while 4,000-sf exceeds the neighborhood average, it complies with the 4,700-sf maximum allowed for the lot.

Letters were received from two neighbors, expressing concern with mud slides that could occur when the carport is demolished. Director Stanley advised of having visited the site with the Senior Building Inspector and the City Engineer. Since the driveway area is benched, slope calculations were taken from there. He noted the lack of mud flow or slides from the recent 100-year

storms and the City Engineer advises that loosening top soil would not cause a large land slide.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Engler asked if the rear portion of the wall next to the carport was retaining anything; if the carport is removed, what would retain the hillside? He remarked that a geology report might be necessary.

Director Stanley advised that concern would be addressed in the demolition plan. The applicant will need a permit for the new wall; if Building and Safety believe more information is needed, it will be required. He added that it is a low wall.

Commissioner Cahill did not have a problem with the request, it would not block views and the technical issues would be handled through the required processes.

Commissioner Gelhaar was concerned with the lack of an easement across the steep driveway and asked how a property line dispute between neighbors would be resolved. He requested a condition to address that issue.

City Attorney Steres advised that be overextending the Commission's authority; that concern could be raised regardless if the project is built.

Commissioner Davitt confirmed there would be no construction within the area that extends to the neighboring property.

M/S/C Engler/Cahill to approve Hillside Development Permit 04-47 as conditioned. Unanimous.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Conditional Use Permit 210 (amendment); Variance 05-04; Flintridge Preparatory; 4543 Crown Avenue:

Assistant Planner Lang reported the applicants request to amend an approved Conditional Use Permit. The project would add 14,954-sf and replace the single-story, 5,384-sf library with a new, two-story library. The Variance addresses two stair towers at the northeast and southwest corners of the new library that would reach 40 ft in height, exceeding the 35-ft height maximum allowed.

The site is located at the northwest corner of Foothill and Crown Avenue, in the Downtown Village Specific Plan area and must meet the standards of the Public/Semi-Public Zone.

Student enrollment would remain constant at 500 in accordance with a prior condition. The library is sited on the lot's interior, away from residential uses north of the school. It would be screened by the Auditorium and Science buildings, street trees and classrooms; any visual impacts would be minimized.

Trees - one unprotected tree is slated for removal; however, all trees on non-residential property are subject to the City's Tree Ordinance and a Tree Removal Permit will be required. The draft conditions also address protection of an oak west and down slope of the library.

Design Review will be required should the Commission approve the request.

Staff reviewed the required findings to approve the Variance and could not support Findings 1, 2 or 3. Staff could not determine any special circumstances that would deprive the school of any privileges enjoyed by other similarly zoned properties in the vicinity and believed that a redesign of the towers at the allowed height of 35 ft would not result in difficulties or unnecessary hardship.

Staff recommended approval of the requested amendment to the CUP and denial of the requested Variance for over height stair towers.

Commissioner Engler asked for an explanation of the towers.

Project architect Ara Zanobian responded that the towers serve as focal points on campus and identify the library. As designed, they would conceal the typical stairway.

Chairwoman Mehranian asked if they were a matter of functionality or a trademark.

Mr. Zanobian responded that they would serve aesthetic purposes and internal reference points.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Mr. Zanobian advised that the closest tower to Crown Avenue tower would be 109 ft from the street; the second tower would be 200 ft from Foothill.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered from the audience and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cahill stated that he did not have any issues with the requested amendment, including the issue of excess height. He compared this project to the recently approved variance for the Presbyterian Church --- the over height structures are substantially inward from setbacks at 109 ft and 200 ft and the project makes a nice statement for an educational facility.

Commissioners Engler and Gelhaar concurred.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Davitt, Attorney Steres advised that draft condition 13 calls for a more detailed parking management plan than for the typical project.

Chairwoman Mehranian re-opened the public hearing at the request from a member of the audience to speak.

Mary Jane Linder, who resides across from the school, commented that it appeared the project would not produce any negative effects, given its interior location and assurances that enrollment would not increase. Since construction would most likely occur during the summer, she was concerned that construction vehicles would enter the site via the driveway directly across from her driveway. She advised that 4 neighbors are impacted by use of that driveway; with vehicles turning around, backing up and near misses are continuous. She stated that she would like to see that mitigated at some point.

Mr. Zanobian advised that the driveway in question is at the far north end of the campus; it's narrowness precludes drivers from maneuvering construction vehicles through it. He believed contractors would enter the site from the other two driveways, near the auditorium and off Foothill.

Director Stanley stated that draft condition no. 13 could be amended and confirmed that the Commission wanted all construction vehicles to park on site; "on site" includes use of the parking lot across Crown Avenue. Use of the northern driveway is prohibited.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Davitt to approve amendment to Conditional Use Permit 210 and Variance 05-04 with condition no. 13 amended as discussed.

Director Stanley advised that Staff would present a Resolution for adoption at the next hearing.

B. Conditional Use Permit 126 (amendment #3); Le Petie Vendome; 958 Foothill Boulevard:

Assistant Planner Lang reported that this was the third request to amend the CUP that would increase the number of wine tasting and education seminars. An approval would increase those occurrences from four per month to sixteen per month.

The project site is located within the Mixed Use 2 district of the Downtown Village Specific Plan Zone. The initial CUP, granted in 1992, was amended in July 2000, to allow up to allow on-site consumption of alcohol via two wine tasting seminars a month. A second amendment in 2002 allowed up to 4 wine tasting seminars a month, increased the allowed number of participants and extended store hours when seminars were held.

The instant request would not change the hours of operation, class size or the amount of alcohol served. Staff did not anticipate conflict with other nearby businesses and allowing the request would not conflict with the primary hours of other tenants within the Center. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions imposed with the 2000 approval.

Commissioner Engler commented that staff reported the rear parking lot provides the equivalent of approximately 35 parking spaces. He counted 19 spaces available.

Chairwoman Mehranian recalled that the Commission viewed wine tasting seminars differently than sale of alcohol, but that parking was always an issue.

Assistant Planner Lang stated that the initial analysis was that the parking lot could accommodate 35 cars, though it is only partially striped. The applicant reports an absence of conflict among the uses in the center or parking complaints. Staff also verified this with the Sheriff's Department.

Commissioner Engler stated that the property owner uses a portion of the parking lot for vehicle storage. He asked that the record reflect the actual number of available spaces.

Raymond Belknap, store manager since 1999, advised that there has never been a problem with parking.

Chairwoman Mehranian requested comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Davitt state that he is not have a problem with the request conceptually, but was concerned with the nearly 400% requested increase, which seemed excessive.

Commissioner Engler could support the request based on past performance.

Chairwoman Mehranian felt the seminars were conducted very professionally.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to approve the amendment as requested and as conditioned. Unanimous.

C. Modification 04-86; Boyd; 5125 Hayman Avenue:

Planner Gjolme reported that the applicants received approval in 2001 to construct a 396-sf, single-story addition along the south side of their home. Since the project was not built, the approval expired and the applicant is once again before the Commission.

The project presents a 5'-2" side setback at its closes point, where a 13-1/2-ft setback is required. Since the home is angled in relation in relation to the south property line, the setback would incrementally increase to 10 ft as the addition extends toward the rear. Staff continued to recommend approval, based on the minimal size of the project and the lack of any intrusive view impacts.

Commissioner Engler commented that it seemed odd to build within the 6-ft-wide Edison easement. He confirmed that any problem arising from that would be between Edison and the applicant

Senior Planner Buss advised that the lot lines projected on the overhead depiction no longer applied. This property was part of a three-lot line adjustment in 1999, where structures were crossing property lines, etc.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gelhaar remarked that the project is a good trade off in lieu of a second-story addition.

The Commissioners concurred.

M/S/C Davitt/Gelhaar to approve Modification 04-86 as conditioned. Unanimous.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Appeal of the Director's denial of Modification 04-84 (Administrative); Faire; 4385 Bel Air Drive:

Director Stanley reported that the applicants' request qualifies for an Administrative Setback Modification, which requires written endorsement of the most affected neighbor, in this case, the one immediately south. Since that neighbor did not support the project, he had no choice other than to deny the request. The property owner subsequently timely filed an appeal, which is now before the Commission.

The project entails replacement of a failing staircase and landing at the rear of a detached garage without permit. The second-floor landing aligns with the south side of the garage's building line, which maintains a 2'-6" setback, rather than the 5-ft required setback. Staff reviewed photos of the former structure and discussed the project with the neighbor to the south. Staff concluded that the new landing extends approximately 2-3 ft further to the south than the former structure and that it would be visually prominent from the neighboring yard, despite tall landscape screening along the property line.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Engler, Director Stanley advised that final permits have not been issued for the pool and the Building Inspector has left a notice that the pool equipment must comply with setback regulations.

Applicants Pam and Ken Faire advised that the former landing was in approximately the same location. It was so rotten and unsafe that they barely used it. During the remodel of their backyard, it seemed to be an issue of simply replacing it. Mrs. Fair advised that the landing serves as an access to storage area above the garage.

Commissioner Gelhaar reported of having sat in a chair on the landing, which seems to have been converted into a leisure spot. He had a clear view into the neighbor's spa and pool area.

Director Stanley advised that the City has the authority to compel the applicants to push the landing back to meet the required setbacks, but it would not preclude views into the neighboring yard.

Jim McMenamain, 4389 Bel Air Drive, the northerly neighbor, advised that similar view issues into his yard are possible, but he has never seen anyone near or on the landing. The previous configuration was never a problem.

Ray Izadi, 4381 Bel Air, property owner to the south, expressed the same concerns with loss of privacy as noted by Commissioner Gelhaar. He stated

that future property owners could use the landing as a barbeque area, etc. He noted that the landing is closer to the property line than the original structure.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Mr. Izadi stated that with the previous configuration, he only saw corrugated plastic sheeting under the eave line.

Commissioner Gelhaar asked Mr. Izadi if he would sign-off on the pool equipment encroachment if the applicants removed the landing area where the chair is placed.

Mrs. Faire advised that the pool equipment was relocated out of the setback.

Contractor John Garnall, addressed what he stated were inaccuracies in the Director's denial. As confirmed by photos he distributed, the new landing has the same dimensions and is in the same location as the one it replaced. Further, the rails are the same height and proximity to the property line as the original landing; the only change is that the rails are now painted. His clients are willing to plant more landscaping and/or repaint the landing so that it is less noticeable.

Commissioner Cahill commented that he did not see a problem as he stood in the applicant's back yard; however, from the neighboring property's vantage point, he found the landing visually intrusive and a privacy issue. He supported moving the landing back to meet the setbacks and somehow changing its appearance to the degree that no one would be inclined to sit on the landing.

Commissioner Davitt concurred, stating that the project appeared as a hanging patio. He could support the project if the landing were removed.

Director Stanley clarified for the Commission that once the project meets the required 5-ft setback, the matter is out of the Commission's hands. He recognized that the post would have to be moved, unless the Commission allows it to remain within the setback.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that he could support leaving the post "as is" if the landing was eliminated.

Director Stanley commented that the Commission could override his denial, require that the portion of the landing in question be removed and allow the post and beam to remain within the setback.

Attorney Steres stated that Commissioner Gelhaar's suggestion would give the Commission more control of the situation.

Commissioners Cahill and Engler concurred.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler allowing the encroachment by the post and beam and adding a condition denying the encroachment for the landing. As an alternative, everything, including the post and beam, could be relocated to meet the setback requirement. Unanimous.

B. Receive and file: report of recent Administrative Approvals: HDP 05-02; Madsen, 1218 Inverness and HDP 05-01; Agakanian; 700 Forest Green Drive.

Commissioner Gelhaar reported on two administrative hearings over which he presided and approved.

X. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

Chairwoman Mehranian was congratulated on being named Woman of the Year by Assemblywoman Carol Liu.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR

Director Stanley reported that the Chevron project was reviewed and approved by the City Council. The approval included a bulb-out that satisfied the Traffic Engineer and right turns only will be available on the easterly driveway.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/C Davitt/Cahill to adjourn at 9:00 p.m. Unanimous.

Secretary to the Planning Commission