



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 7/27/2020

Time: 7:00 p.m.

GoToWebinar.com – ID #769-333-851

A. Call To Order

Chair Henry Riggs called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He provided information to attendees on virtual meeting public comment process.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Chris DeCardy, Michael Doran (Vice Chair), Larry Kahle, Camille Kennedy (arrived at 7:03 p.m.), Henry Riggs (Chair), Michele Tate

Staff: Fahteen Khan, Assistant Planner; Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Senior Planner Corinna Sandmeier said the City Council at its July 28, 2020 meeting would consider the CIP Plan for FY 2020-2021. She said at 4:00 p.m. on July 30, 2020 a Commissioner Training would be conducted via Zoom for all City Commissioners.

(Commissioner Camille Kennedy joined the meeting.)

Commissioner Chris DeCardy noted staff's response to his request for an item on the Commission's agenda on the development of the City's zoning ordinances and General Plan. Planner Sandmeier said the City Council at some point would initiate the process for the Housing Element and after that various City Commissions would provide input.

Commissioner DeCardy asked for clarification whether the Commission had discretion to place on its agenda matters of interest for study and input. Planner Sandmeier said the Planning Commission did not have a work plan as other City Commissions did. She said the Planning Commission reviewed development projects and made final decisions on many of those and made recommendations on those going to the City Council for final decision. She said to agendaize other items of interest for the Commission that the Chair would bring those to staff. She said staff would need information on how the items of interest would tie in with tasks of the Commission. She said the training for commissioners might better explain commission roles and how those roles related to the City Council.

Commissioner DeCardy said he strongly believed the Commission should have an informational session to understand the history of how Menlo Park got its zoning ordinances and its General Plan in place. He said it was a long history and deeply tied into covenants in neighborhoods that did not allow house sales to people of color and on redlining. He said it was absolutely germane to every decision that they paid attention to as the Planning Commission. He said he did not think looking at it

simply in conjunction with an aspect they would be considering was the right way to do that. He said they should have the opportunity to explore and understand as a Planning Commission and be able to hear from stakeholders in those decisions including developers and residents. He said this should be independent of a compressed time line around when they were considering specific development projects.

Chair Riggs said it might be appropriate for the Chair and possibly Commissioner DeCardy to discuss with staff what the priorities were for placing items on the Planning Commission agendas and what the Commission's role was as opposed to the City Council for example. He said one item to follow up would be to determine what neighborhoods still had active blue laws or other compromising elements from the City's past. He said that was something he saw interest in by Commissioners. He said they were limited on how much they could discuss on this tonight as it was not agendized.

Commissioner Camille Kennedy said she was in complete agreement with Commissioner DeCardy and she would find it suspect if the Commission did not study this.

Commissioner Michael Doran said the discussion was very appropriate for the Commission to have. He said the Planning Commission did not have written bylaws, which many commissions have. He said they did have the provisions of state law that in addition to the Commissions quasi-judicial power it was also here to provide the City Council counsel on planning matters. He said he wanted to plant the idea it would be a good idea for the Commission to have bylaws that provided more precise detail.

Commissioner Michele Tate said she supported Commissioner DeCardy's suggestion noting she also had at the meeting when he originally suggested it. She said she believed this was something that should come before the Commission as it would be a learning exercise.

Chair Riggs said he would follow up with staff.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the July 13, 2020, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Doran/Larry Kahle) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of the minutes from the July 13, 2020 Planning Commission meeting; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners DeCardy and Kennedy abstaining.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Sina Djafari/1600 Bay Laurel Drive:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage and basement on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-S (Single Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. The project also includes a request for a use permit for excavation into the required rear setback for the

basement lightwells. ([Staff Report #20-035-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan said one of the Commissioners had pointed out that the streetscape for the project did not seem to accurately draw the windows. She said the applicant, the property owners, were notified and they had revised the streetscape accordingly. She said an email showing the revisions was sent to all Commissioners. She said staff received an email after publication of the staff report. She read the email into the record.

Dear Planning Commission,

My name is Martha Hutchison and I live at 315 Olive Street, which is next door to the Djafari family who is planning to build a new home at 1600 Bay Laurel.

I am writing to express my full support for this new build. I have viewed the plans and personally discussed the project with them.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (her phone number).

*Thank you,
Martha Hutchison*

Applicant Presentation: Sina Djafari introduced himself, his wife Jen, and Amy Azaren, the project manager. He said they had lived in the existing home at the subject property for the past 10 years and loved their neighbors and neighborhood. He said they worked toward a design that respected the surrounding area. He said they had reviewed their plans with neighbors and everyone had been supportive. He provided slides of the proposed design and explained the features. He said the materials planned were stucco and cedar. He described window placement to protect privacy.

Commissioner Kahle thanked the applicant for updating the streetscape. He asked if it was accurate now noting that nine-foot tall windows on the subject house seemed to align a bit higher with seven-foot windows on the next door house. Mr. Djafari said he measured as best he could without doing a laser measurement and an actual survey.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the structure was prefabricated. Ms. Azaren said the structure was technically prefabricated in that the materials were produced beforehand but the home was fully custom. She said it would be a net zero energy home. Commissioner Kahle said he was asking because of height. He said he thought the one-story section had a 12-foot wall height rising to 14 to 15 feet not counting the vaulted ceiling area. He asked if those heights were adjustable. Ms. Azaren said the design was custom and they made sure with all of the ceiling heights that those were compliant with regulations. She said any areas over 12 feet in height were double counted in the gross floor area calculation. She said they tried to limit those areas to just common areas to have more impact. She said replying to Commissioner Kahle that the height was a design decision and not a structure function.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the cedar material matched in color as it appeared some was gray and some stained. Mr. Djafari said the initial idea was the cedar on the two-bedroom section and the

cedar on the garage would match with a natural clear stain. He said the kitchen bump out would have slightly darker colored cedar. Commissioner Kahle referred to M1 and M3 and said he just wanted to know the major difference between the two and orientation. Mr. Djafari said the difference was intended to be very subtle.

Commissioner Kahle referred to the Olive Street side in the last elevation, the bottom drawing on sheet A2.0. He said it looked like there was a small section of wall that had vertical siding but other drawings did not show that. Ms. Azaren said the vertical siding was just the section of the kitchen bump out. Commissioner Kahle confirmed with Mr. Djafari that they were using wood windows with metal cladding. He said the staff report indicated more information was wanted on the grids. Mr. Djafari said they had looked at a number of windows. He said they had looked at Kolbe that had different panes of glass and wood between them but still grids on both sides with a spacer in the middle. Commissioner Kahle said if not true divided light windows the Commission liked to see windows with grids on the inside and outside with a spacer bar in between. He noted two windows on sheet A2.0 that showed one's casement opening one way and the other one's opening the other way, and suggested they match. Mr. Djafari said that was helpful.

Chair Riggs opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Doran said the project was supportable noting he liked the layout as it made good use of the slightly different lot shape, was sympathetic to neighbors on both streets and created privacy for the owners in the center, which was sometimes hard to do on a corner lot. He said that the only reason the project was before the Commission was the lot was deficient in one dimension by 1.6 feet.

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Andrew Barnes said he knew the property owners but that did not influence his decision on the project. He said he liked that construction would be done offsite. He noted the materials, the style, and the siting on the lot. He said the applicants had done a wonderful job keeping an open floor plan well within the perimeters of the lot. He said he supported the use permit requested for the residence. He said the other use permit request was to allow the light wells to encroach into the rear setback noting that the outer edges of the light wells were located approximately 27-feet, 10-inches from the closest neighbor residence. He seconded the motion to approve.

Commissioner Kahle said he agreed the house was very handsome and the massing was well done. He said his only concern was the overall height noting 15-foot high measurements at the underside of the structure. He said the garage itself was very tall at 17-feet or so. He said it could easily decrease one foot in height and made that suggestion to the makers of the motion/second.

Commissioner Kennedy said she was willing to amend her motion to reduce the height of the garage one foot.

Commissioner Barnes referred to D19. He noted perspective 1 and 2. He said reducing the garage one-foot in height would impact the dwelling structure it connected to.

Commissioner Kahle referred to D17 that showed the garage roof was independent of the dwelling's one-story roof. He said there was a flat roof over the mud room area. He said that his intent was the entire roof assembly would be lowered one foot.

Ms. Azaren said the design intention was to use the gabled roofs so even at the maximum height the appearance of the mass was minimized with the sloping and firmer eaves. She said the garage volume and the common area volume had roof lines that were basically mirroring each other so the peaks and eaves of the roofs were at the same height. She noted the breezeway connecting them with a lower roof. She said if they reduced the garage height the symmetry would be eliminated. She said there might also be some structural or construction complications from having the eaves so close to the breezeway roof.

Mr. Djafari said he would echo Ms. Azaren's comments and that considerable design attention was given to matching up the eave end of the living structure to the eave end of the garage. He said they had lowered the mudroom roof for constructability. He said they would prefer not to change as he thought there were significant design reasons for what they were proposing.

Chair Riggs said it was a sympathetic and quality design and the encroachment was no threat to the neighbors. He said he might have designed the project with a lower roof on the garage but the project as proposed was very well integrated. He said he would not support a motion to alter what was an overall successful design.

Recognized by the Chair, Commissioner Kennedy said she would like to keep her original motion to approve without amendment. Commissioner Barnes said he appreciated Commissioner Kahle's input but in this instance, he did not support the proposed amendment.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kennedy/Barnes) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 7-0.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by July 27, 2021) for the use permit to remain in effect.
 - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Bone Architecture, consisting of 22 plan sheets, dated received July 13, 2020, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

- c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
- d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
- e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
- f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
- g. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.
- h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
- i. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre- construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.
- j. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.
- k. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Advanced Tree Care, dated June 17, 2020.
- l. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

m. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:

- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised arborist report indicating that tree # 1 will not be removed, subject to review and approval of the City Arborist and the Planning Division.
- b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans and elevations showing railings around the lightwell, subject to review and approval of the Planning and Building Divisions.

F2. Use Permit/Levent Niazi/847 Woodland Avenue:

Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with a basement on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #20-036-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Matt Pruter said they received an update on the plan set for the site plan, sheet A-1A that had one edit made to correct an error on the rear, right side right corner of the proposed residence. He said the revised measured at five-feet, six-inches.

Applicant Presentation: Levent Niazi said he and his wife were the property owners. He said they looked at multiple designs and decided on a very traditional home with divided windows and stucco exterior.

Romain Curtis, Design Everest, project architect, said they had gone through a number of design iterations over nine months to try to find the right aesthetic for the street as well as to meet the homeowners' needs. He noted that a basement was a solution to allow for more square footage and to keep the aboveground structure compatible with the one-story and one-and-a-half story homes in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kahle said the garage slab seemed to be one foot higher than the surrounding grade. Mr. Curtis said the garage sloped towards the house from the street and was more like six to seven inches with the slight slope to the street. Commissioner Kahle referred to the left side elevation on sheet A5 and the note that the average natural grade was 47.8 feet and the finished floor was 49.06 feet. He asked if the finished floor measurement was for the garage or for the house. Mr. Curtis said it was for the house and the garage would be somewhat less than that.

Commissioner Kahle noted the proposed use of fiberglass windows and asked about upgrading to wood windows. Mr. Curtis spoke about anticipated increased costs for wood windows such as those using mahogany and the improved aesthetic of fiberglass windows from what those had in the past. Commissioner Kahle said he was not suggesting using mahogany and questioned the amount of increased costs Mr. Curtis was suggesting would occur changing from a high end fiberglass window to moderate end wood window. He said he would suggest upgrading to a wood window. He asked about the window trim. Mr. Curtis said the trim would be either cedar on the side with the most exposure and primed pine on the side with the least exposure.

Commissioner Kahle said stucco was the primary material and asked if they had thought of using a different material to contrast. Mr. Curtis said the front elevation was the narrowest part of the house and the stucco would be a smooth finish with tint that would comprise only 55% of the front elevation.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the reason for the 16-foot, 3-inch high garage noting it was fairly prominent to the rest of the house. Mr. Curtis said the garage was small and they were trying to have enough room to do an accent window on it. Commissioner Kahle said generally in Menlo Park it was preferable to de-emphasize the garage and not make it a design feature. He asked if the louvre on the gable end was painted or metal. Mr. Curtis said it would be wood.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the entry noting the small roof seemed like an afterthought. Mr. Curtis commented on the narrowness of the frontage and the need for living space between the garage and the front entry. He said looking at the entry way from a human scale it would have the right proportion and a nice big front door.

Chair Riggs referred to sheet A6 and said it appeared the door was recessed and the living space and second floor were somewhat forward. He said the plane that contained the front door and side light seemed to go up all the way within about four-inches of the 12.76-foot finished floor. Mr. Curtis said he said it was meant to stop at the door noting they were missing a line above the door on the drawing.

Chair Riggs said they were using a mix of hip and gabled roofs. He said he really liked the left elevation because it formed integrity between the two floors. He said the front façade had a hip roof facing forward that had a peak to it on the left. He asked if they had considered simplifying the roof or adding a gable on the second floor to create coordination between the garage roof and the upper roof. Mr. Curtis referred to A4c where they had the proposed roof line. He said they had tried a gable but it did not tie in well with the right side second story. He said the ridge was in the middle of the back of the house and not in the middle of the front of the house on the second story.

Chair Riggs opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner DeCardy asked about the concern raised by a neighbor about the basement. Planner Pruter said the letter expressed concern about a basement being built in what was presumed as a flood zone. He said the project and project site were not located in the flood zone. He said a basement was therefore allowed to be built subject to the building code requirements. He said they spoke with the City's Building Official regarding the concern of liquefaction impacts and to clarify that related from a building standpoint to properties located in flood zones and did not affect this property in any unique way.

Chair Riggs asked about guidance for contractors on dewatering in reference to basement construction. Planner Pruter said it was related to the building code and best management practices and this project would be subject to the same. He said he could follow up further if Chair Riggs wanted more information on that. Chair Riggs said he would as he thought it would help better inform Commissioners and suggested perhaps for the next meeting or by email as staff chose.

Commissioner Kahle said he thought the project missed the mark. He said he appreciated the applicants had gone through many iterations and how the second floor stepped in on the sides. He said it was a very large house with many bedrooms and a basement. He said too many

compromises were made to get to the design proposed and that an all stucco house with fiberglass windows missed the mark. He said the garage was very prominent and tall. He said the entryway seemed thrown together and did not do anything for the house. He said he did not like the two-story wall where the front room has a bedroom directly above it. He said he would not support the project.

Chair Riggs commented on the Commission's purview and quality standards as well as equity related to projects that came before the Commission on substandard lots and those that did not on standard lots, noting that was something he had made suggestions on how to resolve for many years. He said he was comfortable with fiberglass windows having had projects with them over the last five years. He said the profile was fully acceptable and very much like the cladding needed on the exterior of wood windows to enable them to handle heat. He said typically a second material added to a single-material home was often helpful. He said on the other hand some designs referred to certain elements of material and style. He said the closest reference point to this project was Mission style, which was clearly stucco only. He said it was reassuring to him that the project would use smooth stucco as it would lend a 21st century element and other benefits that made it more appropriate in Menlo Park. He said he did agree that the little entry roof was somewhat challenging but he could not find in that enough reason to hold back the project. He said if there was an available improvement to be made to the entry, he would want to suggest it but he did not see that. He said the project was a width-restricted design. He said while personally he was not in favor of the hip roof second floor, he felt there were limits to how far he would reach to help with someone's design. He said he found the project supportable as presented noting he did not see a lot of flexibility from the architect regarding the roof and front entry as the architect's comments and observations seemed quite valid about the restrictions he had with the site and design. He said he was willing to support the project.

Commissioner DeCardy said the project had aspects he personally would not have designed. He said some of those had been addressed. He said with such a project it was important for him to know how neighbors felt about the proposal. He said from the staff report it was his understanding that outreach had been made to the immediate adjacent neighbors and that the applicant reported there were no objections. He said he would prefer more extensive effort to get written correspondence of support from neighbors as was done in the first project on the agenda this evening. He moved to approve the project as recommended in the staff report.

Commissioner Doran said he wanted to observe that projects were always a matter of compromise and that compromise had to be resolved in a way that worked for the property owner and person willing to finance construction. He said this project did that and he thought the proposal was an improvement over what was there now. He said he thought neighbors would be glad to see the upgrade to the property. He seconded the motion to approve.

Commissioner Barnes said in reviewing use permit applications he looked at whether a proposal was deleterious to the area as the hurdle. He said he thought the left side elevation was reserved on the second floor and did not create privacy issues for the neighboring house on the left and for that passed the hurdle. He said the materials and siting passed the hurdle. He said he would support the project.

ACTION: Motion and second (DeCardy/Doran/Barnes) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-1 with Commissioner Kahle opposed.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by July 27, 2021) for the use permit to remain in effect.
 - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Design Everest Consulting Engineers, consisting of 19 plan sheets, dated received July 21, 2020, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 27, 2020, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - g. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.
 - h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits.

- i. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.
- j. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.
- k. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by DSoto Tree & Arborist Services, Inc., dated received March 24, 2020.
- l. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.
- m. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

H. Informational Items

- H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.
- Regular Meeting: August 10, 2020 – Cancelled

Planner Sandmeier said the August 10 meeting was canceled as no projects were ready for consideration.

- Regular Meeting: August 24, 2020
- Regular Meeting: September 14, 2020

I. Adjournment

Chair Riggs adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on August 31, 2020