

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, April 27, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: George Webber, Chair
James Macdonald, Vice-Chairman
Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner
Thomas Osborne, Commissioner
Paul Thompson, Commissioner

ABSENT: Caroline Laymon, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Robert Dalquest, Principal Planner/Project Manager
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Richard Malacoff, Associate Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
Alicia Heideman, Junior Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Webber called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Laymon and Miller.

Chairman Webber noted that he received a letter from Mr. Dwight Yeoman relative to a request for a grading permit that may have an impact on his property. Chairman Webber requested that staff report back to the Commission with information on the grading permit.

II. CONSENT ITEMS - NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 259** - A request for Planning Commission consideration of one (1) pedestal sign with a total face area of twenty-four (24) square feet located at 1680 W. Redlands Blvd. in the EV/CG, East Valley Corridor Specific Plan General Commercial District. Request submitted by GLOBAL SIGN SYSTEMS.

Mr. John Jaquess requested the item be tabled and Item IV-A be heard at this time.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 304** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an Ordinance Text Amendment to add Chapter 8.06 to the Redlands Municipal Code to establish regulations for the control of noise. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Commissioner Miller arrived at 2:05 p.m.

Mr. Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Dalquest stated that staff utilized a Noise Control Ordinance obtained from the League of California Cities that was adopted by the City of Whittier. Mr. Dalquest stated the ordinance was modified to strengthen provisions identified by staff, the Ad Hoc Committee, the City Attorney, and Redlands Police Department. Mr. Dalquest stated that a section was deleted that allowed for an administrative variance process if a property/business owner could not comply with the ordinance upon recommendation from the City Attorney.

Mr. Dalquest stated the proposed noise ordinance establishes baseline standards for maximum interior/exterior noise exposure limits for residential, commercial, public space, institutional, and industrial uses. In addition, the proposed ordinance contains provisions that deal with noise disturbances that are specifically prohibited or prohibited after a certain period of time.

Mr. Dalquest noted that the proposed ordinance:

1. Provides noise measurement procedures
2. Allows commercial and industrial operations currently in existence a certain period of time to comply based on the cost of improvements and,
3. Includes provisions for violation of the Noise Control Ordinance which would be enforced by Code Enforcement Officers or others designated by the City Manager

Mr. Dalquest noted that the proposed ordinance would implement a number of policies contained in the Noise Element of the General Plan which provides a comprehensive program to achieve/maintain land use compatibility with environmental noise levels.

Mr. Dalquest stated the Ad Hoc Committee and staff recommend adoption of the proposed Noise Ordinance.

Commissioner Thompson expressed concern on the weekend time limits proposed in the ordinance. Mr. Dalquest noted that the ordinance may be modified by the Commission.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Cunningham stated currently noise levels are measured at the private back yard, which he feels is a direct violation of Measure U. Mr. Cunningham stated the proposed ordinance

is well done and he encouraged its adoption.

Mr. Dalquest stated an exemption in the ordinance would allow for new home construction

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne noted that the wording in 8.06.080 Interior Noise Standards refers to dwelling units which implies that it is a residential use. It was determined that the words "dwelling unit" would be replaced with "structure" which encompasses all uses, such as institutional, commercial, and industrial, in addition to residential.

Chairman Webber addressed Commissioner Thompson's request that the time for maintenance of residential property be changed from "between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m." to "between the hours of **7:00** a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends.

Commissioners Cook, Miller, and Macdonald concurred with Commissioner Thompson.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1027, recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance Text Amendment No. 304 with a modification to the wording:

5. Minor maintenance of residential property such as maintenance of landscaping or minor repair of the residence or ancillary structures. This exemption applies if conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays, and **7:00** a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends and Federal holidays, and provided the activity does not generate more than 90 dBA (Example, Lawn mower, leaf blower, etc.)

Item III A which was tabled earlier in the meeting was heard at this time.

- A. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 259** - A request for Planning Commission consideration of one (1) pedestal sign with a total face area of twenty-four (24) square feet located at 1680 W. Redlands Blvd. in the EV/CG, East Valley Corridor Specific Plan General Commercial District. Request submitted by GLOBAL SIGN SYSTEMS.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman stated the proposed project was continued at the March 23rd Planning Commission meeting so that revisions could be made to the plans. To date, the applicant has not submitted those revisions. Ms. Heideman continued by saying the applicant requested a 90 day time extension which must be granted by the City Council. Due to the Permit Streamlining Act, the City has until May 5, 2004 to take action.

The earliest the Council can hear this issue is May 4th, the day before the Permit Streamlining Act expires. If the City Council is unable to approve the time extension, the

project will be automatically approved before Planning Commission can take action. Staff is recommending denial of the project since the applicant has yet to submit the revised plans and to prevent automatic approval of the project.
Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Michael Lewin, representing the applicant, questioned Finding #3 which states that placing a monument sign at this location will improve the visibility. Mr. Lewin stated he could not understand why a monument sign would improve visibility over a pedestal sign.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission felt the trees would interfere with a pedestal sign. Mr. Shaw interjected that the combination of pedestal signs and monument signs is easier to see.

Mr. Fred Zepeda, applicant, stated he has 400 feet of street frontage with a wall sign only, which is visible to traffic traveling westbound on Redlands Boulevard and the sight line for eastbound traffic is not impaired.

Mr. Lewin asked why his applicant does not meet intent and purpose for Section 15.36 (Finding #5) as they feel the project was designed well within the sign criteria.

Mr. Shaw stated Section 15.36 relates to aesthetics and the appearance of the community in which it is located. Mr. Shaw stated that the Code allows for either a monument or a pedestal sign, however, signs are reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and a determination is made as to which would be most appropriate.

Mr. Zepeda stated the City rules are codified by the City Council, and he questioned how the Planning Commission can override the Municipal Code.

Mr. Shaw stated the applicant can withdraw the application and resubmit with no additional fees required.

Mr. Lewin requested withdrawal of the project, and there was no further discussion.

- B. COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 384 (REVISION 2) -** Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a Commission Review and Approval to install one 4,071 square foot carport and one 1,839 square foot carport with a solar electric system mounted on the roof in the existing parking lot of the Edwards Mansion located at 2064 Orange Tree Lane in Specific Plan 29. Request submitted by GORDON BLOOM.

Ms. Heideman explained she was having difficulty with the PowerPoint presentation, and was unable to provide a site plan for the project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gordon Bloom, Genself Corp., stated the first phase provided approximately 30% of

the applicant's total annual energy usage, and this project, when completed, will provide 80-90% of the applicant's total energy usage.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 384 Revision 2 subject to the following findings:

1. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed car port.
 2. That the site properly relates to Orange Tree Lane which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development.
 3. That the conditions of approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 384 Revision 2 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare.
 4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community.
 5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial Designation of the General Plan.
- C. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 402** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a Zone Change from unincorporated County of San Bernardino to a proposed zoning of R-1, Single Family Residential District for 4.89 acres located on the northwest corner of Mentone Boulevard (Highway 38) and Amethyst Street. Request submitted by DAVID HIGGINSON.
- D. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 818** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 16,030 square foot religious institution on 4.89 acres located on the northwest corner of Mentone Boulevard (Highway 38) and Amethyst Street within the unincorporated area of the County of San Bernardino (proposed City of Redlands R-1, Single Family Residential District). Request submitted by DAVID HIGGINSON.

Mr. John Jaquess stated the applicant filed an application for annexation of the site to the City, in addition to the two items before the Commission. Mr. Jaquess stated a question was raised during final review of the staff report as to whether the annexation or the zoning consideration should occur first. That matter is being reviewed by the City Attorney,

therefore, Mr. Jaquess requested the proposed project be continued to May 11th.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Zone Change No. 402 and Conditional Use Permit No. 818 to May 11, 2004.

- E. **VARIANCE NO. 676** - PUBLIC HEARING for Planning Commission consideration of a Variance from Section 18.52.130 of the Redlands Municipal Code to waive the requirement for front-yard setback of twenty-five (25) feet to allow a swimming pool, pool equipment, and wood fence six (6) feet in height at the rear of the existing house on a corner lot at 302 W. Fern Avenue (northwest corner of W. Fern Ave. & Grant St.) in the R-2, Multiple Family Residential District. Request Submitted by JOHN GARDNER.

Project Planner Asher Hartel distributed a copy of a revised site plan he received from the applicant prior to the meeting. Mr. Hartel stated the variance application which covers the swimming pool, pool equipment, and a wood fence is no longer necessary for the fence since the applicant is proposing to reduce the fence height from five (5) feet to four (4) feet. However a variance is required for the pool and pool equipment.

Commissioner Osborne noted that the revised plan shows the distance from the pool to the property line has been decreased from thirteen (13) feet to eight (8) feet. Commissioner Osborne stated he would prefer to have a landscaping buffer between the pool and the property line.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Gardner, applicant, stated he would prefer to have a five (5) foot fence offset six (6) inches from the property line in order to allow for planting of a vining plant on the exterior of the fence.

Discussion was held on the placement of the pool.

Commissioner Miller stated the vines are nice, but he felt additional trees, which would provide variations of height, should be planted between the sidewalk and the paving.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioners Cook, Thompson, and Osborne agreed that a five (5) foot fence would be more appropriate, although a variance would be required.

Mr. Shaw asked the Commission to review the two plans and determine which plan is most appropriate.

Chairman Webber noted that the original plan submitted included a landscape buffer and a five (5) foot fence.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Discussion was held comparing the two plans that were submitted by Mr. Gardner.

Commissioner Miller stated there should be a five (5) foot planter, at a minimum.

Mr. Gardner stated he will have a five (5) landscaped area inside the fence, however if the fence is moved back seven (7) feet, as requested by the Commission, he will lose the landscaped area.

The Commission reached a consensus on supporting a five (5) foot fence along the property line.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 676 subject to the following findings and revised Conditions of Approval:

1. There are exceptional circumstances to this proposal because the lot was subdivided prior to the current regulations, which makes it difficult to make any additions or provide backyard amenities which meet the code requirements. The existing house encroaches into the front-yard setback along Grant Street and the proposed pool, pool equipment, and fence will maintain the same setback as the house.
 2. There are many instances on surrounding streets that already have the setbacks requested and a variance for the front yard setback has been recently granted under Variance No. 617 and 658.
 3. The applicant's request for reduced front yard setbacks will not have a negative impact on the City, neighborhood, or any specific property owner.
 4. The granting of the requested variance will not conflict with the City's General Plan, with a revision to Condition of Approval 2 to read:
2. This project approval includes the granting of a variance for reduction of the front

yard setback from twenty-five (25) feet to **eight (8)** feet for a swimming pool, **one (1)** foot for pool equipment, and **six inches** from the Grant Street property line for a fence with a height of five (5) feet.

- F. **AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE REMOVAL NO. 102** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Agricultural Preserve Removal on 19.6 acres at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, on property located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request Submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- G. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 394** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a Zone Change from A-1, Agricultural District to R-E, Residential Estate District on three (3) contiguous parcels totaling 19.6 gross acres at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request Submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- H. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 806** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 19.6 acres consisting of 52 residential lots and four (4) common lots at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request Submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- I. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16747** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 19.6 gross acres into 52 residential lots and four (4) common lots at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed R-E Residential Estate District). Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.

Project Planner Asher Hartel stated the project requires the demolition of an existing house on the property. Mr. Hartel stated the project was reviewed by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission (HSPC) and they indicated they would not support the demolition.

Mr. Hartel stated that (Planned Residential Development) PRD standards require a ten (10) foot setback on each side of the lot that abuts the property lines. Mr. Hartel stated that staff has conditioned the project to comply with the standards. Mr. Hartel stated all other lots (interior) will have a minimum five (5) foot side yard setback and a minimum combined setback of fifteen (15) feet.

Mr. Hartel stated staff is requesting the project be continued to allow the applicant time to redesign the tentative tract map to meet PRD standards for side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the Code is interpreted to mean a ten foot side yard setback is required if the property abuts property that is not part of the project. Mr. Hartel responded by saying if any part of the lot abuts property that is not part of the project a ten (10) foot side yard is required. Commissioner Osborne questioned whether the Code is being interpreted correctly due to the fact that the **rear** property line of the proposed project abuts land that is not part of the project. Commissioner Osborne disputed staff's interpretation.

Commissioner Cook asked Mr. Hartel if a ten (10) foot side yard setback is required for the R-E District. Mr. Hartel answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Cook asked Mr. Hartel if the RV parking is counted towards open space.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kirk Duke, LSA Associates, stated that discussion was held to donate the building to a historical society.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, Thatcher Engineering, stated he concurs with the staff report and Conditions of Approval with the exception of Planning Division Condition of Approval 13. Mr. Thatcher stated the developer Dick Darling, project architect, landscape architect, and geologist were available to answer questions.

Mr. Thatcher stated he has an issue with the requirement for minimum ten (10) foot side yard setbacks for lots that abut the east and west property lines. Mr. Thatcher indicated he has an issue with the requirement for a minimum fifteen (15) aggregate for interior lots.

Mr. Thatcher noted he submitted two (2) prior projects (Tract 16174 and Tract 16359) that were processed and approved by the City, with side yard setbacks that were less than ten (10) feet.

Mr. Thatcher stated he was not advised to apply for a variance by either the Preliminary Review Committee or the Environmental Review Committee, so he did not apply for a variance as a matter of consistency.

Commissioner Macdonald stated the (2) projects were approved before the Commission made the decision to evaluate projects with less than ten (10) foot side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Cook concurred with Commissioner Macdonald.

Discussion was held on the two projects referred to by Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. Shaw stated staff would research the two projects and report back to the Commission.

Mr. Thatcher stated the benefits of a PRD are being taken away and the developer has no flexibility when plotting houses. Mr. Thatcher stated the goal of PRDs is allowing flexibility in the project so that the houses can be plotted.

Mr. Thatcher asked the Commission to consider revised language for Condition of Approval 13 as follows:

Minimum front and rear yards for the project shall comply with the provisions of the Municipal Code. Side yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 5'. A minimum of 15' of separation shall be maintained between two story structures. A minimum of 10' shall be maintained between structures wherein at least one of the structures is either single story or has a single story element along that common property line.

Mr. Shaw recommended the Commission change the Code, if there was an error of interpreting the Code in the past, rather than say the Code will not be applied.

Commissioner Osborne stated he did not feel the Code needs to be changed, nor does he feel the Commission made a mistake.

Chairman Webber stated the "abutting" issue will be investigated by staff.

Commissioner Miller requested a broader comparison of other tracts, relative to lot size, frontage, side yard setbacks, and amenities.

Commissioner Osborne requested staff give its interpretation of the Code relative to the intent of "projects abutting other projects".

Mr. Thatcher stated everyone in this price range has toys, and they want to have a place to park the "toys". Mr. Thatcher stated the recreational vehicle parking is an amenity.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Thatcher what he will do with the house that is on site, if the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission does not want it demolished. Mr. Thatcher stated there are a number of options to consider such as relocating the structure or keeping it on site.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Shaw if there are other subdivisions that have RV storage of this size. Mr. Shaw stated there is a subdivision off Cypress Avenue with an RV storage area.

Commissioner Miller expressed concern on the chain link fence surrounding the RV storage area, and suggested wrought iron with the pickets placed close together so that a vine could cling to it. Commissioner Miller stated the park is very nice, within a nice development, and he feels the chain link will detract from it.

Mr. Thatcher stated there will be a solid hedge of green and the chain link will not be seen.

Commissioner Cook asked Mr. Shaw if RV parking has been counted towards open space in previous projects. Mr. Shaw stated he did not recall, but he would be happy to research that issue.

Mr. Thatcher stated he has come before the Commission many times, and has been asked many times, "What are the amenities?"

Chairman Webber stated he felt the RV parking is a great amenity.

Commissioner Macdonald urged the Commissioner to drive out to the tracts that have been approved and compare the five foot and ten foot side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Cook stated the Commission has to be careful to maintain the low density residential feeling.

Commissioner Macdonald reminded the Commission of the discussions and concerns they have had in the past relative to five (5) side yard setbacks.

Mr. Shaw stated he would return to the Commission with an overview of approved PRDs and a breakdown of the setbacks that have been granted.

Mr. Shaw stated they have tried to get the word out to the developers that there is concern on reduced setbacks.

Mr. Shaw stated he did not feel there is an interpretation question relative to the Code Requirement. He stated the applicant can file an application for a variance, amend the Code, or revise the project to accommodate the setback requirement. Mr. Shaw stated he would discuss this issue with the attorney.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 102, Zone Change No. 402, Tentative Tract No. 16747, and Conditional Use Permit No. 806 to May 25, 2004 to allow the applicant time to revise the Tentative Tract Map and development plan to meet the Planned Residential Development standards for side yard setbacks.

V. ADDENDA

A. FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 743 -
PATHWAY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL (formerly Temple Baptist School)

Mr. Richard Malacoff gave a brief presentation and stated Phase I is under construction. Mr. Malacoff reviewed minor landscaping issues that need to be addressed and can be handled administratively. Mr. Malacoff stated that Reverend Gary Jefferson was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Miller expressed concern there aren't many shade trees around the buildings (Phase II) and there aren't enough trees between the sanctuary and the driveway.

Mr. Malacoff stated the applicant is not required to have more trees, but they can be added to the project.

Commissioner Miller suggested additional shade trees be planted:

1. On the west side, between the parking lot and the two classrooms (Phase II)
2. On the west side of the sanctuary and the multi-purpose building facing the driveway (Phase III)
3. On Cypress Avenue, near the southwest corner, where the entrance drive turns westerly,

Commissioner Thompson suggested additional trees in the area on the west side of classrooms in Phases I, II, and III. Mr. Malacoff stated there is a drainage channel that runs through the area, however, he suggested adding wording to the motion that would require trees along the drainage channel (between Phase I and Phase III) subject to the approval and requirements of the Public Works Department.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Pastor Gary Jefferson concurred with staff's recommendations which are subject to Public Works Department requirements.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Final Landscape Plan for Conditional Use Permit No. 743 subject to the recommended changes:

1. Provision of more trees adjacent to the west side of Phase II facing the parking area.
2. The wet side of the sanctuary and multi-purpose building area facing the driveway.

3. Provide more shade trees on the corner of Cypress Avenue at Redlands Boulevard.
 4. The addition of more trees between Phases I and III subject to the approval of the Public Works Department since this area contains a drainage channel which may limit the amount of landscaping to include trees.
- B. REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION FOR THE TRANSFER OF AN ON-SALE GENERAL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL LICENSE FOR APPLEBEE'S NEIGHBORHOOD GRILL & BAR AT 2046 W. REDLANDS BOULEVARD.

Mr. Jaquess gave a brief presentation.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the On-Sale General Alcoholic Beverage License for Applebee's Neighborhood Grill & Bar. No Conditions are recommended to be added as there are no problems associated with this facility.

- C. REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION FOR THE TRANSFER OF AN OFF-SALE GENERAL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL LICENSE FOR ROYAL MARKET LOCATED AT 716 TENNESSEE STREET

Mr. Jaquess gave a brief presentation and noted a correction in the wording for the motion.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the person to person transfer of the Off-Sale General License for Royal Market, no conditions are recommended to be added as there are no problems associated with this facility.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. April 13, 2004

Chairman Webber thanked the Secretary for the April 13th minutes stating that they were very detailed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commission Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of April 13, 2004.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of April 20, 2004.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT TO MAY 11, 2004

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to May 11th at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Ortiz, Senior Admin. Assistant
Community Development Department

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department