

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD ON JULY 14, 2015**

I. CALL TO ORDER: Vice-Chair Smith calls the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

II. ROLL:

Also present are Commissioners Hazen and Jain. Commissioner Gunter is absent. Chair McConnell is expected to arrive. *[He arrived at 6:08 p.m.]*

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:

Commissioner Jain recommended moving Item VII to the end of the agenda. Director Stanley recommended hearing the continued items prior to other business. Vice-Chair Smith recommended moving the Consent Calendar to the end of the agenda in order to have Chair McConnell participate.

M/S/C Jain/Hazen to reorder the agenda per recommendations.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes: May 12, 2015:

M/S/C Jain/McConnell to adopt the minutes. 3-0-1 (Abstain: Smith)

VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Zone Change 12-02; City of La Canada Flintridge; Downtown Village Specific Plan and CPD Zone Citywide

[Continued from May 12] Consideration of amendments to the City's Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP - Ordinance No. 312) and the Community Planned Development (CPD) Zone (Chapter 11.14 of the Zoning Ordinance) pertaining to the allowance and development standards for drive-through facilities and potential overlay zone.

Senior Planner Buss notes that the project has been through several meetings of the Planning Commission and the City Council subcommittee.

Mr. Buss presents two options. First would be to continue the concept of an accessory use through Conditional Use Permit approvals in the Mixed Use 2 and CPD Zones. Second, as recommended by the subcommittee, would be develop overlay zones specifically identifying areas of city where CUP could be applied for. That could be limited to the MU2 and CPD Zones. Staff is still recommending the same criteria as previously reviewed.

Chair McConnell endorses the subcommittee's direction of an overlay zone, noting that it should determine appropriate locations. He states that merely allowing them in the two zones is too broad. He states his comfort that some appropriate locations could be separate from underlying zoning. He expresses hope that the Planning Commission recommendation would not be so Draconian as to not allow the use. Commissioner Hazen comments that the overlay makes it very feasible, with the other way Draconian. Chair McConnell states that Senior Planner Buss did a good job investigating, though he didn't agree with the direction, but did regard the recommended numbers as appropriate (with the exception of staff's 20 feet per vehicle rather than 15 feet). Commissioner Hazen notes the importance of both service time per car and the length of the cars. Chair McConnell suggests a requirement that the queue cannot extend onto the public right of way.

Vice-Chair Smith confirms with Senior Planner Buss that no drive-through would be allowed in the Mixed Use 1 Zone.

Mr. Buss recalls that the carwash property was rezoned from Mixed Use 1 to Mixed Use 2 approximately 10 years ago to accommodate the possibility of the use. He notes that Mixed Use 1 should remain pedestrian-oriented, and that the eligibility of a use for a Conditional Use Permit does not mean that it will be allowed. Chair McConnell expresses concern about findings either too high -- prohibitive - or not high enough. He states that the CUP is the right process, but that the overlay zone is needed.

Director Stanley clarifies that the Town Center includes MU1 and MU2, including the Shell station. He notes that the existing CPD ordinance does not list drive-throughs, and thus they are not currently allowed in that zone.

Senior Planner Buss notes that applying new regulations to specific areas would require advertising in those areas. He states that all the Commission can adopt under the existing notice is what staff originally proposed, and that anything else would be moving a recommendation up to the City Council.

Commissioner Jain states that an overlay zone would eliminate confusion, but that it can't be adopted until it is advertised.

Senior Planner Buss notes that the City Council has reserved for itself the determination as to whether there would even be drive-throughs. He suggests that the Commission should make a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair McConnell suggests that it appears that the Commission will not be sending an ordinance to the City Council. Mr. Buss states that the City Council wants an ordinance that could potentially work, whether or not the Planning Commission agrees. He suggests that the Commission can send an ordinance to the City Council, and that they will indicate whether they want it done, and if so send it to the Commission.

Director Stanley adds that the City Council could direct the Commission to prepare an ordinance, and that the Commission can make any recommendations to City Council. He cites the history of the reader board regulation, that the Commissions did not want it, but the City Council directed the Commission to prepare an ordinance for their review.

Vice-Chair Smith questions the point of sending the original ordinance if the City Council does not want it. Deputy City Attorney Guerra agrees. Senior Planner Buss notes that even with an overlay zone standards would be needed. Chair McConnell suggests sending up standards but not in within an ordinance. Mr. Buss replies that the standards could be removed from the ordinance format. Director Stanley states that the City Council wants an ordinance to look at. Mr. Guerra recommends amending the ordinance to incorporate an overlay zone process. Commissioner Jain states that, since Senior Planner Buss will be leaving the City after the meeting, the Commission should take an action tonight, and the City Council will direct staff to proceed. Mr. Jain recommends option 1. Chair McConnell states that it would be unfair to the subcommittee. Commissioner Jain states that they can send it back again with options.

Vice-Chair Smith opens the public hearing.

Bill Koury identifies himself as a La Canada Flintridge resident affiliated with La Canada Shell. He states that any drive-through that is correctly located and designed would be good for the community. He praises Senior Planner Buss' professionalism.

Vice-Chair Smith closes the public hearing.

Senior Planner Buss describes the ordinance produced to date as unsatisfactory, but a starting point of discussions of overlay zones. Chair McConnell and Vice-Chair Smith concur. Mr. Buss states that the standards can be removed from ordinance format and further adjusted. Director Stanley asks the Commission if they are ready to endorse option 2B (overlay zones).

M/S/C McConnell / Smith to recommend City Council direction of further development based on overlay zones (Philosophy 2B): 4-0

A. **Zone Change 15-01**
Citywide
City project

[Continued from May 26] Consideration of an ordinance establishing procedures for approval of Development Agreements.

Vice-Chair Smith opens the public hearing. With no public speakers, he closes the public hearing.

The Commissioners decline discussion.

M/S/C McConnell/Jain to recommend City Council adoption of the ordinance: 4-0

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. **Setback Modification 15-07**
2215 San Gorgonio Road
Jaquez/Medina

Request to allow retention of existing side-yard setback encroachments

Planning Aide Yesayan introduces the proposal to allow a single story addition which would encroach within the required sideyard setback. He notes that it is considered new construction because of the extent of the roof removal. The existing encroachment would be retained, with 9'-0" provided on the west side and 9'-2" on the east, as compared to the 10-foot requirement. Mr. Yesayan notes that the subject lot's 100-foot width is typical for the area, and that most houses have sideyard setbacks between 7 and 11 feet. He displays photos of the site and notes that the ceiling height is to be raised 9 inches, continuing to conform to height limits.

Chair McConnell arrives at 6:08 p.m.

Planning Aide Yesayan notes an error in staff report, which stated dormer height of 19'-10" rather than the actual proposed 18'-10". He notes that the overall floor area conforms to code limits, and cites no negative impacts. Mr. Yesayan concludes by recommending positive findings.

Vice-Chair Smith opens the public hearing. With no public members to speak to the project, he closes the public hearing.

Chair McConnell recalls visiting the site, and notes the lack of impact to neighboring properties. He can make positive findings.

Commissioner Hazen recalls his site visit, noting that the design is good for the street. He also can make the required findings.

Commissioner Jain states that he visited the site, and describes the project as a no- impact, one-story addition.

Vice-Chair Smith states that when he visited the site he noted neighbors with similar setbacks. He states that it was fortuitous to have space to expand without a second story. He notes that the addition is not far enough back to have views into the neighbor's pool. He can make the findings.

M/S/C Jain/Hazen to approve the project: 4-0

B. Second-Floor Review 15-10
4930 Revlon Drive
Lesin

Request to allow construction of a new 3,842 square foot two-story house on an 11,086 sq. ft. lot

Director Stanley states that the Second-Floor Review request would allow a new 3,842 sf house on a lot of slightly over 11,000 square feet. The existing driveway on the north side, serving a detached garage encroaching in the north sideyard setback. He describes the existing single-story house as typical for the area, and displays a slide of the proposed two-story house. Mr. Stanley notes that Public Works has reviewed the new driveway location favorably, noting also that it would work around the existing street tree and use permeable pavers. He mentions two lightwells proposed for the south side, not deeper than 4 feet, with adequate fire access.

Director Stanley displays a slide showing the project's compliance with the second-floor setback and angle plane standards. He notes the attractiveness of the elevations, and the minimal second floor windows, with no balconies or privacy concerns. He displays a slide showing other 2-story houses in the area, including a northern neighbor at higher elevation.

Mr. Stanley notes that one of the story poles was in error, intended to show the ridge but was located too close to the property line. Chair McConnell confirms that the story pole on the other side has a similar error.

Vice-Chair Smith asks if any comments from neighbors have been received. Director Stanley replies that none have been, to his knowledge. Mr. Smith notes the absence of landscaping or grading plans, and Mr. Stanley replies that none are required for Second-Floor Review. He also notes that review for drought tolerant landscaping will be required due to the project size. Chair McConnell observes that no note has been provided stating that the existing driveway is to be removed. Director Stanley replies that it will be required, with no condition needed.

Vice-Chair Smith opens the public hearing.

Ethan Lesen, applicant, apologizes for the story pole confusion. He states that he did have the chance to talk with some neighbors, and received no negative feedback. He notes the project's traditional character and code compliance. Vice-Chair Smith observes that the house is large for the parcel, yet wouldn't utilize much of the rear portion of the property. Mr. Lesen states that the project involves only 3,300 sf above ground excluding the garage, and is proportionate to the lot size.

Veronica Cho next door neighbor to the south, states that the house is elevated above her property so that its two stories would seem like three stories. She states concern about the loss of privacy, and displeasure with the moving of the driveway next to her property. Chair McConnell asks if she received a notice from the City. She replies that she had received a notice, but had a lot going on, and thought there would be more time to discuss the project, which now seems like it's already done. She states that she wished that the applicant had come to her door. Vice-Chair Smith mentions that the driveway won't go all the way to the rear of the property. Director Stanley notes also that the driveway would be seven feet from the shared property line.

Chair McConnell points out to the neighbor that on the south elevation, the architect also limited number of windows to one, looking at the top of the neighbor's roof, with the others being clerestory for privacy.

Ms. Cho states that she won't see the sky from the bathroom anymore. Director Stanley explains that the setback would be approximately 14 feet, and the separation between houses approximately 25 feet, so that sunlight would not be affected. He displays the front elevation with sideyard setbacks.

Mr. Lesen states that the previous week he had made an attempt to talk to an elderly man in the neighboring house. He states that he has a landscaping plan which should have been included in presentation. Mr. Lesen states that he is open to suggestions.

Vice-Chair Smith opens the public hearing.

Chair McConnell recalls visiting the site. He states that the neighborhood is in transition to 2-story homes. He states support for a condition to remove the north driveway. With regard to the neighbor's comments, he notes that rules have provided protection for light, ventilation, and other effects of house additions, and that the architect was sensitive in handling the north and south window treatments.

Commissioner Hazen recalls his site visit, and expresses appreciation for the thoughtful design approach to the neighboring properties on the sides. He states that he can understand the southern neighbor's concerns if she had incomplete information. He states his support for the project.

Commissioner Jain states that he also had visited the site and concurs with the other Commissioners' comments. He notes that a thoughtful approach has been taken to setbacks and building volumes. He states that landscaping should be included, especially along the south side, and asks if a condition should be included. Chair McConnell suggests a condition requiring landscaping along the south side subject to Director's approval; Director Stanley indicates that it would be appropriate to mitigate the impact of the second story.

Vice-Chair Smith states that he has also visited the site, and largely concurs with the other comments. He notes the neighborhood in transition to two-story and the thoughtful design.

M/S/C McConnell / Jain to approve the project with an added condition for the removal of the driveway and the provision of a landscape plan addressing the interface to the south and subject to Director's approval: 4-0

C. Setback Modification 15-09
5300 Alta Canyada Road
Aslanian/Riverside Investors Inc.

Request to allow conversion of an existing detached garage structure into an open cabana with a roof composed of individual trellis beams. The change would require removal and reconstruction of the structure's roof, which qualifies the structure as 'new.' The Setback Modification would allow the remodeled structure to retain encroachments into the required north side and rear setbacks.

Consulting Architect/Planner Cantrell recalls that the overall project was approved in October 2014, with a condition that the subject structure be either removed or validated through the Setback Modification process. It was originally a garage, but the size of the overall project precluded the subject structure's floor area. With the solid roof removed, it no longer counted as floor/roofed area, but it also became a new structure as considered by code, and thus lost its grandfathering as far as its substandard side and

rear setbacks were concerned. Mr. Cantrell notes the 4-foot side and rear setbacks as compared with the code minimums of 10 feet to the side and 15 feet to the rear.

He notes that there are no impacts caused by the project, and that the structure acts as a retaining wall for the neighboring property to the rear. He recommends positive findings and approval.

Commissioner Jain confirms with Mr. Cantrell that the original approval addressed the removal or validation of the structure. Mr. Jain asks about the possibility of the structure being roofed illegally in the future. Deputy City Attorney Guerra states that enforcement is the same as elsewhere in the City. He adds that constructive notice in the form of a covenant could be provided for future owners.

Richard Pejsa, neighbor to the north, addresses the Commission regarding the stability of the retaining wall that exists, and questions whether modifying the structure would diminish the wall's retaining strength. Director Stanley replies that Building & Safety would have to look at the wall as part of the project.

Donna Bullock identifies herself as counsel for the adjacent neighbor to the east and states opposition to the project. She states that the problem is that the previous building permit raised the house to diminish the privacy of her clients. Ms. Bullock is then corrected by staff and Commissioners about her misconception of what garage is being changed, since she was referring to the new garage on the east side rather than the subject existing garage in the northwest corner.

Ms. Bullock complains to the Commission about noise from the site and other issues and states that she has a pending appeal from the prior approval. Director Stanley notes that there there is no pending appeal because the City Council already took action at the appeal hearing months before.

Sam Aslanian, project architect, introduces himself and states that the owner is also present.

Commissioner Jain asks if it is necessary to retain the structure. Mr. Aslanian replies that the wall is retaining and it would be significant endeavor to remove the wall.

Commissioner Hazen confirms that the retaining wall is in functional condition, and the location of the trellis to replace the roof.

Vice-Chair Smith asks about the back wall of the garage and the wall behind it: whether the space between the walls is filled. Mr. Aslanian states that they will get an engineer to confirm existing conditions and upgrade if needed.

Deputy City Attorney Guerra explains the limits of authority of the Commission, with structural review lying outside of it. Director Stanley explains that a condition could be added that Building & Safety look at the wall as part of the building permit process.

Arthur Aslanian, owner, states that the structure was never part of the prior approval, and that this application tonight seems to be redundant. Director Stanley explains that the prior approval could not happen without removal of the roof in order to meet the limits of floor area of the lot.

Mr. Aslanian comments about the neighbor speaker representative.

Vice-Chair Smith closes the public hearing.

Chair McConnell recalls visiting the site, and questions a reason to maintain the structure. He states that he cannot find the special privilege finding (no. 2)

Commissioner Jain states that the intention to keep the structure should have been made with the original approval, and that he cannot make the findings. Mr. Jain adds that his views could be shifted if it is proven that the structure will not be converted.

Chair McConnell agreed that it could satisfy his finding.

Commissioner Hazen states that he could approve the project if Building & Safety will require engineering review and certification that it will work.

Vice-Chair Smith agree with the other Commissioners, stating that the structure has been there a long time and served well but assurance is needed that it is structurally sound. He states that he will be comfortable only after structural information is provided.

Vice-Chair Smith reopens the public hearing to ask the applicant if he would prefer continuance or a vote.

Mr. Aslanian states that he would like the condition in the approval and move from there.

Vice-Chair Smith closes the public hearing.

Mr. Smith suggests that there will not be a positive vote without knowing about the wall. He suggests alternatives to the proposal but states that it all comes back to the structural integrity of the two walls, with the applicant concerned that if the structural members of the building are removed the wall could fall down.

Commissioner Jain suggests a covenant on the property to prevent the structure from being converted back to floor area.

M/S/C Smith / McConnell to continue the project to a date uncertain: 4-0

M/S/C Smith / McConnell to reconsider motion to discuss dates: 4-0

Director Stanley states that a project resubmittal including engineering documentation should be received by staff by August 11 in order to be scheduled for the September 8 meeting date, and that it would be preferable prior to that date.

M/S/C McConnell / Hazen to continue the project to the date certain of September 8, 2015: 4-0

IX. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Noise Ordinance

Input discussion relating to a new Citywide noise ordinance to be placed in the Municipal Code [Public Peace - Chapter 5.02].

Director Stanley reviews the history of the effort, starting with an October 20, 2014 study session in which the City Council stated its desire to consider a comprehensive noise ordinance. The discussion was in response to a neighbor complaint about construction noise from a neighbor's carpentry hobby. It was noted that landscape maintenance is a more common concern. Mr. Stanley introduced Ken Dapeer, consulting City Prosecutor.

Director Stanley recalls another City Council study session, on June 1, 2015, and notes the distribution of a discussion paper on applicable Municipal Code Section 5.02 by Mr. Litvak of Mr. Dapeer's office. The City Council had enforcement concerns, with either code enforcement or the Sheriff's department to handle enforcement. He notes the need to delete inapplicable code text, which could be overly onerous in affecting homeowners' Sunday and holiday gardening and minor construction. He notes the attendance of Erik Matejka, Deputy Sheriff, and states that the ordinance is set up for both subjective and objective criteria.

Vice-Chair Smith asks about the intent of the current review. Mr. Stanley replies that it is to provide feedback to the City Council, and that rescheduling for additional time can be arranged if needed.

Chair McConnell asks if the item is to be brought before the Public Safety Commission. Director Stanley replies that it has not, as directed by the City Manager.

Vice-Chair Smith provides an example to consider - whether a garage band, still within allowable sound measurements, doesn't rise to a nuisance after five hours' duration.

Mr. Dapeer replies that enforcement is difficult at best. He provides a wedding or major event as something that the Sheriff's Department will not shut down, noting context and subjectivity. He notes that enforcement is on a case by case basis, providing an example of client city Beverly Hills, where barking dog complaints are common but a dog can be quiet when officer is there. He notes that creative enforcement measures can be called for. He reports that not many cases go to trial, and can be cut and dried with measurement of excess decibel levels.

Director Stanley notes that under General Prohibitions 5.02.040, duration of noise is a criterion, along with level and intensity.

Vice-Chair Smith confirms with Mr. Dapeer that the code is silent on whether a noise source is commercial or residential.

Vice-Chair Smith notes that Enforcement Section 5.02.100 states the use of written or verbal warning, and asks if verbal is adequate. Mr. Dapeer replies that no warning is required at all, but that the goal is compliance, not punishment. He states that officer warning in a report is sufficient, noting that verbal warning is appropriate for a party, but not for machinery. Director Stanley notes that the Sheriff generally gets compliance.

Sheriff Matejka states that mediation is often called for. He notes that a complaint call is always recorded on the computer system, and that if compliance is not attained, a criminal report is written.

Director Stanley notes the chart on page 11, noting that the proposal is to not use the zones.

Commissioner Jain asks if the main reason for the drafting of the ordinance is activity related to construction. Director Stanley replies that it was the original impetus, but that the City Council came up with other issues. Mr. Jain notes that weekend parties are not as common as construction, and asks about criteria for construction noise levels during the hours allowed, and how to deal with excess noise. He asks if buffers would be required.

Director Stanley directs Mr. Jain to the Stationary Equipment section on page 12. Mr. Jain expresses concern that the ordinance will have impact on construction mostly. Director Stanley states that the Mr. Litvek's report had much on dBa levels, and weighted noise by ambient levels, longevity etc. Mr. Stanley notes that no research was conducted at the City level. Mr. Jain repeats his concern about impacts on construction, asking if under some circumstances the use of a jackhammer could be prohibited.

Commissioner Hazen asks how many cities have noise ordinances. Mr. Dapeer replies that most do, usually focusing on animal noises and similar concerns. He notes that the

use of a decibel meter involves problems of training and calibration. Mr. Dapeer also states that most cities have construction hour's limits. He advocates a comprehensive approach to get issues resolved.

Commissioner Jain asks if the City is going beyond what is necessary. Mr. Dapeer notes that the ability to control the unexpected cases calls for the comprehensive approach.

Commissioner Jain notes the differences in ambient noise levels among cities, so that La Canada Flintridge should not use the same parameters as a city such as Hollywood with high ambient noise. Mr. Dapeer states that the numbers are realistic to eliminate really excessive noise.

Commissioner Hazen states that some items are obviously important, such as construction hours, band instruments, and barking dogs. Mr. Stanley states that the City had regulations on the import issues before, but they didn't raise the particular carpentry issue brought before the City Council.

Commissioner Jain repeats his concern about onerous regulations on construction activity, using jackhammers as an example. Mr. Dapeer asks about jackhammer noise continuing for four months continuing. Chair McConnell suggests temporary and stationary construction sections. Mr. Dapeer notes that the regulations are designed with two ways of violation evaluation - subjective standards and specifics (decibel level).

Chair McConnell states concerns about air conditioning systems as a problem between neighbors, with the need for a decibel limit. Mr. Dapeer agrees. Chair McConnell recommends that that section should be objective, and Director Stanley offers to take a look.

Vice-Chair Smith asks if the regulations apply to residential uses only. Director Stanley states that they do not.

Commissioner Jain raises concern about regulations affecting fixed-income seniors without the means to pay for correcting the conditions.

Referring to Table 5, page 9, Chair McConnell asks if the highlighted levels came from EPA regulations. Director Stanley replies that they are from the General Plan Noise Element. Mr. McConnell comments that most schools in the city would not meet the standards during recess, and also questions the amplifier provisions under Page 5-M. He asks about exemptions for special events such as Fiesta Days. Director Stanley agrees that the question is important, citing also Music in the Park as a potential violator.

Referring to Item I-1, Page 5, Chair McConnell states that he doesn't recall sound barriers for construction projects. Director Stanley replies that they are new, next to noise-sensitive use as defined on page 4.

Chair McConnell asks about limits on gardening noise, noting that the previous hours had different hours for weekdays and weekends. Director Stanley replies that domestic power tools are limited to the hours between 7am and 7pm on weekdays, and between 9am and 5pm Saturday. Chair McConnell comments that not being allowed to mow one's lawn on Sunday seems extreme, and notes the difference between taking down a tree and mowing the lawn on Sunday.

Director Stanley asks if the Commission wants a report on decibel levels. Commissioner Jain replies that it would be helpful to know real-world levels. Commissioner Hazen asks about the current construction noise limit. Mr. Stanley replies that it is 65 dBA, noting also that the City Council has been consistent. Commissioner Smith suggests that the Commission could use real life examples of noise levels, e.g. jackhammers.

Director Stanley notes the need to define holidays, and to address concerns about construction noise relate to specific situations. He notes the school and public right-of-way events issues raised by the Commission, and the issues involved in prohibiting weekend construction and landscaping.

Mr. Stanley also refers to Chapter 11.46 regulations regarding Temporary Use Permits and amplified music. He notes the need to change the second "O" to "P", and that "J" refers back to itself. He further notes blank chart areas on Page 10, and the need to modify zoning designations on Page 11 to include nonresidential. Mr. Stanley mentions a chart that includes legal holidays that the City does not allow, and asks if the Commission has other items to address.

Vice-Chair Smith mentions Item C on Page 11, asking if the cited allowable noise level is measured at the property line. He notes that Page 8 refers to interior and exterior noise levels, and that the chart can refer to it.

Director Stanley voices appreciation for the comments, and states that staff will have new information at a future meeting.

X. REPORT OF DIRECTOR'S REVIEWS

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

XII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR

Director Stanley thanks retiring Senior Planner Buss for 17 years with the City, noting that Mr. Buss saw it as a profession rather than a job. He praises Mr. Buss' dedication to ethic standards and professionalism. Mr. Stanley recalls that he and Mr. Buss worked together in several cities over the past 30 years: Simi Valley, Palmdale, and Murrietta, with its 120-mile commute. He recalls that they stayed in touch when Mr. Buss went to consulting for Edwards AFB. Director Stanley notes that he brought Mr. Buss to interview in La Canada Flintridge, where they shared a vision for what to do with the department and for the City, including bringing much-needed technology and zoning code codification. Mr. Stanley notes that Mr. Buss was a good working partner, friend and professional, and that it is sad to see him go.

Chair McConnell thanks Mr. Buss for shepherding the Commission through the Housing Element in particular.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

M/S/C Smith/McConnell to adjourn at 9:26pm: 4-0