

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, June 27, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: James Macdonald, Chairman
Thomas Osborne, Vice Chairman
Paul Foster, Commissioner
John James, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner
Ruth Cook, Commissioner

ABSENT: Eric Shamp, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF
PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Michael Reiter, Assistant City Attorney
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
Joshua Altopp, Assistant Planner

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

Chairman Macdonald called the meeting to order. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Shamp and Miller.

Mr. Jaquess announced that Planner, Asher Hartel, is leaving the City of Redlands and will be taking a position with the City of San Jacinto.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. YOCUM-BALDWIN DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

1. Parcel Map No. 16515 - Request for Final Approval of Parcel Map No. 16515 (minor Subdivision No. 291), located on the northeast corner of Colton Avenue and New York in the C-4, Highway Commercial and C-M, Commercial Industrial Districts.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote to approve the Consent Calendar.

III. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. YOCUM-BALDWIN DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

2. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
4. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 817** for construction of one (1) building with 29,660 square feet and 3,726 square feet at mezzanine level for twelve (12) manufacturing/warehouse/office units on 2.1 acres, located on the east side of New York Street between Colton Avenue and Brockton Avenue in the C-M, Commercial Industrial District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Asher Hartel stated that staff is waiting for a revision of plans and for an existing easement to be finalized for this project. Staff is recommending continuance to July 11, 2006.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak. No comments were forthcoming, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue consideration of Commission Review and Approval No. 817 to July 11, 2006.

B. BRIAN KING, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 887** - A Conditional Use Permit for a seven (7) unit planned residential development on 2.64 acres located on the south side of Franklin Avenue, north of Sherril Lane and west of Crestwood Drive in the R-E, Residential Estate District.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 13649 (Revision No. 1)** - A Revision to a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide 2.64 acres into seven (7) lots and one (1) common area lot for property located on the south side of Franklin Avenue, north of Sherril Lane and west of Crestwood Drive in the R-E, Residential Estate District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manual Baeza gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. Mr. Baeza commented that an issue arose from Municipal Utilities relative to a sewer and water easement found along the private driveway south of the project site. Municipal Utilities modified their conditions to allow for the preservation of approximately twenty (20) trees that are located on each side of the easement. Mr. Baeza stated that staff has provided the revised Conditions of Approval to the applicant and the commissioners.

Brian King, applicant, concurred with the conditions but commented on two Public Works conditions requiring the construction of sidewalks along Franklin Avenue and on the site. Mr. King asked Public Works Director Ron Mutter to remove the conditions, stating that he would rather put in landscaping to match the rest of the street. However, he will put in the sidewalks if the commission feels that it is necessary.

Commissioner Osborne asked about the drainage on the site. Mr. King stated that several infiltration basins have been incorporated throughout the site to hold a hundred year, one hour flow. There will be less flow after development than before development.

Chairperson Macdonald asked about the entrance of the proposed project. Mr. King referred to the PowerPoint presentation, explaining the entrance to the site.

Director Jeff Shaw asked Mr. King for clarification of which Public Works conditions of approval that he wanted removed. Mr. King stated that it was item B. 8 (c).

Dave DaBov, resident and owner of 124 and 128 Franklin Avenue, had questions and concerns relative to drainage, his cesspool, grading, and fees to connect to a sewer line.

Mr. Baeza stated that the applicant is installing a sewer line on Little Franklin for this project, and believes that Mr. DaBov can connect to it.

Mr. Shaw commented that Mr. DeBov can continue to use his cesspool for as long as it is functional, but once it fails, he would need to hook up to the sewer line on Franklin Avenue. He added that the sewer line that will go up the length of Little Franklin will assist Mr. DaBov considerably relative to the cost of installation of the line.

Mr. King responded to Mr. DeBov's concerns regarding grading and the sewer line. He stated that Mr. DeBov's furthest lot is far enough away from the proposed sewer where he would not be forced to connect to the new sewer line if his septic failed. Mr. King was not sure of the exact cost of putting in a sewer but thought it could be in the \$25.00 to \$30.00 per foot range.

Mr. DaBov commented that he would be opposed to the project if the fees were expensive. Mr. Shaw stated that staff could call Municipal Utilities to obtain estimated costs.

Mr. Shaw asked Public Works Director, Ron Mutter, if there were any issues relative to Mr. King's request to delete the sidewalks on Franklin Avenue. Mr. Mutter stated that Mr. King approached him regarding the sidewalks and concurs with Mr. King's request. Mr. Mutter stated that there is no other sidewalk on that side of Franklin Avenue and that landscaping would fit in better with the neighborhood.

Chairperson Macdonald asked Mr. Mutter about the sidewalks in front of the condominiums. Mr. Mutter stated that it would be up to the planning staff since it was a private street.

Chairperson Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Cook commented that she liked the architecture.

Commissioner James commented on the continuation of the sidewalk on the private drive beyond lot six (6), and would be in favor of continuing that onto the cul-de-sac. Commissioner Foster did not concur with Commissioner James, stating that the area is very narrow and the added sidewalk would take away from the landscaping value that would be gained in the project. Commissioner Cook concurred with Commissioner Foster.

Commissioner James asked if staff had included a condition to continue the sidewalk. Mr. Baeza stated that he could strike planning condition of approval number twenty-seven (27) if the commission was of a consensus that a sidewalk was not needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract No. 13649, and Conditional Use Permit No. 887 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract No. 13649, and Conditional Use Permit No. 887. 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 887, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval, **as amended:**

1. The Planned Residential Development applied for is proper for a Conditional Use Permit; the project 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 where it would be located; the project will develop an existing dirt field into an attractive residential development with a full landscape pallet;
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 seven (7) lots;
5. The site properly relates to Franklin Avenue 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; mitigation measures for the project will address impacts to public health and safety; and,
7. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Very-Low Density Residential General Plan Land Use Designation."

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract No. 13649, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

3. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Very-Low Density

Residential and zoning of R-E, Residential Estate District, and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code including the Planned Residential Development Ordinance;

2. The site, which is located off of Franklin Avenue, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is an in-fill lot and is large enough to subdivide into seven (7) lots;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a seven (7) lot subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Very-Low Density Residential allows for seven (7) 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; 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."

This includes the amended Conditions of Approval from the Municipal Utilities Department, the deletion of condition twenty-seven (27) relative to the Planning Division Conditions of Approval and the deletion of conditions eight (8)c and fourteen (14)c on pages four (4) and six (6) of the Public Works Department Conditions of Approval.

C. DAVID HIGGINSON, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **REVISION NO. 1** to **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 818** to develop a 7,000 square foot interim sanctuary building on a 4.89 acre site the site approved for the development of a 16,030 square foot religious institution on property located at the northwest corner of Mentone Boulevard (Highway 38) and Amethyst Street within the unincorporated area of the County of San

Bernardino, Annexation pending (proposed City of Redlands R-1, Single Family Residential District).

Chairperson Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated staff recommends approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Osborne asked why there were not any perimeter trees along the south side of the building. Mr. Baeza responded that it is not required by code to provide trees and that the applicant would eventually like to construct a building in that area.

Daryl Cartozian, representing Higginson and Cartozian Architects, asked for clarification relative to the number of parking spaces required. Mr. Baeza stated that the floor plan shows a fixed seating area. However, there is additional parking required for the stage area. Mr. Cartozian commented that he concurs with the condition requiring additional trees and was available for questions.

Chairperson Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 818, and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined 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 James, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 818 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed."

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 818, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached conditions of approval:

1. That the use applied for at the location set forth in the application is proper for a conditional use permit which is authorized by this title; the proposed interim sanctuary is consistent with the Church use already approved for the site;
2. That the use is necessary or desirable for the development of the community, is in harmony with the various elements or objectives of the General Plan, and is not detrimental to existing uses or to uses specifically permitted in the zone in which the proposed use is to be located; the proposed use of a church sanctuary is generally not as intense a use as other non-residential uses and generally co-exists successfully with adjoining residential uses throughout the City;
3. That the site for the intended use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use, and all the yards, walls or fences, landscaping, and other features required in order to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses on land in the neighborhood; the project meets all development standards for the R-1, Single Family Residential District;

4. That the site for the proposed use relates to streets and highways properly designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic generated or to be generated by the proposed use; The project is located on a state highway which will be improved along the site's frontage to properly carry traffic generated by the use.
5. That the conditions set forth in the permit and shown on the approved site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety or general welfare; mitigation measures for the project will address impacts to public health and safety and,
6. That Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 818, therefore be Approved, subject to all department recommendations."

D. **QUANTUM STRUCTURES, LLC, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **General Plan Amendment No. 108** an amendment to change the land use designation from Office to High Density Residential on approximately 7.5 gross acres (APN: 0292-201-08, 21, and 22) located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Amendment 33 to Specific Plan No. 40** (East Valley Corridor Specific Plan) to change the land use designation from EV/AP, Administrative Professional District to EV2500RM, Multiple Family Residential-2500 District on approximately 7.5 gross acres (APN: 0292-201-08, 21, and 22) located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Tentative Tract Map No. 17693** - to subdivide 7.5 gross acres into eighty-one (81) numbered lots and one (1) lettered lot for the purpose of town homes for property located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District (proposed EV 2500RM, Multiple Family Residential 2500 District) of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.
6. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 814** to develop an eighty-one (81) unit town home project on approximately 7.5 gross acres, located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District (proposed EV 2500RM, Multiple Family Residential District) of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairperson Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Altopp gave a brief presentation of the proposed condominium project.

Commissioner Osborne commented that a correction should be made to state that each end unit is provided with two enclosed spaces instead of two covered spaces.

Commissioner Cook had concerns that the long paved area between the garages would look like a huge channel of cement. Mr. Altopp stated that there will be small planters that will contain a small tree and shrubs.

Vicky Valenzuela, Thatcher Engineering, representing the applicant, thanked staff for their hard work on the project. Ms. Valenzuela concurs with staff's recommendations including the added condition to up-size twenty-five (25) percent of the trees to a minimum 36" box.

Commissioner Cook had concerns relative to the landscaping and trees that would grow in such a confined space along the garages.

Jerry Zigrossi, developer for the project, gave an overview of what he sees happening in the proposed project area. He stated that this is his fourth tract on Orange Avenue and that he tries to produce a product that young families and professional people can afford. Mr. Zigrossi concurred with the staff report.

Commissioner Miller arrived at 3:00 p.m.

Chairperson Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Director Jeff Shaw commented on the landscaping along Alabama Street, stating that there have been some problems along Alabama Street with the utility lines, particularly involving palm trees. He advised the Commission that staff will be looking at this issue between now and before this recommendation goes forward to the City Council to ensure that we do not have a conflict between the utility lines and the proposed palm trees.

Commissioner Osborne referred to the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, asking how the cost benefit ratio is calculated. Mr. Shaw responded that it is a composite factor of a number of different issues that make up the revenue side of the formula. It includes property tax and anticipated sales tax revenue generated by residents living and spending money in the City.

Commissioner Miller commented that he supports the project from a land use standpoint but there are improvements in other areas that need to be made.

Commissioner Cook reiterated that there is a lot of concrete between the garages without any landscaping or decorative paving to break it up. Commissioner Foster concurred with Commissioner Cook asking the applicant if they were willing to consider some cobblestone, color, pressed concrete or something that would break up the asphalt flow.

Chairperson Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Zigrossi commented that he understands the commission's concerns but the India Hawthorns and bubble trees would break up the white concrete against the black asphalt, which is why they are using more colored stucco and trim. Mr. Zigrossi is agreeable to using stamped concrete in some areas but that it would need to be economical for the development.

Commissioner Foster commented that he would like to see that done in keeping with Commissioner Cook's comments.

Chairperson Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller commented that there appears to be a basin in the multi-purposed field area and asked if it was for water retention.

Chairperson Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Ms. Valenzuela stated that the basin is for both water retention and infiltration. Ms. Valenzuela stated that the project engineer advised that the detention basin's maximum capacity would allow infiltration to a maximum of forty-eight (48) hours. It is specifically designed to maintain its value and intended use as a play field.

Commissioner Miller had concerns with the water staying there for forty-eight (48) hours and questioned if the landscaping was going to survive being inundated for two straight days.

Commissioner Miller had concerns about the wall along Alabama Street. He commented that the two story units are nine (9) feet above the street and that we could step those units so they do not have a huge change in elevation. Commissioner Miller also had a concern about the setbacks and asked Mr. Altopp if six foot high walls were allowed that close to Alabama Street. Mr. Altopp stated that there are noise mitigation measures for issues that would require a higher wall and that this may require a Minor Exception Permit. Commissioner Miller commented that if we are going to change this to residential, then we should live by the residential standards and not make an exception.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification relative to the basin at the corner of Alabama and Orange Avenue, asking if it was a berm for decoration or a basin. Mr. Altopp stated that it was a basin.

Commissioner Miller had concerns regarding the site plan, stating that there is an abundance of paving. He recommended introducing more landscaping to various areas of the site stating it would give a more residential quality.

Commissioner Miller stated that relative to land use, it would be great to incorporate mixed use. He would still support the project if that did not work out.

Commissioner Miller stated that nine items needed addressing relative to the elevations. He expressed concerns about disorganized and random elevations, window sizes, inadequate shutters and columns, the architecture and noise issue regarding the balconies facing Alabama Street.

Mr. Dave Musser, project architect, gave an overview of the noise impacts along Alabama and Orange Avenue. He proposed to build the wall and berm it on each side to reduce the impact of the wall and that it would act as a sound continuation wall. Commissioner Miller asked if that was why the combination of berming and the wall is up nine feet. Mr. Musser responded yes.

Commissioner Miller asked about the second floor patios. Mr. Musser stated that the acoustical report indicated that the second floor windows could be treated with a laminated glass if the wall was there.

Mr. Musser commented on the buildings, stating that the architecture is contemporary rather than a Craftsman style. Mr. Musser stated that he has no issue in making adjustments to the design of the project.

Chairperson Macdonald commented on the landscaping and potential noise severity in the garage aisles. He stated that Commissioner Miller's comments in using some of the width between the two structures with additional landscaping, would help cut down the noise. Mr. Musser responded that the planters could intrude to the point of reducing the drive aisles widths.

Commissioner Cook concurred with Commissioner Miller's comments.

Commissioner Miller commented on the architecture, stating that he would like to see a specific type of style. Commissioner Cook had questions regarding the steel tube and/or wrought iron fencing, asking if the fencing would be decorative or solid steel tube. Mr. Musser stated that the fencing would be tube steel with spaced pickets.

Commissioner Macdonald asked Mr. Musser if he had the information he needed to make the recommended, suggested, requested changes from the commission. Mr. Musser stated he had a list of notes that were taken but did not know if he has a definitive list.

Commissioner Macdonald asked how much time Mr. Musser needed to revise the plans. Mr. Shaw stated that staff would need to have revised plans within a few of weeks prior to the next hearing in order to review the modifications and prepare a staff report. If modifications could be completed in two weeks, the project could come back for the second meeting in July, otherwise, it should be continued to the first meeting in August. Mr. Musser stated that he presumed that his client would prefer the second meeting in July.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that staff would appreciate it if Commissioner Miller would share his notes relative to the modifications and would be glad to share them with the applicant to ensure they are communicated accurately.

Commissioner Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote to continue the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, General Plan Amendment No. 108, Amendment 33 to Specific Plan No. 40, Tentative Tract Map No. 17693, and Commission Review and Approval No. 814 to July 25, 2006.

V. ADDENDA

A. Determination of General Plan consistency for a proposed Dog Park at Ford Park.

Assistant Director John Jaquess gave a brief overview of the Planning Commissions duties to review capital improvement projects in the City for consistency with the General Plan. Mr. Jaquess stated that the dog park is consistent and within the General Plan boundaries. He recommended that the commission determine that the project is consistent with the General Plan.

Public Works Director Ron Mutter gave an overview of the proposed dog park stating that they have been working closely with the Redlands Rotary Club and that the Ford Park site was chosen since it had the access, the room, and available space. He stated that the final concept plan was presented to the Parks Commission on June 8th, who gave a unanimous recommendation to the City Council to proceed with the park.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Mutter where the dog park would be located in Ford Park. Mr. Mutter stated that it was in the northerly field, behind and adjacent to the fire demonstration garden. Commissioner Foster commented that families and groups use that area for activities and events and had concerns in possibly taking away from that use.

Mr. Mutter stated that the dog park would take a quarter of one of the two large areas in Ford Park and there would still be a large, open area available for families.

Elizabeth Kulbin, Rotary Club representative, addressed additional parking, the small and large dog areas, security gates and rules for the dog park.

Commissioner Osborne asked about maintenance of the dog park. Ms. Kulbin addressed maintenance issues stating that ongoing improvements would be addressed through a dog park user's group.

Commissioner Foster asked if a dog park was surveyed as a high priority for our community. Brian King, Parks Commission representative, stated that there is a priority list that is updated every year and that the dog park has been on the priority list for quite a while.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission determine that the proposed development of a Dog Park at Ford Park is consistent with the City of Redlands General Plan.

VI. MINUTES

A.. June 13, 2006

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 13, 2006.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF JUNE 20, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of June 20th.

VIII. ADJOURN TO JULY 11, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m. to July 11, 2006.

Christine Szilva
Administrative Secretary

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department