

**TOWN OF MORAGA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Moraga Library Meeting Room  
1500 St. Mary's Road  
Moraga, CA 94556

May 5, 2014  
7:00 P.M.

**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Kuckuk called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 P.M.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Commissioners Levenfeld, Marnane, Onoda, Schoenbrunner\*, Woehleke,  
Chair Kuckuk  
\* Commissioner Schoenbrunner arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Commissioner Comprelli

Staff: Shawna Brekke-Read, Planning Director  
Ellen Clark, Senior Planner  
Ella Samonsky, Associate Planner

**B. Conflict of Interest**

There was no reported conflict of interest.

**C. Contact with Applicant(s)**

There was no reported contact with applicant(s).

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the public.

**III. ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. March 17, 2014 Minutes**
- B. March 17, 2014 Special Meeting Minutes**

Chair Kuckuk requested the following amendments to the minutes of March 17, 2014.  
To the third sentence of the third paragraph on Page 2:

*He [Bob Bratton] referenced the "No Parking" signs which had been placed along the route which detracted from the scenic corridor and asked that the curb be painted.*

To the first paragraph on Page 2, to read:

*Mr. Wright asked that when considered by the Planning Commission, the Commission reject the project and require an independent study of the application.*

Senior Planner Ellen Clark requested an amendment to the fourth sentence of the third paragraph on Page 5, to read:

*He [Mr. Skinner] noted that for a slide to occur it would have to slide through all of the reinforced layers and that geogrid would not degrade over time or be exposed to ultra-violet (UV) rays.*

On motion by Commissioner Onoda, seconded by Commissioner Marnane to adopt the Consent Agenda, subject to amendments to the minutes of the March 17, 2014 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Levenfeld, Marnane, Onoda, Woehleke, Kuckuk  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Comprelli, Schoenbrunner

#### **IV. ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA**

On motion by Commissioner Woehleke, seconded by Commissioner Marnane to adopt the Meeting Agenda, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Levenfeld, Marnane, Onoda, Woehleke, Kuckuk  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Comprelli, Schoenbrunner

#### **V. PUBLIC HEARING**

- A. Consider a Resolution Recommending Adoption of an Ordinance Amending in its Entirety Chapter 8.88, Signs and Outdoor Advertising, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code**

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report dated May 5, 2014.

Ms. Samonsky recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the Town Council adopt an ordinance amending in its entirety Chapter 8.88 Signs and Outdoor Advertising, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code (MMC).

Responding to the Commission, Ms. Samonsky explained that lighting and illumination had been an area of change in the proposed ordinance, and would likely result in more legal non-conforming signs if the Sign Ordinance, as proposed, were to move forward. She compared the Town's existing and proposed regulations for lighting and illumination, and identified numerous examples of such signage.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Kathe Nelson, Moraga Chamber of Commerce, asked for clarification on the allowable use of internally illuminated open signs, and the permitted time period for the use of portable signs.

Joan Bruzzone found the ordinance to be all inclusive and not just about signs. She understood that the Town had received a grant for the Livable Moraga Road Project which would cover a number of issues, and asked that the Town consider how to improve business environment and increase sales tax revenue rather than focus on signage.

Chair Kuckuk explained that the original meeting agenda had been revised with staff to provide an update on the Livable Moraga Road Project, and to introduce the Draft Preferred Concepts. Public comment would also be welcomed at such time as the Commission addressed that agenda item.

Ms. Bruzzone stated that the signs in her shopping center had been used since the 1960s and she objected to an all inclusive ordinance that would tell property owners what they could and could not do with their property. She suggested less was more, questioned fixing something that was not in need of fixing, at least with her own shopping center, and sought more energy and focus on addressing empty storefronts.

Dave Bruzzone, Moraga, commented that he had recently reviewed the ordinance and had found the 18-page document to be alarming with its primary purpose of how to address the Town's drastically inefficient existing Sign Program. He expressed concern that the Town would dictate a Master Sign Program as a requirement for multi-tenants subject to specific criteria, prior to issuance of a building permit, particularly since it would impact the Moraga Center that had been constructed in the 1960s. He noted that the Safeway Store had occupied the center in the 1980s and the pad in the front of School Street and Moraga Way next to Wells Fargo Bank was currently empty. He expressed concern that potential tenants desirous of building on that empty pad may hold the entire shopping center hostage if a Master Sign Program was required. He found the ordinance to be heavy handed and did not appreciate another level of regulation since some tenants in the center were already having difficulty paying rent.

Mr. Bruzzone expressed the same concerns with the Master Sign Program requirement which could impact plans to put a sign in the area in front of the Moraga Country Club where the putting green was located, and where some form of signage would be desired at such time as the Bruzzone-owned 68 lots in the Moraga Country Club were sold. He understood there were regulations prohibiting signage on Moraga Open Space Ordinance (MOSO) lands including "For Sale" signage, which should also be discussed by the Planning Commission.

Chair Kuckuk closed public comment at this time.

Ms. Samonsky clarified the recommendation for exempt illuminated signs with one illuminated sign allowed per frontage; portable signs would be permitted annually for a 12-month period; Real Estate signs used for the sale of real property would be exempt including signs for the sale of lots for new homes, and construction signs as reflected in the exempt section of the Draft Sign Ordinance, with said signage required to be removed 30 days after the property was leased, sold, or construction completed. She added that the Master Sign Program had been included in the Draft Sign Ordinance given the challenges with each new tenant independently going through the process to get signs approved. She explained there had been a desire to streamline the signage process for future tenants to allow greater flexibility for a multi-tenant building as opposed to a single business on a single parcel. A Master Sign Program would include specific standards that would apply to a multi-tenant parcel, to be developed by a property owner, and once approved, allow a property owner and tenant to streamline approval. A change to the approved Master Sign Program would require the approval of the Design Review Board. Variances would still be available for special circumstances.

Planning Director Shawna Brekke-Read reported that staff had met with Edy Schwartz and Joan Bruzzone regarding the Draft Sign Ordinance. She understood that Ms. Bruzzone's tenants were subject to some requirements for consistent signage similar to a Master Sign Plan. The purpose of the Master Sign Program was to make the process easier for both the property owner and the tenants.

Ms. Samonsky walked the Commission through the background and reasoning behind the proposed Draft Sign Ordinance as outlined in detail in the May 5, 2014 staff report, with the amendments intended to ensure that the Town had a legally defensible sign code, and to respond to comments that the Town's sign review process was long, challenging, and difficult to complete. She further clarified that signs that were legally approved, and/or legally installed prior to a new Master Sign Program would be allowed to remain, did not require replacement, and would become legal non-conforming.

Chair Kuckuk allowed for additional public comment at this time.

Mr. Bruzzone questioned the purpose of the Draft Sign Ordinance to make the process easier. He reiterated his concerns pointing out that some businesses, such as gas stations, were required to use corporate signage and logos.

Mr. Bruzzone stated he had a previous sign program for eaves on his buildings, and many of his tenants had logos that were required for the business. He sought more flexibility and suggested that the ordinance, as proposed, allowed less flexibility, with fewer exemptions. He again reiterated his concern that the ordinance was heavy handed, making it more difficult with less flexibility for long attached buildings to use eave signs which were required for that type of development. He opposed imposing a Master Sign Program requirement on property owners of multi-tenant buildings.

## PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

The Planning Commission walked through Attachment B, Draft Sign Ordinance, page by page and requested clarification, and offered comments and/or direction to staff, as follows:

- Revise Section 8.88.010, Authority and Purpose 3), to read: *3) Encourage a desirable semi-rural character with a minimum of overhead clutter;*
- Staff clarified that Section 8.88.040, Signs on Town Property 3) Signs in traditional public forum area, applied to non-commercial message signs, signs used in protests, parades, and anyone in public with a message, as examples;
- Staff clarified that Section 8.88.040, Signs on Town property (B), allowed the Town the ability to discern what signs are placed on Town property; that Section 8.88.040 (E) clarified the permit process for the public to place signs on public property; clarified First Amendment regulations; clarified signs for community events such as the Community Faire, as an example, would potentially be addressed in the Town's Fee Schedule; identified a typographical error in Section 8.88.040 C) v); and clarified pursuant to Section 8.88.040 (E) the grounds for denial of the placement of signs on public property;
- Staff identified a typographical error in Section 8.88.050, signs allowed without a permit D), Informational signs; clarified this section would not apply to business signs; acknowledged that informational signs could be an illuminated open sign; and acknowledged a request for informational, directional, individual signs such as those for birthday parties for a reserved space, to be allowed on Town property for one day; staff clarified that the Town could not regulate based on content; acknowledged such signage would be temporary and enforcement would be likely to be a high priority with said signs addressed under Section 8.88.040 C) 3); and with modification to Section 8.88.040 Signs on Town property C) v), eliminating the notation at the end of the sentence reading: *please review and modify as appropriate;*
- Revise the second sentence under Section 888.050, Signs allowed without a permit, D) Information signs, to read: *One single illuminated informational sign, without movement and under 2 square feet in area, is allowed per premises;*

- Streamline Section 8.88.070 Master Sign Program; Commissioners found the regulations to be reasonable and while acknowledging some felt it was overreaching the intent was to streamline the process, variances were still allowed if a tenant wanted to vary from the Master Sign Program. The majority of the Planning Commission support the intent of this section although upon discussion, staff suggested the first sentence of Section 8.88.070 Master Sign Program, A) Requirement, be modified to read:

*A master sign program shall be required as follows:*

*Before any permanent sign is placed or modified;  
Or, prior to approval of, a renovation of more than 5,000 square feet,  
Or, prior to renovation requiring Design Review Board approval;  
Or, prior to a Conditional Use Permit requiring Planning Commission approval,  
Or, approval of a monument sign or marquee sign.*

Chair Kuckuk reported that Commissioner Schoenbrunner left the dais at 8:12 P.M. and returned at 8:14 P.M.

- A recommendation to eliminate Section 8.88.070 B) 4) was not supported by the majority of the Planning Commission; staff clarified an applicant may propose multiple monument signs; and the Design Review Board (DRB) may determine it was inappropriate for a small parcel, and therefore it may be appropriate in some circumstances to allow more than one monument sign per parcel, such as for the Rheem Shopping Center and the Moraga Center;
- Add the definition of "multi-tenant" to Section 8.88.020, Definitions;
- Revise Section 8.88.070 Master Sign Program A) 2) to read: *The owner of an existing development or a site shall submit a master sign program to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.*
- Discussed Section 8.88.090 Permanent signs, A) General sign standards, 3) Location, with respect to a prior request for a monument sign off-site for the Presbyterian Valley Church; staff clarified in that case the sign was already located off-site; clarified signage to be located on someone's else's property required permission from the property owner; and that the Sign Ordinance included a provision for off-site signs;
- Expressed concern with Section 8.88.090 Permanent signs, B) 8) Portable signs for permitting a portable sign for an extended period of time (12 months) with the possibility for an extension of time after review; staff explained this section had been included after staff had discussions with the business community; staff suggested a 12-month period for a portable sign allowed the community and the Town Council time to assess the approach to portable signs;

- Staff acknowledged the time period for a portable sign could be modified at the discretion of the Planning Commission; the Commission suggested portable signs be of a pedestrian oriented to communicate to passersby, may be acceptable in a shopping center; not be located in the scenic corridor; not be allowed on the sidewalk or in the public right-of-way;
- Modify §8.88.090 Permanent signs, B) 8) vii) Placement and Removal to read: *A portable sign shall not be permanently attached to the ground or other permanent structure, shall be located on-site, shall be erected and removed on the same calendar day, and may be displayed for a maximum of 12 consecutive hours during a day, during the hours of operation of the associated business or organization.* Although there was support to permit portable signs for six months only, the consensus of the Planning Commission was to allow one year for the approval of portable signs and consensus to modify the resolution to recommend specifically revisiting §8.88.090 Permanent Signs, B) 8) Portable signs after the first year, and consensus to direct staff to review the entire ordinance after the first year, with a report to the Planning Commission;
- Recommended that §8.88.110 Abandoned or obsolete signs, include information on the Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) in the event an abandoned or obsolete sign was not removed, with staff reporting that the Town Council would be considering two ordinances at a future meeting including nuisance abatement and administrative citation procedures, and once adopted those regulations would apply to this section; and
- Staff reported that the Town was developing the means available through §8.88.130 Severability, to address enforcement through the Town Council, to be reflected in different chapters of the MMC.

Ms. Brekke-Read described the process for Town Council consideration of the ordinance through first and second readings; the timeline for the consideration of the Sign Ordinance by the Town Council; and identified the proposed changes to the Sign Ordinance, as discussed by the Planning Commission and as summarized during the discussion. Staff also recommended the following modification to the Draft Resolution, as follows:

Revise the Now, Therefore Be It Resolved clause on Page 1 of the resolution to read:

***NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission of the Town of Moraga does hereby recommend that Town staff review the entirety of Chapter 8.88, Signs and Outdoor Advertising, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code, as drafted in Exhibit A to this resolution, entitled Draft Sign Ordinance, dated May 5, 2014, one year after adoption of the ordinance, including the appropriateness of the portable sign regulations, and provide a report and recommendation to the Planning Commission.***

On motion by Commissioner Marnane, seconded by Commissioner Onoda to adopt a Resolution Recommending Adoption of an Ordinance Amending in its Entirety Chapter 8.88, Signs and Outdoor Advertising, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code, as discussed and as modified. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Levenfeld, Marnane, Onoda, Schoenbrunner, Woehleke, Kuckuk  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Comprilli

## **VI. ROUTINE & OTHER MATTERS**

### **A. Livable Moraga Road: Update and Introduction of Draft Preferred Concepts**

Senior Planner Ellen Clark presented a PowerPoint presentation to update the Planning Commission on the Livable Moraga Road Project and outlined the background of the project; significant public outreach efforts with two public workshops; and meetings with the Town's Livable Moraga Road Town Advisory Committee (TAC) and stakeholders. Based on the work with the consultant team and the public outreach efforts, Draft Preferred Concepts had been identified. The Draft Preferred Concepts would be brought to a public workshop and then be submitted to the Town Council for endorsement to develop design drawings. She identified the current work schedule for the project; outlined the discussions from the latest public workshop in March 2014, and identified a draft vision statement and guiding principles.

Ms. Clark reported that three different options had been presented and discussed during the March 2014 public workshop. The first option, Concept A, included connections to sidewalk gaps, restriping bike lanes, installing few landscaping improvements, and transit shelter and improvements to the corridor at low cost. The second option, Concept B, allowed more space for those facilities, with buffering for bike lanes, widening sidewalks, and the other improvements as contained in the first option. The third option, Concept C, identified as the Complete Connected Corridor, included a multi-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists from end to end of the corridor, include connected bike lanes and sidewalks, additional pedestrian crossings, and require more real estate in the road with lane reductions and lane reconfigurations.

During the March 2014 public workshop, all the pros and cons of the alternatives had been reviewed with a consensus on a number of points: support for the idea of a generous multi-use trail stretching from Commons Park all the way to Campolindo High School; a need for signalization at Corliss Drive with the intersection to be improved to better connect to the spur trail and a bus stop; continuous bike lanes; and traffic to be accommodated in a safe way with side street turning movements off Moraga Road. In addition, driveways off of the Rheem Center were found to be problematic and created conflicts and a less than desirable operational aesthetic. There was a discussion of a trade-off to provide better bicycle and pedestrian facilities and how it

would affect the traffic flow particularly if there were lane reductions. Most of the public supported some pedestrian crossings with an emphasis on maintaining the vehicle flow.

Ms. Clark explained that based on the input from the community as well as the consideration of all ideas and Concepts A, B, and C, the consultant had prepared a Draft Preferred Concept.

The Draft Preferred Concept consisted of continuous bike lanes, multiuse path, and sidewalks, intersection improvements including the potential reconfiguration of the Woodford Drive intersection near Campolindo High School to better align with the school driveway, improvements at Rheem Boulevard with fewer turning movements, signalization of Corliss Drive, conventional four-way intersection at St. Mary's Road, additional medians and dedicated turn pockets around Campolindo High School, transit stop improvements, shelters, seating at all bus stops, and narrowing of lanes in the Rheem Center area producing more generous sidewalks and bike lanes allowing for off-street parking along Corliss and Donald Drives.

Ms. Clark detailed the Traffic Engineer's analysis as related to the proposed improvements. She expressed her hope that during future public workshops and Planning Commission meetings there would be a sense of whether the Draft Preferred Concept would be an acceptable trade-off for the community. She reported that the project would be completed in a series of phases since it could not be done at one time given the financial constraints, and that the consultant had suggested short- and long-term projects. In the short term, the consultant recommended a focus around Campolindo High School and those improvements to be installed by developers such as the Camino Ricardo Skate Park crosswalk and the Donald Drive to Corliss Drive gap. In the mid-term, it was recommended that there be a focus on projects in the vicinity of Rheem Boulevard and the area around Commons Park. Long-term projects included the St. Mary's Road intersection and the area between Campolindo High School and Rheem Boulevard.

Ms. Clark reported that the Draft Preferred Concept would be presented to the DRB at its meeting on May 12, 2014, and then on to the Town Council on May 14, 2014, with the next public workshop tentatively scheduled for June 3 or 4, 2014. Based on all feedback, a Preferred Concept would be presented to the Town Council at a future meeting in July with the hope of receiving Council endorsement to allow for the preparation of 35 percent design drawings. Additionally, the project would be presented to the Los Perales and Rheem Elementary Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) on May 21, 2014 to solicit input and educate parents, with large project posters on the concept to be displayed at the Library, Town Offices, on-line, and possibly at local businesses. On-line input would also be accepted.

Input had previously been received from the Parents Club from Campolindo High School in December 2013, and the consulting Traffic Engineer had provided expertise to the Acalanes Union High School District (AUHSD), which was pursuing designs to correlate the Woodford Drive intersection with the High School driveway and improve drop-offs at Campolindo Drive.

Ms. Brekke-Read reported that the next meeting of the Planning Commission would be a joint meeting with the Park and Recreation Commission on May 19, 2014. The Draft Preferred Concepts could be agendaized for that meeting or the first Planning Commission meeting in June.

Ms. Clark added that the Traffic Consultant had prepared a series of updated traffic counts for Moraga Road; reviewed the roadway capacity; identified modest projections of growth in Moraga including regional forecasts with safety for all modes being the most important goal of the Livable Moraga Road Project; and the Draft Preferred Concept accommodated both pedestrians and bicyclists. She clarified that the Lafayette portion of Moraga Road was out of the scope of the project. In addition, she suggested the Draft Preferred Concept was closest to Option C; the consultant had reviewed and supported the Camino Ricardo skate park crosswalk and signalization and improvements to the existing crossing at Corliss Drive. She acknowledged a request for background material and better graphics when the item was next brought to the Planning Commission.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Joan Bruzzone clarified with staff the number of crosswalks anticipated at Camino Ricardo as part of the Camino Ricardo Subdivision and the Livable Moraga Road Project, and expressed concern with two crosswalks so close to one another which could restrict traffic flows. She asked of the extent of the mitigations along St. Mary's Road given bicycle use on the weekends; how the Livable Moraga Road Project would be funded; and expressed concern with the potential for additional taxes. She stated the Town had become stifled by the emergence of so many rules and regulations that it was difficult to function in a competitive manner. She otherwise complimented the Planning Commission on its volunteerism, time, and effort spent on the projects that had been presented to the Commission.

Ms. Clark explained that the Traffic Consultant had prepared an analysis and had determined there would not be an issue with frequent crossings; the Livable Moraga Road Project was financed by the Transportation for Livable Communities Grant administered by Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Measure J funds.

Chair Kuckuk added that the Livable Moraga Road Project area would extend from Moraga Road at Campolindo Drive all the way down to the St. Mary's Road intersection. The intention of the project was to position the Town to pursue grant funding for the individual road sections.

Dave Bruzzone, Moraga, liked the idea of a multi-use path from the Commons to Campolindo High School but expressed concern with the potential reduction in lanes, and additional pedestrian crossings up and down the roadway. He suggested there were ways to have a safe path and a multi-use bike lane while not having to reduce the lanes.

Mr. Bruzzone was not convinced the Level of Service (LOS) would not decrease once the lanes were reduced; was uncertain that all the potential streets that could be impacted had been counted; and pointed out that pedestrians and bicyclists were a small minority of the traffic on the roadways.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Chair Kuckuk stated that the TAC had been provided more information than what had been presented to the Planning Commission. As a result, she emphasized the importance of bringing the item back to the Planning Commission prior to final Town Council consideration.

Ms. Brekke-Read advised that in the event the Town Council made any changes to the Draft Preferred Concept during its May 12, 2014 meeting prior to the project coming back to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission would be so informed. She acknowledged a request for the Town Council to be informed and that the Planning Commission would not see the Draft Preferred Concept again until May 19, 2014.

## VII. REPORTS

### A. Planning Commission

Commissioner Levenfeld reiterated a prior request for a report on the total approved housing units in Moraga, which she suggested was important as the Commission reviewed updates to the Housing Element.

Ms. Brekke-Read advised that the report was on her to do list. She also reported, when asked by Commissioner Woehleke, that the appeal of Planning Commission action on two conditions of approval for the Camino Ricardo Subdivision Development Agreement (DA) would be considered by the Town Council on May 14, 2014; and acknowledged a request by Commissioner Woehleke for a discussion to ask Planning Commissioners to attend the hearing to explain why the Planning Commission had voted the way it had.

Chair Kuckuk noted the item which was not on the agenda and therefore could not be discussed per the Brown Act should be agendaized for a future meeting as she was uncomfortable discussing this item.

Commissioner Levenfeld agreed with Chair Kuckuk on adding the process for Planning Commission appeals to a future agenda as she also felt uncomfortable since the item was not on the agenda.

Ms. Brekke-Read stated that Planning Commissioners could attend the Town Council meeting as individuals and not as representatives of the Planning Commission unless the matter had been agendaized ahead of time and a Commissioner was named to speak on behalf of the Planning Commission. She added that a quorum of Planning Commissioners at the May 14, 2014 Town Council meeting could be a violation of the Brown Act.

On the question by Commissioner Levenfeld, she suggested a separate agenda item could be considered to review the process for Planning Commission appeals which could also be part of a future training session.

**B. Staff**

Ms. Clark reported that a Community Workshop would be held on May 22, 2014 for the Housing Element; with a stakeholder meeting held earlier in the day. She also updated the Commission on the discussions of the first workshop for the Hillside and Ridgelines Committee, which had been well attended, with a second meeting scheduled for June 5, 2014 at Saint Mary's College (SMC), and with a steering committee meeting to be held after the completion of that meeting.

Ms. Brekke-Read added that staff would be making a request for the Town Council to consider and approve on-call architectural services during its May 14, 2014 meeting; the Town Council had continued the nuisance abatement and code enforcement regulations during its April 23, 2014 meeting to a future meeting date; and the Hetfield Estates Appeal had been continued from April 23, 2014 to a special meeting scheduled for May 21, 2014. In addition, the May 12, 2014 DRB meeting would include consideration of the City Ventures/Via Moraga Subdivision; projects for 1873 St Andrews and 5 Paseo Linares; a proposal for an electronic marquee/sign on Town property; and an update on the Livable Moraga Road Project.

Commissioner Onoda asked that the Planning Commission consider a future discussion for an Arts Council similar to what had been created by the City of Orinda, which could be considered as part of the Livable Moraga Road Project.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion by Commissioner Levenfeld, seconded by Commissioner Marnane and carried unanimously to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 10:00 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy



Secretary of the Planning Commission