

**TOWN OF MORAGA
TOWN COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING**

**May 21, 2014
MINUTES**

7:00 P.M. Special Meeting

Joaquin Moraga Intermediate School Auditorium
1010 Camino Pablo, Moraga, California 94556

I. CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting was called to order at 7:02 P.M. by **Mayor Ken Chew**.

ROLL CALL

Councilmembers present: Mayor Ken Chew, Vice Mayor Roger Wykle, and Councilmembers Phil Arth, and Dave Trotter

Councilmembers absent: Councilmember Metcalf

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Mayor Wykle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

IV. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Wykle) to adopt the meeting agenda, as shown. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Metcalf.
--

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Consider an Appeal of the Planning Commission's Decision to Approve the General Development Plan, Vesting Tentative Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Hillside Development Permit for the Hetfield Estates Project, a seven-lot Single Family Subdivision on a 58.2-Acre Property. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project was certified in June 2012. (Proposed Resolution 43-2014)
(Continued from April 23, 2014)

Senior Planner Ellen Clark presented the staff report dated May 21, 2014 for consideration of an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to approve the General Development Plan, Vesting Tentative Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Hillside Development Permit for the

Hetfield Estates Project, a seven-lot single family subdivision on a 58.2-acre property. The item had been continued from the Town Council meeting of April 23, 2014, which had focused on conditions related to the fire trail and the Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA), and parking and lighting. The Conditions of Approval had been revised in response to the direction from the Town Council, specifically Condition #24, #40, and #76, as reflected in the staff report and in a redline strikeout attached to the Conditions of Approval. Staff recommended an additional revision to Condition #40, [which had not been reflected in the redline handout] to show that the hiking trail would extend into the intersection of Fire Trail #41-7 as shown on the exhibit, as opposed to the old Moraga Ranch Trail to be consistent with Condition #36, as revised.

Ms. Clark recommended that the Town Council adopt a resolution considering the appeal, upholding the Planning Commission's decision, with modifications to the Conditions of Approval, and approve the General Development Plan, Vesting Tentative Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Hillside Development Permit for the Hetfield Estates project.

In response to the Council, Ms. Clark advised that there was no diagram for the proposed change to the parking configuration but the condition allowed flexibility for a modification as part of the Precise Development Plan (PDP). She acknowledged the parking within the cul-de-sac would be closer to Lot 7 than shown on the plans, and there was no drawing to show that revision. She identified the proposed alignment for the fire trail and EVA, which was the reason that Condition #40 had been modified to be more consistent with Condition #36.

John Wyro, Applicant, acknowledged an inconsistency between Condition #40 and Condition #36; clarified the need to conform with Condition #36 calling for the trail to end where the Hetfield Trail intersected with Fire Trail #41-7; and should the EVA go through, the alignment would be the easement on the Vesting Tentative Map and Development Plan, and at that point in time it would adhere to the easement. On an interim basis, until the Sanders Ranch Homeowner's Association (HOA) decided it wanted an EVA, the hiking trail would end at Fire Trail #41-7. Pursuant to a diagram which had shown Fire Trail #41-7, everything to the west would be as shown in the EVA easement and the temporary alignment would pick up Fire Trail #41-7. When and if the Sanders Ranch HOA decided to move forward with the EVA, it would go back to the alignment shown on the plans dated October 18, 2013 without the cul-de-sac (turnaround) since that was where the EVA would leave the subject property to travel up to Sanders Ranch Road; it would not go along the fire trail which was too steep. In the interim, the existing Fire Trail #41-7 adjacent to a wetland area would be used.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Edy Schwartz, Moraga, thanked Mr. Wyro for working long and hard on the project which had a number of restrictions. She affirmed that she had met with Mr. Wyro to review the project plans and details and that Mr. Wyro had suggested waiting until the project had been reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB). She thanked Mr. Wyro again for his openness and expertise.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Councilmember Trotter requested the following amendments to the Conditions of Approval as follows:

The second sentence of Condition #40 (b) to be revised to read:

Payment or required funds for construction of the Fire Trail shall be made to the applicable project GHAD (or the Town, or other entity designated by the Town Council.)

Assistant Town Attorney Karen Murphy advised that modification would be acceptable.

Councilmember Trotter asked that the same change be reflected in the last sentence of Condition #40 (c). He asked the Council to opine whether it really needed a temporary alignment for a hiking trail/fire road while the Sanders Ranch HOA decided whether to move forward with the EVA. He questioned why the EVA had to be in a different configuration from the existing Fire Trail #41-7, particularly given the proximity to the wetlands which could otherwise be avoided.

Mr. Wyro clarified that the existing fire trail actually went through the wetlands while the proposed easement missed it. He stated they were restricted with the EVA which must not go over certain grades and which argued for the easement to remain as shown until such time as the Sanders Ranch HOA made a decision on the EVA (stopping the hiking trail where it connected to the fire trail). He understood the concerns with potential impacts to the wetlands and the desire to avoid environmental impacts and asked that the Project Civil Engineer be allowed to address the Town Council.

Bob Rourke, Civil Engineer, explained that the existing fire trail came off the end of a bulb, down and up to a drainage/wetland area, which they must cross under either scenario. Once the wetland area had been crossed there were no wetland impacts further east through the proposed alignment whereas the existing fire trail alignment would angle down the slope crossing the wetland a second time. If improved into a fire trail at a later date, the question was whether the area would be re-impacted above and beyond minor grading that had already been planned. He commented that at the time of the alignment, the intent was to avoid impacts altogether by improving the trail further down the line. He identified the daylight line where grading would be avoided, the northern end of the wetland, and in both cases an effort had been made to keep grading impacts away from the wetlands. The fire trail would disturb a portion of the wetland anyway and if an EVA was placed in the current location there would be a bit more disturbance since it must be wider.

If the Council was contemplating not going along the easement and the fire trail route, Town Manager Jill Keimach asked for input from staff on the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Planning Director Shawna Brekke-Read advised that an addendum had been prepared for the EVA, as shown, while the alignment suggested by Councilmember Trotter had not been analyzed under CEQA. The addendum analyzed the impacts of the first wetland and not to the second wetland area, which the proposed alignment avoided.

Mr. Wyro explained that under the alternatives shown, they had stopped the trail where Fire Trail #41-7 intersected the project trail and they had no plan to do anything related to the fire trail which was under the purview of the Moraga-Orinda Fire District (MOFD). He therefore suggested that the developer's trail and project would not create any environmental impacts.

Vice Mayor Wykle clarified with Mr. Wyro that the contours for the project had not changed with the only change the elimination of the turnaround. He asked the MOFD representative present in the audience to opine on the trail.

MOFD Fire Marshal Kathy Leonard explained that the MOFD used the trails with Type 3 all-wheel drive fire engines that were used to go up and down the hills, and the trail was well established and graded.

Ms. Brekke-Read reiterated that if the EVA alignment followed the existing fire trail it would go through wetlands that had not been analyzed. She suggested the time to conduct that analysis

would depend on the scope of work and would require staff to discuss it with the EIR Consultant and it could require biologic resource evaluation. She was uncertain of the additional costs and noted that with the Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) the exact alignment for the EVA had not been analyzed in the EIR, with the CDP to have some of that analysis conditioned in the GDP phase. She suggested it may be possible to have one alignment or the other subject to approval at the PDP phase.

Ms. Murphy advised that as long as it did not impact the map that would be acceptable direction since the action before the Town Council included the approval of the Vesting Tentative Map.

Councilmember Trotter commented that the alignment was on an existing disturbed path and he questioned whether that would trigger CEQA.

Mayor Chew suggested it would be unfair at this stage to require a change in the alignment of the EVA even though this was a de novo hearing. He asked why Councilmember Trotter was adamant to recommend a change at this time.

Councilmember Trotter suggested the proposed alignment of the EVA with the fire trail would create the least environmental impact, less than what had been proposed, and if it went across a couple of feet of wetland when the existing blading did the same thing every year he described that as a de minimis circumstance. The Fire Marshal had also stated that the fire trail alignment was bladed routinely, was functional, and was usable in that location. Having walked the area, he stated it was not that steep in the location where it traveled south from off the end of Sanders Drive and crossed over, but farther to the east and up to the old Moraga Ranch Trail he had been informed that steepness did not allow a functional EVA and it would be a temporary measure on up the hill towards Sanders Ranch Drive. If the Sanders Ranch HOA decided it wanted the EVA, it would start at the bottom of the hill anyway and design from that point. He suggested a decision could be made at this time where the EVA would be located on the Hetfield Estates property which justified keeping the alignment with the existing fire trail since the environmental impacts appeared fewer than what had been proposed.

Councilmember Arth commented that he had not walked the property, recognized that Councilmember Trotter had walked the property several times, and he concurred with Councilmember Trotter's comments.

Ms. Keimach reiterated the concerns with new environmental impacts to wetlands that had not been analyzed.

Councilmember Arth found there would be minimal disruption to the wetlands and he was confident it would be regarded as de minimis.

Ms. Murphy advised that an addendum had been prepared for the Planning Commission decision with respect to the EVA, which addendum had analyzed environmental impacts related to the first EVA alignment. She was uncertain of the analysis on the alternative paths. She emphasized that there had to be assurance that the analysis had been appropriately documented.

Ms. Brekke-Read advised that the Biologist and the Environmental Consultant had reviewed the EVA alignment, as shown, had analyzed the impacts of the EVA, and had not analyzed the alignment of the existing fire trail. The EVA was not exempt from CEQA pursuant to advice from the Environmental Consultant.

Mr. Wyro emphasized that everyone had been working in good faith. He was amenable to either alignment but if further study was required he requested approval of the Vesting Tentative Map at this time. He suggested as part of the GDP a condition of approval could be added to direct that the issue of the EVA alignment be revisited prior to PDP approval and an additional study could be conducted, if necessary, which would allow the project to proceed.

Councilmember Trotter suggested that Mr. Wyro's recommendation was a reasonable one. He recommended that the Town Council approve the Vesting Tentative Map and the General Development Plan subject to the proposed changes in the conditions, as discussed, with an additional condition that if the Council's wish was to have an EVA on top of the existing fire trail as an alternative to what had been shown on the Vesting Tentative Map the applicant shall be instructed to study that alternative and return for approval and modification at the Precise Development Plan stage. He suggested that any analysis would likely involve a one-page addendum to an environmental document and should not delay the project.

Councilmember Arth supported Councilmember Trotter's recommendation.

Vice Mayor Wykle supported that direction given that the Fire Marshal had indicated that the terrain changes were acceptable. He thanked the developer and staff for working through the parking issues.

Councilmember Trotter offered a motion to adopt a resolution to uphold the Planning Commission's decision, with certain modifications to the Conditions of Approval, and approve the Vesting Tentative Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Hillside Development Permit for the Hetfield Estates Project, with the Conditions of Approval to be as proposed by staff with the additional language in Condition #40 to include references to the Town being a potential recipient of the funds for the cost of construction of a future EVA and GHAD as previously discussed; approve the General Development Plan subject to a condition that the applicant, in connection with the Precise Development Plan approval of the project, may relocate the proposed EVA to conform to the sketch provided on the redline on Page 39 of the May 21, 2014 resolution, with conformance of the EVA to the location of Fire Trail #41-7.

Ms. Murphy commented that Condition #40, as written, had stated that if the alignment for the EVA was altered, one way for the Council to address that would be to show it on the Precise Development Plan and then modify the map. The resolution could be modified to make those changes and the Precise Development Plan could be reviewed at that time.

Mayor Chew suggested the motion, as stated, would be a way to address the concerns with the EVA alignment. **Councilmember Arth** seconded the motion.

Vice Mayor Wykle commented that since this was a de novo hearing he would not support the motion, as stated, since he was of the opinion there remained issues with non-conformity with the General Plan, an issue that had been part of the Planning Commission discussions.

ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Arth) to adopt a resolution Considering an Appeal, Upholding the Planning Commission's Decision, with certain modifications to the Conditions of Approval, and Approving the Vesting Tentative Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Hillside Development Permit for the Hetfield Estates Project, a seven-lot Single Family Subdivision on a 58.2-Acre Property; with the conditions of approval to be as proposed by staff with the additional language in Condition #40 which includes references to the Town being a potential recipient of the funds for the cost of construction of a future EVA and GHAD, as previously discussed; approve the General Development Plan subject to a condition that the applicant in connection with the Precise Development Plan approval of the project may relocate the proposed EVA to conform to

the sketch provided showing on the redline on Page 39 of the May 21, 2014 resolution, conforming the EVA to the location of Fire Trail #41-7. Vote: 3-1-1. Noes: Wykle. Absent: Metcalf.

VI. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR ACTION

- A.** Consider Introducing and Waiving the First Reading of an Ordinance Repealing and Replacing Moraga Municipal Code Title 7 Health and Safety, Chapter 7.16 Nuisance Abatement; and an Ordinance adding Title 1 General Provision, Chapter 1.28 Administrative Penalties (*Continued from April 23, 2014*)

Associate Planner Ella Samonsky presented the staff report dated April 23, 2014. She asked that the Town Council introduce and waive the first reading of an Ordinance repealing and replacing Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 7.6, Nuisance Abatement as presented in Attachment A to the staff report, Existing Town of Moraga Nuisance Abatement Process Outline; and Ordinance adding Chapter 1.28 regarding Administrative Penalties as presented in Attachment B, Proposed Town of Moraga Nuisance Abatement Process Outline.

Responding to the Council, Ms. Keimach advised that the item was before the Town Council as a Town Council goal, had started a couple of years ago when new businesses had come in and used temporary signs, and there had been an effort by staff to clean up the Town from a sign point of view and to address neighborhood issues. She cited the property at Calle la Montana which had involved full nuisance abatement and issues with fencing which were not up to code, and explained that the process had been cumbersome for staff to address.

Mayor Chew added that he had encouraged the agenda item in response to the Town's experience with the property at Calle la Montana.

Councilmember Trotter pointed out that the Town had historically not paid for a position for code compliance. He asked staff the cost to implement the ordinance.

Ms. Keimach advised that the issue could take on a life of its own and could become an expense, although she clarified that no additional staff would be hired and the ordinance would be handled on a complaint basis with staff to act as the Code Enforcement Officer for the specific department where the issue had been raised. Staff had coordinated staff-wide meetings on that discussion and it was her hope the ordinance would streamline the process and allow the Town the tools to respond to complaints. She acknowledged it was likely the ordinance would have to be tested the first year, although the intent was not to go after everything; the intent was to be business as usual but with staff to have the tools to address any issues on a complaint driven basis.

Ms. Samonsky added that staff received complaints from the community and from neighborhoods and it was a matter of how to proceed and respond. Staff made the effort to record the complaints, write letters, and make contact, although it would be up to the Town Council to act. She recognized it was time intensive for staff to prepare items for public hearings and time on the Town Council schedule. If staff were to pursue nuisance abatement and other items and bring each one to the Town Council that would take more time resources than could be addressed through an ordinance. She also clarified that staff had reviewed the ordinances of neighboring communities and the ordinance for Contra Costa County.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

There were no comments from the public,

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Mayor Chew liked the proposed ordinance given that the current situation did not allow the Town to address the issues and the ordinance was not intended for the Town to become a police state but to address issues through a complaint driven process. He also clarified with staff the citation fines that could be imposed, the appeal process, and if one did not agree with the citation the issue would thereafter be referred to the Town Council. The hearing officer would be a staff member designated by the Town Manager.

Ms. Murphy clarified that the individual fine would have to be paid in order for the appeal to be heard.

Mayor Chew recommended that the fines be increased to \$250 for the second offense, and \$500 for the third offense with a collection process for lack of payment. He did not want to see a situation where an issue could be prolonged.

Ms. Murphy commented that some communities first issued a warning citation which would be issued by statute or as common practice, and once the citation had been issued the fine would be imposed. She noted the need for due process with a public hearing. She understood the concerns that the process would be time consuming although, as an example, she explained that if someone had been assessed a fine one day and still had the violation in place the next week that person could be faced with successive fines and the hearing officer could combine all into one hearing. The amount of the fines would be subject to Town Council decision.

Ms. Keimach suggested another option would be not to have the violation appealable to the Town Council since the process could stop with the hearing officer.

Mayor Chew agreed that appeals before the Town Council could be time consuming.

Councilmember Arth liked the new provisions for nuisance abatement and administrative citations; suggested they were necessary and agreed there should be some enforcement, i.e. fines or they would be ignored; agreed there should be due process; and regardless of the citation fee recommended an appeal before the Town Council with the appeal officer to address the violation and advise why a fine had been levied. He suggested that process would not result in a proliferation of appeals before the Town Council.

Councilmember Trotter agreed with Councilmember Arth's comments, noted that the Town Council was essentially the safety valve for such issues, and if there was a perception in the Town that staff was overbearing and unfair it should come to the Town Council to make an adjustment or uphold the staff decision. If done correctly, he suggested it would not happen that often. He recommended that the ordinance include a first warning provision to allow modification of behavior without the Town being heavy handed. He clarified with staff the intent of Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities as part of Attachment D, Draft Nuisance Abatement Ordinance that had been based on the City of Orinda's ordinance, and based on discussions with staff of the common nuisances in which staff had been involved.

Councilmember Arth agreed that the ordinance should include a first warning provision which would not burden staff since staff already issued warning letters.

Ms. Samonsky clarified the staff process of informing an individual of a violation through telephone calls and in writing, and that citations could be issued for any violation of the MMC. The Town's existing practice had not been codified in the ordinance. She took the opportunity to identify the differences in the ordinance compared to the procedures utilized by the cities of Lafayette and Orinda, and by Contra Costa County.

Mayor Chew suggested that the current staff process was already a first warning with no fine. He sought an ordinance that allowed staff the necessary tools for enforcement through the ability to issue a citation.

Councilmember Trotter was not opposed to language that the first warning be either a written or a verbal warning, but wanted it required in the ordinance. The Town Council was to serve the public and give warnings to encourage behavior modification rather than being punitive.

Vice Mayor Wykle suggested that warnings were important but did not necessarily need to be stipulated in the ordinance. He equated it to any police action and suggested the ordinance was fine as is other than the dollar amounts for the citation fines which he suggested should be doubled for each violation.

Ms. Keimach commented that a police officer may sit as the hearing officer depending on the citation.

Mayor Chew suggested that police officers were good at giving warnings and he again asked the Town Council to opine whether the citation fines should be increased after the first citation.

Councilmember Trotter disagreed and cited People vs. Smith, and although he was cautioned that case could not be discussed since it was a matter of a Closed Session he suggested the Town would be better served whether community policing or code compliance to issue warnings before becoming too heavy handed with residents and other members of the community.

Mayor Chew reiterated his recommendation that the fines be increased to \$250 for the second violation and \$500 for the third violation.

Councilmember Arth supported the Mayor's recommended revisions to increase the citation fines.

Ms. Murphy advised that change would be brought back to the Town Council at the time of the second reading.

Councilmember Trotter referenced Section 1.28.030 Definitions of Attachment E, Draft Administrative Penalties Chapter, and recommended that a definition for Director of Administrative Services be included. He also recommended that the form of the ordinance needed to be modified in that Item 6 under Section 1.28.040 Issuance of administrative citation had not been indented properly as shown on Page 4; asked for consistency when referencing the Town Council throughout the ordinance and it should be capitalized; asked for clarification from staff of the intent of Section 1.28.110 Collection of unpaid fines and costs, B (4); and asked for a consensus whether a written or verbal warning for the first violation would be included in the draft ordinance.

Councilmember Arth suggested there should be a warning for the first violation; it could be verbal or written depending on the circumstances, and he trusted the compliance officer to determine what would be appropriate. He affirmed, when asked by Councilmember Trotter, that he was comfortable that it was not written into the ordinance but left to the discretion of the particular circumstance.

Mayor Chew expressed concern that direction could make it more difficult for staff to do its job. He understood there was consensus to revise the citation penalties to \$250 for the second violation and \$500 for the third violation.

As to the property related citations, Ms. Murphy explained they were intended to be citations that related directly to real property where a lien or special assessment could be placed against the property, which allowed the Town a better way to collect. She affirmed that Property Related and Non-Property Related Citations/Fines could be added as another definition in the draft ordinance.

Mayor Chew referenced Attachment D, Draft Nuisance Abatement Ordinance, and requested modification to Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities B, to include a reference to C&D construction and demolition and green waste, although the consensus of the Town Council was to leave the section as written.

Ms. Murphy agreed that the section remain as written in that other sections addressed construction and demolition issues, including the language in Section 7.16.040 (D) which offered flexibility for code enforcement.

Ms. Keimach explained that the Town did not enforce unlawful activities on private property unless there was a public safety issue, and the Town would not regulate the backyards of private property owners if not visible from a public street unless there was a safety issue.

Ms. Murphy added that the Nuisance Abatement Ordinance included a provision that any violation of the MMC was a nuisance which would cover any violation of State law; i.e., storm water regulations pursuant to Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities, A. Signage that did not comply under the Zoning Regulations could be called out separately but would be addressed in Section 7.16.040, C and D.

Councilmember Trotter requested further modification to Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities, N. to include a reference to private properties, with Ms. Keimach advising that property owners were responsible for sidewalks in front of the property.

Councilmember Trotter also expressed concern with Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities, W., as written. He did not want to see the Town get in the habit of asking residents to remove personal property, particularly from cul-de-sacs.

Ms. Keimach explained that the language, as written, excluded cul-de-sacs but suggested the section could be revised to read: *Placement of personal property or sports equipment, such as basketball standards, soccer goals and skate ramps, in the public right-of-way on arterials or collector streets, or in a manner that blocks the travel lane in the public right-of-way.*

By consensus, the Town Council accepted the revision to Section 7.16.040 Unlawful activities, W., as proposed by staff.

Councilmember Trotter also referenced Section 7.16.070 Notice, on Page 6, and identified a typographical error, recommending the elimination of the title *Compliance Officer* from the introduction of that section.

Ms. Murphy explained that the motion, with amendments, would have to be read into the record since this was a first reading of an ordinance that would return for a second reading.

ACTION: It was M/S (Wykle/Arth) to Introduce and Waive the First Reading of an Ordinance Adding Title 1 General Provision, Chapter 1.28 regarding Administrative Penalties as presented in Attachment E; as amended during this discussion; adding language with Director defined as Director of Administrative Services and Finance of the Town of Moraga; revise the indent error shown on Page 5; reference to Town Council to be capitalized throughout the ordinance; with the fines to be addressed in a resolution

that would be brought back at the time of the second reading based on the comments of Town Councilmembers. Roll Call Vote: 3-1-1. Noes: Trotter. Absent: Metcalf.

ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Wykle) to Introduce and Waive the First Reading of an Ordinance Repealing and Replacing Moraga Municipal Code Title 7 Health and Safety Chapter 7.16 Nuisance Abatement in the form provided by staff with the following changes: the list of Unlawful Activities in Section 7.16.040 to include a paragraph related to signage; add a subsection X. to read: "Signs placed, located or otherwise in violation of the Town's Municipal Code;" sub paragraph (W) to be modified so that the last clause reads "or in a manner that blocks the travel lane in the public right-of-way;" the words Compliance Officer at the end of the introductory section for Section 7.16.070 Notice, to be deleted; and the Definition Section 7.16.030 to include a special definition of Director as the Director of Administrative Services and Finance of the Town of Moraga. Roll Call Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Metcalf.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: It was M/S (Trotter/Arth) to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 P.M. Vote: 4-0-1. Absent: Metcalf.

Respectfully submitted by:


Marty C. McInturf, Town Clerk

Approved by the Town Council:


Ken Chew, Mayor