

MINUTES

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

March 4, 2013

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Evans, Leon, Gordon
and Chair Langille
Absent: Commissioner Campbell

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Evans

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director George White
Associate Planner Lee Diaz
Associate Engineer Ray Donguines

**APPROVAL OF ORDER
OF AGENDA** Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the Order
of Agenda; Commissioner Leon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Evans, Leon, Gordon
and Chair Langille
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
FEBRUARY 19, 2013** Commissioner Evans moved approval of the
minutes of February 19, 2013; Commissioner Leon
seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0-2**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Evans and Leon
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioner Gordon and Chair Langille

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF March 11, 2013:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None

CONSIDERATION:

Adoption of Resolution Certifying that Vacation of Portions of Olympian Way and Pompeiian Way conform to the General Plan. Recommended CEQA status: Exempt.

Assoc. Planner Diaz presented the staff report. He then mentioned that Ray Donguines from Engineering was present to answer any questions.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he had the original map from a previous hearing and had the present map. He could not find the additional 1,600 square feet and asked if someone could mark his map.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines then marked his map.

Commissioner Clifford gathered that everything that he crossed out was not as the additional.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively. He explained that previously the applicant requested the vacation of only half of Pompeiian but they are now asking for vacation of the whole right-of-way which was the 40 feet of Pompeiian and half of Olympian and which was consistent with what was requested prior.

Commissioner Clifford asked if they were asking that it be vacated and they receive the property or was that half going to the property owners on the other side of the right-of-way.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that Pompeiian Way was dedicated at the edge of the subdivision and there was no other property owner in this subdivision and, theoretically, the vacated portion can be acquired by this property owner. He explained that it had happened to the south (orange) which was fully vacated and the whole right-of-way was acquired by the adjacent property owner.

Commissioner Clifford asked when that happened.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that the vacation to the north (pinkish) happened in 1953 and he didn't have the exact date for the one to the south but it was acquired back in 2012.

Commissioner Clifford stated that they have never done a vacation there.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines explained that they acquired the property in 2012, but the vacation took place before the city was incorporated.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that it was done prior to 1957.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively, adding that it was vacated by San Mateo County.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he kind of remembers what happened at the last meeting. He thought, if they split the street down the middle in terms of the right-of-way, half would go to this property owner and half would go to the property owners in Shelter Cove.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines explained that Shelter Cove does not belong to this subdivision and they have no right to this.

Commissioner Clifford asked confirmation that it abuts the right-of-way but they have no right to it.

Assoc. Eng. Donguines responded affirmatively, adding that only the properties within this subdivision have rights to the vacated right-of-way.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he wanted to be clear about it with no misunderstanding. He assumed that they were talking about 5,200 sq. feet.

Planning Director White confirmed that it was 5,262 sq. feet.

Commissioner Clifford thought that was equal to more than what they consider a regular lot, which would be about 5,000 sq. feet.

Commissioner Evans thought, in the first map, all they were doing was following the lines from what they had done the previous year, the west half of the paper street.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon stated that the yellow portion was what they approved for vacation at the last meeting, then on looking at the map with the multiple colors, he was trying to understand, based on the discussion with Commissioner Clifford, that the properties abandoned by San Mateo County were vacated decades ago.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon stated that they were now talking about the purple area and half of that has already been approved at the last meeting.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines clarified that it was in April of last year.

Commissioner Gordon asked the reason for wanting the additional vacation.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that the applicant returned because he found out later that the full width of the right-of-way was vacated to the north and south and he just wanted to follow what had originally been processed.

Commissioner Gordon thought the reason for the vacation at the last meeting was for the public access.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon asked if they were saying now that they wouldn't get public road access with what they already vacated.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that they still have access either way.

Commissioner Leon thought, in the yellow map, access provided was identified as abandoned Parcel #2 which gives access to Olympian Way.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon asked where that was.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was powder blue, an abandoned lot, Parcel #2, and provides the connection.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the additional land being vacated was not connected with the need for public access.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded that the city does not have plans for any public access in any portion of Pompeian Way.

Commissioner Gordon thought he had read somewhere in the staff report that it was the reason for the vacation this time around.

Commissioner Clifford asked if there were other ways to grant access other than vacating this property, and specifically asked if an easement would work. He asked if it would work if the city were to grant an easement across the parcels to their lots and would that be a viable option to have access to their two lots.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded that it would still be viable, but it was already accessible as it was.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that, one way or another, they would have access even if the property was not vacated.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that they do have access, with a little portion of Olympian Way they can access their property.

Commissioner Clifford assumed that access was not really an issue on this matter.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines did not think it was an issue.

Commissioner Clifford then clarified that they did not approve a vacation at the last meeting but approved that it was in accordance with the General Plan. They were not approving a vacation now, which was what the City Council would do if they so choose to do that.

Commissioner Leon stated that one rationale he understood was that the reason for justifying this additional vacation was because all the adjoining properties with similar right-of-ways had been granted a vacation as was being sought here.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines agreed that was one rationale. They didn't want to keep a 20-foot strip of land that doesn't go anywhere.

Commissioner Leon believed it was staff's position that this would remove any maintenance or other burdens on the city regarding this remainder of right-of-way.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon read through the prior minutes and agreed with Commissioner Clifford's comment that they approved conformance. He added that one of the rationales stated was that conformance to the General Plan was that all the lots in the area were single family residences and this action was to be maintained as a single family residence, which was one of the conformance criteria that he read from the prior minutes. He asked if that was a fair statement.

Planning Director White agreed, adding that, if they look at the draft resolution, it made three findings that were consistent with what he said, reading the specific wording in the draft.

Commissioner Leon concluded that the prior vacation of lot #2 did establish access so that the lot was no longer landlocked.

Commissioner Clifford asked if there were other ways to alleviate the city's concern about liability for this particular piece of property, such as assessing its value and putting it on the market.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines explained that this was not a property in fee by the city. It was granted as a right-of-way by the developer.

Commissioner Clifford asked him to explain that to him.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines explained that, when Pompeiian Way was dedicated, it was dedicated as a right-of-way which means that the City and the public have a right to build roads and have access. It was never given to the City as a property that was developable but merely as public access as a road. The City does not own it. They own an easement or right-of-way on top of the property and, if the Council has the right to vacate that right-of-way, then the underlying land goes back to the developer. He reiterated that the city did not own the land underneath the right-of-way or easement.

Commissioner Clifford commented that the developer was no longer in the picture, so he assumed it went back to the adjacent property owners. He added that he wanted to understand the process.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines confirmed that the adjacent property owners who front the right-of-way have the rights to the vacated right-of-way or the easements.

Commissioner Clifford assumed that the city had no rights to the property other than to keep it as a right-of-way.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Chair Langille asked, if there were multiple adjoining property owners, did it go to whoever actually applies for the vacation.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that the adjacent property owner can request the abandonment but, when it comes time to actually acquire it, they can only acquire half of the right-of-way or what

fronts your property. He stated that they are only able to obtain those portions of the right-of-way that are adjacent to the lot line from another process, not through the vacation process.

Chair Langille assumed that took place in another process down the line, not what was in front of them now.

Commissioner Evans stated that, according to the memorandum in front of them, it states that the Commission did not have any authority regarding approval or denial of the proposed vacation but was limited to determining General Plan conformity. He asked, when they confirmed General Plan authority the previous year over the first half of that land, whether there were any differences before them at this time compared to the previous year.

Planning Director White stated that it was just that the area being vacated was bigger, but the circumstances were the same.

Commissioner Evans reiterated that the circumstances were the same but the area was larger.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon commented that, because other adjoining properties were vacated, and they found the two lots to be in conformance, the remaining portion being sought would be landlocked. If the decision makers chose the scenario where only the two original lots were granted, the remaining right-of-way would be landlocked and the city would need permission to access it. He asked if he was correct.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines agreed, stating that, if this was not granted, the access to the remaining right-of-way being sought now would be very limited.

Commissioner Leon assumed that we would have responsibility for maintenance that we could not access.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

The applicant chose not to comment.

Chair Langille opened public comments.

Karl Baldwin, 111 Olympian Way, stated he was giving a notification to the city in writing which indicated that there was a pedestrian trail along the southerly boundary of his property which was adjacent to the property owner requesting the vacation. He explained that the trail has been used for a long time for viewing the ocean and the surrounding scenery, and he felt it should remain intact regardless of the vacation decision. He acknowledged that the only decision at this time was whether the vacation was consistent with the General Plan, but he asked that this trail be considered when this item comes before the City Council.

Chair Langille closed public comments.

Commissioner Clifford stated that the comment brought up a question. He asked if public trails were considered part of the public right-of-way.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that there was no official city trail in the right-of-way at this time.

Commissioner Clifford acknowledged that it was not official, but he asked, if the public has created a trail in an ad hoc manner, does that trail legally exist.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that it didn't exist for City purposes.

Commissioner Clifford thought they might want to double check that with the City Attorney.

Commissioner Leon thought they served the applicant and the interests of the City best by bringing out as many issues as they can for the decision makers to weigh at the time that they take official action on the vacation. He mentioned that this property was in the Coastal Zone, and if there were any Coastal Zone issues, he was sure the City would be looking at those in regard to coastal access. He referred to his earlier question regarding a landlocked right-of-way parcel and questioned whether it was in the City's interest. He thought it was ironic that this started out providing access to a landlocked private parcel and now was turned around. They have seen it consistent to grant but, in doing so, they have created a landlocked right-of-way of what was a public right-of-way. He thought that all the adjoining properties have possibly benefited or at least incorporated the former right-of-ways into their holdings and he didn't see a reason for this one not to be handled in the same way. He felt they would have to wait to see the resolution of the trail issue. He thought he would vote in favor unless he hears a compelling argument against it.

Commissioner Gordon asked the Planning Director if he was aware that there might be a pedestrian path in the area under consideration.

Planning Director White stated that he was made aware of that today, followed up by the speaker's comments.

Commissioner Gordon stated that the question before them was whether the vacation was in conformance with the General Plan. He commented that, at this time, it was merely anecdotal that there was a path being used by the public. He asked, for discussion, that they assume that it was true. Because the City has the right-of-way, the public was able to use it to enjoy the surrounding environment.

Planning Director White acknowledged that they have used it, but whether they are able to use it was another question.

Commissioner Gordon asked him to make further comments on that.

Planning Director White reiterated that the purpose of the right-of-way was to build a road which was never built and never used for the specified use. Now, it was proposed to vacate the use and return the land to the adjacent property owner. However, in the meantime, they would consider that there has been unauthorized use of the area for a trail. He wouldn't say that was a bad thing, but the city was not part of that, didn't build a trail, didn't maintain a trail, didn't encourage the trail to be built, and the legal status of the trail would be something that they would have to explore before the Council would make a decision on the vacation now that the city was aware of the situation. He stated that he did not have the legal answer for them at this time. He thought that the scope of the item in front of the Commission was to state whether or not the vacation, if it

did happen, would be consistent with the General Plan, and he felt that finding could still be made, in his mind, based on the resolution presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Brown asked, assuming the trail was there and was a valuable use of the right-of-way to the community even though it was not an authorized use, if there was a way that they could put something forward to the City Council that would encourage the lot owner to facilitate the ongoing use of that trail and not build on that lot.

Planning Director White agreed that there was always a mechanism, but the question was what was the legal status of the trail and what was the appropriate mechanism if the City and property owner want that to happen. He reiterated that he was not prepared to answer that at this time because they didn't know the trail existed until earlier today.

Commissioner Evans thought he was thinking simplistically as he stated that he had no problem certifying that it meets the General Plan because they already certified that fact with the other part of the land. However, he did believe that, for the Council's information, then also for the Commission's and city's information, it should be run past the City Attorney because he knew there were sometimes issues of land being used for many years and then becoming public land. He thought that needed to be looked at, however, he had no problem certifying that it meets the General Plan since there was nothing different in this piece than what was on the previous parcel. He reiterated that there was a legality that needed to be explored.

Planning Director White agreed, adding that their remarks will be contained in the minutes of the proceedings. He stated that, in addition, they had a written formal request from the adjacent property owner as to the nature of the trail. He stated that they would pass that on with the action by the Commission to the Public Works and Engineering Departments, following which they would prepare whatever response that their research compiled before it is presented to the City Council.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Commissioners were ready for a motion.

Chair Langille thought she heard the Engineering Department state that it was half the right-of-way, and she wanted to confirm whether it was half the right-of-way or the entire parcel.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that, since Pompeiian belonged to this subdivision and there were no other lots on the other side, the property owner will have the right to the full right-of-way. He added that, as stated before, the "pink" area was acquired fully by this single property.

Chair Langille stated that she was on the fence if it was a coastal trail that the public has been using, and there is a prescriptive easement or other terminology.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines pointed out that, on the vacated portion that was approved for General Plan consistency the previous year, the trail did go through that portion also.

Chair Langille understood, and she would like to keep any access to the public ongoing and not lose that, especially in the Coastal Zone. Her thought was to keep that coastal use trail. Commissioner Gordon stated that the finding made the previous year that the proposed vacation was in conformance with the General Plan, with the trail included in that area, wasn't relevant

because they didn't know about the existence of the trail nor did staff. He felt that was not an informed decision as far as he was concerned.

Planning Director White thought that, whether the trail was there or not, it was immaterial to the action to be taken by the Commission.

Commissioner Gordon stated that was his second point since what was driving their action was whether it was in conformance with the General Plan. He admitted that he has not memorized the General Plan but he thought there was probably something within the General Plan that talks about making sure that the public has access to, and the ability to, enjoy the environment. He thought, as a lawyer, he could find something in the General Plan that places that as a priority in addition to the right to enjoy private property. He thought it would be a sense of balancing the two interests. He reiterated that it didn't make sense to say that it was in conformance with the General Plan because that was what they found the previous time, as he didn't think it was taking the full picture into account. He thought they were assuming that there was nothing in the General Plan that would apply to this situation.

Planning Director White agreed that, using that argument, they could go back and look at the General Plan and see if there was anything that talks about an unauthorized trail on an existing, unused right-of-way. He added that he didn't know if there would be anything like that in there since this is a unique situation. He stated that staff was willing to do that if that gave the Commissioners the information needed to make their decision, adding that it was their call.

Commissioner Gordon reiterated that, if it was a trail being used by the public, albeit unauthorized, they have a valid public use on the one hand.

Planning Director White didn't know about the term "valid."

Commissioner Gordon stated that there was a concept called adverse possession. He thought someone referenced it on the dais.

Planning Director White understood that, adding that they were typically tested in court cases and that was not what they were doing at this time. He thought it made sense for the City to find out what the legal status of that trail was, and that was what he would suggest to the Engineering Department when they move it on to the City Council, assuming it does move on to the City Council. He stated that, if they want staff to do more in terms of looking at the General Plan and bringing back the parts of the General Plan that they might think apply to the situation, staff was willing to do that. He reiterated that if that was what they direct staff to do, that was what they will do.

Commissioner Gordon understood, adding that, in order for them to evaluate the application of the General Plan to the situation, they would need to know the legal status of the trail.

Planning Director White was not sure, but if that was the direction given to staff, that was what they will do.

Commissioner Clifford agreed that, saying they approved something with a trail on it in the past when they didn't know the trail was there and was not part of the discussion, made that comment irrelevant. He didn't approve it because there was or was not a trail, since he didn't know about a

trail and it wasn't part of his decision making. He thought the issues of whether or not they should wait for legal status of the trail before they make the decision regarding whether it conforms to the General Plan was kind of an important question. He wasn't sure where he wanted to go with that, but it seemed like an important question as to whether it actually affects whether it was in conformance with the General Plan. If the public has been using public land and created a trail, regardless of whether it was authorized by the City, did that mean the public maintained the right to that access and were they right in saying it should be given away.

Planning Director White thought it was important to use the correct terminology. As Mr. Donguines pointed out, these are not public lands, but private property with a right-of-way.

Commissioner Clifford thought it was a public right-of-way that the public has been using as a trail.

Planning Director White reiterated that it was a right-of-way which essentially gives the City rights to do certain things which was to construct a street that was never constructed.

Commissioner Clifford stated that the property didn't belong to anyone at that point, since it didn't belong to the applicant.

Planning Director White stated that we don't own it in fee title. It was just a right-of-way and there was an underlying ownership which was the original developer of the subdivision.

Commissioner Clifford commented that the original developer was not in the picture.

Commissioner Brown appreciated the dialogue and he wanted to bring up the counterpoint which was that there was a property owner who has owned a lot that is currently inaccessible and the original request for vacation was to remedy that situation. He felt they were balancing ownership of land with public trails. He questioned whether a vacation was consistent with the General Plan. He wasn't sure they heard anything that tells them that it is not.

Commissioner Evans asked if, when the City vacates a property and it goes back to the adjacent property owner, that property owner will come the next year and pay additional taxes on the property.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines agreed that it becomes a taxed property.

Commissioner Evans assumed that no one has paid taxes on that property up until this time.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans then asked staff if there was anything in the General Plan that they can think of that identifies with this trail coming across private property.

Planning Director White stated that there was nothing that they could find regarding that.

Commissioner Evans thought it didn't make any difference.

Planning Director White agreed, adding that it was what he had commented on earlier. He stated that, short of doing an exhaustive page by page analysis of the General Plan on this issue, he could not say it with absolute certainty.

Commissioner Evans understood, adding that the legalities were another issue, and he still wanted that to be addressed by the City Attorney. He felt that, with the General Plan, he didn't see it to be different than what they saw last year, whether there was a trail there or not. They didn't know about the trail last year, and thus it conformed to the General Plan. He then referred to staff saying that they don't know of any issues in the General Plan to which they can point that would cause the trail to make any difference.

Planning Director White stated that they did not.

Commissioner Gordon stated that the City has a right-of-way on the land that was owned by a private property owner. He asked if that legal interest by the City would be the basis for some kind of agreement with the private property owner that would allow for a trail.

Planning Director White stated that he had mentioned earlier that it would be up to the Council to determine the status of the trail and whether some arrangement could be made for both situations to coexist. He reiterated that, without knowing the legal status of the trail, it was hard for him to answer the question. He thought there was always a mechanism if they want there to be one. He stated that he didn't know what it was or what was appropriate, he didn't know what the applicant was willing to do, and there were a lot of unknowns. He thought those were the sorts of things that the Council in the scope of their authority can consider.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he was concerned because they haven't done an analysis about conformity with the General Plan, given the new facts.

Planning Director White stated that they have done an analysis, mentioning the point being made by Commissioner Evans as to whether the now known existence of this possibly unauthorized trail changed the analysis provided to them. He didn't feel that it has, but staff was willing to do the work if they want staff to do it.

Commissioner Gordon felt that was the question. If it doesn't change the analysis, then he was right and the existence of the trail was irrelevant to their analysis.

Planning Director White stated that it was irrelevant to their action, but it was probably relevant to subsequent action by the City Council.

Commissioner Gordon understood that he was saying it was irrelevant to deciding whether it was in conformance. He thought the Planning Director was saying that it was unlikely that there was anything in the General Plan that would be inconsistent.

Planning Director White reiterated that he thought it was unlikely that there was anything in the General Plan that deals with this specific circumstance.

Commissioner Gordon was willing to wager money on that, and he agreed, but he was asking if there were more broad general principles that would be in play.

Planning Director White reiterated that, if they were not comfortable making the determination without that work being done, then he would suggest that they direct staff to do the work.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he was probably not in favor of making a vote until he finds that out, and he was also not interested in unnecessary delay. He also didn't want to make extra work for staff.

Planning Director White stated that was what they were there for.

Chair Langille mentioned again that it was in the Coastal Zone. She was not an expert on the General Plan but definitely on land use issues, where there are trails, whether they are legal or illegal, there was a general favoring of keeping trails and access along the coast. She didn't know the Coastal Plan well, but there was something about coastal trails in there mentioning a preference for having coastal trails and public access. She thought it would be interesting to find out.

Commissioner Leon stated that he was comfortable moving forward with a caveat. He mentioned Parcel #2 was needed for access to the landlocked parcel which was the one they found in conformance the previous year, and that has a trail on it.

Assoc. Engr. Donguines stated that, coming from Olympian, Parcel #2, that was where the trail would be going through.

Commissioner Leon didn't believe they were in a position to answer the question at this meeting, but in the analysis of the trail, given that the parcel is in the Coastal Zone, he recalled an analysis of and restriction of construction between the last street and the ocean where coastal access exists. He thought there was some connection between the last street and he was pointing out a direction which they won't find the answer to at this time. He didn't think they should delay this for the answer. He thought there were a combination of factors, the location of the trail, the location of the existing road where Parcel #2 comes in and the ocean, and the need for construction to take place on that vacated parcel in order to provide access. He believes that was where the analysis would focus and that in combination with what the legal status of the trail was, possibly that it has no legal status at all. However, he felt comfortable in moving the resolution along and was willing to make a motion.

Commissioner Leon moved that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** the resolution next in order entitled, "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA CERTIFYING THAT THE PROPOSED SUMMARY VACATION OF PORTIONS OF OLYMPIAN WAY AND POMPEIIAN WAY RIGHT OF WAY CONFORM TO THE GENERAL PLAN"; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-1-1**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Evans and Leon
Noes:	Chair Langille
Abstain:	Commissioner Gordon
Absent:	Commissioner Campbell

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Leon asked for information on a future study session for which he just received notice.

Planning Director White stated that he was going to mention that. He stated that it was the rescheduled study session about commissions and committees, and vacancies on the Commission. He reminded them that they have five potential vacancies on the Planning Commission that occur at the end of March. He stated that in the notice, it also indicated that it may be necessary that the terms be held over until the issue was resolved since, if they are talking about it on the 20th, they probably will not have it completely resolved by the end of March.

Commissioner Leon assumed that it would be automatic.

Planning Director White thought that was what the intention was.

Chair Langille thought there didn't need to be a Council vote.

Planning Director White thought that would be the discussion on the 20th and he wasn't sure what the discussion will entail. Since they put that language in the notice, he assumed that was what they thought would happen because there were only 11 days and they would have to take another action in April to deal with the actual vacancies and reappointments.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director White stated that he was going to mention the study session discussed in Commission Communications.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Evans, Leon, Gordon and Chair Langille
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

Planning Commission Minutes

March 4, 2013

Page 14 of 14

APPROVED:

Planning Director White