

**TOWN OF MORAGA  
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING**

Via teleconferenced locations

May 18, 2020  
7:00 P.M

**MINUTES**

**THIS MEETING WAS CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS N-25-20 AND N-29-20, WHICH SUSPENDED CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, AND PURSUANT TO THE MARCH 31, 2020 ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, WHICH PERMITTED THE TOWN TO CONDUCT ESSENTIAL BUSINESS UNDER THE ORDER AS AN ESSENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTION.**

**Consistent with Executive Orders Nos. N-25-20 and N-29-20 from Governor Gavin Newsom and the Contra Costa County Health Officer dated March 31, 2020 Shelter in Place Order, the May 18, 2020 Special Meeting was not physically open to the public. Planning Commissioners and essential Town staff teleconferenced into the meeting.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Commissioners D'Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Thiel, Vice Chair Luster\*,  
Chairperson Stromberg  
\*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Commissioner Lueder

Staff: Cynthia Battenberg, Town Manager  
Steve Kowalski, Senior Planner  
Brian Horn, 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).

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was no reported public comment received for this item.

### **3. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **A. April 20, 2020 Minutes**

On motion by Commissioner D'Arcy, seconded by Commissioner Helber to approve the April 20, 2020 Minutes, as submitted. The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

Ayes: D'Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Thiel, Stromberg  
Noes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Lueder, Luster

### **4. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

No action was taken on this item

### **5. PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **A. 9 Avila Lane**

Proposed Changes to Conceptual, General and Precise Development Plans Approved for Developments Under the Names of Country Club Vista, Moraga Valley Lane, and Sonsara (Subdivisions 7301 and 7764), and Design Review Board Application No. DRB-05-20 to Allow a 100-Square-Foot Addition to the Rear of the Existing Residence. (Project Planner: Brian Horn, Associate Planner)

Associate Planner Brian Horn provided a PowerPoint presentation of the staff report dated May 18, 2020, and reported that as conditioned, the proposed project was consistent with the Town of Moraga Planned Development District regulations, the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan, and would have minimal impact on surrounding properties. He recommended the Planning Commission approve the Draft Resolution as shown in Attachment A to the staff report, subject to findings and conditions of approval

Responding to the Commission, Mr. Horn confirmed the proposed modification would be to Lot 25 of Subdivision 7301 as part of the Sonsara Subdivision. As to whether a precedent would be set if the addition were permitted, if any other lot in the subdivision made a similar request the application would have to go through the same approval process before the Planning Commission. Attachment A had detailed the fact the Town currently allowed 200 square foot additions in the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR), and if a larger addition was proposed in the future for a separate lot in Subdivision 7301, it would be considered case-by-case based on the staff recommendation and Planning Commission review.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

Douglas McQuillan, Architect for the applicants, John and Sara Giordani, described the addition as small, the foundation included post-tension slabs, and the addition required no new foundation work. The current patio was not usable, and the addition would have no negative effects to the neighborhood.

The rear of the property sloped up and the rear neighbors were situated up higher than the existing residence. He described the request as minor and asked for Planning Commission approval of the proposed changes.

John Giordani, 9 Avila Lane, Moraga, was present via teleconference but offered no comments.

## PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Vice Chair Luster suggested the addition was a smart upgrade to the residence. She did not see the request as an addition since it was only a 20 x 5 foot space that had already been developed, the space currently had four walls on two sides, a large pillar on one corner, a full ceiling coverage, and an existing impermeable foundation under the patio. The development footprint of the residence remained unchanged. The addition would be no more visible by the neighbors than it was currently visible. She found the request for an increase in allowable habitable space to be minimal and within the range of what was allowed throughout the development. She supported the requested changes.

On motion by Vice Chair Luster, seconded by Commissioner Hillis to adopt Resolution next in number to approve changes to Conceptual, General and Precise Development Plans Approved for Developments Under the Names of Country Club Vista, Moraga Valley Lane, and Sonsara, Subdivisions 7301 and 7764, and Design Review (DRB 05-20) to Allow a 100-Square-Foot Addition at the Rear of the Existing Residence. The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

Ayes:	D'Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Luster, Thiel, Stromberg
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Lueder

Chairperson Stromberg identified the 10-day appeal process to the Town Council in writing to the Town Clerk.

### **B. CIP General Plan Conformance**

Review Proposed Fiscal Year 2020-21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Consistency with General Plan (Project Planner: Brian Horn, Associate Planner and Shawn Knapp, Public Works Director/Town Engineer)

Associate Planner Brian Horn provided a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). He recommended that the Planning Commission: 1) find the proposed CIP consistent with the General Plan provided that; a) future CIP projects continue to consolidate related projects to ensure projects are comprehensively planned and designed, consistent with General Plan policies; and b)

new development projects may be required to construct, repair, or install improvements identified in the CIP as part of the development review process; and 2) recommend the Town Council approve the proposed CIP with the above-mentioned notes.

Public Works Director/Town Engineer Shawn Knapp clarified the CIP General Plan Conformance review was a routine item that was considered by the Planning Commission each year through the budget and CIP process. The Planning Commission was asked to find the projects being proposed to adhere to the General Plan, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission to be forwarded to the Town Council.

Town Manager Cynthia Battenberg explained that the Town of Moraga was a bit different from other jurisdictions in that Moraga had also included planning projects in the CIP, and some of the projects were more planning oriented. As examples, the Livable Moraga Road Project was 80 percent or more complete and fully funded. The Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP), Bollinger Valley Special Study Area Rezone, and a project for streamlining the Planned Development process were also identified. A new project for 2020 included the implementation of the six-cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers and the Town had applied for Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) Grant Funds from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), with the funds intended to assist the Town in removing any barriers to develop housing.

Responding to the Council, Messieurs Horn and Knapp and Ms. Battenberg provided clarification on the following CIP projects:

- **St. Mary's Road/Rheem/Bollinger Canyon Roundabouts** – Town staff had meetings with Saint Mary's College (SMC) staff who had a plan for a roundabout at the entrance of SMC. Staff had reviewed the potential impacts of SMC's plans as related to the Town's plans for the St. Mary's Road/Rheem/Bollinger Canyon Roundabouts, with plans to leverage funding for the improvements. The project was in the conceptual design phase at 35 percent plans. Additional funding would be required to complete the design, a decision to be determined by the Town Council with public input. The Town had also received significant grant funding from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) with a co-match from Traffic Mitigation Fees as part of development fees specifically for transportation projects. No General Fund fees were involved in this project.
- **Implementing the 6th Cycle RHNA** – Jurisdictions were in the process of negotiating formulas to be used to count Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), although no decision had been made. On January 1, 2020, new legislation had gone into effect regarding ADUs, with staff waiting for a technical memorandum from HCD before the Town moved forward given the ADU legislation must also be updated.
- **MCSP Implementation Plan** – Comments had been provided for the administrative draft with a work session to be considered by the Planning Commission during its July/August meetings, to be followed up with draft language.

- **Streamlining Planned Development 3-Step Process** – Staff received direction from the Town Council to prioritize projects in the following order: MCSP Implementation Project, Bollinger Valley Special Study Area Rezone, and then the Streamlining Planned Development 3-Step Process; however, the direction had recently shifted due to the impacts of COVID-19 since the Bollinger Valley Special Study Area Rezone was funded from the General Fund and the project would be held off until January 2021. The Streamlining Planned Development 3-Step Process involved a grant, but staff cautioned that everything depended on the budget.
- Staff clarified that as projects were completed or if the project had been deferred to a future fiscal year, the project had been removed from the CIP General Plan Conformance list. A CIP completed list would be available upon the completion of the budget process.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

There were no reported public comments received for this item.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

On motion by Vice Chair Luster, seconded by Commissioner D’Arcy to: 1) find the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) consistent with the General Plan provided that; a) future CIP projects continue to consolidate related projects to ensure projects are comprehensively planned and designed, consistent with General Plan policies; and b) new development projects may be required to construct, repair, or install improvements identified in the CIP as part of the development review process; and 2) recommend the Town Council approve the proposed CIP with the above-mentioned notes. The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

Ayes:	D’Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Luster, Thiel, Stromberg
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Lueder

**C. Sign Code Amendments**

Conduct a Public Hearing and Consider the Adoption of Planning Commission Resolution \_\_\_-2020 Recommending the Town Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Chapter 8.88 – Signs, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code to Streamline the Approval Process for Certain Types of Signs; Allow for New Master Sign Programs to Include Greater Variation from the Standards Prescribed by Chapter 8.88; and Amend Certain Specific Standards and Regulations for New Commercial Signage including Wall Signs, Monument Signs, and Portable Signs. (*CEQA Determination*: Exempt under the “common sense” exception pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because it can

be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this action may be a significant effect on the environment.) (Project Planner: Steve Kowalski, Senior Planner).

Senior Planner Steve Kowalski provided a PowerPoint presentation on the 2020 Sign Code Amendments, and recommended the Planning Commission find the Proposed Amendments to Chapter 8.88 – Signs of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3); and adopt the resolution contained in Attachment A to the staff report dated May 18, 2020. Alternatively, the Planning Commission may direct staff on additional revisions and/or amendments and continue the public hearing to a date certain to review the final draft once more before forwarding it to the Town Council with a recommendation for adoption.

Chairperson Stromberg reported he had discussed certain concerns he had with the proposed Sign Code Amendments with the Town Manager prior to the meeting, particularly related to oversight responsibilities by the Planning Commission and delegation of some of the oversight and decision-making to the Planning Director. He had also raised concerns that the Zoning Administrator/Design Review Administrator/Planning Director were one and the same and he had encouraged the Town Manager to consider amending the Moraga Municipal Code (MMC) to consider consolidating them all into one single title to avoid confusion in the future. It was his intent that the Planning Commission still had the ability to voice its input and opinions on proposed signs in an expedited way so as not to constitute an onerous burden on applicants or property owners.

Ms. Battenberg acknowledged the Chair had expressed concern with what the Design Review Administrator could approve. Staff had recommended allowing signs less than 25 square feet to be approved over the counter for a \$350 fee, which would take only a day or two to process. There was language in the Design Review section of the ordinance to allow the Design Review Administrator the ability to approve signs that were between 25 and 50 feet, and another provision that enabled the Design Review Administrator to approve monument signs that met the required standards. The applications that could be approved by the Design Review Administrator included an extra layer of notification to properties within 300 feet before they could be approved.

Ms. Battenberg acknowledged the Chair's recommendations and noted that currently the Design Review Administrator may approve all signs with the exception of monument signs. If the application was required to be submitted to the Design Review Board (DRB) instead, it would include a \$1,500 fee or more and a process that would take approximately eight weeks. The Design Review Administrator process involved a \$1,000 fee and a three- to four-week review process. Given the varying levels of review and costs, staff had been concerned taking all of the signs under the purview of the Design Review Administrator and adding an additional level of review.

Chairperson Stromberg stated he had also discussed with the Town Manager the fact that the Planning Commission at times had received an email from staff indicating an

application for an addition to a property, as an example, and inviting the Commissioners to speak up if they had any concerns whether the application should be brought before the Planning Commission. It could otherwise be approved by staff. He equated it to an item on the Consent Agenda which could be pulled if a Planning Commissioner had a concern.

Responding to the Commission, Mr. Kowalski and Ms. Battenberg clarified the following:

- The square footage of the Rheem Center monument sign was ten to eleven feet in height with the vast majority of the sign decorative and with copy below reading *CVS, Dollar Store and TJ Maxx* about 15 square feet in size. The size of the nearby bus shelter was unknown, but likely eight or nine feet in height.
- Section 8.88.060 – Sign Review Procedure, signs 25 feet or smaller had been intended to be placed under the Zoning Administrator purview to be approved over the counter with no discretionary actions or hearings. The decision of the Zoning Administrator could be appealed as currently written in the Sign Code, as shown in Section 8.88.060(G), Appeal.
- Section 8.88.070 – Master Sign Program, (B)(3), the Master Sign Program may allow more than one monument sign and each monument sign may exceed the maximum sign area prescribed by Section 8.88.090(B)(4) by up to one-hundred (100) percent, subject to Design Review Board approval. Staff clarified if CVS were to move out and Walgreen's moved in, as an example, the names on the monument signs could be changed pursuant to Section 8.88.070(A).
- Provisions for signage located in the scenic corridor were clarified.
- Section 8.88.090 – Permanent Signs, 4, Monument Signs, if a property owner did not apply for a Master Sign Program in a shopping complex, they would only be entitled to one sign. Staff acknowledged the majority owner of the Rheem Center had applied for a Master Sign Program (MSP) and had proposed some new signs more contemporary in design, although the Rheem Center had three driveways, two along Moraga Road and one along Rheem Boulevard. The majority property owner had proposed a sign near each driveway. The Planning Commission would have purview over the MSP in that case and could decide how many monument signs to allow.
- As to existing legal non-conforming signage in the Moraga Center, the existing marquee sign could be refreshed but not replaced.
- Section 8.88.090 – Permanent Signs, 8. Portable Signs (ii), Number. One on-site portable sign was permitted per business establishment. Real estate and political signs were exempt, and those existing regulations would not be changed.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Chairperson Stromberg read into the record the following email submitted to the Planning Commission:

*Kathe Nelson, the Chamber would like to acknowledge and thank staff for their thorough review and proposed changes to the current Sign Ordinance. We believe that the added flexibility and ease in permitting to be key to a more contemporary ordinance and less cumbersome process. It also seems to reduce Town staff time currently needed to approve even the most innocuous and easy-to-approve signs. For months to instant or automatic approval. Further the reduction of fees lessening the expense burden will be a very welcome change particularly to our small businesses that are the backbone of our business community. I did reach out to Mr. Kerner and Mr. Bruzzone for their input as it pertains to their specific properties but did not receive a response. They may be communicating directly to the Commission but, overall, the Chamber endorses these proposed changes and hope the Commission votes to accept. Regards, Kathe Nelson, Executive Director.*

#### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner D'Arcy thanked staff for the preparation of the Sign Code Amendments, in particular the cost and time reduction that would make the Town more favorable from the business community's point of view. She suggested the current process was cumbersome and expensive.

In response to the Chair, Ms. Battenberg reiterated her concern adding an additional layer to the Design Review Administrator process which would impact all signs reviewed as part of that process.

Vice Chair Luster commented she was not opposed to the staff recommended changes to Section 8.88.060 – Sign review procedure, although she would like the appeal issue to be addressed. As to the revisions to the Design Review Administrator section, she clarified with staff the changes had been made since currently the provisions were unclear and staff wanted it to be clear that all signs conforming to an approved MSP could be approved ministerially.

Vice Chair Luster agreed that whenever the Planning Commission or Town Council approved a MSP there would be ample time for the public to provide input, and that signage approved by the Planning Director under the MSP should not be subject to further appeal. She suggested the Town Council should have the ability to appeal under the MSP approval process and was informed by Mr. Kowalski that, as with any Planning Commission action, the Town Council maintained the ability to call up the item.

Vice Chair Luster understood if an MSP was in place the Planning Director or designee could approve a sign that complied with the MSP and she understood the Town Council could appeal a sign under the MSP.

Chairperson Stromberg understood the Town Council could always set an agenda item at its discretion to address anything considered at the staff or Planning Commission level.

Ms. Battenberg reiterated the purpose and intent of the MSP approval process. In the event more businesses desired to be added onto a previously approved sign as part of an MSP, staff could make the determination that was not a ministerial approval and may require an amendment to the approved MSP.

As to Section 8.88.060 – Sign review procedure (G), Appeal, Ms. Battenberg suggested the section should be revised to read: *A person may appeal a decision made under Sections (B) and (C) of this chapter. The procedures set forth in Sections 8.12.150 to 8.12.260 shall govern such an appeal.*

Vice Chair Luster asked how an MSP would be addressed in the scenic corridor absent review by the Planning Commission and Town Council, and clarified with Mr. Kowalski that if and when an MSP was proposed for the Rheem Center it would be evaluated to ensure consistency with the Scenic Corridor Guidelines by staff and the Design Review Board.

Vice Chair Luster opposed the staff recommendation to remove Section 8.88.060 – Sign review procedure (C)(1), monument signs, as inappropriate.

Mr. Kowalski explained that people would still receive notification of the Design Review Administrator approval process in the event of any objections of the ministerial approval. As the Sign Code Amendments reflected, the Planning Commission acting as the Design Review Board would have purview of all monument signs included in a proposed MSP, with staff attempting to clarify through the Amendments that monument signs that conformed to an approved MSP could be approved over the counter, while others would include public notification and a chance to call up to the Design Review Board.

Vice Chair Luster preferred the Planning Commission be allowed to review all monument signs that were not in an MSP, and Mr. Kowalski cited the proposed amendment to Section 8.88.060 – Sign review procedure (B)(3), which read: *Monument signs that comply with the standards set forth in Section 8.88.090(B)(4), except such signs conforming to an approved Master Sign Program could be approved by the Design Review Administrator.*

Vice Chair Luster again preferred that in Section 8.88.060 – Sign review procedure (C)(1), monument signs be retained under the purview of the Design Review Board. She was not opposed to the proposed revisions to Section 8.88.070 – Master Sign Program, although the language proposed for (B)(3) implied a disregard for the current size restrictions. She preferred that the square footage parameters be listed or that the current language reading *by up to one-hundred (100) percent* be stricken and reworded.

Ms. Battenberg explained that an application that had been received for the Rheem Center included larger-sized monument signs. Staff had conducted some visits and suggested a maximum be considered. Staff had found the language in this section to be reasonable, imposing a limit of 70 square feet per sign face, thereby avoiding a free-for-all in newly proposed MSPs.

Vice Chair Luster disagreed with the language as shown and suggested rather than including the language *by up to one-hundred (100) percent*, it could be amended to read *80 square feet per side as a maximum*.

Vice Chair Luster also suggested that Section 8.88.090 – Permanent Signs (B)(iii), be revised to read: *Height. The maximum wall sign height shall not exceed the height of the building associated with it*, but Mr. Kowalski noted that Section (B)(1)(ii), which read *Location. The wall sign must be located below an eave or parapet, including the eave of a simulated mansard roof*, already addressed that concern.

Vice Chair Luster also recommended that wayfinding signage be prohibited from above the ceiling height of commercial buildings, particularly since the application for the Rheem Center had proposed very tall wayfinding signage taller than the buildings themselves a few years ago. She wanted that provision included as a way to diminish overheard clutter.

Vice Chair Luster supported streamlining the Sign Code but not to the detriment of the Town's character, particularly along the Town's scenic corridors; however, if the Planning Director gained more ministerial purview, the design guidelines as set forth in Title 8 regarding signs should not be less restrictive. She opposed ministerial review of a monument sign along a scenic corridor but supported the lessening of fees where possible as suggested. She found the amendments to be overall exempt from CEQA and supported them, with the few exceptions she had outlined earlier, including:

- Do not remove monument signs from Section 8.88.060(C)(1);
- Change the language of Section 8.88.070(B)(3), as discussed;
- Ensure that language in Section 8.88.090(B)(1)(iii) includes not exceeding the building height without discretionary review; and
- Wayfinding signage to be prohibited above the roof height of the commercial buildings, which could be passed on to the Town Council as a recommendation.

As to the wayfinding signs, Ms. Battenberg explained that there were no limits since wayfinding signs could only be part of an approved MSP and were thus subject to approval by the Design Review Board.

The Planning Commission discussed Section 8.88.070(B)(3), and recommended further modification to this section to read: *The Master Sign Program may allow more than one monument sign and each monument sign may exceed the maximum sign area prescribed by Section 8.88.090(B)(4) up to a maximum of 70 square feet per side, subject to Design Review Board approval.*

Ms. Battenberg commented that if the Planning Commission were to remove monument signs from the purview of the Design Review Administrator and leave it where it under the purview of the Design Review Board, the Design Review Administrator rights would be clarified but nothing would change and the result of adding language that would require notification to the Planning Commission and ability to call up that item would be an additional step contrary to the Town Council's goal to streamline the process. She

questioned whether that additional step should be recommended. She also clarified that currently the Design Review Administrator could approve signs up to 50 feet.

Chairperson Stromberg explained that he had proposed that the Planning Commission be notified by the Design Review Administrator of a proposed sign between 25 and 50 feet, which would allow a Planning Commissioner the ability to call up the item, and Ms. Battenberg reiterated that the current code allowed the discretionary approval by the Design Review Administrator.

Mr. Kowalski stated that such a process was not currently in use for signs 50 feet and under and if the Planning Commission were to support the Chair's recommendation it would require an additional step which would lengthen the process as opposed to shortening it.

Ms. Battenberg explained that staff never wanted to approve anything that was questionable and would bump items up to the Design Review Board and/or Town Council if there were concerns about the appropriateness of a sign or signs. If there was a questionable sign under 50 feet, staff could potentially conduct that notification to the Planning Commission to see if the Planning Commission wanted to call up the item.

Chairperson Stromberg pointed out the Town did not currently have a Design Review Administrator and they were unaware who that person ultimately would be in the future. It was possible that person may or may not agree with the Town Manager's approach. He was not suggesting an additional layer be added to the process, but he was not comfortable leaving it unaddressed.

On the discussion, Chairperson Stromberg understood the Planning Commission currently did not have the authority to approve signs that were 50 feet or less and there was no need to create an additional bureaucratic step for such signs. As such, he withdrew his recommendation.

Commissioner Hillis acknowledged the Chair's concerns but sought some sort of recording system for the number of signs and what provisions were used to determine whether a problem existed.

Vice Chair Luster noted the public had appeal rights and the Town Council could ultimately recommend that a sign be removed.

Ms. Battenberg reiterated that, as a general rule, staff did not want to approve anything that would be controversial.

Mr. Kowalski reported the Town would be getting a new Planning Director shortly and he had a strong suspicion that person would have a conservative approach.

Chairperson Stromberg again withdrew his recommendation for oversight on the 50 feet or less signs to be approved by the Design Review Administrator. He recognized the goal

to streamline the process to make it more business-friendly and less onerous to support businesses coming to Moraga.

Ms. Battenberg summarized the following changes to Attachment A, Draft Resolution 2020 as discussed:

- Section 8.88.060(B) and (C) to leave the monument sign approval as is under the purview of the Design Review Board and remove it from the purview of the Design Review Administrator.
- Section 8.88.060(G), revised to read: *Appeal. A person may appeal a decision made under Sections (B) and (C) of this chapter. The procedures set forth in Sections 8.12.150 to 8.12.260 shall govern such an appeal.*
- Section 8.88.070(B)(3), revised to read: *The Master Sign Program may allow more than one monument sign and each monument sign may exceed the maximum sign area prescribed by Section 8.88.090(B)(4) up to a maximum of 70 square feet per side, subject to Design Review Board approval.*
- Staff to clarify with the Town Council that the approval of monument signs and all other signs which conformed to an approved Master Sign Program would be under the purview of the Planning Director/Zoning Administrator.

On motion by Commissioner Luster, seconded by Commissioner D’Arcy to adopt Resolution next in number, Recommending the Town Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Chapter 8.88 – Signs, of Title 8, Planning and Zoning, of the Town of Moraga Municipal Code to Streamline the Approval Process for Certain Types of Signs; Allow for New Master Sign Programs to Include Greater Variation from the Standards Prescribed by Chapter 8.88; and Amend Certain Specific Standards and Regulations for New Commercial Signage including Wall Signs, Monument Signs and Portable Signs, as discussed and as outlined by the Acting Planning Director/Town Manager. The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

Ayes:	D’Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Luster, Thiel, Stromberg
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Lueder

Chairperson Stromberg identified the 10-day appeal process to the Town Council in writing to the Town Clerk

## 6. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

There were no Routine and Other Matters.

## 7. REPORTS

Abstain: None  
Absent: Lueder

Chairperson Stromberg identified the 10-day appeal process to the Town Council in writing to the Town Clerk

**6. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS**

There were no Routine and Other Matters.

**7. REPORTS**

**A. Planning Commission**

There were no reports.

**B. Staff**

Ms. Battenberg reported the Town's budget was always tight, but the Town was faring better than other jurisdictions as a result of the impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic. The Town would be facing an estimated \$257,000 shortfall and could not move forward with some of the infrastructure that had been planned at the level preferred. The Town Council had been provided an informative report on the budget during its May 13, 2020 meeting, which was available to the public.

Ms. Battenberg also hoped to have a new Planning Director on board by July 1, 2020. In addition, as part of the April 29, 2020 Shelter-in-Place (SIP) extension, construction activities had been allowed to open back up on May 1, 2020, and starting May 19, 2020 all retail businesses would be permitted to offer curbside services pursuant to the directives of the Contra Costa County Health Officer.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion by Vice Chair Luster, seconded by Chairperson Stromberg to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:58 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy



Secretary of the Planning Commission