

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A Virtual Meeting of the City of Redondo Beach Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Elder at 7:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Hinsley, Toporow, Strutzenberg, Ung, Godek, Berg, Chair Elder

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, Placeworks
Halley Grundy, Placeworks
Veronica Tan, Housing Consultant

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Ung led in the Salute to the Flag.

D. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to approve the Order of Agenda, as presented. Motion carried unanimously (7-0), by roll call vote.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1 Receive and File Blue Folder Items

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to receive and file Blue Folder Items. Motion carried unanimously (7-0), by roll call vote.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1 Approve Affidavit of Posting of Planning Commission Regular Meeting of April 15, 2021

F.2 Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of March 18, 2021

F.3 Receive and File Planning Commission Referrals to Staff Update

Commissioner Hinsley pulled Item No. F.2. from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration.

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese announced there were no e-Comments or written communications received regarding the Consent Calendar.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to approve Items No. F.1 and F.3 of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously (7-0), by roll call vote.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

G.1 (F.2) Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of March 18, 2021

Commissioner Hinsley stated he would like additional time to review the minutes from March 18, 2021.

Commissioner Strutzenberg requested a change to page 4 of the minutes for the paragraph regarding communication between the property owner and neighbor. Staff will verify the requested changed based on the meeting video.

Chair Elder requested a change on page 10 for the date of swearing in to the school board from April 26th to April 27th.

Commissioner Toporow requested a change to page 8 to state “.....respect for the law of nature.”

Commissioner Strutzenberg had technical difficulties and left the meeting, temporarily.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to verify suggested edits and continue Item No. F.2 to the next Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried (6-0), by roll call vote with Commissioner Strutzenberg, absent.

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION NON-AGENDA ITEMS

H.1 Receive and File Written Communications for the Planning Commission on Non-Agenda Items

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese announced there were no e-Comments and no members of the public wishing to speak on non-agenda items.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Berg, to receive and file written communications for the Planning Commission on non-agenda items. Motion carried (6-0), by roll call vote with Commissioner Strutzenberg, absent.

Commissioner Strutzenberg returned to the meeting.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS - None

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION

L.1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GPAC) RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN AND MAP

Discuss, receive public input/comments, consider, and make a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council on the Draft General Plan Land Use Plan/Map which will support and inform the Draft Housing Element Update and serve as the basis for the required environmental analysis (California Environmental Quality Act – CEQA) of the City’s ongoing General Plan Update

CONTACT: SEAN SCULLY, PLANNING MANAGER

Community Development Director Brandy Forbes introduced the item and Consultants Wendy Novak and Halley Grundy, Placeworks and Veronica Tan, Housing Consultant and addressed the review process.

Wendy Novak, Placeworks, displayed a PowerPoint presentation on the General Plan Update and Recommended Land Use Plan addressing the purpose of tonight’s meeting, background, the GPAC and its role, the collective effort, changes in State law, the General Plan and required elements, reasons for the update, progress to date, community workshops, future planning considerations, new State laws affecting housing, the GPAC’s original recommended LUP before law changes, RHNA and RHNA requirements, solving RHNA considerations, affordability breakdown of the City’s RHNA allocation, breakdown of draft allocation, RHNA strategy estimates, potential moderate and above moderate income sites and potential low and very-low income sites. She detailed recommended land use changes for the City, the GPAC approach to land use, the foundation for the recommendations, recommended land definitions, focus areas, total acres and types of changes, differences between the recommended plan and the current plan and density examples.

Community Development Director Forbes explained the RHNA cycle is eight years while the City’s Housing Element is currently a four-year cycle and planning the land use involves a longer term. If the City can submit its Housing Element and adopt it by the deadline, it will return to an eight-year cycle.

Ms. Novak reviewed maps of where comments came from; discussed available searches and information; displayed maps addressing the current General Plan for specified areas and the corresponding recommended land use plan; addressed the 190th Overlay Area, Kingsdale, PCH Central South of Ruby, Tech District Residential Overlay Compatibility with Northrop, and differences from the current General Plan.

Commissioner Hinsley expressed disappointment that the Planning Commission has only one opportunity to consider this matter; noted this subject needs to be given more time for a deep dive; suggested considering what the City would look like in twenty years and what needs to be done to meet the eight-year RHNA cycle.

Chair Elder noted the Commission has flexibility in terms of making recommendations.

Commissioner Strutzenberg referenced the RHNA 20% buffer; noted there is nothing in SB 166 requiring a 20% buffer and asked why it is being built in at this time.

Veronica Tan, Housing Consultant, referenced the HCD Guidebook, AB 1397 provides specific requirements on how to do site inventory; developed a memo regarding the process and sites that could be included and recommended a buffer of 15% to 30%.

Commissioner Ung pointed out when low-income housing was added, there was a ground rule indicating you could not have it in a specified area and asked how that was defined in the process.

Ms. Tan reported there is no definition, and the added requirement came from AB 3686 and one of the requirements prohibits concentrations of low-income housing. She added that because there is no specific threshold to meet, the idea is that the City has to make sure there are opportunities in other areas of the City and reported if some of the census tracts are considered to be low resources, the City must have a plan related to community and neighborhood improvements.

Commissioner Ung referenced public comments noting residents feel some areas are concentrated and noted the need for objective criteria that would suggest they are not concentrated.

Discussion followed regarding when the City was made aware of the RHNA allocations; spoke about SCAG's evaluation of methodologies and discussed their determination of a methodology that no one had evaluated.

Commissioner Berg commended the GPAC and staff on their hard work; wished the Planning Commission had more time to study the item and noted he will have to rely on how the GPAC deliberated.

Community Development Director Forbes reported it was a lengthy process of evaluating the focus groups and developing options in the focus areas and stated the GPAC evaluated comments and options and voted on its recommendations.

Commissioner Toporow asked about cities pushing back on the State and Community Development Director Forbes explained currently, there is no judicial review, challenges are made through HCD and HCD makes the final ruling and reported there is current legislation that would add judicial review. She added that the City has challenged the methodology all along the way and noted other municipalities are having to up-zone/re-zone.

Commissioner Toporow stated there is something inherently wrong in not having a judicial process; noted a discrepancy between State requirements and the vision for the City for the next twenty years; discussed zone changes causing changes in property values, commented on the separation of north and south Redondo Beach; preferred looking at the City as a diverse, five-district city and asked about consideration of the AES site.

Discussion followed regarding the increased possibility for non-profit developers once a certain density is reached.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the Commission may make a recommendation to consider and include the AES site.

Commissioner Hinsley agreed with Commissioner Toporow to consider the City as a whole, five-district, diverse city and in response to his question, Community Development Director Forbes noted that per State regulations, SCAG determines the methodology and allocations.

Chair Elder opened public comments.

Alisa Beeli expressed concerns about the impact adding 950 housing units will have on her neighborhood, community, schools, traffic, and property values; felt the distribution of units needs to be equitable among the five districts; stressed the AES site needs to be considered as an option and opined north Redondo is repeatedly treated unfairly.

Wally Marks, Commercial Property Owner, spoke in support of the Kingsdale/Galleria assessment, consolidation of sites and higher densities.

Bob Pinzler, GPAC, spoke about an item included in the General Plan document provided to the Planning Commission that was not given specific notice to the GPAC relative to the PCF zone including "residential care for the elderly" and wondered how many other edits were made without consulting the GPAC. He recommended that the Planning Commission delete "residential care for the elderly" from the PCF zone.

Marcie Guillermo agreed with the suggestions made by Mr. Pinzler; wondered how the number of units are determined, based on the sizes of roads and sidewalks; suggested the Commission consider that PCH and Torrance Boulevard are major corridors and continue with the old plan.

Holly Osbourne referenced AB 1258; noted it will allow cities to challenge HSC on RHNA; spoke about the City's RHNA allocation and reported the City of Los Angeles led the charge in increasing the City's allocation.

Community Development Director Forbes reported City Council will consider support for AB 1258 at its next meeting as well as another initiative giving control back to Charter cities to make their determinations on land uses.

Suzanne Nguyen expressed concerns with increased traffic in her neighborhood; spoke in support of spreading the RHNA equally, among the five districts and agreed that if the 20% increase is not a requirement, it should not be implemented.

Planning Analyst Portolese read eComments from the following members of the public:

Matthew Kilroy expressed concern that the methodology for counting ADUs is flawed and should be challenged.

Michael Garlan stated the housing allocation submitted by the GPAC is unfair to residents of north Redondo Beach and suggested spreading the housing allocations equitably between north and south Redondo Beach.

Minh Nguyen, asked that the housing allocation be spread equitably between north and south Redondo Beach and suggested consideration of the AES property.

Amy Luthra asked that the housing allocation be spread equitably between north and south Redondo Beach.

There were no other public comments.

Chair Elder acknowledged the public's concerns; reported this is not something the City is pushing but rather it is being forced on the City by the State.

Commissioner Strutzenberg noted the 20% buffer is not a requirement but rather, discretionary; discussed the potential for housing at the Galleria; addressed the proposed overlay and the potential for near-term development to qualify for RHNA within the eight-year RHNA cycle; spoke about the AES not being available, yet and the need for remediation of the site; commented on the removal of mixed-use on the west end; reported the south PCH corridor is a very dense area and suggested matching the zoning to existing conditions for credit.

Planning Manager Scully reported it is not an underutilized site and therefore, would not qualify for RHNA credit.

In reply to Commissioner Strutzenberg's question, Ms. Novak discussed the GPAC review, the need to match the GPAC's recommendations to State requirements and an additional meeting for the GPAC's consideration. She added that all of the GPAC's decisions are documented on the website.

Commissioner Strutzenberg referenced the Torrance/PCH intersection and in response to his question, Planning Manager Scully reported it is recorded as a mixed-use recommendation and included as potential for near-term development.

Discussion followed regarding recommended land definitions and discrepancies, setting higher numbers than what is required and getting credit for same and creation of an MU-2 in the Coastal Zone.

In response to Commissioner Hinsley's question, Community Development Director Forbes discussed the review process and next steps and addressed the number of residents living within the City's two zip codes.

Commissioner Godek commented on the AES site not being available and in response to her question regarding the City having to fill in the gap elsewhere, if a developer does not build to full capacity, Planning Manager Scully used the Galleria site as an example of the City having to make up for the shortfall in other areas.

Housing Consultant Tan added there may be a proposed bill making developers responsible to build at full capacity with mechanisms that if developers do not build at target densities, they would have to pay an in-lieu fee.

Commissioner Ung commented on the AES site being unavailable but noted units do not have to be built but rather, there must be a realistic capacity to build, and Community Development Director Forbes stated it must have the ability to be developed within a given timeframe.

Commissioner Ung discussed considering other areas where overlays might be appropriate, the importance of providing options for at least a perception of equitability, the possibility of park land at the AES property and spoke about mixed-use on PCH along commercial zones and providing options in other areas.

Discussion followed regarding the 20% buffer, carefully considering where to allow it and setting a lower buffer margin.

In response to Commissioner Hinsley question, Housing Consultant Tan reported the RHNA numbers do not include density bonuses and they are not counted until there is a project. She added that for every 100 units built, the City would lose 100 units of feasible sites for lower income and noted the no net loss is not just on the absolute number but also on the income distribution. Commissioner Hinsley felt a 10% buffer would be reasonable.

In reply to Commissioner Ung's question, Housing Consultant Tan reported there is a buffer in the current plan and used the Galleria project as an example. Commissioner Ung referenced the Legado project, where the developer built lower than the maximum.

Chair Elder commented on the need to find low and low-income housing units which can be achieved with high-density housing.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed the Legado project noting it ended up at 115 units which was maximum for the lot they developed.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to recommend a 10% buffer to City Council. Motion carried (6-1), by roll call vote with Commissioner Strutzenberg, opposed.

Discussion followed regarding considering the AES site, recommending dwelling units or mixed-use on a specified percentage of the site, building commercial and park land on part of the property, giving City Council options to choose from, the public's past rejection of 600 units on the AES site and low probability they will accept 750 units on the site, the need to consider many variables and providing recommendations over 2,500 so that City Council can decide what is the most equitable and in the best interest of the City.

Relative to the AES site, Commissioner Ung recommended 30 dwelling units/acre on 50% of the property.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend that City Council consider mixed-use with 30 dwelling units/acre for up to 50% of the AES site to offset some of the overlay alternatives previously recommended.

Substitute motion by Commissioner Hinsley to recommend that City Council zone 10 acres at 45 dwelling units/acre, just residential. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Motion carried (5-2), by roll call vote with Commissioners Hinsley and Strutzenberg, opposed.

Chair Elder noted challenges in terms of high-density units.

Chair Elder discussed the North Tech District and reported concerns that the City's RHNA is high because the City has residential zones in transit corridors.

Housing Consultant Tan reported the RHNA methodology changes every cycle and noted the methodology was changed at the last minute, during this cycle, with emphasis on access to transit and accessibility to jobs.

Chair Elder spoke about finding areas of mixed-use for all areas; noted challenges in the North Tech District and discussed considering parking requirements and having strong incentives to use transit.

Commissioner Berg agreed with Chair Elder's comments; noted residents do not want added housing in the North Tech District; addressed the lack of resources in the area and felt mixed-use would not be appropriate.

Chair Elder proposed no more than 250 units in the North Tech District.

Commissioner Hinsley recommended no housing and finding housing somewhere else in the area such as along Aviation Boulevard between Artesia and Manhattan Beach Boulevards.

Community Development Director Forbes provided background regarding the Kingsdale area including the GPAC recommended LUP, lot consolidation and a property owner's proposal of mixed-use with 60 dwelling units/acre for the consolidated area.

Commissioner Strutzenberg recommended keeping the GPAC's original recommendation of 30 dwelling units/acre.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend that City Council consider keeping the GPAC's original recommendation of mixed-use at 30 dwelling units/acre in the Kingsdale area.

Substitute motion by Commissioner Berg to recommend that City Council consider the lot consolidation and residential use at 60 dwelling units/acre in the Kingsdale area. The Substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of the City getting partial credit for the GPAC recommendations and the possibility of getting credit at 45 dwelling units/acre.

Commissioner Ung offered a friendly amendment changing residential to mixed-use but there was no support from the Commission.

Substitute motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Berg to recommend that City Council consider the lot consolidation area as residential use at 45 dwelling units/acre in the 3-acre consolidated lot on the north end of Kingsdale. The Substitute motion carried (5-2), by roll call vote with Commissioners Strutzenberg and Ung, opposed.

Discussion followed regarding the current zoning immediately south of the consolidated lots and fragmented sites not suitable for assembly.

Commissioner Hinsley recommended returning the area south of the consolidated lots to its current zoning, since the City will not get RHNA credit for any below-market housing in the area.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Chair Elder, to recommend that the Kingsdale area south of the lot consolidation area remain as the existing lower-density, residential land use. The motion carried (5-2), by roll call vote with Commissioners Strutzenberg and Ung, opposed.

Commissioner Hinsley referenced the southeast corner of Artesia and Aviation, north of Carnegie; discussed existing uses in the area and recommended future development of mixed-use at 30 dwelling units/acre on the site.

Commissioner Berg expressed concern about adding housing on one of the busiest

intersections in the City.

Commissioner Hinsley suggested recommended housing on a percentage of the site.

Commissioner Berg noted existing an age-restricted development on the site and in response to his question regarding what constitutes a residence, Community Development Director Forbes confirmed assisted-living facilities count towards RHNA if they have kitchens and noted that age-restricted housing is housing.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg, to recommend residential use at 30 dwelling units/acre on the southeast corner of Artesia and Aviation, north of Carnegie. The motion carried (7-0), by roll call vote.

Commissioner Hinsley suggested removing mixed-use on Green and Artesia; noted commercial on the first floor is not well utilized and recommended adding housing in one or two blocks of Artesia Boulevard.

Chair Elder commented on the COG recommending a neighborhood-oriented design with commercial at major intersections and residential in the middle.

Commissioner Ung spoke about ensuring horizontal mixed-use versus vertical mixed-use.

Ms. Novak reported the GPAC considered Commissioner Hinsley's recommendations in the past and made prototypes to determine what would be appropriate. She offered to review the matter if the Planning Commission recommends residential on Artesia Boulevard.

Commissioner Strutzenberg felt this would be a great opportunity for form-based zoning and Community Development Director Forbes indicated that is an example of something that could be considered.

Discussion followed regarding the senior residential building across the Library, the need to accommodate parking when considering residential on Artesia, the possibility of reducing parking requirements and the GPAC's determination that the only way to make residential, feasible, was to allow three- and four-stories.

Motion by Commissioner Berg, seconded by Commissioner Ung to table consideration of Artesia Boulevard and maintain the GPAC's recommendation. The motion carried by consensus.

Regarding the PCH north area, Commissioner Ung spoke about the industrial and commercial plex zones and suggested it as a residential overlay zone.

Commissioner Strutzenberg referenced the public institutional zone noting it includes residential care for the elderly and felt it should not be included as they are commercial entities and expressed concerns regarding the FAR of 1.25 and requested, they be removed.

Discussion followed regarding the southeast corner of the Galleria site, the number of units proposed for the residential overlay, identifying specific lots and sites for residential and the possibility of adding housing to the Galleria site.

Commissioner Hinsley recommended that City Council consider the southeast section of the area for housing.

Commissioner Ung felt it would be better to consider the entire area.

Discussion followed regarding a residential overlay in the Pacific Crest Cemetery area.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend that City Council consider the southern location of the Galleria south overlay to be more targeted in terms of which areas to be used for the housing at 30 dwelling units/acre (approximately 300 units). The motion carried (5-2), by roll call vote, with Commissioners Strutzenberg and Ung, opposed.

Discussion followed regarding the feasibility of building a pedestrian bridge in the PCH area.

Commissioner Berg suggested removing the Whole Foods shopping center and leaving it commercial.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Toporow to recommend that City Council consider applying the residential overlay to the commercial plex and industrial zones in the PCH area. The motion carried (4-3), by roll call vote, with Commissioners Strutzenberg, Hinsley and Berg, opposed.

Discussion followed regarding options for PCH Central south of Ruby.

Commissioner Toporow stated it would be best to keep the area, commercial.

Housing Consultant Tan noted consideration is given to zoning as well as the viability of specific properties and reported that in terms of residential, the City can only count the net increase.

Planning Manager Scully reported the City would lose 150 units.

Discussion followed regarding new legislation allowing churches to remain and using their parking areas.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommended removing mixed-use on PCH and Torrance Boulevard, replace it with commercial plex and consider Option B. The motion carried (4-3), by roll call vote, with Commissioners Strutzenberg, Ung and Chair Elder, opposed.

The Commission considered Beach Cities Health District sites.

Commissioner Strutzenberg suggested removing the PI category in terms of including residential care for the elderly and the FAR recommendation of 1.25.

Commissioner Hinsley commented on residential care for the elderly as a conditional use.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley to remove the FAR from the PI category and consider a description change to make it consistent with the General Plan description. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Ms. Novak stated she will investigate the issue.

Community Development Director Forbes suggested investigating the description change of the category PI relative to including RCFE and removing the FAR of 1.25 from the definition.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Hinsley, to recommend to City Council to investigating the description change of the category PI relative to including RCFE and removing the FAR of 1.25 from the definition. The motion carried (7-0), by roll call vote.

Discussion followed regarding the North Tech District and Community Development Director Forbes noted prior discussion to recommend having the North Tech District overlay to be reduced or removed.

Planning Manager Scully reported the current unit count is 1,432 and reviewed the proposed changes in RHNA Strategy estimates.

Community Development Director Forbes reframed her suggestion to recommend for the North Tech District overlay to reduce or remove only additional units needed in the commercial zone.

Commissioner Hinsley noted that between the AES site and the residential overlay of the commercial zone next to it, there are 1,000 units between PCH, Harbor Drive and Anita and felt that should be carefully reviewed.

Community Development Director Forbes stated there will be recommendations that the City Council will and will not agree with and noted they will recognize the need for balance.

Commissioner Hinsley letting the City Council know these are options recommended by the Planning Commission and asking them to take them into consideration when deciding on allocations.

Chair Elder suggested letting City Council know the Commission is not, intentionally, trying to force housing into one area.

Commissioner Ung noted the Commission is providing City Council with options to consider in making their final decision.

Commissioner Godek suggested recommending reducing instead of removing units from the North Tech District.

Community Development Director Forbes restated her suggestion to recommend for the North Tech District overlay to be reduced to only include any additional units needed and limit it to only the commercial portion east and north of the railroad and SCE right-of-way.

Commissioner Toporow stated it the area is developed properly; it would change the quality of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ung suggested consideration of the former Aviation High School site (immediately east of the tracks) would be a good candidate for an overlay.

Commissioner Hinsley suggested that City Council consider increasing the FAR in the area between Marine and Manhattan Beach Boulevard, east of Aviation for more of a campus use.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Chair Elder, to recommend that City Council consider the area east of Aviation Park and Aviation track for mixed-use. The motion carried (4-2-1), by roll call vote, with Commissioners Strutzenberg and Hinsley, opposed and Commissioner Ung, abstaining due to proximity of the area to his employment.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, Commissioner Godek, to recommend that City Council consider increasing the FAR in the area between Marine Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard, east of Aviation to maximize commercial/industrial use for more of a campus use. The motion carried (6-1), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Ung, abstaining due to proximity of the area to his employment.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend to City Council to consider the North Tech District overlay be reduced to only include any additional units needed and limit it to only the portion east and north of the railroad and SCE right-of-way of the overlay. The motion carried (5-2), by roll call vote, with Commissioners Strutzenberg and Berg, opposed.

Commissioner Hinsley referenced 190th Street near Hawthorne Boulevard; noted there is a 97-unit complex on the corner that was R3 but was down-zoned in 1992; stated there are many examples of that throughout the City and asked what can be done to get credit for what exists, today.

Housing Consultant Tan reiterated the City can only count net increase to meet RHNA requirements and discussed what the City of Los Angeles did as a policy, where the city is allowed to rebuild what currently exists. She added that the City is not allowed to count inclusionary units until they are built.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek to recommend that City Council consider areas that could be downzoned for additional RHNA credits. The motion carried (7-0), by roll call vote.

M. ITEMS FROM STAFF - None

N. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF

Chair Elder noted this is his last Planning Commission meeting and thanked staff and his Commission colleagues for their help.

O. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Godek motioned, seconded by Commissioner Hinsley, to adjourn at 1:30 a.m. on April 16, 2021 to the next Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, May 20, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (7-0), by roll call vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director