



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

City Council Chamber
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

APPROVED

Wednesday, August 10, 2011

(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Meeting of August 10, 2011, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Kathy Narum.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Narum.

1. ROLL CALL

Staff Members Present: Brian Dolan, Community Development Director; Janice Stern, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Steve Otto, Senior Planner; Marion Pavan, Associate Planner; and Terry Snyder, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Chair Kathy Narum, and Commissioners Phil Blank, Greg O'Connor, Arne Olson, Jennifer Pearce, and Jerry Pentin

Commissioners Absent: None

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. July 27, 2011

Commissioner Blank moved to approve the Minutes of the July 27, 2011 meeting, as submitted.

Commissioner Olson seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, and Olson
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioners O'Connor, Pearce, and Pentin
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: None

The Minutes of the July 27, 2011 meeting were approved, as submitted.

3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

There were no members of the audience wishing to address the Planning Commission.

4. REVISIONS AND OMISSIONS TO THE AGENDA

There were no revisions or omissions to the agenda.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. P11-0063, LIL Middle School Tutoring

Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a tutoring center at 4160 Hacienda Drive, Suite 200. Zoning for the property is PUD-I/C-O (Planned Unit Development-Industrial/Commercial & Offices) District.

Commissioner Blank moved to make the required conditional use findings as listed in the staff report and to approve P11-0063, subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Commissioner Pentin seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce and Pentin
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: None

Resolution No. PC-2011-25 approving Case P11-0063 was entered and adopted as motioned.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OTHER MATTERS

- a. P11-0065 and P11-0066, Robert Abbott and Chevron
Applications for Design Review approval and Sign Design Review approval to change the existing building and canopy colors and to modify the sign program for the building, canopy, and monument signs for the Chevron Extra Mile (former Bernal Corners) service station located on 1875 Valley Avenue. Zoning for the property is PUD-C (Planned Unit Development – Commercial) District.

Marion Pavan presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Referring to the monument sign, Chair Narum inquired if Chevron is asking to change only the Chevron sign and if the brick and the height will remain.

Mr. Pavan replied that only the panel of the monument signs will be changed at both the Bernal Avenue and Valley Avenue entrances. He confirmed that the brick and height will remain as is.

Commissioner Blank inquired if staff supports the increase in height of the sign Chevron wanted to increase to seven feet.

Mr. Pavan said no.

Commissioner Olson stated that he drove through the site and noted that the changes have already been made. He added that the Chevron logo is there and that he thinks it looks fine.

Mr. Pavan replied that it is a flat panel sign and that the applicant would like a sign which would provide the relief achieved by the Jack in the Box sign. He added that Chevron was granted an emergency approval to rename the sign from Shell to Chevron.

Commissioner Pearce requested clarification that the applicant is not proposing to include additional information on the monument price sign and just wants to make the sign bigger.

Mr. Pavan replied that the request is for a taller sign only, with no changes to the price sign.

Chair Narum noted that Condition No. 6 of the ordinance approving the PUD limits site signage shall to one seven-foot tall monument identification sign at the street corner and one price sign at each entrance. She inquired if there is currently a seven-foot tall sign at the site.

Mr. Pavan said yes, indicating that the brick monument sign located on the corner is the seven-foot tall sign.

Chair Narum inquired if this is the sign with a flat panel that is being changed.

Mr. Pavan said yes.

Chair Narum requested confirmation that the applicant is proposing to increase the heights of the other two monument signs to seven feet, which is not in conformance with the ordinance.

Mr. Marion confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Blank inquired if the applicant wants to replace the current Jack in the Box sign that faces front, and if so, what the applicant proposes to replace it with.

Mr. Pavan replied that this is the east building elevation sign, which also reflects what faces north. He indicated that the Jack in the Box logo will remain, but the market and gasoline sign will be replaced by the *Em* ExtraMile logo.

Commissioner Blank inquired if this will not be a dedicated Jack in the Box sign.

Mr. Pavan replied that that it will not.

Commissioner Blank inquired what is currently on the west elevation.

Mr. Pavan replied that the west elevation has the market and Bernal Corners signs.

Commissioner Blank noted that the west elevation has a Jack in the Box, without the *Em* ExtraMile sign. He inquired if this would change or remain a dedicated Jack in the Box sign.

Mr. Marion replied that it will not change.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

Bob Abbott, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., representing Chevron, apologized for the printer quality and stark color contrast of the building elevations pictures, which do not do justice for the applications. He noted that the best representation of the color scheme is the pictures of the Danville site, which were taken right after that project was completed two years ago, and which illustrates the preferred combination of café-au-lait and nutmeg on the building panels.

Mr. Abbott stated that the reason for the request to raise the height of the signage on the two signs with common logos and pricing sign in the center is basically because, with the existing landscaping and the current diesel sign and the car wash sign to the

left, one cannot see the extra panel to be added to the right. He indicated that the goal was to get the signs above the landscaping so they can be seen and to discourage landscapers from cutting down the privet that surrounds the planter box. He added that if the concern is the brick breaks between the panels and the brick return around the top, these could be added so the signs are similar.

Mr. Abbott noted the conditions of approval state that if staff determines the color scheme to be a substantial change from what was previously approved, the item must return to the Planning Commission. He stated that he did not think the colors were a substantial change, but if it is staff's opinion that the colors were muted, he wanted to know what staff thinks the colors were muted from, such as if they were muted from Shell's yellow corporate color. He added that as Chevron's representative, he did not want to be in a position go with Shell's colors. He indicated that if Chevron had its way, the canopy would have brushed aluminum columns and a blue fascia, much like the Chevron station at Hopyard Road and Owens Drive. He noted that the proposed building is the same color as that, except with the addition of the mocca band along the bottom. He stated that if the Commissioners focus on the Danville project and the photo simulation for the existing versus the proposed, the Commission would see that the project is a good match for the neighborhood, not stark in comparison to what is being proposed and being constructed across the street. He asked the Commission to support the project.

Commissioner Pentin indicated that he has a problem with what the applicant has presented to the Commission tonight while submitting a photograph of another location on a given day and a given light that he wants the Commission to believe is what they are going to do.

Mr. Abbott stated that they originally submitted an 8½-inch by 11-inch color board with each color sample, and staff asked for larger color samples. He noted that when staff saw that there was not as much contrast in the colors generated by the office printout versus the color samples, they asked for photos showing something the applicants had done using these colors. He added that they then submitted one photo in the shade and another in the light. He commented that had they done that a month and a half ago, they would not be before the Commission today.

Commissioner Pentin referred to page 3 of Exhibit F of the staff report and asked Mr. Abbott if they are really charging \$8.90 a gallon as depicted on the sign.

Mr. Abbott said no and that they should just have used all zeros.

With respect to the height of the sign, Commissioner Olson stated that he drove through the property and noted that the sign is totally visible from both Bernal and Valley Avenues. He indicated that he did not understand why the sign needs to be raised and suggested that the hedge be trimmed down a little bit.

Mr. Abbott replied that he cannot speak for what is there right now as it was that way when he came into the picture. He then explained that the basis for their request and what they are trying to achieve is to have 18 inches to the bottom of the lowest price, which is the diesel price, and 18 inches of landscape in the foreground. He added that the reality is they will do what needs to be done and find some ways and measures to make sure the pricing can be seen.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that what he sees on the screen is very different from what he has in front of him. He asked if there was a color board, to which the applicant replied that the Commissioners are passing it around. After viewing the board, Commissioner O'Connor noted that the colors look much closer to what is on the screen than what he has.

Mr. Abbott agreed that the two colors on the Danville elevation are nowhere near the contrast on the printed copies.

Chair Narum stated that when this area was built, there was a lot of discussion and emphasis on making it look like residential and blend in with the housing behind it. She noted that one of the things she really likes about the current signage is the area that states "The Market" because it strikes her as residential. She added that she understands why the applicant does not want it to say "Bernal Corners" because it is not anywhere near the ExtraMile; however, she asked Mr. Abbott if they would consider putting "The Market" back up there.

Commissioner Blank stated that an equal case could be argued that "Bernal Corners" is very neighborhood. He indicated that he thinks there will be a lot of possibilities when potential solutions are proposed.

Chair Narum stated that she does not disagree with "Bernal Corners" but assumed that it has to do with branding.

Mr. Abbott stated that one reason they have a singular 'chilled wine' band color over the ExtraMile Market is because the center door is split, and people can go either way. He noted that the ExtraMile Market entrance is the entrance to the right, and they struggled with what to do with the middle, whether they should put a band there as well and ExtraMile Market over it. He added that while there is room in the signage program to do this, it does not make sense. He stated that strictly from his perspective, there would be more balance to put Bernal Corners at the center, with the ExtraMile Market and the Jack in the Box on either side.

Commissioner Blank asked if Mr. Abbott if he has spent any time watching the facility.

Mr. Abbott replied that he did so for about one to one-and-a-half hours.

Commissioner Blank stated that during the time he spent there watching, most of the people he observed went in where the current Bernal Corners sign is; a few went in on the right, and almost no one went in on the left.

Mr. Abbott indicated that this is exactly what the Chevron marketing people are trying to address, that if you want to enter the ExtraMile Market, you enter through Bernal Corners.

Theresa Moore stated that she lives next door to the gas station and is the original owner of her property. She noted that she and her husband had spent hours at Planning Commission meetings for a long time, trying to find out what was planned for this site, following the process very closely, and being good neighbors. She added that they were promised a lot of things such as there would be no fastfood restaurant in that establishment. She indicated that a lot of time was spent by the Planning Commission, the City Council, staff, and the neighbors regarding the original design and what was conducive for the neighborhood. She noted that they have a unique situation in their neighborhood because there is no other neighborhood in the City that sits so close to a service station. She added that it was wonderful to have that input and respect when that area was first being planned.

Ms. Moore stated that she agrees with staff that there is too much nutmeg in the proposed colors. She indicated that she understood Mr. Abbott's explanation that it is difficult to depict the actual colors on slides, and she feels better seeing the colors from pictures of the Danville location, which is primarily of a lighter color and not the same as the darker café-au-lait and nutmeg that are being proposed on the south and east elevations. She noted that these are these are very nice colors and that no one in the neighborhood would have problems with them; however, it seems like they will be going from white and very light yellow, which Shell has muted and goes well with the color of the houses, to a darker color. She indicated that the neighborhood houses look primarily light with different accents in very small portions, but none are painted in those darker hues. She expressed concern that the nutmeg color will be a bit much in terms of how much of it will be on these buildings, particularly on the whole backside. She stated that she understood plants are being proposed but noted that vegetation does not grow on the back of those walls. She noted that changing from the lighter color to the proposed darker colors would be a drastic change to the neighborhood, and would like to see that reduced, if possible.

Ms. Moore stated that she would also not be supportive of the increased height for signage and was glad that staff was opposed to the video spanners. She expressed concern about any additional noise at the site, which has been changing constantly and compounded from what was originally proposed when they purchased their home. She added that she would like to see the original guidelines put in place, that they be adhered to, and that the Commission and the Council ensure that the proposed darker color is significantly reduced on the buildings.

Mr. Abbott stated that from his perspective, the rear elevation is problematic because there is very little articulation on it, unlike the Danville building which has an arch that pulls itself out and is repeated in the rear of the building such that there are natural places to break up the color. He indicated that what was proposed was based on the existing landscaping and that better planting would help provide mitigation. He added that he agreed with Ms. Moore's comments that the plants in those trellis frames will not do enough because the elevation is too low, there is a soundwall there, and most of these things can be seen only from the neighbor, pedestrian, and drive-through views. He noted that the problem is that they will not be able to do any planting of any kind of any substance under the ExtraMile/Jack in the Box panel up toward the top; and that is where they stopped and said that this is where switching between the café-au-lait and nutmeg colors would make sense. He added that they may probably be able to do something at the drive-through as there is a natural point to change color scheme there, but there is no other spot there to do so.

Commissioner O'Connor asked Mr. Abbott if they would consider swapping the colors by putting the darker color in the top parapets and the lighter color below, carry it all around so that the horizontal boarding and the upper area in the front are done in the lighter color, and very little of the darker color on the sides.

Mr. Abbott replied that on the west elevation, the towers are café-au-lait and the nutmeg is recessed.

Commissioner O'Connor stated that it looks like the dark and light colors are about 50/50 on that elevation, but almost all dark on the sides and the back.

Mr. Abbott explained that this is because there is no break above the entry and no natural place to break the color. He noted that if the concern now is too much nutmeg, the new concern would then be too much café-au-lait.

Commissioner O'Connor noted that right now the majority of the building is lighter in color and suggested that the switch would lighten up the building as a whole. He added that when all four sides are added up, it would take it from a 70/30 split to a 30/70 split, which might relieve the concern of both the City and the neighbors while leaving Chevron with its own corporate pallet.

Mr. Abbott stated that the south elevation would be all café-au-lait with just the nutmeg cutting through.

Chair Narum requested staff to comment on Commissioner O'Connor's suggestion.

Mr. Pavan stated that swapping the nutmeg and the café-au-lait would achieve the goal of the recommendation. He added that the nutmeg could be used as a trim, or what is now shown to be café-au-lait could be a cream or white, as previous suggested, and would be reflective of what was shown on the Danville building.

Mr. Dolan stated that he thinks this is one solution; however, his preference for changes is as staff has recommended that the general colors stay the same but of a lighter shade of each of those colors. He added that he thinks the dark color on the top would change the look.

Commissioner Blank stated that he tends to agree but voiced concern that jumping to solutions so quickly before debating the merits of the proposal was premature.

Chair Narum asked Mr. Abbott to comment on the idea of lightening all colors as recommended in the staff report.

Mr. Abbott stated that as he had earlier mentioned and as indicated by Ms. Moore, the colors are fine and match the neighborhood.

Chair Narum noted that she did not think she heard Ms. Moore say that.

Mr. Abbott replied that he thinks he heard Ms. Moore say that the colors were beautiful and they were fine, but that there was too much nutmeg on the rear elevation. He indicated that he would definitely want to stay with this color scheme and was not sure what would be served by lightening the entire rear elevation to still a darker color than the café-au-lait, which would still end up with a darker, monochromatic elevation as there is no natural spot to break it up.

Commissioner Blank asked Mr. Abbott if Chevron did due diligence on this building prior to its purchase, such as on all the PUD requirements.

Mr. Abbott said yes.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Blank stated that in the time he has served on the Commission, he has never delayed a project, but he almost did that on this project tonight as he felt he did not have all the information he needed. He thanked staff for obtaining the Planning Commission Minutes, but he wished he also had the City Council Minutes. He noted, however, that in reading the Commission Minutes alone, he saw that there was astonishing agony and significant discussion about everything from trees to public art, to the car wash, to the paint colors, signs, pedestrian access, layout of buildings, landscaping, parking, green building measures and so many other things. He stated that Shell has a bright yellow corporate view for its livelihood and was requested and required by the City to mute it. He noted that the Minutes mentioned several times a building referred to as the "Brad Hirst building" with the idea was to make this look like a neighborhood environment, and Shell showed the corporate wisdom to mute the colors and move off of their pallet.

Commissioner Blank stated that he appreciates the enthusiasm of the applicant in terms of the pallet being fine, but in his view, losing the Bernal Corner sign does not work, and

neither do the colors and the red banner on the ExtraMile sign. He indicated that this is a huge entryway to Pleasanton and was supposed to have “the Pleasanton look,” and what is being proposed is definitely not that look. He expressed concern that, even though staff has tried to mitigate this, something is being lost. He added that he was also not in support of raising the sign height.

Commissioner O’Connor agreed with Commissioner Blank with regard to Shell’s muting its bright yellow color. He stated that he thinks the front cover of the project shows more of a brighter yellow and agreed that it does not work with the neighborhood look. He noted that there are not too many bright colors like that in the City, except one or two on First Street, which do not match the neighborhood. He indicated that on the contrary, he believes these two colors proposed are Pleasanton-looking and match the neighborhood, although he is not thrilled with the chilled wine color. He added that while he has no problem with the proposed colors, he can agree with the neighbors that having the dark color on three sides of building is problematic; however, if the sides of the building all looked like the front of the building, it would be fine. He indicated that he also does not support raising the height of the signs.

Commissioner Olson stated that he is not a big fan of yellow on buildings and he found the proposed colors to be a vast improvement. He indicated that he agreed with Commissioner O’Connor’s comments and that the Commission should deal with the two ends of the building and the east elevation, make some changes there, and stay with the two proposed colors. He added that he also does not support raising the height of the two signs.

Commissioner Pentin stated that the Commission was given the applicant’s designs and then was given a picture of what the Commission was supposed to believe, which he cannot agree with. He indicated that he passes the building every day and rides his bike by it, and the color on the three sides does not work for him. He added that if the two main colors of nutmeg and café-au-lait were to be approved, he agrees with staff that they need to be muted. He noted that this has already happened on this property, and the history of what has previously been done in order for this property to exist should be adhered to. He added that he does not support raising the height of signs.

Commissioner Pearce stated that she is usually happy to let companies utilize their colors as they would like to, but she agrees with what has been said that given the history of this project, she is inclined to respect decisions of the previous Planning Commission, especially since there has been quite a bit of discussion about this. She agreed with Commissioner O’Connor that the proposed colors are lovely on the paint chip, but look very dark on the renderings; therefore, she agrees with staff’s recommendation to stay with those color families because they are lovely, but to lighten them up. She noted that her inclination when looking at the renderings provided is that there is an awful lot of those colors on a large part of the building. She added that she is never inclined to mess around with color schemes, elevations, or anything else at the last minute because she is not a colorist or an architect. She stated that she likes those colors but would like to see them muted.

With regard to raising the height of the sign, Commissioner Pearce stated that she originally did not care, but when she read the Minutes, she saw that there was a lot of discussion about signage and that the majority of the prior Planning Commission was in favor of a lowered sign or subdued sign, different than the gas station monument sign. She stated that, therefore, she would like to leave the sign as is, given that there is no additional information requested apart from the ExtraMile. She indicated that she likes the suggestion of putting Bernal Corners back up, questioning why the three gooseneck lamps would be left up if there was nothing to illuminate.

The other Commissioners also agreed with having the Bernal Corners sign back up.

Chair Narum agreed with the Commissioners' comments. She stated that her recollection of this is that the people who wanted to build this kept coming back to the Planning Commission, and when the Commission kept opposing the proposal, the applicant asked the Commission what it wanted, which was to have something that looks residential. She indicated that the applicants went to the Dahlin Group in Pleasanton to design this, and they determined how to put the guts of the pump in it.

Chair Narum stated that she does not think it is the Commission's job to design "on the fly" or pick colors. She added that she understands the need for the corporate colors, and wondered if, as a way to solve this problem, the applicant would be amenable to going back to the original architects, having them work with the colors, and then coming back with something that the architects feel meets what they were trying to achieve when they built the building. She indicated that she did not hear the applicant wanting to necessarily diffuse the colors and suggested a third party be considered.

Commissioner Blank stated that there are two things the Commission could do: (1) The Commission could continue the item to give the applicant the opportunity to turn this into something staff would consider as minor changes to the paint color, and the Commission will not need to see the item again; however, this may result in losing the Bernal Corners sign as the applicant is not agreeable to keeping it. (2) The Commission could approve the application as is and add that the Bernal Corners sign remain on the building. He noted that either one of this might accomplish the same thing.

Mr. Dolan inquired if the second suggestion included staff's recommended conditions of approval.

Commissioner Blank said yes, with the Bernal Corners sign being added back.

Mr. Dolan stated that either option would work and that even if the Commission opted for the second option, the first one is still available because if the proposal got to a point where staff did not think the change was substantial, the application would be withdrawn and would be approved on the staff level.

Commissioner Blank stated that the downside to Option 2 is that if it were approved, it could be appealed to the City Council, whereas continuing it gives the opportunity for the applicant to get something done more quickly by working with staff on a color muting.

Mr. Dolan agreed and stated that staff could discuss with the applicant whether or not the advice of the original designer is useful. He indicated that staff actually considered this and that the applicant is open to it; however, in lieu of requiring the applicant to do it, it might be better to dialogue with the applicant to see if there is interest in doing it.

Commissioner Blank stated that he felt continuing the matter for two weeks would give the applicant the opportunity to decide whether he wants to come back and go through the process again formally. He added that it would be quick as a hearing has already been done.

Chair Narum suggested asking the applicant.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS RE-OPENED.

Chair Narum informed the applicant that the Commission can deny the application and the applicant can then appeal the decision to the City Council, approve the application with staff's recommendations, or continue the item to a future meeting.

Commissioner Blank added that the idea of continuing the item is so the applicant can work with staff to avoid having to return to the Commission again.

Mr. Abbott noted that both options would mean working with staff and stated that his preference would be to get an approval under Option 2 and then work with staff on achieving muted colors.

Chair Narum asked Mr. Abbott how he felt about putting the Bernal Corners sign back up.

Mr. Abbott replied that personally he sees the balance in and the reason for it, and that as far as in making this decision, he would have no problem with calling it Bernal Corners and having separate uses there under one name. He stated, however, that he cannot say yes to that as a condition, and should the City make this a condition of approval, he would have the option of appealing it.

With respect to consulting with the Dahlin Group, Mr. Abbott noted that his firm is the architect of record on the original building, although it was not his project per se. He stated that he thinks there was a loggerhead and the suggestion with the owner at that time was to bring somebody else to break the loggerhead, which was the Dahlin Group. He indicated that he had no interest in going back to the Dahlin Group architect to asking how to paint the building.

Commissioner Olson stated that he was in favor of using Bernal Corners but indicated that staff should determine if anyone has filed on that name and whether or not the City can in fact use it or if someone's approval is needed to use it.

Mr. Abbott indicated that he could certainly ask this question of Chevron, as well as the buyers, and what rights they had when they bought it.

Commissioner Pentin noted that when it was still a Shell station, people would refer to it as Bernal Corners, and that even if it is now Chevron, he believes it would still be referred to as Bernal Corners.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Blank moved to approve Cases P11-0065 & P11-0066 subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit A, with the addition of a condition that the existing Bernal Corners sign remain on the central gabled building element on the west side of the convenience market building. Commissioner Pentin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Blank asked whether or not, based on Commissioner O'Connor's comment, the chilled wine color should still be used.

Commissioner Pentin stated that he did not have problem with the color. He noted that there are still gas pumps in front, and anyone driving by cannot see the entire elevation.

Commissioner Blank added that the color will be muted.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Blank, Narum, Olson, Pearce, and Pentin
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
RECUSED: None
ABSENT: None

Resolution PC 2011-26 approving Cases P11-0065 and P11-0066 was entered and adopted as motioned.

Commissioner Blank requested that should this item move forward, staff include in the Council's future packet all of the Planning Commission meeting & workshop Minutes as well as those of the City Council.

7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

No discussion was held or action taken.

8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION

a. Information regarding Private HOAs/CC&Rs and the City's development review process.

Mr. Dolan reported that staff met with Commissioner Blank to discuss some of his concerns on this topic. He stated that staff had done some research and provided information found to date to Commission Blank. He added that after some discussion, they determined there were additional items to research, and Commissioner Blank wanted to be able to think about what was discussed prior to taking it to a formal discussion with the Commission. He indicated that staff proposes to continue this item to the next meeting on August 24, 2011, while continuing to look into this issue.

b. Future Planning Calendar

Chair Narum asked staff if a date has been set for consideration of the Housing Element Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Ms. Stern replied that all the Commissioners are available for a special meeting on September 26, 2011 to consider the EIR. She requested the Commissioners to hold this date, and in the event the agenda is light for the September 14, 2011 meeting, staff will put this item on that meeting's agenda and inform the Commission accordingly.

c. Actions of the City Council

No discussion was held or action taken.

d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator

No discussion was held or action taken.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

No discussion was held or action taken.

10. REFERRALS

No discussion was held or action taken.

11. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S INFORMATION

No discussion was held or action taken.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Narum adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully,

JANICE STERN
Secretary