



MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

May 8, 2006

7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025

CALL TO ORDER – 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Bims (Chair), Deziel, Keith (Vice-chair), O'Malley, Pagee, Riggs, Sinnott

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Megan Fisher, Assistant Planner; Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager; Thomas Rogers, Assistant Planner

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **Architectural Control/Menlo Park Presbyterian Church/700 Santa Cruz Avenue:**
Request for architectural control for exterior modifications to the rear of an existing building located in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district.

Questions of Staff: In response to questions from Commissioner Pagee, Planner Rogers said that a cumulative noise study was not done for the proposed project. He said that should there be noise issues for neighboring residential areas that those property owners might contact the City's Code Enforcement staff.

In response to a question from Commissioner Deziel, Planner Rogers said that the equipment should not be included in the building height measurements.

In response to a question from Commissioner Riggs, Planner Rogers said there were other visible air conditioning units on the rear of similar other buildings in the area.

There was no public comment.

Commission Action: M/S Deziel/Keith to approve as recommended in the staff report.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

- b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Approve the architectural control request subject to the following *standard* conditions of approval:
- a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by BH Bocook AIA Architect, received May 2, 2006, consisting of one plan sheet and approved by the Planning Commission on May 8, 2006, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. 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.

Motion carried 7-0.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Use Permit/Faramarz Tahery/504 O'Keefe Street:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot in regard to lot area and width in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher said that staff had no additional comments

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Sinnott said on the plans that the neighborhood site layout did not seem to be drawn correctly on Page A-3, noting she had physically visited the site and measured the distance to the neighboring house on the left hand side which was at 16 feet not 20 feet as indicated on the plans.

Public Comment: Ms. Mondana Tahery, said she was representing the applicant and that a property line survey had been done. Commissioner Sinnott said the concern she had was with the drawings on Page A-3.

Commissioner Deziel said that there were no windows proposed on the 25-foot wall on the left elevation. Ms. Mondana Tahery said the plans were revised in response to concerns expressed by neighbors.

Ms. Susan Hart, Menlo Park, said her residence would be across the street from the proposed project. She said her concern was the timeframe for the construction and that work should occur only during the week between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. She also had concerns regarding construction staging.

Mr. Brian Hart, Menlo Park, said he hoped Arnold Drive would be used for construction equipment and that O'Keefe would not be blocked by construction equipment.

Mr. Michael Sickinger, Menlo Park, said he was concerned that no one had visited the project site. He said the footprint of the proposed house was not much larger than the existing house and there was at least a 20-foot distance. He said he wanted the project to move forward as it would be an improvement to the neighborhood.

Mr. Michael Palma, Menlo Park, said his home was on the left side and he questioned the setback distance. He said he was concerned with how the project had been managed thus far, noting that the site conditions had been neglected. He said that made him question how it would be managed during construction. He said there would be no side yards or room for landscaping. He said his final concern was the heritage oak tree in the northeast section of the property and how it would be preserved during construction.

Mr. Jon Mester, Menlo Park, said his concern was that the property lines were drawn incorrectly on the first set of plans and were still drawn incorrectly on the revised plans. He said with the property line drawn incorrectly that the amount of square footage of the lot was inaccurate as well.

Commissioner O'Malley asked about the accuracy of the lot area. Planner Fisher said the lot area on the data sheet was correct, but there was a note requiring the applicant to correct their plans before going to the building department.

Ms. Mondana Tahery said that an issue regarding an easement came up the week prior and the City's Attorney was reviewing the easement to see if belonged to the property or the neighboring property. She offered an apology to the neighbors regarding the site conditions noting that it had been a miscommunication between her and the property owner as to who was supposed to contact the gardener.

Chair Bims closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Sinnott moved to approve as recommended by staff; she noted that there was a specific condition to require revised and accurate plans before the applicant could apply for a building permit. Commissioner Deziel seconded the motion with an added condition that if the fence was replaced along the rear lot line that no fence should be allowed within six-inches of the oak tree and no fence posts within three-feet of the root crown of the oak tree.

Commissioner Riggs said that the two-story project was going to set a precedent in the neighborhood as it was all one-story residential on O'Keefe and nearly all one-story residential on Arnold Drive. He said he understand why neighbors had written concerned that the project would not be in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Commissioner Pagee said she agreed with Commissioner Riggs and she would like a plan that picked up more of the elements of the neighborhood. Commissioner Keith said she concurred with Commissioners Pagee and Riggs. She said she would rather see a basement addition than a second-story.

Commissioner Deziel said that he thought windows should be added to second-story wall. He said however that the project represented an investment in the neighborhood and neighbors who spoke this evening had supported the project. He said he would like a condition for a window to break up the mass on the second-story wall.

Commissioner Sinnott said that the second floor on the plan was pushed in on all sides, but she would like to see windows on the blank wall. She said that the Commission needed to be objective about proposed second-story additions. She agreed with Commissioner Deziel's condition to allow windows on the second story wall as agreed upon through staff with the applicant and neighbor on that side.

Commissioner O'Malley said he agreed with Commissioner Deziel. He said he visited the area and although there were no two-story homes in the immediate area there were others not far from the project site. He said he thought the project would make the neighborhood a more attractive place.

Commissioner Pagee said the plans were not accurate and it was not clear what the impacts on the neighbors would be. She said there were no conditions for landscaping. She said she was not opposed to two-stories but she did not feel this proposal worked.

Commissioner Riggs said that the General Plan tasked the Commission with protecting and maintaining the character of a neighborhood. He said there were concerns expressed tonight regarding the applicant's ability to manage the project well. He said the design had not made an effort to blend in with neighborhood and he supported continuing the project for re-design and landscaping.

Commissioner Deziel said this proposal was very similar to projects on Gilbert Street. He said he would like to see landscape screening on the left-hand side and would support a landscaping plan. Commissioner Pagee said that the two-stories built on Gilbert Street were not attractive. Commissioner Riggs said he supported the building of two-stories on corner lots but not this design.

Commission Action: M/S Sinnott/Deziel to approve as recommended by staff with the requirement for a window on the 25-foot second story wall with neighbor approval and if the neighbor would not approve then the item would come back to the Commission as an architectural review item; heritage tree protection measures with distance of any new fence being greater than six-inches from the oak tree and fence posts to be at least three-feet from the root crown; and a landscaping plan for the left elevation.

Motion failed 3-4 with Commissioners Deziel, Sinnott, and O'Malley in support and Commissioners Bims, Keith, Pagee, and Riggs opposed.

Commissioner Riggs moved to continue the item for redesign for a project more harmonious with the neighborhood and to submit a landscaping plan that would hopefully include the addition of a street tree. Commissioner Pagee said she would second the motion if there was a condition to require that the plans be drawn accurately. Commissioner Riggs confirmed with staff that an additional condition for that was not needed. Commissioner Sinnott said that the Commission had to be specific as to what it wanted in its redesign. Commissioner Riggs said that massing and materials were two key aspects and that an architect could design a project that incorporated architectural features from the neighborhood. He suggested that the applicant get a more experienced designer to do the project.

Commissioner Deziel said that it was unclear to him how the design elements of a one-story ranch could extend to a second story. He said perhaps the neighbors present at the meeting should be allowed to comment. Chair Bims said that he would not reopen the public comment; he said there were design issues with the left elevation and that should be addressed. He said

additionally there were errors in the plan and no architect present. He said that raised concerns for him as to whether this is the best plan. He said that when the item returned he would like to see an architect present to answer questions.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Pagee to continue the item to allow the applicant to redesign the project to be more harmonious with the neighborhood and with a requirement for a landscaping plan.

Motion carried 4-3 with Commissioners Bims, Keith, Pagee, Riggs in support and Commissioners Deziel, O'Malley and Sinnott opposed.

2. **Use Permit/Michael A. Chacon/1342 Garden Lane:** Request for a use permit for excavation into a required front and side yard setback for access to a basement garage and for a detached secondary dwelling unit, associated with construction of a new single-family residence in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district.

Staff Comment: Planner Rogers made two minor corrections to the data sheet: Building Coverage from 7,025 maximum square feet to 7,474 maximum square feet and Floor Area Limit from 6,139 square feet to 6,389 square feet.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Deziel asked who would review and enforce the standards for the retaining wall, noting the findings the Commission needed to make. Planner Rogers said that structural elements were reviewed by the Building Department for consistency with Uniform Building Code and any applicable building regulations.

Commissioner Riggs said that the retaining wall would need to be built to retaining wall and seismic standards. He said probably the retaining wall would outlive other structures. Development Services Manager Murphy said that there is a use permit requirement and the Commission was asked to review whether the excavation was appropriate; and the Uniform Building Code had stringent requirements for retaining walls. He said that if in the future the retaining wall was to give way it would be a private matter between the two property owners.

Commissioner Sinnott asked whether this was a precedent. Development Services Manager Murphy said this was his first experience of a request like this in his 10 years of City service. Commissioner Sinnott asked if it was considered a light well. Planner Rogers said it essentially was.

Public Comment: Mr. Mike Chacon, project architect, said the property owners wanted a single-story elegant hacienda-style house. He said they have a number of vehicles, which was why the subterranean garage was being proposed.

Commissioner Deziel asked whether the solid seven-foot wall on the left side had been reviewed with the neighbor. Mr. Chacon said the plans were reviewed by the neighbors and the wall was both for the privacy of his clients and the neighbors. He said in the area referred to the neighbors had a swimming pool and a guesthouse. He said he did analysis of shade and shadow and there was very little impact. He said they talked specifically about the fence because of the driveway. He said there were layers of safety measures to protect from accidents in the area.

Commissioner Keith asked about the bathroom in the kitchen. Mr. Chacon said that the bathroom was for use of pool users because of the kitchen's proximity to the pool.

Commissioner Riggs asked about the emergency generator and possible impacts on neighbors. Mr. Chacon said he did not know those details and thought that would need to be answered by the mechanical engineer(s) during the building permit process.

In response to a question from Commissioner Deziel, Planner Rogers said that an emergency generator in a residence would need to be powered by natural gas, not diesel or gasoline.

Chair Bims closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Sinnott said she thought the extensive excavation would change the fabric of the neighborhood and it was a precedent.

Commissioner Deziel said that he would like a condition that the use permit would be subject to review and renewal if the left side neighbor presented a professional engineering report deeming the retaining wall unsafe. He said he would move to approve with that condition. Development Services Manager Murphy said that he did not think the use permit would need to come back to the Commission. Commissioner Keith said she thought it was a property law issue and the proposed condition would not be needed. She said she would second the motion without the condition. Commissioner Deziel said he would withdraw his motion.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve per the staff report and Commissioner Keith seconded the motion.

Commissioner Pagee said she could not support the project because there would be a stonewall creating an echo chamber that would generate a lot of noise and she was concerned with the diversion of a large amount of water.

Chair Bims said the design generally seemed inconsistent with Menlo Park designs. He said he would prefer a two-story design.

Commissioner Riggs said he agreed with Commissioner Sinnott that this was a major project and with Chair Bims that it was a dramatic project. He said he could not really find a reason to object to the project however and there was a tremendous amount of neighbor support. He said the structure would have a low visual impact. He said the project would also provide a secondary dwelling.

Commissioner Deziel noted that there were excavated garages in Menlo Park already, most of which only were halfway underground; he said unlike those garages that this underground garage would be done properly. He expressed concern about the use permit and future condition of the retaining wall. Commissioner Riggs said he would include a condition to require the property owner to maintain the retaining wall.

Commission Action: M/S Riggs/Keith to approve with the following modification.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 of the current State 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. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by MAC Architecture/Construction, consisting of 18 plan sheets, dated received April 5, 2006, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 8, 2006, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval of 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.
 - e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. These revised plans shall be submitted for the review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - f. 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 issuance of a grading, demolition or building permit.
 - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance. Prior to the building permit issuance, the applicant shall implement the tree protection plan and technique recommendations in the Arborist Report for all applicable heritage trees.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following *project-specific* conditions:
 - a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a revised arborist report, including additional protection measures for the heritage redwood and heritage magnolia at the front of the adjoining property at 1360 Garden Lane. The report shall specify a root protection zone extending at least six feet from the common fence line, in which excavation must be conducted by hand-troweling. The report shall specify that any roots in this area that must be trimmed shall be "clean cut." In addition, these two trees should be dip fertilized before and after the proposed construction. The revised report shall be subject to staff review and approval.

- b. ***The owner must maintain the retaining wall for the left side excavation in a safe condition.***

Motion carried 4-3 with Commissioners Deziel, Keith, O'Malley and Riggs supporting and Commissioners Bims, Pagee and Sinnott opposed):

3. **Use Permit/Rebecca Snowball/887 Oak Grove Avenue:** Request for a use permit for a private recreational use yoga studio in the C-3 (Central Commercial) zoning district.

This Item continued to a future meeting date.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. **Architectural Control and Sign Review/David Lundy with RHL Design Group/710 Willow Road:** Request for sign approval for new and replacement signs containing the color red, and approval of architectural control for changes to the service bay building and pump island canopy.

Staff Comment: Planner Fisher said staff had no additional comments.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner O'Malley asked if the trailer behind the gas station was a permissible use. Planner Fisher said the trailer was used for storage at the station and did not violate any regulations, but noted that it was not attractive. She said however that neighbors were concerned that if the trailer were removed it created an area that would invite loitering. Commissioner O'Malley said it was a very unattractive feature of the property.

Public Comment: Mr. Mark Graff, RHL Design Group, said that he represented RHL Design Group for both items D.1 and D.2. He said that for the canopy on D.2 the client would paint it tan rather than red.

Commissioner Riggs asked regarding D.2 about the color of the columns. Mr. Graff said the very bottom would be painted red, then three stripes of silver and the remainder white.

Commissioner Deziel questioned the need for the three foot by 47 foot stripe of red in the canopy. Mr. Graff said the company was trying to make their three stations look the same – Conoco, Phillips and 76 – except for the logo. Commissioner Deziel asked if there could be less red. Mr. Graff said that it would be either red or tan.

Commissioner Pagee asked if other cities had accepted these changes. Mr. Graff said that Sacramento, Fairfield, Oakland, Petaluma, Vallejo, San Francisco and San Carlos had accepted the corporate proposal.

Commissioner Keith asked about removal of the trailer at 710 Willow Road. Mr. Graff said that was not part of the sign application, but that he had received the correspondence from Planner Fisher. Commissioner Keith suggested that he forward the letter to Conoco Phillips.

Commissioner Deziel indicated that he was in favor of supporting corporate identity, but he had trouble with the amount of red being proposed.

Commissioner Riggs said that there were larger issues than loitering related to the gas station at 710 Willow Road.

Commissioner Keith noted that Mr. Graff had not been present at the last meeting when these items had been discussed at length. She said she thought he should forward the letter about the issues at the gas station to Conoco Phillips. Planner Fisher said that Mr. Phillips represented the sign company; she had been in communication with the representative of Conoco Phillips about the issues and had forwarded that letter to them. She said Mr. Phillips had no ability to change the situation at this gas station. She said since then there had been improvements made at the gas station such as the removal of certain merchandise and installation of motion detector lighting at the rear.

Commissioner O'Malley asked if the proposal was denied whether the company would propose something else. Mr. Graff said they would not and he did not understand if the red was removed what the objection would be. It was determined that there was an option for tan on the canopy for both projects.

Chair Bims asked for public comments on items D.1 and D.2. There was none.

Chair Bims closed the public hearing.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Keith moved to approve with the choice of the pueblo tan canopy; Commissioner Pagee seconded the motion. Commissioner O'Malley said that there was no violation that would force the trailer off the site. He said the removal of certain products from the mini-mart was positive and he wondered if he could presume that the landscaping would be improved. Planner Rogers said that the Commission could make recommendations regarding the landscaping. Commissioner Deziel suggested a condition for landscape screening of the trailer as long as the trailer was there subject to staff review or upgrade the trailer subject to staff review. Commissioner Keith said that landscaping around the trailer might make the area even more attractive to loiterers. She said perhaps the operator or a company representative could present a landscape plan to the Commission.

Chair Bims asked if the Commission as part of the architectural review could have a condition for the trailer to be removed. Development Services Manager Murphy said that under the findings for the architectural review the Commission could make a condition for the removal of the trailer. Commissioner Deziel said that the approval of the color scheme was conditioned upon removal of the trailer and a requirement for landscaping subject to staff report. He said that if the trailer was not removed, the applicant would need to bring the landscape plan to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Keith withdrew her original motion and moved to approve per staff report with the modification that the color scheme for the canopy will be tan; approval was conditioned upon the removal of the trailer and landscaping subject to review of staff; or if the trailer was not removed that approval would be subject upon the Planning Commission's approval of a landscape plan.

Commission Action: M/S Keith/Pagee to approve with the following modifications.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding architectural control approval:

- a. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Make a finding that the signs are appropriate and compatible with the businesses and signage on Willow Road, and are consistent with the Design Guidelines for Signs.
 4. Approve the architectural control and sign review subject to the following *standard* conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by RHL Design Group, Inc., consisting of four plan sheets dated December 6, 2005, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 8, 2006, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
 5. Approve the architectural control and sign review subject to the following *project specific* conditions:
 - a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall revise the sign plans to show the pole sign with a proposed height of 20 feet, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall provide a security-fencing plan for the area around the storage trailer that improves site safety without adversely affecting adjacent properties. The plan shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - c. ***The building permit plans shall show the fascia on the canopy as pueblo tan where red was proposed on the Planning Commission plans.***
 - d. ***Prior to building permit issuance, the owner shall provide a landscape plan subject to Planning Commission approval if the trailer is to remain, or staff approval if the trailer is removed.***

Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Architectural Control and Sign Review/David Lundy with RHL Design Group/1380 El Camino:** Request for sign approval for new and replacement signs containing the color red, and approval of architectural control for changes to the service bay building and pump island canopy.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Riggs to approve with the following modification.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 of the current State CEQA Guidelines.
2. Make the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding architectural control approval:
 - a. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
 - c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
 - d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
3. Make a finding that the signs are appropriate and compatible with the businesses and signage on El Camino Real, and are consistent with the Design Guidelines for Signs.
4. Approve the architectural control and sign review subject to the following *standard* conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by RHL Design Group, Inc., consisting of four plan sheets dated December 5, 2005, and approved by the Planning Commission on May 8, 2006, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.
5. Approve the architectural control and sign review subject to the following *project specific* conditions:
 - a. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall revise the sign plans to show the pole sign with a proposed height of 22 feet, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - b. ***The building permit plans shall show pueblo tan trim on the gabled roof of the canopy where the existing paint color is orange, instead of the proposed fascia.***

3. **Consideration of the minutes from the March 13, 2006, Planning Commission meeting. Portion of the minutes continued from the meeting of April 24, 2006.**

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Sinnott to approve with the following change.

- Page 19, above "D. Regular Business": insert "Motion carried 6-0."

Motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner O'Malley abstaining.

4. Consideration of the minutes from the April 10, 2006, Planning Commission meeting,

Commission Action: M/S Sinnott/Pagee to approve with the following changes.

- Page 3, after 3rd paragraph: Insert the sentence "Chair Bims closed the public hearing."
- Page 3, 6th paragraph, second line: Replace the misspelled word "brining" with "bringing."
- Page 6, above Item 3: Insert: sentence "Motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner Sinnott abstaining."
- Page 6, last bullet of condition 4.a should be highlighted in bold type.

Motion carried 7-0.

5. Consideration of the excerpts from the April 17, 2006, Planning Commission meeting for 695 Oak Grove Avenue.

Commission Action: M/S Pagee/Riggs to approve with the following changes.

- Page 1, Roll Call: Add the word "absent" after Commissioner O'Malley's name.
- Page 6, after condition 6 d: Insert sentence "Motion carried 6-0."

Motion carried 6-0.

E. COMMISSION BUSINESS, REPORTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **Review of upcoming planning items on the City Council agenda.**

Development Services Manager Murphy provided the Commission with a review of upcoming planning items on the City Council agenda.

Commissioner Deziel provided the Commission with information on meeting procedures.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager

Prepared by: Brenda Bennett, Recording Secretary

Approved by Planning Commission on June 26, 2006.