

MINUTES: of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, October 24, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Michael Rieter, Assistant City Attorney
Manuel Baeza, Senior Planner
Joshua Altopp, Assistant Planner
Tamara Alaniz, Assistant Planner

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

Chairman Macdonald called the meeting to order. All Commissioners were present.

Director Jeff Shaw advised the Commission that Assistant Director John Jaquess was taking a position as Community Development Director for the City of Highland. Director Shaw thanked Mr. Jaquess for all the hard work that he provided the City of Redlands.

Chairperson Macdonald spoke on behalf of the Commission and thanked Mr. Jaquess for all of his assistance and wished him luck in his new position.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. **KB HOME, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: TAMARA ALANIZ)

Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 314** for four (4), four foot, six inch (4'-6") inch tall single family subdivision identification signs, each with a sign face area of twelve (12) square feet for the KB Homes subdivision "Blossom Heights" located on each side of the subdivision entrance on the northeast and northwest corners of Pennsylvania Avenue and Village Street and on the southeast and southwest corners of San Bernardino Avenue and Village Street in Tract 16556 (APN: 0168-111-01, -101-07, and -08).

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote to approve the Consent Calendar.

III. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

A. **CITRUS PACKING LLC, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

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 **Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 115** - an Agricultural Preserve Removal on approximately 3.5 acres located on the northeast corner of San Bernardino Avenue Texas Street in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed C-3, General Commercial District).
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **General Plan Amendment No. 112** amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Agriculture City Grove to Commercial for 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 425** from A-1, Agricultural District to proposed zoning of C-3, General Commercial District for 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue.
6. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Commission Review and Approval No. 829** to develop a four (4) building commercial center with 110,512 square feet of floor area on approximately 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed C-3 General Commercial District).
7. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for **Minor Subdivision No. 301** (Tentative Parcel Map No. 17873) to subdivide approximately 5.39 acres into 4 lots for property located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed C-3 General Commercial District).

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated that the applicant is in the process of revising the architectural plans to address the comments of the Planning Commission. Staff recommended that the project be continued to the meeting of November 14, 2006.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 115, General Plan Amendment No. 112, Zone Change No. 425, Commission Review and Approval No. 829 and Minor Subdivision No. 301 to November 14, 2006.

B. **JOHN HIEBERT, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 299** to subdivide Assessor Parcel Number 0172-321-43 totaling 68,591 square feet into two parcels one

totaling 19,288 square feet with an existing house and the other parcel totaling 49,303 undeveloped vacant land within the R-S, Suburban Residential District located at 1107 Cypress Avenue.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief overview of the proposed project. Mr. Altopp stated that there are issues relative to the undergrounding of the utilities. He stated that the applicant is proposing to pay in-lieu fees for the costs. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the waiver of undergrounding the utilities.

Commissioner Osborne asked about the in-lieu fees. Mr. Altopp stated that the fees will be for the true cost of the entire job.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was present to address the Commission.

John Hiebert, applicant, had questions relative to the power lines and the subdivision across the street and asked if he would be required to pull his power under that street. Mr. Altopp stated that it would depend on which development would need to get it done first because of timelines.

Mr. Hiebert had concerns relative to the costs of undergrounding the utilities and the responsibilities of the other property owners. Mr. Altopp stated that staff just conditions the project and leaves it up to the applicant to work out the details with the other property owners involved.

Commissioner Miller referred to the housing development currently under construction across the street and asked if they were conditioned to underground these same utilities. Mr. Altopp responded that they were conditioned to underground the utilities. Director Shaw stated they would be responsible for the lines going across the street but not for the line on Mr. Hebert's frontage. Commissioner Osborne commented that the Vines development would go underground but Mr. Hiebert would need to remove the pole since it is on the front of his property.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that the development across the street is working on recordation at this time and would be required to underground the lines coming from across the street.

Mr. Heibert asked if the development across the street would be required to underground the existing house that was on the original property. Mr. Jaquess stated that would be required as part of the subdivision.

Bill Cunningham, resident, commented that it is disturbing that projects are not being undergrounded as they go forward and stated that it would be a gross mistake to postpone this project with the possibility of never having it completed. He added that putting money into a pool would degrade over time in value.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Director Shaw commented that if the applicant is going to pay for the cost of undergrounding, he may want to go ahead and underground the utilities because of the aesthetic improvement on the site. He stated that in the event that the applicant changes his mind at a later time, staff has written a condition that would give the applicant the ability to still underground the utilities.

Commissioner Miller asked if engineering took into consideration the cost of undergrounding utilities going up at a faster rate than the interest that the money would earn in a fund. Director Shaw stated that according to code, the in-lieu fee cost would cover the cost as if it were to occur today.

Commissioner Osborne asked for clarification relative to the recording of the final map in the event the utilities are not undergrounded. Mr. Jaquess stated that the applicant has the authority to bond for that

improvement and could go ahead and record the map. He added that the applicant is obligated by the surety bond to do the improvements that were conditioned.

Commissioner Miller asked if Public Works expressed an opinion relative to undergrounding the utilities or having the money funded. Director Shaw stated that it was more of a policy issue.

Commissioner Shamp asked what mechanisms were in place to ensure that projects get executed as soon as funds are adequate. Director Shaw stated that it would be best to come back with a report relative to that issue.

Commissioner Osborne commented on the motion of waiver for underground utilities being cost prohibited and asked if the motion is to allow the applicant to pay in-lieu fees or eliminating the undergrounding one hundred percent. Mr. Altopp stated that the applicant would have to pay whatever the true cost would be for the entire project.

Mr. Jaquess stated that staff is trying to identify the physical constraint that makes it impractical in going underneath the channel which is off-site of the applicants property to the west. Director Shaw referred to Municipal Code 17.17.020, item 3A, and recommended that the motion be modified as it relates to the physical constraints.

Commissioner Shamp asked if Public Works had a priority list of undergrounding projects, and if the undergrounding of utilities on Clifton Avenue was considered a priority. Mr. Jaquess stated that Director Ron Mutter should address Commissioner Shamp's question.

Commissioner Shamp commented on the applicant's ability in choosing whether to pay into a fund or undergrounding the utilities, and stated that it would be a wiser use of that money to target priority areas and request that the applicant go one way or the other depending on those priorities.

Mr. Jaquess called the Public Works Department and was advised that Public Works Director Mutter was not available to address the Commission.

Both Commissioners Cook and Shamp concurred that they do not want to leave it as a choice for the applicant to choose between undergrounding or paying in-lieu fees.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the Vines property is conditioned to underground utilities. Mr. Shaw responded that the Vines property was conditioned.

Commissioner Cook asked if why the applicant is not undergrounding the utilities if the costs are the same. Commissioner Shamp requested to hear from the applicant relative to his choice.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hiebert stated that the question he had was relative to the marker for the property line where the power pole is located and that the major problem and expense is in taking the utilities under the drainage ditch, which is on the neighbor's property. Mr. Heibert stated that he could not understand why he has to underground through someone else's property.

Mr. Shaw asked if the pole was on the property line. Mr. Hiebert stated that the pole is either on the property line or within inches of it and could not recall what side of the property line that the pole is located.

Commissioner Cook commented that Mr. Heibert and the neighbor are going to have to underground the pole and asked if Mr. Heibert would be first to develop his property. Mr. Hiebert responded that he would be the first to develop his property.

Mr. Jaquess referred the Commission back to the ordinance section attached to the packet, stating that the code provides the Commission with some potential discretion in this area.

Director Shaw commented that the Commission is still implementing the condition if the pole is on the property line or very close to it. Director Shaw asked Mr. Altopp if the pole was located within inches or on the property line. Mr. Altopp stated that he evaluated the location of the pole according to what was shown on the map.

Mr. Shaw commented that the key issue for this project is where the pole is located relative to the property line. He stated that it will affect the condition considerably if the pole is on or in close proximity to the property line. Mr. Shaw added that staff needs to know exactly where the pole is located so that the Commission can make a decision and recommended a two week continuance.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was any further discussion relative to undergrounding and asked for the Commission's input.

Commissioner James stated that he would rather see undergrounding between the two poles but that the westerly pole remain in place.

Commissioner Miller commented that he would like to ask Public Works Director Mutter what is in the best interest of the City relative to undergrounding the utilities or having the money go into a fund. He added that the undergrounding should be in relative proportion of the development.

Commissioner Osborne concurred with Commissioners James and Miller and stated that the westerly pole could remain if staff determines that the pole is close enough to the property line.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Minor Subdivision No. 299 to the meeting of November 14, 2006.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **JACQUE BILBEY, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 895** for the on-site sale of beer at the existing Redlands Shooting Park on a parcel totaling 10.4 gross acres located at 2125 Orange Street in the O, Open Space District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief overview on the proposed conditional use permit. Mr. Altopp stated that the property previously held a license to sell beer but that it lapsed due to a change in ownership. He added that the Police Department has made the decision to support the beer license. Staff recommended continuance to finalize some details relative to legal issues and procedural matters.

Chairman Macdonald asked is anyone in the audience wanted to speak. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue consideration of Conditional Use Permit No. 895 to November 14, 2006.

B. LOUISE HAYES, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

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 **Tentative Tract Map No. 18169** - a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 1.84 acres into 5 lots for property located on the north side of Cypress Avenue approximately 150 feet west of University Place in the R-S, Suburban Residential District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave an overview of the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Louis Flores, Project Engineer, stated that he was available for questions.

Commissioner Miller commented that the common drive allows cars to pass each other but does not afford parking. He asked Mr. Flores if he would have a problem with a condition that would require the developers of the lots to provide off-street parking in addition to the typical space in front of the garages. Mr. Flores stated that they are complying by providing off-street parking but questioned what Commissioner Miller was asking to do other than providing an easement for parking.

Commissioner Miller stated that he wanted to add a condition requiring a ten by twenty (10 x 20) foot long piece of asphalt or concrete in addition to what is normally in front of the garage. Mr. Flores stated that there would be off-street parking available between the garage and the private drive.

Commissioner Miller asked if the off-street parking needed to be paved. Director Shaw gave several alternatives that could be utilized, such as providing one additional space for each of the lots or providing an additional eight (8) feet of parking area which would provide parallel parking in front of each of the lots. Director Shaw added that this could be done in a form of an easement where visually it would look like part of the street.

Mr. Flores stated that off street parking would be preferable than having the additional eight feet or an easement and did not see a problem in providing an additional paved area.

Commissioner Shamp had questions relative to the detention basins and asked if they would be able to accommodate significant amounts of storm water and how quickly the water would be infiltrated. Mr. Flores stated that the basins are sized according to specific criteria set by the County and should be able to detain the soils as far as the percolation rate in that area.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the perimeter wall on the west side of the private streets was six (6) feet tall. Mr. Flores stated that code would allow a six foot wall but depending on the grade difference, the City may limit the height so as to improve visibility near University.

Commissioner Osborne commented that planters would soften the expanse of the wall. Commissioner Cook concurred and suggested planting vines. Mr. Flores stated that planting vines along the wall would not present a problem but did not want to create a wide planter area that would compromise the ability of fire or trash collection since it would require widening the driveway.

Commissioner Cook asked if the Commission had the ability to condition something along the wall on a tentative tract. Director Shaw stated that the Commission could require landscaping but had concerns relative to the extent of narrowing the driveway and how it would affect the traffic width. Mr. Flores stated that it would not compromise the development standards.

Commissioner Shamp stated that there would be an added advantage in providing a curb as this would protect the wall.

Chairman Macdonald stated that additional parking slabs on the property would work. He commented that the street is very narrow and would be compromised if additional footage was taken for the wall planter.

Mr. Flores suggested widening the driveway a foot to accommodate a planter and provide an easement for parking that could be paved. He stated that an easement for parking would condition the project and each property owner to provide for it. Commissioner Shamp suggested using a lattice block or grass pavers that would look like landscape that could be parked on. Mr. Flores commented that it would improve the project aesthetically and would be one of the preferable methods of treatment that was suggested for the final Water Quality Management Plan, making the provision of an easement preferable.

Commissioner Miller had reservations relative to the impervious block and the survival of the grass that would be parked on or driven over a regular basis. Mr. Flores commented that the impervious block would accommodate vehicles parked on it.

Commissioner Osborne asked if they were considering doing the easement continuously from lots three (3) to five (5) or just doing a twenty (20) foot section with a grassy area. Commissioner Shamp commented on requiring continuous parking on lots three (3) through five (5), stating that it would significantly reduce the usable depth of the lot but that the retention basin would have to be widened so that the area remains the same. Mr. Flores stated that the detention basins can be relocated a little more to the rear building setback area. He added that if there is an area that needs to be used for parking, the detention area can be relocated back to accommodate a vehicle and that the lot grading is designed to allow that to occur.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience would like to address the Commission. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on what is being measured relative to the two foot planter. Commissioner Osborne stated it would be eighteen inches of planter and six (6) inches of curb.

Chairman Macdonald stated that conditions would be needed for the planter area and the easement for the parking.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract Map No. 18169 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study for Tentative Tract Map No. 18169 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Tract Map No. 18169 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential and a zoning of 'R-S', Suburban Residential District and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into five (5) lots;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a five (5) unit subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density Residential and 'R-S', Suburban Residential District both allow for at least five (5) units;
4. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
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;
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 in an agricultural preserve.

This includes the addition of two conditions of approval as follows:

22. The applicant shall install a two (2) foot wide planter consisting of 18 inches of planter and a six (6) inch curb to the west property line along the base of the six foot tall block wall. Landscaping shall be installed which shall be approved by staff and may include vines and shrubs. This landscaping shall be maintained by the Homeowners Association.
23. The applicant shall provide an 8-foot easement on the west property lines of parcels two (2) through five (5) consisting of a pervious surface for the location of guest parking.

C. **TOM CUTLER, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BEAZA)

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. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 842** - a Commission Review and Approval for an approximately 1,890 square foot two-story building addition to the retained portion of the Y Alliance building and a new parking area to be located at 16 E. Olive Avenue (southeast corner of Olive Avenue and Cajon Street) in the A-P, Administrative Professional Office District.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Parking Modification Permit No. 24** - a Parking Modification Permit for the Y Alliance building located at 16 E. Olive Avenue (southeast corner of Olive Avenue and Cajon Street) in the A-P, Administrative Professional Office District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave an overview of the proposed project and gave a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that a landscape plan was submitted but the trees proposed were not on the list of recommended shade trees and did not meet the size requirements. Staff requested that the applicant revise their plan to meet code and tree type requirements. Staff recommended approval of the parking modification but advised that the joint use parking agreement between the applicant and First Congregational Church had not been finalized. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission continue the project to the meeting of November 14, 2006.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to discuss the project.

Tom Cutler, applicant, and Megret Oilwiler, Project Manager, were available for questions.

Commissioner Osborne commented that the project is an excellent plan of reuse of the existing building.

Commissioner Cook asked what the applicant was planning to do with what used to be the viewing room. Ms. Oilwiler stated that the viewing room would remain the same and that there are plans to restore the woodwork to its original condition.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, Parking Modification Permit No. 24 and Commission Review and Approval No. 842 to November 14, 2006.

D. **TANDY HILL, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: TAMARA ALANIZ)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration.

2. Public hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 428** from A-1 (Agricultural Zone) to R-R (Rural Residential Zone) on approximately 12.13 acres (APN: 0294-091-39, and 32) located north of San Timoteo Canyon Road and west of Alessandro Road.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Tamara Alaniz gave an overview of the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the zone change.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Pat Meyer, representing Tandy Hill, echoed Director Shaw's comments relative to Assistant Director John Jaquess' new position at the City of Highland. Mr. Meyer stated that he was available for questions.

Director Jeff Shaw informed the Commission that there is an agricultural preserve removal application that should be considered along with the zone change application. He stated that staff will be recommending continuance so that the application can be brought forward with the zone change request.

Mr. Meyer stated that the applicant concurred with staff's analysis on the zone change.

Commissioner Miller commented on the acoustical analysis that we completed in April, 2004 and asked if the acoustical engineer considered the frequency of trains that is being predicted to travel up San Timoteo. Mr. Meyer stated that acoustical engineer, Gordon Bricken, probably contacted the railroad and projected the noise but will contact him relative to this issue. Mr. Meyer mentioned that the residents along Alessandro are proposing that the area be designated as a quiet zone for the railroad.

Mr. Meyer had questions relative to the date of the continuation and was advised that it would be continued to November 14th 2006.

Bill Cunningham, representing the Redlands Association, commented that the area north of the creek between Alessandro and Fern has been a long time goal of preservation. Mr. Cunningham commented on flooding, the noise from the trains, biological elements and habitat areas that need to be addressed. He had concerns relative to the high pressured petroleum pipeline that goes up along the railroad. On behalf of the Redlands Association, Mr. Cunningham requested that the zoning be no greater than "RL" or two and one half acres per unit.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Foster asked where this parcel falls in relation to the City's proposed land acquisitions. Mr. Jaquess gave an overview of the City's proposed land acquisitions.

Mr. Foster asked if staff could provide a map indicating those parcels and their adjacencies relative to the applicant's property. Mr. Shaw stated staff would provide a map for the Commissioners.

Bill Cunningham requested to address the Commission.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Bill Cunningham commented on the master plan trail system for the County and the City and mentioned a trail along the north side of the creek that would continue from the Santa Ana River through to the Riverside County line.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Zone Change No. 428 to the meeting of November 14, 2006.

V. ADDENDA - None

VI. MINUTES

A. October 10, 2006

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote (Commissioner James abstained) to approve the minutes of October 10, 2006 with correction.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF OCTOBER 17, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council Actions of October 17, 2006.

VIII. ADJOURN TO NOVEMBER 14, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m. to November 14, 2006.

Christine Szilva
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department