

**TOWN OF MORAGA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

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

December 1, 2014

7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Comprelli, Marnane, Onoda, Woehleke, Chairperson Kuckuk

Absent: Commissioners Babcock, Levenfeld

Staff: Ellen Clark, Planning Director
Ella Samonsky, Associate Planner

B. Conflict of Interest

There was no reported conflict of interest.

C. Contact with Applicants

There was no reported contact with applicants.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

3. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. November 3, 2014 Minutes

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

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

4. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

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

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

5. PUBLIC HEARING

There were no public hearings.

6. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

A. Study Session to discuss conceptual plans for the Park Street Residences Subdivision; a 30-unit single-family townhome development, and an alternate design for a 40-unit condominium (apartment) development.

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report December 1, 2014, for a study session to discuss and consider conceptual plans for the Park Street Residences subdivision; a 30-unit single-family townhome development, or an alternate design for a 40-unit condominium (apartment) development. She recommended that the Planning Commission offer feedback on the proposed land uses, density, standards, parking, and treatment of the scenic corridor. The project was located within the area designated in the General Plan as the Rheem Park Specific Plan (RPSP), which Specific Plan had not yet been created and as a result the project site remained zoned Suburban Office. The General Plan policy on the Rheem Park area anticipated that it would be a mix of uses such as residential, office, commercial, and some institutional although the parcel-by-parcel specifics had not been developed.

Ms. Samonsky explained that the proposed project was a residential project and within the General Plan there were policies for residential densities within specific plan areas. Two residential density designations had been identified: 10 dwelling units per acre (DUA) and 16 DUA, which could be used only within the specific plan areas. Of the two alternates, one came in at 10 DUA and the other at 14 DUA, within the ranges included within the General Plan policies.

Ms. Samonsky referred to the conceptual development plans for the residential project and explained that developing a residential development on the site would require an amendment to General Plan Policy LU3.3, and a rezoning from Suburban Office (SO) to Planned Development (PD).

Ms. Samonsky described the location and adjacent uses of the project site, and explained that it could be suitable for the uses identified within the RPSP area policy given that it was adjacent to office, to retail, and a site that was well connected to services, retail, public facilities such as the Town offices, and transit.

Ms. Samonsky added that both of the conceptual layouts proposed a limited building area on the relatively flat portion of the site along the Park Street access road, excluding the steep slope in the rear. Both sites proposed to keep the hillside undeveloped for recreation or general open space and proposed to retain the two-lane Park Street access road with access easements across and double-loaded parking.

Explaining how the 30-unit single-family townhome development had been laid out with 2,000 to 2,500 square foot townhomes in eight buildings, Ms. Samonsky stated that all buildings would be three stories with two-car tandem garages, each unit would have a private patio with access, vehicular and pedestrian, to be off the auto courts, and a pedestrian paseo connecting from Park Street to the hillside. Both residential developments had been designed with a Mediterranean style, tile roofs, awnings, shingles, and use of different colored stuccos.

The alternate 40-unit multifamily proposal, condominiums or apartments, would also be three stories although the units would not be multistory; with 1,200 to 1,800 square foot units, each having a two-car garage, and each having a private balcony. The building would share a lobby with an elevator up to an atrium level where units would be accessed, and each building would have a private clubroom opening out onto a shared patio space. Pedestrian access would be through a lobby; an exterior staircase for the front units on the second floor (similar to the 30-unit townhome development) had been proposed.

Ms. Samonsky stated that while many development standards were similar for both proposals, there were different development standards for the different densities. Since the Town did not have a standard zoning district for medium density development (10-16 DUA) the closest in the Town would be its 20 DUA standard, which was only allowed within the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) only. The MCSP also has a table of development standards for residential development in the 3-12 DUA range, however there is no associated zoning district. Since both options proposed three stories at 35 feet in height, she suggested that would be consistent with what was recommended for medium density in the specific plan. She did not suggest that the MCSP standards are appropriate for the site but used them for comparison purposes and commented that the proposal was consistent with or exceeded most of those standards with the exception of building separation, which had been included in the MCSP but not in most of the Town's zoning districts, and Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

With respect to the FAR, Ms. Samonsky noted that the proposal was a bit higher than what had been anticipated for the 3 to 12 DUA in the MCSP and less than the 20 DUA. She noted much of the development would be limited to the center of the site.

Ms. Samonsky stated that the proposed parking ratio was based on unit size by bedroom. In the case of the townhome proposal, tandem parking spaces had been proposed. She explained that there were General Plan policies related to the flexibility for parking within Specific Plan areas. She noted that one aspect of the proposal was that one of the two lots had a reciprocal parking agreement with the Rheem Theatre. With no recent parking study for the Rheem Theatre, Rheem Park Shopping Center, or the residential proposal, it was not clear what the parking impact would be.

Speaking to building height, Ms. Samonsky stated that General Plan policies indicated that three stories could be considered within the specific plan area, and while the project proposed all three stories it proposed a height of 35 feet which was the maximum height for many two-story structures in other districts. Noting that the building for the Rheem Theatre, without the sign, was 49 feet in height and the nearby Town offices were at 31 feet, the proposed development at three stories would be within the same range of height and only four feet higher than the Town offices.

Ms. Samonsky added that the redevelopment of the site would allow an opportunity to address the appearance of the scenic corridor. The existing condition had a small landscape strip that is not consistent with scenic corridor guidelines.

Commissioner Woehleke confirmed with staff that the 40-unit condominium concept would include one elevator for each of the buildings. He also confirmed the location of the project within the RPSP designation, including the acceptability of building height, although the RPSP existed in concept only.

Ms. Samonsky clarified that the General Plan included multiple policies that referenced the two Specific Plan designated areas. The RPSP did not have associated zoning districts and the project would therefore have to be a PD. There was a specific plan policy that addressed building height within the two specific plan areas, which outlined the three-story exception. She clarified that the General Plan was silent on building height and the reference to the 35-foot building height had come from the existing zoning districts.

Planning Director Ellen Clark explained that similar concerns with zoning and building height had been raised with the Via Moraga project. In that case, a 10-DUA PD district had been written for the RPSP area allowing that density although there was no specificity as to where it should be applied. The Via Moraga General Plan policy amendment was very specifically applied to that property only. She acknowledged some ambiguity between General Plan policies as to allowed building height. She added that the preparation of a parking study would have to be submitted by the applicant prior to the Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) stage.

In response to Commissioner Woehleke, Ms. Samonsky clarified that neither the townhome development nor the condominium development would be recessed into the hillside, and would be located within the flatter area of the site. She also reiterated that the FAR had counted the garage space, and in the case of the multifamily buildings the ground level indoor driveway would be included in the FAR calculation although not in the townhome concept given that the driveways were exterior.

In response to Commissioner Woehleke as to whether the Via Moraga project had been used to set the design standards, Ms. Clark stated that the General Plan Amendment (GPA) had been targeted to the Via Moraga project, and the 10 DUA PD designation had also been adopted as part of the amendments which were more broadly applicable to the RPSP area, although it did not establish the development standards which were to be determined on a case-by-case basis through the PD process. She affirmed that the Via Moraga project would not be used to establish the design standards for broader applicability unless the Planning Commission felt it was appropriate to the project.

Commissioner Comprelli asked staff to clarify statements made in the staff report regarding the parking and existing reciprocal parking agreements.

Ms. Samonsky identified the project site which consisted of two adjacent rectangular lots totaling three acres. One parcel had been developed as a private school (Orion Academy) and the other was undeveloped, covered with gravel, and paved parking along the western property line. The vacant lot had previously been part of the property containing the Rheem Theatre, as part of the subdivision of the lot, a condition had been placed on the subdivision that the two lots have a reciprocal parking agreement, a condition which remained. Given that the parking and site design for a residential and office project would be different, it was unclear how the reciprocal parking agreement would be affected. The Rheem Theatre also had a reciprocal parking agreement with four lots within the Rheem Valley Shopping Center, a private agreement that could be terminated by mutual agreement.

Ms. Samonsky commented that the conceptual design for the office building provided at the time of the subdivision had shown a total of 59 parking spaces on the vacant lot, and the Rheem Theatre had 82 parking spaces. If the reciprocal parking agreement remained intact, people visiting the residences, shops or the theatre parcel could use that parking.

Ms. Clark explained that the parking along Park Street was part of the project area and site. There was potentially parking on the vacant lot itself, along Park Street and the parking currently provided in conjunction at the Rheem Theatre would all interface with the subject project to determine the total parking. She noted the Town did not have sufficient information at this time related to the private parking agreements and acknowledged the need for a parking study.

Commissioner Marnane clarified with staff that an underground garage was possible in the Town of Moraga; the conceptual landscape plans had shown a path leading up the hill pursuant to Sheet L4; the use of low retaining walls could create a small pad area for a shared garden, and that some remediation work would be necessary to the hillside to improve the soils stability condition of the hillside and avoid drainage issues.

Jerry Loving, Loving and Campos Architects, 245 Ygnacio Valley Road, Walnut Creek, the applicant, advised that the proposal had been in process since October 2013, with time taken to prepare studies and surveys prior to the current presentation. He stated he had informed staff from the beginning that if a win-win proposal could not be crafted or the merit of the concept not suitably supported, he would not waste his or the Town's time.

Mr. Loving presented the proposal for a multiple family infill development on two underdeveloped downtown lots, one of which had been vacant and for sale for many years, with no buyers under the current land use or zoning status. The other lot consisted of 1960's single-story offices utilized by a private school. The opportunity to combine both lots into a single proposal offered the best use as residential. He explained that from the start Town staff had encouraged him to combine the parcels.

Mr. Loving stated that his design is consistent with the 2002 General Plan for a residential development not on the hills but infill development on flat downtown land, near shopping centers and services, with walkable pedestrian friendly designs. The General Plan sought the introduction of a variety of housing types to serve Moraga citizens at densities from 10 to 16 DUA. He proposed a townhome development concept at the low end of the General Plan policies at 10 DUA. At staff's request, he had designed another project, the condominium concept at 13.3 DUA. He reported that a geotechnical study and a detailed survey had been prepared for the site, identified the location of the site, and offered aerial views of the property in context with the Rheem Valley Shopping Center. The proposal for multiple family housing was intended to feed into and support the shopping center.

Mr. Loving identified the project site, the hillside part of the development which would not be developed, and stated the project would remain back from the toe of the slope some 20 feet although the lowest portion of the slope might be used. He explained that Park Street belonged to the two parcels, was owned fee simple by the two properties, and had been included in the land area. Park Street had parking and easements and the development of the parcels could be done on Park Street but would require relocation of parking and easements. The developer had proposed to leave Park Street somewhat intact as a benefit to the entire community.

Views through the site viewing west were identified with a 200-foot grade difference between the flat portion of the subject site and Ascot Drive above, forming a backdrop to the proposal. The 35-foot buildings against the 200-foot backdrop offered significant setbacks to the nearest neighbors and views would be blocked by trees. Only units on the far end of Ascot Drive would have views of the property.

Mr. Loving commented that the amount of the site covered in asphalt and that was paved accelerated any kind of water off of the site and had an impact possibly downstream, which the development of the property would address. He identified the surrounding uses to the site which included the Rheem Theatre to the east, and the private academy and convalescent hospital, which was elevated about ten to twelve feet above the subject site.

Mr. Loving detailed the vision for the site to develop an infill multi-family development that would repurpose the properties and utilize the existing infrastructure. He imagined a beautifully appointed interior, with 10-foot ceilings, good finishes for a quality development that would be market rate that would be integrated into the pedestrian circulation of the area. Park Street would be walkable and an amenity to those who wanted to live in the downtown. As to the scenic corridor, he agreed with staff that there was potential to deal with the area and offer an opportunity to enhance the landscape along the corridor in a way that could hide views of automobiles from the scenic corridor. In addition, the buildings would be kept back some 90 feet from Rheem Boulevard.

Mr. Loving detailed the plans to improve the pedestrian circulation by extending the sidewalk through the site and providing an easement to make it available to the public.

He recommended a 10-foot sidewalk which would be flat enough to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards and function as a public walkway.

Mr. Loving also identified the location of a potential crossing point to Town offices and other retail uses located across the street, which had been under consideration by the Town and which would be necessary at some point. The crossing would terminate at the former Moraga-Orinda Fire District (MOFD) Fire Station. He emphasized that the design had been built around the pedestrian circulation.

Mr. Loving also commented that the initial design had included a height at 38 feet although at the suggestion of staff, the design had been revised to a height of 35 feet. He suggested it would not be possible to achieve the multiple family density absent three- story buildings since that would require below grade parking. He did not recommend below grade parking given the water table and liquefaction issues that had been studied, and the financial impacts to such a small project.

Mr. Loving presented a detailed photo montage of the project absent the landscaping to better illustrate the buildings. With the landscaping there would be filtered views. He also identified the parking, with all units in both schemes to have two enclosed garage parking spaces per unit, with visitor parking on Park Street within the project site.

Mr. Loving offered the history and background of the vacant lot, the easement for the Orion Academy, the reciprocal parking agreement between the Rheem Theatre and the property, and explained that if the current easement agreement remained the project could not be developed. He noted that he had worked on that issue for the past year, had submitted a proposal to the Town Manager, and had negotiated an agreement with the Rheem Theatre property owner on the area to be used in the future. He described how the reciprocal parking would work with 24 parking spaces identified in an agreement as part of the visitor parking area, and suggested the project would have ample parking since there would be two visitor spaces per unit and a space and a half per unit for the condominium concept.

Mr. Loving identified potential homebuyers as empty nesters, down sizers, single adults, younger/urban professionals, downtowners, move-overs, those with a metro urban lifestyle, and move uppers. The cost for the townhome units would range from \$675,000 to \$875,000, and less for the condominium concept.

Mr. Loving described the project for the 30 or 40 for-sale units; identified the toe of the slope with some remediation required pursuant to the geotechnical engineer's recommendation to collect moisture from the hillside, and slides that had been addressed over time; and noted that the geotechnical engineer had proposed a solution which would not require a re-grading of the hillside. He added that average unit size would be 1,750 square feet absent the garage for the townhome units and 1,530 square feet for the condominium units; addressed concerns with tandem parking and explained that whether tandem or side-by-side parking would require monitoring to ensure the garages were used; identified the individual garages for each unit at the ground level and noted that those located on the perimeter would have windows, and explained that the lower level would be articulated to not appear as a parking garage. He also

identified the streetscape views, entrance to the parking and the lower level areas, and stairways down to the sidewalk system.

Mr. Loving described the community benefits including an enhancement of the scenic corridor, pedestrian crossing, shared parking, flood control pursuant to C.3 water quality requirements which would benefit downstream properties, stabilization of the slope, and introduction of shopping power into the downtown community. He explained that the proposal represented a \$20 million investment in Moraga. He also spoke to the Town's entitlement process, and expressed his hope that the Commission would provide positive feedback on the proposal and offer direction on the preferred housing type.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

John Glover, Moraga, spoke to the Communications Center located west of the convalescent hospital, and asked whether the height of the three-story buildings would block the existing communication towers and whether the towers would have to be raised. He also questioned the potential traffic impacts on Rheem Boulevard and Moraga Road.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mr. Loving stated that he was uncertain but did not believe the existing communication towers would have to be raised as a result of the height of the proposed buildings. He noted that a traffic study would be required and was pending. Pursuant to a chart in the staff report, an office building would generate far more weekday and daytime traffic than the proposed residential development.

Commissioner Woehleke commented that of the more recent projects considered by the Planning Commission, including Via Moraga and the Moraga Town Center Homes projects, he found the subject proposal to be far superior. He suggested that was because of the Mediterranean architectural style which broke up the façade, and because of the project's close proximity to the shopping center. He preferred the condominium concept solely because it included elevators which similar developments in Moraga had not included and which would serve those with mobility issues. He did not like tandem parking and preferred the condominium option in that the valuable outdoor space would not be taken up by parking.

Commissioner Woehleke found the setback from Rheem Boulevard to be compatible with the scenic corridor, and suggested the height of the buildings would be acceptable and compatible with the Rheem Theatre. He did not like the garages as part of the townhome concept and the potential for parking constraints. He asked that the need for a catchment debris area at the rear and the six-foot building separation for the townhome concept be addressed. He was concerned that the building separation on the townhome option could allow an intrusion of privacy if windows were on the side.

In terms of the land use, Commissioner Woehleke was concerned that the project would have a cumulative impact to the Town since it was another project that would require a zone change. While the project itself might not have a major impact on traffic, there would be cumulative impacts as related to the total build-out of the Town with impacts to

both Moraga Road and Moraga Way. He was not confident that the cumulative impact of the developments proposed for the MCSP had been considered and he was concerned with the impact of that traffic on existing corridors and to neighboring communities.

Commissioner Woehleke recognized that his concerns with the cumulative traffic impacts was not something the Planning Commission could address since it was a Town Council issue, although it remained a concern. He suggested the matter of the land use should be considered by the Town Council sooner rather than later to allow the Town Council to address that issue prior to the applicant making further investments in the project.

Commissioner Marnane agreed that the area of Rheem Boulevard would be improved as a result of the project. He liked the renderings, was confident the property would be developed, but was unsure it would look the same given the review process. He suggested that the project had come across as heavy and overbearing, as compared to the Rheem Theatre, and there was no comparison to the 35-foot height. He was uncertain why Park Street had been included as part of the project and suggested that as part of the project site, that property might want to be redeveloped; would need to be convinced that the proposed density was valid for the property; and would like to see that density clarified in terms of the RPSP. He also emphasized the need to further discuss the proposal for another crosswalk in the Town.

Commissioner Marnane expressed concern with the fact that the project might reach a height of 45 feet, as mentioned in the staff report. He was pleased that the hillside would not be graded, and was pleased with the proposal for remediation. He expressed concern with the parking given the parking constraints with the uses located across the street, and which required additional dialogue. Speaking to General Plan Policy LU3.2, he noted that although explained in the staff report it remained unclear, and he was not certain the existing parking standards needed to be changed to fit the project. He commented on the current poor condition of the Rheem Valley Shopping Center, which was in need of repair, and expressed concern that the shopping center in its present condition in comparison to the proposed development would be incompatible with the scenic corridor.

Commissioner Marnane was not certain the potential for office uses at the property had been exhausted. He was pleased the development would be marketed towards potential empty nesters but was not certain how that would work with the basic development he characterized as a block house. He deferred to the applicant as to the potential for underground parking which he understood would not be financially feasible.

Commissioner Onoda suggested the project was a great one in terms of land use. She too was pleased with the fact the condominium concept would include elevators given the potential for senior residents but also recommended consideration of stacked closets to allow elevators in the 30-unit townhome concept, which she preferred. She also liked the proposed crosswalk and recommended push-button crosswalks, bicycle racks, electric car hookups, and use of solar roof panels to be carbon neutral. She did not like the building separation and recommended an 18-foot separation as opposed to the proposed six-foot separation. While she could see the benefits of the 40-unit

condominium concept, she liked the 30-unit townhome concept better. She agreed that the Town needed to address the cumulative impacts from traffic and impacts to Moraga schools, and noted that a report on potential school impacts was expected to be available soon from the Moraga School District (MSD).

Commissioner Onoda also commented that the Planning Commission had recently reviewed the Town's Climate Action Plan (CAP), which had included a number of ideas to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. She wanted to see those ideas be included in future staff reports. She also liked the Mediterranean style architecture which she suggested fit in well with Moraga and the Rheem Valley Shopping Center. She liked the upgrade to the scenic corridor and suggested it could serve as an impetus to others to improve their properties.

Commissioner Comprelli echoed the comments although he questioned why the buildings must all be three stories given that three-story living units did not generally exist in Moraga. He suggested that the applicant re-evaluate the design, and to add variety in building height to the project as opposed to a wall-to-wall design. He shared the parking concerns and suggested the project would have a significant impact on the area since it would not be self-contained. While the project had merit, he supported changes that could improve the viability of the project for the location and for the Town.

Chairperson Kuckuk found that the medium density housing proposed for the two housing concepts would add variety to the Town's housing stock. She liked the 30-unit townhome development which would add another level of diversity to previously approved residential housing projects, found the condominium concept also had merit, and preferred the parking proposed for the condominium concept and the use of elevators. She noted that the existing reciprocal parking agreement would place a constraint on the vacant parcel and she did not see that had been addressed in either of the proposed plans. She sought a new parking study with a detailed analysis to better identify the parking issues.

Chairperson Kuckuk suggested that the current SO zoning for the vacant lot served the reciprocal parking agreement for the two parcels, but would not serve a residential development. She suggested a residential development made sense for the site but suggested that more thought needed to occur with respect to the reciprocal parking agreement. She disliked tandem parking, preferred the parking concept for the condominium concept, and would not be willing to accept two tandem parking spaces as equal to two parking spaces since they were cumbersome to use and could require difficult maneuvering in the best of circumstances.

Chairperson Kuckuk recognized that the 35-foot building height would be in keeping with the mixed use area, and suggested it would be appropriate and would be no higher than the adjacent wall of the Rheem Theatre; however, the massing for the townhome or condominium concepts presented massing beyond what the community would be willing to accept. She pointed out that typically three stories were stepped back, and in the scenic corridor area a walled-in effect would not be supported. She did not have a problem with the 35-foot height and suggested there could be some tweaking of the design to accomplish that height. In terms of the building separation, she agreed that

six feet was inadequate and that a different standard could be achieved. She supported medium density housing in the mixed use area which made sense for the site.

Mr. Loving suggested that the six-foot separation was a non-issue and would be addressed. He wanted to connect one part of the site to another part of the site at the ground level. In terms of the parking, he would rather have more parking than be short on parking, and suggested the shared parking was generous and needed in the area.

Mr. Loving thanked the Planning Commission for its comments and welcomed any further comments on the project.

7. REPORTS

A. Planning Commission

Planning Commissioners congratulated Commissioner Onoda on her recent election to the Town Council and thanked her for her service on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Onoda thanked everyone for their comments, was pleased to have served on the Planning Commission, and stated she planned to attend future Planning Commission meetings. She reported that she had attended the Hillside and Ridgelines Steering Committee meeting, and was pleased with the mapping information that had been presented at that meeting and the direction for a targeted report from the consultant to help the Town define its regulations.

Chairperson Kuckuk reported that she had attended a recent Liaison Meeting and the Livable Moraga Road Advisory Committee meeting, with further discussion as to how options would be presented to the Town Council. No changes had been made to the options consistent with the discussion during the Joint Planning, Park and Recreation, and Design Review Board (DRB) meeting.

B. Staff

Ms. Clark also reported on the discussions from the Hillside and Ridgelines Steering Committee meeting with updated mapping information on landslide hazards in Moraga, and with a recommendation from the Committee to move forward with additional study. She stated the same staff report and presentation that had been presented to the Committee would be presented to the Planning Commission offering the Commission the opportunity to weigh in before recommendations were presented to the Town Council in January.

Ms. Clark reported that the December 15, 2014 Planning Commission meeting had initially included a number of substantial items although she understood that three Commissioners would not be available on December 15. As a result, if there was a quorum, she would recommend that the December 15 meeting agenda include only the Housing Element Update and Draft Story Pole Policy, with the Hillside and Ridgelines Steering Committee presentation to be postponed to a meeting in January. She added that staff anticipated the cancellation of the January 5, 2015 Planning Commission meeting given the proximity to the holiday period, and asked Commissioners to consider

moving the meeting date to Wednesday, January 7, 2015. She asked Commissioners to inform staff of their availability for either date.

Commissioner Marnane advised that he would not be available for a meeting on January 5, 2015. He was not opposed to scheduling additional meetings, as needed.

8. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Chairperson Woehleke, seconded by Commissioner Marnane and carried unanimously to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 9:10 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to read "John Cho", is written over the text "A Certified Correct Minutes Copy".

Secretary of the Planning Commission