

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 24, 2010**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 24th day of February, 2010, at the hour of 6:35 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Andreani, Fasola, Lesser, Paralusz, Chairperson Seville-Jones
Absent: None
Staff Present: Laurie Jester, Acting Director of Community Development
Esteban Danna, Assistant Planner
Recording Secretary: Sarah Boeschen

B. REORGANIZATION

Chairperson Seville-Jones commended staff and the Commission and stated that it has been a privilege working with them as Chairperson.

Commissioner Lesser commended Commissioner Seville-Jones on her service as Chairperson. He stated that she has acted with compassion for members of the community and has helped members of the public to feel more comfortable in talking before the Commission.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she echoes the comments of Commissioner Lesser and stated that it has been a pleasure serving with Commissioner Seville-Jones on the Parking and Public Improvements Commission as well as the Planning Commission. She said that Commissioner Seville-Jones has shown great leadership and has set an excellent example for the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Andreani stated that it has been pleasure to serve on the Commission under the leadership of Commissioner Seville-Jones. She indicated that Commissioner Seville-Jones is thoughtful and balanced in listening to the other Commissioners, applicants, public, and staff.

Chairman Fasola said that he has been very impressed with the leadership that Commissioner Seville-Jones has shown in conducting the meetings and in receiving opinions and input from applicants, staff, and the public.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 13, 2010

Commissioner Paralusz requested that line 10 of the second full paragraph on page 8 of the January 13 minutes be revised to read: “She indicated that ~~it also has not been~~ the applicant has not demonstrated that the concerns expressed by the neighboring residents would be addressed with extended hours.”

Commissioner Seville-Jones, requested that language be added to page 3 to reflect her discussion with Associate Planner Haaland regarding whether the definition of changeable copy is based on the letters on signs being replaceable or on the signs including text that is constantly rotating. She indicated that such signs are different than those proposed for the Arco station.

Acting Director Jester said that language can be added to the minutes as suggested by Commissioner Seville-Jones.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Seville-Jones) to **APPROVE** the minutes of January 13, 2010, as amended.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
NOES: None.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None.

D. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

01/13/10-2 Consideration of a Use Permit Amendment to Discontinue Requirement for a Satellite Parking Facility and to Require Registered Hotel Guests to Use Paid Valet Parking at 3501 North Sepulveda Boulevard (Belamar Hotel)

Assistant Planner Danna summarized the staff report. He indicated that the site is developed with a 127 room hotel that includes 1,320 square feet of lounge area and 3,575 square feet of conference room and restaurant area. He indicated that the parking study submitted by the applicant states that the site has 74 marked parking spaces and 36 additional spaces available for use as valet parking. He stated that the hotel holds an agreement with the adjacent property at 3621 North Sepulveda Boulevard for use of an additional 17 parking spaces on evenings after 6:00 p.m., on weekends, and on bank holidays. He commented that the current Use Permit requires the hotel to provide complimentary valet service to all patrons and requires that 50 spaces be retained at the site located at 850 Sepulveda Boulevard. He stated that the proposal is to amend the current Use Permit to charge overnight guests for valet service and to remove the condition requiring off-site parking.

Assistant Planner Danna commented that the applicant's parking report indicates that eliminating the requirement for 50 off site spaces would not change the current parking conditions on the site. He said that the City Traffic Engineer has determined that although the existing parking supply does not meet the current Code requirements, the parking lots can satisfy all peak parking demand times on weekdays and weekends with the hotel at full occupancy. He stated that the Traffic Engineer has also determined that the existing condition requiring 50 off-site spaces may be suspended as long as the hotel operation remains significantly unchanged and the parking easement for the use of the 17 off-site spaces remains available. He said that the Traffic Engineer has indicated that charging for valet parking would not significantly change parking habits for overnight guests; however, a valet parking fee for restaurant use and special events guests would discourage visitors from using the on-site spaces and increase the use of street parking by hotel visitors. He said that the Traffic Engineer has recommended special conditions that would be tied to the use of the property which are included in the draft Resolution. He commented that a public notice for the hearing was mailed to the property owners within 500 feet of the subject site and published in the Beach Reporter. He indicated that staff received two letters in opposition to the proposed amendments. He stated that the Traffic Engineer has determined that the current number of parking spaces available to the hotel is sufficient for the parking demand provided that the parking and operational conditions of the hotel do not change significantly.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Assistant Planner Danna said that there have been complaints by the neighbors regarding parking under the previous ownership of the hotel.

Commissioner Lesser said that he is concerned with the parking demand during times when the hotel is full to its maximum occupancy. He asked regarding whether off-site parking may be needed when the hotel is at full occupancy.

Assistant Planner Danna said that the Traffic Engineer has determined that the number of parking spaces that would be provided without an additional 50 off-site spaces would be sufficient. He pointed out that the City can review the site a year after approval to make any necessary modifications.

Commissioner Lesser asked whether it has been taken into consideration that hotel guests may park on the adjacent streets if they learn that there is a charge for valet parking. He asked if there is any method proposed to encourage guests to pay the fee for valet parking rather than park on the street.

Assistant Planner Danna said that a condition is included to provide for a review of the site after six months or a year.

Commissioner Andreani commented that the proposal to charge overnight guests for parking does not seem unusual based upon hotels she has visited in other cities. She said, however, that she is not certain of the practice in Manhattan Beach. She asked whether there are other hotels in the City which charge for overnight parking.

Assistant Planner Danna indicated that the Marriott does charge for parking.

In response to a question, Acting Director Jester pointed out that many projects which have multiple uses are granted parking reductions. She commented that hotel and restaurant uses frequently have shared parking because they have different peak times.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, Assistant Planner Danna indicated that 246 parking spaces would be required if the hotel were to be built today, and the requirement from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) is for 145 parking spaces. He indicated that the existing parking includes 110 parking spaces with an additional 17 parking spaces available during evenings and weekends.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked regarding the wording of the signage indicating that overnight guests would be charged a fee for valet service and that it would be free for short-term guests. She asked whether being made aware that other guests are not being charged would make overnight guests feel that they are being treated differently.

Assistant Planner Danna pointed out that it is common practice for hotels to charge overnight guests for parking. He stated that the intent of the signage would be to encourage people who are attending events at the hotel to use the valet service by informing them that they would not be charged.

Chairman Fasola asked regarding the wording of the signs that would be placed on Oak Avenue to discourage hotel guests from parking within the neighborhood as required in Condition 19 of the draft Resolution.

Assistant Planner Danna said that the signs along Oak Avenue may include language which indicates that complimentary valet parking is available for hotel events.

In response to a question from Chairperson Fasola, Acting Manager Jester stated that the Seaview Inn and the El Porto Motel are located in residential neighborhoods.

John Mackel, general counsel for the hotel operator, indicated that they are glad to be part of the community and want to work with the neighbors. He said that they attempt to be good participants in the communities in which they are located. He commented that their company acquired the hotel at the end of 2006, and their operation is oriented toward business travelers. He pointed out that most business travelers are generally quiet and do not tend to create disturbances. He pointed out that charging for valet service would generate substantial revenue for the hotel. He commented that the current off site parking arrangement is tenuous, which is a challenge in attempting to attract lenders to invest in the hotel. He indicated that they would support a condition requiring hotel employees to park on site. He said that there would also be a condition regarding ride sharing.

Tim McOsker, an attorney with Mayer Brown LLP, representing the applicant, said that the original conditions requiring additional off-site parking and free valet service were intended to mitigate the impact of the hotel operation on the adjacent neighbors. He stated that the owners are working very hard to communicate with the neighbors and to comply with the spirit of the conditions. He pointed out that they now do not have access to the 50 off-site parking spaces previously allotted by Allied Signal, as that site is now part of Plaza El Segundo. He indicated that the current owner of the hotel found that the additional spaces were not used and are not necessary for the hotel operation. He indicated that they hired a consultant to conduct a comprehensive parking study. He stated that the conclusions of the parking study show that all cars can be accommodated even with full occupancy at the hotel.

Mr. McOsker said that their original application was for elimination of the requirement to maintain 50 off-site spaces and for the owners to have the ability to charge all hotel guests for valet parking. He indicated that after further input from the City, they later amended the application to request elimination of the off-site parking requirement and to request the ability to charge only overnight guests for valet service. He said that the City's Traffic Engineer agrees with the applicant's parking consultant that all parking for the hotel can be accommodated without the additional 50 off-site parking spaces and that charging for overnight parking would not impact the adjacent neighborhood. He stated that the staff has drafted conditions that they feel are fair. He indicated that there would be a condition included that employees shall not park on the adjacent streets, and evidence of employees parking on the street would be a violation of the Conditional Use Permit. He said that they are working on establishing a ride share program. He stated that there is also a condition that the project shall be in substantial conformance with the project description submitted to the Commission and that any substantial deviation from the approved plans must be reviewed by the Director of Community Development. He said that there is also a condition that the City reserves the right to modify valet parking operations if parking conditions on City streets worsen as determined by the Traffic Engineer. He pointed out that those conditions allow staff and the Commission the ability to exercise their discretion.

Tom Beedon, the general manager of the hotel, said that they attempt to run a successful business and want to reach out to the neighbors. He commented that they have put a large amount of money into making changes to the hotel based on the feedback that they have received from the neighbors. He indicated that their goal was to base the operation of the hotel toward business travelers, and they built a meeting center to accommodate their business customers. He stated that they renovated the ballroom in the courtyard area to provide

soundproofing in order to mitigate noise impacts to the neighbors. He commented that they have also hosted block parties for the adjacent neighbors.

Commissioner Lesser pointed out that the Commissioners need to be concerned about any changes a future owner may make to the hotel, as the conditions of the Use Permit remain with the property once it is sold.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. McOsker** pointed out that the prior owner did acquire the use of 50 off-site spaces at alternative locations when the use of the parking lot at Allied Signal was lost. He indicated, however, that he does not have information regarding the use of the spaces at the Allied Signal lot by the previous owner.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Sarah Drobis**, Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., said that their parking study took place on a weekend when the hotel was at full occupancy and when a wedding was occurring which maximized the use of the event space.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether any thought was given as to how hotel guests would react to signage which indicates that parking is complimentary for short term visitors but not for overnight guests.

Ms. Drobis said that her understanding is that it is customary for hotels to charge for overnight parking. She pointed out that the signage would be intended to encourage hotel visitors who are not staying at the hotel to use the valet service rather than parking on the street.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she understands that many hotels charge for valet service in areas that are not near residents and where there are no alternatives for parking. She indicated, however, that there are neighborhood streets adjacent to the subject property where overnight guests of the hotel could park in order to avoid paying the fee.

Ms. Drobis indicated that the hotel would provide notice to their business customers regarding the charge.

Chairman Fasola asked regarding the current parking conditions of the hotel.

Ms. Drobis said that they did observe employees and visitors parking on Oak Avenue when the parking study was conducted. She pointed out that the draft Resolution includes a condition that all hotel employees would be required to park on site.

Commissioner Paralusz asked regarding the method the valet would use to distinguish between a short term guest and an overnight guest.

Mr. McOsker commented that the valet charge would be included on the hotel bill rather than paid to the valet operator.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Beedon** said that they would accommodate a guest who requests that the valet charge be taken off of their bill.

Chairman Fasola opened the public hearing.

Audience Participation

Dottie Carey, a resident of Oak Avenue, said that the conditions in the neighborhood have improved since the new owner has operated the hotel. She stated that the general manager does communicate with the neighbors and has made improvements to the hotel. She commented, however, that there will be more of an issue of hotel guests parking on the neighborhood streets if the hotel charges for valet service. She suggested that parking meters be installed which would discourage hotel guests from parking on the adjacent streets. She commented that the former owner of the hotel used the 50 off-site parking spaces at the satellite lot to shuttle employees. She asked whether the parking study included employee parking in considering times that the hotel is at full capacity.

Beth Emery, a resident of Elm Avenue, said that the operators have been good neighbors. She commented, however, that she does feel there would be a potential significant impact to the adjacent residents if the hotel charges for valet service. She stated that she has witnessed what she believes were employees of the hotel parking in the neighborhood. She commented that she also has witnessed a valet parking a car in the neighborhood on two occasions. She said that she always attempts to save her company from a valet charge if possible when she travels on business. She commented that the Marriott hotel does charge a parking fee, and the surrounding businesses have become very adamant about not allowing parking for the Marriott on their properties. She stated that she does believe there would be an impact to the neighbors if the hotel charges for valet service.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Ms. Emery** said that she understands that the City needs to be friendly to businesses; however she does not feel that the proposals to charge for valet service and to eliminate the requirement for off-site parking should be granted.

Ann Rose, a resident of Elm Avenue, said that the applicant has been a good neighbor. She commented that traffic for the hotel is currently very light because of the slow economy; however, parking problems could become worse once the economy improves.

Josh Cooperman, a resident of Elm Avenue, said that the hotel has been a good neighbor; however, he does not feel the subject proposals for charging for valet service and for eliminating the off-site parking requirement should be approved. He said that there has been a parking issue in the adjacent neighborhood when larger events have occurred at the hotel. He said that **Mr. Beedon** has always called him back when he has made complaints. He commented that parking on the adjacent streets is impacted when there are large events at the hotel. He stated that he has witnessed the valets parking cars on the adjacent streets, and he has seen employees parking on the street. He stated that the condition requiring employees on site would be unenforceable. He pointed out that people will park on the adjacent streets if they have the option of parking for free rather than paying for valet service. He said that it would be very difficult to differentiate between hotel guests that are visiting for a short term or staying overnight. He commented that the off-site parking is not currently utilized because hotel guests are not made aware that it is available.

Jason Love, a resident of Oak Avenue, said that he has observed hotel guests parking on the adjacent street when the valet parking is full. He stated that he is not certain whether it was taken into account in the parking calculation that employees would be required to park on site which would reduce the amount of available parking for hotel guests. He commented that he has witnessed employees of the hotel parking on the adjacent streets. He said that consideration was not given to having time limits for parking or placing meters on the adjacent streets to encourage visitors of the hotel to use the valet.

Mr. Beedon commented that **Mr. Cooperman** has talked to him regarding hotel employees parking on the street. He pointed out that they have designated an area of their lot for employee parking. He stated that they have contacted a labor attorney to determine whether it can be made a rule of employment that employees are required to park on site. He indicated that he was not aware previously of any instances of valets parking cars on the adjacent streets.

Ms. Drobis commented that they did observe hotel employees parking in the neighborhood when they were conducting the parking study. She said that the study did account for all of the parking that was observed on the adjacent streets.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Andreani commented that she feels that the primary problem is regarding the parking for hotel guests and not the employees. She said that employee parking can be controlled by the operator. She stated that she is concerned about the number of satellite spaces that would be available for use by the hotel. She indicated that she concurs with requiring the ITE standard of 145 parking spaces, as the hotel would not be at maximum capacity at all hours. She indicated, however, that there is a discrepancy between the 145 as required by the ITE and the 127 that are available for use by the hotel. She commented that she is not clear regarding the alternative locations for off-site parking that are available to the hotel and how they are utilized. She commented that she would like to arrive at a parking solution which would not exacerbate the problems for the immediate neighbors. She asked whether restriping of the parking lot was considered in order to add parking spaces. She indicated that the 50 parking spaces which were previously available to the hotel at Plaza El Segundo were most likely not utilized because they are quite a distance from the hotel. She also suggested the possibility of guests parking at an off-site facility. She also suggested the possibility of establishing a residential parking permit program for certain residents on Oak Avenue, Elm Avenue, and 35th Street. She commented that she would lean toward denying the request to charge overnight guests for valet service, as there could be an impact to the adjacent residents from hotel guests parking on the adjacent streets in order to avoid paying the fee.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would support allowing the hotel to retain fewer than 50 off-site spaces but feels that there is a need to retain some off-site parking. She suggested that the applicant be required to retain 18 off-site spaces for use by the hotel rather than 50 as currently required since this would be the total spaces required by the ITE standards. She also suggested that the spaces could be used for employees or valet overflow parking. She commented that she is concerned that eliminating the requirement for 50 off-site parking spaces altogether may make it difficult to require that a lesser number of off-site spaces be retained in the future if necessary. She said that retaining 18 off-site spaces would make it possible to determine whether they are utilized and whether they are necessary in order to accommodate the parking demand. She said that she is encouraged that the applicant would be able to prevent employees from parking on the street. She commented that unlike a downtown area where hotel guests are forced to use valet parking, the subject site is in a residential area where there is free parking available on the adjacent streets. She suggested that she may be more agreeable to allowing the applicant to charge for valet service if a permit parking program is established or if meters are installed on the adjacent streets in order to discourage guests of the hotel from parking on the street.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she feels the number of spaces required by the ITE is appropriate rather than the City Code requirement. She commented that she is reluctant to eliminate parking requirements, particularly for a successful business. She said that she would also support retaining 18 off-site parking spaces which would match the ITE requirement. She said that she is also concerned that it would be difficult to require that any off-site spaces be

retained in the future if the requirement for retaining the 50 off-site parking spaces is eliminated altogether. She commented that she was not aware previously that the Belamar Hotel did not charge for valet service, and she does not know if hotel guests would be aware that there is no fee even with signage. She said that she will park on the street when possible in order to avoid a valet charge. She said that she is not certain that she could support allowing the hotel to charge overnight guests for valet service.

Commissioner Lesser commended the applicant on their efforts in being a good neighbor to the residents and also thanked the residents for their input. He stated that the Commission must consider the future use of the property. He commented that he feels that it seems fair for the neighboring residents to expect some inconvenience during larger events that may occur infrequently; however, the concern is the impact to the neighbors if large events occur on a frequent basis in the future. He stated that his concern is whether larger events at the hotel would generate more cars than can be accommodated. He commented that he would like more input from staff as to whether they feel requiring the hotel to retain the use of 18 off-site spaces would be appropriate. He indicated that the Commission does have concerns with lowering parking requirements; however their decisions need to be based on clear data. He said that he would be receptive to a requirement that the hotel retain 18 off-site spaces for overflow parking. He commented that it is customary for hotels to charge for valet service. He stated that he has gone to events at the hotel and has parked on the street because there has been a line of cars waiting for the valet service. He indicated that he also was not previously aware that there was no charge for valet service at the hotel. He stated that he is concerned with the impact that would result from the hotel charging overnight guests for valet service and is not certain how it would be implemented. He pointed out that the wording in the draft Resolution would allow staff the opportunity to modify the restrictions in the future. He indicated that he would be receptive to allowing the applicant an opportunity to test charging for valet service in order to determine the extent of any impacts.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester said that the Commission would have the option of approving the application and directing that the applicant pursue the possibility of placing a two hour time limit for parking on the adjacent streets, but there is no guarantee that the parking restrictions would be approved. She said that placing restrictions on street parking would require review by the Parking and Public Improvements Commission and City Council.

Commissioner Lesser pointed out that regulating the parking on the street would be a separate procedure that would be apart from the subject request.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester indicated that her understanding is that the parking study did take into account parking when the hotel was at its maximum occupancy both with the rooms and a large event. She pointed out that the applicant currently has contracts for use of 50 off-site parking spaces. She indicated that ITE parking requirement is used as a comparison in the parking report. She said that a requirement for retaining 18 off-site parking spaces would be an appropriate number to consider. She commented that she is uncertain of the exact number of spaces in each of the three off-site lots that the hotel is currently permitted to use, and it may be appropriate to use one of those lots although they may have slightly fewer than 18 spaces.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that she has a concern with the impact of the hotel charging overnight guests for valet parking because people would have the option of avoiding the charge by parking in the adjacent neighborhood. She said that requiring paid valet parking for overnight guests would encourage people to park on the adjacent streets. She said that she is not inclined to permit the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service.

Chairman Fasola indicated that he feels retaining the use of 50 off-site spaces may not be necessary. He said that and he would support reducing the required number of off-site spaces provided that it can be reviewed by the City and that there is the flexibility to increase the number in the future if necessary. He stated that he does not feel that he can support allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service. He indicated that the subject site is located within a residential community which requires sensitivity to the neighbors. He indicated that charging for parking would result in some hotel guests parking on the street. He commented that he has parked on the street when he has visited the hotel. He also pointed out that there currently business at the hotel is slower because of the economy, and parking for the hotel could become more of an issue as the economy improves.

Acting Manager Jester said that her understanding from the discussion is that there is not support by the Commissioners for allowing the applicant to charge for valet service and that there is support for requiring the applicant to maintain 18 or so off-site parking spaces rather than 50 as currently required. She indicated that staff can modify the draft Resolution to reflect the position of the Commission.

Commissioner Andreani asked for further clarification regarding the wording of the signage that would be placed at the hotel to discourage guests from parking on the adjacent streets.

Acting Manager Jester indicated that the wording of the signs would be considered further and discussed with the City's Traffic Engineer and the applicant.

Mr. McOsker indicated that they would request flexibility if the Commission decides to require 18 off-site parking spaces, as it would be very restrictive for them to be forced to retain parking at a specific location. He commented that he would urge the Commission to allow them the opportunity to test charging overnight guests for valet service and revisit the issue in six months or a year to determine whether there are any impacts to the neighbors.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she would not support allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service. She said that she is not willing to risk any additional impacts to the residents resulting from the hotel charging guests for valet service.

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that she also would not support allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service. She indicated that she would consider allowing the applicant to charge for valet service if it were in conjunction with parking restrictions on the adjacent streets.

Commissioner Andreani said that she would not support allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service.

Commissioner Lesser said that he would be willing to consider the issue of allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service in the future if there were limitations placed on parking along the adjacent streets; however, such a process is not under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Fasola commented that he also is not in favor of allowing the applicant to charge overnight guests for valet service because it would impact on the neighbors.

Mr. McOsker pointed out that the parking on the adjacent streets would be improved by the condition in the draft Resolution requiring employees to park on site. He also indicated that the valet charge is the most important part of their application. He said that they feel charging overnight guests for valet service could be implemented without impacting their business. He

said that they would like the opportunity to have the item continued until the next meeting so that they can consider their options further.

Chairman Fasola reopened the public hearing.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED to (Seville-Jones/Andreani) to **CONTINUE** consideration of a Use Permit Amendment to discontinue requirement for a satellite parking facility and to require registered hotel guests to use paid valet parking at 3501 North Sepulveda Boulevard to the meeting of March 10, 2010.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola

NOES: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None

F. DIRECTORS ITEMS

None.

G. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that the joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting on February 23 was very productive. She said that the issues discussed included the Tree Ordinance and Use Permits, and the Sepulveda Corridor Guidelines. She indicated that hopefully within the next year revisions will come forward for the Tree Ordinance and Green Building Code.

Commissioner Lesser thanked the City Council for a meeting with a broad discussion of issues.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, Acting Manager Jester said that Arco has withdrawn their plans for replacing the service station on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She said that they may chose to renovate the existing structure on the site or build a new structure, same size and location, which would not require a Use Permit rather than to build a new larger structure.

H. TENTATIVE AGENDA March 10, 2010

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m. to Wednesday, March 10, 2010, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

LAURIE JESTER, Acting Community Development Director