

MINUTES

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

February 22, 2022

7:00 p.m.

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

Chair Nibbelin explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to Government Code Section 54953 (as amended by AB 361), to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function as a teleconference meeting with no meeting location open to the public. He also gave information on how to present public comments participating by Zoom or phone.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser, and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: Commissioners Ferguson and Leal

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Domurat

STAFF PRESENT: Dep. Planning Director Murdock
Contract Planner Aggarwal

Chair Nibbelin asked if there were any public comments on order of agenda and Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that there was no one.

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

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

Chair Nibbelin stated that, prior to approval of minutes, he wanted to correct some typos. He outlined the requested revisions to the minutes and asked if anyone had any other comments or would entertain a motion if anyone is inclined.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
JANUARY 18, 2022** Commissioner Hauser moved approval of the minutes of January 18, 2022 as changed; Vice Chair Berman seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser
and Chair Nibbelin

Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2022:

Chair Nibbelin asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock to confirm that they do not need a liaison for the Council meeting.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Dep. Planning Director Murdock introduced the speaker.

Clif Lawrence, Pacifica, stated that this day is the birthday of our first President who once stated that we be mindful of the importance of the role of citizens. He then thanked staff for the updated draft EIR and draft General Plan and pointed out some of the concerns he had with what has been updated and not updated and asked the Commission, as citizens, to grade the quality of the documents.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**S-133-20
SE-31-22**

File No. 2020-014 – Sign Permit S-133-20 and Sign Exception SE-31-22, filed by Mike Terron of Northwest Signs, to establish a Master sign program for on-building tenant signage and revisions to the design of an existing freestanding sign along Oceana Boulevard at the Eureka Square Shopping Center located at 20-210 Eureka Square (APN 016-220-140). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 11 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15311.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock presented the staff report.

Commissioner Hauser stated that this was a detailed staff report, but there was one thing over her head. She referred to the staff report stating, in the event of a narrow business frontage, the proposed MSP provisions could result in signs that have sign areas inconsistent with the PMC provision, and asked if any of the tenants are currently contemplated as narrow.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock didn't think so, stating that the math works out to about a 13-foot linear frontage which is very small, but on occasion you will find spaces carved up, such as when the economy is not as good and people downsize their spaces. He stated that it was probably an unusual situation, but to ensure that in all instances the signs would be consistent with the Pacifica Municipal Code except where the exceptions may be granted by the Commission as noted in the staff report.

Commissioner Hauser referred to the places where secondary signs are allowed for one tenant, she asked if there was a spacing requirement that you can't have two of those secondary signs next to each other.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he wasn't aware of one, but Contract Planner Aggarwal is also present and has done a lot of detailed work on this and he stated that she could chime in if she is aware of such a provision.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that the elevations show the general locations of the secondary signs - the elevation which shows the anchor tenant. She thought it was the west elevation and they are showing the main sign and show two locations for the secondary-signs. She stated that there were three locations for the secondary signs, and it could be on two of those locations.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that would be on packet page 78.

Commissioner Hauser thought it was on page 11 of the sign program, on the bottom elevation.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that it was on the west elevation.

Commissioner Hauser stated that it was west elevation retail.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would open up to the applicant then the public and asked if the applicant was present.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that the applicant, Mike Terron and owner, Thomas Biagini were both available.

Mike Terron, applicant, stated he was with Northwest Signs.

Chair Nibbelin asked him if there was anything specifically he wanted to state beyond what staff reported.

Mr. Terron stated that, in the monument conditions, it sounded like in the conditions it says all tenant panels will have the same font style as the center ID and he was under the impression they were going to allow the market to have their logo and font style. Also, they proposed that the tenant panels to be routed aluminum back with translucent acrylic but they didn't propose them to be push through as that adds cost for the tenant and there are limitations in being able to route the little sign faces and have pushed through acrylic which is a half inch thick acrylic and actually pushes through the openings for the letters. He stated that those were the only two things he noticed in the conditions.

Chair Nibbelin asked to confirm if Mr. Biagini had anything to add, and if not, is there public comment.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he does, but he was on mute.

Thomas Biagini, owner, referred to packet page 79 and the south building, SW elevation retail, and one of the conditions is that the signs will be in a horizontal access, but on looking closely they will see that there are three grade elevation changes and he wanted to be sure staff understands he is agreeing to horizontal access within each grade elevation. He stated that there are three separate grade elevations and they will be on a horizontal access within each grade elevation.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock introduced the speaker.

Julie Haas, Pacifica, stated that she had a problem understanding the illumination of the signage as it says that it is internally lit and her concern was the volume of light. She didn't know how it compares to the existing and was concerned that it might be bright for the house north of the shopping center.

Chair Nibbelin closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hauser appreciated the improvements the shopping center did, and she thought it was nice to update the signage. She thought the graphics presented in the signage program are clear and she was used to seeing sign programs that have more annotation on things such as are neon signs allowed, moving animation signs allowed, changeable copy signs, and the like, and she also wondered if there is going to be wayfinding signs throughout the center. She didn't see anything that struck her as off or didn't concur with staff's assessment, but just that she didn't see as much information as she was used to and she wondered how that is going to be controlled or contemplated.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock agreed with her that sign programs often have a long list of prohibited sign types, and he thought it was a belt and suspenders approach to have that, and ultimately the first issue is that the Pacifica Municipal Code has various types of prohibited signs which would apply regardless of whether they are specifically stated as being prohibited in a master sign program. He stated, more importantly, this master sign program has a specific allowable type of sign for the wall signs, and any sign that is other than sign type would not be allowed because it would be inconsistent with the master sign program, mentioning an example of exposed neon, as it wouldn't meet the specifications of the sign type.

Commissioner Hauser found that helpful. She asked about the wayfinding question and she also asked if there was a requirement that any painted metal sign would be a certain finish or will they allow painted metal signs.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated, regarding the wayfinding signs, there was no requirement for wayfinding signs in the municipal code and he didn't think the applicant had proposed any wayfinding signs. He thought Contract Planner Aggarwal might have had those discussions with the applicant previously. He stated that it could require an amendment to the master sign program in the future, such as if wayfinding signs were needed. He stated that this was not a large or complex shopping center but he thought there could be some benefit for wayfinding signs at some point in the future. He thought the applicant would ultimately need to decide if he wants to pursue wayfinding signs at some point in the future. He stated that, regarding the painted metal signs, he thought he would need to need more about what she is describing.

Commissioner Hauser stated that a typical metal sign would have automotive paint for its finish where you are not painting it and in our ocean climate with salt air it starts rusting in 90 days. She wasn't seeing anything concerning, but was not seeing as much information as she was used to.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that, if she is describing if someone could paint a sign and put it up somewhere in the center, the signage would need to be consistent with the master sign program and that sign type is not permissible unless she is referring to the freestanding sign panels and concerned that the specifications are not rigorous enough on the paint for that.

Commissioner Hauser wanted to understand, for the 20-foot sign, most cars are driving between 30 and 40 mph on Oceana Boulevard and she understood that there is more square footage allowed, and she asked if that size will be appropriate or big enough for Mr. Biagini to get the cars to see it as they are driving.

Mr. Biagini stated that cars on Highway 1 are not going to see the sign as they don't even see the existing sign and it was more of a very local sub-market sign for people driving up and down Oceana Blvd., and they will see the sign well enough. He stated that they were looking at a product of a lot of discussions with Contract Planner Aggarwal and Dep. Planning Director Murdock and what they were proposing is acceptable to them and it will serve the public traveling on Oceana Blvd.

Commissioner Hauser stated that her last question was on the same monument sign on page 3. She stated that the southeast corner of the monument sign looks like it is really close to the edge

of that parking space and she understood she can't see any utilities, etc., but she wanted to be sure they weren't concerned about somebody backing into it, opening a car door into it.

Mr. Biagini stated that it was oriented in that planter island such that anybody opening a car door in the nearest stall won't conflict with the sign and it is back far enough from the concrete curving that, unless an automobile loses control, it won't be hit by cars and he thought it will be fine where it is.

Vice Chair Berman stated she was also concerned about the sign proximity to parking stalls, and she thought it was something that would also be reviewed at the building permit phase, and asked if that was a correct assumption.

Mr. Biagini stated that the new sign was going in the exact same spot that the current sign is and not being moved in any way, just shorter and not as wide.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock added that, as it relates to building code standards, he is unaware if there is a standard where that would be verified in the plan check, and he didn't want to commit to that. He would say that what was a priority for the city's review was making sure the sign would not present a threat to public health and safety from vehicle site distance and that has been evaluated and will be double-checked during the building permit review process by the Engineering Division if this master sign program is approved.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she was not aware of the building code requirement either, and she thought it was common for best practice if they are putting a parking stall next to a wall to add an extra foot or two. That addresses her concerns as long as staff doesn't have any concerns. She also wanted to touch on the public comment, as her take from the staff report was that there was a photometric analysis or consideration to the nearby neighbors on the luminosity of the signs. She asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if he would mind touching on staff's review of impact from light to the nearby neighborhood.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he will make an observation first and allow Contract Planner Aggarwal to speak more specifically to her work on that point. He thought it was important to compare the prior sign design to the current sign design as a preliminary matter. He stated that, comparing illumination is difficult and he didn't think they can descriptively do that where they sit today. He stated that, if they think back to what the signs were before, they were large cabinets with acrylic faces and had a very large illuminated surface area, and primarily had a white background which provided a lot of brightness and visual illumination. He stated that the sign design for the wall signs has channel letters and much smaller illuminated surface area. He stated that the freestanding sign similarly will have relatively small illuminated surface area by comparison to some of the large panels that were in the current sign design. He thought those two factors will likely help to not result in an obtrusive illumination. He stated that Contract Planner Aggarwal might have something to add.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that they looked at the color temperature value and research indicates that anything up to 6,500 K does not cause glare.

Vice Chair Berman thought that, with her read of the staff report, she felt confident that there would not be a negative impact on the neighborhood. She didn't think her next question will apply to this project, but she was wondering if the city has considered trying to suggest solar

panels to applicant to use for energizing signs. She understood it will not apply to this project, but she felt it was something she thought if and didn't know if the city has considered it.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock was not aware that they have considered that related to signage. He said that, since these prior signs and the freestanding sign were installed, the California energy code has advanced significantly and it is quite common to have to provide energy calculations when obtaining a building permit for new construction such as this. He stated that all he can offer is that he would imagine the level of efficiency to the LEDs, as an example, will probably result in much more efficient energy usage for the illumination than with the previous signs.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he has had a background in light physics and 6,500 K is roughly the equivalent of the sunlight on a cloudy day, somewhat overcast, so it should not be that so bright for anybody to be that concerned about it.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he wanted to confirm with staff regarding a comment made by Mr. Biagini regarding the elevations and the signage being on a horizontal axis. He indicated that there would be three grade elevation changes and he wanted to confirm that they have things on a horizontal axis within each grade elevation and he wanted to confirm staff's understanding was consistent with that.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that it was staff's intention to result in the outcome that Mr. Biagini identified where the signs were aligned horizontally within the building facades of comparable elevation, not to have them on an absolute horizontal access. He stated that, if there was some concern on the applicant's part, staff would be amenable to revising the condition of approval to provide some greater clarity as to what the intent is and allowance for a different horizontal axis per segment of façade that has a different elevation, if the Commission was interested in hearing that language.

Chair Nibbelin stated that was clear enough to him. He asked, if there are no questions, whether a commissioner was inclined to make a motion.

Vice Chair Berman thought there was one more comment from the applicant regarding Oceana Market's sign, and maintaining their standard text font.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Berman asked if that was something that both staff and the applicant agree to and is it something that they would want to work into the condition.

Chair Nibbelin thought there was also a reference to push through acrylic for signs and there was some concern about that which was raised. He asked if Dep. Planning Director Murdock would address those points.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded that he would, stating that with respect to the font, staff would have the opinion that the fewer types of fonts, the more consistent the appearance of the sign and the greater visual integrity of it, however deviation for one panel would probably not result in a loss of the integrity of the sign and staff wants some specificity as what that font would be and they could do that post-approval if the Commission approves the master sign program and limit that sign for Oceana Market or at least the anchor tenant panel, to be more generic, to a

particular font so that there is not a deviation at some point in the future to accommodate the desires of that particular tenant. As for the push through letters, he stated that he heard two reasons from the applicant's sign specialist, one was cost and one was potential feasibility concerns. He stated that it wasn't clear to him that it was potentially infeasible to construct the signs in that fashion. He thought it was staff's opinion that it would result in a higher quality of appearance to the signs to have that depth from the push through letters. He stated that, ultimately, the Commission might want to explore that with the applicant and his team to see if there is more to that particular issue.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would be interested in knowing what the feasibility issues are and what is the actual incremental cost difference to have a basis for weighing the pros and cons. He asked if Mr. Biagini or someone else can speak to that.

Mr. Biagini stated that he will let Mr. Terron reply because this is a more technical matter that he would be able to answer better than he can.

Mr. Terron stated that they were asking about the parking next to the planter where the sign will be located. He stated that he is on Google Earth now and there is a yellow area. He stated that his artist doesn't show that on his site plan and master sign plan. You can't park adjacent to that curb and that first parking space doesn't exist. He then referred to push through letters and cost, he couldn't say what the increase is offhand, but he would say that maybe \$500 per two panels might be the additional cost for push through. He stated that the push through is a half inch thick acrylic that is cut out in the shape of those letters and slips through the letters that are routed into that metal background so they stick through like a three-dimensional letter. He stated that the difficulty occurs when you get smaller lettering as they are limited to a certain space on those small tenant panels, and until they have what each tenant wants to say, you don't know for sure that it is infeasible, but it could create problems. He stated that they can make it work if that is what it has to be.

Commissioner Hauser thought it was important to have a flexibility with the anchor tenants to have the different fonts and she would be in support of that. She also concurs with staff that the push through looks better, but she is not entirely convinced either way.

Chief Nibbelin stated that he likes to have some flexibility and cost savings, but it doesn't strike him that either one will minimize the other factor by a stretch. He stated that, while he wants to be sensitive about potential costs to businesses, with the improved aesthetics from push through letters, he would be in favor of what staff is recommending.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she was inclined of being more supportive of allowing the flexibility for the anchor tenants, to the discretion of the planning director's review and approval on font size. She is willing to hear staff's overall recommendation or other commissioners.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that, from staff's perspective, having a unified font for all of the tenant panels on the freestanding sign would result in the most aesthetically appealing and integral appearance to the freestanding sign. He wasn't clear whether the Commission was considering allowing up to one panel or panels for all anchor tenants to have different fonts. He stated that, at this time, there may only be the one anchor tenant with Oceana Market, and he didn't know what the future will hold in terms of consolidation of lease spaces. He stated that, if they allowed all anchor tenants to have different fonts, they could lose the integrity in the

aesthetics to the sign. He thought, if the Commission wants to provide that flexibility, it could be limited to one anchor tenant panel or setting all the panels to the font that Oceana Market so they are unified and integral to one another.

Vice Chair Berman thought she should clarify that she was thinking on Oceana Market's building structure versus on the freestanding sign. She thought they could be the same or could be looked at differently. She was not going to die on the mound, but she thought it was good that they are talking about it.

Chair Nibbelin wanted to clarify that the applicant's request was specific to Oceana Market but not for all anchor tenants. He thought they would deviate from where they are with respect to that specific anchor tenant.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock admits that he thought the comment was specific to the freestanding sign, but if it was broader than that, he was not aware of that request.

Commissioner Hauser thought, based on what he just said, they may need some clarification from the applicant but she would be supportive of just doing it for Oceana Market if that was where they were leaning, which is what it sounds like to her.

Chair Nibbelin thought her suggestion was good and he would turn to the applicant but Commissioner Godwin had a comment now.

Commissioner Godwin likes the idea where they let the anchor tenants select the font and apply it to all the signs, as that is the one that would be most aesthetically pleasing to him.

Chair Nibbelin asked Mr. Biagini to clarify what they were specifically looking for with respect to this matter.

Mr. Biagini stated that, with respect to the monument sign, they are looking for what you see, the logo and Oceana Market in a smaller font. He stated that the other six tenants are all small independent tenants and they would have the font size that you see on the plan. He stated, regarding the building itself, Oceana Market would have a 36-inch high letter on the building façade and two smaller signs on either side would each be 18 inches. He stated that they would let him decide what font he uses, assuming that it is consistent with the Municipal Code.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock wanted to clarify that the proposed master sign program would already allow that to happen for the wall signs. On packet page 72, there is general sign information which is the general sign standards and No. 3 indicates that flexibility for all of the tenants in the shopping center to have a font type in color acceptable to the landlord and to the city. He stated that they are not seeking to prescribe the font type for all of those wall signs, but when collected in aggregate in such a small area, the freestanding sign was where they sought, through the conditions of approval, to achieve greater unity for the font style.

Commissioner Berman stated that clarification addresses her concerns and she was supportive of the staff report as written.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he would like to provide a further clarification. There was a lot of discussion about the font types but he thought getting mixed into that was the

size of the text, etc. He stated that they have not sought to prescribe letter size on the freestanding sign. He stated that they have other criteria in terms of the amount of the panel surface that can be comprised of signage to ensure there is a margin to achieve an appropriate aesthetic balance and limit the copy to two lines of copy. Otherwise, they have just sought to have all of the font styles themselves match what is shown for the Eureka Square Shopping Center panel, and if the Commission wanted to allow flexibility for the anchor tenant panel, i.e., Oceana Market, to have a different font style, they would need to make that provision to the conditions of approval, but if they were just concerned about flexibility in the size of the text, that is already flexible, in staff's opinion.

Chair Nibbelin asked if there was an interest in affording flexibility with respect to font style as to the anchor tenant, as he thought that would require a tweak to the conditions as they have presently.

Commissioner Domurat thought some flexibility would be okay. He would be concerned that, if a font or script style was picked that was not legible and not easily readable from the street as people are driving by would be a concern. He thought there may be something they can agree to that would be a choice of two or three styles to give some consistency but give a little flexibility.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he is happy with what the anchor tenant selects and it would be good if everybody else adopted the same font style.

Chair Nibbelin asked, if they were different, whether he would be supportive of allowing the anchor tenant flexibility with respect to font style if the other tenants did not track that font style.

Commissioner Godwin thought he could live with it, as he thought the sign will look a little less effective.

Vice Chair Berman stated she had no comments or questions now.

Chair Nibbelin asked if she had a view with respect to allowing flexibility to the respective font style for the anchor tenant.

Vice Chair Berman stated that, since Dep. Planning Director Murdock clarified the item she was concerned about, i.e., flexibility for the wall sign on the building, she was flexible for either option of the freestanding sign. She likes how it is visually laid out in the staff report which is pretty consistent. She understood the Oceana Market sign is a different font but she thinks it still looks nice and she did think it would look nice if they were all the same font as well.

Commissioner Hauser concurs with Vice Chair Berman, adding that she may be misunderstanding the discussion about letting Oceana Market choose everyone else's font on the freestanding sign, but that would not be her preference and she didn't know if it would be appropriate. She is just echoing Vice Chair Berman.

Chair Nibbelin didn't think the request of the applicant was to allow the anchor tenant to pick the font size but to allow a different font style between the anchor tenant and the other tenants.

Commissioner Hauser was in support of that concept and she agrees with Vice Chair Berman on what is shown in the staff report and the master sign program graphic is aesthetically appealing.

Chair Nibbelin thought they have worked through this, exhaustively and productively, and he asked if there was a motion.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she can make it but someone will have to help her a lot. She asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if they made changes to the conditions that staff recommended.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he was aware of two potential changes that may have been floated at the request of the applicant, but one subject to more discussion than the other. He stated that the first was to revise condition 2.A.ii, on packet page 64 to provide some clarity as to the horizontal access requirements for the wall signs. To avoid some unintended consequence that they are installed on one common access inadvertently, that language would be along the lines of “the anchor tenant and small tenant signs shall be center aligned with each other along a horizontal axis for each segment of building façade at the same elevation level to account for elevation differences throughout the shopping center and shall be installed in the general locations as shown on the elevations.” He stated that the other potential revision that was discussed would involve condition 2.B.iv.d, on packet page 65, under the freestanding monument sign heading addressing the font and letter styles, in order to allow flexibility for one anchor tenant panel, the Commission could change the condition to read as follows, “The font and letter height of the ‘Eureka Square Shopping Center’ identification top panel shall be as shown on the ‘New Monument Sign Elevation’ (page 9). All tenant panels shall utilize the same font, except that one anchor tenant panel may deviate from the font style required herein.”

Commissioner Hauser stated that she was amenable to both of those wordings.

Commissioner Hauser moved that the Planning Commission finds the project EXEMPT from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Sign Permit S-133-20 and Sign Exception SE-31-22, by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval as amended in Exhibit A; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference.

Chair Nibbelin appreciated Dep. Planning Director Murdock’s assistance in stitching it together.

Vice Chair Berman seconded the motion.

Dep Planner Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser
and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

Chair Nibbelin declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Hauser stated that they have been getting a lot of feedback from the public through emails and at the meetings on different things going on in the city, and for the record, she asserted that they read all the emails and they appreciate the outreach. She stated that they don't always respond but they are listening and appreciate all the work being done.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that Council has extended the public review and comment period on the Plan Pacifica draft DEIR through 5:00 pm on March 8. He stated that, for those who do not know, the Plan Pacifica process involves a comprehensive update to the city's General Plan and a new Sharp Park Specific Plan. He stated that the draft EIR would evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with both of those plans. He stated that the city encourages public involvement in the process and review and comment on the documents. He stated that anyone interested can visit Planpacifica.org to learn more and see the draft documents and draft EIR and learn more about the process.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Vice Chair Berman moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m.; Commissioner Hauser seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser and Vice Chair Berman
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Assistant City Manager/Planning
Director Wehrmeister