

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

June 4, 2018

7:00 p.m.

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Rubinstein, Stegink, Clifford, Gordon,
Kraske and Chair Campbell
Absent: Commissioner Nibbelin

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Rubinstein

STAFF PRESENT: Sr. Planner Murdock
Asst. City Attorney Sharma
Contract Planner Aggarwal

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Vice Chair Clifford moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Gordon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Rubinstein, Stegink, Clifford, Gordon,
Kraske and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MAY 21, 2018 Commissioner Gordon moved approval of minutes of May 21, 2018; Vice Chair Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Rubinstein, Stegink, Clifford, Gordon,
Kraske and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 11, 2018:

None required.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

S-166-17

File No. 2017-033 - Specific Plan SP-166-17 for the construction of a three-story, 3,643 square foot (sf) single-family residence on a 5,618-sf vacant lot at 327 Beaumont Boulevard (APN 009-037-470).
Recommended CEQA Action: Class 3 Categorical Exemption, Section 15303.

Contract Planner Aggarwal presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Clifford referred to the survey portion, stating he was curious about the trees. He stated that the one in the southern corner appears to be not only on the property before them but in the city right-of-way and on the adjacent property and doesn't indicate that it is wholly owned by the applicant, and the next one is just a stump. He stated that the biggest drip line was indicating six inches at two feet up, but that is the Monterey Cypress and is at least twice as big as the one in the lower corner. He thought it was also a shared tree. He asked staff if they have the survey report and how it was accomplished.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they did not, explaining that the entire information of the topographic survey is included in the plan sheet that he referenced.

Vice Chair Clifford thought the six inches was clearly wrong and he will be having a problem with what was in front of him as it doesn't add up with what is on the site.

Commissioner Stegink referred to the Peters' letter on the adjacent property, and he asked if there was any responsibility for the applicant to repair the adjacent property.

Contract Planner Aggarwal asked if he referred to repairing the adjacent property from the shoring that was done.

Commissioner Stegink responded affirmatively, adding that it was a bizarre jumble of past applications. He was curious if there was any responsibility for the applicant to take care of that as part of this project.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he didn't have a good understanding of what he was asking that the applicant should repair. He understood a claim of over excavation with improper shoring by a prior property owner.

Commissioner Stegink thought that was accurate.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked if he was specifically talking about the claim of undocumented fill and whether that needs to be removed and remediated.

Commissioner Stegink responded affirmatively.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that it was on the project site and she didn't think it was identified in the geotechnical report that the applicant submitted as being on the neighbor's property.

Commissioner Stegink stated that he was talking about something west of the project property, and he assumed that was what the Peters and Souza were referring to as it was quite obvious.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the Peters letter is from 329 Beaumont which is to the east and if there was damage or other features to the west, he wasn't sure they would relate to damage incurred by the owner of 329, but the project would have to account for the site conditions and whatever undocumented fill or other soil conditions, and it has been designed to account for those. He stated that anything beyond the property line was not in question, based on the information staff has.

Commissioner Stegink was of the understanding that he was referring to 327 Beaumont towards the ocean from the project property.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the Peters' owner is at 329, just to the right or east of 327 Beaumont, the subject application site, and there are claims of over excavation and placement of undocumented fill in the past, but those are issues that need to be worked through by the project applicant to ensure the site designed and constructed safely.

Commissioner Gordon referred to Vice Chair Clifford's comments, and asked, in the event that one of the trees is located on the project site as well as a neighboring site, whether there were any legal implications of the Commission approving the removal of the tree without the consent and agreement of both property owners.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that the City's Heritage Tree ordinance does not speak to that circumstance, but that the property owners would need to resolve the dispute among themselves.

Commissioner Gordon concluded that they need consent of all property owners whose tree is on their property.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that while the ordinance does not specify what to do in that circumstance, should the Commission wish to proceed with entitling the tree removal, the Commission can do that. She stated that, if there is a dispute about the location of the tree, the property owner can settle that dispute with the neighbor.

Commissioner Gordon assumed that she said the Commission can agree to the removal of the tree and it doesn't matter if it is a shared tree or not.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma responded affirmatively.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that staff was not aware that there was a controversy over removal of the tree until today and there may be many unanswered questions about the relationship between the neighbors that is better vetted with any public comments that might come up or with a query to the applicant as far as what outreach may have been done with the neighbor.

Commissioner Rubinstein stated that he was going to follow up on whether there was any history between the parties about maintenance of the trees, pruning, etc.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that staff is not aware of any history in that regard.

Derek Vinh, applicant, thanked them for the opportunity to give a brief presentation of their project.

Mr. Vinh stated that the owner of 324 Beaumont was a Bay Area native and contractor for the last 30 years. He stated that this was a project he would like to build for his retirement and his entire family was looking to stay in Pacifica for his retirement. He described the building being designed to minimize the massing of the building and visual impacts. He then explained the various details in the design, including the retaining wall, to keep it from being intrusive into the street side. He referred to landscaping details, including their plan to replace the trees with trees that don't grow too tall and block the view from the building behind them. He stated that there was a project approved at 325 Beaumont in 2016 and it was to design something compatible and similar to what was approved to neighboring residents with the scale of the home fitting with the neighboring residents. He stated that the project would take about 18 months to build, and gave planned work schedules, adding that they were happy to work with the neighbors on any concerns they have. He stated that, regarding the shoring, as an engineering firm, they have looked at the project and will provide proper shoring during the building stage.

Commissioner Kraske asked if the arborist who wrote the report was available.

Mr. Vinh stated that he had a copy of the arborist report with him.

Commissioner Kraske clarified that he was asking if the arborist is present at the hearing.

Mr. Vinh stated that he was not.

Commissioner Kraske stated that his concern was regarding the trees slated to be removed. He referred to the arborist's report stating that it was a steep lot but the removal of the trees will not have an effect on the slope's ability as the entire slope is being developed. He asked how they know that, by removing the trees, it will not affect the slope. He thought they were holding the slope together and removing them could present a hazard.

Mr. Vinh stated that this would be a question for the arborist. He stated that they conducted a site visit and peer review of the project, and this was their conclusion with their report. He stated that he can consult them and have them give a more thorough explanation of that reason.

Commissioner Kraske stated that he would appreciate the clarification from the arborist if he can get that.

Vice Chair Clifford referred to their operating hours, and asked if they would allow that to be a condition of approval. He stated that it wasn't normal construction hours according to city regulations.

Mr. Vinh responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Clifford concluded that they would allow that to be added as a condition of approval of the 8 am-6 pm on Monday through Friday, and 9 am-5 pm on Saturday, with no construction on Sunday. He stated that the city's regulations were 7 am-7 pm on weekdays, and he asked if he was willing to have that as a condition.

Mr. Vinh responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that on the survey presented on the trees, the biggest of the trees has an indication on it that it was only 6 inches around, 2 feet above. He knows that is not correct, and he asked if they have talked with the neighbor about the trees in terms of who owns what.

Mr. Vinh stated that they have not spoken with the neighbors, but this will be the first to talk to the neighbors about the trees. He stated that the same surveyor who surveyed their lot also surveyed 325 Beaumont and that's why they used the same surveyor who knows a lot. He realized that the tree was misrepresented and they will take the initial steps to meet with the neighbor and figure out who owns the trees, adding that they are happy to work with the neighbor.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that they will need to meet with him about the one lower tree because based on 14-15 inches circumference at 2 feet above the ground and the diagram on the plan, part of that tree is also on his property and he will need to talk to him about those. He wasn't certain what he was going to do from his standpoint.

Chair Campbell opened the Public Hearing.

Don Peters, Pacifica, stated that he owns 329 Beaumont. He didn't want to grant access on his property and didn't want their machine ripping his property. He stated that there was a surveyor's monument done years ago in the middle of one of the trees. He didn't want the trees cut down. He planted them. He thought this new excavation is dangerous. He stated that it caved in before. He stated that there are streetcar poles in it from San Francisco. He stated that the guy excavated it and, when it started caving in, he took off and never came back. He stated that it was a damaged piece of property. He stated that there was never any shoring done. He reiterated that the trees are on his property and he doesn't want to grant access to anyone and be liable.

Rebecca Johnson, Pacifica, stated that she and her husband reside at 329 Beaumont. She stated that, since they moved there in March 2014, they have seen two properties dug out of the hill and abandoned. She stated that this was a third property and they would have three properties under construction on the hill. She stated that it was a big concern to all of the residents as it damages the hill, puts it at risk of slides and removals of trees exacerbates the situation. She stated that they have a high level of concern about the integrity of the hill, the property in which they reside, and the proposed property development at 327 Beaumont was a failed project. She stated that she wanted to confirm that they have three pieces of documentation in front of them which she submitted, addressing the original fill not properly compacted and another around the trees. She referred to Mr. Peters' concern of improper shoring, adding that it was abandoned and the property was given to the bulldozer operator in lieu of payment. She stated that the excavation was completed to the street when the hillside collapsed and compromised his property and substandard fill was then used to fill the hillside. She thanked them for the hours of construction which was a concern as a working person wanting peace and quiet on weekends and was glad there will not be any construction on Sundays. She acknowledged that this triggers the mega-home ordinance and she wanted to be sure that the proper paperwork is filled out for that.

Lawrence Souza, Pacifica, stated that on the hillside on Beaumont they have 315 and 317 vacant lots, 319 as a failed project and a collapsed hillside and someone took it over and was starting to do some work. He stated that they have put concrete and haven't moved on the property but personally felt it should be red-tagged. He stated that at 321 Beaumont they had problems building that one and ended up for selling for cost because of the soil issues and landscape issues. He stated that the city had 323 under review which was already under consideration. He stated that he spoke to the owner of 325 Beaumont and he admitted that he underestimated the geological issues associated with the site and probably should have done more geologic tests and surveys before starting construction and tearing out the hillside. He was concerned because there was another property owner present who lives above, adding that he would be concerned about it collapsing or a failed hillside from 325 Beaumont. He stated that it doesn't look like it is going forward. He stated that 327 is next to their property, mentioning that Mr. Peters knows the history regarding collapsing hillside, lack of shoring, and now the tree issues. He was also concerned about the substandard fill if it is taken out and the same thing they did at 318 and they were just looking at another failed project. He felt that looking at the projects and lack of standard and care by the Planning Department and Building Department not going out and red-tagging some them. He felt there was lack of care and he was concerned about the health and safety of their neighborhood.

Rumy Mirza, Pacifica, stated that he owns 296 Farallon Avenue. He stated that it is the house right above the project. He echoed what everyone has been saying. He stated that they moved into the neighborhood in 2016. He stated that it was good and peaceful and all of a sudden at 323 Beaumont they started digging. He stated that, as an engineer, he was interested and spoke to the surveyor and asked him if they had soil reports and the structural integrity. He stated that, after talking to one of the architects who worked on the previous project, he learned that it was a failed project in the past and they dug out the hillside and the city backfilled it with subpar landfill. He was not sure what has happened to that project, but on looking at how they have left it, it is a site for sore eyes. He was mentioning that as a concern. He stated that it has been a challenging project to build on these hills because of the steep topography. He realized that you can build a 1,800 square foot house by not digging too deep, but when he sees the city approving mega-homes of 3,600 square feet, he felt that digs in. He didn't believe that the concrete used today can hold the structural integrity of the hill that well during an earthquake. He urged the city to get a more detailed soil report and look into those things. He then referred to a concern for the trees and natural habitat and he felt that has to be resolved with the property owners. He asked the city that construction schedules are adhered to, and not just dig out a piece of land and leave it there. He stated that it is a risk. They hike around there and their properties are there so he worries that his child might run out and go further down the hill and fall into that hole. He stated that there was no proper fencing and a big hole that is adjacent to their home down the hill which scares him.

Sharyn Ryan, Pacifica, stated that she has lived above Beaumont since 1974 and she has seen the hillside change. She stated that there are Dolger homes all the way down and at Gordon and Beaumont and mentioned the one site that was an eyesore for many years. She stated that they tried to talk to the homeowners association and that project was supposed to be huge and was not in keeping with the neighborhood. She stated that, on walking around the neighborhood, there were several properties on Farallon being constructed and for sale. She stated that every new home since she has been in the neighborhood has cut down all the trees. She stated that was one hill and all the trees are disappearing. She stated that, if they ever have flooding, it was so steep that it will literally wash away the people on the other side of Beaumont below these homes. She

thought it was terrible, mentioning that the bluff was so beautiful and spectacular, but these projects are not kept in line with the adjacent housing, the time frame or fix the mess behind. She was worried about all the trees being gone from every new home being built, with no tree on any of those homes.

George Frank, Pacifica, stated that he lives in the neighborhood on Coral Ridge Drive. He was in favor of projects like this and he encourages development in the area. He thought the proposed design looks tasteful. He added that this particular area has proven to have a number of abandoned projects in the past. He stated that Mr. Peters' home demonstrates a proof that you can build a certain sized home. He would like to see some assurance, if the Commission has the authority, to have some level of deposit or bond that, since previous projects have been abandoned, they would have a correction plan in case it is abandoned to at least fill it and return it to something not half way done and abandoned.

Helena Packoluk, Pacifica, stated that she was a homeowner on Coral Ridge and used to work for the Fairmont Homeowners Association. She stated that they were going to develop on Coral Ridge. She then heard about the lots below and has seen how it has been drawn to get the work done and they are wondering what is going on. She stated that the lot at the top of Gordon had construction in the 1990s and there was a problem which was why they couldn't finish the construction. She stated that the project started again the past fall and it has been many months and they are wondering if there is going to be a problem again.

The applicant was provided an opportunity to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Vinh stated that a main concern is an abandoned project and the structural integrity of the property. He stated that their team has experience building on hillsides in other cities. He stated that they are confident that they can provide a sound structural integrity that the neighbor can review. He believes that the Building Department is more engaged and they were engaged in working with a suitable structural design for the lot. He stated that the owner was a contractor with 30 years of experience and he is building this for his retirement home and he didn't believe this is something he will abandon. He stated that he is eager to start and work on the project with his team.

Vice Chair Clifford asked if he is willing to provide a completion bond.

Mr. Vinh stated that he would speak to him and he believes he will consider it.

Vice Chair Clifford felt they need to talk about it.

Mr. Vinh stated that he was confident that he will be looking to do that, but he will talk to him.

Zon Chu, owner, asked if he was allowed to speak.

Chair Campbell agreed.

Mr. Chu stated that he was a long term Pacifican and lived at 330 Beaumont in the 1990s for ten years before he moved on. He knows Don Peters and the history on that particular lot from the beginning. He stated that it has been abandoned since the 1980s. He took the initiative to purchase the lot. He stated that, because he was a partner in the neighboring lot at 325 Beaumont,

he tried to do something about it. He stated that nothing has been done in the past 20 years, having owned the lot since 1999. He stated that, with the proper engineering, he believes the lot will be very much better than what it is now. He was more than happy to talk to Mr. Peters about the trees. He stated that trees should not be a main issue, but rather whether the job can be completed. He was happy, if there was a thing called a completion bond. He was not coming to fool around. He spent a lot of money on it this time, last time and the time before. He stated that he has been through the hearings and usually keeps his mouth shut and lets the Commission make the decision. He stated that this time it was important to him. He stated that the design he came up with the architectural firm was something he wants. He stated that it was based on the maximum height, lot coverage and amenities for him. He has no purpose to fool around and try to jeopardize his neighbors.

Commissioner Rubinstein mentioned that speakers spoke about adjacent parcels and he found that confusing as he didn't know how they related to his parcel. He asked if he was involved in the development of any of those other parcels or previously involved for the parcel he owned.

Mr. Chu stated that he doesn't own the parcel next door at 325 Beaumont anymore but in the past a couple of plans were approved. However, development never occurred because there was a partnership issue. Since then, he believes his partner sold his lot to the current owner at 325. He has no idea what was going on with the current project which has nothing to do with him. He stated that the previous project which included both 325 and 327 Beaumont got approval, but they never touched the ground and never excavated.

Commissioner Stegink referred to the viability of a completion bond for the neighbors and remembered a case at 801 Fassler where they asked about that and it wasn't an option for pursuing, and he asked the city attorney why it might be possible for pursuing in this case and not 801 Fassler.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma did not recall a completion bond on 801 Fassler.

Commissioner Stegink asked if they have the right to request one if it is a mutual agreement.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was not part of the city's standard process and staff would ask for the opportunity to consider and provide a recommendation on it before the commission might require it. He stated that their typical procedure is that they give an applicant a building permit and they have a finite period to execute their construction project with that permit. If they do not complete it, the city pursues nuisance abatement for partially completed structures. He stated that was the way things work currently under the city's code. He stated that there sounds like there have been some challenging circumstances on this site over recent decades but it didn't sound like any of those circumstances are attributable to the applicant who is before the Commission.

Commissioner Stegink asked if there were two close properties that are being submitted for development.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that there are three properties in the vicinity, one immediately to the west at 325 Beaumont. He stated that the Commission approved that project as the applicant's architect indicated. He stated that the building permit for that project was issued and expires in September 2018. He stated that there was a project to the left of that at 323 Beaumont approved by the Planning Commission and that project has not pulled a building permit yet, but after

speaking with the owners recently, they indicated they were trying to pursue some sort of common construction schedule with 325 to save money on retaining walls, but that did not work out. He stated that they are intending to pull the permit and begin work relatively soon. He stated that the last one at 300 Coral Ridge, a few lots to the west of 323 Beaumont, they are actively pursuing their project, most recently on May 11 passing a footing inspection and the property was also recently purchased by new owners in March 2018 and by all accounts that project is moving forward.

Chair Campbell closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Campbell referred to all the projects mentioned that were in development in the vicinity, and asked if there was a common ownership.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that not to staff's knowledge, adding that the owners indicated on all those applications they were separate entities.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that, until he has some definition on who owns the trees, he wasn't willing to okay cutting them down. He stated that, if they are on their property, he will not have a problem with it, but if a shared tree, they are going to have to have that worked out before he can move forward with this project. He suggested that, if the trees were a problem for this project, they shrink it a bit on the sides and bring it back that way so the trees are no longer an issue at all.

Chair Campbell heard all the public comments and there is a concern about the cumulative impacts of development on this steep hillside that could lead to a public hazard of some sort, and he asked the city's thinking on the various stages of excavation and what is proposed on a cumulative basis.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they are relying on qualified structural and soil engineers to design these projects to be independently stable and designed for the site context. He stated that they have not been presented with any information that would suggest that any of these projects constructed on their individual lots would present any type of cumulative impact to the slope. He stated that the public commenters are speculating about some impact and perhaps there is a common sense element to it, but from an engineering technical standpoint, the professionals who are preparing these studies and analyses and designs have not indicated that there is such a hazard and staff was relying on those licensed professional engineers to prepare appropriate plans for the sites.

Chair Campbell stated that he didn't want to question a qualified engineer as they are the experts. He wondered if each engineer is doing their own analysis in isolation or are they doing it cumulatively. He stated that they have seen issues in other parts of the state and country where homes have been built on steep hillsides and there has been catastrophic flooding, landslides, and he was sure each home was built pursuant to a stamped engineered plan in isolation, but he wondered about it cumulatively. He asked if anyone has looked at all this cumulatively.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, in the event that the Commission were to opt to continue this item, which remains a possibility, given questions about the heritage trees, then they can ask the applicant's qualified professional engineers to comment on that issue and take a look at the other projects in the immediate vicinity and render an opinion in their professional judgement on that issue.

Chair Campbell thought that was a good suggestion.

Commissioner Rubinstein stated that Mr. Peters had mentioned access to his property, and he asked if the project required access to the adjacent properties for it to be built.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the applicant has not indicated at this point that access would be required, and from the method of construction, they will probably be excavating downgrade on their own property and it may not be necessary to enter the other property. He added that, if the trees prove to be on the adjacent property or straddling the property line, then access may be required to remove them. He stated that they would ask the applicant to follow up response to address that as well.

Commissioner Gordon thought Sr. Planner Murdock and Chair Campbell had a very good suggestion about having an examination of the cumulative impacts of all of these projects in the neighborhood. He stated that some of the pictures submitted by the neighbor at 329 Beaumont did seem to indicate there is some kind of property line marker in the middle of one of the trees, which addresses Vice Chair Clifford's comment that the trees are an issue. He stated that, since the neighbors know each other, they might want to resolve that issue. He thought it was awkward to approve the removal of a heritage tree that is partly on the site of another property owner who says he planted the tree. He stated that the design itself was beautiful and he would love to see more of these kinds of designs in Pacifica, modern, tasteful, and works well with the topography. He was very excited about the project but the deeper you dig into it you do see some issues. He would love to see it built, but he feels for the neighbors who live above. It seems a little unsettling for the neighbors above to be seeing this project potentially built. He added that it wasn't fair to punish the present applicant for the sins of other builders who tried on adjacent properties and failed and abandoned their projects in various states. He thought a completion bond would address that issue so, if the project did start and had to be stopped, the neighborhood would have some recourse to restore the lot to a reasonable state. He thought a completion bond would address that issue. He felt it wasn't fair to punish the applicant for what others have done.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that he was so focused on the trees that he did not say that he does like the project and it is a very attractive project. He was personally leaning toward not frosting the glass on the mezzanine deck. He thought that would make that project appear bigger and would also reduce the enjoyment of the property itself by having the glass frosted and losing the view from the house. He agreed that there are issues and when everyone has had an opportunity to comment he will move to continue the item so some of these questions can be answered.

Chair Campbell echoed Commissioner Gordon and Vice Chair Clifford's comments. He stated that everything else about the project was really attractive and they were only looking for clarification on a few issues.

Commissioner Rubinstein echoed that, stating that the design is refreshing and it is nice to see a quality design presented before the Commission. He urged the commissioners to rely on the professional reports that are generated by the geotechnical and soils reports that indicate that the site was developable and not second guess it based on some perceived risk. He thought the general contractor would have to have his own qualifications to do those types of excavations in that type of work, which is a special class of license.

Chair Campbell appreciated his comments and asked staff's thoughts on that. He understood that there wasn't a cumulative type of look at what was going on that hillside among several projects in development or about to start development. He was curious if staff thought this was being unreasonable to ask for a cumulative impacts analysis, not in a CEQA sense, but the city taking a look at this.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was a reasonable aspect of the project and relates to public health, safety and welfare. He stated that there are neighbors in the neighborhood that have concerns about this and they were not asking the applicant to go into a full blown detailed engineering analysis of every site which would be costly and burdensome and he would have issue with that. He thought they should ask the applicant to have a qualified professional describe how, if at all, the surrounding projects could impact this site and what measures, if any, are necessary in the engineering design to account for that. He stated that they will leave it open-ended for the applicant's qualified engineer to address the cumulative construction concerns.

Commissioner Stegink agreed both Commissioner Rubinstein and Chair Campbell and was wary of a single homeowner in the line of three, being charged a million dollars to repair the neighborhood when the others do not get hit in the slightest, and he would like to see it done without it preventing this project from occurring.

Vice Chair Clifford moved to continue this item.

Chair Campbell asked staff if they were comfortable about clarifications being asked by the Commission.

Sr. Planner Murdock was comfortable, adding that he thought they received appropriate direction to carry out the Commission's intent to gather more information. He recommended continuing to a date certain. He thought it was a bit aggressive but he thought it may motivate the parties to work together. He stated that the next date is June 18, and alternatively they would have to look at July 16, which was a rather lengthy delay due to staff's recommendation to cancel the July 2 Planning Commission meeting. He stated that they can look to June 18 if that was the desire of the Commission, and if the parties are not able to bring themselves together to an agreement or need more time, they can continue the project again.

Vice Chair Clifford moved to continue this item to June 18, 2018; Commissioner Kraske seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Rubinstein, Stegink, Clifford, Gordon,
Kraske and Chair Campbell.

Noes: None

CONSIDERATION:

None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Sr. Planner Murdock remarked that the City Council did adopt the ordinance for 801 Fassler, implementing the development plan and the rezoning, reminding them that the Commission approved the development permits for the project and recommended the ordinance to be approved and adopted by Council, and Council did take care of that on May 29. He stated that, at the May 29 City Council meeting, they also introduced the short term rental ordinance and the second reading for adoption will take place in two weeks.

Chair Campbell asked if they will need a Commissioner present for that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they did not typically have a Commission liaison for the second reading.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Vice Chair Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m.; Commissioner Stegink seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Rubinstein, Stegink, Clifford, Gordon, Kraske and Chair Campbell
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister