



Planning Commission Final Annotated Agenda

Regular Meeting August 14, 2007

Planning Commission

Willard McCrone, Chair
Luis Osorio, Vice-Chair
Toynette Bryant
Paul W. Davis
Leon Garden
David Stocker
Ralph Widmar

Council Chamber
Few Memorial Hall of Records
Monterey, California

4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

7:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCrone called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar (Arrived: 4:03 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Senior Planner Chip Rerig, Senior Associate Planner Todd Bennett, City Engineer Tom Reeves, Recording Secretary Terry Lebda

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 24, 2007

ACTION: Commissioner Osorio moved to continue this item to the August 24, 2007 PC meeting to allow time to review the tape of this meeting to be sure comments were not over generalized. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. 7-0-0.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Osorio, seconded by Commissioner Davis, the Annotated Agenda of July 24, 2007 was continued to August 24, 2007. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	7	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None
ABSENT:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC COMMENTS allows the public to speak for a maximum of three minutes on any subject, which is not on the agenda. Any person or group desiring to bring an item to the attention of the Planning Commission may do so by addressing the Commission during Public Comments or by addressing a letter of explanation to: Planning Division, City Hall, Monterey CA 93940. The appropriate staff person will contact the sender concerning the details. Note: Public Comments are taken during the afternoon session and continued at the evening session. Individuals may choose to speak once for up to three minutes at either session, but not both.

None.

REVIEW OF AFTERNOON AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS

REVIEW OF AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS are to review those items recommended for approval on consent, or recommended to be continued, tabled or withdrawn, etc. CONSENT ITEMS consists of those items which are routine and for which a staff recommendation has been prepared. A member of the public or a Commissioner may request that an item recommended for approval on consent be heard on the regular agenda for further discussion.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PUBLIC HEARINGS are held to receive public comment on certain items pending Planning Commission action. You are welcome to offer your comments after being recognized by the Chair. The Chair may limit the time allocated to each speaker.

1. 46 El Caminito Del Norte; Small Subdivision and Variance 07-140; Applicant John M. Lotz; Owner Lotz Family Trust; R-120 Zoning District; Negative Declaration Filed. (Continued from July 24, 2007.)

The project is a Minor Subdivision that proposes to divide a 39,106 square foot (SF) parcel into two new parcels, Parcel A and Parcel B. Parcel A is 18,496 SF in area. Parcel B is 20,610 SF in area. The property is located at the northwest corner of El Caminito Del Norte with frontage on El Caminito Del Norte and Via Del Rey. Access for Parcel A is proposed from Via Del Rey via a new driveway. The existing access driveway from El Caminito Del Norte will be maintained and provide access to Parcel B. The Minor Subdivision requires approval of a Variance because Parcel A does not conform to minimum area standards. The minimum parcel size in the zoning district is 20,000 SF and Parcel A is 1,504 SF below standard. The existing property is currently developed with a 2-story single-family home and single story detached accessory structure. The home is located on proposed Parcel A and the accessory structure is located on Parcel B. Parcel B will accommodate development of a future single-family dwelling, as water becomes available. No trees are proposed for removal at this time, though the proposed concept location for a home on Parcel B contains seven (7) oak and pine trees that could be impacted by the future development.

ACTION: On consent, this item was continued to September 11, 2007 to allow time to modify and re-circulate the Initial Study. 7-0-0

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Stocker, seconded by Commissioner Bryant, on consent it was moved to continue this item to September 11, 2007. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 7 COMMISSIONERS: Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None

2. 2 Dorey Way and 507 Herrmann Drive; Lot line Adjustment and Variance 07-222; Applicant David Nachazel for Atlas Land Surveys, Inc.; Owners Tony Flores for Terawave Communications and Harry Thornberry; R-1-15 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.

Proposed Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) that will revise boundary between two single-family parcels. A variance is required because the parcel at 507 Herrmann Drive is substandard in area and the lot line adjustment further reduces the area. The required minimum lot area is 15,000 square feet (SF). The parcel at 507 Herrmann Drive is 12,732 SF in area and the proposed Lot Line Adjustment will reduce that area by 672 SF for a new total of 12,060 SF.

ACTION: Approved the Lot line Adjustment and Variance as presented including the removal of the accessory structure. 6-1 (Noes-McCrone)-0.

Staff Presentation/Commissioners Questions:

Todd Bennett presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions.

Applicant

David Nachazel, Atlas Land Surveys, said that Mr. Bennett's presentation was well done and that he had nothing to add. In answer to Chair McCrone's question, he said that an easement had not been discussed with the property owner because it is a cleaner process with a property line and fee title transfer.

Public Comments:

None.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Stocker moved to approve the lot line adjustment and variance as presented including removal of the accessory structure. He said the lot line adjustment is minor, an easement is not necessary and the neighbors are in agreement as proposed. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. Chair McCrone said that he will not support the motion because it is not in the City's best interest to further reduce the size of a non-conforming lot and that the same results can be done with an easement which would eliminate the need for a variance.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Stocker, seconded by Commissioner Davis, it was moved to approve the lot line adjustment and variance as presented including the removal of the accessory structure. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Davis, Garden, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	McCrone
ABSENT:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None

3. Mansionization Subcommittee Ordinance Amendments. (Continued from July 24, 2007.)

The City of Monterey proposes to amend the City's Zoning Code. Proposed changes include new definitions for building height, demolition, remodeling, basement, and floor area. Changes are also proposed to the Residential Estate and Single-Family Zoning District development standards. The changes will help ensure that new construction compliments the existing neighborhoods in terms of mass and scale.

ACTION: Recommended mansionization zoning ordinance amendments to the City Council as presented with enhanced graphics as discussed

Staff Presentation/Commissioners Questions:

Chip Rerig presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions. It was discussed that the diagrams will be enhanced to add a chimney to the height diagrams, to add a diagram of irregular shaped or non-rectangular lot setbacks; and to make graphics to scale.

Public Comments:

Doug Chandler, President of the Monterey Vista Neighborhood Association but speaking for himself, said that the amendments to the ordinance will make a difference in how neighborhoods are redeveloped. He said that the standard 20 foot front yard setback has worked very well, that the 15 foot setback will change the appearance of his neighborhood, and suggested that it should be based on an approved variance rather than part of the overall plan. He said that he does not see that stepping a house down a slope is 'encouraged' in the present language and that should be taken into consideration so that there will not be as much impact in the neighborhood as a house that is designed level to the property line.

Jennifer James, Monterey County Association of Realtors, said that none of their previous recommendations were taken into consideration. Regarding the garage space, she said that people will choose living space rather than garages.

Judi Lehman, President Del Monte Beach Neighborhood Association, said that the concerns over the impact and the amount of square footage for garages is an important factor especially in their neighborhood and that people need to park on their property and in their driveways as much as possible. She said that stepping down may encourage understory storage space in some cases, but can also create problems with grading in sand such as in their area and may impact the compatibility of the neighborhood. She said that the diagrams are good visuals, but regarding the second diagram on Page 5 of the staff report, she hopes the height from finished grade to the

ridgeline will run vertical across the lot and that ARC will review the height so there is no visual impact.

Sharon Dwight inquired if the specific policies and problems were addressed by the subcommittee, if the changes were modeled after another jurisdiction's policies and, if so, what results did that city have. She said her concerns are for the height of houses blocking light that affects the growth of the neighbor's vegetation. She said that the illustrations indicate excavating for building massive boxes on a hill; and if the intention is not to excavate the entire site, then there needs to be illustrations showing that and that significant excavation will divert water flow. She said that the basement policy seems to be a way to put a third story in but not count it as FAR and that the neighborhood is against a third story structure. She said that the 15-foot front setback changes the character of neighborhoods and, because they support the single family design guidelines, she feels that these amendments are going in the wrong direction.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Stocker said that the amended ordinance reduces bulk and mass and forces stepping down hill to help reduce box type homes. He said it encourages designs that follow natural grades and that height is the key because that forces conformity to topography of height. He said that the 15 foot front setback with a 20 foot setback to the garage allows for modulation to the building and by leaving the FAR where it was and modulating the side yard setback reduces side house bulk. He said that the basement or uninhabitable space is a building code issue rather than a planning issue. Regarding demolitions, he said the definition was put in to designate what is being done is a demolition, but that variances are allowed for certain case by case projects. He said it is not forcing demolitions, but staff can determine that an application for variance is needed; and if that is not done, the City will continue to allow houses to use old foundation and a stud or two as a remodel.

Chair McCrone said that he attests to the fact that the City continually works with the abuse of the term 'demolition'. Commissioner Davis said that these amendments will be forcing step downs and there will be no understroy with two-story designs. He said he agrees that the basement is a building code matter the same as in the past. He said that the 15 foot setback is new and asked if the subcommittee discussed whether the setback should be restricted to the first floor. He said he agrees with Ms. Dwight's comments that counting non-conforming walls as demolition is punitive and will result in demolition of older houses that could be re-habitable. He said that ARC grants variances for those walls to exist and that the height is parallel with the line on the diagram and none of the roof can exceed 25 feet.

Commissioner Bryant said that the subcommittee discussed setbacks long and hard trying to achieve some modulation so that the front of the house is more prominent than the garage. She said that some modification to the demolition should be considered to preserve parts of older homes but to also allow them to be designed as desired. She moved to recommend to City Council the amendments to the Mansionization Zoning Ordinance as presented. Commissioner Stocker seconded the motion with the additional comment to enhance the graphics hillside lot grade. Mr. Rerig said that staff will also add a chimney to the graphic and a second diagram for side yard setback and to better scale the graphics.

Commissioner Osorio said that tandem parking is now allowed; and the 15 foot front yard setback is a matter of opinion, but there was discussion about the streetscape and gearing toward the desire for a more walkable community. He said he wished that the graphics were easier to understand. Commissioner Garden said that the subcommittee and Planning Commission have met the charge that was before them and he supports the motion. He said the definition of height remedies concerns, the scope of review was appropriate and has taken care of the problem of the look and size of new houses. He said that the improved zoning ordinance allows for possible designs of 2,000 square foot homes on 5,000 square foot lots and gives designers the opportunity to design homes so they don't all look like tall flat buildings. He said there is no change in parking requirements but there are changes for design consideration depending on how you want to park your cars. Commissioner Widmar said that the preservation of homes should be handled by a variance or variations upon ARC design review and he would like to see language added regarding the building character as an incentive not to demolish older property. He said that 15 foot setbacks sounds frightening, but there are many houses even closer to the property line and may help the integrity of the neighborhood by maintaining the historic setbacks. He said that absolute height governs what you can put under the house and basements that are 6'11" might be too tall unless that is a

universal building code. He said he does not want to see doorways into basement space because that invites abuse of renters in uninhabitable space, but screened window wells would be okay for light. He said he will support the motion, but would like consideration for screened window wells for natural light and for a safety route out of basement. Commissioner Stocker clarified that windows in under 6'11" space is currently allowable.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Bryant, seconded by Commissioner Stocker, it was moved to recommend the mansionization zoning ordinance amendments to the City Council as presented with enhanced graphics as discussed. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 7 COMMISSIONERS: Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None

**Recess 5:43 p.m.
Reconvene 7:00 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair McCrone called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Senior Planner Chip Rerig, Associate Planner Forrest Ebbs, Recording Secretary Terry Lebda

PUBLIC COMMENTS
PUBLIC COMMENTS allows the public to speak for a maximum of three minutes on any subject, which is not on the agenda. Any person or group desiring to bring an item to the attention of the Planning Commission may do so by addressing the Commission during Public Comments or by addressing a letter of explanation to: Community Development Director, City Hall, Monterey CA 93940. The appropriate staff person will contact the sender concerning the details. Note: Public Comments are taken during the afternoon session and continued at the evening session. Individuals may choose to speak once for up to three minutes at either session, but not both.

None.

REVIEW OF EVENING AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS
REVIEW OF AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS are to review those items recommended for approval on consent, or recommended to be continued, tabled or withdrawn, etc. CONSENT ITEMS consists of those items that are routine and a staff recommendation has been prepared. A member of the public or a Commissioner may request that an item recommended for approval on consent is heard on the regular agenda for further discussion.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
PUBLIC HEARINGS are held to receive public comment on certain items pending Planning Commission action. You are welcome to offer your comments after being recognized by the Chair. The Chair may limit the time allocated to each speaker.

- 4. **103 Spray Avenue; Appeal 07-253 of ARC Application 07-226; Appellant/Owner Carl Outzen; R-1-6-D1 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Appeal of Architectural Review Committee's Preliminary Design Review approval that denied a request to replace wood siding with stucco material.

ACTION: Overturned the Architectural Review Committee decision and upheld the appeal finding that the revised project was well designed and well modulated. 6-1 (Noes-McCrone)-0.

Staff Presentation/Commissioners Questions:

Forrest Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions.

Appellant/Owner:

Carl Outzen gave a history of the project and said that when he obtained his building permit, he then spoke with a Senior Planner about changing to stucco and that Planner thought it would be appealing. He redesigned the plans with more modulation, made changes to the deck and eliminated the vertical boards on the upper floor, which had made the building appear massive, and incorporated stucco features. Referring to the Land Use Plan, Page 152, he said that the ARC did not refer to this information that read to avoid boxy structures and to use modulation and proportioned cantilevers and that new single family dwellings are to be consistent in colors recommending materials including stucco, wood siding, or a combination of the two. He said that no neighbors spoke against the stucco material and he has only had encouragement by the neighbors. He answered Commissioners' questions saying that he has not yet chosen a color pallet and that out of 125 homes in the area, 57 are stucco homes.

Public Comments:

Clyde Roberson said that he is for the project because Mr. Outzen does quality work as has been shown by previous projects. He said that this project is not a large box such as others in that area built in another time. He said this house is not jammed on the lot, but well set back, and that wood has its place, but he does not think this is the place. He also read an email of August 11, 2007 from Marianne and Richard Lind supporting the stucco materials. He said that this is an opportunity to compliment staff on its good works, but to also note that this is an exception, that it is an asset and beautiful home to that neighborhood.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Stocker said that he does not believe the City should be pushing someone to use imitation rather than real materials, the changes made are very good, and the concept, as in all areas, should be well designed and well modulated. He said they did a very good job with their redesign and moved to overturn the ARC decision. Commissioner Widmar seconded the motion. He said in this case he does not believe the ARC made an error, but over extended the reach of the word 'encourage' found in the Land Use Plan, and that is to 'encourage' the use of certain materials rather than require it. Commissioner Bryant said that the vertical siding makes the top story look enormous and out of proportion. She said that she will support the motion to uphold the appeal saying that the design, modulation, and contrasting colors are nicely done and will make this an attractive house. Commissioner Osorio said that there needs to be room for one to exercise personal taste as in this project. Commissioner Davis said that he agrees with the apparent majority. Chair McCrone said that he can't support the motion because it did not state that ARC erred. He said that ARC works subjectively and it is within their discretion as the experts of the City.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Stocker, seconded by Commissioner Widmar, it was moved to overturn the Architectural Review Committee decision and upheld the appeal finding that the revised project was well designed and well modulated. 6-1 (Noes-McCrone)-0. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Davis, Garden, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	McCrone
ABSENT:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None

5. 136 Tide Avenue; Appeal 07-264, Appellants Frances J. and Ellery F. Williams, and Appeal 07-266,

Appellant Maria Anderson, of ARC Application 06-425; Applicant Christine Hopper; Owner Gene Lavorini; R-1-6-D1 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.

Appeal of Architectural Review Committee's Concept Design Review approving construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot.

ACTION: Denied both appeals and uphold the ARC decision as amended by adding conditions that there be obscure glass on the second story French doors and that a survey be required for building height. 7-0-0.

Staff Presentation/Commissioners Questions:

Forrest Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions.

Applicant:

Designer Christine Hopper said that Mr. Lavorini is working to meet all standards and concerns of neighbors. She said that the Floor Area Ratio restricts the amount of living area, that the house does not block the view of the appellant because of how the view corridor is situated, and they have made modifications to mitigate privacy concerns. To further mitigate the appellant's concerns, she said that the applicant would like to ask the Planning Commission to add another condition requiring obscured glass on the two French doors off the second floor bedrooms. She said that since there is no storage on Spray Avenue the basement will help and that there is no impact to the subterranean. She said that the owner objects to lowering to below grade and at the highest point the house sits 6" above grade with perhaps an average of 12" above grade.

Appellant Francis Joan Williams said that she lives behind the proposed project and that the house is designed with decks literally a stones throw away from their house. She said she spoke with Mr. Lavorini about the obscured glass in the upstairs bedroom doors, but there was no discussion of this or the privacy issues at the ARC meetings. She said that the only way to prevent privacy impacts is to eliminate the second floor balcony and to put high windows on the south or east side for light and air. She said modifications might be a hardship to the owner, but asked, what about their hardship? In answer to Chair McCrone's question, Ms. Williams replied that the obscure windows do not satisfy her concerns because of the proximity of the balcony, which will still be there. Appellant Maria Anderson showed pictures of a retaining wall that the City installed and said that it has created more of an issue with the blowing sand and changes the grade. She said the proposed design is massive for the site and the decks are not taken into consideration to the staked area. She said the home in comparison is an illegal house and should not be used as an example.

Public Comments:

Sonny Von, neighbor to the Ms. Anderson's home, said that when he built his home several years ago, he voluntarily brought his home to street level. He said the point of reference should be to street level before the retaining wall was built because the retaining wall now creates artificial data. Gerald Switcher said he, too, believes the lot should be graded down to street level and he agrees with the other neighbors' concerns. Judy Lehman, Del Monte Beach Neighborhood Association President, said that view sharing should be taken into consideration, grading should be below or at street level and that grade was established at an artificial grade and should be adjusted accordingly. She said that the obscure glass French doors are only good if the doors are closed; that the decks should be reduced or eliminated to mitigate the mass; the large upstairs and small downstairs is not appropriate and does not help with view sharing; she suggested that for modulation she would rather see the windows built in rather than out; and she has concerns about the overhang and deck in the rear on the first floor. She said it is not just about this house but, because this neighborhood is in transition, concerns should be considered with all remodels. Dale Hogan said that there is no need to build up because there is just as good a view on the street level; and, if he grades down a couple of feet into his garage it may be steep, but will not impact the view. Dick Cleves said that he formerly owned this lot under discussion and said that he is in favor of allowing this house to be built; and with the height of other houses in the area, his will not block their views. He added that he will also need a building permit so that he can be placed on the water waiting list. Joyce Cappella said that if houses are built close to the street, it is noisy and a problem with cars in short driveways and

you need to walk in the street to avoid them. She said that the last lots are now being built on and the last home was built low so the neighbor behind has a view. She said this house is designed above street level where sand has been piled up over the years but it needs to be at street level for view sharing.

Christine Hopper said that she has heard neighbors wanting the house closer to or further away from the street and nothing will satisfy everybody. She said that they have done all they can to make compromises and that nothing in the design is intentional to cause problems for the neighbors. She said they are 6" above grade on one side because of the significant slope of street grade and lot constraints and asked, what will 6" do for the people behind them? She said that others have decks in the back and she does not know why the applicant cannot have a deck in the back of their house and you can't eliminate views into others' yards or windows. She said that it will be a while before the house is built due to being on the water waiting list and she would like the Planning Commission to uphold the ARC decision and deny the appeals. Ms. Williams said that Mr. Cleves owned the lot in front of her lot and sold it and that is why he is supporting the proposal and reiterated that the privacy impact into her home can be eliminated eliminating the balconies. Ms. Anderson said that she does not know how the first floor can be sitting at street level, when it is so tall and with the balconies it is a huge project.

Mr. Ebbs clarified that the City Council intentionally excluded the condition in the land use plan that houses will be at or below street level, but they encourage it. He said that roof heights are measured by point of the gable. Mr. Rerig said that he spoke with Mr. Reichmuth about the retaining walls and that it was a Neighborhood Improvement Project as a response to neighbors' concerns over blowing sand. He said that due to this project, the retaining wall and sand will be removed.

Chair McCrone called for a recess at 9:40 p.m.; the meeting reconvened at 9:50 p.m.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Osorio said that he will not be able to support either appeal because he went to the Williams' home and his perception is that the proposed building fully complies with the current view sharing policy, that the applicant seems to have gone to a great extent to accommodate the perceived loss of view sharing, and the applicant will also have privacy impacts from the neighbors home. Commissioner Bryant said that view sharing has been contentious for years and will not change. She said that some of the view will be blocked, but there will still be views for the house behind and the house has been lowered to mitigate the concerns.

Commissioner Garden moved to deny both appeals and uphold the ARC decision with additional conditions that there be obscure glass on the French doors and that a survey is not necessary. Commissioner Osorio seconded the motion.

Commissioner Stocker said that he disagrees regarding the survey because it is very important, heights get out of control and it is not a huge imposition to require a survey. He said that this house is higher than what would be allowed under the City's upcoming new mansionization standards. Commissioner Garden revised his motion to include a condition that the applicant be required to have a survey to match survey heights to building heights. Commission Osorio seconded the revised motion.

Commissioner Davis said that the floor levels are only 4/10ths higher than the sidewalk, so basically it is at street level. He said that there is no finding of size and bulk when other homes are larger. Chair McCrone concurred that view sharing is a difficult decision but that they are bound by laws as they currently exist. He said he cannot say ARC has erred or made an incorrect decision, but pleased the applicant made concessions to the obscure windows.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Garden, seconded by Commissioner Osorio, it was moved to deny both appeals and uphold the ARC decision as amended by adding conditions that there be obscured glass on the second story French doors and that a survey be required for building height. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 7 COMMISSIONERS: Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Osorio, Stocker, Widmar
NOES: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None
ABSENT: 0 COMMISSIONERS: None

Additional Conditions:

- The applicant shall install obscured glass on second story French doors at the rear of the new building.
- The applicant shall survey the finished height during framing to ensure that it does not exceed the maximum approved height.

COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioners may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, the Commission may provide a referral to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning any City matter, or direct staff to place a request to agendize a matter of business on a future agenda (G.C. 54954.2).

6. Response to Commissioners' Comments at July 24, 2007 meeting. Report received.

New Comments:

- Chair McCrone said that at the August 13 Mayor's Meeting, they discussed both condominium conversion progress and the concern that interested parties and neighbors wish to receive reports sooner so that they have time to review and contribute input. Commissioner Garden said that he would like to see this agendized for discussion at a future Planning Commission meeting to understand if the difficulty is in the time it takes to write the reports or the clerical production of the reports so that the reports can be available 10 days before the meeting. Commissioner Bryant said that she agrees and that staff is directly affected by this proposed transition.

Chair McCrone announced that the next Mayor's meeting will be the Boards and Commissions Meeting on December 13.

PLANNING DIVISION UPDATES

This report supplies information on activities or announcements and may request clarification or direction regarding scheduling of Commission meetings and study sessions.

7. Planning Division Update. Report received and reviewed.

- Chair McCrone said to make note that he will be late to the Condominium Conversion Adhoc Subcommittee Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Planning Commission Chair Bill McCrone

Senior Planner Richard S. Marvin

Respectfully Submitted, Terry Lebda
Recording Secretary
Planning Commission

