

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, February 22, 2005, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: George Webber, Chair
James Macdonald, Vice-Chairman
Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Caroline Laymon, Commissioner
Paul Thompson, Commissioner

ABSENT: Gary Miller, Commissioner
Thomas Osborne, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Leslie E. Murad II, Assistant City Attorney
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
David Jump, Junior Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - 3 MINUTES

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

Chairman Webber advised the audience that parking passes can be obtained from the Planning Commission secretary for those who parked in the Civic Center parking lot.

II. CONSENT ITEM- NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **VARIANCE NO. 693 - PUBLIC HEARING** for a Variance from Section 18.144.200 (B) of the Redlands Municipal Code to permit recreational open space within private rear yards in lieu of the requirement for recreational open space in the proposed common area of Tract No. 16816 located on the east side of Alessandro Road in Specific Plan No. 43. Request submitted by CLIVE PETERS. (Project Planner: Manuel Baeza)
- B. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 843** - Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Conditional Use Permit for the establishment of a Planned Residential Development on 26.81 gross acres consisting of 10 residential lots and 3 common area lots located on the east side of Alessandro Road in Specific Plan No. 43. Request submitted by CLIVE PETERS. (Project Planner: Manuel Baeza)

C. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16816** - Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide 26.81 gross acres into 10 residential lots and 3 common area lots located on the east side of Alessandro Road in Specific Plan No. 43. Request submitted by CLIVE PETERS.
(Project Planner: Manuel Baeza)

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated the map was revised to include contouring of slope areas and reduction of building pad areas resulting in a reduction greater than 11%. Mr. Baeza stated the pads for lots 7 and 8 were reduced by more than 23%.

Mr. Baeza stated staff was asked to provide information on the pad sizes for neighboring residential developments such as Smiley Ridge and Sunset Hills. Mr. Baeza stated the pad sizes for Smiley Ridge averaged approximately 10,000 square feet and the developed portion of Sunset Hills averaged approximately 20,000 square feet which is considerably larger than the proposed project average of 16,460 square feet.

Commissioner Laymon asked how much is still undeveloped in the Sunset Hills Specific Plan. Mr. Baeza stated he believed there is one more neighborhood to be developed, but he was unsure of the specific acreage.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, Thatcher Engineering, stated at the last Planning Commission meeting there was considerable discussion relative to the grading and the impacts of the manufactured slopes to create the individual house pads. Mr. Thatcher stated the slopes for the roadway and pads have been contoured, as a result of recommendations made by the Planning Commission. Mr. Thatcher concurred with staff's presentation and recommendation.

Commissioner Laymon asked Mr. Thatcher who would be responsible for revegetating the slopes. Mr. Thatcher responded by saying the project will be mass graded and the slopes will be revegetated at that time by the developer.

Commissioner Laymon requested clarification on the public/private open space issue. Mr. Baeza stated the applicant would provide an easement for the public to use the trails. Mr. Baeza stated the eucalyptus groves would be private to the tract.

Ms. Cindy Totten, 911 Sunset Hills, asked how a backyard qualifies as open space when it is usually private.

Mr. Thatcher stated one of the requirements for residential development is 20% functional open space for amenities. Mr. Thatcher stated this is an unusual project because of its unique topography and large lots. Mr. Thatcher stated the open space amenities for this project (a eucalyptus grove and trails) could be used in a passive way rather than trying to regrade and install tennis courts or volleyball courts.

Commissioner Laymon stated she believed there was supposed to be a wildlife corridor in the specific plan to allow for deer passage and with a limitation on fencing in the area.

Mr. Thatcher stated typically the migration patterns are located in the wash areas. Mr. Thatcher stated the Specific Plan preserves the entire face from the south end to the northeast corner with no impediments other than two roadways. Mr. Thatcher stated there is no fencing proposed from the southwest corner to the northeast corner.

Mr. Jaquess asked Mr. Thatcher if any of the required 20% open space is located in the individual lots. Mr. Thatcher stated the required open space will be owned in common by the homeowners' association.

Ms. Totten asked how much of the ridge area would be graded; how many of the lots would be cut and how many would be fill.

Mr. Thatcher stated the preliminary grading plan was discussed in detail when the Specific Plan was reviewed. Mr. Thatcher stated the amount of grading was reduced from what was approved for the specific plan and the pads were made smaller.

Mr. Thatcher stated the pads are substantially "cut"; they are creating flat areas from the ridges and using the soil to build the roadway.

Ms. Totten asked for clarification on the amenities that will be provided. Commissioner Cook stated that the required open space will not include amenities such as a swimming pool however, there will be a eucalyptus grove and a trail. Ms. Totten concurred that it would be better than looking at a pool or tennis court.

Ms. Sherli Leonard asked for clarification on contour grading.

Mr. Thatcher stated traditionally in grading, when transitioning from one pad to the next, a straight slope is cut. Mr. Thatcher stated they are proposing to soften the cut by wrapping the hill around from one pad to the next.

Mr. Thatcher stated with contour grading, more native land is disturbed and has to be revegetated.

Chairman Webber asked how the fuel modification plan reconciles with the area that is designated to remain natural.

Mr. Jaquess stated the property is cleared and the vegetation is disturbed, in order to create a clean site for revegetation. Commissioner Macdonald stated that this is known as "scraping."

Chairman Webber suggested a Condition of Approval be added to clarify the area that will be called out for the fuel modification plan.

Mr. Baeza stated a Condition of Approval could be added to clarify that "natural on the map means natural grade."

Commissioner Macdonald asked if Specific Plan No. 43 supercedes the Southeast Area Plan. Mr. Baeza stated that both documents are consistent.

Chairman Webber asked if any of the Commissioners took issue with the pad size. There was no comment.

Commissioner Laymon stated she has always been bothered by the variance process; specifically, one of the findings for granting a variance is that other residences in the area have previously been granted a variance.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he is having difficulty with the proposed development and its location because one of the objectives of the Southeast Area Plan is to protect grading of the ridges. Commissioner Macdonald stated some of the slopes between the homes will require massive grading and probably more grading than what is authorized by the Southeast Area Plan. Commissioner Macdonald stated he is not in support of the proposed project and he feels the Commission needs to take a stand on what is going to be allowed in the canyons.

Commissioner Macdonald stated there have been a lot of changes in the environment, the City, and the City's growth since the Specific Plan was originally adopted.

Commissioner Thompson commended the applicant for reducing the amount of land to be graded from the previous plan that was proposed. Commissioner Thompson reiterated Commissioner Miller's comments from the last Planning Commission meeting that landowners have to know the conditions under which they can develop their property. Commissioner Thompson stated he supports the proposed project.

Commissioner Laymon stated the granting of the variance will set a precedent, because there is still land available in the Specific Plan that can be developed.

Chairman Webber stated the Specific Plan as written, gave wide latitude to preserving canyon walls and minimizing grading.

Commissioner Laymon asked if the Commission should follow the intent of the General Plan or follow the intent of the Specific Plan. Mr. Baeza stated the Specific Plan is consistent with the Southeast Area Plan.

Commissioner Laymon expressed the opinion that she is unsure if the Specific Plan is consistent with the intent of the General Plan.

Commissioner Macdonald stated there should be a way for the Commission (as a panel) to make changes to things that are in opposition to the current feelings of the citizens in the City.

Chairman Webber asked if there have been any plans to revise the Specific Plan. Mr. Jaquess stated that staff has not been advised of any City or community objective to revise this specific plan, in particular.

Commissioner Macdonald stated it is the responsibility of the Commission to interpret and enforce the General Plan.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission has no right to delay the project until the Specific Plan has been revised; it is unfair and illegal. Commissioner Macdonald concurred.

Commissioner Macdonald stated his suggestion to deny the variance, gives the Commission the opportunity to stop the project from moving forward so that changes could be made to the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Cook stated the rules should not be changed in the middle of the game, and she supports the variance as she feels the eucalyptus grove is better than fake amenities.

Commissioner Macdonald stated they (Commission) do not have a responsibility to look out for the interests of the developers; their responsibility is to look out for the interests of the City and its citizens.

Commissioner Cook stated there is a Specific Plan in place and she questioned the fairness of changing their minds.

Commissioner Macdonald stated they are trying to protect something in the City that they are rapidly losing through perfectly legal, legitimate means and anytime they have an opportunity to change it or slow it, they (Commission) have a responsibility to do so.

Commissioner Cook stated she listened very carefully to both sides and she felt if they (Commission) were going to change the Specific Plan, it should have been made clear weeks ago. Chairman Webber stated once a project has been submitted and accepted, you cannot change the rules in the middle of the game.

Commissioner Thompson asked Mr. Jaquess to clarify the process for changing the Specific Plan. Mr. Jaquess stated most typically a landowner prepares a document that goes before the Planning Commission and City Council during public hearings.

Mr. Jaquess stated the City can also initiate an amendment to the Specific Plan at City expense and it would be a fairly involved process.

Commissioner Thompson stated that Commissioner Macdonald is correct in his assumption that someone has to "step up and say no" but it should occur at the next level, when another Specific Plan is submitted.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Jaquess how much more acreage in the Specific Plan No. 43 is available for development. Mr. Jaquess stated the largest bulk of developable land has been developed. Mr. Jaquess stated there is a neighborhood within the Specific Plan that has not been developed, but it only includes 5 or 6 lots.

Chairman Webber stated he supports the project because the pad sizes of Sunset Hills were considerably larger and the average of the proposed development is 16k square feet, which is right where it ought to be.

Commissioner Macdonald stated his interpretation of the grading in this development is that it is much more severe than other parts of Sunset Hills.

Assistant City Attorney Murad asked Mr. Baeza for wording on the Condition of Approval that will be added. Mr. Baeza stated Condition of Approval (number 53 for the Tentative Tract and number 41 for the Conditional Use Permit) will read:

Areas specified on the map as remaining natural shall not be graded. The removal of native vegetation in these areas shall be permitted for Fuel Modification purposes.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract No. 16816, and Conditional Use Permit No. 843 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Tentative Tract No. 16816, and Conditional Use Permit No. 843. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or over burden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 693 based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. The request for the variance has exceptional or extraordinary circumstances because of the steep terrain and unique and unusual features of the site which makes strict compliance with the requirements of providing common, landscaped, recreational open space difficult to achieve and not practical in a hillside development;
2. That the variance is necessary for the enjoyment of a substantial property right in which other Planned Residential Developments in hillside areas have not been required under the same or similar zoning to provide recreational open space.
3. That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity;
4. That the proposed Planned Residential Development is consistent with the policies

and guidelines of the Redlands General Plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 843, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. The Planned Residential Development applied for is proper for a Conditional Use Permit; the project (with the exception of the variance) meets all requirements of the Planned Residential Development Ordinance ;
2. The Planned Residential Development as proposed is a project that is necessary, essential or desirable for the public welfare as well as the development of the community; the project will provide new housing opportunities for future and current City residents;
3. The Planned Residential Development is not detrimental to existing or permitted uses in Specific Plan No. 43 where it would be located;
4. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed Planned Residential Development; the site is large enough to accommodate the proposed ten (10) lots;
5. The site properly relates to Alessandro Road which will be designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed Planned Residential Development;
6. The conditions set forth on this Conditional Use Permit are deemed necessary and reasonable to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
7. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Resource Preservation General Plan Land Use Designation with the addition of Condition of Approval 41 to read:

Areas specified on the map as remaining natural shall not be graded. The removal of native vegetation in these areas shall be permitted for Fuel Modification purposes.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Tract No. 16816, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

2. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Resource Preservation and zoning of Specific Plan No. 43, and is consistent with

both the General Plan and Municipal Code including the Planned Residential Development Ordinance (with the exception of the variance);

3. The site, which is located on the east side of Alessandro Road, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is in a hillside location and is large enough to subdivide into ten (10) lots;

4. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a ten (10) lot subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Resource Preservation allows for ten (10) dwelling units;

4. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

5. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems. This is a residential project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems, aside from temporary air quality and noise impacts during construction addressed in the project's Mitigation Measures;

6. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision; public streets and pedestrian access will be provided throughout the project site;

7. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.4, of the Subdivision Map Act the land is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The property is not under Williamson Act Contract and with the addition of Condition of Approval 53 to read:

Areas specified on the map as remaining natural shall not be graded. The removal of native vegetation in these areas shall be permitted for Fuel Modification purposes.

D. **DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 19** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Development Agreement to lock-in the existing use of the site and future expansion under the land use policies and regulations of General Plan Amendment No. 98, Zone Change No. 401, and Street Vacation No. 127 on 27.94 acres located on both sides of New York Street, north of State Street, and east of Tennessee Street. Request submitted by ESRI. (Project Planner: Asher Hartel)

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated there are issues to be addressed in the language of the development agreement by the applicant, City staff, and the City Attorney, therefore staff is requesting the proposed project be continued to March 22nd.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Development Agreement No. 19 to March 22, 2005.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 784 (REVISION NO. 1)** - Planning Commission to consider a revision to an approved two-story 49,988 square foot building to eliminate the requirement for a six (6) foot wide sidewalk along California Street. The project is located on an 3.39 acre property located on the east side of California Street and north side of Orange Tree Lane in Specific Plan No. 29. Request submitted by CARAT, LLC. (Project Planner: Manuel Baeza)

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. David Curtz, representing the applicant, stated he was available to answer questions.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 784 (Revision 1) subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use;
 2. That the site properly relates to Orange Tree Lane and California Street which are 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. 784 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.
- B. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 368 (REVISION 3) - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a revision to an approved Conditional Use Permit to construct a detached two-story 900 square foot accessory building at the side of

Kimberly Crest House, Historic Landmark No. 59, at 1325 Prospect Drive. Request submitted by KIMBERLY-SHIRK ASSOCIATION. (Project Planner: Asher Hartel)

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Mr. Hartel stated the application for a Conditional Use Permit will not increase occupancy, but it will provide an improved facility for the previously authorized number of occupants.

Commissioner Laymon asked if there would be any changes made to the landscaping. Mr. Hartel stated nothing is proposed at this time.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dick Burkhardt, representing the applicant, stated initially the neighbors were concerned about new uses and weddings that could intrude on their neighborhood, however their concerns were mitigated.

Mr. Burkhardt stated the proposal is to support the uses that are there currently in place. Mr. Burkhardt stated a historical study was performed several years ago and their recommendation was to remove as many activities out of the house as possible to preserve the building.

Mr. Burkhardt stated the existing buildings will be changed to the public sewer system rather than septic. Mr. Burkhardt stated the current proposal is the most unobtrusive location they could find. Chairman Webber noted that the proposed project was reviewed by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission and determined the project is not detrimental to the Kimberly Crest historic landmark. Chairman Webber stated he supports the proposed project.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 368 (Revision 3), subject to the following findings:

1. That the proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City, because the use at Kimberly Crest House at 1325 Prospect Drive is an approved adaptive reuse of a historically significant house that is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Regulations. The proposed accessory building and its use is consistent with the City's land use plans;
2. That the proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, because Conditions of Approval from various City departments require any necessary improvements;
3. That the proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, the applicable zoning district and the City's development standards because current standards have been applied to the project Conditions of Approval;

4. That the proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location because both the General Plan and Zoning District provide for the use of the accessory building at 1325 Prospect Drive.

V. ADDENDA

A. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 781- WESTERN REALCO (Project Planner: David Jump)

Project Planner David Jump gave a brief presentation on the project background. Mr. Jump stated the applicant is ready to pull building permits, however approval of the final landscape plan is required.

Mr. Jaquess noted there is a blank area that will be left without landscaping as it is not owned by the applicant.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated there is a sewer lift station building located adjacent to the proposed project. Mr. Meyer stated the south, east, and west sides will be landscaped, however the north side of the building is used for access. Mr. Meyer stated that shrubs will be planted alongside the building to discourage graffiti.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Final Landscape Plan for Commission Review and Approval No. 781.

B. TRANSFER OF AN OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE LICENSE FOR J & J MARKET AND SMOKE SHOP LOCATED AT 1005 WEST REDLANDS BOULEVARD

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated staff recommends approval of the alcoholic beverage license transfer.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the person to person transfer of the Off-Sale Beer and Wine License for J & J Market and Smoke Shop and no conditions are recommended to be added as there are no problems associated with this facility.

C. TRANSFER OF AN ON-SALE GENERAL ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE LICENSE FOR LAS FUENTES MEXICAN GRILL 2 LOCATED AT 336 N. EUREKA STREET

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated this is a new use for a restaurant adjacent to the Krikorian Theater. Mr. Jaquess stated staff recommends approval of the alcoholic beverage license transfer.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Premises to Premises and Person to Person transfer of an On-Sale General Alcoholic Beverage License for Las Fuentes Mexican Grill 2. No conditions are recommended to be added as there are no problems associated with this facility.

D. REPORT BACK ON LETTER FROM DWIGHT AND LINDA YEOMAN REGARDING 1327 ARROYO CREST

Assistant Director Jaquess stated the Planning Commission considered a request for a Variance at 1327 Arroyo Crest that was ultimately denied. Mr. Jaquess stated the applicant redesigned the plans and is currently submitting grading plans that will be followed by building plans. Mr. Jaquess stated staff has kept the neighbors apprised of revisions to the grading plan and they have had an opportunity to review the plan.

Mr. Jaquess stated the grading plan is not approved at this point in time, and the letter staff received from Mr. Yeoman and Mr. Ken King has been forwarded to the various City departments. Mr. Jaquess stated the neighbors are requesting the grading plans not be approved without a set of house plans, although this is not required by Code.

Mr. Jaquess stated the neighbors have requested that the project be consistent with the CC & Rs for the tract, although they have been advised numerous times that staff cannot and does not enforce CC & Rs.

Chairman Webber noted if the City approves a grading plan and the applicant later comes in with building plans that do not fit the approved grading plan, the site will have to be regraded per a new plan.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission wants to ensure that grading for the site is done properly.

Commissioner Laymon requested a discussion item be placed on the next agenda relative to Phase IV of the Cordillera project (Specific Plan No. 43).

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. January 11, 2005

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of January 11, 2005.

B. February 8, 2005

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote (Commissioner Cook abstaining) that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 8, 2005.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

A. City Council Report

Assistant Director John Jaquess gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of February 15, 2005.

VIII. ADJOURN TO MARCH 8, 2005

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to March 8th, at 4:00 p.m.

Patti Ortiz, Senior Administrative Assistant
Community Development Department

John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Community Development Department