

**TOWN OF MORAGA
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

Via teleconferenced locations

July 6, 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 SHELTER IN PLACE ORDERS OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, INCLUDING THE MOST RECENT ORDER DATED JUNE 16, 2020, 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's Shelter-in-Place Orders, the most recent Order dated June 16, 2020, the July 6, 2020 Regular 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 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 P.M.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners D'Arcy, Helber, Hillis, Lueder, Thiel, Chairperson Stromberg

Excused: Vice Chair Luster

Staff: Cynthia Battenberg, Town Manager
Afshan Hamid, Planning Director
Brian Horn, Associate Planner
Mio Mendez, Assistant Planner

B. Conflict of Interest

There was no reported conflict of interest.

C. Contact with Applicant(s)

Commissioner D'Arcy reported that while she did not have contact with the applicant for Agenda Item 5A, 1790 School Street, she had visited the site and while there had spoken to someone outside. She also had received an e-mail from Moraga resident Ferenc Kovac.

Chairperson Stromberg reported the e-mail from Mr. Kovac had been distributed to the entire Planning Commission.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Associate Planner Brian Horn reported no public comment had been received via e-mail.

3. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. May 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes

On motion by Commissioner D’Arcy, seconded by Commissioner Thiel to approve the May 18, 2020 Minutes, as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

4. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

On motion by Commissioner D’Arcy, seconded by Commissioner Hillis to adopt the meeting agenda, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

5. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 1790 School Street

Conditional Use Permit (UP-03-20) to Allow the Construction of Above-Ground Public Utility Structures and Variance (VAR-02-20) to Allow a Surge Tank and Enclosure to be Located Within the Front-Yard and Side-Yard Setbacks and a Generator to be Located Within the Side-Yard Setback, and a Variance and Fence Permit to Allow a Portion of Fence Located Within the Front-Yard and Side-Yard Setback to be 8 Feet in Height. (Project Planner: Brian Horn, Associate Planner)

Associate Planner Brian Horn provided a PowerPoint presentation of the staff report dated July 6, 2020, and recommended due to the project’s consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, with minimal impact to surrounding properties, that the Planning Commission approve the resolution for Use Permit (UP-03-20), Variance (VAR-02-20) and a Fence Permit, as contained in Attachment A to the staff report, subject to findings and conditions of approval.

Chairperson Stromberg introduced and welcomed new Planning Director Afshan Hamid, who was also present via teleconference.

Planning Director Afshan Hamid, thanked the Chair for the introduction. She was excited to work for the Town of Moraga, serve the Planning Commission and Town Council, and work with Town staff.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Horn confirmed construction on the surge tank had already commenced, with the fencing, landscaping and generator remaining to be constructed.

Town Manager Cynthia Battenberg reported that she and the Public Works Director/Town Engineer had met with the applicant, the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District (CCCSD), a public agency that had provided essential services to the Town on multiple occasions. The CCCSD had been operating in the residential neighborhood at 1790 School Street for some time and staff had discussed the need for upgrades. The existing chain link fence would be replaced with a wood fence which would be attractive in the residential neighborhood, and the CCCSD had agreed to improve the landscaping beyond the existing junipers.

Ms. Battenberg also responded to concerns the public had not been notified about the project. She reported that numerous pieces of information had been included in the About Town Newsletter, and the CCCSD had held at least one community meeting when the project had been started over a year ago. She acknowledged the project involved a significant investment in the community.

Mr. Horn clarified the landscape plan would be reviewed by Town staff including the Public Works Department. He acknowledged a final landscape plan had not been provided to the Planning Commission for review.

Chairperson Stromberg pointed out a condition of approval had been included for VAR-02-20 related to the landscaping. Condition 11, required *New landscaping shall be planted at the front of the property partially within the School Street right-of-way between the new 6-foot high redwood fence and rear of the sidewalk along School Street. The applicant shall submit a landscape plan for review and approval by the Public Works Department, Planning Department, and Moraga-Orinda Fire District. The landscape plan shall be comprised of plantings selected from Appendix B of the Town of Moraga Design Guidelines. Selected plantings shall be drought-tolerant, fire-resistant and non-invasive species.*

Mr. Horn added that the new wood fence would be located in the same location as the existing chain link fence, along the northern side property line, and a six-foot high redwood fence along the front property line north of the existing driveway and interior of the property to enclose the surge tank and generator area of the property.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Keith Gellerman, Project Manager/Associate Engineer, CCCSD, explained that the project had been in process for some time, and as the Project Manager he had managed the design and construction.

Responding to the Commission, Mr. Gellerman described five pumps in the CCCSD pump station, two of which were 1,000 horsepower diesel engine driven pumps, to be replaced with two electric motors. Due to the switch from different motor styles, there could be more of a risk to have an electric driven pump shut off instantly, whereas a diesel driven motor would be able to slow down a bit prior to shutting off. The Project Consultant had determined an additional surge tank was necessary at the front of the property in order to provide certain protections for the new electric driven pumps. As a result, there would be two surge tanks, with the existing surge tank a bit smaller in dimension and located farther from the new surge tank that would be built in a relatively large structure, set mostly below grade, and at a low profile to blend in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Gellerman explained that theoretically the surge tank should not need to operate but was intended as emergency protection and usually operated only during a power outage, essentially serving as a pressure relief tank, and he described in depth how the equipment would operate as a pressure relief tank. He acknowledged that potentially the equipment may operate in the event of a PG&E Public Safety Power Shutdown, particularly if PG&E did not warn the CCCSD about a potential power shutdown. In the event the CCCSD was notified of a potential PG&E shutdown, CCCSD operators would be able to slow down and power off the pumps, and once the power was technically off, the equipment could be turned back on and resume operation. The current surge tank would remain in operation during the entire course of construction and stay in operation afterwards. Construction was scheduled to conclude ideally in December 2021, with strict deadlines on the time period when the contractor may conduct the work from May through October.

Mr. Gellerman clarified that the CCCSD could operate the generator as long as needed. The new generator involved a day tank for one day of operation, to be refilled on an as-needed basis in the event of a multiple day shutdown.

Assistant Planner Mio Mendez reported no public comment had been received via e-mail for this item.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner Helber understood that another chain link fence was located on the opposite side of the pump house. He asked whether the applicant would replace that same chain link fence, and Mr. Horn referenced Page D-MO-1 (D) of the applicant's plans, which had identified where the chain link fence would be demolished. The existing chain link fenced located on the other side of the property (southern property line) would not be replaced.

Mr. Gellerman identified a driveway for additional access to the site on the southwest side of the property, and acknowledged there were no plans to remove the existing chain link fence on that side of the property since the CCCSD would not be conducting any work in that area.

Commissioner Helber referenced the fence design and his understanding the applicant had proposed to replace the existing chain link fence with a wood fence, and while nicer, it would be higher than the average fence height.

Commissioner Helber recommended a higher spec level for the fence given it was now pickets installed on a rail on the back, whereas many of the neighborhood fences had a top rail, with lattice above, to mitigate some of the light and air through rather than just an exposed picket fence. He recommended consideration of an overlapping or overlocking picket design. With that revision, he could support the project moving forward.

Mr. Gellerman explained that while the intent had been to keep the project as-is with the job having been bid originally with the design to match the existing fence, the CCCSD was open to different fence designs as mentioned, with lattice on top of the fence as a potential option. He did not see that option would represent a significant cost to the CCCSD. The design of the fence, as proposed, had been discussed with Town staff, along with different height considerations for the fence or potentially lattice redwood fencing, similar to what was located across the street from the project site. He reiterated that the CCCSD was open to different fence styles.

Chairperson Stromberg thanked the applicant for being open about the fence design and agreed that what Commissioner Helber had proposed, aesthetically and from a light standpoint, would offer significant advantages.

Commissioner Helber suggested the second sentence of Condition 11 of Attachment A could be revised to read: *The applicant shall submit a landscape plan and fencing design for review and approval by the Public Works Department, Planning Department, and Moraga-Orinda Fire District.*

Commissioner Hillis commented that the Planning Commission had been presented few important Public Works Department or infrastructure projects in the past. He emphasized that this was the first time the project had been presented in a public hearing. He suggested there should have been more information on the project, either via the staff analysis or the applicant's presentation, to be entered into the public record, particularly for those who may not have had any public outreach or been made aware of such an important improvement to the Town's infrastructure.

On motion by Commissioner Helber, seconded by Chairperson Stromberg to adopt Resolution next in number to approve Conditional Use Permit (UP-03-20) and Variance (VAR-02-20) for 1790 School Street, subject to the findings and conditions of approval as shown, and revised, as follows:

Revise the second sentence of Condition 11 to read:

The applicant shall submit a landscape plan and fencing plan for review and approval by the Public Works Department, Planning Department, and Moraga-Orinda Fire District

The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

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

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

B. 9 Archer Circle

Design Review Board Application (DRB-01-20) and Hillside Development Permit Application to Allow the Construction of a New 3,334-Square Foot Two-Story Single-Family Residence and 618-Square Foot Attached Garage on a Vacant Lot in the 3-DUA Zoning District. (Project Planner: Mio Mendez, Assistant Planner)

Assistant Planner Mio Mendez provided a PowerPoint presentation of the July 6, 2020 staff report, and recommended due to the project's overall consistency with the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan and Design Guidelines as well as the minimal impact it would have on the surrounding properties, that the Planning Commission approve Design Review Permit (DRB-01-20) and the accompanying Hillside Development Permit as conditioned in the draft Design Review Board Action Memorandum, as contained in Attachment A to the staff report.

Responding to the Commission, Mr. Mendez verified that an adjacent home on 10 Archer Circle had a partial second story. He also confirmed that staff had reviewed multiple homes, although not located on Archer Circle specifically, since the homes consisted mostly of single-story residences, although there were second story homes located on the adjoining streets and on top of the hill in the surrounding neighborhood. He also referenced the Design Guidelines which applied to the project, as outlined in the staff report, and noted that the Design Guideline related to prohibiting two, two-story homes located adjacent to one another would not apply to the subject project. Because there were no second story homes located adjacent and on either side of Archer Circle, the proposed two-story home would be permitted.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Flavio Morais, 1945 Contra Costa Boulevard, #2327, Pleasant Hill, identified himself as the Applicant for the project. He described the home as a split level similar to other homes in the area and noted that two-story homes typically had a level above the garage, and newer homes were closer to 3,000 square feet in size with second stories above the garage. In this case, the home would not include a second story above the garage. The home would be low profile comparable to most homes in the neighborhood, and would not appear massive even though it would be 3,334 square feet in size.

Chairperson Stromberg reported as part of his preparation work for the meeting that he had discussed with staff what he saw as an omission in the application submittal, particularly when applications were reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB). He stated a color and materials palette had not been provided to help identify the aesthetics of the residence which the Planning Commission was permitted to consider operating as the DRB. He clarified with Mr. Mendez the applicant had not provided that information to staff directly but if that information was available it could be presented at this time.

Mr. Morais advised the exterior would consist of Hardie board and batten consistent with other homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Morais presented visuals of the colors and materials and described the exterior walls and trim that would be painted a Fresh Popcorn color, black casement windows, charcoal gray pavers, and a Steel Carriage House garage door. The materials for the exterior lighting were also identified in an Earth Black color, the front door would be solid wood with three glass panels, black in color, and the roof would consist of Georgetown Gray composition shingles.

Mr. Morais confirmed the home would be built in the same footprint as a previous residence on the property, which had burned down. Existing Monterey pine trees and trees which had also burned on the property at that time were not part of the proposal, or proposed to be removed, although he acknowledged there were some neighborhood concerns with the condition of the trees. At this time, he expressed the willingness to remove those trees that had been damaged by a prior fire.

Oscar Osuna, Civil Engineer and Land Surveyor, provided the details for the drainage plans. He explained that a system would be incorporated that would slow down the water from the hill which had not yet been shown in detail on the plans. A swale would be located on the back of the retaining wall which would have some water going to inlets, to be taken to a pipe underneath to the front and around the home. As the water came around the home it would be slowed to the front and an underground closed pipe system in the front would serve as an infiltration trench slowing the water. A perforated pipe had not been proposed to be used until reaching the bottom slope after having passed the home, and then there would be the infiltration trench encased with gravel. That system would slow the water down significantly. He acknowledged that level of detail had not yet been shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mendez advised that Moraga's Associate Civil Engineer, Mark Summers, was also present via teleconference to respond to questions. He clarified the level of details related to the drainage plans would come into effect during the building permit phase with review by the Public Works Department.

Commissioner D'Arcy sought a copy of the drainage report given that residents of the area were aware of the fact that the area consisted of clay with water sheeting off, and the area was known to have landslides. She emphasized that having drainage systems in place were important. She added the plans had shown five, not four, bedrooms contrary to information in the agenda packet which needed to be corrected.

Chairperson Stromberg reported he had spoken with staff prior to the meeting about the geotechnical report. He had reviewed the boring logs and soil composition and had been surprised they were not dealing with expansive clays, but materials that had a much lower plasticity index. While he understood the soil was not typical to the type of soils found in the area, he still found the soil had issues with respect to drainage.

In response to concerns with the landscaping, Mr. Morais explained that pursuant to the site plan, they had only proposed to plant two trees and retain most of the existing vegetation around the property as shown. On the discussion, he also clarified that an image that appeared to be shown on the plans provided to the Planning Commission (not on the applicant's plans) to the right of the pervious paver driveway, was identified as a topographic line.

Mr. Morais further clarified in terms of the driveway that it would be over 20 feet wide and able to accommodate two vehicles contrary to concerns raised by the Planning Commission that modification to the driveway design was required to accommodate two vehicles.

Mr. Morais confirmed an Arborist's Report had not been provided as part of the application but he acknowledged a request from the Planning Commission to see that information given concerns from the neighbors the area was located in a High Fire designated area. He commented, however, that the Arborist's Report had not requested information on the health of the trees on the site but had provided information on the diameter and number of trees on the site.

Mr. Mendez also verified staff did not have an independent report on the health of the trees on the site, or the number of trees that may have expired, beyond the submitted Arborist's Report which had not provided any information on the health of the trees.

Chairperson Stromberg reported correspondence had been received from the public raising concerns with the health of the existing trees on the property, particularly trees that had been killed by the structural fire which had occurred in 2017.

Mr. Morais reiterated he would remove any trees that were dead or a fire hazard, but that such a report had not been requested by the Planning Department early on in the process.

Chairperson Stromberg reported that staff had provided the Planning Commission with written comments from **Ferenc Kovac**, **Ryan and Ashley Smith**, and **Steve and Ellin Swanback**, whose comments would be made part of the public record and agenda packet.

Mr. Mendez read into the record the receipt of public comments received via e-mail as follows:

Alex M: We have two questions. We live up the hill from this project. We would like to see a copy of the geo report. There was a landslide on the property in the 60's. There is a V-ditch from our property that runs through a plastic pipe across this property and we would like to understand how this will be handled going forward.

Myrna Volpentest: To whom it may concern. We live on 33 Woodside Drive on the corner of Woodside Drive in Archer Circle. We welcome our new neighbors on 9 Archer Circle. We would like the following items addressed. 1) Existing trees. The current plans indicate only two trees will be removed on the plan construction location, a small yucca plant and dead buckeye. We are worried that the trees that are damaged during the fire of 2017 and the dead Monterey pines are not going to be removed in the construction phase of this project. Considering the age of the trees we have concerns that will be a fire hazard to our neighbors and the local community. 2) Scale of the home. The home is out of scale with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood. We are wondering if story poles could be used to show the height of the roof and plan as it is typically used in other developments in Moraga. We thank you for your time to address these points and concerns. Sincerely, the Volpentest family at 33 Woodside Drive.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Commissioner D'Arcy expressed concern with an inadequate Arborist Report as it related to tree removal and a drainage plan for the back and base of the hill. She also acknowledged the concerns expressed by neighbors related to the size of the home and the fact pursuant to correspondence received that the two-story side of the home looked directly down into a neighboring kitchen, bathroom, and rear yard. She emphasized the importance of addressing the privacy issues and concerns with large or remodeled homes looming over existing single-story residences.

Commissioner D'Arcy also understood pursuant to one of the letters of correspondence received that the home would be 58 feet and 8 inches below the ridgetop rather than 11 plus feet taller than Archer Circle. She stated the scale of the home was out of place, and suggested a 4,000 square foot home was too large for the neighborhood and should be scaled back. She also disagreed with the finding the residence would not lower property values and result in a tasteful manner consistent with size and scale, stating that particular finding was not fitting for the home in this context.

Chairperson Stromberg recognized some homes in Moraga had been built years ago when the community had been comprised of primarily small Ranch homes in the 1,800 to 2,200 square foot range. While he recognized times had changed where it was not unforeseeable or unreasonable for new owners to seek to expand the footprint, Floor Area Ratio (FAR), or build partial second stories, it was also not uncommon for neighbors to bemoan the changes in their neighborhoods. While to some degree it was reasonable to expect that properties intermingled would at some point be expanded by new owners, there must be a reasonable limit. He suggested the project represented an unreasonable expansion given the existing neighborhood.

Chairperson Stromberg commented that depending on how the size of the home had been calculated it would be 70 percent larger than the existing homes in the immediate vicinity. He agreed that the size of the home had gone over the line and exceeded the bounds of reasonableness, particularly since due to the location and proposed size, the home would materially change the composition and complexity of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Stromberg also commented that having been a former member of the DRB and the Planning Commission for the past five years, he found the application was incomplete with inadequate information to allow the Planning Commission to analyze the application. Lacking that information, he could not justify an affirmative vote on the application at this time.

Commissioner Thiel recognized the project was challenging given the concerns of the neighbors related to drainage and fire safety with the site located at the top of the cul-de-sac. He agreed the home was larger than most and agreed with other Commission comments.

Commissioner Hillis shared the concerns of the Chair, particularly given the comments received from the neighbors related to drainage and the condition of the trees. He too found the application to be incomplete making it difficult to make an adequate judgment absent the missing information.

Commissioner Lueder agreed the application was insufficient and incomplete for the Planning Commission to make a decision. He recommended the item be postponed until such time as the application was deemed complete.

Commissioner Helber agreed that additional information was needed, particularly with respect to the drainage and the condition of the trees, and he wanted to see greater detailed plans identifying how the front of the landscaping would be addressed, and how the home would fit in with the rounding of the community. He also acknowledged the concerns with how the property would potentially impact the privacy of an adjacent lot (Lot 140) to the east.

Commissioner Helber added that having reviewed Sheet E1 of the plans, the first floor bedroom had a window that looked out on a six-foot high fence at the same elevation and that window would not affect anyone's privacy. He recognized that the architect had taken some consideration to push the mass of the second floor back away from that neighbor, with two windows; one at the top of the stairs that looked out and another in another bedroom that would look out, but which could be mitigated by raising the ceiling height or through the use of landscaping. He also acknowledged another egress window located at the back of the home, which had to be larger.

Commissioner Helber also understood there were concerns with the FAR and the fact the home was larger than existing homes in the neighborhood, but noted the home was situated on an L- or V-shaped lot. If the applicant took advantage of the existing landscaping, the home could fit on the site. He had no concerns with the overall square footage but how the building fit within the site, and he found that the Planning Commission did not have enough information at this time to make a determination on the application.

Commissioner D'Arcy reported the home owner of 10 Archer Circle, not 7 Archer Circle, had expressed concern with potential privacy impacts. While those impacts could be mitigated, she wanted to see those details before a decision was made.

Commissioner Helber commented that 10 Archer Circle was above the pad for 9 Archer Circle by around four feet. He again suggested more information was needed prior to the item moving forward. He offered a motion to continue the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to prepare and submit additional information including the items the Planning Commission had discussed. He also asked the applicant to provide a section cut between the neighbors on either side to allow the Planning Commission to view the potential privacy impacts.

Commissioner D'Arcy seconded the motion. She also requested additional information as discussed related to the landscaping, drainage, materials and color board, and the Arborist Report as it related to the condition of the trees.

In response to concerns as to the usability of the driveway, Chairperson Stromberg suggested the applicant should revisit with his Civil Engineer how one vehicle's position could literally cut off the right of access to the second garage stall. He suggested the plans could be revised to show a larger apron extending out which would then give the second vehicle more ability to come straight into that particular garage stall.

Commissioner Helber cited an unexplained image on the plans and asked the applicant to resubmit a landscape plan or planting plan to ensure the applicant screen back certain layers on the AutoCad file, which the Planning Commission did not necessarily need to see, and Mr. Mendez asked that Commissioner Helber provide something specific in writing to allow staff to work with the applicant.

Ms. Battenberg asked that the item be continued to a date certain of September 8, 2020, which would not require the application to be re-noticed.

Mr. Morais confirmed he could provide the additional information as requested but asked for an earlier meeting date since he had been waiting three months for the current public hearing.

Ms. Battenberg suggested as an alternative the Planning Commission could hold a Special Meeting on August 24, 2020 and the item could be continued to that date.

Commissioners present indicated the willingness to be present for a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission on August 24, 2020.

Mr. Morais stated he could have the information ready in two weeks in time for a meeting in early August, although Ms. Battenberg advised that the meeting of August 24, 2020 was the earliest the item could be continued given that the Planning Commission would go dark the first of August, and there would be meetings on the Moraga Center Specific Plan (MCSP) Implementation Project prior to that time.

As to the architectural style of the home, Commissioner D'Arcy again recommended the size of the second story be reduced; and Chairperson Stromberg suggested that a reduction in the size of the second story would offer more of a split level appearance consistent with other homes in the neighborhood.

Planning Director Hamid expressed the willingness to work with the applicant and acknowledged the comments offered by Commissioner Helber to provide further articulation, create soft shoulders, and provide context.

On motion by Commissioner Helber, seconded by Commissioner D'Arcy to continue Design Review Board Application (DRB-01-20) for 9 Archer Circle, to a date certain of August 24, 2020, subject to the additional information requested by the Planning Commission. The motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

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

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 this was the first day with the Town of Moraga for Planning Director Hamid, who she welcomed to the Town and whose qualifications and background she detailed. She was thrilled Ms. Hamid would be working with the Town of Moraga.

Ms. Hamid was excited to serve as the staff to the Planning Commission. She welcomed input and feedback from the Planning Commission and looked forward to working on all Town projects.

Ms. Battenberg also reported the Town Council had adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) Budget for 2020/21, which included four advanced planning projects, including the continuation of the MCSP Implementation Project, and the review of the Bollinger Valley Special Study Area, which required midyear budget review by the Town Council to determine available funding due to COVID-19. In addition, advanced planning projects included streamlining the three-step planning approval process, and implementation of the 6-Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers.

Chairperson Stromberg reported he had requested staff provide the packets for the MCSP Implementation Project at the earliest convenience given the need to be prepared for the upcoming Planning Commission meetings when the project would be discussed.

Ms. Hamid reminded the Planning Commission that a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be held on July 20, 2020, the August 3, 2020 Planning Commission meeting had been canceled, August 17, 2020 was a regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, and August 24, 2020 would be a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission.

8. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Commissioner D'Arcy seconded by Commissioner Helber to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:55 P.M.

A Certified Correct Minutes Copy



Secretary of the Planning Commission